

**The London School of Economics and Political
Science**

*Hans Morgenthau's Scientific Man Versus Power Politics
and Politics Among Nations: A Comparative Analysis*

Curran Flynn

A thesis submitted to the Department of International
Relations of the London School of Economics for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy, London, September 2014

Declaration

I certify that the thesis I have presented for examination for the MPhil/PhD degree of the London School of Economics and Political Science is solely my own work other than where I have clearly indicated that it is the work of others (in which case the extent of any work carried out jointly by me and any other person is clearly identified in it).

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Quotation from it is permitted, provided that full acknowledgement is made. This thesis may not be reproduced without my prior written consent.

I warrant that this authorisation does not, to the best of my belief, infringe the rights of any third party.

I declare that my thesis consists of 73814 words.

Abstract

This thesis explores the discrepancies and apparent contradictions between *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics* and *Politics Among Nations*, two of Hans Morgenthau's seminal works, published in 1946 and 1948 respectively. Despite the large amount of material published on Morgenthau this discrepancy has been overlooked. Analysing these two works is achieved through the use of the Skinnerian method. To understand the purpose of the books the thesis compares each book with similar books that Morgenthau read during this period, as well as utilizing his personal correspondence to understand his motivation. The thesis argues that the tension between the works is a result of their contrasting purposes and the shift in Morgenthau's thinking wrought by changes in the external context. This external context is Morgenthau's acclimatization to US academia, the growth of the discipline of International Relations (IR) within it, and the onset of the Cold War. As well as throwing light on the cogency of Morgenthau's IR contribution, the thesis illuminates the general IR literature of this period, much of which has languished under the shade of *Politics Among Nations* in particular.

Acknowledgements

A thesis is never the product of one individual. Intellectually the ideas of the author are blended with the suggestions of others. Ideas are casually adopted and modified by the author, knowingly or unknowingly, to form part of his work. Many times this influence is impossible to detect, even for the author himself. Therefore, most people I have interacted with in the last 5 years have all made a contribution to the writing of this thesis.

Most notably I would like to thank my parents Colin and Sharon. Their support has been unwavering throughout this journey. The long conversations with my father helped reassure me that I was on the right track and that the process was manageable. Without them I doubt the thesis would have seen completion.

My partner Farina was a constant source of encouragement throughout the thesis. She endured my discussions about the topic and was understanding when I was engaged in writing.

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Peter Wilson. His comments and encouragement were an incalculable benefit to the work.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

The Problem of History and Method Page 6

Chapter 2

The Analytical Approaches to the Works of Hans Morgenthau Page 35

Chapter 3

The Creation of Scientific Man Page 61

Chapter 4

Politics Among Nations Among its Contemporaries Page 83

Chapter 5

The Influence of Political Geography Page 113

Chapter 6

The Progression of Rationalism Page 150

Chapter 7

Diverging Ethics Page 179

Chapter 8

Conclusion Page 227

Bibliography Page 230

Chapter 1

The Problem of History and Method

Introduction

Realism is a theory which has dominated the field of International Relations (hereafter referred to as IR) for over half a century, resulting in numerous variations and giving rise to innumerable discussions of its merits from countless political theorists. Its leading disciple is arguably Hans Morgenthau, the preeminent American realist, whose work has garnered a recent revitalization due to a plethora of works analyzing his life and his writings.¹ This leads to a poignant question posed in one of these works: why does there need to be another study on Hans Morgenthau?² As with most deceptively simple questions the answer is both simple and complex. In this case the general answer is contained within the essence of the question. The simple answer is that there are issues in Morgenthau's work which have not been addressed and thus have a need for examination. The unspoken question that this answer raises is why should these issues pursued in this research be examined? The simplest answer is that as they are not answered it is a worthwhile pursuit to try and add to the sum of human knowledge. However, this does not give any answer to the question of priority, i.e. why this topic and not another?

¹ See Christoph Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2001) ; William E. Scheuerman, *Morgenthau* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009) ; Mihaela Neascu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations: Disenchantment and Re-Enchantment* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) ; Oliver Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) ; Benjamin A. Schupmann, *Morgenthau mal compris: Investigating the Philosophical Roots of Hans Morgenthau's Political Realism*. (Saarbrücken: Verlag Dr. Müller, 2011) ; Michael C. Williams, ed., *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J Morgenthau in International Relations*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

² Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, Viii.

The more complex answer is that the refinement and understanding of Hans Morgenthau's thought is important for IR due to his theory's ubiquity. It is easily the most maligned and misunderstood theory despite the overwhelming attention that it has been given by the academic community. However, there are many articles which adequately explain his thought to those who have been indoctrinated with oversimplifications or fictitious claims. As Duncan Bell notes recent work has sought to show that realism is "a sophisticated, albeit amorphous, body of political theory that draws deep from the well of western (above all German) social and political thought."³ To add to this literature would not accomplish any meaningful ends other than reiterate a point made by others. However, once the general clarifications have been made regarding what Morgenthau's theory is, a deeper analysis of the theory is needed in order to grasp the full dimensions and intricacies of his position. There are many accounts which do this, dealing with a particular issue, analyzing his work as a whole or analyzing segments of his work in the form of an intellectual biography.⁴ This present work differs from these in its subject matter, as it explores the discrepancies and apparent contradictions between *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*⁵ (hereafter referred to as *SMPP*) and *Politics Among Nations*⁶ (hereafter referred to as *PAN*), two of Morgenthau's seminal works which were written in 1946 and 1948, respectively. The discrepancies that result from comparing these two pieces of work underlines a striking tension within Morgenthau's work that has not yet been adequately explored.⁷ In analyzing these two works it will be crucial to place them in their context by identifying the purpose of the book in general and its

³ Duncan Bell, "Writing the World," *International Affairs* 85 (2009): 6.

⁴ Examples of the work which deals with Morgenthau's thought in general or as part of an intellectual biography are listed above. See footnote 1.

⁵ Hans Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946).

⁶ Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle For Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1948).

⁷ The contrasting points between the two works will be summarized in the next chapter which will provide an outline of the thesis as well as a review on the relevant literature on Morgenthau.

constituent parts and what perception Morgenthau was trying to argue against. In doing this the external context of the period as well as the internal academic discourse needs to be examined to properly elucidate the reasons for these tensions.

Criticisms of a historical approach

In order to engage upon this project it is necessary to address some general objections. In examining the past there are always criticisms that are levelled against its study. First among these is the implicit criticism in any non-historical field of whether examining the history of the discipline and its key thinkers is a worthwhile pursuit. A possible response is given by Quentin Skinner who states that “the analysis of political ideology is inescapably a historical subject” and thus “it is the merest parochialism to imply that this constitutes a reason for refusing to assign it the place which it clearly deserves in any academic study of politics.”⁸ This answer corresponds to the simple answer above, that the issue regarding Morgenthau’s work is part of the discipline and as it has not been answered it is necessary to answer it. But this answer is subject to the countering criticism that historical study is the equivalent to the interest of antiquarian furniture dealers in aspects of a chair's "authenticity" or "genuineness," completely without regard for what the chair may be useful for today.⁹ This criticism obviously places a premium on the functional value of academic work towards the present. While this view can be seen as parochial or depressingly philistine¹⁰, it has the support of many political

⁸ Quentin Skinner, “Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action,” *Political Theory* 2 (1974): 282.

⁹Peter L. Janssen, “Political Thought as Traditionary Action: The Critical Response to Skinner and Pocock,” *History and Theory* 24 (1985): 125.

¹⁰ Duncan Bell, “Political Theory and the functions of Intellectual history: a response to Emmanuel Navon,” *Review of International Studies* 29 (2003): 156. Quentin Skinner, “A Reply to My Critics,” in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. James Tully (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988), 286.

academics.¹¹ However, the study of the past in the field of politics is different from mere antiquarianism and its utility towards the present should not be seen as diminishing its aesthetic value. The method in which the past has utility towards the present is subject to many competing metaphysical claims. The first which has already been partially illustrated is that the present is in the subject matter of the past. Namely, that what we choose to study is motivated by the discussions that are occurring at the present.¹² In this particular case, a revitalization of Morgenthau's thought has occurred and the present study is being undertaken in order to add to what the author believes is a gap in the literature. Obviously the historian does work based on his own intellectual priorities, but these priorities cannot help but be influenced by the context of the present.¹³ In the article *A Reply to My Critics*, Quentin Skinner advocates the study of the past so that our own attitudes can be understood reflectively in the present.¹⁴ However, this is not to advocate that there is a direct parallel between the present and the past. Clearly issues in the past are different than ones today. One would not read a book about the foreign policy of Mao and try to use it as an interpretative tool to the practices of China today. However, the study of the past, for example the practices of Mao's foreign policy, can be explained from multiple perspectives using a variety of sources and thus we can use that knowledge to see what happened during this period as clearly as possible. With this knowledge we can then understand how the events that occurred between Mao's era and the

¹¹ See Alexander George, "Knowledge for Statecraft" *International Security* 22 (1997): 44-52 ; Stephen H. Haber, David M. Kennedy and Stephen D. Krasner, "Brothers Under the Skin: Diplomatic History and International Relations," *International Security* 22 (1997):34-43 ; Edward Ingram, "The Wonderland of The Political Scientist," *International Security* 22 (1997):53-63 ; Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, "Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory: Respecting Difference and Crossing Boundaries," *International Security* 22 (1997): 5-21.

¹² Jonathan B. Isacoff, "On the Historical Imagination of International Relations: The Case for a 'Deweyan Reconstruction'," *Millennium* 31 (2002):625.

¹³ Skinner, "A Reply to My Critics," 248 ; Skinner, "Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action," 281 ; Isacoff, "On the Historical Imagination of International Relations," 614.

¹⁴ Skinner, "A Reply to My Critics," 287.

present and from that China's foreign policy today can be understood.¹⁵ Therefore it can be seen how our ideas of thought developed from the past and this helps to understand in a genealogical sense what has happened.¹⁶

This genealogical reason is also championed by Brian Schmidt who argues that analysis of the past allows for critical reflection upon the present through understanding the method by which our present assumptions and ideas are formed.¹⁷ An additional reason provided by Schmidt is that the field is shrouded in a mythology about its origins and development that distorts debate. Many authors continually use the past to justify the validity of their own theoretical positions, even though the evocation of the past to solve a contemporary issue is anachronistic and a clear example of the "appeal to authority" fallacy.¹⁸ While it should be noted that this form of rhetoric is anachronistic this unfortunately does not seem to limit its use in argument.¹⁹ Thus, the examination of the past can provide two separate methods to combat this. The first is to show contextually how the origins and development of the object of inquiry differ from the present. The second is to expose errors in commonly held assumptions

¹⁵ The example of Mao is used as it is perhaps the starkest contrast between the era when Morgenthau's writings were taking place and the present that would be understood by a wide audience of political scholars. A similar example using Stalin and Russia today is more historically accurate for illustration of the point, as a contrast between the period of the late 40's and now, however it does not provide as radical a change which adequately highlights the importance of studying the past.

¹⁶ Skinner, "A Reply to My Critics," 286-287; Gerald Holden, "Who contextualizes the contextualizers? Disciplinary history and the discourse about IR discourse," *Review of International Studies* 28 (2002): 263.

¹⁷ Brian Schmidt, "On the History and Historiography of International Relations," in *Handbook of International Relations*, eds. Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmond (London:Sage,2002),4.

¹⁸ The appeal to authority fallacy can be defined as the use of a prominent event or idea from the past which is evoked by an individual who wishes to use it for his own ideological ends in the present. An example would be the admonition that negotiation with the enemy is equivalent to Chamberlain's appeasement to Hitler. It is a powerful rhetorical tool as the spectre of World War Two still looms large. However, the contextual factors would be different and thus the conclusion the arguer is trying to impress about the audience is contextually false. However, this obviously does not delegitimize the arguer's total position, merely that the analogy he is using is not factually accurate.

¹⁹ Duncan Bell, "Language, Legitimacy and the Project of Critique," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27 (2002): 333.

about the event in the past, thus limiting its traditional use.²⁰ This has clear relevance for IR in particular.²¹ Brian Schmidt's use of this strategy is set out in his book *The Political Discourse of Anarchy* in order to dismantle the myth of the First Great Debate and the pejorative use of idealism by realists in order to try and establish ideological supremacy.²² Related to this is the argument on the effect that history has upon the formation of identity. As individuals and groups gain identity through a unifying label, the history of that label should be investigated in order to illuminate its meaning.²³ The present study thus helps clarify the historic concept of realism through understanding Morgenthau's early works and the context of the discipline of IR after the Second World War.

A final criticism of the history of IR is that it is a "retreat into self-referential navel-gazing,"²⁴ or narcissism.²⁵ Reflecting this concern, one senior British IR scholar writes that he shudders at the thought that the history of the discipline of political science might itself become a recognised research field.²⁶ This criticism is intricately linked with the discussion of presentism above. It implies that there is no inherent reason why the history should be studied. As this point has been addressed above this element of the criticism will not be explored further. However, two other points need to be quickly stated in relation to this

²⁰ Skinner, "Reply to My Critics," 287.

²¹ For an analysis of the problem of reification in theory generally see Daniel Levine, *Recovering International Relations: The Promise of Sustainable Critique* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). For use of this strategy in relation to realism in particular see Molloy, *The Hidden History of Realism*.

²² Brian C Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1998), 1-42.

²³ Bell, "Language and Legitimacy," 333 ; Elman and Elman, "Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory," 9.

²⁴ Patrick Finney, "Still Marking Time? Text, discourse, and truth in International History," *Review of International Studies* 27 (2001):305.

²⁵ Bell, "Writing the World," 3.

²⁶ Chris Brown, "International Political Theory – A British Social Science?," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 2 (2000):118. Duncan Bell seems to imply that this comment represents an attack on the historical study of IR. However, the context of the statement seems to imply that it is more benign. See Bell, "Writing the World," 3.

criticism. The first is that no one is suggesting that all historians or political scholars should suddenly abandon all other projects to devote themselves entirely to critical historiography. Ultimately such investigations are relatively rare both in the field of the historian²⁷ and of the political scientist.²⁸ Lastly, this criticism is a little late. Prior to this criticism work on the history of the field had been conducted since the 1940's, albeit with little research into the beginnings of the field.²⁹

The Methodology of Quentin Skinner

Skinner's method is the most suitable for exploring the reason for the discrepancies between the books. The method contains several important aspects, all of which can be used profitably in discovering the discrepancies between *PAN* and *SMPP*. The methodology in its barest form can be described as a comprehensive study of the contemporary texts of the author's historic period, both minor and major, in order to understand the social internal context of the discipline and the relationships between them while relating these texts to the

²⁷ In 1998 an Institute of Historical Research survey of the top ten interests of UK historians revealed that 387 respondents identified their main interest as gender/women where only 386 expressed a similar concern with international relations. It should be noted that this is history of international relations in general, ie the relations between states rather than the much smaller study of the history of the academic field. See Finney, "Still Marking Time," 297.

²⁸ To my knowledge there are no official figures related to the production of literature by subject matter in international relations. However a cursory knowledge of international relations and the historiography of the field leads to the suspicion that the ratio is miniscule.

²⁹ For a very brief selection of some of these works See Carl J. Friedrich, "Instruction and Research: Political Science in the United States in Wartime," *The American Political Science Review* 41 (1947): 978-989 ; William T.R.Fox, "Interwar International Relations Research: The American Experience," *World Politics* 2 (1949):67-79 ; Arnold Wolfers, "International Relations As a Field of Study," *Columbia Journal of International Affairs* 1 (1947): 24 ; William T.R.Fox and Annette Baker Fox, "The Teaching of International Relations in The United States," *World Politics* 13 (1961):339-359 ; Pierre Renouvin and Jean-Bapiste Duroselle, *Introduction To The History of International Relations* (New York: Frederick A Praeger, 1961) ; Stanley Hoffman, "An American Social Science: International Relations," *Daedalus* 106 (1977): 41 -60 ; David Long and Peter Wilson, eds., *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-War Idealism Reassessed* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) and Ole Waever, "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations," *International Organization* 52 (1998): 687-727.

external social context that was occurring at the time of writing.³⁰ Skinner's method and its use can be divided into three sections, general method and theory, contextualism and speech acts.

1. General method and theory

Skinner argues that the historian is not expected to provide a correct interpretation, in the sense that it explains everything perfectly and thereby discredits all competing accounts.³¹ He refers to the hope of having complete intelligibility of the past as overly optimistic.³² Due to the partial nature of our understanding of the past it would be absurd to claim complete knowledge over it. Therefore Skinner parallels Oakeshott's maxim that we are engaged not in an argument but a conversation.³³ But Skinner's insistence that we cannot know the full picture is not a reversion to a form of extreme historic idealism. In contrast, Skinner critiques those that try to ascertain a full picture of history, thus he criticizes Bruadel and the Annales School for dealing with trivial matters, and ultimately failing as there are infinite facts which would take an infinite amount of time to detail.³⁴

One of the key issues in intellectual history is the assigning of influence on thought. As Bell notes, the tracing of influence on an individual is a particularly challenging task.³⁵ Skinner proposes that to show influence of A upon B it is necessary to show that B had some contact

³⁰ Bell, "Language, Legitimacy, and the Project of Critique," 331 ; Dunn, "Identity and the History of Ideas," 88-89.

³¹ Quentin Skinner, "Motives, Intentions and the Interpretation of Texts," *New Literary History* 3 (1972): 393.

³² Skinner, "A Reply to My Critics," 259.

³³ Michael Oakeshott, "Political Education" in *Rationalism in Politics And Other Essays* (Liberty Fund: Indianapolis, 1991),58.

³⁴ Kari Palonen, *Quentin Skinner: History, Politics, Rhetoric* (Oxford: Polity Press, 2003),24 ;Skinner, "Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action," 280.

³⁵ Duncan Bell, "Unity and Difference: John Robert Seeley and the political theology of international relations," *Review of International Studies* 31 (2005):575.

with A. This could be either mentioning his work, or proof that he owned copies of A's books. Then the historian has to isolate the distinguishing characteristic of A's work. If B shares the same characteristic it is possible that one influenced the other. After doing this it has to be ascertained that this characteristic could not be caused by another idea or event. If it appears that B shares the same distinguishing characteristics and has come into contact with A's works the historian can therefore claim that A might have influenced B. Skinner warns though that this is still subject to criticism as the case of influence is never absolute. But its possibility is defensible.³⁶ A second contention involved in intellectual history is the tendency to see thinkers as exhibiting cohesive doctrines throughout their writings. This results in the oversimplification of various thinkers to specific bullet points which they intricately tied, both in the literature and in collective memory. Examples are Hobbes and anarchy, and Locke and republicanism. The phrase Machiavellianism is now taken to mean "the employment of cunning and duplicity in statecraft or in general conduct". This ignores the other contributions to political theory made by these writers. Hobbes translated many Greek works into English including *The Iliad*, *The Odyssey* and *The History of The Peloponnesian War*. He also wrote extensively on rhetoric, sophistry and the philosophical conception of liberty. Machiavelli wrote extensively on republicanism³⁷ and Locke's work is characterized by a change from support for autocracy in his youth to the well-known republicanism of his later life.³⁸ As a result of these caricatures inconsistencies in these thinkers' writings are discarded, swept away in awe of a supposed coherent doctrine of thought. In Skinner's estimation it is more likely that the writer merely overextended his intelligence and thus caused a contradiction, or that their

³⁶ Quentin Skinner, "The Limits of Historical Explanations," *Philosophy* 41 (1966):203-212.

³⁷ Niccolo Machiavelli, *Discourses on the Ten Books of Titus Livy*, trans. Harvey C Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

³⁸ Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8 (1969):19.

views, as in the case of Locke, simply changed over time.³⁹ Thus Skinner emphasizes the complexity and possible non-coherence of large bodies of intellectual work, the difficulty in assigning intellectual influences on an author, and the inability of the historian to fully know what happened in the past. Taken together these tenets seem pessimistic and appear to accentuate the inherent difficulty of history rather than illuminating the discussion's progression. Fortunately Skinner gives some positive guidance in dealing with the past through the methods of contextualism and speech acts.

2. Contextualism

Before a discussion can begin on contextualism it is important to clarify what it means. In the sense used in this work it simply means the placing of the text within its relevant historic context.⁴⁰ Contextualism is needed as it is at the heart of what is history. As Lawrence Stone argues, "The discipline of history is above all a discipline of context. It deals with a particular set of actors at a particular time in a particular place".⁴¹ A contextual history would examine the history of the period and the surrounding texts in order to gain an understanding of the world the object of inquiry inhabited.⁴² Ideally this should include moral and political philosophy, international law, military and diplomatic history, political economy, imperial and domestic policy, and so forth. These would have to be related to the object of inquiry and from this a greater depth of understanding can arise.⁴³ While this is the ideal situation it cannot exist in practice. As noted earlier the historian naturally has to select facts due to the complex and

³⁹ Skinner, "The Limits of Historical Explanations," 210. At the end of this chapter a more sophisticated explanation of inconsistencies in thought which is directly applicable to *PAN* and *SMPP* is given.

⁴⁰ Bell, "Writing the World," 10 ; Gordon J. Schochet, "Quentin Skinner's Method," *Political Theory* 2 (1974): 268.

⁴¹ Lawrence Stone, *The Past and The Present* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 31, quoted in Levy, "Too Important To Leave To The Other," 24.

⁴² Duncan Bell, "International Relations: Dawn of a historiographical turn?," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 3 (2001):116.

⁴³ Bell, "Writing The World," 7.

infinite nature of reality. There is also a structural reason for limiting the depth of context. Simply, a thesis or book can only be so long. Even if the individual wished to try and transcribe the entire relevant context, assuming it is possible, then the manuscript would take decades to complete and would be so long as to be unreadable. Thus it is more feasible to include a wider context to the text but to narrow this context to what is most relevant.⁴⁴ The question of what is relevant rests upon the judgement of the historian and later the peers who review his work.

However, Skinner thinks that focusing on the leading thinkers in the period merely shows what is generally known. It does not properly highlight context as there are more unknown thinkers in an era than the ones that readily come to mind. By analyzing the works of authors who have not achieved transhistorical acclaim the historian can grasp a better understanding of the intellectual milieu which surrounded the work in question.⁴⁵ This approach is seen in Skinner's own work where he established that Hobbes thought was not unique in the period.⁴⁶ Skinner's focus on a contextualist approach has lead him to oppose those who favor a textual approach, studying the text itself and disavowing any need to examine the wider context in which the work was written.⁴⁷ As Schochet notes "Skinner has exposed the fallacies (and foolishnesses [sic], too, in many cases) of the group of contentions that the interpreters of a particular text need look no further than the text itself for its specific meaning".⁴⁸ There are strong arguments against exegesis in studying intellectual history. The first is that by definition textualism ignores context. This leads to interpreting the text

⁴⁴ Carus and Ogilvie, "The Poverty of Historical Idealism," 278.

⁴⁵ Skinner, "The Limits of Historical Explanations," 212-213.

⁴⁶ Schochet, "Quentin Skinner's Method," 263.

⁴⁷ Skinner, "Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action," 279.

⁴⁸ Schochet, "Quentin Skinner's Method," 265. Dryzek and Leonard have referred to these textualists by the very broad term of Whig historians. See John Dryzek and Stephen T Leonard, "History and Discipline in Political Science," *The American Political Science Review* 82 (1988): 1255.

unhistorically, the most extreme of which is reading the text as if it were written today.⁴⁹

Dryzek concurs with this analysis by noting that

Lasswell's accounts of deranged political man are successful in a deranged decade. Popper and Dewey are successful in the context of the mid-century global political struggle. The muckraking science of Beard and Bentley makes sense in the context of a political agenda largely defined by the Progressive political movement.⁵⁰

While the author writes in his present there is little justification for bringing that author to our present and critiquing him for not anticipating events that occurred after their death. This leads to the fallacy described above, that of directly applying the past to the present.⁵¹ The second is subtracting the context from the analysis eliminates any possibility of understanding why it was written, this ultimately results in converting it into a different argument.⁵² As has already been stated, books are written for a purpose and while it may be possible to understand the text without external aids why neglect factors which can help?⁵³ The inclusion of external context will naturally be seen to strengthen an argument.⁵⁴ However in political science it is unlikely that the subject matter will be autonomous. As the subject inevitably is the result of a phenomenon that has occurred externally to the text these external factors should obviously be included in its interpretation.⁵⁵ Despite this there is a long tradition of textualism

⁴⁹See Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," 3-53.

⁵⁰ Dryzek and Leonard, "History and Discipline in Political Science," 1256.

⁵¹ N.J. Rengger, "The fearful sphere of international relations," *Review of International Studies* 16 (1990): 367.

⁵² Dunn, "Identity of the History of Ideas," 94. In his article Dunn points out that understanding an argument such as irony can only be done contextually as reading the text *prima facie* would not give any indication as to motive which informs the reader to tone. Also see Quentin Skinner, "Hermeneutics and the Role of History," *New Literary History* 7 (1975): 227-28.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 228.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 224.

⁵⁵ Bell rather harshly calls this exclusion naïve. See Duncan Bell, "Empire and International Relations in Victorian Political Thought," *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 287.

in international relations. The most obvious example is the construction of a realist “tradition”.⁵⁶

While contextualism seems to be an overwhelming superior analytical position to textualism, recently there has been a development towards internal contextualism as opposed to the external contextualism advocated by Skinner. Internal contextualism consists of looking at the historic context of works written within the field of the subject. Theoretically it excludes external context such as political events, social context of the societies in which the work was created and the individual’s position within that society.⁵⁷ This view was championed by Brian C. Schmidt in an article published in 1994 and continued in his influential book *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*.⁵⁸ Schmidt is diametrically opposed to external contextualism as he claims it has perpetuated a false and distorted view of the history of international relations. His attack on external contextualism rests on two arguments. The first, and stronger, is that contextualism cannot explain theoretical or methodological changes in the field and that focusing on external factors has led to the history of IR being segmented based on the occurrence of external events rather than their original occurrence. This contention forms the main thesis of the book as he shows that various writers discussed concepts prior to the supposed external events which traditionally have been assumed to be the catalyst. The best example of this is the myth that IR as a discipline was formed after the First World War in Aberystwyth.⁵⁹ The second is that external events may cause internal changes but the

⁵⁶ Bell, “Language, Legitimacy, and the Project of Critique,” 330.

⁵⁷ See Peter Wilson “Where are we now in the Debate about the First Great Debate?,” in *International Relations and the First Great Debate*, ed. Brian C. Schmidt (London:Routledge,2012), 133-152 for the need to distinguish between the professional capacity of an individual in order to interpret context.

⁵⁸ Brian C Schmidt, “The historiography of academic international relations” *Review of International Studies* 20 (1994); 359-364 ; Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, 32-38 ; Holden, “Who contextualizes the contextualizers?,” 256-258.

⁵⁹ Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, 34.

externalists have not properly shown this causal link, merely assuming it to be true. Schmidt points out that external factors do not instantly cause changes as there is a lag between events as they occur and events as they are described. Schmidt varies on this point however, at times insisting that external context plays no role in the discussion of political theory.⁶⁰

While Schmidt is correct that the traditional conception of the history of IR has rested upon unverified assumptions this is not a fault of method but of practice. A more penetrating criticism would be of the detail and level of study of the genesis of IR rather than an attack upon method. In response to the second contention it seems to be valid *a priori*. Articles and books take time to write and during this period the external world can change. But Schmidt seems to overextend this argument. IR is a discipline based upon describing external events. While there might be a delay between the event and its academic discussion this difference will be insignificant. It seems that while external events such as the First World War did not create the discipline it certainly provided the catalyst for its expansion. Schmidt seems to subtly acknowledge this by citing James T. Shotwell's introduction to Farrel Symonds' *Courses on International Affairs at American Colleges, 1930-1931*. In this introduction Shotwell claims that the First World War opened the doors of American education to politics and history.⁶¹ This reference to an external factor is not an isolated occurrence in Schmidt's work. Schmidt constantly references external factors both overtly and subtly to explain internal discursive changes. One of the most startling examples is chapter four. The chapter is devoted to the rise of the discussion of imperialism and colonialism in American academia, which Schmidt acknowledges is the result of the Spanish American war. To quote Schmidt

⁶⁰*Ibid*,38. Schmidt makes the rather absurd claim that "it would be difficult ,if not impossible, to explain changes in key concepts such as the state, sovereignty, anarchy, and power by reference to external factors."

⁶¹ *Ibid* ,155. Also see pages 157 -159 for further evidence of WW1 changing the direction of study in IR.

Although it is indisputable that the acquisition of several colonial possessions by the United States following the Spanish-American War in 1898 helped to make the subject of colonial governance extremely conspicuous and relevant to American political scientists, this external event, by itself, does not explain the conversation that arose in the field of international relations.⁶²

This seems to be a very poor defence. No one would take the mono-causal view that the Spanish American War solely caused a discussion of imperialism in the field. However, most would argue, as Schmidt grudgingly agrees, that it seems to be the most important factor. Therefore, as this external event is the most important factor in the development of the internal context to exclude it would seem suspect, but its inclusion severely weakens Schmidt's theoretical argument. Schmidt runs into this problem frequently throughout the book. In the discussion of G. Lowes Dickinson, Schmidt remarks that originally Dickinson was a scholar of ancient Greek and Chinese civilizations but during the beginning of the First World War he felt compelled to devote attention to the problems of international relations. Within the same paragraph Schmidt seemingly tries to resurrect his method by claiming that it is "difficult to explain the metamorphosis that Dickinson underwent".⁶³ Two other brief examples highlight this difficulty. The first is Schmidt's discussion of Carr. Without mentioning the external political climate at the time Schmidt can give no motivation for the arguments within Carr's text and thus his explanation of the texts seems empty.⁶⁴ Secondly, Schmidt points out that the influx of German émigrés and the failure of the League of Nations led to the rise of realism in IR.⁶⁵ These are clearly external factors which changed the theoretical focus of the field. However, this statement by Schmidt is more damaging to his method considering that earlier

⁶² *Ibid*, 125- 126. See also Brian C. Schmidt, "Political Science and the American Empire: A Disciplinary History of the 'Politics' Section and the Discourse of Imperialism and Colonialism," *International Politics* 45 (2008): 675-687 for a similar claim.

⁶³ Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, 160.

⁶⁴ See Casper Sylvest, "Interwar Internationalism, the British Labour Party, and the Historiography of International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2004): 409-432 for an external contextual account of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.

⁶⁵ Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, 210.

Schmidt explicitly refers to these specific claims as “at best, nebulous”.⁶⁶ As Gerald Holden notes it is difficult to write an interpretation of international relations without referring to external events.⁶⁷

This is not to detract in any way from the empirical work which Schmidt has done. Illuminating the lesser known work of the early pioneers of the field and dispelling the misplaced ideas about this period of IR is clearly necessary. His argument that too often authors have superficially mentioned external context to explain events in academia rings true. However, in practice this is harder than Schmidt acknowledges, despite his own struggles in investigating external causes.

A large problem in conducting historical research, particularly on motivations for writing is that frequently there is no evidence, either archival or anecdotal to build an argument. This thesis encounters this difficulty. Evidence can be assumed from the difference between the two works and the events that occurred in between the period but nothing can be stated concretely. Furthermore, there is the problem of too much detail in a work which can obscure the points it is trying to make. This thesis takes the position that that instead of proposing a belief in a purely internal discourse while allowing external factors to continually intrude, it acknowledges the legitimacy of external explanations while pointing out that these causal links should not be assumed. To those critics who would complain that there should be more references to external factors in the explanation, the enormity of including all the external context could not be done in the structure of a thesis. External explanations are given to changes in some aspects of the books where it appears obvious that there is sufficient evidence to make a claim. In other sections, such as ethics, the external context is not

⁶⁶ Ibid, 33 and 35.

⁶⁷ Holden, “Who contextualizes the contextualizers?,” 259.

emphasized due to a lack of references. This position is more defensible than to disclaim the immediate influence of external factors.

3. Speech acts

The final aspect of Skinner's method of intellectual history is the analysis of speech acts. Speech acts as a form of analysis was pioneered by Ludwig Wittgenstein and J.L. Austin.⁶⁸ Speech acts are relatively simple once they are explained; the problem is that many accounts including Skinner's own are obtuse. However, before a discussion of speech acts begins it is important to clarify a conceptual point. In discussing speech acts it is necessary to use a variety of Skinner's writings which deal with different aspects of it. The works cited span a period of twenty two years and as a result at times they contradict each other. This is only natural as Skinner himself must be subject to changes of thought as illustrated by his own theory. The problem lies in using these works in explaining speech acts as if they formed one coherent whole. Since this chapter is merely to illustrate a method relating to temporal changes in Morgenthau's work and not Skinner's, these temporal changes will largely be ignored and his work will be presented as a coherent whole for the purpose of brevity and simplicity. This will be most prominent in the discussion of motive which forms an integral part of exploration to understand Morgenthau's thought.⁶⁹

Words are actions.⁷⁰ This famous phrase of Wittgenstein's serves as the basis of speech acts. What is said is an action, usually meant for a purpose. From this deceptively simple formulation one can then use words to try and understand what the actor was doing in uttering a given utterance. To demonstrate this it is necessary to illustrate the various parts of

⁶⁸ Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1953) ; J.L. Austin, *How To Do Things With Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

⁶⁹ See Martin Hollis and Quentin Skinner, "Action and Context," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society: Supplementary Volumes* 52 (1978): 43-56 for Hollis' discussion on Skinner's treatment of motive.

⁷⁰ Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, 546.

speech and how speech act categorizes them through an example. Say a policeman calls out to a skater on a frozen pond. He tells the skater "The ice over there is very thin." The locution in this statement is the pure textual meaning of the words.⁷¹ That is, that there is ice over there and it's thin. However, the policeman was doing more with his words than merely remarking on an observable fact. There was a purpose to this utterance. This purpose or intent can be seen to be a warning to the skater. Skinner classifies this subtext of an action as an illocution. The idea of illocution can be separated into two parts, the illocutionary force and the illocutionary act. An illocutionary act is the intention, what the speaker saw himself doing in stating the statement. In this case the illocutionary act is one of warning. The illocutionary force of the statement is the impact it had on its intended audience.⁷² Thus, the statement can mean different things to different people. The skater may take this statement as an order rather than a mere warning. A further example is the phrase "Would you like to come in and have some coffee?" after a date. This statement can either mean to come in and have coffee or an invitation for sexual activity. The enquirer can mean the former while the enquired can assume the latter. This multiplicity of possible meanings is important for the meta-theoretical aspect of studying texts. This ensures that while the author can mean one thing the audience may find more meanings in his text than what he originally meant.⁷³ Thus, meanings change over time and that an act in one instance has a different connotation when it is done in another setting.⁷⁴ This clearly relates to the discussion above on presentist uses of texts and

⁷¹ Bell, "Language, Legitimacy, and the Project of Critique," 331.

⁷² Skinner alters what he means by illocutionary force. In Skinner, "Motives, Intentions and the Interpretation of Texts," he considers it to be what the author meant by writing the statement. However, the definition of it here is from Skinner, "A Reply to My Critics," 266-267.

⁷³ Skinner, "A Reply To My Critics," 269.

⁷⁴ Palonen, *Quentin Skinner*, 2.

the appeal to authority.⁷⁵ Gunnell sums up the importance of linguistic acts in a text when he summarizes Skinner's position as

Although he concedes that there are various senses in which a text might be said to have meaning, he maintains that the meaning of what is written is "actually equivalent" to the author's intentions in writing it, and thus recovery of this meaning and a grasp of what the author was doing must always be "amongst" the interpreter's tasks. It is the "necessary condition" of all other tasks the interpreter might take on and "indispensable" for attributing any other types of meaning. The "decoding" of these intentions embodied in the "nonnatural meaning" ... of speech acts and logically linked to the meaning of what is said (semantically) in a text must be supplemented by a recovery of the motives which "prompted those particular speech acts" and indicated what an agent meant by performing them.⁷⁶

However, the use of words can be deceptive if not linked to the context in which they were uttered. Thus, Skinner posits the idea of convention, which is the way words are used in a particular society or situation. The example from Dunn regarding irony has already been noted to illustrate the importance of context and how it relates to words.⁷⁷ Skinner further explains this with the examples of "I wonder if you would mind accompanying me to the police-station, sir?" and "The manager feels you may wish to know you are now over-drawn on your current account".⁷⁸ While the locution of these statements is obvious the illocution is informed by convention. The former example is a question but clearly it is meant and probably will be taken as an order, particularly if it is spoken by a policeman. The latter example is a statement but is meant as a threat or demand. The only way these meanings are known is through their use in present culture, they would not be obvious to an average person from a different culture or time period. A historical example of how convention can be applied in order to decode a text

⁷⁵ See pages 5 and 6 and especially n18.

⁷⁶ John G Gunnell, "Interpretation and the History of Political Theory: An Apology and Epistemology," *The American Political Science Review* 76 (1982),: 322. [References omitted] It should be noted that though Gunnell seems to state this correctly the rest of his article is a critique against Skinner's method.

⁷⁷ See n 79

⁷⁸ Quentin Skinner, "Conventions and the Understanding of Speech Acts," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 20(1970): 122.

is *Don Quixote*.⁷⁹ *Don Quixote* is a parody of chivalric codes of honour but this, much like Dunn's general example of irony, cannot be seen by a textual reading.⁸⁰ Therefore, any analysis that is done through a textual reading will misinterpret the text. As such the text is woven within the context in which it is written and the conventions surrounding the text will naturally be used as a guide for the interpretation of the text, even though in some instances such as the policeman asking the individual to come to the station it is done automatically.⁸¹

Having shown that convention is important for the recovery of intention the last issue that needs to be addressed is motive. Motive in Skinnerian parlance is the reason behind an action which occurs prior to the act.⁸² Skinner notes that motive, particularly in discussion of principles, naturally informs actions and thus intention. Therefore, categorizing motive and explaining it is essential to any discussion of action.⁸³ While there are critics who doubt that motive is essential for historic explanation and causally related to action, it appears that motive causally relates to intention which together explain actions.⁸⁴

The investigation of these linguistic phenomena does not follow the linear occurrence in which the events happened. If events occur in history by a motive then an act/intention, it does not follow that the historian necessarily has to follow this linear path in exploring the reasons behind an act. For example, suppose a man is in the audience at a conference. He wishes to ask a question and every time he raises his hand and the speaker acknowledges him, the speaker cuts him off mid-sentence and continues the lecture. This occurs several times

⁷⁹ Skinner, "Hermeneutics," 223.

⁸⁰ See n103 and 78.

⁸¹ Holden, "Who contextualizes the contextualizers?," 261 ; Janssen, Political Thought as Traditionary Action," 116.

⁸² Skinner, "Motives, Intentions and the Interpretation of Texts," 402 ; Quentin Skinner, "On Performing and Explaining Linguistic Actions," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1971):15. In Linguistic Actions Skinner contends that intention is non causal. While this may be true, intention is naturally formed by motive and thus while intention by itself is non causal it is connected to a causal mechanism, motive.

⁸³ Skinner, "Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action," 290.

⁸⁴ *ibid*, 291. Skinner notes that some followers of Wittgenstein express doubts about motives being causes.

until the man stands up while the speaker is lecturing and exits the room.⁸⁵ The natural assumption of the observer is that the man left because he was angry and that his leaving the room during the lecture was a deliberate snub of the speaker. However, while this is likely the correct linear progression of events, the interpretation of the events is only possible if our assumptions reinforce each other. Thus, his action of walking out can be attributed to the convention of a snub at the speaker only if his motive is anger and the assumption that his motive is anger is based on the interruptions and his act of walking out.⁸⁶ Therefore, the events work together to provide an explanation rather following them through step by step as they naturally occurred. This principle is applied in the thesis by determining motive in a non-linear fashion. This non-linear use can be seen by using the text to determine the motive for its writing.

The inclusion of this hermeneutic device was first used by Skinner in *Hermeneutics and the Role of History*. This form of non-linear analysis is known as a hermeneutic circle.

According to Gadamer it originally was used in ancient rhetoric but has been appropriated in hermeneutics as a form of understanding.⁸⁷ Other prominent hermeneutic philosophers such as Ricoeur have stated that the hermeneutic circle forms an essential role in the reconstruction of texts.⁸⁸ Skinner has restated this as forming an essential part of the hermeneutic enterprise and is one of Gadamer's key propositions in *Truth and Method*.⁸⁹ The use of hermeneutics brings forth the question how Skinner uses hermeneutics, other than the hermeneutic circle, compared to Ricoeur and Gadamer. To investigate this issue the content of their hermeneutic

⁸⁵ This example is given in Skinner, "Hermeneutics and the Role of History," 210-211.

⁸⁶ *Ibid* ; Skinner, "A Reply To My Critics," 266-67 notes that the illocution helps to explain motive.

⁸⁷ Hans-Georg Gadamer *Truth and Method* (London: Continuum, 1989): 189 and 291.

⁸⁸ Paul Ricoeur, "The Model of a Text: Meaningful Action Considered as A Text," *New Literary History* 5 (1973): 106 and 116-117.

⁸⁹ Quentin Skinner, "Introduction" in *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences*, ed. Quentin Skinner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 7.

theory should be investigated. It is beyond the scope of the thesis to offer a full discussion of all the intricacies of their work on hermeneutics but the fundamental aspects of their thought will be briefly explored to see the differences and similarities between their work and that of Skinner.⁹⁰

The most notable claim that Gadamer makes is the assertion that texts have meanings that are beyond what the author originally envisioned. Therefore he posits that the meaning naturally comes from the text rather than the author.⁹¹ From this claim he states that the mental experiences of the author in developing the book are not necessary to understand it, rather it is the text itself which goes beyond the author and what he or she originally intended.⁹² Ricoeur's position is similar to this but the emphasis differs. He argues that while there is an intended meaning by the author what is important is the changing character of its interpretation over time rather than an original meaning.⁹³

Therefore for Gadamer the context, illocution and conventions within the text are not a necessary element to explore as it offers "only a very crude historico-hermeneutic criterion" The text by method of its transference from the past to the present has detached itself from the original circumstances and meaning.⁹⁴ A furthermore criticism of this approach is that what can be considered the original circumstances and the addressed audience? Is a book no longer contemporary after a year or five? The line drawn in this formulation will necessarily be arbitrary and to Gadamer this highlights the absurdity of the claim.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Obviously, Ricoeur and Gadamer have differences between them but the purpose of the comparison is to show how they differ from Skinner rather than how they differ from each other, As these differences are rather substantial the subtle nuances between Ricoeur are not relevant to the overall point.

⁹¹ Gadamer, *Truth and Method* 365. Also see Ricoeur, "The Model of a Text", 5 and 15.

⁹² Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 365.

⁹³ Paul Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language Action and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 174.

⁹⁴ Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 397.

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, 396.

Despite these claims Gadamer does admit that understanding the original conditions of a work can be an important tool to understanding the text. However, he notes that this reconstruction of the past is not feasible. It is an imitation of something that happened and as a result naturally has the flaws that all imitations have.⁹⁶ Thus, according to Gadamer understanding is more than merely reconstructing a past world. In exploring a text the reader comes to the text with certain preconceived notions towards the ideas in the text both consciously and unconsciously. These pre conceived notions are products of the reader's own horizon, or cultural-historical situation. This is not viewed as a negative aspect as the text is not situated purely in the past but due to the fact it is written and being read in the present it is a natural part of the present world as well.⁹⁷ This paradox of both past and present represents a familiarity and strangeness to the reader. While the reader can identify to some degree with the text and the tradition it originates from, it is at the same time alien. The interplay of familiarity and strangeness thus creates the conditions in which the interpretation of the texts occurs.⁹⁸ Since the text is not concretely grounded in a specific period the interpretation of the text must differ in each subsequent period of reading.⁹⁹ But this does not imply a complete relativist perspective. The interpretation does not consist of the individual reading what he or she wants from the text nor is it a set of universal givens that can be taken from the text. The interplay between the two, the one sided dialogue of text and reader allows a meditation of perspectives which lead to an understanding of the text.¹⁰⁰

Therefore, the text does not have a fixed point of correct interpretation but must continually be reinterpreted upon each reading to correspond with the conditions of the

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 118 and 159.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 290

⁹⁸ *Ibid*, 295.

⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 296

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, , 271, 291 and 321.

reader.¹⁰¹ Gadamer remarks that as long as they fulfill their function of engaging the reader they are contemporaneous with any age.¹⁰² Thus the hermeneutic circle is never closed in the absolute sense. The reader is a part of history, a continuing chain that never fully reveals the particularities of the situation. This is a matter of being within time. Knowledge therefore is never complete.¹⁰³

As a result of this position Gadamer is dismissive of the attempts of historians in interpreting texts. He attempts a distinction between the historical and literary consciousness with the historical consciousness being engaged in a process that is anathema to the correct interpretation of texts.¹⁰⁴ This leads to the general condemnation of the discipline of intellectual history as a failed enterprise.¹⁰⁵ This is a caveat to this dismissal. Gadamer recognizes that historical investigation in a text can be useful as possible material for understanding the past but only as a source to validate a totality of a historic tradition or as a manner of imperfectly understanding historical context.¹⁰⁶ A general concern with this method is the problem of being situated within history. Gadamer claims that those who seek to view an object historically can never detach themselves from the situation they are in, being in history is the fundamental nature of being. Therefore, to try and escape this is axiomatically doomed to failure.¹⁰⁷

These statements have an inherent logic in them but do not shed any light on how this form of hermeneutic approach would be undertaken practically. Though Gadamer professes not to be engaged in the process of defining a methodology he does try to link the thoughts in

¹⁰¹ *ibid*, 119

¹⁰² *ibid*, 58 and 81

¹⁰³ *ibid*, 189 and 301.

¹⁰⁴ *ibid*, 139 and 332.

¹⁰⁵ *ibid*, 158.

¹⁰⁶ *ibid*, 195.

¹⁰⁷ *ibid*, 197, 302 and 390.

his book to an activity to illustrate their use. This activity is the practice and interpretation of law. He states that the judge's decision is not a form of unreflective regurgitation of principles but a meditation on the past, when the law was written, and the present practices where it can be applied in keeping with society's changing conception of the importance of the law.¹⁰⁸ Therefore, the original intention of the law is deemed unnecessary, a relic for the investigation of legal historians rather than its practical import.¹⁰⁹ The parliamentary proceedings are of no account, what is important is the present circumstances to find the interpretation of the law.¹¹⁰ However, this is not correct. Within the Westminster Common Law system, the intention of parliament is the basis for the law. Any lawyer or judge can attest to the number of times they have had to investigate the parliamentary proceedings through a tool such as Hansard in order to try and find the meaning and intention of a law. Nor is this correct in light of international law. By the Vienna convention on the law of treaties the intention of the law was deemed paramount.¹¹¹ Previously, this was already a staple of customary international law. While Gadamer is correct that there is some meditation in the law, particularly for laws which are inevitably archaic the primacy is on the past and intention in the past rather than the meditation between present and past.¹¹²

To what degree is Skinner located in this hermeneutic tradition? Skinner's focus on the author obviously places him outside the hermeneutic camp of Ricoeur and Gadamer. His focus is clearly on a recovery of the authors intended meaning which is an investigation into the past. However, he does not deny the ability of a text to expand beyond the author's meaning.

¹⁰⁸ *ibid*, xxix

¹⁰⁹ *ibid*, 323

¹¹⁰ *ibid*

¹¹¹ Articles 31 and 32 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties does allow for the use of background information, known as the "travaux preparatoires" to help explain the meaning of words in a treaty. "Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (adopted 23 May 1969, entered in force 27 January 1980) 1155 UNTS 331 (VCLT)

¹¹² *ibid*, 324.

He argues that the difference between him and Ricoeur is one of priorities. He does not insist that the authors intended meaning is the meaning of the text, as texts can be interpreted differently over time. However, he does argue that recovering the author's intention helps refine and correct interpretations of a work in the present. Therefore, the authors intention can help clarify the text but by no means is the sole meaning of a text. In response to the claim that the recovery of intention is impossible Skinner would not completely disagree but would argue that it can be done to a fair degree of accuracy.¹¹³

Skinner therefore does not fit within the confines of hermeneutics as per the philosophical school of Gadamer and Ricoeur. However, the label of hermeneutics is broader than the works of representative of this 20th century form of thought. Hermeneutics can mean the interpretation of texts and utterances. It is in this broader definition that Skinner can easily be placed.¹¹⁴

Taken in this light the present thesis can also be placed within this form of investigation. To what degree does this thesis accept the conclusions of hermeneutics as a 20th century philosophical school? This thesis accepts the use of what Gadamer called the Aristotelian conception that the problem of method is determined by the object under inquiry.¹¹⁵ This conception is further reiterated by Collingwood who Gadamer quotes somewhat approvingly.¹¹⁶ It can also be agreed that the present by necessity alters the conception of a text, what the interpreter thought of the authors intention and the object of enquiry in general. However, as noted above the present thesis is wary of the different application of the past to today. Even meditated by the dual conceptions of present and past

¹¹³ In answer to the question of what purpose this has see the section entitled Criticisms of a Historical Approach above.

¹¹⁴ See Michael N Forster, "Hermeneutics," in *Oxford Handbook of Continental Philosophy*, eds. Brian Leiter and Michael Rosen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 30-74 for this view.

¹¹⁵ Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 312.

¹¹⁶ Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 363-368.

there is a fundamental disconnect between the past and the present. Finding a texts' answer to the present is not a true answer and becomes close to the dangers of an appeal to authority.¹¹⁷ While it is possible to mitigate the dangers of this appeal by referencing obliquely, ultimately the text is a product of the past, its use in the present is solely done through the mind of the individual who reads it and while it may have use for the present this is a product of the mind of the individual and not of the text.

Conclusion

To conclude there are a few points that need to be made about the application of method and some modifications made in applying this method. The first point is that this chapter in no way assumes that Skinner's method should be applied unreflexively in all aspects of IR or intellectual history. There are other reasons and methods in which one can legitimately investigate a work. An example should help to illustrate this point. Sean Molloy's book *The Hidden History of Realism* analyzes realist thinkers as if each thinker had a unitary coherent perspective. However, the point of the book is to disprove the idea that realism forms a Kuhnian paradigm and as such can be grouped by the simple label of realism.¹¹⁸ In light of this particular vector of analysis it is not relevant to show the inner inconsistencies of each thinker but merely to show how they are different from each other.¹¹⁹ Therefore due to the book's vector a Skinnerian approach could not be utilized. Different historical methods are not paradigms fighting for predominance but tools to be used according to the problem that needs to be addressed.¹²⁰ The goal is to promote understanding not converts.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ See for example the use of Aristotle in justifying slavery in the 19th century.

¹¹⁸ Molloy, *The Hidden History of Realism*.

¹¹⁹ Vector is used instead of the more general word of approach because it connotes the method as well as the end result.

¹²⁰ Dryzek and Leonard, "History and Discipline in Political Science," 1249.

The final point which needs to be addressed concerns how thinkers possess contradictory ideas. As noted before Skinner says that this can be a function of time as thinkers can change their minds over the course of a lifetime or an overextension of their intellectual capabilities. But Skinner makes a distinction for having contradictory beliefs at the same time. He quotes Quine and says that it is not possible for a person to simultaneously believe in A but also hold the view of Not-A.¹²² While the preceding two causes could explain some of the inconsistencies in Morgenthau's thought, this simultaneous double think, to use the Orwellian phrase, directly applies to the contradictions between *SMPP* and *PAN*. Some examples may help to illustrate how it is possible to simultaneously hold A and not-A. Suppose that you are standing between two men having a conversation. There is a light downpour of rain. The first man says to the second "Look it is raining outside." The second man replies "That's not raining it is only drizzling!" As the observer you can understand how the first man could call a light rain rain and how the second man could classify it as not rain but drizzle. However, one can argue that this merely competing definitions of a word and not truly holding contradictory viewpoints. Against this argument it could be said that there are individuals who simultaneously believe in the right to life and the death penalty. However, this can again be argued against but less successfully. The argument would be that the question is one of context. These individuals believe in right to life for a fetus who is innocent versus the death of someone who is guilty of a heinous crime. A similar example is the simultaneous belief in determinism and free will. The believers in determinism hold that the social context and the genetics of an individual determine behaviour. However, while holding this belief they act as if free will existed. For how else could you reasonably have concepts like punishment if the

¹²¹ Skinner, "A Reply To My Critics," 256. Here Skinner again is evoking Oakeshott's idea of conversation not argument.

¹²² *Ibid*, 257.

actions were not the result of an autonomous being but pre-determined? The individuals act as if free will exists even though they believe otherwise due to the inability for society to function if their belief is true. Therefore, it is possible to believe in A but not-A if the context requires it. To assume simultaneous incoherence is not a radical idea, as R.M. Burns states

But actually, of course, it is very common for highly self-consciously rational people, who normally have a strong commitment to conceptual consistency as an ideal, to tolerate what appear to be inconsistencies in their beliefs provided that they have overriding reasons for doing. Three widely discussed instances of the deliberate holding together of what appear to be two incompatible beliefs are the Christian claim that Jesus is both God and man, Kant's claim that we must regard human actions as both free and causally predetermined, and the positing of both wave and particle theories of light in modern physics.¹²³

Bell agrees with this conflict within ourselves stating

The complexity of human thought, mutating with the multiple contexts in which it is embedded and through which it is structured, is often, on close inspection, very difficult to reconcile with our often anachronistic and homogenising accounts of the manifold varieties of political thought.¹²⁴

It is the context that the thought is in that determines the belief. Therefore depending on the

vector a person can simultaneously avow A while declaring not-A. This applies to

Morgenthau's books due to the fact that both books are written for a particular purpose. In

arguments rhetoric is often employed in order to achieve the end that is desirable. By engaging

in rhetoric in order to reach the end point, such as, all murderers should be executed; we

inherently contradict other statements we have made. What is important in understanding an

individual's line of thinking is to look at the time between statements and the context in which

they were uttered. Failing to do this results in an oversimplification which perpetuates a

historic and intellectual myth.

¹²³R.M.Burns, "Language Tradition and the self in the generation of meaning," *History of European Ideas* 28 (2002): 65-66.

¹²⁴ Bell, "Unity and difference," 579.

Chapter 2

The Analytical Approaches to the Works of Hans Morgenthau

Introduction

As stated previously, there are fundamental contradictions between Morgenthau's earliest American books, *SMPP* and *PAN*. Despite the short time period between the publication of the books and the similar subject matter of international relations, their approach and purpose are heterogeneous. *SMPP* is a pugnacious critique on "scientism" and its adherents within the study of social sciences. Scientism can be defined as a "rationalist philosophy ... which assumes the social world is susceptible to rational control conceived after the model of the natural sciences."¹ The adherents to this philosophy are identified primarily as the followers of Liberalism, Marxism and Legalism. In contrast, *PAN* was written as a textbook for undergraduate students in IR. The arguments made in *PAN* tend to contradict Morgenthau's polemic against scientism; listing criteria to determine action and at some points alluding to the fact that the idea to engage in an action can be determined by quantitatively measurements.² Through an examination of these two books, their purpose and the context in which they were written, the discrepancies can be noted and a possible explanation will be given.³ However, this does not preclude other explanations that could be derived in the future using alternative sources or methods. This is not due to uncertainty of the analysis this study is

¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 2.

² Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 13-162.

³See chapter one Method and The Problem of History for a detailed discussion of the methodology.

engaged in, but a belief that method determines the nature of the object and thus the conclusions that can be drawn through analysis.⁴

1. Literature Review

To emphasize the value of this present work it is necessary to examine the issues that are analyzed in the literature on Morgenthau. This literature analysis will be divided into categories. It will focus on those aspects of Morgenthau's works that have been subject to scrutiny rather than an analysis of each particular piece. This approach allows for a more concise and detailed analysis on the issues that are relevant to the present study on Morgenthau rather than dealing with secondary issues that occur within the books.⁵

1.A The Divide between PAN and SMPP

The first category for analysis focuses on any reference to a divide between the subject matter of *PAN* and *SMPP* in the literature. However, it should be noted that many articles which do make mention of a divide do not use the first edition of *PAN* but the subsequent editions. This results in a focus on the six principles of realism which is not included in the first

⁴ An example is if the analysis included *In Defense of The National Interest* written in 1951 and the 2nd edition of *PAN* which was published in 1954. These books display greater disparity to *SMPP* than the first edition of *PAN*. Therefore, if they were included the majority of the focus would be on their dissimilarities and in comparison the first edition of *PAN* would appear relatively congruent with the arguments made in *SMPP*. This is not to say that the arguments are congruent but that they would appear to be so in light of the vast differences between *SMPP*, the 2nd edition of *PAN* and *In Defense of the National Interest*. See Nicholas Guilhot, "Politics between and beyond nations. Hans J. Morgenthau's Politics Among Nations," in *Classics of International Relations* ed. Henrik Biddal, Casper Sylvest and Peter Wilson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013) and Scheurman, *Morgenthau*, 101.

⁵ For example Vibeke Tjalve's book *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace: Niebuhr, Morgenthau and the Politics of Patriotic Dissent* is not specifically focused on Morgenthau but there are elements within the book which are relevant, thus an analysis of the book itself would provide elements which are superfluous to this discussion.

edition.⁶ Many of these articles are written ahistorically and thus jump between various examples throughout the course of Morgenthau's academic career. Using these authors to show there is a divide still has some utility as they can show that the "contemporary theory on biography which does not take on the myths of the closed coherent historical personality" holds true for Morgenthau's thought.⁷ However, it should be emphasized that these authors are speaking of Morgenthau's work in its entirety.

Nobel notes that the inconsistencies in the two works are both theoretic and empirical, but Morgenthau's eloquence and intellectual dexterity helped him cloak these to the observer.⁸ Ashley notes two distinct strains of thought in realism which are exemplified by Morgenthau's work. These are called practical realism and technical realism. Technical realism corresponds to positivism while practical realism is historical and qualitative in character.⁹ Scheuerman and Smith also note the tension that results in this blend of normative and empirical analysis in Morgenthau's realism.¹⁰ Stanley Hoffman noted this flaw as well but he modified his criticism by stating that reality is too complex for any one form of analysis to encapsulate its essence.¹¹ Robert Jervis appears to agree with Hoffman's latter point as he argues that attempts to distill Morgenthau's thought to specific forms will not succeed as his

⁶ See in particular Veronique Pin-Fat, "The Metaphysics of the National Interest and The Mystique of The Nation-State: Reading Hans Morgenthau," *Review of International Studies* 31 (2005): 217-36 ; Benjamin Wong, "Han's Morgenthau's Anti-Machiavellian Machiavellianism" *Millennium* 29 (2000): 389-409 ; Jaap W Nobel, "Morgenthau's Theory and Practice: A Response to Peter Gellman" *Review of International Studies* 15 (1989): 261-271 ; Richard K Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," *Political Studies Quarterly* 25 (1981): 204-236 ; Robert Jervis, "Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics," *Social Research* 61 (1994): 853-876 ; Sean Molloy, "Truth, Power, Theory: Hans Morgenthau's Formulation of Realism," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 15 (2004): 1-34; Robert Kaufmann, "Morgenthau's Unrealistic Realism," *Yale Journal Of International Affairs* 1 (2006): 24-38.

⁷ Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, 31.

⁸ Nobel, "Morgenthau's Theory and Practice," 262.

⁹ Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," 204 and 210.

¹⁰ Scheuerman, *Morgenthau*, 102 and Michael Joseph Smith, *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1986), 143.

¹¹ Stanley Hoffman. " A Long Road To Theory," *World Politics* 11 (1959): 352 and 365.

thought has too many contradictions, specifically to the role of morals.¹² Of all the works which note inconsistencies Sean Molloy's article "Truth, Power, Theory: Hans Morgenthau's Formulation of Realism" gives the most attention to these inconsistencies. The article is written for the purpose of detailing Morgenthau's thought from *SMPP* to his death. He notes that *PAN*'s analysis is a mirror image of the theories derided in *SMPP* and represents a breach in Morgenthau's thought.¹³ Others note the distinction but do not attempt to explain it. For example Michaela Neascu states that the concepts of rationalism and rationality in Morgenthau's work can be seen to lead to tensions. She argues that this can be used as an easy target for those who wished to label Morgenthau as a contradictory thinker.¹⁴ However, she does not explain this any further but rather attempts to show the consistency between the two works.¹⁵ Petersen also notes inconsistencies but he tries to solve them by subsuming them under a Nietzschean philosophical framework in order to show that the inconsistencies can be logically rectified.¹⁶ Similar to this, Barkin notes that some scholars have interpreted the disjuncture in Morgenthau's thought as a radical change in outlook.¹⁷ However, he argues that

But to make this claim is to confuse predictive with prescriptive rationality, as was discussed above. What Morgenthau is arguing against in *Scientific Man* is the attempt to understand the world as a rational place rather than to rationally understand the

¹² Jervis, "Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics," 853 and 867. See also Robert L Shinn, "Realism and Ethics in Political Philosophy" in *Truth and Tragedy: A Tribute to Hans J. Morgenthau* ed. Kenneth Thompson and Robert J. Myers (Washington: The New Republic Book Company, 1977), 95-96.

¹³ Molloy, "Truth, Power, Theory: Hans Morgenthau's Formulation of Realism," 2 and 19.

¹⁴ Neascu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations*, 171.

¹⁵ See *Ibid*, 122 and 139-140.

¹⁶ Ulrick Enemark Petersen, "Breathing Nietzsche's Air," *Alternatives: Local, Global, Political* 24 (1999): 83

¹⁷ Heikki Patomaki and Colin Wight, "After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism" *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (2002): 222 quoted in J. Samuel Barkin, "Realist Constructivism," *International Studies Review* 5 (2003): 331. It should be noted that Barkin misquotes Patomaki and Wight. While they say Morgenthau in *SMPP* was skeptical of scienticism they do not say he underwent a radical change of mind between the two books, merely noting that over time this form of scepticism in the discipline as a whole was forgotten.

world. What he is contending in *Politics among Nations* is that there is a problem in attempting to rationally understand the world, when the world is not, in fact, a rational place. In other words, both books are arguing the same point but coming at it from different directions.¹⁸

There is merit to this view. In *SMPP* Morgenthau stated that “Politics must be understood through reason but it is not in reason that it finds its model.”¹⁹ However, it is a stretch to claim they are arguing the same point but from different directions. Morgenthau’s discussion on the rest of the page in *SMPP* warns against abstract and simple solutions to a complex social world. While the introduction in *PAN* does caution the reader against formulating unreflexive opinions, this caution tends to act only as a disclaimer to the concrete principles put forward by Morgenthau. Benjamin Schuppman also uses Barkin’s argument in order to establish a coherent unity to Morgenthau’s thought.²⁰ Schuppman notes that there can be a contextual shift based on external stimuli but still claims that there is unity throughout the work.²¹ His account is very detailed but ultimately is not convincing due to the absence of any competing evidence and the lack of reference to the primary research materials in the Morgenthau Archive in the Library of Congress.

1.B Rationalism

One of the key issues related to the logical rupture in Morgenthau’s thought is the criticism of unrealistic rationalism that pervades his work in *PAN*. Many of the works which comment on this rationalism do so ahistorically and by corollary, uncontextually. However, the present citations chosen to illustrate this rationalism are referencing the corresponding sections in the first edition of *PAN*. Morgenthau’s discussions in *PAN* are viewed as being

¹⁸ Barkin, “Realist Constructivism,” 331 -32. [References omitted]

¹⁹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 10.

²⁰ See Schuppman, *Morgenthau mal compris* It should be noted that Schuppman’s footnotes are not clear. He continually cites *PAN* but rarely references which edition the particular footnote is from.

²¹ *Ibid*, 49.

inherently rationalistic. This rationality is seen by Nobel as creating a theory divorced from the irrational empirical reality which it is supposed to be describing.²² Molloy shares this criticism by noting that comparing the rational essence of the theory to the reality of historical examples causes a disjuncture as the historical examples would have to be selectively chosen as the experience of history as a whole cannot fit with the hypothesis.²³ Hoffman describes Morgenthau's version of reality as essentially static stating

Power is a means toward any of a large number of ends (including power itself): the quality and quantity of power used by men are determined by men's purposes. Now, the realist theory neglects all the factors that influence or define purposes. Why statesmen choose at times to act in a certain way rather than in another is not made clear. The domestic considerations that define national power are either left out or brushed aside. So is the role of internationally shared values and purposes. We get a somewhat mechanistic view of international affairs in which the statesmen's role consists of adjusting national power to an almost immutable set of external "givens." The realist world is a frozen universe of separate essence.²⁴

Similar to this critique of Morgenthau's mechanical view of nature is Tucker's criticism of the lack of subjectivity that Morgenthau assigns to factors relating to national power. While noting that Morgenthau allows for some subjectivity in the analysis of these factors, Tucker notes that Morgenthau takes these factors to be too objective in his analysis. They are not as static or as quantifiable as his work suggests.²⁵ Other commentators have focused on specific elements which they believe possess too much rationality. The majority of these have focused on the role of the statesman in *PAN*.²⁶ Speer and Hoffman both comment upon this in their articles.²⁷ However, Nobel succinctly expresses the problem when he says

²² Nobel, "Morgenthau's Theory and Practice," 261-262 ; Jaap W. Nobel, "Morgenthau's Struggle With Power: the theory of power politics and the Cold War," *Review of International Studies* 21 (1995): 82.

²³ Molloy, "Truth, Power, Theory," 12. It should be noted that this criticism is the same as Morgenthau gives to Marxism and liberalism in *SMPP*. See *Ibid*, 5.

²⁴ Hoffman. " A Long Road To Theory," 350.

²⁵ Robert W. Tucker, "Review: Professor Morgenthau's Theory of Political 'Realism'," *The American Political Science Review* 46 (1952): 219.

²⁶ See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 419-443.

Far from venting his lust for power on the world, Morgenthau's statesman represents the essence of rationality. It is he who, recognizing the forces at work, seeks to control them and to achieve the best under the circumstances: the least of many evils.²⁸

This statement clearly expresses the problem of rationality in *PAN*. If the central actor, the statesman, is the essence of rationality how can the real statesman live up to this ideal?

Simply put, he cannot.

1.C The Problem Of Ethics

Nobel's statement introduces the next issue that arises in the literature, the problem of ethics. As noted earlier, Jervis does not believe Morgenthau has a consistent position on ethics.²⁹ Morgenthau's ethics are contentious in IR scholarship as he is imprecise in explaining ethics and how they are meant to be applied. Scheuerman diminishes this tension by stating that Morgenthau was a crude and simplistic moralist.³⁰ Implicit in this critique is the assumption that as he was not a moral philosopher, it is not surprising that his reflections were unpolished. Despite Morgenthau's apparent paucity as a moral philosopher, the element of morality in his work cannot be ignored as it forms an important part of both *SMPP* and *PAN*.

While Morgenthau was remarkably vague in his discussion of ethics, the literature is in agreement that he did not support intention driven ethics. The issue within the literature is whether Morgenthau supported a universal ethic as a basis of action or whether Morgenthau supports an ethic of responsibility. In favour of a universal ethic is A.J.H Murray. He states that the universal ethical norm is the opposite pole of the lust for power and thus forms part of the

²⁷ James P. Speer, "Hans Morgenthau and The World State," *World Politics* 20 (1968):216 ; Hoffman, "A Long Road to Theory," 352.

²⁸ Nobel, "Morgenthau's Struggle With Power," 66.

²⁹ Jervis, "Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics," 853. Also see footnote 12.

³⁰ Scheuerman, "Was Morgenthau a Realist," 518.

conditions that result in the tragedy of existence.³¹ To support this supposition he quotes *SMPP* that "there is not one kind of ethical precept applying to the private sphere, but one and the same ethical standard applies to both-observed and observable, however, by either with unequal compliance."³² However the end of the quote characterizes its normative nature as the universal ethical principle is not followed. Thus, the implication is that it is an idealization. As Morgenthau does not give the content of this universal ethics, the nature of this ethic is hard to prove. However, Tucker's emphasis on the reality of these universal ethics shows how it is possible that they exist in practice. He does this by giving examples of "the moral principles faithfully to observe promises made to others, not to resort to aggressive war, and many others."³³ He also notes that their existence is shown by

almost daily protestations of foreign offices that their conduct, but not that of their opponents, is in conformity with recognized principles of international morality. That these principles are not very effective in regulating the conduct of states is still another question.³⁴

By giving substance to the universal ethic he proves that they are not transcendental but a normative system of ethics which are loosely defined but exist in reality. This interpretation follows Morgenthau's position in *PAN* which states there are circumstances in which the universal ethic is still practiced.³⁵ Scheuerman takes a moderate position on this issue arguing that the ethics are meant only as a method of stopping the political actor from becoming an amoral Machiavellian.³⁶

³¹ A.J.H Murray, "The Moral Politics of Hans Morgenthau," *The Review of Politics* 58 (1996): 97.

³² *Ibid*, 105.

³³ Tucker, "Professor Morgenthau's Theory of Political 'Realism'," 222.

³⁴ *Ibid*.

³⁵ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 177.

³⁶ Scheuerman, *Morgenthau*, 68.

There are others who dispute this claim and argue that the universal ethic is transcendental and thus the ethics of responsibility, a Weberian idea that is comparable to the utilitarian position of the greatest good, applies to the empirical realm. A strong proponent of this view is Veronique Pin-Fat who states that Morgenthau “sought solace in the transcendent realm of eternal verities, thus falling victim to his own admonitions against evading the existential experience of irresolvable antinomies and the tragedy of human existence.”³⁷ She posits that acting in accordance with this ethic is possible only for God and that man’s flaws prevent him from doing so. In creating such an ethic Morgenthau closed off the possibility that this ethic could ever be applied in practice.³⁸ Thus, the only guide for action is the ethic of responsibility, which is political success.³⁹ Kaufmann indirectly supports the view of the universal ethic as transcendent by noting that while Morgenthau uses a concept of universal ethics he denounces the attempt by nations to claim their own ethic as universal.⁴⁰ In advocating an ethic of responsibility Barkawi notes that Morgenthau created a logical flaw which rendered the ethic almost meaningless. He states

According to Morgenthau’s theory, the *only way* national values can survive and flourish in international politics is by means of ‘national security’; for Weber, policies are always to be assessed in terms of their consequences for national values, for fear that the means become ends-in-themselves. Even as Morgenthau reminded statespersons and their advisers to choose the ‘least evil means’, he introduced a critical slippage between means and ends into realist theory and policy science of international politics. Policies, instead of being judged in terms of whether they furthered national values, were to be judged in terms of whether they furthered the means—power and security—to those values.⁴¹

Hoffman raises a further problem with this formulation. If an action is to be judged by political success how can success be defined? If success can only be judged after the action has been

³⁷ Pin-Fat, “The Metaphysics of the National Interest,” 218.

³⁸ *Ibid*, 220,225-26,235.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 236.

⁴⁰ Kaufmann, “Morgenthau’s Unrealistic Realism,” 29.

⁴¹ Barkawi, “Strategy as a Vocation,” 160. [references omitted]

completed at what historic stage does the observer pass judgement on the action? Hoffman notes that Metternich's policies had succeeded by 1825, failed by 1848 and historians were unsure whether they were a success or failure by 1914. As the historic conditions change, the actions which occurred in the past have different meanings. Therefore the idea of success is ill defined and thus cannot inform action, rendering the ethic impossible in practice.⁴² The literature on Morgenthau's ethics is thus opposed, primarily due to his lack of clarity on the issue. However, the affirmation of a Weberian ethic of responsibility leads into the next topic, Morgenthau's philosophical influences.

1.D Influences on Morgenthau's Work

The question of influence is the most pursued topic within the literature on Morgenthau. This issue can be separated into two categories. The first is philosophical influences from Western philosophy such as Weber, Hobbes, Nietzsche and Aristotle. The second is the more contemporary influences from Morgenthau's legal background and the social context in the Weimar Republic.⁴³ This separation is not factually distinct but is used

⁴² Hoffman, "A Long Road to Theory," 353.

⁴³ For philosophical influences see Stephen Turner and George Mazur, "Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist," *European Journal of International Relations* 15 (2009): 477-504 ; Niels Armstrup, "The 'Early' Morgenthau: A Comment on the Intellectual Origins of Realism," *Cooperation and Conflict* 13 (1978): 163-175 ; Patomaki and Wight, "After Postpositivism?," 213-237 ; Speer, "Hans Morgenthau and The World State," 207-227; Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," 204-236 ; Tarak Barkawi, "Strategy as a Vocation: Weber, Morgenthau and Modern Strategic Studies," *Review of International Studies* 24 (1998):159-184 ; Jan Willem Honig, "Totalitarianism and Realism: Hans Morgenthau's German Years," in *Roots of Realism* ed. Benjamin Frankel (London: Frank Cass,1996), 283-313 ; Jervis, "Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics," 853-876 ; Brian C Schmidt, "Competing Realist Conceptions of Power," *Millennium* 33 (2005): 523-49 ; Pin-Fat, "The Metaphysics of the National Interest and The Mystique of The Nation-State," 217-236 ; William E. Scheuerman, "Was Morgenthau a Realist? Revisiting Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Constellations* 14 (2007): 506-530 ; Sean Molloy, " Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of The Lesser Evil," *Journal of International Political Theory* 5 (2009): 94-112; Nicholas Guilhot, "American Katechon: When Political Theology Became International Relations Theory," *Constellations* 17 (2010): 224-253 ; Sean Molloy, "'Cautious Politics': Morgenthau and Hume's Critique of Balance Of Power," *International Politics* 50 (2013): 768-783; Petersen, "Breathing Nietzsche's Air," 83-118 ; Schupmann, *Morgenthau mal compris* ; Vibeke Schou Tjalve, *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace: Niebuhr, Morgenthau, and the Politics of*

here as a method of categorization. Works which posit philosophical influences on Morgenthau also acknowledge some influence on Morgenthau's early legal and social context.⁴⁴ The present study does not seek to engage in a detailed analysis of this literature as it is generally irrelevant to develop an understanding of the immediate context operating during the writing of *SMPP* and *PAN*. However, this does not discredit them as influences but assumes that these influences are latent to the immediate context in which Morgenthau was situated. As Fred Halliday stated, the works of Morgenthau did not "emerge from reflections in the library" but clearly were in response to ideas and events that occurred around him.⁴⁵ Thus, previous ideas and influences are used in conjunction with the present circumstances in which the individual finds himself. It would be unnatural to assume that Morgenthau consciously decided to use a Nietzschean framework for all his writings without reference to the circumstances around him, as individuals simply do not behave that way. Jutersonke appears to agree with this point stating

influences need not, by any means, be internally consistent: already the briefest of introspective reflection on one's own development will undoubtedly show the haphazard and unsystematic way ideas and arguments make their way into one's thought process, only to be digested and reproduced in one form or other in subsequent work. So why should Morgenthau's thoughts be any more coherent?⁴⁶

Patriotic Dissent (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) ; Neascu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations* ; Christoph Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*.

⁴⁴ For more contemporary legal and social influences see Guilhot, "American Katechon," 224-253; Daniel Rice, "Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau: A Friendship With Contrasting Shades of Realism," *Journal of American Studies* 42 (2008):255-291 ; Molloy, "Truth, Power, Theory," 1-34; Robert Schuett, "Freudian Roots of Political Realism: the importance of Sigmund Freud to Hans J. Morgenthau's theory of international politics," *History of the Human Sciences* 20 (2007): 53-78 ; Armstrup, "The 'Early' Morgenthau: A Comment on the Intellectual Origins of Realism,"163-175 ; Honig, "Totalitarianism and Realism: Hans Morgenthau's German Years," 283-313 ; Molloy, "Truth, Power, Theory: 1-34 ; William E. Scheuerman, "Realism and the Left: The Case of Hans J. Morgenthau," *Review of International Studies* 34 (2008): 29-51 ; Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism* ; Scheuerman, *Morgenthau*.

⁴⁵ Fred Halliday, "The End of the Cold War and International Relations: Some Analytical and Theoretical Conclusions," in *International Relations Theory Today* ed. Ken Booth and Steve Smith (Cambridge:Polity,1995), 40 quoted in Schuett, "Freudian Roots of Political Realism," 66.

⁴⁶ Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, 67.

However, it would be remiss if the specific philosophical influences attributed to Morgenthau were not recounted.

1.D1 Past Philosophical Influences

The primary influence postulated in the literature is the work of Max Weber. This is due to allusions to Weber in Morgenthau's work and to Morgenthau's specific reference to Weber as a philosophical influence.⁴⁷ This use of Weber as a central figure in Morgenthau's thought is found in articles written by Barkawi, Pichler, Turner and Mazur.⁴⁸ Others such as Scheuerman and Schmidt mention Weber as an influence on Morgenthau's views of power or anti-scientificism.⁴⁹ Others have referenced Weber as a source of Morgenthau's ethics or disenchantment.⁵⁰ The second most attributed source of influence on Morgenthau are the writings of Frederick Nietzsche. There are a few authors who repeat this claim, notably Schuppman, Tjalve, Speer, Petersen and Neascu.⁵¹ However, the major proponent of this influence is Christoph Frei. The main source of Frei's position comes from extracts from

⁴⁷ For an example of an allusion to Weber see Morgenthau's statement "Little do they know they meet under an empty sky from which the gods have departed." in Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 196. The word gods was used interchangeably by Weber to refer to values. See Fritz Ringer, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 237. Knowing this reference makes sense for the surrounding context of international versus transcendent morality. For Morgenthau's specific claim that Weber influenced him see Hans J. Morgenthau, "Fragment of an Intellectual Autobiography: 1904-1932" in *Truth and Tragedy: A Tribute to Hans J. Morgenthau* ed Kenneth Thompson and Robert J. Myers (Washington: The New Republic Book Company, 1977), 6-7. Also see Hans Morgenthau to Mr. Bodilsen, May 3 1976, HJM-B7 where Morgenthau states that he was most influenced by Max Weber.

⁴⁸ Barkawi, "Strategy as a Vocation" 159-184; Hans-Karl Pichler, "The Godfathers of 'Truth: Max Weber and Carl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics," *Review of International Studies* 24 (1998): 185-200; Turner and Mazur, "Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist," 477-504.

⁴⁹ Scheuerman, "Was Morgenthau a Realist?," 508; Schmidt, "Competing Realist Conceptions of Power," 532.

⁵⁰ Pin-fat, "The Metaphysics of the national interest," 227 and 229; Scheuerman, "Was Morgenthau a Realist?," 519; Neascu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations*, 56-61,

⁵¹ Schuppman, *Morgenthau mal Compris*, 11-13; Petersen, *Breathing Nietzsche's Air*, 83-118; Tjalve, *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace*, 100; Speer, "Hans Morgenthau and the World State," 218; Nietzsche is located in various sections of Neascu's book. However the most concentrated reference is Neascu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations*, 50-56.

Morgenthau's diary showing his immersion in and admiration of Nietzsche's thought. However, most of these extracts are from 1923 to 1930. The argument that a fascination with Nietzsche's thought while Morgenthau was in his mid-twenties subsequently influenced most of his work twenty years later is difficult to sustain. This is due to Frei's penchant for overemphasizing Nietzsche's influence on Morgenthau's work at the expense of other influences.⁵²

Some writers have also claimed that Morgenthau's works were also influenced by Hobbes, Schopenhauer, St. Augustine and Aristotle.⁵³ However, the influence of these philosophical writings are cited with less frequency than those that reference Weber and Nietzsche.

1.D2 Contemporary Philosophical and Legal Influences

The contemporary philosophical influences on Morgenthau's work are attributed to thinkers such as Freud, Schmitt and Niebuhr. The literature suggesting a Freudian influence is relatively thin, though notable inclusions are Schuett's article and book.⁵⁴ However, it should be noted that Morgenthau discounted the Freudian attributes in his thought; therefore this

⁵² A lengthy examination of Frei's work is beyond the scope of this chapter. However, see below as well as Aristotle Course Notes, 1945, HJM-B81F5; Western Tradition of Political Theory Course Notes, 1948, HJM-B81F6; Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 170; Hans Morgenthau, "The Political Philosophy of Prussianism," in *The Decline of Democratic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 222. This essay was originally published in 1945. For criticisms of Frei's overemphasis see Turner and Mazur, "Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist," 479-482; Scheuerman, "Was Morgenthau a Realist," 527-528, footnote 11. For Frei's denunciation of Weber as an intellectual source see Frei, *Hans J Morgenthau*, 95 and 109.

⁵³ For Hobbes see Speer, "Hans Morgenthau and the World State," 223. For Schopenhauer see *Ibid*, 218; Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, 80. For St. Augustine see Murray, "The Moral Politics of Hans Morgenthau," 87-90; Guilhot, "American Katechon," 229-231. For Aristotle see Anthony F. Lang, eds. *Political Theory and International Affairs: Hans J. Morgenthau on Aristotle's 'The Politics'* (Westport: Praeger, 2004) and Molloy, "Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of The Lesser Evil," 94-112.

⁵⁴ Schuett, "Freudian Roots of Political Realism," 53-78; Robert Schuett, *Political Realism, Freud, and Human Nature in International Relations: The Resurrection of the Realist Man* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) See also Molloy, "Truth, Power, Theory," 16.

influence should be treated with caution.⁵⁵ The influence of Carl Schmitt on Morgenthau's thought is more developed by recent academics. Scholars such as Chris Brown, William E Scheuerman, Hans-Karl Pichler and Nicholas Guilhot have argued that Morgenthau was influenced by Schmitt's concept of the political, his arguments on ethics and geopolitics and his theological references.⁵⁶ As Scheuerman notes there has been a recent revival in interest on Schmitt in IR literature and this, combined with the revival in interest on Morgenthau can help explain Schmitt's prominence in the philosophical literature.⁵⁷ Also, Morgenthau's rather well known excerpt from his fragment of an autobiography mentioning Schmitt and Morgenthau's later distaste for Schmitt's politics have given some credence to this link.⁵⁸ However, Jutersonke disputes this claim, arguing that while it would have been difficult for a legal scholar in the Weimar Republic not to have been influenced by Schmitt the present accounts tend to overstate the relevance of his thought to Morgenthau's work.⁵⁹

The final contemporary philosophical thinker, Reinhold Niebuhr, is a well-known theologian and contemporary of Morgenthau's. There are many accounts which give varying

⁵⁵ Morgenthau, "Fragment of An Intellectual Autobiography," 14.

⁵⁶ For Chris Brown's argument on Schmitt's influence on Morgenthau's ethics and historical outlook see Chris Brown, "The Twilight of International Morality? Hans J. Morgenthau and Carl Schmitt on the end of the *Jus Publicum Europaeum*" in *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau in International Relations* ed. Michael C Williams (Oxford:Oxford University Press,2007), 42 -61 ; For Scheuerman's works linking Morgenthau to Schmidt see Scheuerman, "Was Morgenthau a Realist?," 509-513 ; William E Scheuerman, "Carl Schmitt and Hans Morgenthau: Realism and beyond," in *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau in International Relations* ed. Michael C Williams (Oxford:Oxford University Press,2007),62-92 ; Scheuerman, *Morgenthau*, 44-50. For Pichler's work see Pichler,"The Godfathers of Truth," 185-200;For Guilhot see Guilhot, "American Katechon," 224-253.

⁵⁷ Scheuerman, *Morgenthau*, 45. For a sample of recent works on Schmitt see Louiza Odysseos and Fabio Pettito eds. *The International Political Thought of Carl Schmitt: Terror, Liberal War, and the crisis of global order* (New York: Routledge, 2007) ; William Hooker, *Carl Schmitt's International Thought: Order and Orientation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,2009) ; William E Scheuerman, *Carl Schmitt* (Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield,1999) ; Gopal Balakrishnan, *The Enemy: An Intellectual Portrait of Carl Schmitt* (London: Verso, 2000)

⁵⁸ Morgenthau, "Fragment of An Intellectual Autobiography," 15-16.

⁵⁹ Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, 48-51 ; 61-68.

levels of influence of Niebuhr on Morgenthau.⁶⁰ Out of the possible intellectual influences on Morgenthau, Niebuhr's is the one that is generally taken as assured. The footnotes in *SMPP* validate this view as Niebuhr is cited only twice but is given credit for the entirety of Morgenthau's discussion on ethics.⁶¹

There is a problem with attributing elements in Morgenthau's American work to Niebuhr. Frei makes the point that Morgenthau used Niebuhr as an appropriate source to disguise his Germanic philosophical thought that was largely derived from Nietzsche.⁶² This is a legitimate point. It is hard to distinguish what constitutes a point of origin for influence in a thinker's work, particularly when those concepts are nebulous. While it is possible that Niebuhr was used as a form of legitimation for previously held ideas this thesis takes the view that regardless of the origin of these ideas the impetus for their inclusion in Morgenthau's American works is due to their prevalence in American academia through the works of Niebuhr. Therefore, Morgenthau would feel intellectually secure in expounding these ideas in his own work. As a result these ideas helped form the context of these works, even if they were not originally inspired.

Legal influences are harder to compartmentalize as they are more numerous and deal with thinkers and issues that are normally beyond the purview of international relations scholars. For this reason the legal influences on Morgenthau will be brief. The key text for this area of inquiry is Jutersonke's well researched book *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*. Jutersonke states that the scholars that are most influential on Morgenthau are L. Oppenheim, Hans

⁶⁰ Rice, "Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau," 255-291 ; Guilhot, "American Katechon," 224-231 ; Tjalve, *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace*, 83; Ashley, "Political Realism and Human Interests," 217 ; M. Benjamin Mollov, *Power and Transcendence: Hans J. Morgenthau and the Jewish Experience* (Cumnor Hill: Lexington Books, 2002), 213-216. Niebuhr is frequently mentioned within Mollov's book but the pages referenced present a summary of his position.

⁶¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 226 and 236.

⁶² Frei *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 185-186

Kelsen, and Arthur Baumgarten.⁶³ However, Jutersonke is not alone in researching this area. William E. Scheuerman started the analysis of Morgenthau's legal roots and how this legal background could subsequently have influenced his later writings. Scheuerman focuses on Hugo Sinzheimer, a prominent Weimar jurist. Morgenthau was Sinzheimer's assistant at the University of Frankfurt and worked in his law office at the Labour Court. From this connection Scheuerman shows how Sinzheimer influenced Morgenthau's thinking on realism and the law.⁶⁴

One of the key issues of analyzing Morgenthau's Weimar era writings is the connection implied by some authors between these earlier writings and his later American works. This can be found primarily in the works of Frei, Jutersonke and Behr and Rosch. Frei is more adamant about the link between Morgenthau's German and American writings, going as far as to claim that these writings contained little "new or original material."⁶⁵ Similar to Schuett, Frei notes that there are some similarities between Morgenthau's 1930 work on the *Origins of The Political in the Nature of Man* and *SMPP*.⁶⁶ However, the majority of the focus is directed towards proving that *PAN* was a product of Morgenthau's writings in the 1930's. He first states that Morgenthau's discussion of status quo and imperialist states in *The Concept of The Political* mirrors a similar discussion in *PAN*.⁶⁷ Following this he states that Morgenthau's discussion of mores and norms and his attack against positivism come from the same text.⁶⁸ However, in a later footnote he alters this to state that a simplified version of the discussion of

⁶³ For Oppenheim see Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law, and Realism*, 68-73 ; for Kelsen and Baumgarten see *ibid*, 75-104.

⁶⁴ Scheuerman, "Realism and the Left," 29-51.

⁶⁵ Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 208.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 128.

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 129- 132.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*. 133 .

norms and mores is included in *PAN*.⁶⁹ Other authors disagree and explicitly note that while the subject matter is the same, the overall outlook and perspective is different.⁷⁰ Lastly, Frei states that all of these writings were loosely connected but were not placed together until *PAN*.⁷¹ Thus, Frei's account implies that Morgenthau merely copied his previous work from the 1930's and republished it in English without any large changes. There is no doubt that his study of international law would be a part of his intellectual heritage and inform his discussion of these issues in *PAN* but to infer that it constitutes such a large portion of his work is to overrepresent its impact.

Jutersonke has a more nuanced view of the relationship between these writings. He notes that the discussion of norms, mores and laws is similar to Morgenthau's 1933 book *La realite des norms*.⁷² Continuing this analysis he notes how Morgenthau's discussions on international morality and world public opinion in *PAN* mirror his pre-American writings.⁷³ However, while attributing some elements in *PAN* to Morgenthau's earlier works, Jutersonke clarifies that he is not claiming that the earlier works informed all Morgenthau's writing but that *PAN* is the book where some of these earlier writings were expressed.⁷⁴ This position is more defensible than Frei's assertion that all of Morgenthau's works were derived from his German writings. In writing on international law in *PAN* it is reasonable that Morgenthau would draw on his previous experience as a professor in international law. But to claim Morgenthau's writings are the same throughout his life is to deny the impact of context on a writer. The static image of Morgenthau portrayed by Frei tarnishes his own work and diminishes the intellectual reputation of Morgenthau.

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, p. 139 footnote 94.

⁷⁰ Scheuerman, *Morgenthau*, 42.

⁷¹ Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 144.

⁷² Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, 98.

⁷³ *Ibid*, 100.

⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 183.

2. The Present Project

The most striking aspect of the literature on influences is that the focus has been heavily weighted towards past philosophical figures while the literature on contemporary influences has been principally related to figures from Morgenthau's legal past. Although there is merit to both these approaches in determining where thoughts came from, this neglects the idea that actions and thoughts result from immediate context. Thus, the problem with the work that has been completed on Morgenthau is that the explanation of the immediate internal academic and external political context has been neglected. The majority of the references to Morgenthau's contemporaries relate to his relationship with Niebuhr. While this relationship is clearly relevant it does not constitute an adequate exploration of the context surrounding *SMPP* and *PAN*. The present study proposes to fill the gap that this leaves in the literature. By doing this, the reasons for the inconsistencies between the works will be clearer and the nature of early postwar IR scholarship will be illuminated.

This dearth of focus on contemporary context between *SMPP* and *PAN* is unsurprisingly absent in more theoretical discussions of Morgenthau's work. As a result this thesis seeks to address a lacuna in the literature on Morgenthau. First, in contrast to many of the contemporary works, it aims to establish that there are elements in Morgenthau's thought which are contradictory if his work is considered whole without regard to context. This is not meant as a critique, as many of these publications implicitly acknowledge that the unity they find is through the lens of a distortive theoretical perspective. This means that by finding unity in some aspects of his writings, the purpose of their investigation inevitably privileges the conception of unity over the elements which invariably contradict. Overall, this leads to an impression that Morgenthau's works are trans-historical, united in a common metaphysical or

philosophical view that is unaffected by contextual considerations. The article seeks to address this issue by explicitly highlighting tension in his early American work.

As has been stated in chapter one the method that shall be used is that of the Cambridge School, particularly illustrated through the methodological writings of Quentin Skinner. This method favours a contextual approach, looking at the external factors of the time of writings as well as the writings of the contemporaries of the object of enquiry, in this case Hans Morgenthau. This examination of the writings will include lesser known works as well as the more established works of this period. The lesser known writings help give a picture of the intellectual milieu at the time the works were being done. This is used in conjunction with the analysis of speech acts in order to discover the conventions that operated in this period. Through an interpretative hermeneutic framework, primarily through the use of the hermeneutic circle in relation to actions in the past, the analysis of texts the ideas of motive and intention can be ascertained, creating a deeper understanding of the text. This approach will then offer an explanation of the inconsistencies in the texts of *SMPP* and *PAN*.

2.A Scientific Man Versus Power Politics

The remainder of the thesis will consist in exploring the context surrounding the works, their purpose and the inconsistencies between them. The analysis will first focus on *SMPP*.

The purpose of this chapter is to establish the context surrounding *SMPP* and its publication. This context ranges from the generally descriptive in detailing the evolution of *SMPP* to a more active comparison with other texts at the time to determine motive and thus intention. The use of a descriptive exposition in explaining the genesis of *SMPP* is relevant in order to further the purpose of the thesis. By explaining the formation of the text the content of the text can be understood based upon when certain content was added. In relation to

Morgenthau's writing of *SMPP* this allows certain aspects of the book to be seen as products of European thought, unchanged throughout *SMPP*'s genesis. Also, this allows other aspects that are included over time to be attributed to other factors such as his Americanization and integration with other forms of thought. Particularly, the chapter argues that during the writing of *SMPP* Morgenthau was unaware of the issues in IR or that he was now engaged in political science rather than international law. Obviously, these issues are important for determining the motive, intention, convention and illocution of the statements made within *SMPP*. This also allows the thesis to explain the reasons for shifts between *SMPP* and *PAN*. Once the reason for the inclusion of certain statements and sections is clarified it is possible to understand why the text was written as it was and thereby to explain how it is different from *PAN*.

The inclusion of the reviews of *SMPP* are similarly important. They illustrate the negative reception that Morgenthau achieved in the field at large. This rejection plays an important role in the different scope and issues that are seen in *PAN*.

To briefly outline the chapter the approach examines the origins and purpose behind writing the text. Following this is a discussion of the text beginning with its origins as a lecture given in 1940.⁷⁵ Then, the numerous drafts that were written until the published version in 1946 are analyzed. However, in order to establish context it is important to note who Morgenthau was trying to refute. Therefore, it is necessary to show who the advocates of scientism were. Unfortunately, the footnotes of *SMPP* do not provide an adequate guide as Morgenthau is guarded in ascribing these positions to particular contemporary individuals. However, using sources from the Morgenthau Archives it is possible to link Morgenthau's position to the works of other contemporary authors. Articles in a similar context are examined

⁷⁵ Liberalism and Foreign Policy, Lecture given in 1940 at the New School on Social Research, August 16 1940, HJM-B168F5. It should be noted that this transcript is fragmentary but provides a useful source for the impetus behind what later would be *SMPP*.

in order to establish the general context in the debate about scientism. These include other proponents and detractors such as Reinhold Niebuhr. Also, the reviews of *SMPP* are analyzed as well as Morgenthau's reaction to them in order to establish Morgenthau's state of mind in this period.

2.B Politics Among Nations

A similar approach is undertaken for the discussion of *PAN*. The major difference between the two chapters is that the analysis of *PAN* stresses a comparison to other textbooks of the period to illustrate the similarities in content. Clearly this is a fundamental difference between the two chapters. The reason for this is that there is no evidence that Morgenthau looked at similar books other than Niebuhr's that shared the same content at the time of writing *SMPP*. Based on the Skinnerian model other textbooks of the period that might be similar cannot be included if it cannot be proved that Morgenthau did not read them. In contrast, Morgenthau used textbooks of a similar nature to *PAN* to teach his undergraduate classes prior to writing *PAN*. In fact the genesis of *PAN* originally comes from lectures made by Morgenthau using these textbooks. Therefore, this difference is unavoidable, but does not harm the similarities of the approach, ie to show how the books and their various sections developed. The use of comparing the textbooks to *PAN* shows how Morgenthau sought to adapt his writing based upon his integration with American IR. As there are remarkable similarities to other textbooks of the period the chapter describes the reasons why this textbook dominated the marketplace, becoming the premier textbook for undergraduate IR students. This does not minimize the unique elements of Morgenthau's thought in *PAN* which are contrasted to the other books but helps explain how a book that mirrors other books in the same format could take such a large share of the marketplace.

Generally, the contrast of *SMPP* with *PAN* serves the purpose of highlighting the differences between them. It can be argued that this is a comparison of two things which are not alike and thus cannot be adequately compared. This criticism can be countered in two ways. The first is that the fact they are not the same is one of the fundamental assertions of the thesis. This forms one of the reasons for the differences between the books. As the purpose of the thesis is to fulfill a lacuna in the literature by explaining the differences between the works, the difference between the books is highlighted. This is a response to the present literature on Morgenthau. As it has already been noted most of the works ignore the differences between Morgenthau's work in trying to find a unified element to his thought. The purpose of showing the difference between the works based partially on the different nature of the books is to illustrate that on an intellectual historical level this cannot be done. However, at a theoretical level, finding unity between two separate books from the same thinker to illustrate a theoretical point, for example as a surrogate critique to a more robust form of liberalism⁷⁶ or to prove realist thinkers differ from each other⁷⁷, is obviously a legitimate enterprise.⁷⁸ But it should be remembered that this unity is generally a theoretical abstraction. This is one of the purposes of the thesis.

Secondly, the claim that the books cannot be compared due to their dissimilarity severely restricts the basic method of compare and contrast. All things ultimately differ in form and structure on some level. However, the two books are from the same period, at some

⁷⁶ See Michael C. Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

⁷⁷ See Molloy, *The Hidden History of Realism*.

⁷⁸ This does not invalidate the earlier claim that there is a danger of appeal to authority logic. Such as famous thinker clearly said x therefore x is truth. While clearly the two examples cited do not engage in this practice this is a constant danger in all forms of theoretical and intellectual work, especially those that are engaged in prescriptive practices.

points overlapping and are written by the same author. By this standard a comparison is arguably appropriate.

The chapter begins with an examination of the general content and its various drafts in order to show its development. It is then compared to several other introductory textbooks within the field in order to contrast it and evaluate its similarities and differences. These books include works by Walter Sharp and Grayson Kirk, Georg Schwarzenberger, Raymond Garfield Gettell, Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges and Joseph Roucek.⁷⁹ Also included will be the chief competitor to *PAN*, Fredrick L. Schuman 's *International Politics*.⁸⁰ Morgenthau's personal relationship with these individuals are examined in order to identify intellectual debts that would not be apparent simply from a textual reading. In particular, the relationship between Schuman and Morgenthau is assessed to develop the influence of this complex relationship upon Morgenthau's approach to *PAN*. The external political situation of the newly developing bi-polar world is investigated to show what role it played in the work.

Following the examination of the two books, the analysis provides an examination of the areas of tension between the two works. This is undertaken by analyzing the various publications in the immediate context to ascertain the developments and general state of the literature during this timeframe. The three categories under consideration are geopolitics, ethics and rationalism.

⁷⁹ See Walter R Sharp and Grayson Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics* (New York: Rinehart Company,1946) ; Raymond Garfield Gettell, *Political Science* (Boston: Ginn and Company,1933) ; Georg Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1941) ; Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek eds. *Contemporary World Politics: An Introduction to the Problems Of International Relations* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940).

⁸⁰ Fredrick L Schuman, *International Politics: The Western State System in Transition* 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill,1941) ; Fredrick L Schuman, *International Politics: The Destiny of The Western State System*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill,1948)

2.C Geopolitics

Geopolitics is the first chapter which discusses the changes to various elements in the text. The purpose of the chapter is to illustrate the differences between the discussion of geopolitics in *SMPP* and *PAN*. The evidence within the books suggests that the geopolitics section in *SMPP* was a product of Morgenthau's continental thinking that was unchanged throughout *SMPP*'s development. In *PAN* this view is altered to reflect the opposite of Morgenthau's original argument. The reasons for this are the Americanization of Morgenthau, his integration to IR and the various geopolitical thinkers of the time in America and the changing external context between the two books.

The chapter begins by outlining Morgenthau's position in the drafts and published versions of *SMPP*.⁸¹ Following this, the chapter analyzes the various renditions of *PAN* to try to ascertain if the change accorded in one of its drafts. Within *PAN* Morgenthau notes that the computation of national power is not complete and gives a disclaimer about the instability of other factors other than geography which he refers to as stable. However, these elements are considered a matter of evaluating the power of a state based upon the very factors he decried in *SMPP*.⁸² But, this still goes against the claim made in *SMPP* that quantitatively measuring the worth of land is not a feasible activity. The internal developments of geopolitics in IR are examined through the works of H.W. Weigert, Johannes Mattern, Robert Strausz-Hupe, Halford J. Mackinder, Nicholas Spykman, Derwent Whittlesey and James Fairgrieve.⁸³ The

⁸¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 92-93.

⁸² Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 80-105.

⁸³ H.W. Weigert, *German Geopolitics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1942) ; Johannes Mattern, *Geopolitik: Doctrine of National Self-Sufficiency and Empire* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1942) ; Robert Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics: The Struggle for Space and Power* (New York: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1942) ; Halford J. Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality* 2nd ed. (New York: Henry Holt Company, 1942) ; Nicholas John Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1942) ; Derwent Whittlesey, *Germany Strategy of World Conquest* (Tiptree ,Essex: F.E. Robinson, 1942) ; James Fairgrieve, *Geography and World Power* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1917).

external developments encompass the era of the Second World War, when the majority of these books were written, the immediate aftermath of the war and the implications of geopolitics in the global contest between the two newly formed superpowers.

2.D Rationalism

As evidenced by the literature review the subject of rationalism as a problem in *PAN* as compared to its treatment in *SMPP* has been noted by a few scholars. However, the problem is the method in which they analyzed this problem. The problem of rationalism is typically examined through the use of the six principles of political realism which appeared in the second edition of *PAN*. This forms the anchor of their analysis. However, using documents from the Morgenthau Archives from this period in conjunction with the rationalism of contemporary texts that Morgenthau used in his classes, an explanation can be provided for an apparent shift between *SMPP* and the first edition of *PAN*. One of the key figures in this chapter will be Charles Merriam. Merriam was the driving force towards scientific politics at the University of Chicago. Morgenthau's attacks against scientific planning coincided with Merriam's recent publications on planning in administration and politics.⁸⁴

2.E Ethics

The final section of the thesis is a comparison of the ethics of *SMPP* and *PAN*. The chapter shows that there are differences in the formulation of Morgenthau's ethics. The overall point of the ethics are fundamentally the same between the two books but the focus and some of the underlying logic behind the positions are different. This section begins by

⁸⁴ Annual Report of The Political Science Department: University of Chicago, 1943, HJM-B177F7; Annual Report of The Political Science Department: University of Chicago, 1944, HJM-B177F9. For works by Merriam on planning see Charles E. Merriam, "The Natural Resources Planning Board: A Chapter in American Planning Experience," *The American Political Science Review* 38 (1944): 1075-1088. Also see Morgenthau's comment on Merriam, Letter to Mr Jen Bouwer, Dec 7 1949, HJM-B7.

completing a textual analysis of the ethics in *SMPP* and *PAN* as well as Morgenthau's remarks of Carr's ethics. Contemporary sources that have illuminated the various strands of Morgenthau's ethics are interspersed throughout this analysis in relation to the various elements of the ethics they discuss. Following this, the different forms of ethics noted in the two books are linked to Niebuhr's work, particularly *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, *Christianity and Power Politics* and *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*.⁸⁵ This will be contrasted with thinkers who favoured a more optimistic, rationalist or positivist approach. The influence of Dewey, Carr, Weldon and Maritain are examined in detail.

Conclusion

As argued earlier in this section the approach that has been proposed will show the reasons for the inconsistencies between *SMPP* and *PAN* through the contemporary context in which Morgenthau was situated. By the application of the Skinnerian method, the motives and intentions behind these works will become clear, thereby allowing a unique understanding of the works and the tensions between them.

⁸⁵ Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932) ; Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940) and Reinhold Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness* (London: Nisbet and Co., 1945)

Chapter Three

The Creation of Scientific Man

1. Introduction

The object of this chapter is to explore the development of *SMPP* in relation to its purpose and surrounding context. The chapter will begin by discussing the applicability and use of Skinner's method in analyzing the book. Following this, the textual development of *SMPP* during its writing will be examined to ascertain its purpose and how it was altered due to changes in Morgenthau's thought and context. Afterwards, the external and internal context mentioned within the text will be discussed to explain why Morgenthau thought the purpose of the book was relevant to the present. This illustrates that Morgenthau viewed the errors described by the book as occurring in the present, thus emphasizing the difference between it and *PAN*. Lastly, the major themes of *SMPP* will be considered briefly in order to determine the major themes of the book. Within the discussion of these themes similar positions by authors Morgenthau read at the time will be mentioned in order to establish possible influences that helped direct Morgenthau's line of argument. In particular, the work of Reinhold Niebuhr will be shown to have a strikingly similar position to some of the statements in *SMPP*. These themes and connections will be explained in more depth in the later chapters that focus on specific elements within *SMPP* and *PAN*.

2. Methodology

The reasoning behind Skinner's method has already been discussed. However, as each chapter has a particular purpose the different chapters will use a certain aspect of Skinner's method to explain the tension between the two books. As stated in the prior chapter Skinner's

method will be used in this chapter to determine the purpose of *SMPP*. The reasoning for this is the purpose determines content, therefore, understanding the purpose of *SMPP* helps illuminate reasons for the differences between it and *PAN*. Examining the genesis and editing of the work will determine how this process changed during its writing, while analyzing the major themes helps reinforce the conclusions drawn from the analysis of its contextual influence. Analyzing the textual statements made within it as to its purpose helps illuminate what Morgenthau thought he was trying to do in writing the book. Also, noting the major themes and their academic influences provides an introduction to the subject matter of the later chapters.

3. Development

3.A First Manifestation

SMPP began as a short lecture at New School For Social Research in 1940.¹ The lecture was part of a series meant to explore the nature of liberalism in the present. Morgenthau's particular lecture was entitled *Liberalism and Foreign Policy*. Despite the shortness of the lecture it is remarkable to note that the basic elements of *SMPP* are present. Morgenthau claims that there are three separate elements of liberalism, its tenets as a philosophy from the late 18th century which influenced thought both in the 19th century and the present period, the application of liberalism in the domestic sphere as an ideology used by the middle class against the aristocratic class and finally the application of this ideology in the international sphere by the successful middle class. These three elements are found in the published version and are

¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, v. Also see, Liberalism and Foreign Policy Lecture, August 16 1940, HJM-B168F5 for the stenographic transcript of this lecture.

integral to Morgenthau's argument.² Furthermore, in this paper Morgenthau espoused an argument that would be critical to *SMPP*. This point is that philosophical thought needs to adapt to remain relevant to changing historic circumstances. He argues in this early paper that liberalism is a philosophical idea that was created in response to the events of the late 18th and 19th centuries. For this purpose liberalism was successful, however, Morgenthau argues that as the historic context has changed liberalism no longer adequately resolves the issues that confront people in the present.³

Other themes that are present in the paper that would be elaborated on in *SMPP* include the belief that education inspires individuals to make the rationally correct choice⁴, that peace can be achieved through an adequate distribution of raw materials⁵, and that the application of liberalism in foreign policy is predicated upon its success in the domestic sphere.⁶ These ideas will be explained briefly in subsequent sections of the chapter. A more detailed analysis of these ideas can be found in chapters five and six which analysis Morgenthau's positions on geopolitics and rationalism.

The inclusion of these core ideas at such an early stage indicate that Morgenthau was aware of the argument that would expanded upon in *SMPP*. Although this thesis argues that Morgenthau was primarily influenced to write both *SMPP* and *PAN* in response to the present context, it is also important to recognize this assumption of primacy does not exclude the obvious prior sources of influence on him. In Christoph Frei's biography of Morgenthau he claims that *SMPP* is a product of Morgenthau's study of American literature and law between

² For a discussion of liberalism as philosophical entity see Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 3-5. For a discussion of the middle class in the domestic context see *Ibid*, 19 and 45. For a brief synopsis of the thesis see *Ibid*, 41-42.

³*Ibid*, 2.

⁴ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 14, 122-123, 170, 173, and 210

⁵*Ibid*, 91-93.

⁶ *Ibid*, 108-121.

1939-1943.⁷ In the 1940 paper Morgenthau writes that his conclusions are tentative and that cannot give more than aphorisms on the subject. This supports Frei's conclusions. Frei also claims that prior to 1939 Morgenthau was not particularly immersed in American culture, being too busy trying to survive as a German immigrant without any much knowledge of the language or contacts in America.⁸ This is undoubtedly true. However, it is striking that between January of 1939 and the late summer of 1940 Morgenthau does not make any reference to any American thinkers or foreign policy decisions, instead aiming his critique at the repercussions of 19th century thought and specific 19th century conferences and books. It seems more reasonable to assume that due to Morgenthau's drastic change of circumstances, he borrowed from past experiences and knowledge, particularly on schemes for international peace in the 19th century.

3.B From a Speech to An Article

Shortly after presenting the paper in New York, Morgenthau received confirmation from the American Philosophical Society that they would give him a grant to further his proposed research project on liberalism and war.⁹ The synopsis of his proposal was to study the flaws of the political philosophy of liberalism in reference to the basic ideas of pre and post-war foreign policy.¹⁰ This synopsis helps establish the claim made above. If the original purpose was to focus on pre-war foreign policy under the guise of liberal philosophy then it would primarily draw upon both the proponents of liberal philosophy such as Mill, Bentham and others. It is arguable that Morgenthau would have been aware of them prior to his

⁷ Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 180.

⁸ *Ibid*, 181.

⁹ Letter From American Philosophical Society to Hans Morgenthau, October 14th 1940, HJM-B4F5.

¹⁰ Hans Morgenthau, "The relationship between the political philosophy of liberalism and foreign policy, with special reference to the basic ideas of pre- and post-World War foreign policy" *Yearbook of the American Philosophical Society* (1941): 211-214, HJM-B96F16.

emersion in the American literature. The writing of others such as Grotius, Spinoza, Abbe St. Pierre, Proudhon, Comte and Kant would also have been familiar to him. The practical policies in the 19th century, particularly those that relate to international law would surely have been known to him. Policies such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Treaty of Versailles are clear targets in Morgenthau's denunciation of liberal foreign policy and are subjects that he would have been intimately familiar with. Therefore, it seems that in the process of immigrating to a new country with a foreign language, teaching unfamiliar subjects, Morgenthau originally choose a topic with which he was knowledgeable.

During his tenure at Kansas City University Morgenthau did not progress as quickly with the text as he would have liked. Due to an overburdened course load and a hostile administration the work proceeded slowly. The circumstances were so arduous that Morgenthau was unable to fully spend his research grant in the allotted period, having to ask the Philosophical Society to hold installments of his grant as he did not have the time to use the funds.¹¹ Despite this, by 1941 Morgenthau had polished his original paper into an article entitled *Liberalism and War*. This paper exhibited more of the examples that would permeate *SMPP*. Cobden, Bentham and Wilson are quoted as examples of faulty liberalism while individuals such as Angell are subtly referenced.¹² The previous allusions to events such as the formation of the League of Nations and international conferences are still in the text but at this point they are integrated to provide a synthesis of his previous knowledge and his adaptation to the thought of the English world.

In late 1941 Morgenthau tried to submit this paper to the journal *International Law*. The choice of journal is interesting. The article is not in the realm of what would be considered

¹¹ Letter From Hans Morgenthau to the American Philosophical Society, April 29th 1941, HJM-B4F5.

¹² Hans Morgenthau, *Liberalism and War*, unpublished manuscript, HJM-B96F14.

international law. It is clearly a political science article. The editors of the journal shared this opinion, rejecting the article as they felt it did not fall under the scope of the journal, suggesting Morgenthau submit to a political science journal.¹³ The reasoning behind Morgenthau's choice of journals is nebulous. The possible explanations that can be assumed from this choice are; Morgenthau was not comfortable submitting to a political science journal, he was unaware of the different journals in political science and therefore defaulted to a journal he knew or that he was unaware that the topic in which he was exploring was not considered within the ambit of international law. All of these options are reasonable and there is little evidence to assume one over the other. However, in relation to the possibilities it is important to present some relevant evidence that has been neglected in other accounts of Morgenthau's early years. Upon arrival in America Morgenthau primarily engaged in legal debates; the most well-known of these articles was published in 1940.¹⁴ In the following years Morgenthau continued to publish in international law, writing articles on administrative law in 1943 and 1944.¹⁵ Little known is that by 1946 Morgenthau still wrote in the field of international law, presenting a paper at APSA on administrative law and sought to publish a paper on the subject.¹⁶ Therefore the evidence of Morgenthau's shift to political science from international law is not straightforward.¹⁷ It is staggered and gradual and an attempt to impose a boundary between the two in this period is an artificial distinction that is stated for analytical purposes. The historical record is more complex.

¹³Letter From American Journal of International Law to Hans Morgenthau, November 24th 1941, HJM-B4F3.

¹⁴ It should also be noted that during this period at Kansas City Morgenthau was teaching at the Law School. Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 183.

¹⁵ Hans Morgenthau, "Implied Regulatory Powers in Administrative Law," *The Iowa Law Review* 28 (1943): 575-612; Hans Morgenthau, "Implied Limitations on Regulatory Powers in Administrative Law," *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 11 (1944): 91-116.

¹⁶ Letter From Hans Morgenthau to Fredrick A. Ogg, January 6th, 1946, HJM-B4F8.

¹⁷ Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall Of International Law 1870-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 464 specifically makes the claim that after 1940 Morgenthau lost his interest in international law.

3.C From An Article to a Book

After the rejection of *Liberalism and War* there is no evidence that Morgenthau tried to publish it in another journal. As Frei notes, Morgenthau's infrequent spare time was now under more strain as a result of his course load and the subsequent fallout with the administration at the university which led to Morgenthau's dismissal.¹⁸ As a result little work was done on *SMPP* between 1941 and Morgenthau's arrival at the University of Chicago in 1943.¹⁹ After arriving at the University of Chicago in the fall of 1943 Morgenthau's writing and research expanded rapidly. In the Morgenthau Archive at the Library of Congress there are over a dozen drafts of *SMPP*. The quality of these drafts range from partial scripts, totalling forty or fifty pages, to fully complete editions which are relatively similar to the final version.²⁰ The majority of these are from 1943 to 1946. Thematically they are an expansion upon the 1940 and 1941 articles, containing the same general discourse but with additional examples and discussion. Despite this, the increase in examples supports Morgenthau's increasing familiarity with the subject matter in the American context. Using examples from such as Beard, Dewey, Glueck, Gallup, Laski, Lerner and Lynd among others Morgenthau has clearly linked the problems that he observed prior to his arrival in America to modern commentators and debates.

Considering the nature of *SMPP*, Morgenthau's relocation to Chicago is surprising. At this time Chicago was the vanguard for modeling the social sciences on the natural sciences. Prominent individuals in the university such as Charles Merriam, Harold Lasswell and William Ogburn rejected the pre-rationalist forms of political philosophy, emphasizing empirical work

¹⁸ These impediments are obviously in conjunction with the articles cited in n15 and the various reviews that Morgenthau wrote in this period.

¹⁹ Frei, *Hans J Morgenthau*, 183.

²⁰ See HJM-B147, HJM-B148 and HJM 149 for these drafts.

that could be directly applied to specific situations. However, Morgenthau's personal situation was desperate as his dismissal from Kansas City left him bereft of an income. Furthermore, the University of Chicago was one of most prestigious institutions in the country and Morgenthau's temporary appointment represented a significant career advancement.

As stated, Morgenthau's research output on *SMPP* was motivated by the improved conditions at Chicago. Yet, it appears that the increased output can be partially attributed to the intellectual impact of Merriam and his supporters. Thus, by arriving at Chicago Morgenthau became more integrated with American culture, linking his thoughts on liberalism to contemporary issues. By closely observing the strongest supporters of what he was arguing against, Morgenthau was motivated to pursue his argument with an intellectual vigor that he did not have since arriving in America.²¹

3.C1 Engagement with Academia

Another notable effect in this period is the increased integration that Morgenthau had with the political science community, publishing chapters of his book as articles and attending multi-disciplinary conferences as opposed to ones focused exclusively on international law.²² The first article was published in 1944. Entitled *The Limitations of Science and The Problem of Social Planning*, the article is the same as the relevant section of *SMPP* with several lengthy examples omitted.²³ By 1944 Morgenthau began attending Lyman Bronson's annual *Symposium on Science, Philosophy and Religion*. The papers presented in these conferences are excerpts from what was to become *SMPP*. The first paper is a synopsis of the argument

²¹ Frei, *Hans J Morgenthau*, 190 and Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations*, 468.

²² Previously, Morgenthau's American articles and reviews were almost unilaterally concentrated in international law journals.

²³ Hans Morgenthau, "The Limitations of Science and the Problem of Social Planning," *Ethics* 54 (1944): 174-185. Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 124-152.

against scientific solutions to social problems and the paper presented the following year would later be published under the title of *The Evil of Politics and the Ethics of Evil*.²⁴

The reception to these papers was mixed. This is partially due to the composition of the conference. The attendees of the symposium ranged from professors of zoology to political science and probably helped Morgenthau acquaint himself with the general trends and ideas in American academia at the time. This conference would also have aided Morgenthau in understanding the positions which he argued against in *SMPP*. Many of the papers in the conference posited methods in which science could solve political and cultural problems of the period. Furthermore, Lyman Bronson, one of the heads of the conference, was a staunch believer in the ability of science to solve the issues that were occurring at the time.

Morgenthau specifically referenced Bronson as one of his critics.²⁵

3.D Publishing

Despite this opposition Morgenthau's progress continued. With two articles from what was to become the book published in respected journals and a clear objective that was relevant to his contemporary context he continued editing and revising *SMPP*. At this point Morgenthau had already signed a contract with Alfred A. Knopf for the publication of what would later be *PAN*.²⁶ Seeking to capitalize upon this relationship, in late 1945 Morgenthau offered the book to Knopf. However, Knopf declined stating that their manufacturing facilities were overburdened and that the book would require special promotion and handling which

²⁴ See Hans Morgenthau, "The Scientific Solution of Social Conflicts" *Approaches to National Unity: Fifth Symposium*, eds., Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelman and R.M. Maclver.(New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945), 419-443; Hans Morgenthau, "Ethics and Politics" in *Approaches To Group Understanding: Sixth Symposium Of The Conference On Science, Philosophy and Religion*, eds., Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelman and R.M. Maclver (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), 319-341 and Hans J. Morgenthau, "The Evil of Politics and the Ethics of Evil," *Ethics* 56 (1945): 1-18.

²⁵ Letter From Hans Morgenthau to Michael Oakeshott, May 22nd 1948, HJM-B44F9.

²⁶ See Chapter 4 for a discussion of the development of *PAN*.

they are unable to do at the present.²⁷ In response by early 1946 Morgenthau submitted the manuscript, at this time called *Dilemmas of Scientific Man*, to the University of Chicago Press.

The internal reviews of *SMPP* were not favourable. The earliest review was written in February 1946 and declared that Morgenthau did not succeed in proving his claims within the book.²⁸ The reviewer complimented the writing style and noted that due to its small size and interesting subject matter it would sell well but that the University of Chicago should not publish it as a university should not discourage rational and scientific solutions to politics. The following month a subsequent internal review was conducted by the famed economist Frank H Knight.²⁹ Professor Knight's review is extremely critical of *SMPP*. His strongest criticism is that the book is assertive without proving fact and often exaggerates and overemphasizes claims to make a point. He notes that Morgenthau's terminology is not precise, interchangeably using science and rationalism. Despite these reviews, in April the University of Chicago Press decided to publish the book.³⁰ After finding a publisher Morgenthau made minor cosmetic changes to the text such as altering the title. There is no evidence that Morgenthau sought to integrate any of the criticisms by the internal reviewers into the text.

4. Reviews

The final part of this section is on the treatment of *SMPP* by the academic community and Morgenthau's reaction to it. The purpose of this is to try and ascertain his state of mind after its publication through his response to the reviews. The negative response to

²⁷Letter From Alfred A Knopf to Hans Morgenthau, November 27th 1945,HJM-B146F9

²⁸ University of Chicago Press Manuscript Report, February 5th 1946, HJM-B146F9.

²⁹ Letter From Frank H Knight to John G.H. Scoon, editor of the University of Chicago Press, March 28th 1946, HJM-B146F9.

³⁰ Contract for Dilemma of Scientific Man, April 8th 1946, HJM-B86F2.

Morgenthau's work can be viewed as a possible reason for the subsequent change of focus in *PAN*.

After its publication *SMPP* was widely reviewed. While the reviews were not wholly negative as the internal publishing reviews, its reception was mixed. Listing all the various reviews is unnecessary but to judge the impact and reception of his work the most notable ones will be mentioned. Unsurprisingly, Reinhold Niebuhr responded positively, stating that the subject was one of the most important of the time and that it should be read as widely as possible.³¹ Others such as Hans Weigert and C.A.W. Manning were cautiously optimistic, Manning noting that there were flaws but that the discussion was important and the conclusions were correct.³² Hans Weigert agreed with the book but stated that it was overly pessimistic in its conclusions and tone.³³ The *Literary Supplement of the Times* reviewed the book and was the most complimentary of *SMPP*'s reviewers.³⁴ Morgenthau appeared to be the most pleased with this review as he mentioned it often in his letters, stating it to be most penetrating.³⁵ Morgenthau did not mention Niebuhr's review in any of his surviving letters. This could be a result of missing material from the archive or the assumption that Niebuhr would obviously agree with the points he is making. Therefore there would be no point in emphasizing this fact.

³¹ Reinhold Niebuhr, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Christianity and Society* (1947): 33-34. This review was also circulated in a flyer sent out by University of Chicago Press to newspaper columnists. Letter From University of Chicago Press to General news columnists, December 12th 1946, HJM-B146F9.

³² C.A.W. Manning, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *World Affairs* 1 (1947): 47-50.

³³ Hans Weigert, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," HJM-B149F8. Unfortunately there is no journal title so it is impossible to know where Weigert published it.

³⁴ The Intellectual in Politics, *The Times Literary Supplement*, June 21st 1947.

³⁵ Letter from Hans Morgenthau to Georg Blau, Dec 11 1947, HJM-B146F9 and Letter From Hans Morgenthau to Eduard Heimann, August 21 1947, HJM-B146F9.

The most notable review which both praised and criticized *SMPP* was Michael Oakeshott's review in the *Cambridge Journal* in March of 1948.³⁶ Oakeshott's review is balanced, noting the flaws of the book and Morgenthau's writing, while praising the subject matter and the illustration of the fallacies inherent in the subject's application to the world. The major criticism that Oakeshott notes is the unclear and confused terminology employed by Morgenthau in trying to explain the essence of rationalism and scientism. Oakeshott makes mention of smaller flaws such as the lack of historical explanation in Morgenthau's narrative and the use of the knowledge of the statesmen as a form of bulwark against bad decisions. Despite reiterating the flaws in Morgenthau's work the review reads as kindly criticism while encouraging the author to try and elaborate and clarify the shortcomings in the work.

Morgenthau's response to Oakeshott clarifies his reaction to some of the critiques of his work. He is appreciative and states that for the work to be taken seriously is surprising and gratifying. Clearly, this is a reaction to the negative reviews that he received which misconstrued his meaning and were overly defensive of the research paradigm that Morgenthau attacked.³⁷ He agreed with the major point of contention in Oakeshott's review, that the use of terms was unclear. This admission from Morgenthau is rare as throughout his early career he did not respond to criticism well, preferring to rely on his own judgement of the merits of his writing and argument.³⁸

³⁶Michael Oakeshott, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *The Cambridge Journal* 1 (1948): 347-358. Also see Nicholas Rengger, "Realism, tragedy and the anti-Pelagian imagination in international political thought," in *Realism Reconsidered*, ed. Michael C. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 118-136 for a discussion of the link between Oakeshott and Morgenthau.

³⁷ It should be noted that Oakeshott noted in his review that those who had a vested interest in the promotion of what Morgenthau was arguing against would not take the book seriously. Oakeshott, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics", 347.

³⁸ A prime example of this is Edward Shils' notes on *PAN* which Morgenthau asked for but did not implement. See chapter four for a more thorough discussion of this.

The negative reviews bear notice for their vehemence against Morgenthau and the book. In the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* the reviewer abandons professional decorum and courtesy by mocking the content.³⁹ He describes Morgenthau's writing as flailing about and condemns his sources as a motley collection. While the particular reviewer is correct in some of his assertions, such as the sweeping generalizations and possible straw men that Morgenthau uses to prove his argument, the review contains obvious misstatements that are attributed to Morgenthau. These statements concern the "accidental" success of liberalism in the 19th century, that the rule of law is always doomed to fail and that Morgenthau refers to Edmund Burke as a liberal. These misstatements combined with a tone that is venomous and condensing spurred Morgenthau to write a letter of rebuttal to the journal where he cited the relevant passages that disproved those claims.⁴⁰ The reviewer refused to respond publicly, stating to the editor that he does not want to engage Morgenthau in any controversy but feels "his review sized up Morgenthau with considerable accuracy."⁴¹ The review in the *American Political Science Review* gave a similar critique, stating that "the author flails about in every direction" and that "unfortunately, he is often dogmatic, at times supercilious, and not infrequently sneering and flippant."⁴² The *Philosophical Review* was curter but exhibited the same sentiments. It did not bother to give a full review of the book, stating in a three sentence summary that the thesis of the book is that while problems are not susceptible to scientific enquiry they are capable of being solved by ill-informed men

³⁹ William Anderson, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 250 (1947): 135-136.

⁴⁰ Hans Morgenthau, "Letter From Hans Morgenthau," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 252 (1947): 173-174.

⁴¹ Letter from William Anderson to Wallace Weaver, April 21st 1947, HJM-B146F9.

⁴² R.K. Gooch, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *American Political Science Review* 41 (1947): 335-336.

who possess insight of a higher kind.⁴³ The final negative review that is remarkable is Fredrick Schumann's review in the *Journal of Political Economy*.⁴⁴ Schumann's review praises Morgenthau's style of writing, describing it as "written with consistent felicity of style and occasional literary power which distinguish it happily from much current writing on public affairs."⁴⁵ He also agrees that there is a need for a critique of contemporary scientific social science. However, he argues that Morgenthau's execution is poor, committing basic errors, engaging in contradictions and having a confused argument. The review is similar to Oakeshott's in tone but unlike Oakeshott who agreed with some elements of the argument, Schumann discounts Morgenthau's line of argument completely.

These select reviews reinforce Morgenthau's statement to Reinhold Niebuhr that the philosophical responses have been mixed but the "reactions of the political scientists have been mostly disastrous."⁴⁶ Worse, the scathing review in the *Annals* was written by a former head of the American Political Science Association. Morgenthau's argument against the practices that he saw in American academia was soundly denounced by the practitioners. It was not an auspicious start to his career. Despite Morgenthau's division of the reviews by academic field it appears that the reviews of British academics were generally positive, thereby underlining a sharp distinction in the thought and practices between the communities in the two countries.⁴⁷ Despite the differences between the reception of *SMPP* and *PAN* the effect that Morgenthau's peers had towards the writing of *PAN* appears to be less than what would be assumed from the evidence presented thus far. This is due to the overlapping period in

⁴³ "Books Received," *Philosophical Review* 56 (1947): 230.

⁴⁴ Fredrick L. Schuman, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Journal of Political Economy* 55 (1947): 470-471. For a lengthy discussion of Schuman's history with Morgenthau see chapter four.

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 470.

⁴⁶ Letter from Hans Morgenthau to Reinhold Niebuhr, May 16th 1947, HJM-B44F1.

⁴⁷ Letter from Hans Morgenthau to Georg Blau, Dec 11 1947, HJM-B146F9 remarks that Blau, an Englishman, is too optimistic in assuming the mode of thought criticized by Morgenthau has disappeared from American social science.

which the books were written.⁴⁸ However, it appears obvious that the poor reception must have had some impact upon the content of *PAN* as Morgenthau became aware of the intellectual attitude of his peers in political science.

5. Internal and External Relevance

Having discussed the personal contemporary context during the period of *SMPP*'s development, the next section looks at the textual evidence to illustrate the influence of the contemporary period within the text. This will demonstrate that despite the books frequent allusions to the 19th century it was targeted at specific situations and individuals in Morgenthau's own period, thus justifying the need for the book. This also demonstrates that the method of focusing on contemporary authors employed in this thesis is in line with Morgenthau's own perspective and thoughts. Relevance is divided into two sections. The first is on external relevance meaning the relevance to recent developments in the international political situation. The second is on internal relevance, where Morgenthau shows various authors in his own time that are advocating various rationalist positions. Both these sections will deal only with textual remarks; in the final section other non-textual circumstantial evidence that demonstrates Morgenthau was influenced by certain authors will be briefly presented.

5.A External Relevance

Morgenthau begins *SMPP* by noting that the intellectual roots of rationalism come from the 18th and 19th centuries but that the philosophy has not really changed in the present period.⁴⁹ As a philosophy it has penetrated Western thought, becoming the dominant form in

⁴⁸ See chapter four for a detailed discussion of *PAN*.

⁴⁹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 4.

both theory and practice.⁵⁰ The problem that Morgenthau notes is that this mode of thinking is no longer relevant to the modern period as it does not give meaning to life through explanation as circumstances have changed.⁵¹ This failure to properly explain the world around the individual naturally leads to a need to re-examine the philosophy to understand why it cannot properly explain and direct action.⁵² This has practical application as Morgenthau states that the problems of the 1930's and 1940's stems from the application of rationalism to foreign policy.⁵³ This application worked in the 19th century but the external conditions had changed since then to render it obsolete.⁵⁴ The failure of rationalism and liberalism to change with these conditions led to its rejection as it no longer could conform to experience. One of the results of this was the rise of fascism.⁵⁵ In practical application rationalism led to proposals in the 1930's for actions such as disarmament which helped Hitler perceive weakness in the liberal nations, resulting in war.⁵⁶ This fear of conflict is inherent in modern rationalism and led to hesitancy and avoidance of the nature of the political at the time.⁵⁷ Following this line of thought, Morgenthau's goal is to critique these views in order to show that they are not relevant in the contemporary world and thus prevent the continuance of these errors in the future.

5.B Internal Relevance

The majority of the internal academic references within *SMPP* are to authors from the previous centuries. There are various reasons this is so, from establishing the philosophical

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 32.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 2.

⁵² *Ibid*, 9.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 5-6.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 59.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 8.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 44-45, 54 and 100.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 69, 79.

roots of the ideas he is critiquing, his unfamiliarity with much of the literature due to his recent arrival in America, or a hesitancy to attack well known American figures as an émigré scholar who was beginning his career. Of the scholars cited it is important to note that there is a surprising lack of German sources. This is possibly due to a fear of being associated with the academic thought that was popular in Germany prior to the Second World War. Of the current scholars mentioned in *SMPP*, Morgenthau particularly attacks Robert Lynd. He is mentioned twice as a negative example of rationalism in the social sciences. In the first instance he cites Lynd as an example of the sociological laboratory method of finding solutions in the scientific vein.⁵⁸ In the second instance he quotes Lynd stating that the causes of war are known but the problem is making the populace accept and understand this knowledge.⁵⁹ Other scholars mentioned in conjunction with scientific thought include Charles Beard⁶⁰, John Dewey⁶¹, E.L. Thorndike⁶², Karl Mannheim⁶³, Gordon Gallup⁶⁴ and Alfred Adler.⁶⁵ While the references are sparse it shows that Morgenthau incorporated his knowledge of the internal academic community and the positions of its authors in relation to this issue.

6. Themes

The defining aspect of *SMPP* is its attack on liberalism, rationalism and scientism. As many of the reviewers noted the definition of these terms is not clear. Morgenthau appears to

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 34.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 91-92. A review in *Rural Sociology* in March 1947 took exemption to Morgenthau's lack of citation of any living sociologist except Lynd. See Morton King Jr, "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Rural Sociology* 12 (1947): 80.

⁶⁰ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 29-30.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 28.

⁶² *Ibid*.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 34.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 205.

deliberately avoid giving a precise definition.⁶⁶ However, he is much more forthright in detailing the flaws that result from subscribing to these beliefs. In *SMPP* these errors can be divided into theoretical and empirical errors. The theoretical errors are the use of models, a simplified causation and single cause solutions to problems. These theoretical errors are similar in that Morgenthau posits that they all simplify reality in order to explain phenomenon. These three types of errors are usually formed in a sequence. Starting from a simplified model the rationalists use the model to explain causation which then leads to the supposed solution. By using a flawed starting point as the basis of their explanation, the subsequent analysis is inevitably wrong.

The empirical errors can be seen as by-products of the theoretical errors. Empirical mistakes such as an overreliance on geopolitics are a prime example of the use of a single cause solution to solve complex issues. Morgenthau specifically notes this problem in the Congress of Vienna but mentions that it has persisted to the present.⁶⁷ Another empirical mistake noted by Morgenthau is the emphasis on planning in order to control outcomes in a specific manner to the benefit of the planner. This mistake primarily is a fault of applying a simplified causation to reality. Two other empirical mistakes are noted throughout *SMPP*. The first is the belief that tools such as education and psychology will lessen conflicts in society and after this, enable groups to solve any remaining issues. This solution is another example of the use of single cause solutions. The final mistake is a misunderstanding of the difference between the domestic and the international. This mistake uses domestic successes and blindly applies them to international problems expecting the same success.

⁶⁶ See chapter six for a discussion of the definition of rationalism in *SMPP*.

⁶⁷ See chapters five and six for a discussion of geopolitics in *SMPP*.

While *SMPP* devotes the majority of its length to discussing the errors of rationalism as supported by liberalism there is a chapter which discusses the problems of ethics. Within this chapter Morgenthau outlines a critique of traditional ethics while elaborating what he feels is the preferred ethical action due to the evil which is ubiquitous in all actions.⁶⁸ Morgenthau's critique is complex and this complexity is amplified by the manner in which it is written. The section is unfortunately disjointed with discussions on a particular ethical system mentioned then abandoned followed by a resumption of the original discussion in fragments later in the chapter. The critique can be summarized as the traditional distinction between intention and consequences which traditional ethics is founded upon is a spurious dichotomy. Morgenthau argues that both these ethical systems cannot be divorced from another and the practical foundations of each system do not reflect reality, as to prove the primacy of consequences or intentions requires a belief in an end in which the use of one or another can be evaluated.⁶⁹ However, reality does not end and actions reverberate causing other actions later. Therefore it is impossible to say that the intentions/consequences were good and therefore it is a good act.

In discussing ethics as it relates to international politics, Morgenthau discounts the prevailing theory of a dual morality. This rejection is not as absolute as it first appears. While rejecting a dual morality in favour of a single morality he notes that the observance of this morality differs in degree between individual actions and the political actions.⁷⁰ Morgenthau then predicates his own theory on the ubiquity of evil in all actions. As political action affects more people a political act necessarily causes more harm than individual actions. Morgenthau therefore concludes that the only way to act ethically, particularly in politics, is to abide by the

⁶⁸ See chapter seven.

⁶⁹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 189.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 195.

principle of the lesser evil. This principle states that to act ethically the least harmful decision should be taken. There are flaws with this formulation which will be discussed later.⁷¹

7. Influence

Morgenthau's position in *SMPP* is most influenced by Reinhold Niebuhr. The similarities between the two authors are striking. The similarities are sharpest in the discussion of rationalism generally, the problem of education and planning, as well as some of the nature of the lesser evil. In discussing rationalism Niebuhr states that it is a historic product of the 19th century and notes that the nature of reason needs to change to adapt different situations.⁷² This is similar to Morgenthau's argument at the beginning of *SMPP* for the failure of modern liberalism. Niebuhr's view on education is parallel to Morgenthau's position in *SMPP*. He believes that education will not change human nature and that education is itself inevitably biased by the view of the educator.⁷³ The final overlap on rationalism between Morgenthau and Niebuhr is found in the conception of planning. In *Moral Man and Immoral Society* Niebuhr points out the flaws of planning that is less detailed than Morgenthau but is analogous in terms of their fundamental conclusions.⁷⁴

The similarities between Niebuhr's pre-1946 works and *SMPP* are found primarily in the discussion of motives and consequences and the lesser evil. Niebuhr has less detail on consequence and motive in his works than Morgenthau. In *Moral Man and Immoral Society* Niebuhr briefly mentions that both consequences and motives are not useful by themselves in judging ethics. He seems to favour intention as opposed to motive but this leads back to the

⁷¹ See chapter six.

⁷² Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, xii, xxv and Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 103 and 155.

⁷³ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 197, 214, and 246 and Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 134.

⁷⁴ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 212-214.

problem that he originally states, namely that understanding the motive/intention of an act is difficult and the statements made by an individual with respect to the supposed goal are unreliable.⁷⁵ The clearest example of the link between the two thinkers is on their conception of the lesser evil. Niebuhr argues that all actions have an element of evil in them as all actions fail to be absolutely good.⁷⁶ The solution is to use the least damaging form of action as can be best determined by the actor but even this lesser form of harm will inevitably cause more harm if the action is taken in a political context as opposed to an individual one.⁷⁷ This is the same conclusion that Morgenthau reaches in *SMPP* and can be attributed to Niebuhr's influence. Interestingly in a footnote in the ethics section of *SMPP* it is specifically stated that the subject matter has been most illuminatingly treated in the books of Reinhold Niebuhr.⁷⁸

8. Conclusion

Due to its long gestation period the drafts of *SMPP* show how Morgenthau adapted his thesis to the changing context and circumstances that surrounded him. Originally starting as a critique of liberalism in foreign policy in the 19th and early 20th centuries, it expanded to include contemporary events and issues as Morgenthau became integrated into American society. This change can be primarily seen after 1943 with Morgenthau's relocation to the University of Chicago. Despite these changes and his gradual shift from international law to international politics, the general idea for the text remains the product of his pre-American roots, adapted and updated as the situation warranted. The works of some of Morgenthau's scientific colleagues at Chicago and his appreciation for the work of Reinhold Niebuhr reinforced his conviction in his thesis, despite the mixed reception of the book.

⁷⁵ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 170.

⁷⁶ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 174.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 179, 238 and 267 and Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 166.

⁷⁸ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 236.

In contrast to the history of the development of *SMPP*, the next chapter will show *PAN* is primarily the product of Morgenthau's American experiences. Starting from its genesis in 1945 the chapter will explore the development of *PAN* to its publication in 1948. After explaining the process of its development the chapter will examine the structural components of *PAN*. It will be compared to the other successful American textbooks of the period that Morgenthau read. This will show how the discussion in *PAN* was influenced by the prevailing trends in American academia. Despite these similarities the chapter will show the manner in which *PAN* distinguished itself from its competitors leading to its primacy among IR textbooks. This success would lead to an improved academic profile that would make Morgenthau a household name in IR.

Chapter 4

Politics Among Nations Among its Contemporaries

1. Introduction

As the previous chapter explored *SMPP* and its genesis in order to understand the context of its components, this present chapter explores the development of *PAN*, its relationship to other textbooks of IR within the period and the external context that motivated its content.¹ While the previous chapter did not explore the contemporary books written from a similar perspective, due to lack of evidence that Morgenthau read any of them other than Niebuhr, the present chapter uses contemporary textbooks that archival evidence shows Morgenthau read and probably used in the construction of *PAN*. Using Skinner's method the analysis of books of a similar type within the period is necessary in order to see how much of *PAN*'s content is influenced by previous works. By doing this it can be seen whether this influence could have altered Morgenthau's discussion of international relations which would explain the discrepancy between *PAN* and *SMPP*. Exploring the broader academic and external context in which the books were placed allows the writing of IR in this period to be understood. This will show how Morgenthau's textbook became dominant and managed to circumvent some of the prevalent academic conventions for IR textbooks. Overall, the chapter will show that one of the reasons for the difference between *PAN* and *SMPP* is *PAN*'s greater conformity to the intellectual conventions in American IR.

¹ The period will consist of prominent textbooks of the late 1930's and most of the 1940's.

2. Method

Skinner's methodology advocates the comprehensive study of the contemporary texts of the author's historic period, both minor and major, in order to understand the intellectual context of the period and the possible relationships between them. The intention in writing a text is informed by the intellectual context in which the author is immersed. Studying similar works within the same period also provides perspective on the conventions which were active. Understanding both the intent and conventions allows the reader to see the text in a broader dimension by understanding what the author was doing when he wrote the text.² Additionally, based upon Skinner's own work it is common to find that the political issues and structure in which these problems are dealt are not unique.³ Skinner asserts this claim as a general assumption of intellectual investigation, stating that the work in question is bound to have some similarities with works of the same genre and in the same period, though he does allow for the possibility of some differences created by the author.⁴ Skinner's method also advocates incorporating the external context of the work in order to understand purpose of the text. The external context is important as intellectual works are not written in a vacuum and necessarily are influenced by 'real world events'.⁵

² Palonen, *Quentin Skinner*, 45.

³ Schochet, "Quentin Skinner's Method," 263. Also see Skinner, "The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought," 286-317.

⁴ Skinner, "Hermeneutics and the Role of History," 221.

⁵ See the previous chapter on method for a detailed discussion of internal and external context in Skinner's work and IR historiography.

3. IR as a Discipline in the 1940's

The study of the history of IR as an academic discipline has been generally neglected, with serious research starting fifteen years ago. Notable works since then include the work of Peter Wilson, Brian Schmidt, Lucian Ashworth, Torbjørn L. Knutsen, Andreas Osiander and Casper Sylvest.⁶ Most of this work deals with two particular issues -the mythical Idealist-Realist debate and IR scholarship prior to the 1940's. Both these issues fundamentally relate to the IR scholars in the 1940's. The concept of an Idealist paradigm dominating IR scholarship in the 1930's is a polemic invention of E.H. Carr in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.⁷ This claim was quickly repeated throughout the 1940's by many scholars in favour of a new "realistic" outlook.⁸ The second issue debates a claim also typically made in the 1940's, that IR was a new academic discipline and as such needed to be formalized through specific courses and textbooks in universities. While these works have done a great service to IR in dispelling these mistaken ideas, little has been done in exploring the 1940s themselves, what these individuals thought they were doing in the "formation" of IR and how this work changed the focus and direction of IR. To pursue this objective it is important to consider what these individuals thought about

⁶ See Peter Wilson, 'The Myth of the "First Great Debate,"' *Review of International Studies* 24 (1998): 1-16, Peter Wilson, "Where are we now in the debate about the first great debate?" 133-151, Schmidt, "The historiography of International Relations," 349-367, Brian C. Schmidt, "Lessons From the Past: Reassessing the Inter-war Disciplinary History of International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1998): 433-459, Schmidt, *The Political Discourse Of Anarchy*; Brian C. Schmidt, "Political Science and the American Empire, 675-687; Lucian M. Ashworth, *Creating International Studies. Angell, Mitrany and the Liberal Tradition* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), Lucian M. Ashworth, "Did the Realist-Idealist Debate Really Happen? A Revisionist History Of International Relations," *International Relations* 16 (2002): 33-51, Lucian M. Ashworth, "Where the Idealist in Interwar International Relations?," *Review of International Studies* 32 (2006): 291-308, Lucian M. Ashworth, *International Relations Theory and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making 1918-1945* (London: IB Tauris, 2007), Lucian M. Ashworth, "Mapping a New World: Geography and the Interwar Study of International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 57 (2013):138-149, Torbjørn L. Knutsen, "A Lost Generation? IR Scholarship Before WW1," *International Politics* 45 (2008): 650-674, Andreas Osiander, "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited," *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1998): 409-432 and Sylvest, "Interwar Internationalism, the British Labour Party, and the Historiography of International Relations," 409-432.

⁷ See Wilson, "The Myth of 'The First Great Debate,'".

⁸ See below.

the history of IR, rather than as it really was. The most detailed work of this period on IR in the past is Grayson Kirk's book, *The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities*. This book was commissioned in the spring of 1946 by the Council of Foreign Relations to study International Relations in American universities. The purpose of the book was to investigate the subject matter of IR and its instruction in American universities. The contents of the book were achieved through a roundtable discussion at six regional conferences attended by notable IR scholars of the period. Interestingly, Morgenthau was one of the participants and as such was immersed in the claims made about IR by these American scholars.⁹ Kirk claims that prior to World War One international relations was dealt with in a fragmentary and peripheral manner usually in a course on international law or diplomacy.¹⁰ He alludes to some exceptions but states that these are rare.¹¹ The catalyst for teaching IR in universities was World War One, as universities created courses to fill the demand of individuals desiring to prevent events like it in the future.

At the time of writing Kirk notes that there was a problem with the tendency to have introductory IR courses offered late in the student's progression at the university. Generally, when IR was offered as a separate course it was offered to juniors.¹² Other writers mirrored this critique and were concerned about the state of IR in universities, particularly the need to properly situate IR within the university.¹³ Contingent to the idea of having more accessible IR

⁹ Grayson Kirk, *The Study of International Relations: In American Colleges and Universities* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1947), 110.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 2.

¹¹ *Ibid*. In particular he makes reference to Paul Reinsch's work. This claim is repeated by Raymond Gettel. See Raymond Gettel, "Review of Essays in Political Science," *American Political Science Review* 31 (1937): 958. For Schmidt's reference to the work on Reinsch see in particular Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*, 70-73.

¹² Kirk, *The Study of International Relations*, 33.

¹³ See Waldemar Gurian, "On The Study of International Relations," *The Review Of Politics* 8 (1946): 275-282 and E.H.Carr, "Review of International Studies in Modern Education," *International Affairs* 17 (1938): 543.

courses or even a degree in IR was the need to have a textbook which properly elucidates the concepts and ideas within IR. Kirk notes a few textbooks were written on the subject but states that they were too few in number and of poor quality.¹⁴ By 1946 this had changed but there was no great classic textbook of IR which sufficiently dealt with all the subject matter.¹⁵ Gurian has a similar opinion, suggesting using Schuman's textbook *International Politics* as the standard textbook, but notes there are flaws in it, such as the neglect of economics and geography.¹⁶

The importance of understanding the context of what IR scholars thought about IR as a discipline can be seen by this belief that IR was still in its developmental stage. Logically, if a discipline is still being formed the members of the discipline are more elastic in accepting changes in conceptual ideas of the discipline or methods of analysis. This elasticity is only increased when the members of the discipline are actively asking for a contribution to fill a void. In this case, the need for a seminal textbook for IR provided the opportunity for Morgenthau to reorient the discipline through *PAN* towards a more abstract and analytical approach.¹⁷

4. The Beginning of Politics Among Nations

PAN was originally a proposal sent to the publishing house of F.S.Croft as a possible introductory textbook for IR in the summer of 1945. However, the textbook was then called *International Politics* and consisted of only a rough outline. This outline was substantially different from the finished product. One of the largest differences was the inclusion of a long

¹⁴Kirk, *The Study Of International Relations*, 56.

¹⁵ *Ibid*,57. This is interesting as Kirk himself had written a textbook on IR in 1940. See below.

¹⁶ Gurian, "On The Study of International Relations," 278.

¹⁷ For an analysis on how Morgenthau continued this objective in the 1950's see Nicholas Guilhot, ed., *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, The Rockefeller Foundation and The 1954 Conference on Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011).

discussion on the concept of science in international politics. This discussion appears to be reminiscent of *SMPP* on which he was concurrently working.¹⁸ Croft rejected the publication saying it was not in line with contemporary textbooks.¹⁹ This led to Morgenthau approaching Alfred A. Knopf who were more agreeable, leading to a contract in the fall of 1945.²⁰ After the proposed title was rejected by Knopf, Morgenthau completed a new outline, which eliminated the sections on science.²¹ This outline was more in line with the content of the other textbooks of the period. There are sections on the policies of the major powers, regional analysis of world politics, constitutional controls of foreign affairs, a history of international organizations and a specific section dealing with the problems of race.²² Due to these shifts in structure and the upcoming publication of *SMPP*, Morgenthau consistently missed his publishing deadlines. By late 1946 he had discarded all of the previous outlines and had decided to proceed from a transcript of his own lectures.²³ This transcript would be the basis for the published version of *PAN*.²⁴

Knopf was skeptical about Morgenthau's proposed changes, arguing that the book would be too theoretical and abstract for an introductory textbook.²⁵ Upon receiving a draft of the book Knopf sent it out to reviewers stating that they did not think the internal reviewers would like it.²⁶ However, it was well received by the scholars.²⁷ Despite this, Knopf still pressed

¹⁸ Outline of International Politics, HJM-B124F6.

¹⁹ Letter From Allen Swibler to Hans Morgenthau, August 2nd 1945, HJM-B121F6.

²⁰ Letter From Alfred A. Knopf to Hans Morgenthau, September 12th 1945, HJM-B121F6.

²¹ It is interesting to note that Knopf informed Fredrick Schuman of the title as it was similar to his own. Schuman expressed his displeasure and Knopf, who published some of Schuman's work told Morgenthau he had to change the title. Letter From Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, June 19th 1946, HJM-B121F6.

²² Outline of International Law and Relations, HJM-B124F7.

²³ Letter From Hans Morgenthau to Roger Shugg, December 11th 1946, HJM-B121F6.

²⁴ Notes From International Relations class, 1946, HJM-B168F6, HJM-B169F1 and HJM-B169F2 and Morgenthau, Prologue.

²⁵ Letter From Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, January 17th 1947, HJM-B121F6.

²⁶ Letter from Harold Sprout to Roger Shugg, December 24th 1947, HJM-B121F6.

Morgenthau for a more conventional textbook which he ignored. In the summer of 1948 *PAN* was in the process of publication. By the end of 1948 it was threatening the dominance of *International Politics* and Schuman's publisher, McGraw Hill was actively campaigning against it.²⁸

4.A Alternative Claims

Before investigating *PAN*'s relationship with the other popular textbooks of the period it is necessary to briefly defend the history of *PAN* that has just been outlined. Christoph Frei suggests that *PAN* is the culmination of Morgenthau's writings in Europe, finally brought together in a single book which united the various strands of his theory.²⁹ The evidence for this claim is at best ambiguous. Frei cites various one sentence comments from the early 30's where Morgenthau stated that he was planning to write a book that would be an expansion upon his previous books.³⁰ The citation of this claim does not prove much other than Morgenthau wished to continue writing on the same subject as his previous works. This is not a particularly profound revelation. However, from this evidence he claims that fourteen years later after Morgenthau finally found stability after his forced exodus from Germany, Switzerland and Spain he completed this goal. To prove the book is the same he cites similarities between these works and *PAN* in the treatment of the concepts of status quo, revisionist, and imperialist powers, anarchy, politics as a struggle for power and international organizations.

There is no doubt that these concepts were borrowed from Morgenthau's earlier works and inserted into *PAN*. However, Frei goes on to claim that after arriving in America

²⁷ Letter from Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, February 21st, 1947, HJM-B121F6.

²⁸ Letter From Hans Morgenthau to Roger Shugg, Dec 31st 1948, HJM-B121F7.

²⁹ Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 208-210.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 208-209.

Morgenthau submitted a grant application to the Guggenheim Foundation which was an outline of *PAN*.³¹ The differences between this outline and *PAN* are pronounced. Notably, the outline is focused on international law with international politics being discussed in its relation to how it affects law. Also, some of the concepts that Frei claims are in the outline that would be later reiterated in *PAN* are in fact not in the outline. This includes the discussion of ethics and the discussion of diplomacy, two sections which form an integral part to the development of *PAN*'s overall argument.³² The Guggenheim outline can clearly be seen as the product of an international law scholar who wishes to write a book about international law as it relates to international politics rather than a textbook for international relations that peripherally examines international law. Upon viewing the outlines of *PAN* in 1945 it can be seen that Morgenthau was originally planning to write a book which varied widely from the Guggenheim outline. This shows that the idea of *PAN* was continually evolving rather than being a book which he planned to write as early as 1933 and finally managed to do so after his personal situation was settled. Furthermore, in Morgenthau's pre-American works his discussion of diplomacy is antithetical to how it is treated in *PAN*. In *The Concept of the Political* Morgenthau argues that tension between powers due to political issues cannot be resolved rationally through diplomacy due to the inherent nature of the dispute.³³ This is the opposite of what would be concluded in *PAN*, that the best hope at the present for solving political problems is skillful diplomacy.³⁴ Overall, the exclusion of some of the key components of *PAN*, the

³¹ Hans Morgenthau, "Guggenheim Grant Application," 1938 ,HJM-B96F10.

³² Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 209. To be fair to Frei diplomacy is mentioned in the Guggenheim grant proposal but it is a small sub section at the end of the outline entitled International law as a form of diplomatic argumentation. The similarities between this and diplomacy as it is used in *PAN* are in name only.

³³ Hans Morgenthau, *The Concept of The Political*, ed. Felix Rosch and Hartmut Behr (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012): 128.

³⁴ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 419-443.

difference in focus and the lack of detail in Frei's evidence do not support the claim that *PAN* was the product of Morgenthau's pre-American work

5. International Relations Textbooks Prior to 1948

To explain why *PAN* was written the way it was, it is necessary to see what textbooks were being used to teach IR at the time. This will help explain the manner in which the discipline was taught to undergraduates, how Morgenthau's approach differed from these books and how Morgenthau's book became preeminent in the field. The books that will be compared to *PAN* are Raymond Gettel's *Political Science*, Walter Sharp and Grayson Kirk's *Contemporary International Politics*, Frank Simonds and Brooks Emeny's *The Great Powers in World Politics*, Thorsten V. Kaalijarvi's *Modern World Politics*, Francis Brown, Charles Hodges and Joseph Roucek's *Contemporary World Politics*, Georg Schwarzenberger's *Power Politics* and Fredrick L. Schuman's *International Politics*.³⁵ The selection of the textbooks is primarily undertaken by looking at Morgenthau's Bibliography in *PAN* as well textbooks he mentioned in his private letters.³⁶ An exception is made for E.H.Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis* which is not listed by Morgenthau as a textbook but was used as a textbook during this time and influenced some aspects of *PAN*.³⁷

³⁵Gettel, *Political Science*, Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, Frank H. Simmonds and Brooks Emeny, *The Great Powers in World Politics: International Relations and Economic Nationalism*, 2nd ed. (New York: American Book Company, 1939), Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, ed., *Modern World Politics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), Brown, Hodges and Roucek, eds., *Contemporary World Politics*, Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, Fredrick L. Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed. and Schuman, *International Politics*, 4th ed.

³⁶ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 473-474.

³⁷ As *The Twenty Years' Crisis* does not seem to be considered within the realm of a textbook by Morgenthau it will not be used extensively in the chapter as a possible template for *PAN*. However, it will be mentioned when obvious similarities occur as Morgenthau had read the book.

6. Purpose and Historical Context of The Books

Gettel's book is written as an introductory textbook for political science. It has a dual focus on domestic issues such as the separation of powers and the functions of the legislative, executive and judiciary and international issues such as international law and sovereignty. It is written in a simplistic style, outlining basic definitions of political concepts and theory. This illustrates the lack of theoretical complexity in the field and the confusion about IR as a separate field of study from political science in the US. Its lack of focus on international issues, concentrating on political science and subsuming what would be considered IR within its discussion shows that the distinctiveness of this field both in academic material and teaching was absent. After its publication in 1933 it was not revised until after Gettel's death in the late forties which was its final edition.

Sharp and Kirk's book is an attempt at the end of the inter war years to try and create a textbook of IR that was analytic rather than merely repeating contemporary history.³⁸ The authors state that the contemporary demand for a book which explains the reasoning behind the events leading to World War Two prompted them to write the book.³⁹ However, these two goals of the book tend to cause a stylistic clash within the text. The first 400 pages are analytic and structured thematically rather than regionally, but by the end it abandons the aim of detached theoretical analysis in favour of a long description of contemporary affairs.⁴⁰

Contemporary International Politics was not printed after 1946. The reasons for its demise as an IR textbook had to do with two factors, the bad timing of the book and the publication of

³⁸ Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, viii.

³⁹ *Ibid*, vii.

⁴⁰ James T. Watkins, "Review of Contemporary International Politics, Elements of International Relations, and Principles and Problems of International Relations," *American Political Science Review* 34 (1940): 807. See Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 447-776. The editors at Knopf also agree with this analysis, calling the book descriptive. See Letter from Roger Shrug, November 17 1949, HJM-B121F7.

PAN in 1948. As the book was published in 1940, it only refers to the First World War. As the book was being reprinted throughout the war its effectiveness in providing an explanation for the international world diminished. An addendum to the text at some point during the war, similar to Brown and Hodges edited volume, would have helped its readability as the war progressed.⁴¹ However, a second edition after the war would have solved these problems. The publication of *PAN* and its adoption by many universities and colleges in the US cut into sales resulting in the publishers deciding that it was not economically feasible to rewrite and market the book.⁴² As a result of these two factors the book was not reprinted after 1946. The more optimistic power politics approach of Sharp and Kirk was neglected and the more pessimistic form of realism that Morgenthau favoured became dominant in the field.

The sub title of Simmonds and Brooks book *The Great Powers in World Politics: International Relations and Economic Nationalism* gives a strong indication of its content. The textbook is focused heavily on the material factors of world politics, particularly resources.⁴³ Also, it focuses on contemporary analysis, conducting regional analysis and stressing the material capabilities and issues at the time of writing. This was a typical approach for IR textbooks of this time. This is due to uncertainty of what IR entailed as well as the demand for contemporary knowledge and analysis on contemporary events.⁴⁴ Many of the university courses that dealt with international issues prior to World War Two were of this type and could

⁴¹ See Francis Brown and Joseph Roucek, "About Face!," in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 707-735 and Charles Hodges, "The War Itself: First Deductions," in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 736-767. For a further discussion about this book see below.

⁴² Letter from Hans Morgenthau to Roger Shrug, February 10, 1949, HJM-B121F7. Morgenthau is quoting a letter he received from Professor A.E. Hotz who relayed a conversation about Sharp and Kirk's book with representatives of Rinehart publishers.

⁴³ Emeny's other well-known work, *The Strategy of Raw Materials* follows a similar line of research. Brooks Emeny, *The Strategy of Raw Materials*. (New York: Macmillan, 1934).

⁴⁴ Letter from Roger Shrug to Hans Morgenthau, November 17, 1949, HJM-B121F7.

possibly be also labeled as contemporary history courses.⁴⁵ Before *PAN*, it was assumed that these textbooks would be the bestsellers for textbooks in the field. Both Emeny's and Sharp and Kirk's books sold very well.⁴⁶ Unfortunately there is a lack of discussion of events after 1940.⁴⁷ In the study of IR, particularly in a book focused on the immediate material situations of the Great Powers the lack of contemporary analysis after 1940 is a large drawback to the continued use of the textbook.

The second edition of Thorsten Kalijarvi's edited volume *Modern World Politics* endeavours to analyze the new post-war world in a realistic fashion.⁴⁸ It attempts to analyze the world as a whole, dealing with a myriad of theoretical, domestic and international issues. This focus allows more detailed understanding of the international system beyond what is traditionally considered politics, but clouds the overall direction of the textbook. The reason for the textbook's lack of success in the latter half of the 1940's is the partial focus on contemporary issues within some of the chapters. Clearly, a regional analysis section becomes outdated quickly. Other sections which were more abstract also suffered from this problem as they did not take into account the development of the world into two opposing blocs and the resulting change that would occur in the discourse. A new edition of the book was not written until 1953 but by this time it was too late to recapture the market. No subsequent editions appeared thereafter.

Contemporary World Politics was written in response to the public demand for analysis of international issues using "a new approach to international politics as compared to the old

⁴⁵ Sharp and Kirk, *The Study of International Relations*, 2.

⁴⁶ Letter from Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, November 17, 1949, HJM-B121F7.

⁴⁷ It should be noted that Simmonds died sometime before 1948, thereby making a subsequent edition less likely. Letter from Harold Sprout to Roger Shugg, December 24th 1947, HJM-B121F6.

⁴⁸ Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "Preface" in *Modern World Politics*, ed. Thorsten V. Kalijarvi. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.), v.

legalistic approach” as “today international anarchy has broken the backbone of the highly desirable devices.”⁴⁹ It focuses on a wide set of issues, ranging from international organizations to propaganda. Oddly, there are chapters on the fascist, communist, Catholic and Protestant views on world affairs which are extremely partisan towards the respective viewpoints.⁵⁰ The odd choice of chapter topics as well as the quickly out of date discussion on contemporary events, particularly with the Second World War and the impending Cold War, weakened the book’s appeal past its publication date of 1940. The book was not renewed after its second edition.

Power Politics is not written in the traditional format of a textbook of the period. It is more focused, written as an exploration of the possible methods of preserving peace after World War Two. Thematically, the book shares some of its structure with *PAN*, particularly in its explanation of international law, power politics and morality. The discussion of international law and power politics is particularly reminiscent of the discussion in *PAN*. However, despite the similarities in structure and content *Power Politics* reads as a general treatise on various forms of international organization. Despite this, in a review of the book Morgenthau unreservedly recommended it to introductory classes of IR as well as the general reader.⁵¹ The failure of *Power Politics* to become the standard textbook in IR is due to problems of timing. As the book was published in 1941 some of the references to the war would quickly appear dated. This diminishes the utility of the book but due to its more theoretical focus it does not hamper the book as much as the other textbooks of the period.

⁴⁹ Brown, *Contemporary World Politics*, vii.

⁵⁰ Ugo V. D’Annunzio, “The Fascist Autarchy,” in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 597-613; Theodore Draper, “The Communist International’s Road To Peace,” in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 614-633; Marie J. Carroll, “The Catholic View Of Peace,” in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 647-662 and Walter W. Van Kirk, “The Protestant View of Peace,” in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 663-673.

⁵¹Hans Morgenthau, “Review of Power Politics,” *American Journal of International Law* 36 (1942): 352.

Schwarzenberger would not publish a second edition until 1951. While *Power Politics* did not gain the popularity of *PAN* its later editions would become respected contributions to the literature of international law and politics.

International Politics was the predominant textbook for IR before the publication of *PAN*.⁵² The reason for its predominance is easy to see when it is compared to the other textbooks. The book is written in a manner which is entertaining and easy to understand, containing a more in depth discussion of abstract features of the international system than its contemporaries while using recent examples to illustrate its points.⁵³ For these reasons Schuman's book was used by Morgenthau as the general textbook for his IR courses at the University of Chicago prior to the publication of *PAN*.⁵⁴ The decline of *International Politics* as the predominant textbook in IR was caused by several factors. First, the publication and subsequent competition of *PAN* led to a decline in sales. Unlike many of the textbooks analyzed, a new edition of *International Politics* immediately followed *PAN*, reaching the market in late 1948. The new edition of *International Politics* was more extreme in its political statements than previous editions. One of the major problems was a new introduction which was decidedly anti-Christian. Describing the history of civilization Schuman states that ancient pagan tribes had ceremonies that were "often accompanied by temporary sexual license, they kill the totem animal and, in a primitive mass, or "communion," eat its flesh, drink its blood, and thereby acquire its virtues."⁵⁵ In the same introduction he also said that Christianity is traceable to Sumerian mythology, Egyptian mythology and the Greek cult of Adonis. Likewise he stated that there are many "Other age-old myths and creeds told of the coming of a sacred

⁵²Letter from Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, November 10th, 1949, HJM-B121F7.

⁵³Harold Sprout calls the writings of Schuman "whisky prose". Letter from Harold Sprout to Roger Shugg, December 24th 1947, HJM-B121F6.

⁵⁴ See Course lists HJM-B78F4.

⁵⁵ Schuman, *International Politics*, 4th ed., 21.

king, of a holy mother and divine son, of the dying god who gives his life for man, and of grace through partaking of the flesh and blood of godhood."⁵⁶ This aggressive atheism is not necessary for the subject of the book and whatever Schuman's personal beliefs it would be hard to imagine that these beliefs would be found acceptable in a major college textbook in the late 1940's.

What damaged the reputation of the book more than the new anti-Christian rhetoric was the increase in opinions which were biased towards the Soviet Union. A review of the new edition stated that

In his comments on methods of applying "the strategy of fear", there is little reference to Communist practice beyond such cryptic statements as "In the U.S.S.R., public dissent from current government policies is, of course, not tolerated", and "Communists also lie when it serves their purposes". His explanation of Soviet rejection of the proposed four-power pact to keep Germany disarmed by the statement "Past experience with such documents evoked no enthusiasm in Moscow" is obviously intended to put the Soviet Union in a more favorable light than a more complete explanation would permit. Schuman's description of the U.S.A.'s "New look" under Truman is highly prejudiced and misleading, and seems difficult to harmonize with the results of the recent election and Wall Street's reaction thereto. His account of the growing rift between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. almost completely ignores the possibility of any Soviet responsibility.⁵⁷

The reviewer goes on to say that the book is unsuitable, even dangerous for a beginner to use.⁵⁸ Waldemar Gurian echoed this sentiment. In a comparison review of *PAN* and

International Politics he stated

He is, in spite of some casual remarks about the impoliteness of Molotov, inclined to overlook Soviet responsibility for the collapse of wartime cooperation between Russia and the West, and to magnify American shortcomings.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 28 and 53.

⁵⁷ Leland M. Goodrich. "Review of *International Politics: The Destiny of the Western State System*," *The American Political Science Review* 43 (1949): 155. [References omitted]

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 156.

⁵⁹ Waldemar Gurian. "Review of *Politics Among Nations and International Politics*," *The Review Of Politics* 11 (1949): 258. Many of the reviewers of the new edition experienced a similar sentiment. In a letter to Morgenthau from Roger Shugg, Shugg states that the bad reviews of Schuman's book are hurting it. Letter to Hans Morgenthau From Roger Shugg, Feb 9th 1949, HJMB121-F7.

Reading the text shows that these remarks are understated. Schuman's personal opinion colours much analysis of the book. Starting with the brief introduction of the history of the world he gives a distinctly Marxist interpretation of the Greek city states and the rise and fall of Rome.⁶⁰ In discussing the role of diplomats, Schuman denounces the plutocratic and elitist appointment practices while denouncing the internal witch hunt for subversives within the American government.⁶¹ In discussing the Soviet diplomats who fled from the regime he states

On the other hand, some Soviet diplomats and agents abroad (e.g., Alexander Barmine and Victor Kravchenko) have turned traitor to their masters out of a devotion to freedom or an interest in the fleshpots of capitalism. Anti-Soviet propaganda on the part of such renegades is invariably lucrative in the bourgeois States and affords easy entry into the highest social circles.⁶²

In discussing the comparative weaknesses and advantages of the US and the Soviet Union he mentions the American superior material capabilities but says this is counterbalanced by the instability of the capitalist system and the failure of American treatment of ethnicities. He notes that there is "an emotional identification by some of its leaders and diplomats with medieval monarchs and feudal aristocrats." He continues by praising the USSR for its equality among its diverse ethnic groups.⁶³ Continuing this defense of equality in the USSR Schuman states

there was little concrete evidence to support the view that Soviet society was becoming stratified into a closed ruling caste and an unprivileged multitude. This seldom occurs in a rapidly expanding economy. Despite grievous losses, Soviet economy continued to expand during and after the war. Able individuals, without regard to race, nationality, sex, or social origin, had ready access to posts of honor and increased income, thanks to a persistent quest for talent and an elaborate system of prizes, bonuses, and other rewards. If this fluidity had few aspects of a truly "classless society" in the original Marxist-Leninist sense, it still meant that the humblest child of the remotest villager, if he were good, could "make good" in the military, political, or managerial elite on condition of strict conformity to current political orthodoxy.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Schuman, *International Politics*, 4th ed., 35-52.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 203-204. The hunt for subversives is related to his own experiences with governmental inquiries on Communist sympathizers. See below for more detail.

⁶² *Ibid*, 205.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 418 and 451.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 895.

Further in the same chapter he states

By American standards, dire poverty was still the lot of the Soviet masses. But all citizens enjoyed social security, albeit on a low level and without freedom. All had opportunities for personal advancement through merit. All had assurance against mass unemployment in a completely socialized economy which, whatever its shortcomings, admitted of no violent fluctuations between prosperity and depression.⁶⁵

Lastly, throughout the text there is strong criticism of the current American anti-Communist attitude and the investigations on individual's political beliefs.⁶⁶ This was a reaction by Schuman to the investigations into his beliefs as he had previously been questioned before the House Committee on Un-American Activity in 1943 and by an Illinois State inquiry of Communist influences at the University of Chicago in 1935.⁶⁷

7. Politics among Nations and its Comparison with the other Texts

In an early letter to Knopf editor Roger Shugg, Morgenthau explained he did not want to write a textbook that perpetuated what he saw as the traditional errors of academic textbooks in IR.⁶⁸ This was primarily a response to the journalistic style of describing contemporary political actions found in many textbooks. He wanted to do a more analytic, theory-driven approach. As stated above, due to the events of World War Two and the onset of the Cold War many of the previous popular textbooks were out of date and thus could not

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 900.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 809-810 and 433.

⁶⁷ For a discussion of Schuman's personal relationship with communism and American legislators see Susan L. Brinson. *The Red Scare, Politics, and the Federal Communications Commission, 1941-1960* (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 76,77, 101-103, Randi Storch. *Red Chicago: American Communism at its Grassroots 1928-1935* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007),211, Frank A. Warren III. *Liberals and Communism: The "Red Decade" Revisited* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press,1966), 69, 74, 95-97, 109-11,0 145-146, 164-166, 169, 199-201.

⁶⁸ Letter from Hans Morgenthau To Roger Shugg, August 7th 1945, HJM-B121F6. It should be noted that all University of Chicago faculty were under what was known as the 4E contract which stipulated all outside earnings such as speaking engagements and book publication were to be reported to the University and remitted to it. Therefore, the motive for *PAN* was not financial. See Vouchers and Expense Claims, HJM-B75F1.

adequately be used to teach. The only other textbook that came out during this time was Fredrick Schuman's *International Politics*. This text alienated many of its previous supporters due to the radical statements within it. Therefore, Morgenthau's text enjoyed a period of supremacy in the field of IR textbooks. As a result, Morgenthau had an opportunity to alter the discourse of the discipline in a more theoretical direction.⁶⁹ While this positive aspect should be welcomed it unfortunately had the side effect of neglecting other valuable areas such as international political economy. Ultimately, this deficiency would be a missed opportunity for further integration of economics within IR, despite many commentators previously encouraging its growth.⁷⁰ Comparing *PAN* to the textbooks which came before will demonstrate what discussions within the book were a change of direction for the discipline and what was a continuation of previous and developing trends.

7.A Anarchy

As stated earlier, it is unlikely that any work, despite its innovation, is not indebted to ideas, structures or concepts from previous works in the same field. This holds true for *PAN*. Some contemporary commentators noticed this, stating that while *PAN* is well written, some of the ideas seem to have been stated before.⁷¹ The most notable example of this is the focus on the concepts of anarchy and power. Brian Schmidt has aptly demonstrated the awareness of the problem of anarchy for international security was already well established in IR scholarship

⁶⁹ For discussion on Morgenthau's theoretical dominance of the field after the publication of *PAN* see Harry Howe Ransom, "International Relations," *The Journal Of Politics* 30 (1968): 350-351.

⁷⁰ Scholars such as E.H.Carr, Edward Meade, Albert Hirschman, Jacob Viner, Fredrick Dunn and Eugene Staley argued that economics and IR were necessarily intertwined. See Michael Mastanduno, "Economics and Security in Statecraft and Scholarship," *International Organization* 52 (1998): 825.

⁷¹ See the comments from an anonymous reviewer in Letter from Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, Feb 21st 1947, HJM-B121F6 and Sprout's comments in Letter from Roger Shugg to Hans Morgenthau, Dec 24th 1947, HJM-B121F6. Sprout's comment says that he suspects Morgenthau has borrowed liberally from others.

prior to Morgenthau's writings.⁷² This awareness was still a fundamental aspect underpinning these books. Schwarzenberger's book is a key example as it was written for the purpose of discussing these two issues and how they could be resolved. Similarly, the materialistic focus of Emeny's book was predicated upon the idea that the need for resources is a product of the dangers inherent in an anarchical international system.⁷³ The state's national interest is based upon its protection from other states. Emeny argues that this need is a direct corollary of the anarchical structure but can be mollified by resources in order to maintain a balance of power among the Great Powers. Other possible solutions such as the Great Powers voluntarily giving up sovereignty in order to nullify this reality are utopian.⁷⁴ Schuman follows this structural argument, putting a strong emphasis on the anarchic nature of the international system and that, as a result of this anarchy, states are in competition for power to ensure survival.⁷⁵ In Brown's edited volume this notion is rejected, with the editors stating that material gain does not explain the underlying motivation for expansion, attributing aggressive international policies to the desire for domination.⁷⁶ However, whether the problem is structural or in the individual both authors agree that anarchy and power are important factors for understanding international affairs. Kalijarvi's book echoes this assessment as in the opening chapter sentiments such as "international morality is highly desired but power is the reality." are commonly stated.⁷⁷

This form of analysis would later become part of the legacy of *PAN* and Morgenthau in the IR canon. Anarchy is the underlying assumption of most of the analysis in *PAN*, yet the

⁷² See Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy*.

⁷³ Emeny, *The Great Powers in World Politics*, 22,28-29,31,41,153-154

⁷⁴ *Ibid*,157.

⁷⁵See in particular Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 52, 61 and 261-264.

⁷⁶ Brown, *Contemporary World Politics*, 4.

⁷⁷ Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "What is Power Politics?" in *Modern World Politics*, ed. Thorsten V. Kalijarvi. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 8.

word itself is rarely used in the text. The problem of an anarchical system is treated as an inherent assumption being used to explain the flaws of the international system, such as international law, but not undergoing any explicit analysis by itself.⁷⁸ Like Brown, Morgenthau avoids tying the necessity of power to the particular structure of the international system, stating that the centrality of power is integral to humankind and has been so throughout history.⁷⁹ Thus, while anarchy is important to explain the state of international affairs, understanding is achieved through acknowledging man's inner nature and his relationship with power. Morgenthau's understanding of these concepts is not unique in the literature of the period but the emphasis throughout the text on these issues is stronger.

7.B Balance of Power

One of the concepts that inevitably follows a discussion of anarchy and power is the ideal of a balance of power. Kalijarvi refers to it as the only realistic plan for peace.⁸⁰ However, many of the other textbook authors are dismissive of the usefulness of balance of power. Schwarzenberger states that one of the key features in an anarchic world based upon power is the need to maintain a balance of power. In illustrating this point he differs from Morgenthau's treatment as he gives an extended historical analysis of the concept.⁸¹ But he notes that a balance is not feasible as a practical solution in the world outside of theory. Like Schwarzenberger Schuman does not think balance of power is a useful tool in maintaining peace. His explanation of balance of power is brief, totalling a page but the content is a concise summary of the balance of power section in *PAN*.⁸² Both books use abstract examples,

⁷⁸ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 217. It is telling that six of the ten chapters of *PAN* have power in the title.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 16-18.

⁸⁰ Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "Planning As A World Force," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 473.

⁸¹ Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 117-125.

⁸² Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 52.

identifying countries as A,B and C and using the same theoretical positions complete with diagrams and prognosis of the viability of balance of power.⁸³

One of the most important factors of power and its balancing is the relationship of powers in the international order. Morgenthau provides a typology of powers which he categorizes as revisionist and status quo. Status quo powers are powers that do not wish to see a change in the conditions of the world as it presently favours them. Revisionist powers are states who wish to alter the international order in ways favourable to it increasing its power, usually to the detriment of the status quo powers.⁸⁴

This typology is seen most famously in E.H.Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.⁸⁵ The concepts of status quo and revisionist powers underlined Carr's analysis. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* had a large impact upon the field of IR. The influence of Carr can be seen in many of the textbooks written between 1939 and 1948, particularly in the discussions of the futility of ignoring power in the establishment of legal frameworks for peace.⁸⁶ Many of the textbooks had also used these concepts albeit not as extensively as Carr.⁸⁷ There is no doubt that Morgenthau had read Carr's book by the publication of *PAN* as he wrote a critical review in 1948 in the journal *World Politics*.⁸⁸

It should be noted that Morgenthau originally used this typology prior to arriving in America. In *The Concept of the Political*, written in 1933, Morgenthau stated that the actions of states can be compartmentalized into the categories of preserving, increasing or manifesting

⁸³ See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 129-133.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 21-25.

⁸⁵ E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 51,76-79, 98,136,142,174-176, 191,194-195,201,207-208.

⁸⁶ See Kalijarvi, "What is Power Politics?", 8, Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 210-11 and 256.

⁸⁷ See Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "The Continent of Europe," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 518; Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "The United States," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 601 and Emeny, *The Great Powers In World Politics*, 33-39 and 353.

⁸⁸ Hans Morgenthau, "The Political Science of E.H.Carr," *World Politics* 1 (1948): 127-134.

power.⁸⁹ Though the categories are worded differently it is the same idea. The inclusion of this concept in *PAN* therefore was probably encouraged by its use in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* but was not originally inspired by Carr's usage.

7.C Geopolitics

One of the most important factors for the success of revisionist states is power. In discussing this many commentators focused on geography and geopolitics as one of the primary sources in understanding political power in the international arena. Gettell goes as far as primarily using the concepts of geopolitics and sovereignty to define the state and thus its relation to others.⁹⁰ Other writers are more restrained in the amount of importance attached to geopolitics, with the exceptions of Emeny, whose book is based on material and geographical considerations and Kalijarvi's book.⁹¹ *Modern World Politics* devotes more space to this topic than *PAN*, as it is covered in three separate chapters as well as being pronounced in the introductory discussion of the nature of power politics.⁹²

Morgenthau's treatment of geopolitics shares strong similarities with the other writers. Contra Emeny and Gettel, he cautions against engaging in the fallacy of using single factors such as geography in isolation to understand international relations. He combines different

⁸⁹ Morgenthau, *The Concept of The Political*, 106-107.

⁹⁰ Gettel, *Political Science*, 17-54. Morgenthau mentions Gettell's book is being used in small universities in Ohio though he states that the book is sub-par and that the teachers agree. Letter from Hans Morgenthau to Roger W. Shrug at Knopf Publishing, January 10th 1948, HJM-B121F6.

⁹¹ See Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 41-80, Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 291-299 and 338-348. and Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 110-111 for less prominent discussions of geopolitics.

⁹² Thorsten Kalijarvi, "What is Power Politics?," 1, and 9-11; Winchester H. Heicher, "Geography and World Politics," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 40-43, 51, 55-56; Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "International Law," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 79-83, Glenn E. Hoover, "The Economic Struggle For Power," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 171-173; Bernard Brodie, "Sea Power in World Politics," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 275-290, Stefan P. Possony, "Aeopolitics," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 291-317 and Joseph Roucek, "Geopolitics, Imperialism and War," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 339-365.

elements from the authors, such as Sharp and Kirk and Schuman, in talking about the different factors of power, the necessity of self-sufficiency, and the problems of geo-determinism and geopolitik.⁹³

7.D International Organizations

The focus on power in these texts precludes the possibility that international organizations will be able to mediate the world's political problems, particularly when the interests of the stronger powers are involved. Morgenthau spends a large portion of *PAN* discussing the various approaches that have been tried. He explains the historic circumstances surrounding the various attempts and why, due to the particular historic circumstances, they resulted in failure. However, he goes beyond this to explain analytically why these attempts, divorced of context, will continue to fail in the future.⁹⁴

The texts of the period discussed the phenomena of international organizations in various ways. *Contemporary World Politics* discussed the history of these organizations but failed to analyze it in an abstract manner.⁹⁵ As Schwarzenberger was trained as an international lawyer like Morgenthau, it is unsurprising that like Morgenthau he devotes a large section of his book to the problems of international law. He notes that the Kelsenian concept of the supremacy of international law over the state is fanciful and that arbitration and disarmament treaties are limited to the willingness of states to abide by them.⁹⁶ He later takes this idea and

⁹³ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 80-118.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 309-415.

⁹⁵ See Frank M. Russell, "The Growth of The Idea of International Organization," in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940), 377-391 and Quincy Wright, "International Law," in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940), 392-410.

⁹⁶ Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 72-73 and 144-147.

expounds the various problems with international treaties and theories of world peace.⁹⁷

Schuman's analysis is similar though more truncated. His position is similar to Carr's, stating that international law is followed when it is expedient to do so.⁹⁸

7.E Solutions For Peace

The major problem facing international relations scholars in this period was if the balance of power could not be a viable long term solution and international organizations were unable to compel a workable peace; then how could the instability of the international system be resolved? *PAN* is structured so that the textbook builds to this inevitable question. The solution Morgenthau conceived is a reinvigoration of diplomacy which is formulated as a set of general maxims; ambiguous in description and application.⁹⁹ Morgenthau postulates several reasons for the decline of diplomacy as a method to manage world affairs, the most notable being the demand for public diplomacy following the First World War.¹⁰⁰ However, there is a major problem to Morgenthau's solution. Investing the onus of responsibility for the success of the policies on the ability of the statesman to navigate the specific context, Morgenthau's statesman is an abstraction, an ideal Bismarckian figure that cannot possibly create long term peace any more than the other failed solutions.

As diplomacy is an integral part of international relations it is unsurprising that this topic was included in many contemporary textbooks though it did not have the same importance in these books as in *PAN*. Similar to Morgenthau, Kirk writes favourably about the

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 351-435.

⁹⁸ Schuman, *International Politics*, 105-106, 113-115, 118-119 and Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, 159-190.

⁹⁹ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 419-420 and 431-445.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, 425-438.

prospect of secret diplomacy as well as the importance of diplomacy in an anarchic system.¹⁰¹ The diplomat is described as representing the state's national interest and a good diplomat is described in impossible attributes, similar to Morgenthau's ubermensch-like description of the diplomat in *PAN*.¹⁰² In a reversal of Morgenthau's position Kalijarvi suggests that while balance of power can preserve the peace in the long term, diplomacy is a short term solution to instability.¹⁰³ *Contemporary World Politics* discusses diplomacy but does so by merely stating the history of these ideas rather than doing so in a more abstract analytical fashion. Unique among its contemporaries, this includes the economic aspect of diplomacy which is surprisingly absent from many of the other textbooks.¹⁰⁴ Schuman also discusses diplomacy but does so in a more descriptive manner. While an entire chapter is devoted to diplomacy it is merely an organizational list of the responsibilities and hierarchies of diplomats.¹⁰⁵

7.F Contemporary Events

As previously stated, one of the major differences between *PAN* and contemporary textbooks was the exclusion of long discussions of contemporary affairs. Prior to *PAN* many of the textbooks were written to complement IR courses which were then taught as contemporary history courses.¹⁰⁶ As a result, many of the textbooks had a regional analysis of the current political situation which took up a significant portion of the text and was quickly

¹⁰¹ Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 4, 39. See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 426-428 and 431-438.

¹⁰² Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 37. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 422-425 and 439-443.

¹⁰³ Kalijarvi, "What is Power Politics?", 3 and 13-25, and Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, "Diplomacy and Power Politics," in *Modern World Politics*, ed., Thorsten V. Kalijarvi (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946), 218-220.

¹⁰⁴ R. Ernest Dupuy, "Nations At War," in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940), 100-118 and DeWitt Clint Poole, "Diplomacy," in *Contemporary World Politics*, eds., Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940), 417-420.

¹⁰⁵ Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 143-161.

¹⁰⁶ Sharp and Kirk, *The Study of International Relations*, 2.

outdated.¹⁰⁷ Schuman's book manages to ameliorate this weakness while discussing the political events in the manner of a newspaper, integrating the IR concepts of balance of power and anarchy within it.¹⁰⁸ Morgenthau's analytical approach improved upon this unreflective style without delving too deeply into theory. This was achieved by obliquely referencing the Cold War and using Russian examples to illustrate an abstract point, such as what factors contribute to a state's power. Likewise, the problem of the bipolar world is clearly stated, but the scarcity and vagueness of these particular references allow the book to avoid the problem of quickly becoming outdated. This point was highlighted in the advertisements for *PAN*.¹⁰⁹ This change to a more analytical form of textbook would strengthen the theoretical foundation of IR, moving it away from reactive analysis of contemporary events.

7.G Ethics

Morgenthau's work on ethics differs from his contemporary sources but it did not have the same impact on the discipline of IR. However, Morgenthau's discussion of ethics is multi-layered and dependent on historical context. It starts with an analysis of a historical change in ethics during peacetime. He notes that at the present, the idea of an ethical ideal prevents us from taking action, even if this action could be justified by some higher purpose, expressly distinguishing his position from Carr's by noting that Carr merely said the command of ethics was to restrict actions from creating *unnecessary* suffering.¹¹⁰ Furthermore Morgenthau subtly critiques Carr by stating that international morality is not simply an ideological shield for action

¹⁰⁷ See Kenneth Thompson, "The Study of International Politics: A Survey of Trends and Developments," *The Review Of Politics* 14 (1952): 435; Kalijarvi, *Modern World Politics*, 477-661, Emeny, *The Great Powers in World Politics*, 163-648; Brown, *Contemporary World Politics*, 118-374, 707-753 and Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 447-776.

¹⁰⁸ See Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 510-686. Morgenthau would later refer to Schuman's book as a translation of the *New York Times*. Letter from Hans Morgenthau to Roger Shugg, Jan 10th 1948, HJM-B121F6.

¹⁰⁹ Advertisements for *Politics Among Nations*, HJM-B121F5.

¹¹⁰ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 177 and Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, 141.

but a legitimate, if weak, functioning of morality.¹¹¹ Morgenthau builds upon this idea of ethics influencing decisions by noting that while the international laws and conventions were not effective in their aims the fact that they were tried shows that there is an element within humankind that finds warfare abhorrent, even if it ultimately engages in it.¹¹² The purpose of this is to show that ethics have a different authoritative pull upon actions depending on the context. Morgenthau then applies this analysis to the post Second World War. Due to the rise of nationalism, the breakdown of the bonds of class and increasing technology there is a dissolution of the ethical system which was practiced half a century earlier.¹¹³

Morgenthau's discussion of ethics is more sophisticated than in most of the textbooks, from which it is generally absent. Gettel's book mentions ethics but its treatment is superficial, giving no substantive discussion.¹¹⁴ Kalijarvi's statement that "international morality is highly desired but power is the reality." is similar but lacks the nuance of Morgenthau's work.¹¹⁵ *Contemporary World Politics* is better, noting the need for a universal ethic but does not adequately explain why this is needed.¹¹⁶ Out of all the other contemporary textbooks *Power Politics* has the most extensive discussion of ethics, often explicitly disagreeing with Morgenthau. In the early sections of *Power Politics* Schwarzenberger critiques the Christian account of morality stating that the concept of Christian ethics is an elastic concept that can mean almost anything.¹¹⁷ Furthermore, echoing Carr, he argues that states use morality as a justification for pursuing their own interests.¹¹⁸ However, he retreats from this position, stating that morality does have some power in international affairs but it generally is not

¹¹¹ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 180 and Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, 118-120.

¹¹² Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 178-181.

¹¹³ *Ibid*, 181-196. See chapter six for a more detailed discussion of ethics in *PAN*.

¹¹⁴ Gettel, *Political Science*, 5 and 13.

¹¹⁵ Kalijarvi, "What is Power Politics?", 8.

¹¹⁶ Charles Hodges, "Why War?," 25-26.

¹¹⁷ Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 162-163.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid*, 168.

enough to force a moral action. By the end of the book he returns to the concept of Christian morality as more realistic in its appraisal of man and the flaws of human nature than the liberal myth of progress.¹¹⁹ He states that the transcendental Christian ethics are the source of all that is good in Western civilization and thus should be used as much as possible.¹²⁰ He proposes, contra Morgenthau, that this Christian sensibility be used as a method of unifying the various states of the world under a common identity.¹²¹

7.H World Community

This wish for cosmopolitanism is found in *Power Politics* but also appears in *Contemporary International Politics*. Schwarzenberger tends to be more insistent than Morgenthau on trying to find a solution to abolish the current international state of affairs. The solution he favours the most is world government but he acknowledges that it is not possible for the moment. While Morgenthau states the same in *PAN* the manner in which Schwarzenberger writes about the point wavers between realization that it cannot happen and the belief that perhaps the problems can be resolved. Morgenthau's review of *Power Politics* makes the same point, stating that

He still believes, as now even Frederick L. Schuman does, that power politics can be abolished by political and social reform, even though he is much more skeptical with regard to the current blueprints for a new international order than most of his writing and lecturing contemporaries.¹²²

While Kirk and Morgenthau agree on the distant possibility of a world government, they differ on the possibility of collective action being an effective guarantor of peace. The emphasis

¹¹⁹ *Ibid*, 432-433.

¹²⁰ *Ibid*, 418.

¹²¹ *Ibid*, 434.

¹²² Morgenthau. "Review of Power Politics," 351.

placed by Kirk on the possibility of peace in the future through education and responsible organization is vastly different from Morgenthau's position.¹²³ Morgenthau takes the position that a world state cannot be created under the current conditions in international society.¹²⁴ What is needed is a common culture which can bind people together in a world state.¹²⁵ Therefore, organization alone cannot bring the nations of the world together. The use of education towards peace is also attacked as irrelevant to the concept of peace.¹²⁶ Intellectual and esthetic knowledge do not create a common culture. What is necessary is a shared political and moral framework.¹²⁷ Morgenthau proposes by minimizing conflicts using diplomacy functionalism can slowly integrate the nations of the world into an eventual world community.¹²⁸

9. Conclusion

Morgenthau's motivation in writing *PAN* was to create a textbook which would rectify what he perceived as the flaws in IR. He wanted to do a more analytic, theory-driven approach. Fortunately, due to the external events of World War Two and the Cold War many of the previous popular textbooks were out of date. This allowed Morgenthau an opportunity to reorient the way the discipline was taught. The only other textbook that could capture the changing dynamic of the post-World War Two world was Fredrick Schuman's *International Politics*. However, due to the increased hostility of the Cold War the text alienated many of its

¹²³ See Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 207-209, 729,731, 742-748,767-770 and Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*. 391-406 for the problem of international organization and 407-412 for the problem of education leading to peace. Though it should be noted that Morgenthau thinks that good diplomacy and functionalism might be able to resolve some of the problems of anarchy. See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 412-415.

¹²⁴ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 402.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, 406.

¹²⁶ *Ibid*, 409.

¹²⁷ *Ibid*, 412.

¹²⁸ *Ibid*, 415.

previous supporters due to the radical statements within it. As a result, the discipline changed, with theoretical textbooks becoming standard. The themes within *PAN* are not unique; being found to a varying degree in other previous textbooks. However, Morgenthau did not blindly ape the other textbooks but modified his message within the theoretical discourse at the time to reflect his own view. The structure and content of *PAN* can be seen as a complex interplay between Morgenthau's vision of an IR textbook and the prevailing academic discourse in the period.

Chapter 5

The Influence of Political Geography

1. Introduction

The previous two chapters have dealt with Morgenthau's early American works and the immediate contextual influences surrounding each work. The next three chapters will proceed to analyze specific sections of these texts and show how, when viewed comparatively, they tend to show fundamental differences in themes and opinions on the same issue. Furthermore, these conflicts will be explained by the immediate internal and external context of the period as well as the different intentions and motives of the works. The three specific areas that will be examined are political geography, rationalism and ethics.¹

The purpose of this chapter is to show a fundamental difference in Morgenthau's view on political geography within *SMPP* and *PAN*. The section on *SMPP* shows how this section can be attributed to Morgenthau's continental past. The section on *PAN* shows that through the influence of writers in the Anglo-Saxon world, the changing external context and the difference between the books, his view changed to reflect the opposite position stated in *SMPP*. The discussion of these internal contextual influences shows how Morgenthau was influenced by works of the individuals who he read. It further demonstrates the political geographical thought that occurs in *PAN*. This is important as it provides the reasoning and influence behind the centrality of political geography in *PAN* in relation to its relative marginalization in *SMPP*.

¹ This does not preclude other areas in which the two books clash but merely suggests that these might be the most obvious ones.

As a result the internal contextual influences on political geography provide a catalyst to the subsequent discussion in the book.²

As mentioned, Morgenthau's discussion of political geography is more limited than his discussions of rationalism and ethics.³ Political geography receives a brief mention in *SMPP*, totalling two pages, and then quickly turns to a discussion of the fallacy of single causal explanations, particularly with the use of science in the study of social affairs. The relevant section from *PAN* is lengthier, totalling 29 pages, two of which echo Morgenthau's previous admonishment against single causal explanations. Except for this similarity the analysis in the two books differs. Morgenthau's argument in *SMPP* argues against the use of criteria in order to determine the power of states. In *PAN* he then uses these criteria to help describe a possible method of evaluating state power but cautions against using geography as a sole method of understanding.

The chapter will proceed by explaining the detail of both works followed by an analysis of the earlier drafts to ascertain its evolution as well as to note what material was removed. Analysis of Morgenthau's class lectures from this period will then be included as the notes of his lectures helped form the structure and content of *PAN*.⁴ Following this, the context of the approaches in the two books will be examined. The chief academic debates in political geography at the time, which include the definition and use of geopolitik as well as the influence and legitimacy of geo determinism or geographic environmentalism, will be examined to determine the level of influence these debates had upon Morgenthau's position. The analysis will proceed to the works and criticisms of Halford Mackinder and James

² See Chapter six on rationalism.

³ A distinction is made within this chapter between geography, which corresponds to physical features such as mountain ranges and political geography which is inclusive of factors within a state which are advantageous.

⁴ See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, Foreword.

Fairgrieve, whose works were disparaged in *PAN*.⁵ From this analysis it will be determined how fair Morgenthau's critique is, as well as how some of Mackinder's and Fairgrieve's ideas may have positively contributed to *PAN*. Nicholas Spykman's geographical works will similarly be examined as the intellectual link between these two authors has been conspicuously absent from most of the Morgenthau literature. The external contextual elements of the Second World War, the beginning of the Cold War and the awakening of American global power will then be considered as factors in the shift towards a more favourable view on geographical considerations in international relations in *PAN*. Lastly, the relation between Morgenthau's changing geographical ideas and the inclusion of more rationalist ideas will be explained. The differences in Morgenthau's ideas of rationalism as set out in *SMPP* and *PAN* will be the focus of the next chapter.

2. Scientific Man Versus Power Politics

In Morgenthau's discussion on political geography in *SMPP* he advances two key propositions. The first proposition is that the concept of the frontier acquired a scientific meaning in the latter half of the 19th century. He tacitly highlights this importance by referencing Disraeli's speech justifying the Second Afghan War as the quest to create a scientific boundary. Implied in this justification is the belief that making the boundary scientific will create stability based upon the territorial attributes of the boundary, ignoring the political implications of expanding British territory in Central Asia. The second proposition advanced by Morgenthau is that a frontier is quantitatively evaluated by "objective" standards such as population and fertility. Referencing the Congress of Vienna, Morgenthau explains how Metternich established a statistical commission to evaluate the territories in dispute. By using

⁵ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 118.

factors such as population, fertility, quality of the population and type of populations the commission could determine the value of the land, thereby eliminating the political elements of diplomacy and statesmanship. Morgenthau refers to this as a mathematical proposition.

Based upon the context of the passage, Morgenthau's approach can be read as an implicit criticism in two distinct ways. The first is that these factors are not quantitatively measurable, as the quality and type of populations do not have an inherent numerical value that can be assigned to them. Assuming they were quantifiable, the numerical assignment would be a reflection of the personal value of the group engaged in the project and thus would be relative to the individual and wider historical context of the evaluating group, rather than a concrete scientific truth. Secondly, this evaluation, based upon pre selected criteria, ignores other factors which are valuable in determining the distribution of land among nations, such as ethnicity and historical relationships, culture, the wishes of the people within the state, and political leanings of these individuals. These are obviously phenomena subject to change over time but their absence demonstrates a lack of foresight and consideration in the determination of the land and its people. Following this, Morgenthau casually mentions that geopolitics endeavoured to put foreign policy as a whole on a scientific basis. It is unclear if he is referring to geopolitics as a synonym for political geography or whether he is referring to the specific Nazi form of geopolitics.⁶ Morgenthau then swiftly switches topics to attack reason and the scientific approach in international affairs in general before discussing single causal explanation in international relations.⁷

⁶ As a term geopolitics during this period was used to describe political geography as well as the particular ideological form of political geography practiced within Nazi Germany. Ernest H. Short, *A Handbook Of Geo-Politics* (London: Phillip Alan, 1935), 12.

⁷ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 92-93.

The brevity of Morgenthau's treatment of political geography can be read in several ways. First, it could be assumed that he did not think the topic was overly important, therefore he only devoted a few lines to exposition and explanation of his opinion on the topic. A second reading could be that the discussion of science and political geography was a recent inclusion in the text and as such it was not fully developed in time for printing or that the section had undergone major revisions throughout the process of writing which subsequently resulted in its terse character. The third option is that Morgenthau felt that the issue did not need elaboration and his exposition was clear. The third option is more likely considering the archival evidence. The earliest American writing of Hans Morgenthau on the problem of geography and its mathematical application in international relations is a stenographic transcript of a series of lectures given in the New School of Social Research on August 16th 1940.⁸ As noted in Chapter Three this manuscript is the beginning of *SMPP*. The later drafts of *SMPP* also contain the same element of disapproval of statistical political geography.⁹ In the earliest completed draft of *SMPP*, the geographical section is identical to the finished product.¹⁰ The only difference is the inclusion of Disraeli's speech at Chatman House in the final version.¹¹ This evidence suggests that Morgenthau clearly regarded this section as a critical component to his overall thesis. Due to the enormity of the work undertaken in its revision and the lengthy development time it is unlikely he would have left the section unless

⁸ Liberalism and Foreign Policy Lecture, August 16 1940, HJM-B168F5. See chapter three for a more detailed view of this transcript and the development of *SMPP* as a whole.

⁹ See HJM-B147, HJM-B148 and HJM 149 for these drafts. In the Hans Morgenthau Archives there are over a dozen drafts of *SMPP*.

¹⁰ Power and Reason: A Critique of Liberal Foreign Policy, undated, HJMB147F1. From a comparison of the drafts this is the earliest completed draft due to the greater dissimilarity to the finished product compared to the other complete drafts in the Archives.

¹¹ As is typical for Morgenthau's writing style, historical or anecdotal evidence is usually added later to the text.

he thought it provided a valuable addition to the text.¹² A further objection that could be proposed is that Morgenthau might have merely kept the section in the text due to hesitancy to alter or remove any finished ideas in the manuscript. The sheer number of drafts and the voluminous corrections, additions and rearrangement of the text should admirably counter this argument.¹³

A final remark should be made on the genesis of the ideas in *SMPP*. While this thesis advocates the position that more attention should be given towards contemporary sources of Morgenthau's era which influenced him, it should be noted that there are ideas in his works which are undoubtedly remnants of his European past, unaltered from the experiences and writings in America. This section is one such area. The only citation for this brief section is a French work from the early twentieth century that discusses the balance of power as a result of the Congress of Vienna.¹⁴ It is fair to assume that this citation, which encompasses the central issue of the section, was read by Morgenthau before he came to America. Therefore, this position is the product of his intellectual debt to his European heritage. While it is possible to find contemporary sources that would state a similar sentiment, there is no strong evidence that Morgenthau would have read or known about it. The contrast between *PAN* and *SMPP* is more striking as a result of this as it partially represents Morgenthau's changing viewpoint as a result of his contact with American IR literature.

¹² If the fragmentary stenographic transcript in, HJM-B168F5 can be considered the beginning of *SMPP* then the text was in development for six years. Admittedly, Morgenthau did not spend all six years on this text due to the tumultuous work conditions he suffered during this period. However, six years can be considered a long time to edit and expand a work. For details on Morgenthau's personal life during this period see Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, 67-73.

¹³ See chapter three for details on the progression of the text.

¹⁴ Charles Dupuis, *Le Principe d'équilibre et le Concert Europeen* (Paris:Perrin et Cie,1909).

3. Politics Among Nations

In *PAN* Morgenthau's view on political geography required more explanation and a lengthier exposition. This is found in chapters seven and eight, titled *Elements of National Power* and *Evaluation of National Power*. The former chapter contains a list of factors which can be used to determine a nation's power. They are divided into two sections, material factors and human agency. At the end of his analysis Morgenthau elaborates on types of single cause fallacies in judging the power of a state, similar to the transition at the end of the section in *SMPP*.

3.A Material and Quantitative Factors

The material factors listed by in *PAN* are geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, and military preparedness. By defining these factors as material factors Morgenthau is tacitly acknowledging the quantitative nature of these characteristics. Geography is explained as the most stable of the elements. Morgenthau emphasizes that as geography does not change, the fact of geographic location such as the position of the United States, separated from Asia and Europe by the Pacific and the Atlantic, will always be used in the evaluation of the strategic elements of foreign policy regardless of details of the particular political situation. He proceeds by giving historic examples such as the Alps and its relation to Rome.¹⁵ Half the section on geography is devoted to the geography of Russia and its advantage in size.¹⁶ Morgenthau particularly emphasizes the strategic failure of Napoleon and Hitler to consider the scope of Russian territory before their invasions. He also points out the lack of a proper geographical frontier such as a mountain range or large rivers which could impede the

¹⁵ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 81.

¹⁶ The size of this discussion is due to the topical nature of Russian power at the beginning of the Cold War. See below for a further external contextual explanation.

movement of armies between the West and Russia which has historically been a source of conflict.

The section on natural resources is lengthier than the geography section. The chapter begins with a discussion of the most valuable historic resource, food.¹⁷ The discussion on food stresses an underlying theme throughout the entire section, the strategic need for self-sufficiency. Morgenthau stresses the dangers of not being self-sufficient by emphasizing the historic decline of Spain due to deforestation and the decay of the Middle Eastern irrigation systems which coincided with their diminishing political power. Morgenthau discourages acquiring these resources through trade due to the possibility of blockade or trade restrictions. He further claims that due to the increasing industrialization of warfare the value of natural resources has increased. As a corollary to the idea of agricultural self-sufficiency, for the state to remain competitive the various materials necessary for industrial production need to be located within the state. Throughout the chapter Morgenthau obliquely refers to the ability to quantitatively evaluate the natural wealth and value of states. In discussing the changing military industrial needs of the state Morgenthau mentions the recent importance of uranium deposits. The states which possess these previously unimportant materials “have risen in the power calculations.”¹⁸ This statement is ambiguous as it is unclear if these power calculations are qualitative or quantitative but the use of the word calculation implies a mathematical basis. Taken by itself it is not definitive. However its characterization as a material element and when viewed in context with the section on industrial capacity it seems more probable that a quantitative scale is what is being referenced.

¹⁷ This reference to food might be inspired by the Norman Wait Harris lectures of 1944 on Food in International Relations at the University of Chicago. See Friedrich, “Instruction and Research: Political Science in the United States in Wartime,” 986.

¹⁸ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 86.

Industrial capacity is stressed by Morgenthau as the mechanism which unlocks the power potential of a state rich in natural resources. Again, he mentions the need for self-sufficiency. The industrial plants need to be located within the state for the same reasons as listed above for the self-sufficiency of natural resources. Again, he discounts the value of external trade as the transport of these resources may not be feasible during a war. The quantitative aspect of industrial capacity is emphasized through references to *The Economist*. The quotation from *The Economist* states that the weakness of the Soviet Union can be calculated statistically by national production and wealth. The inclusion of this in the text to demonstrate the weakness of the Soviet Union on an industrial level signifies approval for the quantitative evaluation of a state by this criterion. Therefore, the previous reference to power calculations is more likely referring to a quantitative basis.

The fourth element, military preparedness, is a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative factors. Morgenthau divides military preparedness into three separate categories; technological innovation, quality of leadership and quantity and distribution of arms and personnel. The first category is ambiguous as Morgenthau does not show if this can be known through either method. The historic examples given seem to point towards the conclusion that technological innovation can only be evaluated effectively after its successful implementation. The second category, quality of leadership, is clearly a qualitative judgement. Lastly, the quantity of arms and personnel is designated by Morgenthau as an issue of a “quantitative character that has direct bearing on national power.”¹⁹ He stresses that the answers to these issues will directly affect the United States in its power relations to other nations.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 91.

The latter half of the elements of national power are described by Morgenthau as human factors. These human factors are population, national character, national morale and the quality of diplomacy. Morgenthau makes a further distinction between this grouping, explicitly calling population a quantitative component compared to the qualitative nature of the latter three.²⁰ Morgenthau notes that population alone is not indicative of power but must be viewed in conjunction with the elements already discussed. The remainder of the section then examines the historic and predicted population trends for Western Europe, America, South America, China and the Soviet Union. Morgenthau notes that population by itself is not the key component in determining the strength of the nation but future development of its population. A large population is not an indicator of strength if the population is elderly. Ideally, the numbers of the age group between twenty and forty should show considerable increase.²¹

3.B Qualitative Factors

The first qualitative factor is national character which Morgenthau prefaces by stating that he is not concerned with its development or genesis. He concedes the element itself is contested but to his mind it is incontestable and a permanent feature of the power of the state.²² He asserts the objective quality of this characterization of a group of people and gives philosophical and historical examples which seemingly demonstrate the unchanging element of national character. According to Morgenthau the French national characteristics can be seen as early as the time of Julius Caesar, and Tacitus' remarks on German tribes can adequately describe Fredrick Barbarossa, Wilhelm II and Hitler. Morgenthau then proceeds to discuss the

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid*,94.

²² *Ibid*, 96.

Russian national character using lengthy examples from Bismarck's memoirs and an excerpt from *Time* magazine. He notes that the Communist ideology cannot alter this national character, implying that political and economic structures do not alter the values and character of a people. Failure to correctly assess national character will result in difficulties in the foreign policy of a state, as evidenced by Germany during World War One and Two regarding the Americans and in World War Two regarding the Russians.

The second qualitative element is national morale. Morgenthau emphasizes that the national morale of a state cannot be judged as an extension of its national character. Morale is a combination of two factors, the situation that the state is in at the moment and the quality of its government. The situation that the state is facing cannot be used to determine when morale will collapse as different stressors at different times produce different results. An example is the collapse of German morale in 1917 and the strong morale exhibited by Germany in 1945 when the situation was arguably worse. Quality of government is not a watchword for democratic governments but how well the government truly expresses the will and desire of the people. This second factor seems to be the most visible indicator of how the morale will function under stress.

The final element is the quality of diplomacy, which is discussed in greater detail in Part Ten of *PAN*.²³ The discussion that does take place within this chapter only gives historical examples of good diplomacy and mentions it is a unstable factor and depends on the situation, the diplomat and the head of state.

²³ *Ibid*, 419-445. See chapters four and six for a more detailed discussion of diplomacy.

3.C Geopolitics in PAN

The second chapter titled *Evaluating National Power*, specifically references geopolitics. Morgenthau begins by directly comparing the power of the United States with Russia and posing questions to the reader on particular issues relating to power. He then remarks that the evaluation of power is almost impossible and occurs in an ideal world. It is unclear whether he is commenting on the incomplete knowledge of the leaders towards other states, the impossibility of fully knowing the qualitative elements or the inability to correctly synthesize all the elements to gather a complete picture.²⁴ However, he then cautions against mistakes which are typically made in this evaluation. The first two can be summarized as regarding power as a permanent factor, untouched by contextual changes. The third mistake is the most interesting for this topic as he attacks the idea of single causal explanations of power. The fallacy of the single factor is divided into three topics: geopolitics, nationalism and militarism. The first topic is the most relevant to the present topic and as such will be examined to the exclusion of the others.

Morgenthau begins the geopolitics segment by immediately attacking geopolitics as a pseudo-science based upon the conception of space.²⁵ This reference to space contrasts the supposed static nature of space versus the dynamic attributes of the people that inhabit it. This indicates that Morgenthau thought geopolitics viewed the natural characteristics of a region as essentially unchanging. However, the reference to people being dynamic hints that space and therefore geography, can be altered through the efforts of individuals. The following

²⁴ See chapter six.

²⁵ Unlike previously, this reference to space makes it clear he is referring to the Nazi conception of geopolitics.

sentence is a clear allusion to the Nazi conception of geopolitik²⁶, stating that geopolitics understands that people must expand by conquering space or perish.²⁷ He states that the catalyst for geopolitics was formulated by Halford Mackinder in his article “The Geographical Pivot of History” in 1904.²⁸ Morgenthau states that the German geopoliticians used Mackinder’s thesis of a Heartland in Eurasia, which if conquered, would set the conditions for that state to conquer the world, as a basis for Nazi expansionism. Morgenthau attacks Mackinder and Fairgrieve for presenting a valid picture of the reality of national power from a distorted mono causal view. He further claims that the German geopoliticians took this idea and altered it into a form of political metaphysics.²⁹

This second chapter shows the remnants of the thoughts that pervaded *SMPP*. Morgenthau is still attacking what he views as single cause explanations which do not give the full picture of reality. Also, he is attacking geopolitics and geography in general as a form of single cause analysis, similar to his critique of the statistical land commissions at the Congress of Vienna. However, the disjuncture between his earlier critique on the attempts to evaluate land and his recommendation to try this evaluation on similar grounds is passed over without comment. Confusingly, it appears that Morgenthau did not try to explain or rectify this within the text. However, it should be remembered that consistency is not easy to achieve if the context has fundamentally been altered, even when speaking of similar topics within a short period of time. To illustrate this point it is necessary to examine the beginnings of *PAN* to see its evolution and inconsistencies.

²⁶ The use of term geopolitik will be used to distinguish the Nazi use of geopolitics.

²⁷ For a further discussion on the militarism aspects of the Nazi use of Geopolitik see below.

²⁸ However, the preceding quotation from Mackinder is from his 1919 book *Democratic Ideals and Reality*.

²⁹ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 116-118.

3.D Sources for PAN

3.D1 Class Notes

The first written record of the strategic factors for evaluating power occurs in the class notes for International Relations, , taught by Morgenthau, at the University of Chicago in 1943.³⁰ These class notes are brief, simply listing the factors with a short explanation. It is interesting to note that national character and national morale are combined into national spirit and industrial capacity is not mentioned. The critique of Mackinder and Haushofer is still present though there is no mention of Fairgrieve. The other fallacies are also absent, indicating that the geopolitics critique was one of the earliest formulated sections. As stated by Morgenthau in the foreword of *PAN*, this lecture in 1943 was the beginning of the idea of *PAN*.³¹ The presence of these factors in 1943 indicates that Morgenthau possessed these two ideas simultaneously as *SMPP* was undergoing revisions at this time.³² This contradiction can be explained by Morgenthau's introduction to Western sources such as Mackinder and Spykman and the different contexts in which the ideas were generated.

The geographical factors are mentioned briefly again in the existing Morgenthau course notes in 1944.³³ These course notes appear to be for the same class as the previous 1943 notes. According to these notes Morgenthau has limited the factors to geography as the stable factor followed by changing factors such as changes in the technique of war, military preparedness and national morale. There is another factor scrawled in pencil underneath national morale but it is illegible. The changing nature of these factors in Morgenthau's

³⁰ See Class notes for International Relations 1943, HJM-B77F8.

³¹ See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, Foreword.

³² See chapter three for details on the evolution and writing of *SMPP*. For further evidence on the early placement of geopolitics in *PAN* see the draft outlines in HJM-B124F7.

³³ These notes were taken by Miss Mary Jane Beneditz, who is credited in the foreword of *PAN* for her stenographical transcript of Morgenthau's lecture in 1946. See Below.

lectures can either be attributed to his opinion altering or the brevity in which the notes were taken.³⁴

The most complete course notes in relation to *PAN* are notes that were taken by Mary Jane Beneditz in 1946. Miss Beneditz is credited in the foreword of *PAN* as transcribing the lectures in the Winter Quarter of 1946 which would allow Morgenthau to write *PAN* in a year.³⁵ It is interesting to note that all the factors mentioned in *PAN* are present with the relevant examples.³⁶ The major difference is in the discussion of national character which is elongated due to the constant questioning of this concept by the class. Morgenthau struggles to adequately explain the basis and existence for the idea of the national character, stating that it is prior to tradition and customs and that its origin is a question for anthropologists rather than political scientists.³⁷ In relation to the idea of national character, Morgenthau gives a further statement in his discussion on Aristotle in the same period.³⁸ He claims that national character is similar to Rousseau's general will or Hegel's idea of the organic state. Immediately after this he claims that the idea of the national character cannot be measured but apparently can be observed. This reference to Hegel and Rousseau should be viewed with skepticism as the context of the discussion is philosophical and it is the sole mention of this connection in all of the published or archival material. The idea of the national character is anomalous within *PAN*

³⁴ See Class notes for International Relations 1944, HJM-B149F2.

³⁵ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, Foreword. For Beneditz's voluminous notes see HJM-B168F6, HJM-B169F1 and HJM-B169F2.

³⁶ See particularly the 11th, 12th and 13th lectures in HJM-B169F1.

³⁷ The entire 12th lecture is taken up by questions from the class on this concept. The class seems incredulous of Morgenthau's claim, particularly his assertion that it is generally a permanent conception.

³⁸ The course notes on Aristotle are undated but are in the folder with course notes from 1947. Therefore it is likely that these course notes are from the mid to late 1940's. See HJM-B76F3.

as it seemingly contradicts Morgenthau's penchant for employing methodological individualism in his ideas on the existence of the state.³⁹

As stated earlier, Beneditz notes are almost identical to the finished version of *PAN*. This explains the short development time between *SMPP* and *PAN*. However, during the period between these notes and the published version Morgenthau made additions to the text. The chief example of this is a draft of *PAN* which has notes written in the margins by an anonymous reviewer, probably Edward Shils.⁴⁰ This draft is similar to the final version of the text but is valuable for the insightful comments of the reviewer and the important additions made by Morgenthau which are absent from the published version.⁴¹ The most revealing comment is the reviewer's disagreement with the eternally consistent nature of national character. He astutely notes that mentioning national character as eternal is not necessary to Morgenthau's argument and is contentious. Despite the reviewer's notation of this flaw in the idea of national character, this version of *PAN* is interesting for a small inclusion in the text about the Congress of Vienna. Morgenthau states that fertility of the soil and the number and quality of the populations concerned have been used as objective standards by which to determine the increase in power which the individual nations received through the acquisition of territory. While in the 18th century this standard was crudely applied, the Congress of Vienna refined the policy of compensation by appointing in 1815 a statistical commission which was

³⁹ Morgenthau directly attacks this idea of the state in Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 118-119.

⁴⁰ The assumption that this is Shils is based upon the inclusion of the Edward A Shils and Waldemar Gurian as reviewers in the Foreword. However, this version of the Foreword is not the finished version as the dedication was to his children while the final version was to the memory of his father. This addition to the Foreword was first added in a later draft of *PAN* located in HJM-B123F7. Also, on September 13th 1948 Morgenthau asks his publisher for the second time to send a copy to Shils at LSE as he made an outstanding contribution to the book.

⁴¹ See Draft of *PAN* in HJM-B123F5. This version was written sometime before January 1948 as Morgenthau mentions on January 5th that both Gurian and Shils have both read the manuscript. HJM-B121F6.

charged with evaluating the territories to be disposed of by the standard number, quality, and type of population. This statement is the opposite of the sentiment expressed in *SMPP*. Its inclusion in the draft shows how Morgenthau's view between the books has dramatically changed. To be fair, this statement was later moved into the discussion of balance of power, thereby limiting the absolute contrast between the two sections.⁴² The displacement of this statement into a different section indicates that Morgenthau was possibly aware of this problem, though it is interesting that he decided to include it in the published version without remarking on how this statement could be reconciled with the earlier statements in *SMPP*.

3.D2 Academic Influences

Contrary to the pre-American sources used in *SMPP*, the sources in *PAN* are more contemporary to Morgenthau's time of writing. Out of the fifty sources for these two chapters the two earliest books were published in 1903 and 1927. All of the remaining sources are in the 1930's and 1940's, with the majority being in the 1940's.⁴³ The difference is striking and points to the different genesis of the ideas in both books. Obviously the political geography section in *SMPP* arose from Morgenthau's continental learning while the similar section in *PAN* is the product of his intellectual Americanization.

4. Internal Academic Context

Being aware of the textual differences between the works on political geography is crucial but without the addition of the contextual factors that helped create this difference this knowledge is merely the reiteration of facts without understanding. Thus, the contextual factors need to be explored to understand the reason behind the shift. The influences on

⁴² Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 135.

⁴³ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 477-479.

Morgenthau within the internal academic discourse at the time include conferences in which he participated, general debates about political geography which were prevalent in this period and academic writers of geopolitical issues.

4.A Conferences

In the spring of 1946 the Council of Foreign Relations commissioned a study by Grayson Kirk on the study of International Relations in American universities. The purpose of the book was to clarify the subject matter of International Relations as well as its objectives and method of instruction. The contents of the book were achieved through a roundtable discussion at six regional conferences. The ideas were then condensed into the book. Morgenthau was one of the participants in the Chicago conference.⁴⁴ The relation between political geography and International Relations is one of the key themes within the book. The quantitative geographical factors listed by Morgenthau within *PAN* are all mentioned as being one of the first things a student must catalogue before the state can be adequately analyzed.⁴⁵ This can be interpreted in several ways. It is possible that this discussion did not occur at the Chicago conference and the conference and the publication of the book had little impact on *PAN*. This seems unlikely due to the ubiquity of political geography in this period.⁴⁶ A second possibility is that the issue was discussed and Morgenthau viewed it as a confirmation of his own thoughts. Lastly, Morgenthau could have put forward these points and they were generally accepted and therefore placed in the book. This is less likely considering the number of conferences and attendees. Therefore, the most probable scenario is that Morgenthau would have viewed it as a confirmation of the ideas which he would later use in *PAN*.

⁴⁴ Grayson Kirk, *The Study of International Relations: In American Colleges and Universities* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1947),110.

⁴⁵ *ibid*, 15-16.

⁴⁶ See below for a further discussion.

Regardless of which interpretation is factually correct the mention of the material factors and the exclusion of any qualitative factors in the discussion of political geography shows the more rationalistic academic discourse of America at this period. It is exceedingly unlikely that Morgenthau could not have been affected by this.

4.B Academic Debates

4.B1 Geo-determinism

Within the academic discourse during this period there was a debate on the level of impact by which geographic features determine the state. The idea of a high correlation between physical environment and human action is called geo-determinism. The position in *SMPP* can be seen as an extreme reaction to this belief in geographical laws, denying the ability of man to use elements in order to solve political problems. The position in *PAN* is more moderate, encouraging the numerical understanding of several factors while simultaneously asserting the presence of other qualitative factors.

Despite Morgenthau's shift to a more quantitative line of thinking it is clear he is still trying to avoid being placed within the geo-determinist camp, as evidenced by his criticism of geopolitics. The followers of geo determinism believe international relations are determined primarily by geopolitical considerations. Echoing Morgenthau, Dwight Flanders stated that this point of view does not give due weight to all the elements of national power: the political, the geographic, the economic, the demo-graphic and the military.⁴⁷ By the 1920's the geo-deterministic view was out of fashion but still prevalent in certain circles.⁴⁸ During the 1930's

⁴⁷ Dwight P. Flanders, "Geopolitics and American Post-War Policy," *Political Science Quarterly* 60 (1945): 578.

⁴⁸ Karen DeBres, "Political Geographers of the Past IV: George Renner and the great map scandal of 1942," *Political Geography Quarterly* 5 (1986): 392.

and 1940's there was a partial revival in the ideas of geo-determinism. Hartshorne described this as a

“partial return to the "geographic materialism" of the middle nineteenth century or to certain teleological principles of the earth surfaces to state areas, we have in either case another throwback to "environmentalism," in a form which permits the exploitation of the purely nationalistic interests of the student .”⁴⁹

Hartshorne notes that the views of previous geographers such as Ratzel lead to exaggerations of the importance of geo-determinism which helped its rise to the forefront of the academic debates. The position has been strongly attacked by many political geographers as they were weary of constantly being attacked under the guise of geo-determinism.⁵⁰

By the 1940's many political geographers were trying to distance themselves from the idea of geo-determinism. Many articles from this period contain denunciations against the intellectual emptiness of this geographic idea. Hartshorne uses Whittlesey's work to illustrate this point, pointing out that Whittlesey 's work on Andorra does not simply use geographical features to explain complex phenomenon such as the cultural conditions within the state. He uses political, geographical, political and historical factors in order to form an explanation.⁵¹ Similarly, in a review of Whittlesey 's book *The Earth and The State: A Study of Political Geography*, Hartshorne notes he avoids the error of many geographers in assuming that the historical development of a society is mechanically related to the physical landscape.⁵² This sentiment is echoed by Robert Strausz-Hupe who states that geographical location might

⁴⁹ Richard Hartshorne, "Recent Developments in Political Geography II," *The American Political Science Review* 29 (1935): 961.

⁵⁰ Richard Hartshorne, "Recent Developments in Political Geography I," *The American Political Science Review* 29 (1935):796.

⁵¹ Hartshorne, "Recent Developments in Political Geography II," 948.

⁵² Richard Hartshorne, "Review of the Earth and the State," *Geographical Review* 30 (1940): 509. However these favourable descriptions of Whittlesey's work should be contrasted with Mattern's statement that Whittlesey is an example of a geo-determinist as well as an proponent of geopolitik. Johannes Mattern, *Geopolitik: Doctrine of National Self-Sufficiency and Empire* (Baltimore, John Hopkins Press,1942), 47.

determine where an act occurs but how is determined by man.⁵³ Isaiah Bowman's book *Geography in Relation To The Social Sciences* contains constant attacks against the idea of geodeterminism.⁵⁴ The most noteworthy of these is his claim that "no geographer of any standing now believes in geographic determinism."⁵⁵ While many of these statements can be considered factually accurate others tend to over exaggerate the academic danger of geodeterminism. Hans Weigert's statement that "geographical materialism is nothing but a dynamic nihilism which flourishes only in a nation which has buried its gods and is worshipping Mars instead" is a typical example of these types of polemics.⁵⁶

The political geographers drew a distinction between their field of political geography proper and geodeterminism by sustaining these attacks on it but rarely did they seek to adequately explain the differences between the two.⁵⁷ Hartshorne summarized the two positions by stating "political geography is the science of political areas, or more specifically, the study of the state as a characteristic of areas in relation to the other characteristics of areas."⁵⁸ In an article for training political geographers, the author gives a similar explanation saying "Political geography aims not only to describe, classify and map political groups, but to explain the processes that affect them in terms of the relationships of these processes to the

⁵³ Robert Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics: The Struggle for Space and Power* (New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1942), 173. Also Strausz-Hupe notes the difference between different types of national geography as he states that the French think of German geography as deterministic while they regard their own as merely influencing possibilities. *Ibid*, 134-135.

⁵⁴ Isaiah Bowman, *Geography In Relation To The Social Sciences* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), 32, 33, 54-55, 68-69, 70, 120, 121-122, 150, 158, 161, 183-184, 196, 225.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 69.

⁵⁶ Hans W Weigert, "Haushofer and the Pacific," *Foreign Affairs* 20 (1942): 733. Weigert's comments share a similarity with Morgenthau as he is linking geographical materialism to the Geopolitik school under Karl Haushofer. For a discussion of geopolitics at this period see below.

⁵⁷ Charles B. Hagan, "Geopolitics," *The Journal Of Politics* 4 (1942): 483. See also Kirk's statement that a clearer conception of political geography is needed in order to utilize it effectively in the study of international relations. Kirk, *The Study of International Relations*, 105.

⁵⁸ Hartshorne, "Recent Developments in Political Geography I," 804.

earth.”⁵⁹ Bowman does not give an explanation of what political geography is but states that an extended text would be needed to give an outline of it.⁶⁰ Morgenthau’s position in *PAN* mirrors these statements, particularly Hawthorne’s. His attack on geopolitics and the determining of political and cultural factors from geographical environments is the same as theirs and his placement of Fairgrieve and Mackinder within this tradition corresponds to the historiography of geo-determinism as outlined by the political geographers.⁶¹

4.B2 Geopolitik

Morgenthau explicitly links geopolitiks with geo-determinism in his section on the single fallacies. Geopolitik, as practiced and written by the German geographers was a popular subject during this period with scores of articles and books written on the subject.⁶² The heightened interest in academic subjects related to the war lead to a voluminous amount of material, much of which contained hysterical inaccuracies about the Germans and their geopolitik doctrine.⁶³ However, no such hysterical accounts are present in Morgenthau’s bibliography in *PAN*. While it is unlikely he was not aware of these accounts as the geopolitik

⁵⁹ John K. Wright, “Training For Research In Political Geography,” *Annals of The Association of American Geographers* 34 (1944): 194.

⁶⁰ Bowman, *Geography In Relation To The Social Sciences*, 211.

⁶¹ For the impact of Fairgrieve and Mackinder on Morgenthau and the correctness of his view see below.

⁶² For books written on the subject see Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics*; Mattern, *Geopolitik*, Derwent Whittlesey, *German Strategy Of World Conquest* (London, F.E.Robinson and Co. 1942); Hans Weigert, *German Geopolitics* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1941). For a selection of articles see Werner J. Cahnman, “Concepts of Geopolitics,” *American Sociological Review* 8 (1943); Werner J. Cahnman, “Methods of Geopolitics,” *Social Forces* 21 (1942); Hagan, “Geopolitics,” and Weigert, “Haushofer and the Pacific,”.

⁶³ Mattern, *Geopolitik*, 42. An example of this form of error is the claim that “General Haushofer keeps in his Geopolitical Institute a file on almost everything and everybody in every country and in every part of every country on the face of this globe.” Cahnman, “Concepts of Geopolitics,” 59 and Cahnman, “Methods of Geopolitics,” 152. See Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics*, 86 and Gearoid O Tuathail, Simon Dalby, and Paul Routledge. eds., *The Geopolitics Reader*, 2nd ed. (New York, Routledge, 2006), 26-27 for the rejection of this claim.

was a common subject in this period, the information he drew upon according to the bibliography is of a higher intellectual caliber.

Morgenthau's critique of geopolitik is ambiguous. While it is clear that he finds the concept reprehensible it is unclear if he regarded the Nazi espousal of the doctrine as geo-deterministic or whether he felt that English writers built a foundation of geo-determinism which was then exploited by the Germans to use as a national ideology. The difference between these two ideas is that the first is geo-determinism and the second is not necessarily geo-determinism, it is an ideology which conveniently uses geo-determinism to support certain practices that are occurring in the present. The latter conception can then discard geo-determinism when it does not suit its purposes but the former is wedded to the idea as a basic law of action. Morgenthau was not alone in this confusion. The geopolitical books of this period are divided on the question of determinism versus ideological convenience.⁶⁴

Despite Morgenthau's critical analysis of the geopoliticians he shares some similarities with the German geopoliticians as well as the political geographers who discuss these topics.

Cahnman makes the claim that geopoliticians

⁶⁴ For sources in favour of geopolitik being geo-deterministic see Whittlesey, *German Strategy Of World Conquest*, 62; Weigert, "Haushofer and the Pacific," 733 and Hagan, "Geopolitics," 489. Werner J. Cahnman is ambiguous in his treatment saying it is not rigid, allows mathematical formula to be used but allows individualization of circumstance. Cahnman, "Methods of Geopolitics," 149-150 and Cahnman, "Methods of Geopolitics," 56 and 58. Strausz-Hupe has a more nuanced view on the issue stating that Haushofer has stated that geographic principles determine about ¼ of human action. Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics*, 26 and 83. For sources which advocate an ideological basis see Nicholas Spykman, "Geography and Foreign Policy I," *The American Political Science Review* 32 (1938): 30n4 ; Nicholas Spykman, *Geography of The Peace* (New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1944), 7; Hartshorne, "Recent Developments in Political Geography II," 956 ; Nicholas Spykman, "Review of Geopolitics: The Struggle For Space and Power and Geopolitik: Doctrine of Self Sufficiency and Empire," *Political Science Quarterly* 57 (1942): 598 and Hans Weigert, *German Geopolitics*, 11-12. It is interesting to note that Weigert at different periods takes both viewpoints. Morgenthau is aware of Weigert's works as he is cited on page 118 in *PAN*. Also Weigert was a reviewer of *SMPP* and was generally favourable to Morgenthau's ideas in the text. See HJM-B149F9 and chapter three.

“take into account physical geography, population, and government as interrelated parts of that whole, rather than as parts of physical geography, population, and government in general. It was only in this way, they would say, that an all-inclusive and hence realistic political science could emerge, which was to comprise all the social sciences upon a geographical foundation and in their political aspect.”⁶⁵

Given Cahnman’s less than pristine record concerning the habits of practitioners of geopolitik this should not be given much credence. However, Hartshorne appears to concur on this issue stating that the requirements of political power in the state is a question that geographers have traditionally considered without definitely answering it. He then notes that this question is a central occupation of the Geopolitik school of thought.⁶⁶ Mattern’s book primarily illustrates the geopoliticians’ idea for the need of the state to be self-sufficient.⁶⁷ This is comparable to Morgenthau’s insistence on the same need for self-sufficiency.⁶⁸ Despite the similarities Morgenthau’s work is not a work of geopolitics. As Mattern states, the difference between political geography and geopolitics is that the former is how things are and the latter is how things ought to be.⁶⁹ In his description of the power factors of a state Morgenthau is describing factors which are or are not present which will affect the power of the state. The normative aspect is not present in Morgenthau’s account.

Morgenthau’s stated aversion to geopolitics is not surprising. While there was much criticism of this idea in the United States due to its German origin, a few scholars such as Fredrick Schuman supported the idea, advocating that Americans need to know geopolitics in order to be competitive on the international stage.⁷⁰ The German origin, particularly its rise to

⁶⁵ Cahnman, “Method of Geopolitics,” 147.

⁶⁶ Hartshorne, “Recent Developments in Political Geography II,” 952.

⁶⁷ Mattern, *Geopolitik*, 12.

⁶⁸ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 82-88. Also see pgs 7-8 in this chapter.

⁶⁹ Mattern, *Geopolitik*, 45.

⁷⁰ Fredrick L. Schuman, “Let Us Learn Our Geopolitics,” *Current History* 5 (1942). This should be contrasted with Bowman’s more emphatic claim that Geopolitics as a so-called science is bunk. Neil Smith, “Political Geographers Of The Past Isaiah Bowman: Political Geography and Geopolitics,” *Political Geography Quarterly* 3 (1984): 75. IN hindsight Bert Chapman notes that the German association with

prominence during Nazism also helped earn it Morgenthau's disdain. As Ashworth notes "Given geopolitics' association with fascism in the 1940s, it is perhaps not surprising that German émigrés, such as Morgenthau and Herz, would not wish their realism to be associated with it."⁷¹

4.C Prominent Geographers

4.C1 Mackinder

Much like geopolitics, Morgenthau's insistence on the error of Mackinder's analysis hides some similarities in approach. These "errors" are debatable as Mackinder's work cannot be simplified to such an extent. Morgenthau's attack on Mackinder might be based upon the intellectual view of Mackinder's writings at the time, which were not favourable.⁷² However, Mackinder's topical popularity at this time could not be denied.⁷³ Mackinder's publicly held relationship as a progenitor of German geopolitik, particularly the influence his writings had on Karl Haushofer, the leader of the German Geopolitik school, probably did not help Morgenthau's view of him.⁷⁴ While the influence of Mackinder on Karl Haushofer and the

geopolitics had a profoundly negative impact. Bert Chapman, *Geopolitics: A Guide To The Issues* (Oxford, Praeger, 2011), 2 and 8.

⁷¹ Lucian M. Ashworth, "Realism and the spirit of 1919: Halford Mackinder, geopolitics and the reality of the League of Nations," *European Journal of International Relations* 17 (2011): 294.

⁷² For the negative view of Mackinder see "Review of Ideals and Reality," *Amerasia* 6 (1942): 338. This states that Mackinder's view rationalizations based upon pseudo-science that can do little good and much harm. Also Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics*, 189-190 ; Isaiah Bowman, "Geography vs. Geopolitics," *Geographical Review* 32 (1942): 657; Bowman, *Geography In Relation To The Social Sciences*, 60. Bowman in particular seems to have a low opinion of Mackinder as he excludes him from the discussion of geography teachers in England. See *Ibid*, 318-319. Lastly, Spykman, despite owing his own thesis to Mackinder's work publicly mocks Mackinder's idea on the importance of land power. Nicholas J. Spykman, "Geography and Foreign Policy II," *The American Political Science Review* 32 (1938): 224-25. Spykman also partially discounts Mackinder's Heartland thesis in his posthumous book. See Spykman, *The Geography Of The Peace*, 38-45.

⁷³ Brian W. Bloeut, "Political Geographers Of The Past V: The political career of Sir Halford Mackinder," *Political Geography Quarterly* 6 (1987):365 and Ashworth, "Realism and the spirit of 1919," 293.

⁷⁴ For works that link Mackinder to the geopolitical tradition see Weigert, "Haushofer and the Pacific," 738 and 741 ; Whittlesey, *German Strategy Of World Conquest*, 65 and Derwent Whittlesey, " Haushofer:

German school of geopolitik is indisputable, the claim that Mackinder is an unapologetic geo-determinist is not a wholly accurate description. A nuanced reading of Mackinder would show that while at times he can fall into this position while at other periods he explicitly argues against it.⁷⁵

Despite Morgenthau's dismissal of Mackinder's work an examination of Mackinder's writings shows that Morgenthau and Mackinder share similar ideas. The most interesting is that both believe in the concept of a national character. Mackinder states that national character is malleable when it is young but after the state becomes settled the character become fixed.⁷⁶ Also, Mackinder shares Morgenthau's view on the rise of nationalism disintegrating the class ties which had previously united the ruling classes of Europe.⁷⁷ Mackinder even shares the same view on how to properly evaluate national power. Mackinder says

"I have spoken as a geographer. The actual balance of political power at any given time is, of course, the product, on the one hand, of geographical conditions, both economic and strategic, and, on the other hand, of the relative number, virility, equipment, and organization of the competing peoples. In proportion as these quantities are accurately estimated are we likely to adjust differences without the crude resort to arms. And the geographical quantities in the calculation are more measurable and more nearly constant than the human."⁷⁸

The Geopoliticians," in *Makers of Modern Strategy*, ed. Edward Mead Earle (London, Oxford University Press, 1943), 390 and Spykman, *Geography of The Peace*, ix and 37.

⁷⁵ For aspects of Mackinder's deterministic outlook see Halford J. Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality* (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1942), 2, 12 and 81 ; H.J.Mackinder, "The Geographic Pivot of History," *The Geographic Journal* 23 (1904): 422; Ashworth, "Realism and the spirit of 1919," 296 and Halford J. Mackinder, "The Round World and The Winning Of The Peace," *Foreign Affairs* 21 (1943): 597. For Mackinder's rejection of geo-determinism see Mackinder, "Geographic Pivot of History," 422; Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality*, 29. For others stating Mackinder rejects geo-determinism see Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics*, 142 and Ashworth, "Realism and the spirit of 1919," 291.

⁷⁶ Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality*, 3 and 155.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 193-193; Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 184-196.

⁷⁸ Mackinder, "The Geographic Pivot of History," 437.

It appears that that Morgenthau did not read Mackinder too closely as this statement mirrors his own view in *PAN*.⁷⁹ The similarity of Morgenthau and Mackinder in these areas is not to suggest that Morgenthau took these elements from Mackinder while discrediting him. It does suggest though that Morgenthau either did not read Mackinder too closely before criticizing him or that Morgenthau did not wish to be associated with Mackinder's line of thinking and thus sought to distance himself from this view.

4.C2 Fairgrieve

While Morgenthau's criticism of Mackinder may be misplaced his criticism of Fairgrieve is correct. Fairgrieve's book is typical of a work that focuses on geo-determinism. Fairgrieve places emphasis on geographical conditions for the macro processes of history. An example of this is the people of equatorial regions do not have seasons and therefore they do not need to plan ahead or work to conserve energy for the colder months. The fact that the Europeans had to engage in these activities allowed them to develop as a civilization.⁸⁰ In response to the idea that geography only influences and that man has direct control of his actions Fairgrieve responds that geographical conditions are more powerful than the genius of individuals and are more powerful even than racial characters unless those characters are due to geographic controls.⁸¹ Within the text there are countless other examples of a similar nature.⁸² Fairgrieve was aware of this element in his work and pointed that while the book was "materialistic in the sense it deals with material things. While it does not refer to a spiritual dimension that does not mean it does not exist."⁸³ Furthermore, he states that the argument he chooses

⁷⁹ Lucian Ashworth has come to this conclusion as well. See Ashworth, "Realism and the spirit of 1919," 293.

⁸⁰ James Fairgrieve, *Geography And World Power* (New York, E.P.Dutton and Company, 1917), 17-19.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, 22.

⁸² *Ibid*, 13, 60,155, 158,162, 260 and 287. See also Hagan, "Geopolitics," 483.

⁸³ Fairgrieve, *Geography And World Power*, Preface.

determines the evidence that he draws upon. Therefore, an argument on the importance of geography uses geographical examples and thus diminishes the importance of non-geographical factors.⁸⁴ This is an important caveat that Morgenthau does not make mention of in his analysis. However, it does not excuse the one-sided dimension of Fairgrieve's argument.

Like Mackinder, Fairgrieve was an influence on the school of Geopolitik as *Geography and World Power* was translated to German with a special introduction by General Haushofer.⁸⁵ However, similar to Mackinder this influence of Geopolitik is not as far removed from Morgenthau's thought as he would portray it in *PAN*. Fairgrieve shares the belief that national characteristics are permanent. He posits that these characteristics are ingrained and will be passed down from generation to generation even when the people have moved away from this geographical area. Also, like Morgenthau he does not attempt to explain this belief saying it simply happens and he does not know why.⁸⁶

It is interesting to note that Morgenthau in his class lectures speaks more highly of Fairgrieve than his mention in *PAN*. In class notes from 1947 Morgenthau states that Fairgrieve's book is good but its explanatory power is dubious due to its focus on economic and geographical issues.⁸⁷ Also, Fairgrieve's book is cited in several places in *PAN* outside the geopolitics section.⁸⁸ This indicates that while Morgenthau's criticism was harsh in the geopolitics section he did not find Fairgrieve's book as poor as is implied.

⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 1-2.

⁸⁵ Whittlesey, *German Strategy of World Conquest*, 65 ; Hagan, "Geopolitics," 483; Strausz-Hupe, *Geopolitics*, 83.

⁸⁶ Fairgrieve, *Geography and World Power*, 66-67.

⁸⁷ Class notes on International Affairs, HJM-B77F6

⁸⁸ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 302-303. Morgenthau quotes about 600 words of *Geography and World Power* approvingly in his description of how technological change has altered the world.

4.C3 Spykman

While it is unlikely that Morgenthau took his ideas in *PAN* from either of these two authors, Nicholas Spykman seems to be a major influence in the change of Morgenthau's opinion of geographical factors. From the start of Morgenthau's tenure at the University of Chicago, Morgenthau includes Spykman's magnum opus; *America's Strategy in World Politics*, in his required course reading list.⁸⁹ Spykman was an International Relations scholar at Yale who died in 1943 and was a well-known figure in the field. However, many of the sources of this period do not refer to him favourably.⁹⁰ There were others such as Bowman who heaped praise upon the book stating

"On grounds of merit and public value "America's Strategy in World Politics" should be read in not less than a million American homes Every government official responsible for policy should read it once a year for the next twenty years-even if he may not agree with some of the remedies proposed."⁹¹

Immediately following this recommendation Bowman unwittingly draws a parallel between Morgenthau and Spykman, stating "doubt if a man without an European background could have made so strong a case in international politics for facing realities instead of reciting lullabies."⁹² This same sentence could be from a review of *PAN*.

⁸⁹ Spykman's book was required reading in Morgenthau's International Politics class in 1944, 1946, 1947 and 1948. By 1948 it was also required reading for Morgenthau's PhDs as well. See HJM-B78F4.

⁹⁰ See Kurt R. Mattusch, "Geopolitics "science" of Power Politics," *Amerasia* 6 (1942) ; Weigert, "Haushofer and The Pacific," 734n1 ; Mattern, *Geopolitik*, 49 and Robert Strausz-Hupe, "Review of The Geography Of The Peace," *Military Affairs* 8 (1944). Also see Sprout's comments on reviews of Spykman in HJM-B123F9.

⁹¹ Isaiah Bowman, "Review of America's Strategy in World Politics," *Geographical Review* 32 (1942): 350. This statement should be contrasted with Neil Smith's assertion that privately Bowman was disparaging of Spykman. Neil Smith, *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization* (Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2003), 288.

⁹² *Ibid.*

Spykman's influence can be seen in the difference between *SMPP* and *PAN*. If the geographical section in *SMPP* is the product of Morgenthau's continental intellectual tradition, then the same section in *PAN* is largely due to Spykman's influence. The major change between *SMPP* and *PAN* is the list of criteria as Morgenthau seemingly rejects his earlier dismissal of quantifiable criteria in *SMPP* and proceeds to approvingly cite these same criteria as a way to determine national power. This research program was first championed by Spykman in 1942, where he asked "To what extent do geographic factors determine the power potential of a state, and what formula for power can be devised for the guidance of statesmen in their work on the map for the New World Order."⁹³ These criteria are a constant source of discussion in Spykman's work. In *America's Strategy* Spykman lists the criteria as geography, military power, size of territory, nature of frontiers, size of population, absence or presence of raw materials, economic and technological development, financial strength, ethnic homogeneity, effective social integration, political stability, national spirit.⁹⁴ In comparison to Morgenthau's factors national character and diplomacy are missing while Morgenthau does not include financial strength and ethnic homogeneity. In an earlier article Spykman stated that

"Unfortunately for the political scientist with a fondness for simplification, but fortunately for the statesman striving to overcome the geographic handicaps of his country, neither does the entire foreign policy of a country lie in geography, nor does any part of that policy lie entirely in geography. The factors that condition the policy of states are many; they are permanent and temporary, obvious and hidden; they include, apart from the geographic factor, population density, the economic structure of the country, the ethnic composition of the people, the form of government, and the complexes and pet prejudices of foreign ministers; and it is their simultaneous action and interaction that create the complex phenomenon known as "foreign policy."⁹⁵

⁹³ Nicholas John Spykman, "Frontiers, Security and International Organization," *Geographical Review* 32 (1942): 444.

⁹⁴ Nicholas John Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power* (New York: Harcourt, Brace And Company, 1942), 19 and 41.

⁹⁵ Nicholas J. Spykman, "Geography and Foreign Policy I," *The American Political Science Review* 32 (1938): 28.

The similarity with Morgenthau's position in *PAN* is clear. Much like Morgenthau, Spykman was aware that the factors determining power are not all quantifiable. In evaluating a state's power he notes that

“There are other intangibles equally hard to measure that greatly influence the military effectiveness of states. Without obedience and discipline, national fervor, and willingness to sacrifice and suffer, no nation can survive in the struggle for power, even if it owns all the iron ore in the world. After due consideration has been paid to the intangibles in military strength, there remain, nonetheless, a great many factors directly observable in geographic terms, such as size, location, topography, climate, population, arable land, and minerals.”⁹⁶

The idea of obedience, discipline, national fervor and willingness to sacrifice and suffer obviously correspond to Morgenthau's idea of national character and national morale.

Spykman's work bears similarities to Morgenthau's in other areas of *PAN*. His comments on the balance of power resemble Morgenthau's. Linked to the evaluation of power section, Spykman notes that the balance of power is subjective and ultimately there is no way of knowing who has the advantage unless the war is fought. Therefore, the goal is always to try and have more power than the nearest competitor.⁹⁷ Thus, the balance of power is unstable but at the moment it is the best method of securing peace.⁹⁸ In his discussion of the balance of power Spykman makes allusions to the classical period of balance of power with Britain maintaining the balance on the European continent. This allusion to Britain as the holder of the balance is a frequent occurrence in Morgenthau's writings on balance of power.⁹⁹ Spykman's work also contains the same as Morgenthau in his discussion of mores, customs and

⁹⁶ Spykman, “Frontiers, Security and International Organization,” 444-45.

⁹⁷ Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, 22. For the same statements in *PAN* see Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 151-56.

⁹⁸ Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, 22 and 472. Morgenthau's statement on this issue is similar. See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 125, 159 and 285.

⁹⁹ Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, 100. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 143 and 385.

laws.¹⁰⁰ His position on isolationism is also similar. While the debate on isolationism versus interventionism was a common debate during the early 1940's Spykman makes the same argument that Morgenthau would later make in *PAN*, referencing Washington's Farewell Address while noting that the historical context has changed.¹⁰¹ The point of this comparison is not to say that all these ideas came from Spykman's works or that Morgenthau merely borrowed many of the ideas in *PAN* from Spykman. Some of the ideas such as the mores, customs and laws originate from Morgenthau's continental writings. On other issues Morgenthau's view is opposed to Spykman's.¹⁰² However, if another author shared similar ideas that Morgenthau previously held, it is likely that Morgenthau would be more willing to incorporate the author's other ideas into his work. Due to the change of Morgenthau's writings on the issue of political geography between *SMPP* and *PAN* it seems likely that the influence of American writings, particularly Spykman's, helped shift his opinion.

5. Purpose of The Books

The shift between *SMPP* and *PAN* cannot be explained solely through the influence of contemporary writers such as Spykman. The difference purpose of the books modifies the message contained within. As *SMPP* is a diatribe against the overuse of science in politics Morgenthau is naturally drawn to argue against the use of quantifiable criteria in determining state power. Since *PAN* is designed as an introductory textbook to IR and has an underlying theme of how to preserve peace, Morgenthau points out the ways that national power can be observed through the use of these same criteria. These different purposes alter the messages

¹⁰⁰ Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, 12. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 170-173.

¹⁰¹ Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, 3. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 5-7, 118.

¹⁰² Spykman's views ethics as a means to power that has no value in itself. Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, 12 and 18. Morgenthau's views on ethics are more nuanced than Spykman's realpolitik. See chapter seven. Also, Spykman's views on geography are more deterministic than Morgenthau though they are moderate enough to avoid the label of geo-determinism. See Nicholas J. Spykman, "Geography and Foreign Policy II," *The American Political Science Review* 32 (1938): 218 and 236 and Spykman, *Geography and Foreign Policy I*, 30.

that are contained within. The arguments for or against a certain idea are not dependent upon the validity of the idea as a whole.¹⁰³

6. External Context

However, the academic discourse and the purpose of the books are not the only factors that can account for the change between the two books. Morgenthau wrote the books at a certain period of time and it is highly unlikely that the events which occurred around him could not have influenced the direction of his academic thoughts. The American academic community's research was clearly altered by the events of the Second World War.¹⁰⁴

Many researchers received grants in order to explore subjects that would further the effectiveness of America in the war. Other academics were recruited directly into government to plan and manage activities relating to the war. Morgenthau benefited by this government recruitment as his position at the University of Chicago was given to him due to the absence of Quincy Wright who left the University to work within the State department.¹⁰⁵ In regard to geography, works were commissioned to try and analyze and understand Nazi strategy.¹⁰⁶ Political geographers such as Isaiah Bowman were appointed to positions of national influence such as Special Adviser to the President, ensuring that their ideas directly influenced the foreign policy of the United States.¹⁰⁷

This external influence of the war changed the public discourse in society in relation to geography as well. President Roosevelt encouraged the public to follow the war by

¹⁰³ Morgenthau hints to this fact himself stating that his criticism of UNESCO wouldn't have been so harsh if the praise of it hadn't been so extreme. Letter to R.W. Van Wagenen, Sept 22nd 1950 HJM-B121F7. For discussions of the purpose and ideas of *SMPP* and *PAN* see chapter three and four respectively.

¹⁰⁴ See Friedrich, *Instruction and Research*.

¹⁰⁵ Annual Report of the University of Chicago Political Science Department 1943, HJM-B177F7.

¹⁰⁶ The list of works in this paper on geopolitics is only one particular manifestation of this trend.

¹⁰⁷ Smith, "Political Geographers of the Past Isaiah Bowman," 71; Smith, *American Empire*, 317-415 and O Tuathail, Dalby and Routledge, *The Geopolitics Reader*, 27.

familiarizing themselves with European and Pacific geography through atlases. The Nazi concept of geopolitik was conveyed to the populace through different forms of media. The United States Army orientation course provided in films and lectures, detailed accounts of the Geopolitical Institute's work under General Karl Haushofer.¹⁰⁸ A popular film series in this period, entitled *Why We Fight*, discussed Nazi geopolitik at length. It specifically attributes Hitler's military strategy to the concept of Mackinder's Heartland thesis, though it does not mention Mackinder by name.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, the academic community engaged with the army in an effort to try and educate in order to enhance its effectiveness. These approaches typically used the list that Morgenthau and Spykman employed in order to teach the army recruits the relationship between geography and national power.¹¹⁰ It is unlikely that such media portrayals were unnoticed by Morgenthau and the capitalization on this trend would be seen in the adoption of the criteria of state power in *PAN*. Lastly, by the time *PAN* was written the Cold War was just beginning. During the writing of *PAN* in 1947 the American foreign policy had noticeably hardened against the Soviet Union. Truman had publicly formulated his policy of containment with the intellectual help of George Keenan in what would be known as the Truman Doctrine. Furthermore, Churchill had given his Iron Curtain speech which ostensibly cast the Soviet Union as an adversary to Britain and the United States. Throughout *PAN* this changing external context of a new bi-polar world is constantly emphasized. Within the section on state power the constant allusions to the nature of Russian power show the effect of the external context to the text. As an introductory IR textbook it is clear that it

¹⁰⁸ Kenneth V. Lottick, "Why and How To Teach a Unit in Geopolitical Understanding," *Journal of Geography* 48 (1949): 207.

¹⁰⁹ "Why We Fight: The Nazis Strike" <http://archive.org/details/TheNazisStrike> [last accessed September 23rd 2014].

¹¹⁰ For example see Grayson Kirk's review of one of the army field manuals written by leading political geographers. Grayson Kirk, "Review of Geographical Foundations of National Power," *Geographical Review* 36 (1946): 165.

addresses an issue that the contemporary readers are concerned about, the relations between the two superpowers. Thus, it is necessary to give possible criteria in which the powers can be evaluated. Due to these conditions Morgenthau may have thought it more prudent to try and give advice to the student who wished to avoid war or barring that, to guide the United States through the present difficulties by increasing its power so it could not be subjugated.

7. Conclusion

Morgenthau's argument in *SMPP* argues against the use of criteria in order to determine the power of states. In *PAN* he then uses these criteria to help describe a possible method of evaluating state power but cautions against using geography as a sole method of understanding. The internal academic debates such as geo-determinism and geopolitics, and the negative and positive influences of works such as Mackinder, Fairgrieve and Spykman which Morgenthau was exposed to as a result of his move to the United States helped effect this change. Another important factor is the motivation behind the two books. The differing motivation and purpose behind the books caused the discussion on similar subjects to diverge, thereby causing differences. Lastly, the changing external context between writing the geographical section in *SMPP* and the publication of *PAN* possibly influenced this difference. The discussion of the geographic elements and their use as a form of rationalistic explanation in *PAN* will be continued in the next chapter which focuses on the differences of rationalism between the two books.

Chapter Six

The Progression of Rationalism

This chapter explores the concept of rationalism as defined in *SMPP* and its use as an explanatory tool in *PAN*.¹ The thesis is that while *SMPP* is a polemic against rationalism in politics, *PAN* uses a rationalist analysis to support its conclusions. The chapter will begin with a brief explanation how this particular method is valuable to the analysis of rationalism in these works. The argument will then proceed to explain the impetus behind writing *SMPP* with a particular focus on the contemporary authors and situations. Following this, rationalism in *SMPP* will be analyzed. Morgenthau's discussion of rationalism will be divided into themes. It will begin by clarifying Morgenthau's definition of rationalism, then proceed by separating rationalism into theoretical and empirical errors. These categories within these two divisions are diffuse, ranging from rational models, the social aspects of rationalism, and various programs and methods. Interspersed within this thematic division will be various contemporary authors that Morgenthau appears to be critiquing or was influenced in making a particular point. This inclusion of influential works within the discussion of Morgenthau's work differs from previous chapters. The reason for this divergence in style is due to the smaller amount of works in Morgenthau's period that could be proven to have influenced him. Lastly, the argument will conclude by explaining how the position in *PAN* uses some of the same rationalistic devices condemned in *SMPP* in order to explain and offer advice in international relations in the mid twentieth century.

¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics* and Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*.

Methodology

Skinner's methodology has been discussed in the previous chapters. In this chapter the method is used primarily for three purposes. As has been noted in previous chapters motive informs actions. As previously stated in chapter three, the motive of *SMPP* is to argue against various forms of rationalism, therefore the content of the book will naturally proceed in that direction. As a corollary of this, some thoughts are naturally emphasized to the exclusion of others in order to further the argument. Similarly, as discussed in chapter four *PAN* is an introductory textbook for IR, concerned with an analysis of contemporary theoretical devices for peace and therefore avoids metaphysical arguments on rationalism. From this basis it is logical that some of the arguments of *PAN* will be used in contradiction of the statements made in *SMPP*. Secondly, from establishing motive the illocution of the statements made within the texts in relation to rationalism can be surmised. Thirdly, the method privileges the contemporary sources as forming motive. While it is possible that a book is written in response to an idea or work in the past it seems more likely, particularly in the field of IR, that a book is written in response to a contemporary external issue or a contemporary position within the field. This is not to say that books in the past do not provide impetus for the sources or ideas in a book but merely that this influence is secondary as the authors are individuals who respond to events that interest and affect them in the world at large and in the field of their study. In this chapter this tenet means the exclusion of some sources, particularly the 19th century sources that occupy a fair percentage of footnotes in *SMPP*.² While it is acknowledged that

² Also, this chapter excludes from mentioning the possible contributions of influences in the past that helped shape Morgenthau's response to issues in the present. This does not minimize the contributions as they do exist, but gives emphasis to the neglected sources of Morgenthau's immediate context. For a discussion of German sources that influenced Morgenthau's American writing see Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*; Neascu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relation* ; Jutersonke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism* ; Robbie Shilliam, *German Thought and International Relations: The Rise and Fall of a Liberal Project* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 177-198 and Felix Rosch and Hartmut Behr,

Morgenthau is responding to these authors as well, his argument is on the effect that these authors have had on contemporary authors who are outside the social conditions which originally inspired these writings. His argument is not that these writers do not deserve to be studied but that if the fundamental assumptions in those writings are non-applicable due to changing historic circumstances then they should not be used to justify contemporary action.³

Scientific Man Versus Power Politics

The discussion of rationalism in *SMPP* is divided into three sections. These three sections were covered in varying lengths in chapter three in order to explain the purpose of *SMPP*. The first section explains Morgenthau's position on why this issue has contemporary relevance. The second section discusses theoretical problems of rationalism and is separated into four sub-sections: a definition of rationalism, rational models, causation and single cause solutions. The third section is the specific programs and ideas that result from rationalism. These include geopolitics, planning, education and psychology as a form of behaviour adjustment, and a faulty comparison between the international and the domestic. A common theme of these programs and ideas is the shared belief in the ability to rationally control society.⁴ Morgenthau's position is that this belief is not realistic due to the problems at the theoretical and empirical levels.⁵

"Introduction," in *The Concept of The Political* eds. Felix Rosch and Hartmut Behr (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 3-79.

³ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 9. See Below for Morgenthau's own justification of the contemporary relevance of the topic.

⁴ *Ibid*, 2, 18,27-28, 71, and 91.

⁵ *Ibid*, 219. For others agreeing with this opinion see Max Lerner, *It Is Later Than You Think* (New York: Viking Press, 1939), 18.

1. Relevance

The discussion of relevance is necessary in order to see why Morgenthau thought the book was relevant to the contemporary period. As this topic has already been explored fully in chapter three, the present section will briefly reiterate these points in order to demonstrate that Morgenthau believed the book was a necessary admonition to ill-informed solutions to modern problems. As in chapter three relevance will be divided into external and internal relevance. External relevance will show how the policies of rationalism have resulted in problems in international relations. Internal relevance will show that Morgenthau viewed authors in his own period as espousing rationalist positions which are inherently flawed. Both these sections will deal only with textual remarks; in later sections other non-textual circumstantial evidence that Morgenthau was influenced by certain authors will be presented.

1.A External Relevance

Morgenthau begins by noting that rationalism has dominated Western thought since the 18th and 19th centuries and has not changed significantly in the modern period.⁶ Without changing the philosophy to correspond with changing circumstances the philosophy is no longer relevant to the modern period as it does not adequately solve contemporary problems.⁷ This continued failure necessitates a re-examination of the philosophy to understand why it can no longer provide solutions.⁸ Morgenthau states that the recent problems in the 1930's and 1940's stem from the unreflective use of rationalism in foreign policy.⁹ Morgenthau posits that the continued failure of rationalism lead to attempts to formulate new solutions. An

⁶ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 4 and 32.

⁷ *Ibid*, 2.

⁸ *Ibid*, 9.

⁹ *Ibid*, 5-6.

unfortunate result of this was the rise of fascism.¹⁰ Furthermore, rationalist plans for peace in the 1930's indicated to the fascists that the liberal nations were weak, resulting in war.¹¹ By critiquing these views Morgenthau's goal is to prevent the continuance of these errors in the future.

1.B Internal Relevance

As noted in chapter three, the majority of the internal academic references within *SMPP* are to authors from the previous centuries. However, Morgenthau does note current scholars that are subject to the error of an overreliance on rationalism in their academic writings. He particularly attacks Robert Lynd, a well-known sociologist in the period.¹² However, other prominent scholars are mentioned as well. John Dewey is linked to a quantitative research program, emphasizing that the scientific method as a form of solution to ethics and political conflicts.¹³ Frequently Morgenthau will list individuals who he argues are associated with a particular aspect of rationalism. In one example he lists Robert Lynd, Ferdinand Lundberg, Karl Mannheim and George Gallup as believers in a form of scientific social control of society.¹⁴ While the references are sparse in comparison to 18th and 19th century thinkers their inclusion shows that Morgenthau was aware and responding to the academic literature of the period.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 8.

¹¹ *Ibid*, 44-45, 54 and 100.

¹² *Ibid*, 34 and 91-92.

¹³ *Ibid*, 4,14,28 and 30. See chapter seven for a discussion of Dewey and ethics.

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 34.

2. Theoretical Issues

2.A Definition of Rationalism

Defining rationalism as a concept is a difficult task. However, for the purposes of the thesis it is not necessary to define rationalism as an objective concept but Morgenthau's conception of it.¹⁵ Morgenthau does not make this task easy.¹⁶ At the beginning of the book he purposively tries to avoid defining the term, stating

rationalistic assumptions: the conception of the social and physical world as being intelligible through the same rational processes, however these processes are to be defined, and the conviction that understanding in terms of these rational processes is all that is needed for the rational control of the social and the physical world.¹⁷

Halfway through the book he helps clarify this by stating that rationalism means two things, man has the capability of understanding through reason himself and the world and his ignorance is a mere quantitative shortcoming, therefore man understands the link between knowledge and action.¹⁸ From these statements it is clear that rationalism is a form of logic, either *a priori* or from empirical observation. Therefore by using logic to understand the causal connections rationalism can be used to create the most optimal solution. Morgenthau appears to support this interpretation by stating that the reliance of reason through logical deductions from postulated or empirical premises is supposed to lead us to the truth of philosophy, ethics and politics and allows the rationalist to recreate reality in light of these truths.¹⁹ He further

¹⁵ The phrase objective is used by Morgenthau eleven times in *SMPP*. However, of these eleven times it is used as adjective instead of a noun three times. The first occurrence is in relation to objective frontiers as previously discussed in chapter five and the other two times it refers to a lack of an objective standard to view the ends in an ends means ethic which is discussed in the next chapter.

¹⁶ In a review of *SMPP* Michael Oakeshott noted that Morgenthau was not clear in his terminology, interchangeably using science, scienticism, rationalism and rational. Oakeshott, "Scientific Politics," 349. In a letter to Oakeshott Morgenthau agreed that the criticism was valid as the terms were not clear. Letter to Michael Oakeshott, May 22, 1948, HJM-B44F9.

¹⁷ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 3.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, 122-123.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 3.

asserts that rationalism in its later manifestations focused mostly on empirical observations in the attempt to try and become a science.²⁰

Both of these assumptions of what rationality is can be correlated to works that Morgenthau read and considered to represent a rationalistic view of politics.²¹ The first element of rationalism, which is the conscious weighing of options and constructing a means-end analysis, is a common definition in the literature.²² The second definition of rationality, the use of empirical data to develop a science of politics was also common at this time. Various writers stressed the need for measurements of phenomena, particularly in relation to political power, in order for politics to be a science.²³

This definition of rationality is then denounced by Morgenthau as a misguided belief that reason will solve societal ills.²⁴ The assumption that reason will inevitably solve social problems is not particularly well established in the literature. Most commentators are more circumspect in their discussions. However, the former position can be seen in the writings of Charles Merriam, a colleague of Morgenthau's at Chicago and founder of the Social Science Research Council.²⁵ Merriam placed an absolute faith in the ability of rationalism and science to

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Other than the footnotes in *SMPP* many of the works cited in this chapter representing rationalist views are taken from Morgenthau's reading list for one of his courses. Many of these books are used to answer course questions on scientific methods and approaches to politics. See Reading List for Political Science 353, Spring Quarter 1948, HJM-B80F3.

²² Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behaviour: A Study of Decision Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 1st ed. (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1945), 62; Morris R. Cohen and Ernest Nagel, *An Introduction To Logic and Scientific Method* (London: Jarrold and Sons, 1934), 400; Walter James Shepard, "Political Science," in *History and Prospects Of The Social Sciences*, ed. Harry Elmer Barnes (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925), 427.

²³ G.E.G. Catlin, *The Science And Method of Politics* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), 200-201, 251-252. Charles Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925), 33, 44-45 and Felix Kaufmann, *Methodology Of The Social Sciences* (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), 143.

²⁴ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 1.

²⁵ See Charles E. Merriam, *Systematic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), viii, 33,37, 39,261, 295. This book has been chosen to represent Merriam's views as it is a concise summary of his life's work. See *ibid*, x. However, as a later publication it omits some elements of his philosophy such as

solve the problems of poverty, crime, war and revolution.²⁶ In Merriam's earlier work this belief in progress as represented by quantitative measurement was absolute, arguing that quantitative work allowed for no difference in opinion. Therefore, if studies on the same subject matter disagreed it was a fault of not utilizing the proper method or classification scheme rather than a reflection of the different aspects of the same phenomenon.²⁷

Morgenthau was not alone in denouncing this supposed belief in academia. A strong influence on Morgenthau's argument on rationalism is from the earlier works of Reinhold Niebuhr. Niebuhr had claimed that there was a naïve belief that rationalism alone would eventually solve societal ills.²⁸ In a paper presented to the Chicago Institute for Religious and Social Studies in February 1946 Morgenthau presented a shortened and modified paper that summarized his arguments on rationalism. During the question period at the end of the presentation a member of the audience remarked that Morgenthau's analysis was very similar to Reinhold Niebuhr's. Morgenthau's reply that he was fully aware of that indicates that he was actively pursuing a similar line of critique to Niebuhr.²⁹

The rejection of this belief was not limited to qualitative scholar such as Morgenthau and Niebuhr. Stuart Rice, one of the pioneers in the use of quantitative and statistical analysis in politics firmly rejected the progressive promise of quantitative methods.³⁰ This rejection was

the more strident defence of quantitative methods and an advocacy of eugenics. Also see the personal correspondence of Morgenthau to Jan Bouwer where he remarks that it is surprising that he is the same political science department as Merriam but as Merriam is in retirement things are progressing in the right direction, albeit slowly. Letter to Jan Bouwer, December 7, 1949, HJM-B7F1. Koskenniemi also notes that *SMPP* can be seen as an extended critique against Merriam. Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations*, 468.

²⁶ Charles Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, ix.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 120 and 165.

²⁸ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 54 and Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 214.

²⁹ Hans Morgenthau, *The Transformation Of Our Contemporary Culture Into A Spiritual Culture As Seen By A Political Scientist*, unpublished manuscript presented on February 5, 1946, HJM-B168F7.

³⁰ Stuart Rice, *Quantitative Methods in Politics* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1928), 17.

partially informed by his insistence that the accumulation of data is not in itself a positive thing nor would it necessarily lead to positive outcomes.

It can be argued that the two elements in the definition of rationalism noted above would make proving the idea of tension between the books guaranteed, as any analysis must naturally result in a discussion of options and possible alternatives. However, Morgenthau notes in the beginning section of *SMPP* that politics must be understood through reason but it is not in reason that it finds its model.³¹ It seems that this means a model of politics must be built not using a rational model of action but that the actions must be interpreted rationally after they happen. This would seem likely due to the problems of understanding causation in the moment and the fact that the actors themselves do not behave objectively rational but can be interpreted rationally through subjective means after the relevant evidence comes to light.³² It is on this basis that the concept of rationalism can be seen to be in contradiction between *SMPP* and *PAN*.

From Morgenthau's definition of rationalism it is clear that he views rationalism as resulting in two forms of error. The first is in the formation of theoretical principles and the second is particular programs of action that result from these principles. The theoretical mistakes are an overreliance on models, a misunderstanding of the complexity of causation and the determination to find a single cause which is the underlying root of social problems.

³¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 10.

³² *Ibid*, 211.

2.B Models

As noted above, Morgenthau does not believe that political action is susceptible to a rational model, preferring rational analysis to occur after the fact.³³ The primary objection to rational models is that they simplify reality in order to fit the characteristics and behaviour indicated by the model.³⁴ Due to the complexity of social reality, each individual situation has varying characteristics that a model, premised on abstract criteria, will not be able to explain. Thus, the absolute or probabilistic prediction of the model without the knowledge of the circumstances is meaningless.³⁵ This position was common among some of the thinkers Morgenthau considered scientific. Herbert Simon notes that rational theory focuses on rationality, but actual behaviour is different.³⁶ However, he states that rational decision would be too complex if everything were taken into account to make it manageable; it usually applies to a limited area and limited time.³⁷ This position is also adopted by Stuart Rice.³⁸ Other commentators on scientific method such as G.E.G. Catlin rejected rational models, agreeing with Morgenthau that the unique circumstances of a situation need to be taken into account.³⁹ However, others such as Rice and Cohen and Nagel take the position that simplifying phenomenon leads into an easier classification of the event, leading to a better understanding of society as a whole.⁴⁰ The key difference between these positions is how they view causation. Simon and Rice simplify the analysis in order to provide causal explanations while being aware

³³ *Ibid*, 11.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 71.

³⁵ *Ibid*, 161.

³⁶ Simon, *Administrative Behaviour*, 61-62 and 79.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 13 and 69.

³⁸ Rice, *Quantitative Methods in Politics*, 24. Rice's position differs slightly from Simon's. He argues that it is not necessarily the simplification of knowledge which leads to error but an essential disjuncture between reality and how we observe it. The use of models compounds this problem but should be used as it can produce beneficial results.

³⁹ Catlin, *The Science and Method of Politics*, 182-183 and 215.

⁴⁰ Cohen and Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method*, 400.

it does not adequately represent how reality actually operates. The benefit to this approach is that has led to valuable results despite not being reflective of reality. Nagel and Cohen agree with this position in order to have a more comprehensive theory while Catlin and Morgenthau reject it as it does not explain the peculiarity of each situation.

2.C Causation

Morgenthau's position on causation in international relations is that the complexity of the social world does not allow the observer to construct causal chains to predict or control actions.⁴¹ The only possible prediction is one based on probability in the future.⁴² This directly contradicts the position of the writers at the time such as Merriam who argued that in the future political events would be predictable.⁴³ Merriam argued that human affairs were not more complex than phenomenon predicted by science and by using ingenuity and creativity the problems of accurate measurement could be overcome.⁴⁴ Morgenthau's argument is that statistical averages could only be used by the statistician to predict what might happen based upon what happened in the past.⁴⁵ However, he argues that the contingencies and uniqueness of events make it harder for any of these probabilities to be correct in practice.⁴⁶ The ability of the individual to achieve things out of proportion to both experience and means confounds the interpretative and predictability of statistics.⁴⁷ Furthermore, Morgenthau states that as the social sciences are inevitably focused on individuality, this unpredictability becomes even more

⁴¹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 129-130.

⁴² *Ibid*, 136. This position is similar to the one expressed by Rice. See Rice, *Quantitative Methods in Politics*, 14 and 35.

⁴³ Mark C. Smith, *Social Science In The Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918 – 1941* (Durham: Duke University Press,1994), 94.

⁴⁴ Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, xii, 54 and 225-227.

⁴⁵ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 135, 151.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 150-151.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 128.

pronounced.⁴⁸ Morgenthau's focus on individuality stems from his use of methodological individualism; therefore the state's actions are the individual who orders it rather than a collective entity. Thus, Morgenthau's position is that it is possible to determine statistically what will happen based upon what happened in the past, but this determination is both non applicable to determining actual results and inherently flawed based upon the complexity of the social causes.⁴⁹

2.D Single Cause

Related to the conception of causation is the fallacy of the single cause. Morgenthau argues that rationalism tries to simplify the social world, through causation and use of the rational model. The single cause is a logical error that stems from the theoretical simplification of a rational model and an avoidance of the complex reality of social causation. Obviously, this single cause distorts reality and therefore is not applicable as a solution.⁵⁰ As the single cause is built upon an abstraction rather than reality it cannot provide relevant answers to reality.⁵¹ The idea of the single cause is built upon the hope for the ability to change the world rather than an observation of things. The appeal of a single cause to a problem is that it is easier to solve, as the individuals who ascribe to various single cause hypotheses propose simply to alter the cause in some manner and thereby eliminate the problem.⁵² One of the examples that Morgenthau lists is the proposal to ban armaments and the outlawry of war.⁵³ By the mid-20th century this view does not seem to be particularly widespread with well-known proponents of

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 139.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 149. This should be contrasted with Merriam's claim that experimentation can be done with social forces and as the phenomenon are frequently recurring. Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, 253 and 255.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 95.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 127.

⁵² *Ibid*, 99-101. See also Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 36 and 54 for a similar discussion of single cause fallacy.

⁵³ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 100.

rationalism and science such as Charles Merriam denouncing single cause solutions.⁵⁴

According to Merriam, the most widespread single cause explanation in academia at the time was the belief in geopolitics. He argued that there has been an overemphasis on geopolitical interpretations to the exclusion of the whole.⁵⁵

3. Empirical Mistakes

3.A Geopolitics⁵⁶

In *SMPP* Morgenthau appears to agree with Merriam, attacking geopolitics as a misguided approach to understanding national security. The placement of the discussion of political geography is significant as it leads into the discussion of the fallacy of single causal explanations, indicating that for Morgenthau the two are linked. In his discussion of geopolitics Morgenthau references the Congress of Vienna, explaining how Metternich established a statistical commission to evaluate the territories in dispute. The committee used factors such as population, fertility, quality of the population and type of population to try and determine the value of the land, thereby eliminating the subjective individual political elements from consideration.⁵⁷ Geopolitics thus violates the problems of causation noted by Morgenthau. The factors of population and land are important but they are not predictive as the causation of events is too complex. The geopolitics section only has limited citations but they are from the early 20th century and late 19th century. As the genesis of *SMPP* was in the early 40's the

⁵⁴ Merriam's use of "science" as a single cause does not fall into this typology as his conception of science relies on multiple solutions working in tandem to negate the problems of society.

⁵⁵ Merriam, *Systematic Politics*, 1 and 22. However, this should be contrasted to Merriam's earlier praise of geopolitics. See Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, 13,34 and 152.

⁵⁶ See chapter five for a more detailed discussion of geopolitics.

⁵⁷ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 91-93,

inclusion of this particular section in the first known drafts tend to support the argument that this idea occurred to Morgenthau prior to his arrival in America.⁵⁸

3.B Planning

A second category of action that is linked to the theoretical flaws of rationalism is the concept of planning. Morgenthau's conception of planning is the conceptualization of action in linear fashion in the future. This could be anything from going to see a movie tomorrow or planning a military campaign.⁵⁹ The difficulty with planning is that the simple action of going to see the movies depends upon a large number of subsequent steps between making the plan and seeing the movie. Any failure in one of these steps derails the plan. In a complicated scenario such as a military campaign or controlled economic planning, the level of complexity of causation is too high to plan effectively. Morgenthau notes that if planning merely means preparing for all possible or probable eventualities than planning is justified. However, the plans that he is criticizing are not envisaged for preparing for action but for directly acting to try and achieve a particular end through narrow means.⁶⁰

Planning was a trendy topic in academia at this time though it often referred to many different things.⁶¹ One of the most vocal proponents of social planning was Charles Merriam, who served on the National Planning Board.⁶² Merriam believed that panels of experts in a chosen field could create plans that would create peace and improve society.⁶³ Max Lerner's book, *It is Later Than You Think*, quoted approvingly in another context in *SMPP*, devotes an

⁵⁸ Liberalism and Foreign Policy Lecture, August 16 1940, HJM-B168F5.

⁵⁹ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 145-146.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 29.

⁶¹ Smith, *Social Science in The Crucible*, 107 and Simon, *Administrative Behaviour*, 7-8.

⁶² Smith, *Social Science in The Crucible*, 85 and 110.

⁶³ Merriam, *Systematic Politics*, 157-158, 252,253, 260 and Smith, *Social Science in The Crucible*, 86 and 107.

entire chapter to planning as a necessary function of a progressive civilization.⁶⁴ E.H.Carr, who is often considered to be one of the founders of realism, was also an advocate of planning in society. In *Conditions of Peace* he emphasizes planning, particularly economic planning, as a form of progress that will be necessary in the second half of the 20th century.⁶⁵ Morgenthau was not alone in this criticism of planning. Well known theologian and political theorist Reinhold Niebuhr had previously critiqued the concept of planning, stating that planning was an essentially idealistic activity, noting its flaws and calling it naïve.⁶⁶

3.C Education and Psychology

Education and psychology are together in the sub-group as Morgenthau treats them similarly within the text. Education in *SMPP* is represented as a progressive faith in humanity and is indicative of a belief in a single cause solution. Advocates of this view maintain that education will inevitably result in the elimination of social problems which are caused by individuals acting in ignorance against their interests. Therefore, educating the general populace will lead them to understand that activities which harm their interests such as war are detrimental.⁶⁷ Once the general populace understand this fact they will no longer act in this way as acting against one's interest is not rational. This view draws heavily upon the idea that man is inherently rational and by presenting differing knowledge to his actions man will voluntarily change his behaviour.⁶⁸ Prior to *SMPP* Niebuhr argued the same position, holding

⁶⁴ Lerner, *It is Later Than You Think*, 133-166, 221-22 and 252.

⁶⁵ E.H.Carr, *Conditions of Peace* (London: Macmillan Publishing, 1942), 109. This shift in Carr's later writings on International Relations was remarked upon by Morgenthau as an intellectual and moral degeneration. Letter to Edward Earl Meade, September 21, 1948, HJM-B18F5.

⁶⁶ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 213 and Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and The Children of Darkness*, 111.

⁶⁷ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 14, 170, 173, and 210.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 122-123. Lyman Bryson's book *The New Prometheus* draws heavily upon this theme. See Lyman Bryson, *The New Prometheus* (New York: Macmillan, 1941).

rationalism accountable to the romantic illusion that education will change human nature.⁶⁹ This was not a caricature of the position by Morgenthau and Niebuhr but a legitimately held belief at the time. Charles Merriam stated this viewpoint as a fundamental fact, arguing after the Second World War that in international society violence is on the decline due to an increase in education.⁷⁰ He admitted that believing that education can change the personality and actions of an individual is utopian but that it is a fact of which he is convinced.⁷¹

The opinion that influence on personality will change the individual and thus society was shared by the more optimistic supporters of psychology. Morgenthau was generally dismissive of this new science, stating that psychoanalysis is not a respectable method of research.⁷² This was partially the result of the belief that psychoanalysis could “cure” people and lead to a better society.⁷³ Well known scholars such as Lasswell and Merriam endorsed this view without reservation. At various instances Lasswell asserted that psychology had the ability to reduce tension in society leading to the elimination of conflict.⁷⁴ Merriam shared this view stating that personality maladjustments were responsible for political distress which could be cured by psychological study.⁷⁵ While relatively few commentators on scientific method endorsed this extreme position due to the unproven nature of this new science, psychology was considered by some such as Walter Sheppard as contributing a valuable

⁶⁹ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 23-24 and 197 and Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 134.

⁷⁰ Merriam, *Systematic Politics*, 300.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, 329. The acknowledgement that this position might be utopian is an improvement on Merriam’s earlier position which argued for the ability of education to transform individuals as an absolute truth. See Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, 4,19,203 and 224.

⁷² Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 163. For a detailed discussion of Morgenthau and psychology see Schuett, *Political Realism, Freud, and Human Nature in International Relations*.

⁷³ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 171-172.

⁷⁴ Harold D. Lasswell, *Psychopathology and Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), 203 and Smith, *Social Science in The Crucible*, 214, 231 and 235.

⁷⁵ Merriam, *Systematic Politics*, 3-5, 178, 304 and Merriam, *New Aspects of Politics*, 76, 84 and 93.

resource to politics.⁷⁶ The major contributing factor to the acceptance of psychology was its ability to solve problems on an individual basis in domestic society. Therefore, if social ills are the result of personality defects, the mass applicability of this method would result in the elimination of these problems. The three major problems with this line of thought are the assumption that international problems are caused by particular personality defects, the reliance on a single cause to solve these problems and a misapplication of the experience of a domestic success leading to an international solution.

3.D The analogy of the domestic

The final flaw that Morgenthau attributes to rationalism is its attempt to transport devices and ideas that were successful in the domestic context to the international. Two specific examples are mentioned in the text, international law and world government. International law is a solution due to its success in the domestic sphere. However, Morgenthau notes that it is a mistake to transplant one institution into a different context and expect similar results. The reason why domestic law works is due to the particular power structure within domestic society. In the international system there is no overarching structure which can support the rule of law, merely other parties trying to further their own interest. When the law does not support these interests there is no force which compels them to follow the law. This deals with the difference between purely legal questions and political questions.⁷⁷ The desire for the institutionalization of law in the international sphere to create peace is a fundamental misunderstanding of the difference between legal and political issues as well as

⁷⁶ Shepard, "Political Science," 440-441.

⁷⁷ The argument that the domestic is not similar to the international was originally stated by Morgenthau during his PhD and continued throughout his continental writings. See also Hans Morgenthau, "The Machiavellian Utopia," *Ethics* 55 (1945): 145-147.

the different structure of the international as opposed to the domestic.⁷⁸ The concept of world government is an answer to this criticism, by creating a power structure above the state which can then enforce the laws on these states. This solution bears the hallmark of the single cause fallacy noted above.⁷⁹ Obviously, while a world government could solve the problem of authority to enforce international law, there are many practical problems with creating this government. The reason why this belief in transferring ideas from the domestic to the international is so prevalent is due to the success of liberalism and rationalism in this sphere. As government, law and rationalization have worked in the domestic sphere the assumption of some scholars is that by exporting these ideas to the international they will work with similar success.⁸⁰

Politics Among Nations

The discussion of *PAN* commences by reiterating its motive in order to understand the reason why it is written in a manner which contradicts the discussion of rationalism in *SMPP*.⁸¹ Following this, three sections of *PAN* are reviewed to show how they logically support each other to create a possible method of modern statecraft which, when viewed in comparison to *SMPP*, clearly exhibits a rationalistic analysis. Lastly, a discussion of the use of key words such as objective, rationalism and science will be undertaken. Within the discussion various contemporary textbooks will also be referenced as additional sources, showing how Morgenthau might have been influenced in the writing of *PAN*. Upon detailing the difference between the two books the reason for its difference will be clear.

⁷⁸ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 108-121.

⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 114.

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 97-100.

⁸¹ For a longer discussion of motive and the influence of contemporary textbooks on the structure and content of *PAN* see chapter 4.

1. Motive

As stated in chapter four, Morgenthau did not want to write a textbook that perpetuated what he saw as the traditional errors of academic textbooks in IR.⁸² This was a response to the journalistic style of contemporary textbooks. Morgenthau thought a more theory-driven approach to introductory textbooks would be advantageous to the student and the field. The success of this approach was helped by two factors. The first is that due to the events of World War Two and the onset of the Cold War many of the previous popular textbooks were out of date, referencing only the First World War or describing the Second World War as ongoing and thus could not adequately be used to teach. Therefore, Morgenthau's text enjoyed a period of supremacy in the field of IR textbooks due to a lack of competition. Despite a desire to be analytical Morgenthau obliquely references the Cold War and uses Russian examples to explain abstract concepts, such as what factors contribute to a state's power. Likewise, the problem of the bipolar world is discussed, but the scarcity and vagueness of contemporary references allow the book to avoid the problem of quickly becoming outdated. This point was highlighted in the advertisements for *PAN*.⁸³ Secondly, the only other textbook that was released during this time was Fredrick Schuman's *International Politics*. This text alienated many of its previous supporters due to the radical statements

⁸² Letter from Hans Morgenthau To Roger Shugg, August 7th 1945, HJM-B121F6. It should be noted that all University of Chicago faculty were under what was known as the 4E contract which stipulated all outside earnings such as speaking engagements and book publication were to be reported to the University and remitted to it. Therefore, the motive for *PAN* was not financial. See Vouchers and Expense Claims, HJM-B75F1.

⁸³ Advertisements for Politics Among Nations, HJM-B121F5.

within it.⁸⁴ The combination of these two factors helped *PAN* become the standard for textbooks in IR in America during the early Cold War period.

2. Geopolitics

Geopolitics in *PAN* has been discussed at length in both chapters four and five. As a result this section repeats some of the analysis already discussed earlier. In the two years between the publication of *SMPP* and *PAN* Morgenthau's position on political geography required more explanation and a lengthier exposition. This is found in chapters seven and eight, titled *Elements of National Power* and *Evaluation of National Power*.⁸⁵ The first chapter contains a list of factors which can be used to determine a nation's power. They are divided into two sections, material factors and human agency. The material factors are geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, military preparedness and population. By defining these factors as material factors Morgenthau is tacitly acknowledging the quantitative nature of these characteristics. This quantitative nature is emphasized by statements indicating their possession by a state increases its ranking in the power calculations⁸⁶, as well as statements claiming that the measurement of these factors is largely quantitative in nature.⁸⁷ The three factors that rely on human agency are national character, national morale and diplomacy, which Morgenthau considers to be qualitative. At the end of his analysis Morgenthau

⁸⁴ Schuman, *International Politics*, 4th ed. 21, 28,53, 35-52, 203-204, 205, 418, 433, 451, 809-810, 895 and 900. These statements range from anti-Christian sentiments, anti-American statements, communist and pro-Soviet statements. See also Goodrich. "Review of International Politics," 155. Gurian. "Review of Politics Among Nations and International Politics," 258. Many of the reviewers of Schuman's new edition experienced a similar sentiment. In a letter to Morgenthau from Roger Shugg, Shugg states that the bad reviews of Schuman's book are hurting it. Letter to Hans Morgenthau From Roger Shugg, Feb 9th 1949, HJMB121-F7.

⁸⁵ See chapter four for a more detailed discussion of these two chapters.

⁸⁶ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 86.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 91. Though Morgenthau does make allowance that military preparedness is both qualitative and quantitative in nature.

elaborates on types of single cause fallacies in judging the power of a state, similar to the transition at the end of the section in *SMPP*.

The second chapter entitled *Evaluating National Power*, specifically references geopolitics. This second chapter shows the remnants of the thoughts that pervaded *SMPP*. Morgenthau is still attacking what he views as single cause explanations which do not give the full picture of reality. Within the chapter he is attacking geopolitics and geography in general as a form of single cause analysis, similar to his critique in *SMPP* of the statistical land commissions at the Congress of Vienna. However, the disjuncture between his earlier critique on the attempts to evaluate land and his recommendation to try this evaluation on similar grounds is passed over without comment. It can be argued that while Morgenthau does state that using these factors to calculate the power of a state can only be done in theoretical ideal conditions, their elaboration within the text indicates that this evaluation should be done, even if it only gives a partial reflection of the true power of the various states.⁸⁸ Furthermore, in the discussion of balance of power, which uses these factors in a mechanical model, he states that the Congress Of Vienna refined the method of evaluating land based upon the number quality and type of population.⁸⁹ This positive recommendation of evaluation based on geopolitics is a direct textual contradiction of his opinion of geopolitics in *SMPP*. Clearly, Morgenthau's use of geopolitical factors to determine power is in direct contradiction to the similar segment in *SMPP*. However, it also appears to be a rationalist argument in the form of a statistical evaluation and measurement of power. Also appears to be rationalistic in that it is an analysis of these factors which occurs in the present rather than after the action has been completed.

⁸⁸ *Ibid*, 109-112.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 135.

In the contemporary textbooks of the period many authors focused on geography and geopolitics as one of the primary sources in understanding political power in the international arena. Raymond Gettell's textbook *Political Science* attributes the concepts of geopolitics and sovereignty as the primary mechanism to define the state and its relation to others.⁹⁰ Other writers are more restrained in the degree of importance attached to geopolitics.⁹¹ Exceptions are Simmonds and Emeny's book which is based on material and geographical considerations and Kalijarvi's textbook, *Modern World Politics*.⁹² The influence of these books is a possible explanation why Morgenthau put more emphasis on geopolitics in his own textbook.

3. Balance of Power

The factors for measuring a state's power lead into the next section - the balance of power. The discussion of balance of power begins with a comparison of balance of power in the social sphere to the natural sciences. Morgenthau uses a lengthy analogy to show how balance of power in the international sphere operates in the same manner as in the domestic sphere.⁹³ Then he proceeds to construct a rational model of balance of power, claiming that it can only have two permutations with only a few possible results which depend on the strength of the state.⁹⁴ However, after explaining this model Morgenthau proceeds to show how ineffective it is due to its rational assumptions. He argues that while the quantitative factors could be known and calculated, the qualitative factors of national morale, national character and quality of government can only be ascertained after any decision been taken.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Gettell, *Political Science*, 17-54.

⁹¹ See Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 41-80; Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 291-299 and 338-348 and Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 110-111 for less prominent discussions of geopolitics.

⁹² Simmonds and Emeny, *The Great Powers in World Politics* and Kalijarvi, *Modern World Politics*.

⁹³ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 127-129.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 129-133.

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, 151-152.

Furthermore, Morgenthau asserts that the balance of power inevitably causes war as states attempt to shift the balance in their favour and that the balance of power has only worked because of a tacit acceptance of its purpose resulting from a common cultural understanding.⁹⁶ Therefore despite his earlier statements this portion of his analysis does not violate his original conception of rationality. However, Morgenthau acknowledges that a balance of power does exist between the Soviet Union and America during this period and as a result while the rationalist elements of the success of its use in the domestic is negated, the rationalist model and its simple causality still stand.⁹⁷

Balance of power was a popular topic in the textbooks of the period. Kalijarvi refers to it positively, describing it as the most likely mechanism to ensure peace.⁹⁸ This optimistic appraisal is in contrast to the other textbook authors who are dismissive of the efficacy of balance of power. Schwarzenberger argues that one of the key features in an anarchic world is the need to establish a balance of power.⁹⁹ Despite this, he notes that the use of balance of power to maintain peace is a purely theoretical construct and is not practically possible. Schuman agrees with this position stating that the balance of power is not a useful tool in maintaining peace.¹⁰⁰ Morgenthau's use of balance of power in *PAN* is similar to their appraisal and it is possible that his own view was shaped by their treatment of the concept within their textbooks.

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 155-166.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, 270 and 286.

⁹⁸ Kalijarvi, "Planning as a World Force," 473.

⁹⁹ Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 117-125.

¹⁰⁰ Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 52. It is interesting to note that Schuman's analysis of balance of power is almost literally the same as in *PAN*.

4. Diplomacy

The major problem facing international relations scholars in this period was if the balance of power could not be a viable long term solution; then how could the instability of the international system be resolved? *PAN* is structured so that the textbook builds to this inevitable question. Throughout *PAN* Morgenthau discounted the ability of international law, international government and a world state to compel a workable peace.¹⁰¹ The solution Morgenthau conceived is a reinvigoration of diplomacy which he formulates as a set of general maxims.¹⁰² Morgenthau states the first set of maxims as

- 1) determine power in light of the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives
- 2) diplomacy must assess the objectives of other nations and the power actually and potentially available for the pursuit of these objectives
- 3) diplomacy must determine to what extent these different objectives are compatible with each other
- 4) diplomacy must employ the means suited to the objective.¹⁰³

All of these maxims except maxim three depend upon a rational model of the balance of power and an accurate measurement of the qualities of national power to succeed. Morgenthau reiterates this point later in the same section, stating that diplomats are responsible for evaluating a rival state's power and they cannot make a mistake in this evaluation as it would have disastrous consequences.¹⁰⁴ The statement that the balance of power and evaluation of strength is to be used as the basis of diplomacy demonstrates that *PAN* uses rationalism as its purposed method of maintaining peace in the mid 20th century. The definition of rationalism developed in *SMPP* was the conscious use of a means end relation to determine choice and the use of empirical data to determine the characteristics of phenomenon in order to make that choice. The objectives listed above that Morgenthau

¹⁰¹ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 209-243, 361-390, and 391-418.

¹⁰² *Ibid*, 419-420 and 431-445.

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 419.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 424 and 444.

envisioned as a framework to have peace in the present employ both those criteria. The concept that reason can only be used in retrospective to evaluate decisions is also negated by these principles, as the action for diplomats is obviously one that is previous to action.

Morgenthau's concept of diplomacy is in tension with the concepts of a rational model, causation, planning and geopolitics, all subcategories of rationalism noted in *SMPP*. The discrepancy between his condemnation of rational models and the balance of power is obvious as his description of its function is based upon a rational model. The balance of power is an abstraction that ignores the particular circumstances of a situation in order to explain all events of a similar type. By design, this abstraction reduces the complex causality of particular situations to a simplistic analysis of whether opposition to acts will succeed. Furthermore, Morgenthau's proposed solution uses planning as a method of preserving the state. Being aware of its own objectives and the objectives of the opposing states the diplomat must plan by using a means end analysis in order to evaluate the possibility of success. Lastly, despite Morgenthau's insistence that the qualitative elements of geopolitics are unknowable, his concept of diplomacy uses these criteria with the balance of power as a guide to action. Therefore, it explicitly contradicts his discussion of this concept in *SMPP*.

While it can be argued that this conception of the balance of power is an ideal type as per Weber, the ideal type is an abstraction which reality is measured against. As an ideal type reality pales to the standard set by the abstraction. However, the abstraction is considered ideal, as in the form that reality should strive to take if conditions are perfect which in the social world they never will be. In this sense Morgenthau can be seen to argue that the ideal type of the balance of power is the goal of the ideal statesman.

The position of the contemporary textbooks needs to be reiterated in order to emphasize any influence that they might have had upon Morgenthau's conception of diplomacy. As noted in chapter four, Kirk and Sharp write favourably on the importance of diplomacy in an anarchic system.¹⁰⁵ The diplomat is described in similar terms to Morgenthau's description of the diplomat in *PAN*.¹⁰⁶ Kalijarvi argues the opposite position, stating that while diplomacy is a short term solution to instability only an effective balance of power can preserve the peace in the long term.¹⁰⁷ *Contemporary World Politics* discusses diplomacy but does so by merely stating its historic development and progress rather than doing so in a more abstract analytical fashion. Schuman also discusses diplomacy but does so in a more descriptive manner. While an entire chapter is devoted to diplomacy it is descriptive, comprising an organizational list of the responsibilities and hierarchies of diplomats.¹⁰⁸ Despite the use of diplomacy in the textbooks none of them use diplomacy to the same extent or importance as it is in *PAN*. Thus it appears that Morgenthau's use of diplomacy as a temporary solution to the problem of peace in a bipolar world reflects his own thinking on the matter rather than outside influence.

5. Key Words

The use of the word objective is sparse in the first edition of *PAN* as compared to its later editions. In the first edition the word objective appears three times.¹⁰⁹ The first

¹⁰⁵Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 4, 39. See Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 426-428 and 431-438.

¹⁰⁶ Sharp and Kirk, *Contemporary International Politics*, 37. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 422-425 and 439-443.

¹⁰⁷ Kalijarvi, "What is Power Politics?", 3 and 13-25, and Kalijarvi, "Diplomacy and Power Politics," 218-220.

¹⁰⁸Schuman, *International Politics*, 3rd ed., 143-161.

¹⁰⁹ This should be compared to the more famous usage of objective at the beginning of the six principles of political realism in later editions. See Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle For Power and Peace*, 3rd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 4.

occurrence is in the context of the discussion of imperialism. Morgenthau notes that imperialism used to have an ethically neutral, objective and identifiable meaning.¹¹⁰ The second occurrence is concluding the discussion of imperialism. Morgenthau states that the subjective and objective conditions for an active foreign policy will naturally produce a policy of imperialism.¹¹¹ The final use of objective occurs in discussing localized imperialism. Morgenthau states that the limits of imperialism are not the product of objective facts of nature. The first usage of the word objective clearly corresponds to the everyday usage of objective as a term defined as observable and non-partial. The second and third mentions are related to the aspects of national power. The subjective and objective conditions refers to the eight forms of evaluating national power. If the objective and subjective forms are met Morgenthau posits that this will naturally produce an active foreign policy engaged in imperialism. The third mention refers to geography, Morgenthau is stating that this is an objective fact and the choice of Russian imperialism is not predicated on the objective fact of geography but is a free choice.

Similarly, the phrase science is only used three times in the first edition of *PAN*. The most significant of these uses is the first instance where Morgenthau states that the popular usage of imperialism is not objectionable from a scientific point of view as long as it implies no general theory of the nature of expansionist policies.¹¹² It is difficult to ascertain what Morgenthau meant by this sole usage of science but it appears that he meant that the term scientific implies a testable form of theory or at least a theory which could be actively proven or disproved. This rationalistic conception of science stated in a positive manner in *PAN* points

¹¹⁰ *ibid*, 26

¹¹¹ *ibid*, 34.

¹¹² *ibid*, 26.

to his shift towards a more rationalized view but as it is the only significant mention it cannot be considered strongly significant.

The other two instances where science is mentioned is in relation to mono-causal views of power. Morgenthau states that both geopolitics and nationalism are pseudo-scientific.

¹¹³ This can be considered as a favourable interpretation of the word science but the evidence is meager.

Rational and its derivatives such as rationalism are used five times in the first edition of *PAN*. Two of these instances are the word rationalize which carries its common everyday usage.¹¹⁴ The first instance of the word rational is in relation to Hitler, Alexander, Imperial Rome and Napoleon stating that they had no rational limits to their expansionist policies. Rational here is taken to mean a form of control as all the individuals were unable to stop their desire for conquest leading to their downfall. The second instance states that economic imperialism is a rational method for gaining power. Here rational is taken to mean calculating as economic imperialism is advantageous to those who engage in it.¹¹⁵ The final use of rational occurs in reference to the balance of power during the 18th century. Morgenthau states that the princes had a rational pursuit, within ethical limits, of the power objectives of the state.¹¹⁶ Here both balance of power and rationalism take the form of a positive attribute. This corresponds with the discussion above, although Morgenthau denies this view later in *PAN* he ultimately returns to it in his discussion of diplomacy.

¹¹³*ibid*, 116 and 118.

¹¹⁴ *ibid*, 48 and 159.

¹¹⁵ *ibid*, 39.

¹¹⁶ *ibid*, 165.

Conclusion

The discrepancy between the treatment of rationalism in *SMPP* and *PAN* is predicated on the nature of each book. While *SMPP* over emphasizes the flaws of rationalism by concluding that all rational interpretation can only be done after the fact, *PAN* as a textbook of International Relations uses some of these criteria to evaluate in the present. It is not necessary for *PAN* to focus on the present despite being a textbook for IR. Schuman's *International Politics*, one of the preeminent textbooks of the period, almost solely focuses his analysis on past contemporary events. The fact that Morgenthau chose to engage with a present oriented analysis is a deliberate stylistic choice. This points to a shift in his thinking from the need to critique action to an attempt to try and influence thinking about what actions should occur. This shift appears to be influenced by the change in external circumstance, with the end of the Second World War and the worrying development of the two ideological blocs of the Cold War which dominates the discourse of *PAN*.

Chapter 7

Diverging Ethics

Introduction

Ethics, the last area of tension between the two books that will be discussed, is partially linked with Morgenthau's conception of rationalism, analyzed in the previous chapter.¹ Within the topic of ethics the contradiction between the two books is based upon two factors. The first is the different motivation for each book. *SMPP* is written as a treatise against scientism and positivism in the study of IR and as a result it is more philosophically oriented than *PAN*. This philosophical orientation results in a discourse of what ethics should be considered as, rather than its empirical operationalization within IR.² In contrast, as *PAN* is an introductory textbook for IR it is focused upon the manner in which ethics tends to be perceived and acted, both historically and in the contemporary period. As a result of these two different perspectives a comparative evaluation of ethics will naturally lead to the discovery of areas of tension or logical disagreement. The second factor is the divergence in Morgenthau's conception of the state in *SMPP* and *PAN*. In the former he implicitly ascribes to the idea of methodological individualism, the understanding that larger entities such as the state are controlled and influenced through the acts of individuals. Thus, there is no categorical separation of acts or intentions by one or the other as they all originate within an individual. From this basis he dismisses the argument of a dual morality and postulates a single moral

¹ This link is due to the progression of Morgenthau's argument in *SMPP* which relies upon his discussion of the fallacy of rationalism, both generally and towards ethics, in order to develop his own position on ethics.

² This should not be seen as an absolute as some aspects of the discussion of *SMPP* drift towards the empirical. However, in comparison it is clear that the discussion of ethics is more philosophical in nature than *PAN* and this effects the direction and content of the discussion.

idea, the lesser evil, which is applicable to both. However, while continuing to advocate methodological individualism in most of *PAN*, within the section on international ethics he explicitly rejects this view at length. Thus the rejection of this view destroys the logical underpinning of his argument of a lesser evil. The separation of a state and individual as two different entities in thought and action removes the underlying argument that they have the same moral view and thus reintroduces a dual conception of morality for the two different types of actors. This is clearly a contradiction in the formulation of ethics between the two books.

The chapter will proceed by exploring the ethical discourse in *SMPP* and *PAN* in greater detail, outlining Morgenthau's overall argument while highlighting key elements such as Morgenthau's position on methodological individualism, relativism, power, nationalism and transcendence. Following this, an analysis of Morgenthau's 1948 critique of Carr's ethics will show how at this later juncture he differentiated his view from Carr's. To ascertain a possible reason for this shift, the academic literature on ethics read by Morgenthau will be examined to see the level of influence the various authors had on his position. Lastly, the shifting external context from the early 1940s, time of writing of *SMPP*, to the late 1940s will show how the difference in the international socio-political context affected Morgenthau's view on ethics.

An Overview on Morgenthau's Ethical Positions

1. Ethics in SMPP

As stated, in *SMPP* the focus is on a philosophical discussion of ethics.³ Morgenthau's philosophical argument can be separated into two stages. The first is the rejection of the

³ The section of *SMPP* that discusses ethics is titled The Moral Blindness of Scientific Man. Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 168-203. This chapter can also be found as a chapter in an edited

traditional conceptions of ethics, particularly the focus on the primacy of intention or consequence as the basis for an ethical act and distinguishing between different forms of morality in relation to the subject they are interacting with, otherwise known as dual morality. As these foundations of morality are deemed inadequate Morgenthau proceeds to reveal his preference for an Aristotelian form of morality, the lesser evil, which he claims is present in all aspects of life.⁴ While Morgenthau separates his argument into different sections dealing with a particular issue, this separation is disjointed as he sporadically adds vital elements to each argument throughout the chapter. As a result, for the purpose of clarity each topic will be dealt with thematically as an individual whole rather than linearly following Morgenthau's argument throughout the chapter.

1.A Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism undergoes the most sustained criticism of the established ethical positions. This is unsurprising as Morgenthau states utilitarianism is "the prevailing school of thought" for classifying moral action.⁵ Therefore due to its status within the discipline it would necessarily require the longest refutation. Furthermore, utilitarian ethics most closely corresponds to a supposed "scientific" method which Morgenthau strongly opposed. It achieves its scientific distinction through the rational calculation of certain means to certain ends for the greatest amount of human satisfaction. As a result, Morgenthau states that it links the moral act with the successful one.⁶ Morgenthau tacitly highlights the difference between ethics as it is traditionally conceived and the utilitarian scientific characterization of it, noting

volume and an article. See Morgenthau, "Ethics and Politics," 319-341 and Morgenthau, "The Evil of Politics and the Ethics of Evil," 1-18. For the purposes of this chapter all references will be made to the text within *SMPP*.

⁴ Molloy, "Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of The Lesser Evil," 97.

⁵ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 169.

⁶ *Ibid.*

that traditional ethical values are considered the product of ignorance and lack of experience when they do not coincide with a utilitarian solution.⁷ However, Morgenthau asserts that this does not reflect the reality of ethical decisions undertaken by the common man and as such is an ethical standard which is being forced upon individuals without understanding the nature of ethics and their interplay in the empirical realm.⁸

Morgenthau further extends his criticism of utilitarianism by subverting the logical validity of the mechanism for determining action, the means end evaluation.⁹ This mechanism is generally known as the maxim that the end justifies the means. It proposes that the means are functionally and ethically subordinated to the objective of the end, therefore the character of the end determines the nature of the acts used to achieve it. The first problem that Morgenthau has with this mechanism is that it is impossible to achieve in practice. He argues that the determination of whether the good of the end is suitable for the immorality of the means to achieve it is undertaken by an individual, placed within an individual relative context with no transcendent standard by which to guide his decision. The result of this mechanism is that it allows the actor to naturally justify his act by using a valuation which will inevitably support the act while minimizing the evil of the means.¹⁰ Thus, Morgenthau disavows the possibility of utilitarianism being agent neutral; the judgement of the individual who acts will always be the point of reference for the act.

⁷ *Ibid*, 170.

⁸ *Ibid*, 170-171. It should be noted that in this discussion Morgenthau approximates an intuitionist position on ethics as stated in Pin-Fat, "The Metaphysics of the national interest and the mysticism of the nation-state," 228.

⁹ The ethical system of means end evaluation predates utilitarianism, however it is clear from the context that Morgenthau is attacking a means end evaluation with the primacy of the end over the means as a fixture of utilitarian thought.

¹⁰ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 180-184.

The second criticism of the mechanism is focused on the conception of the end. Morgenthau notes that the end of an act is an artificial device used for the measurement of a goal. But as the end naturally has consequences of its own which continue into the future the end is actually the means to other ends. Due to the limits of human intelligence, the “end” of an act, however good, can result in a further end which causes more harm than any other possible action which could have been taken.¹¹ Thus the end is not a true end in relation to the culmination of events. The only true end that could logically exist is an ultimate end which could be identified with absolute good such as God or humanity itself. This creates the position that if the means are directed towards the absolute good, whatever it may be, then all acts are therefore logically and ethically justified which renders the concept of a means end evaluation void as all acts are invariably permitted.¹² It should be noted that despite this strong indictment of utilitarianism and by implication consequentialism as well, in formulating his own system of ethics Morgenthau still relies upon an ethic of responsibility as a basis of ethical action. Therefore success and thus a consequentialist imperative pervades his thought despite his earlier denouncement of it.¹³

1.B Intention

Traditionally, the ethical system opposite to utilitarianism and an ends based evaluation of action is one that emphasizes the means and intention of the actor as the key in judging an ethical action. However, Morgenthau finds this system of ethics logically faulty as well though his criticism is not as comprehensive as it is for utilitarianism. The reason for this lack of discussion is that his criticism is based upon the flaws of the means ends argument which were already elaborated. Morgenthau states that an intention based ethics shares the

¹¹ *Ibid*, 189.

¹² *Ibid*, 185.

¹³ *Ibid*, 203. See below for a more detailed discussion of this.

same weakness as an ends based ethic but in reverse.¹⁴ This formulation shares the same criticism as it merely places the emphasis on good intentions instead of the good end. A second flaw in intention is that Morgenthau states that all political action is subject to the ethic of responsibility.¹⁵ Therefore anything done with good intentions but results in a harmful result is morally at fault.¹⁶ It should be noted that in the other instances when Morgenthau talks about intentions he still places emphasis on the ends as determining the ethical efficacy of the act, thereby subordinating intention. A key example is his later statement that all intentions are generally good but the effect of the actions in the empirical world inevitably lead to suffering and thus by implication are morally lacking.¹⁷

1.C Perfectionism

Morgenthau refers to perfectionism as the rationalist ethical belief that was dominant before the scientific system of utilitarianism.¹⁸ Perfectionism as formulated by Morgenthau uses reason to create abstract rules of ethical behaviour. Morgenthau's critique is that these abstract rules predicated on reason are not applicable to the situations which occur in reality. The use of abstract reason as a way of justifying the applicability of these rules ignores reality and thus invalidates them as a legitimate guideline for ethical behaviour. He notes that a corollary of this behaviour uses Christian morals in place of abstract reason. The inability of the ethical system to guide the actor through the situation leads to a rejection of action in its

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 186.

¹⁵ Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*, 181.

¹⁶ *Ibid*.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, 188.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, 172.

entirety. This is self-defeating and impractical as it ultimately does not alter the situation and is a form of personal selfishness.¹⁹

1.D Dual Morality

After critiquing the standard ethical systems Morgenthau proceeds to dismantle the concept of dual morality which is common to all three. Each system proposes that there is a fundamental difference between individual ethics and ethics undertaken as a political act. However, Morgenthau notes that generally the concept of a dual morality has been more prevalent in ethical literature than in practice.²⁰ It should be noted that this disavowal of the importance of the distinction in practice diminishes the impact of some of the ethical systems which Morgenthau favours such as the ethic of responsibility. Perfectionist ethics takes a position similar to this. It states that through the elimination of ignorance and the culmination of reason in the general populace this conflict will eventually resolve.²¹ The difference between this and Morgenthau's position is his argument is that philosophically the same ethic applies to all action but the tension between acting and following ethics cannot be ameliorated. Despite this, Morgenthau gives some allowance to an idea of a dual standard. He states that the distinction between the morality of a private and political action is one of degree. Both deviate from the ethical norm.²² Following this formulation Morgenthau then deliberately invokes the concept of a dual morality to explain the increasing nationalism that has occurred in the mid-20th century. He postulates that the state uses its position to construct a new morality in its populace which channels the will to power of the individuals to the common purpose of the state. This same will to power would naturally be condemned as unethical if it was in pursuit of

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 174.

²⁰ *Ibid*, 176.

²¹ *Ibid*, 180.

²² *Ibid*, 195.

the gain of the individual.²³ By this latter admission that the dual nature of morality exists in practice it can be seen that Morgenthau's early critique of its existence was an exercise in abstract logic. Based on an assumption that all actors, including states, can be seen as individuals there can only be one form of ethics which applies to an individual.²⁴ Therefore, the context of the act, a personal or political setting, only alters the degree to which the act fails to comply with the standard. However, the reality of the world in which Morgenthau was writing had a dual morality which operated as stated above. Therefore, Morgenthau recognized and stated that while logically there cannot be a dual morality; the individuals act as if there was due to the compulsion of the normative order of the period, the dominance of the nation-state. The competing past normative orders are too enfeebled by time and any future ones too weak and immature to restrain its commands.

After critiquing the traditional ethical systems some aspects of Morgenthau's own ethical position can be seen. His tendency to focus on consequences despite his critique has been noted above. Likewise, in understanding his discourse on a dual standard his agreement with methodological individualism plays a vital role.

1.E Relativism

As noted in the critique of utilitarianism, Morgenthau takes the stance that all action and judgement is relative to the actor. When the actor tries to go beyond this own interest in an action, the action reflects his own views on what should be done, which are invariably distorted from his own position and perspective. Thus, the actor and his views are always present in any intended or consummated action.²⁵ Similarly, all acts are corrupted by the

²³ *Ibid*, 198-199.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 187.

²⁵ *Ibid*, 191.

individual's will to power, the *animus domandi*. This corruption adds to the self centered view noted above and magnifies any inherent selfishness within the actor's viewpoint.²⁶

Morgenthau's conception of the inability of the actor to separate himself from his acts creates a logical foundation for his latter argument that consummated action is invariably evil.

1.F Transcendental Ethics

However, Morgenthau does recognize a transcendental ethic which plays a role in the actions of individuals. This could be seen in the earlier notion of conscience as an intuitional ethical position as well as the notion that most intentions are good despite leading to bad consequences. This is reiterated later in the chapter where Morgenthau becomes explicit in detailing his own ethical beliefs. He notes that there is an inherent duty to humanity that is within man and this duty conflicts with the duty to the nation.²⁷ He also notes other inherent good desires in man that necessarily must be compromised or abandoned, such as familial duties and Christian ethics, sometimes due to competing demands from the same transcendental ethics.²⁸ The existence of these ethics, existing but never truly fulfilled in action creates the conflict between man's more base desires and puts a limit on the harm caused in action.²⁹ In Morgenthau's theory this role for transcendent ethics is generally negative and more ineffectual than a true deterrent.

1.G Evil

The concept of evil forms the basis of Morgenthau's ethics in *SMPP*. One of the fundamental pillars of Morgenthau's conception of evil is the *animus domandi* which has been

²⁶ *Ibid* 192-195.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 190.

²⁸ *Ibid*, 190-191.

²⁹ *Ibid*, 192.

noted above. Thus, there is a compelling force within man to try and increase his own standing and power at the expense of others which is weakly opposed by conscience. But as noted above despite man's intentions being good the nature of action and reality naturally frustrates his attempts to be good even when he resists his darker urges. Evil then corrupts all actions, both individual and political. However, in political action it is more pronounced, leading Morgenthau to declare that both deviate from the ethical norm but differ in degree.³⁰ To try and avoid evil by not acting as a form of perfectionist ethics also results in evil, as such an action denies the idea of degrees of evil, thereby losing the ability to distinguish between the greater and lesser evil. Furthermore, this rejection of action is inherently a form of selfishness as it leads to more suffering while the individual perfectionist feels morally superior through his passive permission of the acts.³¹ Morgenthau disavows this idea of transcendent ethics in practice as he notes that the end of Machiavellianism is not of this world at all, as it belongs to a world where evil cannot exist.³²

The concept of selfishness plays an important role in the nature of evil in action. Morgenthau notes that there is a paradox to selfishness when applied to how acts should be done to ascertain the greatest good. This paradox occurs by noting the limited nature of resources that could be applied to a problem. By using all the resources available once a problem is recognized the actor cannot help as much as if he/she could if help was undertaken later when the resources that could aid could be more substantial. Helping defeat a societal ill, such as poverty, in the absolute sense would naturally lead to the loss of all resources of the actor, leading to his self-sacrifice but not defeating the ill. Therefore, to help the actor must be

³⁰ *Ibid*, 195.

³¹ *Ibid*, 202.

³² *Ibid*. See the discussion on page 207 for a discussion of Maritain's idea of Machiavellianism and Morgenthau refutation of his claims.

selfish which violates the ethic of unselfishness. The problem for Morgenthau is unsurmountable and leads to the conclusion that the violation of some ethical good must be necessary.³³

If evil is ubiquitous in action what moral guidelines can the actor follow? The transcendent ethics of doing good through conscience and treating everyman as his own end cannot be achieved in the world as Morgenthau envisions. He concludes his chapter by stating his ethical guide is to recognize that there is evil but to try and do the lesser evil of the options presented. This concept applies equally to both the individual in a personal capacity as well as in politics, but it deviates from the absolute and conscience in a greater degree in the political due to the enormity of the choices. By itself the lesser evil has no value as it would be filled in by the relative perspective of each individual who acts.³⁴ Morgenthau therefore suggests that actions should be determined by the ethics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility is one of success which fits with the consequence oriented ethic of the lesser evil. However the ethic of responsibility must also be intended to happen as the actor must know what he is doing for it to be a moral act.³⁵ There are still problems with this conception. First, the lesser evil has some content but this content is still ultimately decided by the actor. This problem of relativism in choosing between abstract values does not seem solvable and must be accepted as a perennial problem. Secondly, acting to achieve success is not possible due to the limits of human intelligence noted by Morgenthau.

³³ *Ibid*, 191-192.

³⁴ Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*, 179.

³⁵ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 196.

1.H Recent interpretations

Recent interpretations of Morgenthau's ethics have established a more nuanced reading of his use of ethics of responsibility and the lesser evil. All these interpretations have sought to provide a unified conception of Morgenthau's ethics, thereby using sources throughout Morgenthau's life to illustrate their interpretation. In relating these works to the ethics stated in *SMPP* some material will noticeably be absent. However, the overall argument of these works are still applicable in illustrating the depth of Morgenthau's ethical thought.

Sean Molloy and Anthony Lang have stressed the Aristotelian roots of Morgenthau's ethics. Lang is more cautious in his incorporation of Aristotle into Morgenthau's work than Molloy.³⁶ While it is clear from Morgenthau's lectures that he disagreed with aspects of Aristotle's thought, in particular finding him overly politically conservative, the use of Aristotelian concepts in his work is indisputable. The particular concepts Lang notes are the lesser evil in his edited version of Morgenthau's 1970's lectures and the theoretical rejection of an end in public action.³⁷ Molloy focuses on the concept of the lesser evil and distinguishes Morgenthau's view from E.H. Carr's and Kant's deontological ethic.³⁸ Molloy views the lesser evil as a method of moderation espoused by Aristotle as avoiding the extremes in decisions which are morally deficient.³⁹ Molloy notes that in Aristotle's view the lesser evil is not ideal as it is not an absolute good but a conditional good, a decision that is not inherently right but

³⁶ Anthony F. Lang Jr., "Morgenthau, Agency and Aristotle," in *Realism Reconsidered*, ed. Michael C. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 27.

³⁷ Anthony F. Lang Jr. "Political Theory and International Affairs : Hans J. Morgenthau on Aristotle's Politics. (Westport: Praeger, 2004), 18 – 41 and Lang, "Morgenthau, Aristotle and Agency", 34. See Ross Talbot Political Science 355 March 1947 class notes HJM-B76F3 for Morgenthau's use of the concept of the lesser evil.

³⁸ See below for a discussion of Morgenthau's critique of Carr.

³⁹ Molloy, *Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Politics of the Lesser Evil*, 102.

based upon the options the one that is the most ethically correct.⁴⁰ Therefore, choosing between two options which can be labelled as evil revolves around making a moral choice based upon the judgement of the actor.⁴¹ Morgenthau states this choice in Aristotelian terms remarking that

to act with successfully, that is according to the rules of the political art, is political wisdom. To know with despair that the politically act is inevitably evil, and to act nevertheless is moral courage. To choose among several expedient actions the least evil one is moral judgement. In the combination of political wisdom, moral courage and moral judgement man reconciles his political nature with his moral destiny.⁴²

Molloy uses this concept of judgement of the individual to show that for Morgenthau ethics are more than the interests of the state and that Morgenthau does not subscribe to a belief that the interests of the state are paramount. The choices that are made are between the dual command of what is expedient and what is morally required by the dictates of man's inner conscience. This antinomy between the political and the moral is perennial due to the eternal verity of the commands of the political and moral spheres.⁴³ That this reality is tragic, akin to Tantalus position in Tartarus, forms one of the pillars to understanding Morgenthau's reasoning as essentially tragic in nature.⁴⁴ Thus, Molloy's account of Morgenthau's Aristotelian ethics stresses the ubiquity of evil, the guidance of the lesser evil in favour of pure relativism in the sense of might makes right and the deontological ethics of Kant.

This account does not fully encapsulate Molloy's argument. What is missing is his discussion of contingency, transcendence, relativism and prudence. Those topics will be dealt

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 100.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, 101.

⁴² Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 203.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 201. This corresponds to what Morgenthau wrote earlier in SMPP about the eternal verities of Aristotle and Plato. *Ibid*, 5-6.

⁴⁴ Molloy, *Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Politics of the Lesser Evil*, 101.

with after the discussion of PAN and Morgenthau's critique of Carr as these concepts are more relevant in light of what Morgenthau says in these two works.

Another thinker who has focused on the ethics of Morgenthau is Michael Williams. In his seminal book *The Realist Tradition and The Limits of International Relations* Williams explores what he calls willful realism. This realism is a form of cautious political liberalism which can be used to critique the strident and dogmatic assertions found in modern liberalism. In a threefold analysis of the works of Rousseau, Hobbes and Morgenthau Williams builds to a synthesis of their philosophies in the latter half of the book. This construction of a tradition of thought echoes Ned Lebow's earlier work on tragedy within realism which analyzed Thucydides, Clausewitz and Morgenthau.⁴⁵

Williams describes the ethics of Morgenthau as an ethic of responsibility along the same philosophical lines as Max Weber.⁴⁶ Williams finds that the ethic of responsibility is more than a simple consequentialist ethic.⁴⁷ He notes that a pure consequentialist ethic subordinates all means to the ends thereby negating the ethical dimension of the act. However, citing Weber, Williams finds that the ethic of consequences encourages critical reflection by the actor upon himself, others and the ends he is pursuing.⁴⁸ This critical account denies the "blithe, self-serving and uncritical account of abstract moralism or rationalistic objectivism."⁴⁹

This critical reflection emphasizes the limits of the actor. As a result Williams states that the actor himself and the world are opaque to reflection.⁵⁰ This necessarily entails a

⁴⁵ Richard Ned Lebow, *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics Interests and Orders* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

⁴⁶ Williams, *The Realist Tradition and The Limits of International Relations*, 174.

⁴⁷ *Ibid* 172.

⁴⁸ See Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 83 for a similar statement.

⁴⁹ Williams, *The Realist Tradition and The Limits of International Relations*, 175.

⁵⁰ *Ibid* 176.

rejection of an objective standpoint on which to view the social world and fosters a relativism of judgement within the ethic of responsibility.⁵¹ This does not preclude the idea of judgement, simply that the judgement is limited by the partial, perspectival nature of the actor himself. A retreat from the hard choices this concept entails, either in nihilism, which Williams calls soporific relativism, or uncritical action denies the earlier point of ethics of responsibility. Namely that is supposed to be responsible.⁵² The limited, partial nature of historic relative knowledge and ethics paradoxically engenders a more complete and practicable system of ethics as opposed to one which seeks objective certainty in its judgement.

This is an interesting analysis and helps clarify some of the issues observed in the discussion of *SMPP*. Morgenthau clearly stresses the uncertainty inherent in individual's knowledge and actions. It seems that an ethic of responsibility through the means of the lesser evil is the ethical method preferred by Morgenthau. It is questionable whether the critical stance developed by Williams can be applied to the discourse in *SMPP* as opposed to the later works which he cites in support of his claim. Ultimately, the interpretation has merit in that Morgenthau's ethics in *SMPP* can be seen as an ethic of responsibility using the lesser evil to avoid the perils of perfectionism, absolute moral relativism and utilitarianism.

2. Ethics in PAN

The discussion of ethics in *PAN* is based upon history and the contemporary situation of the mid-20th century. As a textbook, *PAN* does not deal with ethics as it should logically be but rather how it existed in the past and its continuity to the present. This discourse links to the previous discussion of nationalism in *SMPP*. However, while the previous discussion appeared almost extrinsic to the overall discussion, in *PAN* this topic is fully developed. By

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 178.

⁵² *Ibid*, 179.

developing it Morgenthau had to revise his belief in methodological individualism, stating that while historically this belief was correct at the present time the state and the individual are separate entities with different ethical codes for each. The reasoning behind this change is stated to be the rise of democracy and nationalism. In exploring Morgenthau's ethics in *PAN* this section will detail his position on transcendent ethics, the position of ethics in the past and their position at the time of publication.

2.A Transcendent Ethics in PAN

Morgenthau's conception of transcendent ethics has changed between *PAN* and *SMPP*. While previously these ethics were intuitive ideas felt by conscience but unable to be realized in practice in *PAN* they have transformed into concrete actions which are easily verifiable. This change is due to the more historic and empirical analysis employed in *PAN*. Morgenthau shows the empirical validity of transcendent ethical ideas through discussing the difference between actions in peace and war. He states that ethical limitations prevent the death of outstanding individuals or groups whose existence causes harm or potential harm to the international system, the example he uses is Germany. Despite it being expedient to remove this problem through their destruction it is considered an absolute moral principle to not do this which "no consideration of national advantage can justify".⁵³ In making this claim he definitely contrasts his position with Carr, quoting him as stating that the goal of ethics is to not create unnecessary death for the attainment of a higher purpose. Thus, he subtly rejects an absolute interpretation of his previous ethical conception of the lesser evil coupled with the ethic of responsibility which Carr is employing.

⁵³ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 177.

Another example of the transcendent in *PAN* is the observation that there are attempts to try and induce states to observe ethical principles through international agreement. Furthermore, the derogations of these agreements and the justification of acts of violence point towards the normative effect of these ethics on actions.⁵⁴ However, while some transcendent principles are strong, Morgenthau notes that many which do exist have little impact on the actions of states. One such example is the use of warfare. Thus, he states that while states do frequently violate the norms imposed by transcendental ethics they feel like they should not.⁵⁵ Therefore, through noting the attitudes and actions of states the power of these ethics can be ascertained. But, Morgenthau makes note of the fact that the way these ethics are followed changes depending on the historical context in which they are embedded.⁵⁶ This imposes a historical relativism to the influence of transcendent ethics but also brings in the question whether transcendent ethics themselves are historically relative or eternal. The use of the phrase absolute moral principle implies that these principles are immutable but the manner in which they are followed varies from period to period.

It appears that Morgenthau is stating that these ethics exist but they cannot be fully grasped. They can only be thought of and felt as partial; funneled through the customs and culture of periods. This allows Morgenthau to simultaneously claim that the ethics are both objective and transcendental and historically contingent. Interestingly this assertion comes from both historical empirical evidence as well as a metaphysical assertion that they do exist.

The historical relativism in relation to transcendent principles is shown through the changing character of war. It is first noted that the idea of preventive war, considered a

⁵⁴ *Ibid*, 179-180.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 181.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 191. Within this passage Morgenthau gives more clarity to the conception of these ethics stating them to be composed of Christian, cosmopolitan and humanitarian elements.

violation of ethical norms was a commonplace occurrence.⁵⁷ Secondly, the subject of who can be killed in the engagement of hostilities is shown to have altered drastically from the past. Originally, the population of the enemy nation was subject to violence but this gradually changed to only include active combatants.⁵⁸ However, by the time of the Second World War this position had reverted to its earlier conception and was now subject to a general acceptance of its justification of necessity.⁵⁹ Related to this, it can be seen that transcendent ethics not only strengthen and weaken over time but disappear, altering them from being considered transcendent ethical precepts depending on the circumstances of the period. As Morgenthau states in the present period

the influence of that system of supra-national ethics upon the conscience of the actors on the international scene, it is rather like the feeble rays, barely visible above the horizon of consciousness, of a sun which has already set.⁶⁰

In the modern period Morgenthau attributes this breakdown of traditional ethics to the rise of the state, particularly through nationalism. By this force the state exhibits a moral compulsion on its members that dwarfs the ability of most supranational or transcendent morals to counteract it. Interestingly, Morgenthau also hints that technology has played an important role as well. By altering the nature of war to allow the ability to engage in certain acts such as total war, technology permits the situations which allow humankind to alter their social conceptions of ethics based on the opportunity for violating them.⁶¹ The end result is

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 180-181.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 178.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 181-183. Morgenthau also notes that the general act of killing is a violation of transcendent ethics which has always been defeated by the nations compelling power. *Ibid*, 192.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 195.

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 192.

that the national ethics supplant the universal ones in practice but also metaphysically as the individual abandons universal ethics.⁶²

Morgenthau posits that a supranational ethics was shared by the states in the 17th and 18th centuries. This ethical unity is claimed to have come from a shared cultural background, the Christian aristocracy, which allowed the ruling members of the states to have shared cultural and ethical values.⁶³ The breakdown of these ethics is not solely due to nationalism. In Morgenthau's view democracy resulted in the change from an aristocratic governing body to a more inclusive group which allowed individuals who have the same embedded values to control policy. As a result of this change the members in charge of policy were not responsible to an individual but a collective, the people of the state. Therefore, the actions of the individual in the capacity of the state were not his own actions as posited by methodological individualism but the actions of the state in which the individual's own opinion and values are irrelevant. In the case where the individual refuses to follow a course of action due to his own beliefs he will resign in protest or be replaced and thus the state continues its actions.⁶⁴ Thus

Moral rules have their seat in the consciences of individual men. Government by clearly identifiable men, who can be held personally accountable for their acts, is therefore the precondition for the existence of an effective system of international ethics. Where responsibility for government is widely distributed among a great number of individuals with different conceptions as to what is morally required in international affairs, or with no such conceptions at all, international morality as an effective system of restraints upon international policy becomes impossible.⁶⁵

What Morgenthau has done is separate the actions of the state from the actions of the individual, replacing one standard for all ethical action into two separate categories. The

⁶² *Ibid*, 193.

⁶³ *Ibid* 184-187.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 188-189.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 189.

significance of this altered view is that there are two separate ethical systems both in theory and in practice, one for states and another for individuals. This reintroduces the conception of a dual morality as there are now two types of ethics which differ based upon on the context of the action.⁶⁶ This is a clear contradiction of the position in *SMPP* and shows how Morgenthau's thought differs between the two books.

To clarify this, in *SMPP* Morgenthau destroys the concept of a dual morality in two logical arguments. The first is that the dual morality generally is written about rather than practiced. All rulers seek to appear that they are following some moral guidelines in their decisions rather than following pure self-interest. The reason for this is twofold. First, Morgenthau references the need for justifying actions based upon the common good, even if the intention is not the good of the whole but a specialized group.⁶⁷ Secondly, there is an inherent tension between morality and politics as man is both a political and a social animal.⁶⁸ The social or moral element is the civilizing presence that prevents man from descending into barbarism as mentioned in the discussion of *SMPP*.

The second argument is that while some would state that there is intrinsic goodness in man but evil in the political act, this dichotomy is false. "It is always an individual who acts, either with reference to his own ends or reference to others."⁶⁹ As the individual is the one who acts, the capacity of their actions is one that differs in kind but is still applicable to the

⁶⁶ Early within the chapter on ethics Morgenthau makes his position on the contemporary acceptance of dual morality between the individual and the political clear stating "the ethics and mores of politics are generally considered to permit greater leeway than the general ethics and mores of society in certain actions such as 'campaign oratory' and promises in general. *Ibid*, 172.

⁶⁷ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 176-177.

⁶⁸ *Ibid* 177. The Aristotelian tones in this statement are obvious.

⁶⁹*ibid*, 187.

criteria of the lesser evil, with the political actions being perhaps more evil due to the enormity of the choices.⁷⁰

However, the discussion in *PAN* rejects this argument about the consistency of actors. This does not necessarily mean that the ethics Morgenthau personally believes in are different. What it does show is that Morgenthau weakened his own argument about the applicability of one ethic in both spheres. By doing so, he logically allows the argument of dual morality to come to the fore. The argument against a dual morality in *PAN* is not based upon a logical foundation, ie. that there cannot be a dual morality due to the nature of action, but that normatively there should not be a dual morality. The command of the nation state and the subsequent weakening of cross state ties have thus had a negative effect in the present. In practice, there is a dual morality as opposed to the ethical system of the lesser evil, governed by an altering conception of the transcendent.

3. Morgenthau and the Review on Carr's Work

Before analyzing the historical context and disciplinary influence on these two positions Morgenthau's discussion of ethics in relation to the works of E.H.Carr should be reviewed. As noted earlier, in *PAN*, Morgenthau makes a rare explicit reference to Carr, emphasizing the lack of transcendental limits to action in Carr's ethics. In a critique of Carr's work published in the same month and year as *PAN* Morgenthau reiterates this point, noting this as the largest flaw in Carr's work. However, it should be noted that in the critique Morgenthau deviates from both the ethics arguments in *SMPP* and *PAN*, setting forth a third position. This position differs from the others due to its focus on the transcendental element of

⁷⁰ *Ibid* , 187-188.

ethics and the condemnation of the ethic of the lesser evil found in *SMPP*. In the first section attacking Carr's ethics Morgenthau states that

The philosophically untenable equation of utopia, theory, and morality, which is at the foundation of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, leads of necessity to a relativistic, instrumentalist conception of morality.⁷¹

This statement is strange considering that a relativistic, instrumentalist conception of morality is the same form of morality advocated in *SMPP*. The inherent logic of an ethic of responsibility and the lesser evil is both relativistic and instrumentalist in nature. It is relativistic in that the lesser evil is ultimately defined by the greater evil. It has no fixed absolute value on its own, it is simply lesser compared to the other successful options. Secondly, it is instrumentalist in that an ethic of responsibility does what is successful in order to preserve the members of the nation state. The use of these terms in a pejorative sense in Morgenthau's critique is odd considering his own position two years previously. To try and reconcile this we should try to understand exactly what Morgenthau meant by relativism. Based on context it appears that Morgenthau understood the term as being almost a form of nihilism. It seems that relativism would be defined by him as unrestricted by any criteria. Therefore, morality would be relative to whoever had the most power. This definition of relativism is extreme but explains the statements made in the review.

The second major point of Morgenthau's ethical critique is that Carr has no solution how to act ethically, merely offering a glib statement on the need to compromise between power and morality. Strangely, Morgenthau attributes this position solely to Carr's most recent work, *The Moral Foundation Of World Order*, though this compromise has been present in Carr's work as early as *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.⁷² Again, this compromise was present in both

⁷¹ Morgenthau, "The Political Science of E.H.Carr," 134.

⁷² Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, 96, 192 and 200.

SMPP and *PAN* though taking different forms in each. If the essence of Morgenthau's critique is not that this position is taken but that Carr does not go beyond the position it still contradicts his own recently published works as Morgenthau himself does not offer a suitable solution to the problem. Hypocritically Morgenthau is critiquing Carr for the same position and the same problem that exists in his own work.

The third criticism Morgenthau offers is that Carr relies too heavily on Niebuhr's distinction between individual and group morality, a position which Niebuhr has long abandoned. The context of this statement implies that this reliance is only found in Carr's most recent work. However it can be easily found in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.⁷³ The claim that Niebuhr abandoned the distinction between a group and individual morality after *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society* is not correct.⁷⁴ As Niebuhr was a strong influence on Morgenthau's work on ethics this claim seems out of place as Morgenthau should have known it was factually wrong.⁷⁵

The final criticism that Morgenthau directs towards Carr is the absence of a transcendent point of view in which to appraise the morality of power. While Carr does not explicitly reference a transcendent morality it is implicit in the idea that morality must temper power. The idea of morality being used to temper the actions of power implies that "Whoever holds seeming superiority of power becomes of necessity the repository of superior morality as well" is incorrect.⁷⁶ Hence, there is some perspective which Carr employs in order to condemn some actions as being morally wrong. However he does not state the form of this morality.

The crux of Morgenthau's complaint seems to be the same as stated in *PAN*, that Carr does not

⁷³ *Ibid*, 136,141 and 145.

⁷⁴ See Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 96-97 and 102 and Niebuhr, *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness*,21,26, 54, and 60.

⁷⁵ See below for the connection between Niebuhr and Morgenthau on ethics.

⁷⁶ Morgenthau, "The Political Science of E.H.Carr," 134.

disallow some actions as too absolute.⁷⁷ This is a legitimate point but it seems lacking. The fact that Carr did not elaborate on a system of ethics while implying some form of ethics exists to temper power can rightly be pointed out and criticized in a review. However, Morgenthau's own ethical position can only be considered well defined by comparison to Carr. The volumes written on Morgenthau's ethics attribute a plethora of different ethical positions to him.⁷⁸

The transcendent aspect of Morgenthau's ethics occupies a large role in Molloy's discussion. The transcendent is stated to be a defining feature of Morgenthau's ethics, separating it from Carr's. Molloy argues that Morgenthau's critique of Carr is predicated on his inability to have any perspective by which to judge an act. Therefore, Carr offers the idea of morality tempering power but has no standard in which to judge the acts or define what is moral.⁷⁹ Molloy states that Morgenthau's placement of judgement and the lesser evil is anchored in a Judeo-Christian ethic.⁸⁰ However, he also notes that Morgenthau uses two forms of relativism in his work, the historical and cultural which modify the response to the command of the transcendent ethic and correspondingly, the lesser evil.⁸¹ Quoting Morgenthau's critique of Carr Molloy notes that Morgenthau does not allow for relativism in his work therefore the justice envisioned from Morgenthau's method must not have a relativist base.⁸² Morgenthau's statement against relativism seems to be based upon his own unique understanding of what relativism is. The use of prudence and the lesser evil is ultimately a judgement of the actor

⁷⁷ Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 177. See also Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 104.

⁷⁸ See Chapter 2 on the discussion of contemporary analysis on Morgenthau's ethics.

⁷⁹ Molloy, *Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of the Lesser Evil*, 97.

⁸⁰ *Ibid* 101. This position is also shared by Benjamin Molloy and Richard Ned Lebow. See Lebow, *The Tragic Vision of Politics*, 237 and M. Benjamin Molloy, *Power and Transcendence: Hans J. Morgenthau and the Jewish Experience* (Oxford: Lexington Books, 2002).

⁸¹ Molloy, *Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of the Lesser Evil*, 101.

⁸² This corresponds with Aristotelian ethics about applying the universal to particular situations.. See Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 310.

rather than an objective perspective.⁸³ Obviously some actions are prohibited by the absolute nature of the transcendent, such as genocide or nuclear war, but decisions that do not approach these horrors are based upon the prudence and judgement of the individual who has to act. Therefore, it certainly is possible that two individuals undertaking the same decision can reach different conclusions based on their own understanding of the situation and consequences.

While Morgenthau did not have a favourable view of Carr's later works the opinion within the review towards ethics cannot be justified on this basis alone.⁸⁴ There are three other possible explanations for the content of Morgenthau's critique which can be explained by analyzing the context of the review. The first is to note the purpose of the article; the purpose necessarily alters the discourse contained within it. As the article is a review the content is more critical, the point of the article is to analyze and critique the works in question. A result of this purpose is that Morgenthau's discussion would be harsher than a reference to the work in another medium. This can be seen in *PAN* when Morgenthau's rebukes Carr in the discussion of ethics. This rebuke does not have the same condemnation found within the review. Secondly, it should be remembered that a critique does not only relate to the logical elements of the arguments but sub textually concerns the use of these arguments in the material world. Morgenthau hints to this consideration within the critique, noting Carr's approval of Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler, his endorsement of the Soviet system of government and his call to change the Western world through large scale planning.⁸⁵ All of these policy recommendations which are the product of Carr's logic would be anathema to Morgenthau. As a German Jewish émigré the policy of appeasement towards Hitler would be personally

⁸³ Lang , *Political Theory and International Affairs*, 102.

⁸⁴ See Letter From Hans Morgenthau to Edward Meade Earle, September 21st 1948, HJM-B18F5.

⁸⁵ Morgenthau, "The Political Science of E.H.Carr," 130-132.

morally abhorrent. Furthermore, as Morgenthau counsels rejecting isolationism in foreign policy the idea of appeasement in this context would be contrary to his established position. Carr's endorsement of the Soviet system as a new form of government in the 20th century is linked to his espousal of planning as a necessary tool for policy. This position is critiqued at length in *SMPP*.⁸⁶ Lastly, it can be argued that Morgenthau's criticism is meant as a form of differentiating between his own form of theory and Carr's. By explicitly attacking some portions of it Morgenthau communicates to the reader that his own work is not a product of Carr's but one that shares some similarities but more differences. Through a synthesis of these explanations Morgenthau's statements on Carr's ethics can be understood.

While the difference between these positions is due to the changing nature of Morgenthau's thought due to developments in the international system, as we have seen, this divergence is partially due to the overall motivation behind the works. *PAN* naturally emphasizes the empirical over the philosophical and as a result places a higher emphasis on the importance of observable action over the possibilities of a metaphysical ought. This leads to the morose evaluation of states acting within supranational ethics in that period compared to the stoicism that is found in *SMPP*. This does not result in a different ethical system but shows that Morgenthau was altering what he considered to be true both due to the nature of the works and the time that lapsed between them.

Contemporary Influence on Morgenthau's Position

The contemporary influence on Morgenthau is divided into five sections. These sections are positivism, optimism, relativism, power and ethics. Positivism will explore the positivist rejection of ethics. Ethics prominent inclusion in *SMPP* can be seen as a response to this

⁸⁶ See the previous chapter for a discussion of Morgenthau's criticism of planning.

position. Optimism is partially connected to positivism. The optimists take the position that education and knowledge decreases ignorance and ignorance is the cause of evil. Therefore, increasing knowledge would result in a purely positive end without the need to specifically consider the ethics of an act. The works which influenced Morgenthau's position in relation to optimism explore the consequences of a positive view of man's nature as it relates to ethics. Relativism will show other contemporaries use of a modest ethical relativism, highlighting the fact that the observer is the arbiter of deciding the value of actions. The section on power shows the emphasis on the inevitable corrupting influence of power on ethical choices. Lastly, the section entitled ethics will highlight other miscellaneous aspects of Morgenthau's ethical thought that can be seen in the works of individuals who he had previously read. The most influential contributor to these ethics is Reinhold Niebuhr. As Morgenthau himself notes in the bibliography for the ethics chapter - "the subject matter of this chapter has been most illuminatingly treated in the books of Reinhold Niebuhr."⁸⁷

1. Positivism

Morgenthau's position in *SMPP* towards the proponents of value free research has already been discussed in previous chapters. The inclusion of ethics is clearly a response to this, emphasizing its importance in social sciences. The position of the authors in favour of ignoring ethics in social science was strong in other fields but was not particularly well established in the developing field of international relations or politics generally.⁸⁸ The evidence of the counter position is not explicitly stated within this section, as the discussion of ethics in any manner other than its call for exclusion can be seen as opposing the former view.

⁸⁷ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 236.

⁸⁸ There are of course notable exceptions to this, in particular see the discussion of some of Charles Merriam's work in chapter six. Also see Dorothy Rice, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) and Smith, *Social Science In The Crucible*.

The strongest proponent of the positivist view that Morgenthau was familiar with is William Whyte. In an article from 1943 entitled *Instruction and Research: A Challenge to Political Scientists* Whyte gives a typical argument for a positivist of this period.⁸⁹ He claims that political science at the present does not concern itself with either politics or science but is concerned with

the more respectable disciplines of political theory, public administration, and international law, whose connections with practical politics are more or less remote. Many have taken an interest in the study of democracy and dictatorship, but this tends to result in ideological arguments, philosophy, ethics-anything but science.⁹⁰

He further argues that ethics is within the realm of philosophy and political scientists should concern themselves only with politics. This involves studying politics at observable levels such as municipal, industrial, provincial/state or national. This insistence of a demarcation of politics from other fields is typical of the period, particularly of individuals who try to stress the importance of scientific study within the field. By focusing on observable data and moving away from more metaphysical questions these commentators believed that political science could mirror the success of the hard sciences.⁹¹ Hallowell reinforces this point by noting that G.E.G. Catlin argued that

it is no more the function of the political scientist to evaluate the good or bad consequences of particular techniques than it is the function of the chemist, qua chemist, to pass ethical judgements upon the use which other men make of chemical knowledge and skill.⁹²

⁸⁹ William Foote Whyte, "Instruction and Research: A Challenge To Political Scientists," *The American Political Science Review* 37 (1943): 692-697. This article was required reading for Morgenthau's IR course in the section entitled ethics. See Reading List for Political Science 353, Spring Quarter 1948, HJM-B80F3.

⁹⁰ Whyte, "Instruction and Research," 692.

⁹¹ See chapter six. Also see G.E.G. Catlin, *The Science And Method of Politics*.

⁹² John H. Hallowell, "Politics and Ethics," *The American Political Science Review* 38 (1944): 640. It should be noted that this is a misrepresentation of Catlin's overall position. At other points of the book he argues for the inclusion of ethics.

The inclusion of a discussion of ethics is clearly meant as a dismissal of this view. A rigid separation of politics from ethical considerations is not feasible as it would be for the hard sciences. Necessarily any research or conclusion about government, law and policy would involve issues such as ethics. While the separation of the two would make the study of politics more tangible, the reality is that these concepts are intertwined; the exclusion of one from the other would be not feasible.

2. Optimism

The influence of optimism on Morgenthau's writings is broader than his work on ethics. Many of the examples have already been illustrated in the discussion of *SMPP* and rationalism.⁹³ *SMPP* is written to disprove the belief that progress, however defined, will alleviate problems in society. The corollary of this is that ethics is treated as a non-issue as it is assumed that as progress is essentially good, the ethics of society will improve if society improves. Other scholars are more circumspect, targeting a particular method by which ethics will improve, for example through education.⁹⁴ The general problem with this view is that it espouses blindness to the complexity of life and ethics, merely assuming a single cause solution to a complex problem.

Optimism will be divided into four sub categories. The first is the belief in the essential goodness of man. Second is the view that reason will alter behaviour in order for a more just society. The third and fourth categories are derivatives of the second. These two categories are *laissez-faire* and education. They are derivatives because both rely upon rationalism as a fundamental force for affecting change. The difference in these two categories is the vector in which change will be affected. However, all the categories are inevitably interconnected as

⁹³ See chapter three for a discussion of *SMPP* and chapter six for a discussion of rationalism.

⁹⁴ See chapter six on rationalism for a discussion of education.

the belief in the goodness of man leads to a discussion of how to use reason to eliminate the obstacles of its expression.

2.A Essential Goodness of Man

One of the most consistent statements found in Niebuhr's thought is the contention that many disparate groups believe that man is essentially good.⁹⁵ Niebuhr attributes this view to mystics, Christians, pacifists and rationalists. He argues that the Christian position that man is essentially good is not a true Christian position but one that has been influenced by modern rationalism.⁹⁶ In Niebuhr's view rationalists are the strongest group that has been perpetuating the belief of man's innate goodness.⁹⁷ The explanation for the evil in the world is inherited from Rousseau. This view holds that the instruments and structure of the society, in whatever guise that suits the thinker, are responsible for corrupting man.⁹⁸ As a result, believers in this doctrine engage in the single cause fallacy, trying to eliminate the cause of man's subversion.⁹⁹ The problem with this view is that it is based on hope rather than experience; when experience disproves the belief it is explained away by extraneous factors. The simpler explanation that man is flawed due to his own inherent nature and that this causes evil is ignored in the hope that man could be perfected.¹⁰⁰ This problem is accurately summarized by T.D. Weldon when

⁹⁵ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 7.

⁹⁶ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 36.

⁹⁷ *ibid*, 20 and 104.

⁹⁸ *Ibid*, 19. Note also Morgenthau's stating this in Hans Morgenthau, *The Transformation Of Our Contemporary Culture Into A Spiritual Culture As Seen By A Political Scientist*, unpublished manuscript presented on February 5, 1946, HJM-B168F7.

⁹⁹ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 36.

¹⁰⁰ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 201.

he stated that you cannot change human nature by wishing it were different or saying it ought to be different.¹⁰¹

2.B Reason

The use of reason in relation to ethics and man's nature has two formulations. The first, which has already been noted, is that reason will attempt to find the external cause of man's unethical behaviour. The external cause varies and will be mentioned below but the chief examples are economics and ignorance. Advocates of this view hold that the use of reason will end this condition and thereby create a harmonious society.¹⁰² The second view differs from the first in that it does not take for granted that people are generally good. The metaphysical properties of man's nature are irrelevant to the theory. These proponents hold that progress will naturally overcome the flaws in society, leading to harmony.¹⁰³ Ascertaining the cause of these flaws is not necessary for the belief, the faith in the transformative power of reason is enough. Niebuhr attributes this belief primarily to the middle class which had been the driving force of progress and modernism.¹⁰⁴ The chief problem that Niebuhr has with this faith in rationalism is that while mankind may have increased intelligence, the tools and their repercussions in the social sphere make the issues more complex, thereby preventing any substantial progress towards an absolute good.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ T.D.Weldon, *States and Morals: A Study In Political Conflicts* (London, John Murray,1946), 25. Morgenthau's review of Weldon's book *States and Morals* was published just after the publication of *PAN*. See Hans Morgenthau, "Review of States and Morals," *Journal of Political Economy* 56 (1948): 553.

¹⁰² Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man And Immoral Society*, 23-24, Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 54, 103, 134, 185 and Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 54.

¹⁰³ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 261 and Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 28.

¹⁰⁴ Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 176 and 214. There are clear parallels here with Morgenthau's treatment of the middle class and rationalism.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 50 and Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 188.

Within sections of Dewey and Tufts' *Ethics* they outline the rationalist view in less dogmatic terms than Morgenthau or Niebuhr. In the earlier sections they outline the view that reason is the method of finding the good. Therefore, using reason leads to justice and irrational acts hinder the progress towards the good.¹⁰⁶ At a later section of the book this position has led to the conclusions of the positivists, that societal problems are administrative and scientific problems and can thus be solved through an application of reason towards these issues.¹⁰⁷ They also note the optimistic view that man will naturally choose the higher moral act voluntarily.¹⁰⁸ The problem they conclude is one of ignorance. Educative institutions need to show the public what the best choice is and then they will follow it due to their inherent benevolent nature.¹⁰⁹ However, at other points in the text they put forward views which oppose this. In relation to progress they do note that as society progresses there will be a progression of the ability to do evil as well as good.¹¹⁰ Also, they note that the unthinking pursuit of the good can cause harm, therefore untempered optimism is unwise.¹¹¹ It should be noted that as the book is a discussion of the various forms of ethics not all the positions outlined above are necessarily Dewey and Tufts' personal positions. As Morgenthau used this book to discuss ethics in his classes and sent a copy of *SMPP* to Dewey to review, it is likely that he was inspired by the discussions within the text.¹¹²

¹⁰⁶ John Dewey and James H. Tufts, *Ethics* (New York: Henry Holt, 1908), 75, 82, 148 and 217.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, 473.

¹⁰⁸ *ibid*, 89 and 397.

¹⁰⁹ *ibid*, 447.

¹¹⁰ *ibid*, 171-172.

¹¹¹ *ibid*, 413-414.

¹¹² In a letter from John Dewey to the University of Chicago publishing secretary Dewey states that he would not read *SMPP* as Morgenthau misunderstands his position. Letter from John Dewey to Miss Waggoner, October 9th 1946, HJM-B146F9.

2.C Laissez Faire and Education

Laissez Faire and education are the two tools which rationalists believe they can improve the ethical state of mankind and which are criticized strongly by both Niebuhr and Morgenthau. *SMPP* continually mentions laissez-faire as one of the key doctrines of liberalism which is inapplicable in the 20th century, though individuals still utilize it as a possible solution to social and international problems.¹¹³ Niebuhr had originally argued this as well, stating that laissez faire is primarily a 19th century doctrine which has died a lingering death.¹¹⁴ Ultimately, Niebuhr concludes that laissez faire cannot fundamentally alter human nature. This position differs from Morgenthau as Niebuhr takes a more static view of the solution, arguing that it was never applicable while Morgenthau argues that it is a product of its time and had some success in the period in which it was formed. In *Conditions of Peace* Carr agreed with this sentiment, stating that the moral problems of the 20th century are due to the use of the solutions in the 19th century, particularly laissez-faire.¹¹⁵

Education as a form of rationalist social engineering has already been discussed in the previous chapter. The belief that education will transform the ethics of society as a whole emanates from a belief that immorality is caused by ignorance. If individuals knew that greater gains were caused by harmony rather than strife and selfishness than they logically would act more ethically. This position is similar to laissez faire in that it believes that the greatest gain for the individual is through peaceful and mutually beneficial interaction. It ignores the possibility that acting harmful to others may have a greater gain in both the short and long term for the individual. The link between improvement of the self and the improvement of the whole cannot be substantiated, undermining the validity of the belief. As it has already been

¹¹³ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 46, 51, 58 and 182.

¹¹⁴ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 33.

¹¹⁵ Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, 102.

shown, Niebuhr had originally condemned this belief and Morgenthau had continued this line of critique in *SMPP*. The ethical dimension of the argument is refuted in the same manner as its deconstruction in the previous chapter, namely that it focuses on a single cause fallacy and appears to stem from wishful thinking rather than a careful analysis of the issue. Furthermore, Niebuhr remarks that education is from a particular perspective and as such it legitimates the view of the educator rather than having an impartial perspective towards truth.¹¹⁶

Many of the ethical arguments related to optimism are connected to rationalism. As noted previously, the refutation of these arguments in *SMPP* can partially be attributed to Morgenthau's indebtedness to Niebuhr. The comparison of Morgenthau's position in *SMPP* to Niebuhr's position in the 30's and early 40's clearly demonstrates the effect Niebuhr had upon him.

3. Relativism

To identify influences on relativism in *SMPP* and *PAN* it is important to note their differences. While relativism is an important aspect of Morgenthau's ethical position in both *SMPP* and *PAN* the focus of its discussion shifts from a discussion of individual relativism to a more macro historical context. Due to this, the possible influences will be divided into two sections depending on their reference to an individual present relativism or a changing macro historical relativism.

3.A SMPP relativism

The works that Morgenthau consulted in writing the ethics of *SMPP* emphasized different factors that could influence different or competing ethical judgements by individuals

¹¹⁶ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 246.

in the same context. These factors are the perspective of the individual, based on the act and the goals meant to be achieved and the influence of society upon values. Overall, the strongest case for the relativism of ethical values is the problem of rationally affirming one set of ethics over another. This is a position endorsed by Edmund Burke in T.D. Weldon's *States and Morals*.¹¹⁷ Burke was an oft quoted source for Morgenthau to give credence to some aspects of his own work. The most notable example of this is the use of prudence in *PAN*. At some points of his writing Niebuhr also endorsed this view, employing the caveat that rational action, as opposed to a Christian view, cannot be impartial.¹¹⁸ This endorsement by thinkers respected by Morgenthau probably helped influence his decision to include this discussion within *SMPP*.

3.A1 Individual

The basic form of individual relativism is based upon the difference in perspective from one person to another. As Weldon notes the personal values and evaluations of the individual's relationship with others affect his view of an issue.¹¹⁹ Schwarzenberger agrees with this claim, noting that the individual needs to be aware that his evaluations on a subject are always subjective; therefore he should analyze them with knowledge of this bias.¹²⁰ Despite Morgenthau and Niebuhr's attacks on Dewey for his believe in progress Morgenthau shares similarities to Dewey in this respect as well. In their book *Ethics* Dewey and Tuft state that the specific ends which ethics can be focused towards are changeable and depend on circumstance. Therefore, the ethics of the individual change depending on the end sought.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ Weldon, *States and Morals*, 1.

¹¹⁸ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, xiii and 44.

¹¹⁹ Weldon, *States and Morals*, 275. This statement is also found in Niebuhr. See Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 28 and 37.

¹²⁰ Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 18.

¹²¹ Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, 311 and 320.

It should be noted that this form of relativism is more extreme than the position advocated by Morgenthau. Morgenthau's rejection of a shifting focus on the end is due to his claim that this renders ethics void. However, Dewey and Tufts' statement can be interpreted as a favourable claim for ethical progress. In the context in which the statement is given the authors are discussing the merits of Kantian ethics, which culminates in the idea that if an action cannot be done universally, then ethically it should not be done. Furthermore, as Dewey and Tufts note that the individual is prone to be influenced by events over time it is more practical that his actions be governed by reason instead of conscience.¹²² While Morgenthau would obviously reject this view the use of a relativistic position by a quintessential American philosopher could have helped embolden him to use such a view in his own work.

Niebuhr also endorsed the view of individual relativism in his work. In *Christianity and Power Politics* he stated that self-interest qualifies every concept and realization of justice.¹²³ This statement can be found in *SMPP*. While this position is dependent on the individual's internal state of mind Niebuhr also notes that morality should be reflective of the external circumstances.¹²⁴ Following this line of thought he notes in the same work that a result of this is that the external context forces the individual to make choices which the individual would not make in a general context. Therefore, the realities of the situation cause people to act contrary to an/their absolute ethic.¹²⁵ As Morgenthau would later state this in *SMPP* it clearly had a strong influence on his thought or at least affirmed his own opinion.

It should be stated that Niebuhr notes a caveat in this discussion. He states in *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society* that there are actions which cannot be undertaken no matter

¹²²*ibid*, 319.

¹²³ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 58.

¹²⁴ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 174.

¹²⁵ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 54 and Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 174 and 248.

the context.¹²⁶ However, he states that this is in an individual setting. In a political setting this injunction does not apply.¹²⁷ In other works Niebuhr continues this discussion by noting that political choices are particularly prone to this problem, generating a choice between relative justice and injustice.¹²⁸ By stating that political choices are highly relative he is implying that these decisions can easily be interpreted as unethical by any individual other than the one who is forced to act.¹²⁹ Therefore, the problem of political choices is not one solely of perception but of circumstances as well. This position can clearly be seen in Morgenthau's discussion of political ethics and evil in *SMPP*.

3.A2 Consequences of Relativism

The consequence of this view in *SMPP* is clear. There can be no justice without evil and injustice to others. This point is made in *Moral Man* but is worded more ambitiously. Niebuhr states that the partial perspective of each group makes justice without conflict impossible.¹³⁰ While this does open the interpretation that Niebuhr believes there can be a form of justice in conflict, based upon the other elements of relativism within his books of this period the interpretation seen in *SMPP* appears to be more valid. This point further validates the statement Morgenthau made in the footnotes of *SMPP*, that his own position was strongly influenced by Niebuhr's previous work.

Both Niebuhr and Morgenthau view the failure to appreciate the nature of relativist ethics as a clear indicator of political naiveté. Niebuhr notes that the inability to see the

¹²⁶ *ibid*, 179.

¹²⁷ *ibid*, 128.

¹²⁸ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 58.

¹²⁹ *ibid*, 75.

¹³⁰ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 32.

tension between self-interest and the general interest is a hallmark of idealism.¹³¹ Much like Morgenthau he observes that the belief that man could somehow escape his partial perspective and create parity between his own actions and transcendent ethics is a dangerous error.¹³² As noted above, this belief can be seen in the rationalist and optimist views which both Morgenthau and Niebuhr condemned.

3.B PAN relativism

Due to the different purposes between the two books Morgenthau shifts his discussion of relativism to a more macro historical level in *PAN*. Therefore, instead of focusing on the individual he uses the community and its development throughout history in the context of changing ethical positions. This shift from the individual to the community parallels his shift away from methodological individualism in ethics to a dual standard of the community and the individual as separate entities. The influence of other works on this concern two issues. The first is the impact of the community on ethics and secondly the passage of time causing a shift in ethical norms.

3.B1 Community

Of the thinkers that Morgenthau read during this period Niebuhr's discussion in *Children of Light and Children of Darkness* is closest to the community relative focus in *PAN*. Niebuhr states the influence of the historic norms within a community results in the community conditioning actions of the individual towards the community.¹³³ However, Niebuhr makes allowances for the possibility of a transcendent ethic to exist much as Morgenthau does. He notes that morals and laws are obviously the product of the community

¹³¹ Niebuhr, *Children of Light Versus Children of Darkness*, 13.

¹³² *ibid*,33.

¹³³ *ibid*, 42.

but these laws try to approach an ideal of a transcendent ethic. Despite this effort they do not succeed.¹³⁴

Carr and Weldon tend to focus on the achievements in moral philosophy throughout history being a product of certain communities. In *Conditions of Peace* Carr states that philosophical ideas invariably come from conditions and circumstance.¹³⁵ Weldon strongly argued for the understanding of philosophical ethics based upon the circumstances of the writer's time. He argues that the hypothesis comes from the conditions in which the person is situated such as the norms and practices of a community.¹³⁶ He continues the argument by stating if the individual has an ethical idea that is different from the norm; the individual modifies the idea until it reaches the threshold of acceptability for the community and the period.¹³⁷ This position differs slightly from Morgenthau's conception as Morgenthau tends to focus more strongly on material factors altering the ideas. However, the discourse in *PAN* allows the possibility that ideas can change the norms of practice, albeit very slowly. Also, the philosophical discussion by Carr and Weldon is similar to Morgenthau's, based on their assertion that the material circumstances form the norms which restrict the ideas in the period to a greater or lesser extent.

3.B2 History

Niebuhr's influence can be seen in the discussion of historical shift of attitudes towards ethics. In his work Niebuhr frequently remarked on the influence of context and norms to determine or guide action. In *Children of Light and Children of Darkness* Niebuhr argues from a deterministic position, stating that there is no absolute freedom history; choices are

¹³⁴ *ibid*, 51 and Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 155.

¹³⁵ Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, 112.

¹³⁶ Weldon, *States and Morals*, 23 and 65-66.

¹³⁷ *Ibid*.

determined by nature and past circumstances.¹³⁸ This deterministic position is muted in *Christianity and Power Politics* as Niebuhr uses relativism in a more general sense. He argues that all historic choices are relative but does note that everything in history is subject to contingencies of nature and time.¹³⁹ There are clear parallels with Morgenthau's own discussion of ethics being transformed and conditioned by the circumstances of history. It should be noted that Niebuhr's use of determinism is not mirrored by Morgenthau and therefore represents a difference between the works. Despite this, the general sense of historic relativism is present and could have been a source of influence on this element in *PAN*.

While Niebuhr used historic relativism in a general sense he also used it as a form of criticism against liberal bourgeois values. He argues that the liberal middle class does not understand the concept of relativism, assuming that there is one true rational form of values and organization. Therefore, the idea that there is an endless amount of permutations that could happen and be equally correct depending on context is rejected in favour of their particular ideology which is claimed as universal.¹⁴⁰ Morgenthau's inclusion of historic relativism in *PAN* can be seen as a subtle affirmation of Niebuhr's view.

Other writers that Morgenthau read in this period used historical relativism but had different perspectives depending on the purpose of their work. Weldon's book is a prime example of this. The focus of his book is on philosophic understandings of morals employed by different states. Within the book he states that the search for a platonic form of eternal values and laws is flawed as the values and laws are a constant reflection of the state itself rather than apart from it.¹⁴¹ Though the focus is different the sentiment is similar to Morgenthau's

¹³⁸Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 42.

¹³⁹Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 62 and 70.

¹⁴⁰ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 91.

¹⁴¹ Weldon, *States and Morals*, viii.

statements in *PAN*. In *Conditions of Peace*, which was written as a treatise to find a new form of world organization after the world, Carr proclaims that due to changing circumstances the ethics of the 19th century do not work for the modern period¹⁴² Dewey and Tufts' book *Ethics*, which is an exploration of different forms of philosophical ethics, tends to use historical relativism in a broad more general sense. Historical relativism is used to distinguish a progressive from a static society¹⁴³

4. Power

Power is an essential aspect of Morgenthau's discussion of ethics in both *SMPP* and *PAN*. In *SMPP* the concept of power inevitably mixes with the flaw of acting leading to actions which are unintentionally evil. In the discussion of ethics in *PAN* power does not play an important role. Due to transcendental ethics Morgenthau notes that power is restrained through norms which are abided by with changing frequency depending on the circumstances of the period. Therefore, the discussion of the sources which influenced Morgenthau's use of power will primarily be focused upon *SMPP*. The next two sections will exclusively relate to *SMPP* with the third, a discussion of balance of power as it relates to ethics, being tangentially related to the overall purpose and progress of the discourse in *PAN*.

4.A Ubiquity of Power

The inexorable presence of power affects all decisions and thereby leads to conflict. This position is the center of Morgenthau's discussion of ethics in *SMPP* and like the other dimensions of his ethical thought in *SMPP* is directly influenced by Niebuhr. The most obvious

¹⁴² Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, 5 and 67-68.

¹⁴³ Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, 186 and 198.

parallel is Niebuhr's highlighting the moral complexities of power.¹⁴⁴ As power is ubiquitous in any action or relationship, it must be a factor in the choices an individual makes, which has a direct bearing on the morality of these choices.¹⁴⁵ But as maintaining power is important for the success and survival of individuals the quest to gain power leads to conflict.¹⁴⁶ Therefore, Niebuhr concludes, that conflict is inevitable and power challenges power due to the relative nature of perspective in individuals.¹⁴⁷ As a result, to use power ethically the individual invested with power has to have a large amount of self-control.¹⁴⁸ As it has been shown above, Morgenthau appears to agree with this point of view.

The problem of power is increased when the individual is in a position of responsibility to the community. Morgenthau illustrates this in *SMPP* by elaborating on the concept of the ethic of responsibility and how this naturally leads to the sacrifice of some ethics in order to preserve the community. Niebuhr emphasizes this point in *Immoral Man*, stating that the individual in charge of a community must protect the community even at the risk of being selfish. However, he notes in the same passage that there are limits to this idea.¹⁴⁹ Weldon also remarks upon the ethic of responsibility by contrasting it with Kantian universal liberalism. His final position is that while the idea that people are an end in themselves is more defensible from a theoretical perspective it is harder in practice while the concept of an ethic of responsibility is harder to defend theoretically but easier in practice.¹⁵⁰

The opposing view is represented by Jacques Maritain. Maritain is one of the few modern scholars Morgenthau alludes to in the ethics section of *SMPP*. Maritain does not deny

¹⁴⁴ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 166.

¹⁴⁵ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, xxiii and 83.

¹⁴⁶ *ibid*, xx and Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness* 21.

¹⁴⁷ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, xii and xv.

¹⁴⁸ *ibid*, 164, 238 and 242.

¹⁴⁹ *ibid*, 267.

¹⁵⁰ Weldon, *States and Morals*, 128-129.

that the position of the ethic of responsibility is commonly used in practice but claims its use was pioneered philosophically by Machiavelli.¹⁵¹ He claims that the questions asked by political ethics, when answered by personal ethics, naturally respond with a transcendental answer which transcends both the context and the question itself. As a result of this transcendental answer the commonly held view is that the answer of personal ethics to political questions is not relevant.¹⁵² However, Maritain maintains that this is incorrect as the answer of political ethics is generally focused on the ruler and his own vanity, his own desire to succeed and control rather than the people for whom these decisions are theoretically meant to protect. Furthermore, he argues that in the case of a ruler who is disinterested in his own glory and genuinely is acting on behalf of the state and its people the ethic of responsibility is still flawed due to the scope of time attributed to the decision. By this he means that the defender of the ethic of responsibility only judges his acts in their immediate impact, where immediate is taken to be the instant of the action and the repercussions of the action for the lifespan of those who choose the action. Maritain argues that this timeframe is too short in which to judge action. The maturity of political action needs to be longer than one's own life. The good ultimately comes from the end of the act but the end is the culmination of all the results caused by an act. Therefore, to act with individual transcendent ethics, which in Maritain's conception is akin to Christian ethics, is the morally correct act, even if that decision costs the lives of those who depend upon the actor to protect them.¹⁵³

Morgenthau responds to this article directly in *SMPP* by stating that the end of Machiavellianism as predicted by Maritain is too orderly and too progressive and ultimately

¹⁵¹ Jacques Maritain, "The End of Machiavellianism," *The Review of Politics* 4 (1942): 2 and 3.

¹⁵² *Ibid*, 14.

¹⁵³ *Ibid*, 19.

not of this world as to escape from evil is impossible.¹⁵⁴ Indirectly, Morgenthau can be seen responding to the article in his assertion that if the end of an action is considered to be the creation of the good this ultimately renders ethics void, as all acts would be considered valid as long as the opportunity to eventually create the ultimate good could be justified.

4.B Problems of not accepting power

The position of those who do not accept the problems power poses to ethical action are the rational optimists that have been discussed above. While most of these individuals subscribed to the belief in progress through reason and the single causal mechanisms of education and laissez-faire, others tended to suggest that a world government or a world police force would solve the problems of power and conflict.¹⁵⁵ A chief example of this is found in the latter pages of Dewey and Tufts' *Ethics*. Within it they give an impassioned argument stating that it is absurd to believe that a worldwide federated community cannot be achieved. They note that from a macro perspective it is not very far off considering the early beginnings of humankind as isolated tribes.¹⁵⁶ There are numerous problems with this view. The first is that it ignores the egoistic corruption of the individual with power who uses the concept of the universal in order to further his own ends. This point is highlighted in both *SMPP* and *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*.¹⁵⁷ The second problem with this view is that it ignores the practical problems of forging a world state. Ironically as Morgenthau and Weldon note, the creation of a world state is dependent upon a shared system of ethical values amongst those who create the state. Therefore, the condition needed for a world state to exist, a shared system of ethical values, would resolve the issue that a world state is meant to solve, the

¹⁵⁴ Morgenthau, *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, 201.

¹⁵⁵ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 111-112. Also see Carr, *Conditions of Peace*, 123.

¹⁵⁶ Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, 482.

¹⁵⁷ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 22 and 36-37.

elimination of conflict. This would make the solution of a world state superfluous as the problem would have already been solved.¹⁵⁸ To Morgenthau and Niebuhr the only solution for the present is to create uneasy compromises between power and ethics.¹⁵⁹

4.C Balance of Power

The concept of balance of power has been extensively examined in other chapters, particularly in reference to rationalism and the discussion of *PAN* as it related to its contemporaries.¹⁶⁰ However, the ethical dimension of balance of power has not yet been explored. Niebuhr's opinion on balance of power is complex. At some points in his work he condemns it but at other times he states that it is necessary. In *Children of Light and Children of Darkness* Niebuhr argues that there are obvious ethical limitations with balance of power and a realist mindset cannot go beyond balance of power.¹⁶¹ In *Christianity and Power Politics* he argues that while balance of power does not escape the fear of tyranny and anarchy, justice at the moment is dependent upon it.¹⁶² However, as he continues his argument he does admit that it is possible that balance of power can be perfected by stabilized or perfected by morality.¹⁶³ This ambiguous relationship with balance of power is similar to the relationship that Morgenthau has with the concept. While balance of power is prone to violent collapse and inspires dubious ethical choices the alternative is ineffective and thus morally harmful as it would cause greater suffering.

¹⁵⁸ Weldon, *States and Morals*, 285-286. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 412 and Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 126.

¹⁵⁹ Niebuhr, *Moral Man Versus Immoral Society*, 4.

¹⁶⁰ See chapters four and six.

¹⁶¹ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 118-119

¹⁶² Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 4, 26 and 104.

¹⁶³ Niebuhr, *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*, 104.

5. Miscellaneous Issues

The transcendental is intertwined in all of the preceding sections with the exception of positivism. The optimists and the rationalists tend to believe transcendental ethics can be achieved through progress and the perfection of man through institutional mechanisms. The problem of the transcendental being the sole form of actionable ethics has been discussed in the relativist and power sections above. Much of the discussion of the transcendental has been attributed to Niebuhr, unsurprisingly considering his Christian background. It is likely that the use of this concept was influenced by Morgenthau's interaction with Niebuhr's work. This is not to say that Niebuhr introduced the concept to Morgenthau but merely that it helped the decision to use this concept and possibly sparked his own thought using this concept. Niebuhr of course was not the only one who used transcendental ethics. A notable example is Dewey. However Niebuhr's writings can reasonably be assumed to have had the most impact.¹⁶⁴

The other issues that must be briefly discussed are the influence of nationalism on ethics and consequence and motive. In the discussion of Morgenthau's ethics in *SMPP* and *PAN* the intervening factor of nationalism was mentioned. Morgenthau states that nationalism fulfills the place of a transcendental ethic, allowing the individual to place his own ego and his concept of the good in the placeholder of the state. Previously this was explicitly stated by Niebuhr in a passage in *Christianity and Power Politics*. Niebuhr states that in a secular society what must invariably occur is that the individual substitutes the concept of God, which equates to the good, with reason or the state.¹⁶⁵

The concepts of consequence and motive as the prime considerations of ethical action can also be seen in a previous work read by Morgenthau. Dewey and Tufts' *Ethics* devotes a

¹⁶⁴ Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, 137.

¹⁶⁵ Niebuhr, *Christianity and Power Politics*, 204.

substantial portion of its length to exploring this issue. Their conclusion is the same as Morgenthau's. They argue that both consequence and intention rely on each other in the decision making process, both in theory and in practice. Therefore, a separation of one from the other is not a feasible discussion.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, they note the problem of ends continuing after the action is completed. The immediate end of the act is not the true end as the consequences from it and subsequent reactions reverberate.¹⁶⁷ Dewey and Tufts' discussion showing the flaws of both forms of ethics and their inter-relation to each other is a strikingly similar discussion to Morgenthau's later section of ethics in *SMPP*.

6. Conclusion

The discussion of ethics in the two books differs due to the different purpose of the books and Morgenthau's changing conception of the state. As *SMPP* focuses on the philosophical nature of ethics and *PAN* is focused on the practical use and change of ethics throughout history it is natural that difference would occur. The change in Morgenthau's conception of the state displays a shift in his own thinking that cannot be contributed solely to a different purpose. This abandonment of methodological individualism alters the conclusions of his previous discussion in a manner that is more fundamental than simply discussing the issue from a different perspective. This shift away from methodological individualism appears to be a response to integrate with many of the authors of this period. As shown in the second section of the chapter many of Morgenthau's ideas about ethics were stated in similar forms by other authors, particularly Niebuhr. This is not to imply Morgenthau stole ideas but that he, like any other thinker was influenced in his writings by the intellectual context in which he was situated. It should be noted that despite the strong similarity between Morgenthau's ethics

¹⁶⁶ Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics*, 238.

¹⁶⁷ *ibid*, 261 and 408.

and Niebuhr's the writers diverge on some ethical statements and issues. The influence of others on Morgenthau's writings is to be expected as any author who does not alter his views depending on the time and context will have a stagnant message and one that does not resonate with the people with whom he is trying to connect.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

The thesis addresses a lacuna in the literature on Hans Morgenthau. Many of the contemporary works aim to establish a form of unity in his thought. This unity is achieved through coupling Morgenthau's work to an underlining influence. The influence takes two forms. The first is a link to a philosophical thinker such as Kant, Nietzsche or Weber. From this link the authors try to show how Morgenthau's works tend to mirror the original author's philosophy. Other works use Morgenthau's European writings to show that his later American works were variations upon his earlier writings. The majority of these works selectively draw upon all of Morgenthau's writings to enforce their thesis. This is not meant as a critique, as many of these publications implicitly acknowledge that the unity they find is through the lens of a distortive theoretical perspective. This means that by finding unity in some aspects of his writings, the purpose of their investigation inevitably privileges the conception of unity over the elements which invariably contradict. Overall, this leads to an impression that Morgenthau's works are trans-historical, united in a common metaphysical or philosophical view that is unaffected by contextual considerations. The thesis addresses this issue by explicitly highlighting tension in his early American work.

The choice of using *SMPP* and *PAN* to establish tensions in Morgenthau's work was undertaken for two reasons. Focusing on two works published in a short time frame allows a micro analysis of Morgenthau's motivation and context. This is possible in a large scale survey but the restriction of context to a smaller portion of time allows greater detail which more clearly illuminates details which would otherwise be unnoticed. Secondly, the discrepancies have not been explored in a systematic fashion. This is strange as arguably *SMPP* and *PAN* are

Morgenthau's most well-known books. Due to their prominence and the concurrent nature of their development, a comparative analysis of the books is a natural topic to explore.

The purpose is not solely to highlight a discontinuity in Morgenthau's writings. Analyzing the tensions between *SMPP* and *PAN* results in an investigation of works in this period that would otherwise be ignored. Investigating the subjects of geopolitics, rationalism and ethics in this period is a valuable glimpse at the discipline when it was in a formative stage. Little comprehensive work has been done on IR in the mid and late 40's and this thesis helps illuminate some of the writings and issues that were dominant through Morgenthau's interaction with them.

To achieve this purpose the Skinnerian method is the most logical approach. Its encouragement of analyzing little known contemporary contextual sources to understand motivation is well suited to the problems of deciphering Morgenthau's motivation and meaning. This encouragement also fulfills the goal of exploring the academic debates within the period. The major flaw in the method as it is traditionally used is its belief that the author cannot hold contradictory opinions at the same time. This is shown to be flawed as the development of *SMPP* and *PAN* partially overlapped. One of the reasons for this is that a different focus on a subject invariably leads to different conclusions.

Another factor that influenced this disjuncture between the two works was the reception of *SMPP*. The evidence hints that the tepid reception of *SMPP* by the academic community disappointed Morgenthau. This appears to have spurred him to adopt a more conventional approach in writing *PAN*. This can be seen by the similarities between *PAN* and popular textbooks of the period. The choice to modify the traditional subject matter with a

more theoretical analysis had greater success than his previous attempt to challenge the positivist orthodoxy of American academia.

A third concurrent factor for the tension is Morgenthau's acclimatization to American academia. The original basis for *SMPP* can be seen as a product of his European past. As he became more integrated with American academia he sought to use contemporary examples to illustrate his original thesis. The acclimatization is especially apparent in his treatment of geography within the books. The original rejection of quantitative evaluation is replaced in *PAN* with a moderate encouragement to use this approach. As *PAN* progresses it is clear that the use of this approach is not whole heartedly endorsed. However, its use was a staple of many American writers. The integration of these factors into his analysis leads to a noticeable shift towards a more rationalist outlook.

The tensions between the books are a product of three simultaneous factors. The difference in subject matter between the two books leads to differences in tone and context which invariably results in areas where the two books contradict. The mediocre reception of *SMPP* led to a more orthodox approach in *PAN*. This change of approach influenced the nature of the discussion of similar topics resulting in noticeable differences between the books. Thirdly, as Morgenthau became more integrated with the American community he adopted some of the common forms of analysis. This adoption ensured that the discussion of similar subjects in *SMPP* and *PAN* fundamentally differed.

Bibliography

Anderson, William. "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 250 (1947): 135-136.

Armstrup, Niels. "The 'Early' Morgenthau: A Comment on the Intellectual Origins of Realism," *Cooperation and Conflict* 13 (1978): 163-175

Ashley, Richard K. "Political Realism and Human Interests," *Political Studies Quarterly* 25 (1981): 204-236.

Ashworth, Lucian M. *Creating International Studies. Angell, Mitrany and the Liberal Tradition*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.

———. "Did the Realist-Idealist Debate Really Happen? A Revisionist History Of International Relations," *International Relations* 16 (2002): 33-51.

———. *International Relations Theory and the Labour Party: Intellectuals and Policy Making 1918-1945*. London: IB Tauris, 2007.

———. "Mapping a New World: Geography and the Interwar Study of International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 57 (2013): 138–149.

———. "Realism and the spirit of 1919: Halford Mackinder, geopolitics and the reality of the League of Nations," *European Journal of International Relations* 17 (2010): 279-301.

———. "Where the Idealist in Interwar International Relations?," *Review of International Studies* 32 (2006): 291-308.

Austin, J.L. *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Balakrishnan, Gopal. *The Enemy: An Intellectual Portrait of Carl Schmitt*. London: Verso, 2000.

Barkin, J. Samuel. "Realist Constructivism," *International Studies Review* 5 (2003): 325-342.

Barkawi, Tarak. "Strategy as a Vocation: Weber, Morgenthau and Modern Strategic Studies," *Review of International Studies* 24 (1998):159-184.

Bell, Duncan. "Empire and International Relations in Victorian Political Thought," *The Historical Journal* 49 (2006): 281-298.

———. "International Relations: Dawn of a historiographical turn?," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 3 (2001):115-126.

———. "Language, Legitimacy and the Project of Critique," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27 (2002): 327-350.

———. "Political Theory and the functions of Intellectual history: a response to Emmanuel Navon," *Review of International Studies* 29 (2003): 151-160.

———. "Unity and Difference: John Robert Seeley and the political theology of international relations," *Review of International Studies* 31 (2005): 559-579.

———. "Writing the World," *International Affairs* 85 (2009): 3-22.

Bloet, Brian W. "Political Geographers Of The Past V: The political career of Sir Halford Mackinder," *Political Geography Quarterly* 6 (1987): 355-367.

Bowman, Isaiah. *Geography In Relation To The Social Sciences*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

———. "Geography vs. Geopolitics," *Geographical Review* 32 (1942):646-658.

———. "Review of America's Strategy in World Politics," *Geographical Review* 32 (1942):349-352.

Brinson, Susan L. *The Red Scare, Politics, and the Federal Communications Commission, 1941-1960*. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Brodie, Bernard. "Sea Power in World Politics," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 275-290. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

Brown, Chris. "International Political Theory – A British Social Science?," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 2 (2000):114-123.

- . “The Twilight of International Morality? Hans J. Morgenthau and Carl Schmitt on the end of the *Jus Publicum Europaeum*” in *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau in International Relations* edited by Michael C. Williams, 42-61. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Brown, Francis James and Joseph Roucek, “About Face!,” in *Contemporary World Politics: An Introduction to the Problems Of International Relations*, edited by Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges and Joseph Slabey Roucek, 707-735. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.
- Brown, Francis James, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek eds. *Contemporary World Politics: An Introduction to the Problems Of International Relations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.
- Bryson, Lyman. *The New Prometheus*. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- Burns, R.M. “Language Tradition and the self in the generation of meaning,” *History of European Ideas* 28 (2002): 51-75.
- Cahnman, Werner J. “Concepts of Geopolitics,” *American Sociological Review* 8 (1943): 55-59.
- . “Methods of Geopolitics,” *Social Forces* 21 (1942): 147-154.
- Carr, E.H. *Conditions of Peace*. London: Macmillan Publishing, 1942.
- . “Review of International Studies in Modern Education,” *International Affairs* 17 (1938): 541-543.
- . *The Twenty Years’ Crisis*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- Carroll, Marie J. “The Catholic View Of Peace,” in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 647-662. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.
- Catlin, G.E.G. *The Science And Method of Politics*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
- Chapman, Bert. *Geopolitics: A Guide To The Issues*. Oxford: Praeger, 2011.

Cohen, Morris R. and Ernest Nagel, *An Introduction To Logic and Scientific Method* London: Jarrold and Sons, 1934.

D'Annunzio, Ugo V. "The Fascist Autarchy," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 597-613. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

DeBres, Karen. "Political Geographers of the Past IV: George Renner and the great map scandal of 1942," *Political Geography Quarterly* 5 (1986): 385-394.

Dewey, John and James H. Tufts, *Ethics*. New York: Henry Holt, 1908.

Draper, Theodore. "The Communist International's Road To Peace," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 614-633. New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

Dryzek, John and Stephen T Leonard, "History and Discipline in Political Science," *The American Political Science Review* 82 (1988): 1245-1260.

Dunne, John. "The Identity of The History of Ideas," *Philosophy* 43 (1968): 85-104.

Dupuis, Charles. *Le Principe d'équilibre et le Concert Europeen*. Paris:Perrin et Cie,1909.

Dupuy, R. Ernest. "Nations At War," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek, 100-118. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

Elman, Colin and Miriam Fendius Elman, "Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory: Respecting Difference and Crossing Boundaries," *International Security* 22 (1997): 5-21.

Emeny, Brooks. *The Strategy of Raw Materials*. New York: Macmillan, 1934.

Fairgrieve, James. *Geography And World Power*. New York: E.P.Dutton and Company, 1917.

Finney, Patrick. "Still Marking Time? Text, discourse, and truth in International History," *Review of International Studies* 27 (2001): 291-308.

Flanders, Dwight P. "Geopolitics and American Post-War Policy," *Political Science Quarterly* 60 (1945): 578-585.

Forster, Micheal N. "Hermeneutics" in *The Oxford Handbook of Continental Philosophy* edited by Leiter and Rosen, 30-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Fox, William T.R. "Interwar International Relations Research: The American Experience," *World Politics* 2 (1949): 67-79.

Fox, William T.R. and Annette Baker Fox, "The Teaching of International Relations in The United States," *World Politics* 13 (1961): 339-359.

Friedrich, Carl J. "Instruction and Research: Political Science in the United States in Wartime," *The American Political Science Review* 41 (1947): 978-989.

Frei, Christoph. *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography*. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 2001.

Friedrich, Carl J. "Instruction and Research: Political Science in the United States in Wartime," *The American Political Science Review* 41 (1947): 978-989.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. London: Continuum, 1989.

George, Alexander. "Knowledge for Statecraft" *International Security* 22 (1997): 44-52.

Gettell, Raymond Garfield. *Political Science*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1933.

———. "Review of Essays in Political Science," *American Political Science Review* 31 (1937): 957-958.

Gooch, R.K. "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *American Political Science Review* 41 (1947): 335-336.

Goodrich. Leland M. "Review of International Politics: The Destiny of the Western State System," *The American Political Science Review* 43 (1949): 153-156.

Guilhot, Nicholas. "American Katechon: When Political Theology Became International Relations Theory," *Constellations* 17 (2010): 224-253.

———. “Politics between and beyond nations. Hans J. Morgenthau’s Politics Among Nations,” in *Classics of International Relations* edited by Henrik Biddal, Casper Sylvest and Peter Wilson, 69-79, Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.

———. ed., *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, The Rockefeller Foundation and The 1954 Conference on Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Gunnell, John G. “Interpretation and the History of Political Theory: An Apology and Epistemology,” *The American Political Science Review* 76 (1982): 317-327.

Gurian, Waldemar. “On The Study of International Relations,” *The Review Of Politics* 8 (1946): 275-282.

———. “Review of Politics Among Nations and International Politics,” *The Review Of Politics* 11 (1949): 255-259.

Haber, Stephen H., David M. Kennedy and Stephen D. Krasner, “Brothers Under the Skin: Diplomatic History and International Relations,” *International Security* 22 (1997): 34-43.

Hagan, Charles B. “Geopolitics,” *The Journal Of Politics* 4 (1942): 478-490.

Halliday, Fred. “The End of the Cold War and International Relations: Some Analytical and Theoretical Conclusions,” in *International Relations Theory Today* edited by Ken Booth and Steve Smith, 38-61, Cambridge: Polity, 1995.

Hallowell, John H. “Politics and Ethics,” *The American Political Science Review* 38 (1944): 639-655.

Hans Morgenthau Archive. Library of Congress. Washington D.C.

Hartshorne, Richard. “Recent Developments in Political Geography I,” *The American Political Science Review* 29 (1935): 785-804.

———. “Recent Developments in Political Geography II,” *The American Political Science Review* 29 (1935): 943-966.

- . "Review of the Earth and the State," *Geographical Review* 30 (1940): 508-510.
- Heicher, Winchester H. "Geography and World Politics," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 42-58. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.
- Hodges, Charles. "The War Itself: First Deductions," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges and Joseph Slabey Roucek, 736-767. New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1940.
- Hoffman, Stanley. "An American Social Science: International Relations," *Daedalus* 106 (1977): 41 -60
- Holden, Gerald. "Who contextualizes the contextualizers? Disciplinary history and the discourse about IR discourse," *Review of International Studies* 28 (2002): 252-270.
- Hollis, Martin and Quentin Skinner, "Action and Context," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society: Supplementary Volumes* 52 (1978): 43-69.
- Honig, Jan Willem. "Totalitarianism and Realism: Hans Morgenthau's German Years," in *Roots of Realism* edited by Benjamin Frankel, 283-313, London: Frank Cass, 1996.
- Hooker, William. *Carl Schmitt's International Thought: Order and Orientation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Hoover, Glenn E. "The Economic Struggle For Power," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 167-185. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.
- Internet Archive. "Why We Fight: The Nazis Strike" <http://archive.org/details/TheNazisStrike> [last accessed September 23rd 2014].
- Isacoff, Johnathan B. "On the Historical Imagination of International Relations: The Case for a 'Deweyan Reconstruction'," *Millennium* 31 (2002): 603-626.
- Ingram, Edward. "The Wonderland of The Political Scientist," *International Security* 22 (1997): 53-63

Janssen, Peter L. "Political Thought as Traditionary Action: The Critical Response to Skinner and Pocock," *History and Theory* 24 (1985): 115-146.

Jervis, Robert. "Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics," *Social Research* 61 (1994): 853-876.

Jutersonke, Oliver. *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Kalijarvi, Thorsten V. "Diplomacy and Power Politics," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 209-220. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "International Law," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 98-109. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. ed., *Modern World Politics*, 2nd ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "Planning As A World Force," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 452-476. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "Preface" in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, v-vi. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "The Continent of Europe," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 507-535. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "The United States," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 593-617. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "What is Power Politics?" in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 3-24. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

———. "World Economics," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 75-97. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

Kaufmann, Felix. *Methodology Of The Social Sciences*. London: Oxford University Press, 1944.

Kaufmann, Robert. "Morgenthau's Unrealistic Realism," *Yale Journal Of International Affairs* 1 (2006): 24-38.

King Jr., Morton. "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Rural Sociology* 12 (1947): 79-80.

Kirk, Grayson. "Review of Geographical Foundations of National Power," *Geographical Review* 36 (1946): 165-166.

———. *The Study of International Relations: In American Colleges and Universities*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1947.

Knutsen, Torbjørn L. "A Lost Generation? IR Scholarship Before WW1," *International Politics* 45 (2008): 650-674.

Koskenniemi, Martti. *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall Of International Law 1870-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Lang, Anthony F. Jr. "Morgenthau, Agency and Aristotle" in *Realism Reconsidered* edited by Williams, 18-41, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———.ed. *Political Theory and International Affairs: Hans J. Morgenthau on Aristotle's 'The Politics'*. Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Lasswell, Harold D. *Psychopathology and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

Lebow, Richard Ned. *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Lerner, Max. *It Is Later Than You Think*. New York: Viking Press, 1939.

Levine, Daniel. *Recovering International Relations: The Promise of Sustainable Critique* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Long, David and Peter Wilson, eds., *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-War Idealism Reassessed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

- Lottick, Kenneth V. "Why and How To Teach a Unit in Geopolitical Understanding," *Journal of Geography* 48 (1949): 207-213.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *Discourses on the Ten Books of Titus Livy*, translated by Harvey C Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Mackinder, Halford J. *Democratic Ideals and Reality*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1942.
- . "The Geographic Pivot of History," *The Geographic Journal* 23 (1904):421-437.
- . "The Round World and The Winning Of The Peace," *Foreign Affairs* 21 (1943): 595-605.
- Manning, C.A.W. "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *World Affairs* 1 (1947): 47-50.
- Maritain, Jacques. "The End of Machiavellianism," *The Review of Politics* 4 (1942): 1-33.
- Mattern , Johannes. *Geopolitik: Doctrine of National Self-Sufficiency and Empire*. Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1942.
- Mattusch, Kurt R. "Geopolitics "science" of Power Politics," *Amerasia* 6 (1942): 236-243.
- Merriam, Charles. *New Aspects of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- . *Systematic Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- . "The Natural Resources Planning Board: A Chapter in American Planning Experience," *The American Political Science Review* 38 (1944): 1075-1088.
- Mollov, M. Benjamin. *Power and Transcendence: Hans J. Morgenthau and the Jewish Experience*. Cumnor Hill: Lexington Books, 2002.
- Molloy, Sean. "Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of The Lesser Evil," *Journal of International Political Theory* 5 (2009): 94-112.
- . "'Cautious Politics': Morgenthau and Hume's Critique of Balance Of Power," *International Politics* 50 (2013): 768-783.
- . *The Hidden History of Realism*. New York: Palgrave, 2006.

———. “Truth, Power, Theory: Hans Morgenthau’s Formulation of Realism,” *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 15 (2004): 1-34.

Morgenthau, Hans. “Ethics and Politics” in *Approaches To Group Understanding: Sixth Symposium Of The Conference On Science, Philosophy and Religion*, edited by Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelman and R.M. MacIver, 319-341. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

———. “Fragment of an Intellectual Autobiography: 1904-1932” in *Truth and Tragedy: A Tribute to Hans J. Morgenthau* edited by Kenneth Thompson and Robert J. Myers, 1-17, Washington: The New Republic Book Company, 1977.

———. “Implied Limitations on Regulatory Powers in Administrative Law,” *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 11 (1944): 91-116.

———. “Implied Regulatory Powers in Administrative Law,” *The Iowa Law Review* 28 (1943): 575-612.

———. “Letter From Hans Morgenthau,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 252 (1947): 173-174.

———. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle For Power and Peace. 1st ed.* New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1948.

———. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle For Power and Peace. 3rd ed.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963

———. “Review of Power Politics,” *American Journal of International Law* 36 (1942): 351-352.

———. “Review of States and Morals,” *Journal of Political Economy* 56 (1948): 553.

———. *The Concept of The Political*, edited by Felix Rosch and Hartmut Behr. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

———. “The Evil of Politics and the Ethics of Evil,” *Ethics* 56 (1945): 1-18.

———. “The Machiavellian Utopia,” *Ethics* 55 (1945): 145-147.

- . “The Political Philosophy of Prussianism,” in *The Decline of Democratic Politics*, 220-226. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- . “The Political Science of E.H.Carr,” *World Politics* 1 (1948): 127-134.
- . “The relationship between the political philosophy of liberalism and foreign policy, with special reference to the basic ideas of pre- and post-World War foreign policy” *Yearbook of the American Philosophical Society* (1941): 211-214.
- . “The Scientific Solution of Social Conflicts” in *Approaches to National Unity: Fifth Symposium* edited by Lyman Bryson, Louis Finkelman and R.M. MacIver, 419-443. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945.
- . *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- Murray, A.J.H. “The Moral Politics of Hans Morgenthau,” *The Review of Politics* 58 (1996): 81-107.
- Neascu, Mihaela. *Hans J. Morgenthau’s Theory of International Relations: Disenchantment and Re-Enchantment*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*. London: Nisbet and Co, 1944.
- . *Christianity and Power Politics*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1940
- . *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1932.
- . “Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics,” *Christianity and Society* (1947): 33-34
- Nobel, Jaap W. “Morgenthau’s Struggle With Power: the theory of power politics and the Cold War,” *Review of International Studies* 21 (1995): 61-85.
- . “Morgenthau’s Theory and Practice: A Response to Peter Gellman” *Review of International Studies* 15 (1989): 261-271.

O Tuathail, Gearoid, Simon Dalby, and Paul Routledge. eds., *The Geopolitics Reader*, 2nd ed. New York, Routledge, 2006.

Oakeshott, Michael. "Political Education" in *Rationalism in Politics And Other Essays*. Liberty Fund: Indianapolis, 1991. 43-69.

———. "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *The Cambridge Journal* 1 (1948): 347-358.

Odysseos, Louiza and Fabio Pettito. eds. *The International Political Thought of Carl Schmitt: Terror, Liberal War, and the crisis of global order*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Osiander, Andreas. "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited," *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1998): 409-432.

Palonen, Kari. *Quentin Skinner: History, Politics, Rhetoric*. Oxford: Polity Press, 2003.

Patomaki, Heikki and Colin Wight, "After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism" *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (2002): 213-237.

Petersen, Ulrick Enemark. "Breathing Nietzsche's Air," *Alternatives: Local, Global, Political* 24 (1999): 83-118.

Pichler, Hans-Karl. "The Godfathers of "Truth: Max Weber and Carl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics," *Review of International Studies* 24 (1998): 185-200.

Pin-Fat, Veronique. "The Metaphysics of the National Interest and The Mystique of The Nation-State: Reading Hans Morgenthau," *Review of International Studies* 31 (2005): 217-36.

Poole, Dewitt Clint. "Diplomacy," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek, 411-430. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

Possony, Stephan P. "Aeopolitics," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 291-317. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

Ransom, Harry Howe. "International Relations," *The Journal Of Politics* 30 (1968): 345-371.

Rengger, Nicholas. "Realism, tragedy and the anti-Pelagian imagination in international political thought," in *Realism Reconsidered* edited by Michael C. Williams, 118-136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

———. "The fearful sphere of international relations," *Review of International Studies* 16 (1990): 361-368.

Renouvin, Pierre and Jean-Bapiste Duroselle, *Introduction To The History of International Relations*. New York: Frederick A Praeger, 1961.

Rice, Daniel. "Reinhold Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau: A Friendship With Contrasting Shades of Realism," *Journal of American Studies* 42 (2008): 255-291.

Rice, Dorothy. *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Rice, Stuart. *Quantitative Methods in Politics*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1928.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

———. "The Model of a Text: Meaningful Action Considered As a Text," *New Literary History* 5 (1973), 91-117.

Ringer, Fritz. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Rosch, Felix and Hartmut Behr. "Introduction," in *The Concept of The Political* edited by Felix Rosch and Hartmut Behr, 3-79. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Roucek, Joseph. "Geopolitics, Imperialism and War," in *Modern World Politics*, edited by Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, 339-365. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1946.

Russell, Frank M. "The Growth of The Idea of International Organization," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek, 377-391. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

Scheuerman, William E. *Carl Schmitt*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.

———. “Carl Schmitt and Hans Morgenthau: Realism and beyond,” in *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau in International Relations* edited by Michael C. Williams, 62-92. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. *Morgenthau*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.

———. “Realism and the Left: The Case of Hans J. Morgenthau,” *Review of International Studies* 34 (2008): 29-51.

———. “Was Morgenthau a Realist? Revisiting Scientific Man Versus Power Politics,” *Constellations* 14 (2007): 506-530.

Schmidt, Brian C. “Competing Realist Conceptions of Power,” *Millennium* 33 (2005): 523-49.

———. “Lessons From the Past: Reassessing the Inter-war Disciplinary History of International Relations,” *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (1998): 433-459.

———. “On the History and Historiography of International Relations,” in *Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmond, 3-22. London: Sage, 2002.

———. “Political Science and the American Empire: A Disciplinary History of the ‘Politics’ Section and the Discourse of Imperialism and Colonialism,” *International Politics* 45 (2008): 675-687.

———. “The historiography of academic international relations” *Review of International Studies* 20 (1994); 349-367.

———. *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1998.

Schochet, Gordon J. “Quentin Skinner’s Method,” *Political Theory* 2 (1974): 261-276.

Schuett, Robert. "Freudian Roots of Political Realism: the importance of Sigmund Freud to Hans J. Morgenthau's theory of international politics," *History of the Human Sciences* 20 (2007): 53-78.

———. *Political Realism, Freud, and Human Nature in International Relations: The Resurrection of the Realist Man*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Schuman, Fredrick L. *International Politics: The Western State System in Transition*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1941.

———. *International Politics: The Destiny of The Western State System*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

———. "Let Us Learn Our Geopolitics," *Current History* 5 (1942): 161-165.

———. "Review of Scientific Man Versus Power Politics," *Journal of Political Economy* 55 (1947): 470-471.

Schupmann, Benjamin A. *Morgenthau mal compris: Investigating the Philosophical Roots of Hans Morgenthau's Political Realism*. Saarbrücken: Verlag Dr. Müller, 2011.

Schwarzenberger, Georg. *Power Politics*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1941.

Sharp, Walter R. and Grayson Kirk. *Contemporary International Politics*. New York: Rinehart Company, 1946.

Shepard, Walter James. "Political Science," in *History and Prospects Of The Social Sciences*, edited by Harry Elmer Barnes, 396-443. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925.

Shilliam, Robbie. *German Thought and International Relations: The Rise and Fall of a Liberal Project*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Shinn, Robert L. "Realism and Ethics in Political Philosophy" in *Truth and Tragedy: A Tribute to Hans J. Morgenthau* edited by Kenneth Thompson and Robert J. Myers (Washington: The New Republic Book Company, 1977), 95-103.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behaviour: A Study of Decision Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 1st ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1945.

Short, Ernest H. *A Handbook Of Geo-Politics*. London: Phillip Alan, 1935.

Simmonds, Frank H. and Brooks Emeny, *The Great Powers in World Politics: International Relations and Economic Nationalism*, 2nd ed. New York: American Book Company, 1939.

Skinner, Quentin. "A Reply to My Critics," in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. James Tully. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988, 231-288.

———. "Conventions and the Understanding of Speech Acts," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 20(1970): 118-138.

———. "Hermeneutics and the Role of History," *New Literary History* 7 (1975): 209-232.

———. "Introduction," in *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences* edited by Quentin Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. 1-20.

———. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8 (1969): 3-53.

———. "Motives, Intentions and the Interpretation of Texts," *New Literary History* 3 (1972): 393-408.

———. "On Performing and Explaining Linguistic Actions," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 21 (1971): 1-21.

———. "Some Problems in the Analysis of Political Thought and Action," *Political Theory* 2 (1974): 277-303.

———. "The Limits of Historical Explanations," *Philosophy* 41 (1966): 199-215.

- Smith, Mark C. *Social Science In The Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918 – 1941*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994.
- Smith, Michael Joesph. *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger*. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1986.
- Smith, Neil. *American Empire: Roosevelt`s Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*. Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2003.
- . “Political Geographers Of The Past Isaiah Bowman: Political Geography and Geopolitics,” *Political Geography Quarterly* 3 (1984): 69-76.
- Speer, James P. “Hans Morgenthau and The World State,” *World Politics* 20 (1968): 207-227.
- Spykman, Nicholas J. *America’s Strategy in World Politics: The United States and the Balance of Power*. New York: Harcourt, Brace And Company, 1942.
- . “Frontiers, Security and International Organization,” *Geographical Review* 32 (1942): 436-447.
- . “Geography and Foreign Policy I,” *The American Political Science Review* 32 (1938): 28-50.
- . “Geography and Foreign Policy II,” *The American Political Science Review* 32 (1938): 213-236.
- . *Geography of The Peace* New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1944.
- . “Review of Geopolitics: The Struggle For Space and Power and Geopolitik: Doctrine of Self Sufficiency and Empire,” *Political Science Quarterly* 57 (1942): 598-601.
- Stone, Lawrence. *The Past and The Present*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Storch. Randi. *Red Chicago: American Communism at its Grassroots 1928-1935*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007.

Strausz-Hupe, Robert. *Geopolitics: The Struggle for Space and Power*. New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1942.

———. "Review of *The Geography Of The Peace*," *Military Affairs* 8 (1944): 144-145.

Sylvest, Casper. "Interwar Internationalism, the British Labour Party, and the Historiography of International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2004): 409-432.

Tjalve, Vibeke Schou. *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace: Niebuhr, Morgenthau, and the Politics of Patriotic Dissent*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Thompson, Kenneth. "The Study of International Politics: A Survey of Trends and Developments," *The Review Of Politics* 14 (1952): 433-467.

Tucker, Robert W. "Review: Professor Morgenthau's Theory of Political 'Realism'," *The American Political Science Review* 46 (1952): 214-224.

Turner, Stephen and George Mazur, "Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist," *European Journal of International Relations* 15 (2009): 477-504.

Van Kirk, Walter W. "The Protestant View of Peace," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by, Brown, Hodges and Roucek, 663-673. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.

"Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (adopted 23 May 1969, entered in force 27 January 1980) 1155 UNTS 331 (VCLT).

Waever, Ole. "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations," *International Organization* 52 (1998): 687-727.

Warren III, Frank A. *Liberals and Communism: The "Red Decade" Revisited*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.

- Watkins, James T. "Review of Contemporary International Politics, Elements of International Relations, and Principles and Problems of International Relations," *American Political Science Review* 34 (1940): 806-808.
- Weigert, Hans W. *German Geopolitics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1941.
- . "Haushofer and the Pacific," *Foreign Affairs* 20 (1942): 734-744.
- Weldon, T.D. *States and Morals: A Study In Political Conflicts*. London, John Murray, 1946.
- Whittlesey, Derwent. *German Strategy Of World Conquest*. London, F.E.Robinson and Co. 1942.
- . "Haushofer: The Geopoliticians," in *Makers of Modern Strategy*, ed. Edward Mead Earle (London, Oxford University Press, 1943),388-411.
- Whyte, William Foote. "Instruction and Research: A Challenge To Political Scientists," *The American Political Science Review* 37 (1943): 692-697.
- Williams, Michael C. ed., *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans J Morgenthau in International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- . *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Wilson, Peter. "The Myth of the "First Great Debate,"" *Review of International Studies* 24 (1998): 1-16.
- . "Where are we now in the Debate about the First Great Debate?," in *International Relations and the First Great Debate*, ed. Brian C. Schmidt, 133-152. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1953
- Wolfers, Arnold. "International Relations As a Field of Study," *Columbia Journal of International Affairs* 1 (1947): 24.

Wong, Benjamin. "Han's Morgenthau's Anti-Machiavellian Machiavellianism" *Millennium* 29 (2000): 389-409.

Wright, John K. "Training For Research In Political Geography," *Annals of The Association of American Geographers* 34 (1944): 190-201.

Wright, Quincy. "International Law," in *Contemporary World Politics*, edited by Francis James Brown, Charles Hodges, Joseph Slabey Roucek, 392-410. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1940.