

POLITICS AT ITS DEMISE: E. H. CARR, 1931-1939

By

KUNIYUKI NISHIMURA

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2009

© 2009 Kuniyuki Nishimura

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ABSTRACT.....	5
CHAPTER	
1 PROLOGUE.....	6
Carr and International Studies.....	6
Why Carr?.....	6
Why Carr Now?.....	9
Why Biographies?.....	13
Approach.....	20
Structure.....	25
2 THE QUESTION.....	27
Dostoevsky as the Other.....	27
Dostoevsky as Synthesizer.....	29
Dostoevsky as Prophet.....	34
The Dawn of an Age.....	37
3 WRONG ANSWERS.....	40
The Romantic Tragedy.....	40
Herzen and the Difficulty of Love.....	41
Turn to the Radicals.....	45
The Tragedy Reprised.....	47
Bakunin's Spectacular Life.....	47
The Rise of Individualism.....	54
Against Romance.....	59
Marx's Unspectacular Life.....	59
The Fall of Individualism.....	61
Beyond Failures.....	67
4 IN THE PRESENT CRISIS.....	70
Escape from Abstraction.....	71
Economic Man Leaves.....	73
History Rages.....	76
Civilization Recovers.....	82
Political Man Arrives.....	89
History against History.....	94

5	RELUCTANT RETREAT.....	97
	Two Cultures.....	99
	Victorian Progressivism.....	99
	Modernist Decadence.....	104
	Divided Text.....	107
	With Victorians.....	108
	With Modernists.....	112
	The Heart of the Tear.....	116
	Being British.....	118
	Saving England.....	119
	Conquering Europe.....	122
	A Long Detour.....	126
6	EPILOGUE.....	131
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	142
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	153

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

POLITICS AT ITS DEMISE: E. H. CARR, 1931-1939

By

Kuniyuki Nishimura

May 2009

Chair: Ido Oren
Cochair: J. Samuel Barkin
Major: Political Science

Despite the revived popularity of Carr in the recent scholarship of international studies, the existing inquiries into *The Twenty Years' Crisis* are still limited because of their lack of attentions to historical contexts. The present study aims at advancing our reassessment of this classical work by clarifying its connection to Carr's early biographical works: *Dostoevsky*, *The Romantic Exiles*, *Karl Marx*, and *Michael Bakunin*. Despite their seeming irrelevancy to international studies, these works vividly clarify one of Carr's deepest concerns in his early academic life: the European crisis. Given this concern, *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is not so much a polemic against interwar idealists as an attempt of political philosophy to tackle with the tension between man and society in the post-individualist age. Carr tried to transcend the deterministic force of history in the difficult era, when the Great War and the succeeding quagmires had demonstrated the possibility of human degeneration after the long reign of rational progressivism. Although his solution ended up a retreat to the old Victorian mode of thinking, the ambivalence of Carr suggests the difficulty of the question in political philosophy. The real value of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* resides not in its insights about specific issues but in its clear revelation of the difficulty of political studies in the post-Enlightenment era. The present study thus attempts to add a contribution to the recent revisions of the history of international studies.

CHAPTER 1 PROLOGUE

Each individual person is bodily and mentally independent. Yet the separation does not guarantee self-sufficiency. A communal form of life arises from demand. However, the original distinctness of each individual becomes endangered because of this communal form of life. Human independence is both the condition and the hindrance of politics. As the number of individuals increases, this inherent difficulty becomes aggrandized. Politics impinges its original aim through its development. The rise of international politics, politics in the largest community on earth, demonstrates this paradox in a remarkable manner. International politics is the form of politics which reveals the limit of politics. What follows is a story about this strange invention.

Carr and International Studies

The present study is an inquiry into the history of the field of international studies. The specific focus is on the writings of Edward Hallett Carr (1892-1982) and the primary subject is from which context his *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (1939a) arose. The present work attempts to unravel the significance of the connection between this monumental work and the four biographies which Carr wrote before it: *Dostoevsky* (1931), *The Romantic Exiles* (1933), *Karl Marx* (1934), and *Michael Bakunin* (1937a). My objective is to reveal the philosophical foundation of his historical thinking by grasping these five works as a consecutive effort to tackle with the European problems in the years between the two World Wars. In this introductory chapter, I will discuss why it is important to study Carr, why scholars of international studies need to read biographies, and which approach is appropriate for the project of this present study.

Why Carr?

To understand the significance of Carr today, it is necessary to grasp the current status of the studies concerning his works. The recent revisions of Carr appeared most remarkably in the

field of international studies. Carr is significant mainly because of his position in the history of this academic field.

The typical narrative of the history of international studies is the so-called Great Debates view. Despite the wide acceptance of this narrative, scholars do not necessarily share the understanding neither about how many debates have occurred in the past nor about what the primary issue in each debate was. Yet, at least, one of the most popular stories unfolds as follows (see Schmidt 2002a). The First Debate occurred in the 1930s and 1940s between idealists (or utopians) and classical realists. The Second Debate was between behavioral positivists and classical realists in the 1960s. The Third Debate started in the 1980s and is ongoing. The main issue in this debate is not necessarily clear, as the inventor of the term already realized (Lapid 1989). It is variously identified as inter-paradigm conflicts: sometimes it signifies the debate between neorealism and neoliberalism; other times it points to the segregation of interpretive approaches from broadly positivist approaches.

This narrative is helpful for grasping the overview of the development of the discipline. Yet its advantage accompanies a certain cost of excessive simplification. For instance, it is doubtful how positivism improved classical realism. The Great Debate narrative tells us that realism has become a more sophisticated theory through its exposure to positivist epistemologies. Yet leading classical realists such as Hans Morgenthau (1946; 1972) did not think of positivism as consistent with political realism. Indeed, it is not sufficiently clear what it means to be scientific to begin with.

The Great Debate narrative is not only silent about such issue but it also vindicates the legitimacy of the field's establishment through such a factually unsupported story. For example, many current forms of realism would prove to be theoretically flawed if realism were really

incompatible with positivism as Morgenthau claimed. Such issue is problematic especially when critical theorists have attacked the positivist assumptions of these realisms in the last decades. Provided that disciplinary history tells us not only where the discipline came from but also in which direction it is moving, the revision of its origin has crucial importance for understanding both the limits and the possibilities of the current scholarship (see Dryzek and Leonard 1988). The revision of the history of the discipline directly concerns the contemporary debate in the field.

Carr occupies a unique place in the recent revisionism. One of the reasons is that he has been among the most popular classical theorists both in the textbooks and the syllabi in graduate courses. He was also one of the earliest advocates of the realist view of international relations. The dichotomization of realism and idealism is supposed to have stemmed from his distinction between reality and utopia in his *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (1939a). Morgenthau's *Politics among Nations* (1948a) later became a more popular literature partly because of its schematic and synoptic format. But *The Twenty Years' Crisis* was published nine years earlier. Other eminent classical realists occasionally appear in academic discourses. Chronologically, Reinhold Niebuhr provided *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932) before Carr presented *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. But Niebuhr has not, for any reasons, become as canonical a figure as Carr or Morgenthau in the history of international studies. It is possible to make a similar statement about other classical theorists such as Arnold Wolfers and Nicholas Spykman.

Another, but not scrutinized, uniqueness of Carr is that he was British. The Great Debate narrative is notably the story of international studies in the United States. This point is worth stressing since both Carr and Morgenthau were non-Americans whereas they have been recognized as the pioneers of American international studies. Morgenthau became popular as a

scholar of international relations mostly after he immigrated to the United States. Carr basically remained in Britain. Indeed, many idealists in the Great Debate narrative, the antagonists of Carr, were also British. It is not a coincidence that early revisionist studies of Carr first came from the so-called English School of international studies in Britain. For example, Tim Dunne (1998: chap. 2) considers Carr as the origin of the English School. If the Great Debate narrative is more ideological than accurately historical, therefore, the problem is magnified in the case of Carr because of its ignorance of contexts. Insofar as Carr is recognized to have established the academic discipline of international studies through his attack on idealism, the clarification of this issue can be crucial for those who believe that Carr's realism is the origin of contemporary international studies.

Why Carr Now?

Therefore, to unravel Carr's thinking is significant not only for understanding the history of the field but also for deciding the appropriate direction of its present and future scholarship. However, some might ask if we need another study of Carr. The discipline of international studies already saw many inquiries into Carr and the First Debate in the last decades.

To justify the present project, therefore, it is necessary to clarify the flaws of the existing inquiries into Carr. I do not doubt that the recent revisions have remarkably advanced our understanding of Carr and thus the origin of the field. They provide more historically convincing views than the previous scholarship has achieved. Yet the revisionists show their own ignorance of historical contexts. I have two related points to make about this issue.

To begin with, we do not yet have much historical studies of Carr. This statement might sound counterintuitive to those who are already familiar with the recent literatures. Yet the trajectory of the recent revisionism suggests this fact.

What is important is that the current revisionism is not a single unitary body of movement. It is rather an amalgam of several different attempts to replace the existing view of the field's history. As I already mentioned, its revision has strong implications for critical theorists who attempt to denaturalize the legitimacy of positivist schools in the discipline. Yet the revisionist movement is not exclusively connected to anti-positivism. As the Third Debate involved various reactions to the slightly distinct schools of thought such as positivism (a philosophy of science), political realism (a normative approach to politics), and structural realism (an empirical theory), the revision of the history came from, and brought about, different concerns.

The debate between structural realists and their critics were multifaceted as the target of criticism was a combination of different theories. In the first place, structural realism was a type of political realism in its assumptions of states' ego-centrism and their specific interests in military power. Next, it was a type of positivism, if its creator denied it (Waltz 1990), in its interests in the generalization of social issues, theoretical parsimony, the analogy to market theories in economics. Last, the theory was a form of structuralism by reducing every state to a unitary actor and presupposing that the international society is innately anarchic. These three points were deeply intermingled but were still separate as the distinct components of the theory. Thus each criticism of structural realism concerned each distinct issue. It seems that these distinct interests in classical theories produced different revisions of different classical theorists with uneven distributions of labor.

Some positivist scholars considered classical types of realism more nuanced by taking morality and domestic conditions of politics into account (Jervis 1994; Rose 1998). They could still vindicate positivism if they were dissatisfied with normative aspects of structural realism. By contrast, more critical scholars praised classical realism as it was not tainted by positivist

scientism (Murray 1997). Both strands contributed to the rise of scholarly interests in the history of the field. The connection between classical realism and structural realism was dubious for both types of scholars. However, the two strands attempted to revive classical realism in different ways for different purposes.

Another example is the studies of Morgenthau. Generally, revisions of Morgenthau seem to share the fundamental interest in political realism. Attempts to uncover his intellectual connection to Nietzsche, Weber, Freud, and Schmitt in history are all dedicated to rediscover richly nuanced realism in his discourse (Barkawi 1998; Pichler 1998; Hyusmans 1999; Frei 2001; Gismondi 2004; Rohde 2004; Schuett 2007; Sheurman 2008). In this regard, the primary interest resides in the thought of Morgenthau itself. The implication of his thought for the history of the field is secondary if not accidental.

Studies of Carr share interests in realism as well. Yet they are more inclined toward the historical position of Carr. In fact, the main strand is rather interested in the antagonists of Carr and its primary focus often deviates from him.

Briefly sketched, recent studies of Carr have developed as follows. A pioneering study is Ken Booth's (1991) rereading of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Scholars have long grasped Carr's dualism between realism and utopianism as a maneuver to defend the former by rejecting the latter. Carr has thus been recognized as a founder of political realism in the current form of international studies. Booth uncovered the more utopian aspects of Carr by almost turning the dichotomy upside down.

The next monumental study was *The Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis* (Long and Wilson 1995). Given the insight of Booth, this collection of essays contributed to remove the misunderstanding that those whom Carr called utopians were starry-eyed idealists. While the

contributors had different views about various idealists, their disagreement itself pointed to the argument that there had been no single school of utopianism in the interwar years.

The succeeding works followed this line of argument. The Great Debate view is more clearly doubted. The revisionist works unanimously asked if there was actually the First Debate as a dominating movement in the field (Osiander 1998; Schmidt 1998a; Wilson 1998; Ashworth 1999; Ashworth 2002; Schmidt 2002b; Thies 2002; Ashworth 2006).

In this regard, scholars have expressed greater interests in those whom Carr is said to have criticized rather than Carr himself. More precisely, scholars expend larger efforts to delegitimize the narrative of the First Debate which Carr is said to have created than to rescue Carr from this myth. I am not presenting the binary that those who are interested in Morgenthau exclusively focus on political realism, on the one hand, and scholars of Carr attempt to denaturalize the Great Debate view, on the other hand. All the works cited above provide both new interpretations of classical realism and the history of the field. Scholars have reasons to focus on the legitimacy of the Great Debate narrative in their investigation of Carr inasmuch as the narrative tells that Carr created the binary of realism and idealism. Their focus is even natural given the aforementioned point that Carr is the origin of the discipline. I am just suggesting the diversity of revisionism. Revisionist scholars commonly attempt to denaturalize the Great Debate view as well as gain fresh insights from classical theories. Yet they differ to which aspect they intend to spill the larger amount of ink. Such difference has led to the curious shortage of the historical studies of Carr despite the abundance of studies about the scholars surrounding him.

The number of Carr studies is especially small when it comes to the specific inquiries into the text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Some studies situate this monumental work in historical context. Yet the objective of them is rather to clarify the influence of the book in the discipline,

not to closely interpret the text (Wilson 2000; Rich 2000). Jonathan Haslam's (1999) biography is now an indispensable source to grasp the course of Carr's intellectual development. Yet the work is not meant to provide close reading of his texts one by one.

Charles Jones's (1998) study gives us a fresh insight about Carr's relativistic notion of scientific inquiry. Jones's attempt to compare Carr and Mannheim, however, is more theoretical if not a-historical at all. It is easy to observe a similar character in Seán Molloy's (2003) study of the dialectical structure in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Other existing works are oriented toward our current problems in politics. These studies are more interested in picking out some useful insights from Carr than situating him in history (Linklater 1997; Goldfischer 2002; Chong 2007). Although these theoretical arguments provide some unique insights for reading his text, they are too selective to uncover the fundamental project of Carr.

Jones' study is almost a single exception, therefore, if it is recognized as a historical one. Compared with the vastness of literatures on interwar idealism, the thoroughly historical inquiries into the text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* are strangely scarce. If interwar idealism has widely been exposed to historical revision, its counterpart deserves for an equally wide varieties of historical investigations.

Why Biographies?

My argument so far is meant to clarify why another historical study of Carr is necessary. It is still not clear why we need to focus on his biographies for the sake of this historical study. The issue concerns the lack of scholarly attentions to the fact that Carr is said to have been a pioneer of the discipline. This is probably another counterintuitive statement. The issue concerns two interconnected points.

On the one hand, it is the retrospective creation that Carr created the discipline. Carr was the professor of international studies at Wales. He discussed international relations. Yet he never claimed himself to have created the discipline.

The point is not that scholars should thus avoid considering Carr as a pioneer of international studies. Embracing the insight of Foucault (1984), it is possible to claim that every origin is imaginary. Scholars might end up finding as many origins as the number of forgotten figures in history.

If so, however, it is important to first think seriously of the fact that Carr has been considered a pioneer. It does not mean that scholars need to recognize Carr as *the* origin unconditionally. My point is that it is vital to begin with understanding him whether other figures should be more appropriate as the founders or not. If every origin is a myth, scholars do not have the immediate reason to sweep the current authority from its power.

One needs to know the presumptions about the origin in order to reject it. It might be the existing criterion of evaluating Carr, not the discourse of Carr itself, which is problematic for the understanding of the origin of the field. It is possible to consider other strands of thought as pioneering for international studies without concerning the issue of criterion. It is even possible to broaden our eyes as such by directing our attention to the unknown scholars. Yet it is not possible to claim such scholars are more pioneering than the current ones without understanding why the latter are considered as pioneering.

The sufficient knowledge about the existing origin is necessary in order to differentiate this origin from other possible origins. It is impossible to compare two different things with two different criteria. However, the current revisionists sometimes make this mistake. For example, Lucian Ashworth (1999, 4) claims that the liberal internationalism of interwar idealists is more

appropriately the origin of the current international studies than realism is. The reason is that the interwar liberal internationalism had gained certain solidarity as a discipline earlier than realism did since it was the heir of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries' idea of international peace. In other words, Ashworth considers liberal internationalism pioneering because it established a certain school of thought earlier than realism did by manifesting its interests in the idiosyncratic traits of international spheres. But what if Carr and other realists attempted to depart from such liberal internationalism? What if Ashworth underestimates the epochal meaning of the rupture between liberal internationalism and realism? It might be more historically accurate to consider that international studies started to take its current shape because realism removed the remnants of the Enlightenment project in liberal internationalism.

Ashworth can claim that liberal internationalism is an origin of international studies. But he cannot say that liberal internationalism is more appropriately pioneering than realism without discussing by what criterion scholars can consider realism as the origin. In fact, revisionists themselves disagree with each other about the criterion. When Brian Schmidt (1998b) claims that nineteenth century American political scientists were pioneering, he emphasizes the continuation of the interests in the analogy between domestic and international spheres instead of the uniqueness of the latter. Schmidt's criterion is different from Ashworth's since the latter focuses on the scholarly interests in the idiosyncratic characters of the international field. If we try to denaturalize the current authority, we need to start from examining it from within.

The aforementioned shortage of the study of Carr seems to have derived from this lack of clarity about the criterion. It is advisable to note that revisionists even share certain problematic presumptions with their predecessors, at least, unconsciously. Current scholars almost unanimously contextualize Carr within his debate with interwar idealists. However, it is doubtful

whether the First Debate is the most appropriate context for *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Ashworth (2002, 38) notices that Carr did not refer to the contemporary works of Norman Angell and Alfred Zimmern. Instead, Carr cites only the works which these idealists wrote before the Great War. Ashworth's point is that Angell's post-1918 works tackle with the irrational part of human mind more seriously and should thus be exempt from Carr's criticism of utopianism. But what if Carr "was criticizing a mode of thought, rather than particular authors," as Ashworth (2002, 36) also realizes? And what if the mode of thought that Carr criticized was the one represented only by early Angell, not by later Angell? In fact, Carr did not criticize any contemporary works of idealists in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* if he denounced their earlier works. It can be the case that Carr simply did not need to criticize later Angell or other idealists.

In fact, the logical conclusion of revisionists' argument suggests Carr's closeness to idealists in terms of his political orientation. On the one hand, revisionists praise Carr for his concern about utopian elements of politics despite his criticism of utopianism. On the other hand, they criticize Carr for his misrepresentation of interwar idealists who were concerned about issues of power and irrationality. The revisionists' view suggests that both Carr and interwar idealists were all, if not evenly, eclectic between utopianism and realism, or liberalism and the criticism of it. It is strange that revisionist scholars emphasize the rupture between Carr and idealists whereas they admit the latter's diversity, in which Carr can safely find his place.

To be fair, the newest revisionist studies seem more balanced. For example, Ashworth (2006) realizes that the terms realism and idealism did not signify two modes of thought in the interwar years. This historical finding suggests that Carr might not have denounced idealists as utopian in the same way that later scholars did. Yet Ashworth (2006, 293-98) still recognizes Carr as the inventor of the dichotomy, which these later scholars adopted. Ashworth (2006, 304)

repeats the fact that Carr ignored Angell's works after 1918. As such, Ashworth fails to grasp the historical awareness of Carr. I will argue that Carr's primary interest resided in the trajectory of the European intellectual tradition. If interwar scholars did not signify two modes of thought by realism and utopianism as Ashworth points out, it is possible that Carr did not even invent the theoretical binary through his usage of these terms. If Carr was mainly concerned about the particular modes of thought, he must have criticized American idealists to the same extent that he attacked British idealists. Yet Carr rarely referred to the so-called idealists in America. Such lack of reference was natural for Carr since, as he was explicit in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, he considered their theories as rootless as they detached from the original context in Europe. There is not much textual and historical reason to consider that Carr's primary objective was to attack particular groups of scholars.

Idealists might have attacked the target they did not need to. As Peter Wilson (2003, 200) suggests, one of the most extensive idealist criticisms of Carr by Leonard Woolf missed the nuanced relationship between utopianism and realism in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (also see Wilson 2000; Molloy 2003, 293-94). If interwar idealists had a more accurate understanding about Carr, they might not have mounted their criticism. If the First Debate was a myth, it might have been a myth partly created by idealists. Carr's ambiguity could have contributed to the denunciation of the idealist approaches. Yet then, the real enemy of revisionists is the group of people who needed to pick up the realist elements from Carr as well as a particular discursive terrain where such interpretation of Carr was welcomed.

As Joel Quirk and Darshan Vigneswaran (2005) persuasively discuss, revisionists might have contributed to the creation of the myth. Indeed, revisionists take a double standard in this regard. On the one hand, they discuss that Carr did not establish a binary opposition between

realism and idealism but rather aspired their dialectical synthesis. On the other hand, they try to rescue idealism given the binary opposition of Carr. If the primary concern of Carr was not interwar idealists, no debate could occur to begin with. Revisionists are not clear whether they attempt to restore interwar idealism because they think it is insightful or because its advocates were unfairly rejected. If the latter is the reason, revisionists contradict themselves since they admit that Carr did not establish a dichotomy. If the former is the reason, revisionists lose the reason to set idealism against Carr.

In short, existing works remain limited by confining Carr into a particular academic field. More specifically, most of them presuppose Carr as a scholar of international studies. To ask whether Carr was realist, idealist, or both is specific to the field. The issue about the First Debate is also very specific to the field of international studies, whether it actually happened or not. Significantly, such implicit contextualization is not only parochial but is also a source of the myth of the First Debate. If Carr did not attempt to criticize interwar idealists, we can doubt whether his primary concern resided specifically in international politics. His interests in the events in the international sphere might have been ephemeral or other more profound concerns.

This is where the biographies have their significance. They suggest that Carr did not write specifically on international studies. The biography of Dostoevsky was not widely received by the contemporary generation but later became popular among literary scholars at least up to the 1980s. This fact shows certain depth of Carr's immersion in the existential philosophy, which is potentially important for realism as it is a thought of survival. *The Romantic Exiles*, the analysis of Herzen and Bakunin, is still so popular among current historians that its reprint paperback edition appeared in 2007. Especially when Carr has been considered a Marxist scholar, there is

no reason to ignore his *Karl Marx*. It is rare to find citations of these books in scholarly investigations of Carr in the field of international studies.

There are even historical reasons for the current scholars to pay attention to these biographies. When Carr presented his writings in the 1930s, academic professionalization and disciplinary border-making were less advanced than the present era. He was not even a professional scholar but a clerk at the British Foreign Office when he wrote first three biographies. It is also possible that Carr did not like an excessive professionalization personally as a graduate of Cambridge in the early twentieth century, where liberal education was preferred to expert knowledge (Soffer 1994, 5-6). Judging from the intellectual scope covered by *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, it is, indeed, somewhat strange to say that the book is for the specialists of international studies. As Jones (1998, 46-47) points out, so many philosophical figures appear in the text that the book must be, despite its subtitle, counterintuitive for those who literary look for an introduction to the study of international relations.

The existing literature about Carr, old or new, basically ignores his apparently non-political works by not paying much attention to this fact. Yet such negligence cannot but be a strategic attempt as it is nothing but a selective disregard of some inconvenient issues for incorporating eminent minds into the history of the discipline. Such maneuver has its own ramification as it ideologically lets the dominant view survive, however dubious its legitimacy is based on the available evidence. It is not easy to categorize Carr into the currently recognized form of an academic discipline.

If someone asked: why do scholars of international studies need to care about biographies? I would rather ask in return: why is it possible to ignore them? It is, in fact, strange that scholars have not discussed these texts just because their apparent disconnection with international studies.

As I already mentioned, recent researchers of Morgenthau have turned their eyes to his early writings of Nietzsche, Freud and Schmitt.

Therefore, I have a legitimate reason to choose biographies as the context of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, despite their seeming irrelevancy to international studies, for the sake of international studies. My focus is ultimately *The Twenty Years' Crisis* because I started from the existing understandings within international studies and my primary interests in the significance of Carr in international studies. My discussion started from the deficits inside the field and then logically reached its outside to fix them. It is crucial to resituate Carr within the discursive terrain outside of international studies for understanding his position inside it.

How persuasive my argument is depends, of course, on the following analyses. At this point, it is adequate to say that the biographical studies enabled Carr to have clarified the question he tried to answer in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Carr also acquired his basic view of history through these early works. Once we understand Carr's particular notion of the western civilization and its process uncovered in his early biographical works, *The Twenty Years' Crisis* appears not so much a mere polemic against interwar idealism as an attempt to recover the possibility of human community in the declining tradition of political philosophy. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* was not a prescription to the crisis of interwar years in particular but was a set of contemplation about the crisis of European thoughts about human life, which became most clearly visible in the interwar years.

Approach

As I identified the problem of the existing works with their lack of historical awareness, it should be now clear why we need to be concerned with contexts. My assumption is that Carr's early biographical works constitutes a context for *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. If so, however, how should we read these biographies themselves?

One possible way is to also contextualize them. But this approach is not most appropriate for the present study. If we need to show how fresh Carr's description of Dostoevsky was, contextualization would help differentiate it from its predecessors. Yet the primary task of this present work is to situate *The Twenty Years' Crisis* within Carr's preceding discourses and then discuss Carr's consecutive project in the 1930s as a whole in wider intellectual contexts. The appropriate context for the former task and the one for the latter can be different. Our endeavor is not to reveal the change of British discourse on Dostoevsky or Herzen or Bakunin or Marx.

Another related difficulty for the present study is that the texts are biographies. The biographical authors are not prohibited from providing their own views. To some extents, they might be encouraged to do so for the originality of their writings. Yet they are usually expected to detach from the figures of their study as much as possible so the readers can acquire credible information about such figures. For sure, we cannot think about a universally and perennially objective biography. An objective description of a person in a particular group of people in a particular era can be an ideological one in a different group of people in a different, or even the same, era. Nevertheless, the biography is different from philosophical and theoretical texts in which authors are specifically expected to provide their own views about metaphysical and practical issues. The thinking of the author must be less clear in biography than in such texts.

These concerns, for sure, do not prevent us from situating Carr's biographies in context. Yet these issues are sufficient for us to consider other text-oriented methods as a supplement. As a complementary way, therefore, I employ a narrativist approach (also see Chan 2003; Kratochwil 2006; Suganami 2008). In other words, I read Carr's biographical works as half novel and half history.

Novel and history are not clearly separate to begin with. As genres of discourse, they have the same root in the religious narratives about the mythological past in Christianity (see Butterfield 1981). They started to part their ways with some clarity in the eighteenth century when the secularization of the world progressed with the advance of capitalism and it became possible to think about their life not as a course predetermined by God (see McKeon 2002). People started to plot their own lives and learned their models from the novels. The appearance of the scientific field of history followed in the aftermath of French Revolution, which evoked people's consciousness about the possibility of radical historical change (see Cassirer 1950; Collingwood 1994).

However, the difference between history and novel has never been totally clear up until today. Paul Ricoeur (1988, chap. 3) argues as follows: historical truth is fictional to the extent that, ultimately, historians cannot know what has actually occurred in the past: fiction is not entirely a product of imagination since it tells us some kinds of human truth; history is read as tragedy in some times and as comedy in others; the fictional past is written as if there was such a period in our historical past. Ricoeur thus points out the importance of plot in both history and novel. "The meaning of real lives, whether of individuals or collectives," Hayden White (1987, 173) concisely summarizes Ricoeur's argument, "is the meaning of the plots, quasiplots, paraplots, or failed plots by which the events that those lives comprise are endowed with the aspect of stories having a discernible beginning, middle, and end. A meaningful life is one that aspires to the coherency of a story with a plot."

Biography is a particularly unclear genre in terms of whether it belongs to history or novel. It is supposed to tell the life of individuals in the most empirically justifiable manner. To that extent, it is closer to history if it concerns the truth(s) of the past. Yet biographers characterize

the life story of people as tragic or comedic to illustrate their personality, thought, and the time they lived. As actual lives of individuals have certain literary elements, such effects necessarily accompany if the author did not intend to add them. Any biographies will turn out to be rather imprecise without some literary elements. The biographical texts approach to novel in this respect. Biographers need to find what they think is the most appropriate plotting however modest the author tries their own personal impressions to be. Even if the chronology of events is out there, it is the biographer who finds their meaningful connection as well as the best order of telling them. Indeed, plotting cannot be separate from the effort to write history. The issue is just remarkable in the case of biographical writings.

To sum up, the manner of plotting reveals the assumptions of the biographer. Note that plot analysis does not necessarily contradict the historicist inclination which I manifested in my critique of the existing works on Carr. Biographers are not only constrained by historical truth but also by their own situations. How can we assume the existence of totally objective truth in history? Historical truth is, to a certain inevitable extent, the product of the present within the inescapable circle of hermeneutics. All we have is our memory of the past and our anticipation of the future. In the constant flow of time, the present exists only as an imaginative point. Reinhart Koselleck (2004) says that every present is the future of the past. Any attempts to distinguish history from the present would never be successful. A biographer needs to make a sufficiently persuasive argument to challenge the contemporaneously dominant view of the past. Plotting is not an arbitrary behavior but a practical action of the author within the existing discursive situation of the time.

By the same token, plot analysis does not suggest that every biography is ideological. Generally speaking, the dichotomy of detachment and attachment is only conceptual. Their

difference is more quantitative than qualitative in practice. As above, any texts cannot be totally objective. Some Marxists and post-Marxists thus claim that every discourse is ideology (Ashcraft 1980; Žižek 1989). Yet the denial of objectivity does not automatically lead to the conclusion that every discourse is equally ideological. What is totally ideological expression? Can we ever make sense without appealing to the intersubjective understanding of facts? Private language is impossible. It is, in fact, self-contradictory that those who deny the possibility of complete objectivity characterize the world as completely ideological: they cannot conceptualize complete ideology without its counterpart. Every discourse might be ideological. Yet some discourses are more objective, or intersubjectively universal, and others are more ideological, or intersubjectively local. This is the implication that the neologism intersubjectivity became significant in the contemporary humanities. Every discourse is somewhere between total objectivity and total relativity in its substance if it is thus ultimately relative in its form (see Bernstein 1983).

Note, in this regard, that a plot analysis is not unfit for the oft-claimed neutrality of Carr's biographies. Nor my plot analysis means to deny such neutrality totally. I just seek to clarify the ineradicable elements of value within them. Such value should be both private and public given the hermeneutical circle of the meaningful human world. The analysis of plotting is thus not a-historical approach to discourse but is more correctly an approach to history.

In my reading of Carr's biographies, I will refer to critiques from his contemporary commentators. My objective is not to condemn Carr for his misunderstanding but to clarify his viewpoint. Carr might have been able to defend his view, if he attempted to do so, in a more convincing manner than his commentators attacked him. I introduce the contemporaneous critiques only to illuminate the points where Carr's discourse could have been contestable in his

time. I am interested not so much in the correctness of Carr's text as in the value behind it. I try to uncover such value to situate it in history for a more convincing interpretation of the text.

Structure

Now that I have discussed the scope, the objective, and the method of this present study, a summary sketch of its entire structure follows to conclude this introductory chapter. In the succeeding two chapters, I will discuss biographies of Carr: *Dostoevsky* in chapter two and *The Romantic Exiles, Karl Marx, and Michael Bakunin* in chapter three. This separation is predicated on the following rationale.

As is intelligible just from their titles, all biographies concern nineteenth century revolutionary movements which have particular connection to Russia. *Dostoevsky* is not only the first book of Carr but is also his first book-length writing in the 1930s. I will discuss that Carr found the primary question for his time in the writings of Dostoevsky. After failing to find the answer to it in Dostoevsky, Carr turned his eyes to other nineteenth century thinkers. Carr's writings in the 1930s were continuous because he was not satisfied with Dostoevsky's solution to his own question in the interwar years. As the next chapter discusses, however, he could not find the answer in other revolutionary thinkers either. In this context, *The Twenty Years' Crisis* proves to be the place for Carr to have invented his own solution.

Grasped as such, there is a direct linkage between *Dostoevsky* and *The Twenty Years' Crisis*: the one is the question and the other the answer. On the other hand, *The Romantic Exiles, Karl Marx, and Michael Bakunin* primarily tell what Carr could not choose to solve the question. It does not mean that these three biographies are less significant. These works, indeed, reveal Carr's view of political strands such as individualism and collectivism: these two extremes, indeed, showed idiosyncratic tension in the nineteenth century (see Talmon 1960). They also contain his direct words about figures such as Hitler and Marx, who frequently appear in *The*

Twenty Years' Crisis. All four biographies play their own roles and I will spend as much space for the latter three biographies as I will do for *Dostoevsky*. When it comes to comprehending the project of Carr correctly, however, *Dostoevsky* has more direct relevance as it unravels in what sense the project of Carr in the 1930s was continuous. The separation of the chapters two and three contributes to clarify this point.

Chapter four starts dealing with the text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Given the insights from the biographies, it will become clear that the primary question for Carr was human irrationality. It will turn out that he actually approached this problem through the way that he learned from Dostoevsky, with the final step aside. Carr tries to grapple with human irrationality by believing in human rationality. Contrary to the recent discussions that the relationship between realism and utopianism is dialectical, the whole history of European civilization unfolds as a progress of utopian liberalism in the world of Carr.

The potential problem of this thinking is that Carr returns to modern utopianism despite his criticism of it. Chapter five scrutinizes this single point by situating Carr in the tension between Victorian culture of progress and the post-war culture of decline. I will use the axis between Darwin and Bergson (via Sorel) somewhat freely. The whole purpose is to clarify in what sense Carr's thinking is ambiguous and because of what presumptions. The dilemma of Carr will become clear once his roundabout approach to the British tradition of liberalism is revealed.

CHAPTER 2 THE QUESTION

My primary thesis is that *Dostoevsky*, *The Romantic Exiles*, *Karl Marx*, and *Michael Bakunin* constitute one of the vital contexts to understand what Carr tried to do in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. The following two chapters discuss these four biographical works one by one. This chapter focuses on *Dostoevsky* and the succeeding chapter the other three.

As *Dostoevsky* is a biography, the text contains detailed descriptions of the life of the author. It is not necessary to follow them all. Our primary task is to understand Carr, not Dostoevsky. What was so unique about Dostoevsky for Carr? How did Carr describe this uniqueness? These are the questions for unraveling the presumptions behind Carr's texts.

Carr finds that Dostoevsky, different from utilitarian liberals, had keen awareness of human irrationality and its social ramification. Focusing on this awareness, Carr converts Dostoevsky's lessons for Russia into the prescription for Europe. To this extent, *Dostoevsky* is a preparatory study for Carr to provide his solution for the European interwar crisis.

Dostoevsky as the Other

It is first necessary to understand how Carr plotted Dostoevsky's intellectual life, in order to find which part of the text is relevant to the present study. Carr divides the intellectual trajectory of Dostoevsky into three stages: early phase, the years succeeding the exile, and later works. This view illuminates the rupture between early and later years of the author. While the early works have some connections with the later works, the "pursuit of parallels between the earlier and the later Dostoevsky is," as Carr (1931, 48) states, "generally speaking, an unprofitable task."

Years in Siberia marked a turning point. Captured as a thought criminal, Dostoevsky experienced extreme situations: repetitious long examinations by the commission; eight months

of solitary confinement; seventeen days of continuous walking to Siberia with the temperature of forty degrees below zero (Carr 1931, 55-58). Carr considers that Dostoevsky first noticed the decisive influence of human irrationality from these experiences. Later works of Dostoevsky are a series of elaborations on this theme. What norms can we defend given the fundamental irrationality of man? How can an irrational man go along with others without subverting their lives? Ethics and politics occupy a vital part of the works. In *The Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoevsky finally manages to synthesize human irrationality with a rational faith in God.

This is not an abnormal narrative of Dostoevsky's life. Indeed, literary scholars have often praised Carr's *Dostoevsky* for its objective and fact-based character (Muchnic 1939, 118). The text had been even one of the orthodox English biographies of Dostoevsky until around 1970s (see Wasiolek 1978, 92). It was not completely new to recognize Dostoevsky as psychologist in the early 1930s. As D. S. Mirsky (1931) stated in his preface to Carr's *Dostoevsky*, it was already not polemical to delve into the subconscious part of Dostoevsky's mind.

Yet given the hermeneutical circle between interpreters and texts, there are no totally objective facts. Whatever biographical sources were available, it was Carr who used it. The detached character of Carr meant that his description was intersubjectively correct. Also, Carr needed to decipher the novels of Dostoevsky. If Carr suggested the rupture between early and later works and characterized the latter as psychological, such evaluation is ultimately based on Carr's own interpretation.

Some examples illustrate this point. For instance, Carr is against Freud by emphasizing the discontinuity of Dostoevsky's intellectual life. Freud discussed the author's Oedipus complex already in 1929. Carr (1931, 37) rejects this view since it contradicts his own view: if the psychological problems of Dostoevsky derived from his childhood, his intellectual life was very

continuous. On the other hand, Carr (1931, 102) has no problem recognizing Dostoevsky as a predecessor of Freud and Jung. In discussing *A Raw Youth*, Carr (1931, 251, 258-59) even suggests the necessity of further scholarly inquiries into this novel on the basis that it is the most psychologically oriented work of the author. According to Mirsky (1931), *Dostoevsky* was the first thorough biography of Dostoevsky in English since the vital materials about the author had become available in the 1920s. Furthermore, the spread of psychoanalytic ideas were slower in England in other countries (Hynes 1968, 164). In the words of Carr's contemporary writers: "The name of Sigmund Freud was first popularly heard about 1920, though his methods were in repute during the war" (Graves and Hodge 1940[1994], 90-91). If Carr considers psychology as one of the decisive elements of Dostoevsky, Carr's interpretation is original on this point.

Notably in this regard, Carr connects Dostoevsky's psychology with Russianness. Carr (1931, 11) states that Dostoevsky was "a Russian of the Russians." Yet Dostoevsky was not most Russian from the beginning. He became a Russian through his literary life. If Siberia was a turning point, the awareness of irrationality constituted a fundamental element of Russianness. To illuminate this point, Carr differentiates Dostoevsky from Europeans. While Dostoevsky himself maintained Russia's distinctness from Europe, Carr uses his own examples to describe this distinctness. In other words, human irrationality is something external to Europe for Carr. *Dostoevsky* uncovers what Carr thinks is the problem of modern western civilization. The Russian character within the writings of Dostoevsky functions as a mirror to reflect the problems of Europe in Carr's discourses.

Dostoevsky as Synthesizer

The plot of Carr's text thus tells that he identified the fundamental uniqueness of Dostoevsky with the author's awareness of irrationality and tried to make this insight for his own European world. Our focus is, therefore, on the problems of human irrationality and how Carr

describes it in his dichotomization between Russia and Europe. On the one hand, it is necessary to understand Dostoevsky's solutions to human irrationality and the consequential ethico-political problems. On the other hand, it is necessary to understand how and to what extent this interpretation of Dostoevsky is particularly Carr's. In this section, the focus is on the first issue.

As Carr discusses the development of Dostoevsky's thought by examining from one work to another, our discussion similarly follows this chronological order. The first important work in Dostoevsky's later years is *Memoirs from the House of the Dead*. This novel was Dostoevsky's first attempt to convert the raw experience in Siberia into a literary event. "It was in the House of the Dead that Dostoevsky first learned to perceive the inadequacy not merely of human law, but of the ordinarily accepted code of moral values, and to ponder on the quest for a remoter truth beyond the frontiers of good and evil as ordinarily defined" (Carr 1931, 70). The issue of good and evil reminds Carr of Nietzsche. In the succeeding paragraph, Carr (1931, 70) quotes a famous sentence from *Beyond Good and Evil*: "He who strives with monsters must beware lest he himself become a monster; and when you look too long into an abyss, the abyss begins to look into you soul." Carr thus finds an existentialist connection between Nietzsche and Dostoevsky. Both thinkers are aware of unconscious irrationality within human mind.

Both thinkers also try to transcend this abyss in search for the authentic shape of the self. Dostoevsky, like Nietzsche, thus needs to criticize western liberalism. Carr illuminates this point by emphasizing the uniqueness of Dostoevsky to the English readers. Dostoevsky first mounted his critique of Chernyshevsky in *Notes from Underground*. Carr (1931, 119-20) calls this Russian figure "a pupil of J. S. Mill" and implies Dostoevsky's detachment from liberal utilitarianism: "The age of optimism, of faith in a morality established by science and reason, has now long passed away. The irrational chaos of human nature has become a platitude, and we no longer

require a subterranean philosopher to put out his tongue at us in order to compel belief in it.” The Russian man separates himself from the economic man of modern utilitarianism.

This separation from European utilitarianism adds another dimension to the Russian character of Dostoevsky’s thinking: Christian orthodoxy. Carr describes Dostoevsky’s occupation by the gambling as if it was a manifestation of a religious belief. In *The Gambler*, an old lady named Antonida unhesitatingly bets a large amount of money against the most risky spot of the roulette. Her only purpose is to enjoy the enthusiasm of winning. Dostoevsky was short of money. But he, like Antonida, gambled for the sake of gambling. “The principal, though often subconscious, impulse which drove Dostoevsky to the gambling rooms,” Carr (1931, 162-63) states, “was not a reasoned calculation of financial profit, but a craving for strong emotions and abnormal excitements, perhaps even the longing, which he often attributes to his characters, to plumb the depths of moral degradation.” Dostoevsky’s absorption into the abyss somewhat paradoxically led to his belief in the transcendental sublime: “to renounce roulette was to renounce the one remaining hope without which existence became morally impossible” (Carr 1931, 165).

This is the basic system of thought in Dostoevsky, at least, in Carr’s description. Ethics occupies the most important part. By using the words of a contemporary Russian critic, Carr (1931, 188) argues that the major theme of Dostoevsky’s later works is “philosophy in action.” Russians do not distinguish ethics from its practice since they are skeptical about abstract metaphysics. “The Russian will accept no principle and no convention until he has explored its very foundations,” according to Carr (1931, 190), “and if he finds that the first stone has not been well and truly laid he will recklessly pull down the whole edifice about his ears.” Principles are highly important but they need to be asserted in practice. This skeptical mind separates them

from English people: “if we find in Dostoevsky’s novels people who murder for a principle, live on bread and water for a principle or commit suicide for a principle,” Carr (1931, 190) emphasizes, “we should remember that such types are far less unfamiliar and fantastic to the Russian than to the English reader.”

Dostoevsky attempts to resolve the tension between human irrationality and rational faith through his last major novels. *Crime and Punishment* is exactly the story about the murder for a principle. Carr grasps *Crime and Punishment* as the introduction of the ethical question for Dostoevsky.

Dostoevsky’s disconnection from his early years is clear in this work. *Poor Folk*, his first published novel, already concerned the same ethical issue. Yet the work was written under the influence of French romanticism represented by Rousseau (Carr 1931, 40-42). Romantic sentimentalism gives individuals a heroic character and negotiates the problem. It always ends with the self-assertion of the pride of such heroic individuals.

Raskolnikov, the main character in *Crime and Punishment*, is a heroic figure. But he is a neurotic hero. Raskolnikov murders an old landlady for the sake of humanity. The killing of an avaricious person should be allowed for the welfare of a larger number of people. Such exception in law is a rational vindication of human freedom. Raskolnikov thinks that he believes in this logic. Yet he is actually not as determined as he considers he is. His crime turns out to be a failure: when Raskolnikov kills the landlady in her house, he is unexpectedly shocked by his own murder; because of his shock, he does not realize her sister coming home from outside; Raskolnikov ends up killing this sister and loses his cause for humanity. Also, he is nearly arrested on the spot because of the same absent-mindedness. The story ends with his exile followed by his somewhat abrupt confession of the crime. The important character of

Raskolnikov is the weakness of rationality, one's inability to control himself, "which agitated Dostoevsky and which is taken up once more by Nietzsche" (Carr 1931, 193). If Raskolnikov is a hero, he is not a romantic but a quasi-Nietzschean hero.

Dostoevsky's succeeding works flesh out the specifics of this peculiar heroism. *The Idiot* illuminates the passive character of Dostoevsky's ethical ideal, given the question introduced by Raskolnikov. It is the ethics of suffering as he showed in his enthusiasm for gambling. The faith in suffering, according to Carr (1931, 209), is totally different from "the western conception of a good man as one who performs good works."

The Devils tackles the question from a different perspective: politics. "In Russia, literature and politics are never far apart" (Carr 1931, 251). According to Carr (1931, 218), the ethical theory of Raskolnikov leads to nihilism in private life. Carr (1931, 220) grasps *The Devils* as a criticism of nihilist revolutionaries in the 1860s. To demonstrate how Dostoevsky was annoyed by such nihilistic thought since his years in Siberia, Carr (1931, 224) discusses that a character in the novel, Shatov, is a self-portrait of the author. With this character, *The Devils* confirms the connection between moral evil and political nihilism only to resolve it through a rational faith: the work received the negative reactions from the outraged nihilists (Carr 1931, 226).

The Brothers Karamazov finally specifies the place of religion in this system of thought. Kirillov in *The Devils* already radicalized the problem of Raskolnikov. Kirillov commits suicide as a logical conclusion of becoming a superman: to be a superman, one has to overcome death; yet death can be overcome only through death since any other experiences cannot substitute it. According to Carr (1931, 229), "Kirillov, the fanatic of logic, the rebel not only against morality, but against God, is the prototype of Ivan Karamazov." Ivan represents the principle of evil. His counterpart is Alyosha, who embraces the Christian ideal (Carr 1931, 286). Many

commentators before Carr has considered Ivan as the mirror of the creator and recognized Dostoevsky as skeptic. Carr (1931, 288) rejects this view and tries to vindicate the point that “Dostoevsky’s faith was the product of reason rather than intuition.” Ivan denies any rational justification of the ethics of suffering. Dostoevsky accepts the validity of his argument. Yet Dostoevsky found Ivan’s search for the rational solution meaningless. The correctness of the abstract reasoning does not count. We have to accept Alyosha’s answer: we have to love life to know its meaning (Carr 1931, 289). Dostoevsky finally reached his “religious, romantic and masochistic” faith (Carr 1931, 292).

Dostoevsky as Prophet

Dostoevsky appears as a synthesizer of rationality and irrationality in his last phase. What is important for the present study is to what extent this figure is Carr’s creation. Many readers of Dostoevsky would not basically reject Carr’s description and literary scholars have actually given positive assessments of *Dostoevsky* for a long period. Yet it is still Carr who considered that the English would refuse to ask the ethical problem of Nietzschean superman. It is Carr who emphasizes the western people’s unfamiliarity with the ethics of suffering. Carr described Shatov as a mirror image of Dostoevsky. Carr chose Alyosha, instead of Ivan, as the ideal of Dostoevsky.

Carr even employs certain literary strategies to defend his view. Carr draws a parallel between Dostoevsky’s development into his later stage and the deepening of his Russian character. Carr (1931, 58) describes the scene of Dostoevsky’s exile as follows: “behind them Europe and the past; in front, Asia and the unknown future.” The exile to Siberia was Dostoevsky’s exposure to the other. So the return from the House of the Dead is, by contrast, the “return to European Russia” (Carr 1931, 83). The exposure to non-European Russia nurtured the idiosyncratically Russian character of Dostoevsky.

Carr also draws a parallel between the intellectual atmosphere in Russia before and after the exile. The debate between the Slavophil and the westerner was the primary concern of Russian intellectuals in the middle of the nineteenth century. The Slavophil tried to make Russia more Russian without her homogenization with Europe. By contrast, the westerner sought a form of Russia's Europeanization for her modernization. The center of intellectual dominance transferred from the westerner to the Slavophil while Dostoevsky was in Siberia. By the same token, Dostoevsky transformed himself from a romantic European to an existentialist Russian.

Scholars have documented this part of Russian history in a more or less similar way as Carr did (see, for instance, Neumann 1996, chap. 3). Importantly, however, Carr does not explain how the change of atmosphere influenced Dostoevsky. This is natural since, as already discussed, the primary cause of Dostoevsky's turn was his exile in Siberia in Carr's narrative. The rise of Slavophil only illuminates the timeliness of Dostoevsky. Carr (1931, 67) states: "It might be too bold a paradox to maintain that, but for Siberia, Dostoevsky would never have developed his idealization of the Russian people; but the form of the cult bears the clear impress of these prison years." Carr merely assumes the parallel between the change of Russian intellectual atmosphere and Dostoevsky's turn. It is as if both the world and the author were supposed to move ahead to a predetermined destination. As such, Carr's description dramatizes the point that Dostoevsky was ready to differentiate him from Europe when he entered his mature years. Remember that Carr even expended some efforts to reject Freud for emphasizing the discontinuity of Dostoevsky's intellectual life.

On the other hand, Dostoevsky left Europe only to return to it. His ideal resided in the Slavophilism in the so-called Pushkin speech, which was the final significant event in Dostoevsky's intellectual life in Carr's assessment. Dostoevsky argued that Russians should

become super-European to be the teacher of Europe because the real Russian is a universal man (Carr 1931, 273). Carr interprets this Slavophilism as a thought of synthesis. Dostoevsky already made explicit his Hegelian inclinations in *A Raw Youth* (Carr 1931, 257-59). Carr (1931, 308) finds the same Hegelian idea in the speech: “the long-standing antipathy of Slavophil and westerner was to be resolved; by making herself most essentially Russian, Russian would become most completely European.”

Therefore, the Russian awareness of human irrationality has a potential to help recreate Europe. Carr’s manner of discussion is significant regarding this point. Carr always compares Dostoevsky with European authors. Juxtaposing Goethe and Dostoevsky, Carr (1931, 99) states: “Raskolnikov is the Russian Faust.” Following Dostoevsky’s own comparison between *Don Quixote* and his own *The Idiot*, Carr (1931, 208) adds *King Lear* for a further contrast. Carr makes such comparisons to clarify the Russian character of Dostoevsky. Yet, at a certain point, Carr starts to take advantage of Russia for the sake of Europe. Indeed, Carr’s conclusion contains strong inclinations toward this direction. “Naked, inchoate human nature has vanished from English literature, and perhaps from English life, since the Elizabethan age.” And Carr (1931, 319) continues that “it was only in a country so unorganised as Russia, and so untrammelled by rationalising convention, that the nineteenth century could hope to recapture something of the starkness and the mobility of a more primitive epoch in the evolution of civilisation.” Russia is now the past of England if it is a recaptured past. Carr suddenly transmutes Dostoevsky’s synthesis into the power of Europe to renew itself. In this context, Carr (1931, 321) even reasserts the rationality of Dostoevsky’s religious faith and its successful synthesis with human irrationality.

As a natural corollary, Carr discerns the western origins of Dostoevsky's Russian character. On the one hand, the duality of mind is "in its genesis, a literary conception of western origin" (Carr 1931, 261). On the other hand, the faith of suffering originates in romanticism. According to Carr (1931, 291), "a typical romantic passage from *Faust* will suffice to show how many of Dostoevsky's most characteristic and, according to modern judgment, most morbid ideas had been anticipated half a century earlier by the most representative of German poets." By discussing as such, however, Carr almost contradicts himself since his starting point is the discontinuity between early romantic Dostoevsky and later existentialist Dostoevsky. The experience in Siberia, originally the mark of the decisive rupture, turns to be an opportunity to reinvigorate romanticism. Carr (1931, 15) states early in the book: "Of all the great Russian writers in the nineteenth century before Chekhov, Dostoevsky alone is completely modern." Mirsky (1931) explains that Dostoevsky is modern only when modern includes Rousseau, Byron and Constant. Dostoevsky's Slavophilism ends up with its reversal by Carr: Europe can be super-Europe through its potentiality.

The Dawn of an Age

Dostoevsky converted his experience of human irrationality into a series of literary expressions. Carr learned the problem of the western world in this author. Originally, Carr emphasized the idiosyncratically Russian character of Dostoevsky. The substance of this Russianness was the indifference between theory and practice as well as the awareness of human irrationality. However, it finally turned out that Russia was just an ideal category for Carr to revitalize Europe. In Carr's story, Dostoevsky was a convenient focal point to clarify the importance of its function. Carr was orientalist in the original sense of the term by Edward Said (1994). If we follow the arguments of Iver Neumann (1996; 1999), not only Carr but also many European intellectuals have long represented Russia in a similar way. We will return to this point

later in chapter five after discussing the connection between *Dostoevsky* and *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. What should be clear at this point is that Carr made such linkage possible through his particular reading of Dostoevsky discussed so far.

Note that Carr was not satisfied with Dostoevsky's solution. "The modern world has accepted Dostoevsky's premise, but denies his conclusion. By his religion, he belongs to the old order, by his psychology to the new" (Carr 1931, 322). Dostoevsky was less praiseworthy for his answer than for his question. What was important for Carr was that Europe and Russia were not completely different. Carr's Russia was, ultimately, not the radically incommunicable Other but an other constitutive within the self. Russia, for Carr, did not signify a substantive nation but a conceptual mirror to see Europe from outside, or, actually, from inside. Europe and Russia could encounter since, by considering as such, Carr could draw a lesson for Europe from Russia. Said differently, it was sufficient for Carr if Russia could only give some lessons for Europe if not the ultimate solution. This interpretation does not conflict with the usual evaluation that Carr was a detached scholar in his historical researches of Russia in later years (see, for example, Davies 2000, 91). What was remarkable about Carr is, perhaps, that he drew such view of Russia by using materials in a relatively detached manner.

If Dostoevsky was a prophet for Carr's contemporary world, his prophetic insight resided in his awareness of the strength of human irrationality as a motor to drive the world. Carr was dissatisfied with the utilitarian model of rational man. He found an alternative in Dostoevsky's irrational characters. Rejecting Dostoevsky's solution, however, Carr was not yet sure how such irrational individuals could live together in a community. He was still in need of another morality for the arising community.

Carr's works in the 1930s were an exploration of this question. The question was old in its form as it concerned the relationship between individual and society. Yet it was new in substance since the voluntarist model of man was discarded. Carr needed an alternate form of society for the new man. The fact that Dostoevsky, Herzen, Bakunin, and Marx were all critics of the western world in the nineteenth century gives a certain continuity of Carr's consciousness of the problem in *The Romantic Exiles*, *Karl Marx*, and *Michael Bakunin*. Now it is time to turn to these biographies.

CHAPTER 3 WRONG ANSWERS

The previous chapter has clarified that human irrationality was the primary concern for Carr in *Dostoevsky*. *The Romantic Exiled*, *Karl Marx*, and *Michael Bakunin* all concern the same issue. Also similarly, Carr fails to obtain any satisfactory solutions through the writing of these works. The present study demands an investigation of these biographical works because they reveal what was not enough for Carr. In addition, the three biographical works provide us some important resources for reading particular portions of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* by unraveling his view of Marx, Bakunin, and others.

The Romantic Tragedy

Our starting point in this chapter is *The Romantic Exiles* by following the chronological order of publication. As already mentioned, Carr discussed, in *Dostoevsky*, the sea change of Russian intellectual climate in the middle of the nineteenth century. The focus of *The Romantic Exiles* is the generation intellectually prior to this change. “It is in this last, and specifically Russian, efflorescence of Romanticism—the generation of the ‘thirties and ‘forties—which is here represented in the person of the Romantic Exiles” (Carr 1933, 28).

As a description of the lives of these “exiles,” the book is not as rewarding as *Dostoevsky* for the comprehension of Carr’s own thought. The text of *The Romantic Exiles* does not contain as much interpretation of intellectual discourses as *Dostoevsky* had. Yet *The Romantic Exiles* is still significant as it clarifies a root of the question which Carr found in *Dostoevsky*. The plot of the text reveals its own unique significance in this regard. *The Romantic Exiles* is also important as it discusses the positions of Bakunin and Marx in Carr’s view of history, which Carr discusses in his succeeding works. In order to historically demonstrate the continuity from *Dostoevsky* to *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, a consistent analysis of *The Romantic Exiles* is indispensable.

Herzen and the Difficulty of Love

The plot of *The Romantic Exiles* is significant, in the first place, because it describes the life of a revolutionary, Alexander Herzen, as a tragedy. Even the table of contents of the book suggests this fact: two “family tragedies” appear early in the book and the penultimate chapter ends as “the last tragedy.” In the epilogue of the book, Carr (1933, 363) states: “The story of the Romantic Exiles ends appropriately in tragedy and—worse still—in tragedy tinged with futility.” Why did Carr have to describe the story as “appropriately” a tragedy?

A part of the tragedy is Herzen’s involvement in the crime of passion. Carr expends first one-fourth of the book to describe the triangular relationship among Alexander Herzen, Natalie Herzen, and George Herwegh (and, to some extent, his wife Emma). The story starts with a close friendship among the three but ends with their breakup. The friendship ends because of the development of love between Natalie and Herwegh. It brings the tragedy as it leads to Natalie’s death.

It is sadly mistaken to consider Carr to have depicted this episode only for a literary effect, given the bulk of the ink he spilt for it. This is a symbolic anecdote which illustrates the fate of the romantic exiles. Carr (1933, 27, 63, 125, 167) repeatedly mentions the influence of George Sand’s secularized romanticism on the contemporaries of Herzen and others. The undercurrent principle of their behavior is often compared and identified with that of Sand: “nineteenth-century Europe, and in particular feminine Europe, not only devoured her as a novelist, but worshipped her as a prophet” (Carr 1933, 63). The cardinal doctrine of the philosophy of Sand was the virtuous nature of love. Carr continues: “If virtue resides in the human emotions, the noblest of these emotions is unquestionably love; and to love must therefore be the supreme act of virtue.”

The love affair was one of the primary concerns of the romantic exiles in their theory and its practice. Carr depicts Natalie as the particularly Sandian figure. Natalie's first love to Herwegh was philanthropic as the love was always as such for Sand. "The mission on earth' of romantic womanhood is, as one of George Sand's heroes remarks, 'to console the unfortunate.'" Natalie, Carr (1933, 55) continues, "felt that she and she alone could *save* Herwegh—save from his own weakness and from the scorn of a dull disdainful world" (italics is original). Started as such, the early relationship among the three was an enactment of Sand's philosophy. "The triangular intimacy," according to Carr (1933, 56), "seemed to these votaries of the romantic faith a realisation of the loftiest ideal of human friendship. The relationship was perfect." The three romantics only needed to learn the ritual to continue their intuitively merciful relationship as well the word to describe this harmony. They found their model in the newly published novel of, again, George Sand. The romantic exiles were the believers of Sand. They practiced her philosophy in their physical and psychological interactions.

Yet this relationship was deemed to end tragically. Carr recurrently foreshadows the collapse of the harmony. For example, he points out the imbalance of the relation of the three in only a page after describing it as perfect. Alexander was uncomfortable with the way Herwegh addressed him as "Landry" and "my twin," while Natalie and Herwegh was not. Natalie did not suspect any dangers in their intimacy, while Herwegh might since he was a westerner and he was familiar with the different conventions in the western civilization. "The triangle was conditioned by a different set of postulates" (Carr 1933, 57). Even the direct word tragic appears in the text for describing their fate (Carr 1933, 58, 86).

The unhappy closure of the story was predetermined for romantics. In other words, Carr implies that romanticism was a philosophy whose failure was foretold. Throughout the book, the

story of Herzen is characterized by his increasing disappointment of the European revolutionary thought of romanticism. He felt disappointment in Paris already from the beginning of his visit. “The Paris in which Herzen found himself was not the Paris of his dreams, the Paris of revolution and of the rightness of man” (Carr 1933, 33). He was let down by Paris, which nurtured the romanticism of Sand. Herzen would later find Paris a more comfortable place by discerning a clearer appearance of class consciousness in this industrialized city. However, Natalie would not (Carr 1933, 38-39). After the revolution of 1848, moreover, Herzen himself would lose his promised land again. “The reaction of Herzen’s feelings in the latter half of 1848 was far profounder and more fundamental than the disappointment which he had experienced when he first came to Paris in the preceding year” (Carr 1933, 44-45). Carr then describes Herzen as a delayed revolutionary, as if to predict the sad ending of his adventure. “He, Herzen, like Byron, had been born out of due time. He had found himself in disharmony not only, as he had once supposed, with his country, Russia, but,” Carr (1933, 45) claims, “with his age, the bourgeois nineteenth century. He had been born too soon—or too late.” Carr’s reference to a canonical English poet here is suggestive. It is nuanced because Herzen would never be satisfied with England, where he moved after his total breakup with Herwegh: “Herzen’s impressions of England were, and remained, those of the disinterested spectator” (Carr 1933, 136). Herzen continued to miss his promised land in his entire life.

It is in this disappointment and disillusionment that the Herzens were annoyed by the difficulty of passion. The declining story of Herzen, qua revolutionary, interweaves with the declining story of Herzen, qua romantic. Herzen would resume a tragic story after he relocated himself in England, this time with his old friend Nicholas Ogarev and the wife of this friend Natalie. Herzen sought Natalie Ogarev for consolation from his loss of the deceased Natalie.

Nicholas welcomed Herzen's affection for Natalie because he was a dedicated romantic, who was always concerned with the universal love (Carr 1933, 189). The story of the three leads to the physical relationship between Herzen and Natalie, and Nicholas' condemnation of Herzen (Carr 1933, 199). Carr titles the chapter of this story, "The Recurrent Triangle."

The anguish of Herzen was that of romantics. "The romantic theory of the irresistibility of love is invoked by Herzen in his own defence, just as it had been invoked by the other actors in this drama" (Carr 1933, 80). Natalie Herzen's anguish between her husband and her lover was affected by this romantic theory. "The romantic doctrine of the rights of husbands was strict and inexorable" (Carr 1933, 98). Therefore, Natalie needed to die as "child and victim of the romantic age which she had never outgrown" (Carr 1933, 116). The private story of the Herzens was a story about romantic Europe. Romanticism was a philosophy in action. The quarrel between Herzen and Herwegh after Natalie's death became a polestar of European intellectuals as it was commented and documented by figures such as George Sand, Karl Marx, and Richard Wagner (Carr 1933, 120-21).

It is noteworthy that, for Carr, the romanticism of the exiles was, even as it originated from Sand, at the same time Russian. "Nowhere in Europe was her influence more potent and more intoxicating than in Russia" (Carr 1933, 64). Herzen found, in his disillusionment in Europe, how Russian he was and tried to rediscover Russia which he had lost: "Herzen's growing distaste for Europe was conditioned and inflamed by a revived longing for his own land" (Car 1933, 209). Carr discerns in the intricate love affairs of romantics the same love-hate complex which he found in Dostoevsky as the idiosyncratically Russian element. Carr (1933, 199) explicitly states that the love-hate complex of Nicholas Ogarev "recalls the psychological probings of the earlier Romantics and anticipates the still profounder analyses of Dostoevsky."

Turn to the Radicals

To sum up, *The Romantic Exiles* is an inquiry into the root of the Russian awareness of human irrationality which Carr first detected in Dostoevsky. The romantics in the story are often caught by the tension between individual passion and universal love. The tension between individual and society (or one's relation with others) recurs while evoking our attention to the irrationality of individuals. As in Dostoevsky, this Russian character has roots in romanticism. Indeed, the issue of love suggests the substantive similarity between Dostoevsky and romanticists. The love is unintelligible unless one initiates it. Contemplation is not enough to know what love is. In this sense, the engagement in love points to the romanticists' departure from the preceding rationalists in the eighteenth century (see Taylor 1989, 380). Remember that Dostoevsky's Alyosha suggested the necessity of loving life as the only way to know its meaning. The rational contemplation of Ivan does not work. Both *Dostoevsky* and *The Romantic Exiles* concern the transformation of European intellectual tradition if in different ways. By circling around this transition, the two works focus on the same psychological duality of a Russian man.

In this sense, it is natural that romanticism was predetermined to fail. Carr was not satisfied with Dostoevsky's solution. It is thus understandable that *The Romantic Exiles* does not tell much about Carr's view of irrationality or his prospect for a new form of society. The work is, however, a necessary bridge to its sequel, *Michael Bakunin*. Indeed, Carr suggests the future publication of a biography of Bakunin in his preface of *The Romantic Exiles* (Carr 1933, 8).

At some points in the book, Bakunin appears as a contrast to Herzen in his political inclinations. In the 1840s, Herzen admired the enthusiasm of Bakunin as a romantic revolutionary (Carr 1933, 32). In the 1860s, they lived in different worlds. Bakunin did not see the collapse of the revolution of 1848 and did not share the disillusionment that Herzen felt in Paris. "Time had stood still for Bakunin for twelve years, while the world, turning on its axis,

had revolutionised the thoughts and opinions of his former associates” (Carr 1933, 221). Carr finds in their difference a turning point of Russian and European political thought. Herzen was once disappointed in democratic Europe and then gained a new faith in democracy by observing the regime of Alexander II in Russia. By contrast, Bakunin maintained his distrust in democracy. Carr considers Bakunin more Russian. “Bakunin stood far nearer than Herzen to his own countrymen; and he shared to the full the instinctive Russian distrust of democracy” (Carr 1933, 225). *Michael Bakunin* will advance Carr’s discussion of political community.

Bakunin is also important because of his intellectual relation to Marx, who is the focus of another biographical work by Carr. The difference between Bakunin and Marx marks another turning point in what Carr considers the history of European political thought. Anarchism is Bakunin’s ultimate goal since it is the logical outcome of his subscription to romanticism. Marx comes after the failure of this political idea. Carr (1933, 226) argues: “Human integrity could travel no further along that road. It only remained for Marx to initiate a new departure in political theory, and to overthrow, in the person of Bakunin, the last and most consistent exponent of political Romanticism.” In the epilogue of the book, Carr (1933, 364) restates this point in a clearer and lengthy manner:

The cause of revolution before Marx had been idealistic and romantic.... Marx made it materialistic and scientific.... He brought to the theory of political revolution the same element of orderly inevitability which Darwin had introduced into biology. The Darwinian and the Marxian theories are strictly comparable in the ruthlessness with which they subordinate human nature and human happiness to the working of a scientific principle; and they have proved perhaps the most important and the most influential products of Victorian science.

These sentences are themselves interesting as they unravel Carr’s view of history as well as the modern Victorian world, the world of his own childhood which disappeared because of the Great

War. We will turn to this issue in chapter five where we will discuss Carr's relationship to Victorian utopianism. At this point, another significant set of sentences should be quoted for this future investigation. Carr (1933, 364-65) continues toward the end of the book:

It was indeed a new age which dawned when Karl Marx replaced Herzen and Bakunin as the most prominent figure in revolutionary Europe. ...the revolutionary movement, as the years progressed, took on more and more of the grim, dogmatic, matter of fact characteristics of the later Victorian age. In the person of that typical Victorian *savant* Karl Marx, it entered a phase whose vitality has not yet altogether exhausted itself.

The sentences suggest the (dis)connection between romanticism and Marxism. To foreshadow the conclusion, the two schools of thought will turn out to represent political philosophies of individualism and collectivism respectively. In the meantime, however, it is necessary to finish our investigation of the romanticist side of the story.

The Tragedy Reprised

Our examination departs from chronology here. *Karl Marx* appeared three years before *Michael Bakunin*. As Jonathan Haslam (1999, 43-56) argues, however, Carr's interest in Bakunin started with his writing of *Dostoevsky*. Carr has finished a substantial amount of research at the publication of *The Romantic Exiles*. On the contrary, Carr was originally disinterested in Marx before the publisher asked him to write *Karl Marx* (also see Carr 2000, xvii-xviii). *Dostoevsky*, *The Romantic Exiles*, and *Michael Bakunin* compose a trilogy of Carr's early study of Russian mind, or a counterforce to modern Europe. *Michael Bakunin* should thus be investigated before *Karl Marx*. The actual text of the book verifies this hypothesis as my following discussion shows.

Bakunin's Spectacular Life

In *Michael Bakunin*, Carr employs a similar literary strategy adopted in *The Romantic Exiles*. The private life of Bakunin intersects with his intellectual life, especially in his early

years, although, unlike Herzen, at the center of the story is not so much the passion of love as the devotion to rebellion. “Since Michael Bakunin has won a place in history not as a great lover but as a great rebel, it is permissible to regard his first rebellion as a more important landmark in his career than his first love” (Carr 1937a, 12). Carr characterizes young Bakunin’s conflict with his father as the first notable event in his life since it unravels the innate revolutionary character of this future anarchist. Already in the early part of the book, it is possible find the phrases such as “Michael’s innate tendency to rebel,” “Michael, the born rebel and romantic,” and his “resilient nature” (Carr 1937a, 14, 67, 88).

As in the case of Herzen, Carr’s story of Bakunin has a teleological moment. Bakunin’s quarrel with his father concerned the forced marriage of his sister. Bakunin gave an objection to this marriage by advocating the importance of love. Love is not controllable but is known only through a genuine practice of it. Born in the middle of the eighteenth century, Alexander, Michael’s father, a rationalist, did not understand the romanticism of the 1830s. By describing the conflict as “a conflict, not merely of two generations, but of two centuries,” Carr (1937a, 14) describes this episode as a sign of the arrival of the new era. In concluding this story, Carr (1937a, 17) states: “the time was coming in Michael’s life when every other authority would in turn be judged, found wanting, and condemned to annihilation.”

After the family problem, the first intellectual step to such annihilation comes from his exposure to romanticism. The romanticism in Russia derived from Germany and thus had a strong idealist inclination. In other words, romanticism implied an escape from reality. Carr points out that this philosophy designates a rupture between two generations in western intellectual history. “The eighteenth century was a masculine age whose catchword was Reason. The motto of the new age was Love” (Carr 1937a, 21).

But love was idiosyncratically idealistic for Bakunin, if his contemporary romanticists were more concerned about the tension between reality and idea. Because young Bakunin was idealistically romantic in love, Carr (1937a, 24) needs to insert the speculation that Bakunin was probably impotent in his later years and had no sexual relations with women. While this is just Carr's speculation, he finds in it a reason to see Bakunin as innately revolutionary. Carr argues that Bakunin's passion is directed toward political enthusiasm due to his disinterest in sexual love. "His tumultuous passions, denied a sexual outlet, boiled over into every personal and political relationship of his life, and created that intense, bizarre, destructive personality which fascinated even where it repelled, and which left its mark on half nineteenth-century Europe" (Carr 1937a, 24).

Bakunin was destined to be a political rebel even when he was not yet interested in politics. Carr's narrative is deterministic as he keeps talking about Bakunin's "nature." Naturally, therefore, Bakunin acquires the political awareness in the succeeding steps of his intellectual development. Bakunin's interests evolve from romanticism to Kant to Fichte, to carry the idealist philosophy to the extreme subjectivism. Carr (1937a, 39) anticipates the future of Bakunin: "Michael, true child of the romantic age, continued throughout his life to shun the common bread of hard reality and to chew the sweetmeats and spices of his own fancy." On the other hand, however, Bakunin did not stick to Fichte. He needed to introduce reality to his world. Carr discerns this opportunity in Bakunin's intense quarrel with Belinsky about the latter's love of Bakunin's sister, a private affair again. "At the first blow of hard reality, his ideal world had crumbled" (Carr 1937a, 44). Other domestic affairs followed and Bakunin was led to realize "that his 'external world' was nothing but 'dreams and phrases,' and that his 'inner life' was 'poor and shallow'" (Carr 1937a, 59).

Bakunin then enters his Hegelian stage to find the reconciliation between reality and idea. Carr notes that Bakunin did not deeply engage in Hegel. But Bakunin “took from it what he wanted and adapted it to his own spiritual needs” (Carr 1937a, 61). Hegel contributed to advance Bakunin’s romantic idealism rather than subverted it. In the intellectual development of Bakunin, his romantic premises were secured since they were innate to him. After the conflict with Belinsky about the interpretation of Hegel, Bakunin first finds his revolutionary awareness in the disciples of Hegel such as Schiller and David Strauss (Carr 1937a, 75).

Bakunin’s final turn to politics was concomitant with his farewell to philosophy, philosophy from Germany. “Neo-Hegelian radicalism was theory. French socialism was practice. Philosophy could only negate the past. The future belonged to men of action” (Carr 1937a, 111-12). While this meant Bakunin’s detachment from his previous standpoint, it was a conversion from one form of romanticism to another. He subscribed to George Sand’s socialist type of romanticism after discarding the romanticism of German idealists. Now the intellectual center for Bakunin moved from Germany to France. Then Bakunin needed to visit France. “Everyone interested in the theory or practice of revolution was bound sooner or later to come to Paris. It was the bugbear of the conservatives and the Mecca of the malcontents. It was the proper element of such a spirit as Michael Bakunin” (Carr 1937a, 125).

Bakunin’s intellectual development is, as such, not only linear but is also predetermined in Carr’s narrative. “Since in so headstrong a character as Michael Bakunin temperament in the long run generally outweighs both tradition and reason, his eventual conversion to the revolutionary cause may reasonably be regarded as a foregone conclusion” (Carr 1937a, 106). Importantly, Carr finds this trait of Bakunin something uniquely Russian. “But the rapidity and completeness of the conversion exhibit symptoms typical both of the Russian aristocrat in

general and of Bakunin in particular” (Carr 1937a, 106). Russianness is linked with the romantic and revolutionary tendency. Said otherwise, the Russian character in Bakunin automatically led him to be a political rebel.

As the early part of the book describes such an epical story of his intellectual development, the rest of the book has another teleological element. The text unfolds as if the life of Bakunin was destined to his debate with Marx. The rest of this section analyzes this part of the text.

It is one thing that the debate between Marx and Bakunin was already well known among Carr’s contemporaries. It is another thing that Carr anticipated it in the middle of his narration of the rebel’s life. After Bakunin transformed himself into a political rebel, Carr foreshadows his coming quarrel with Marx again and again. In 1848, Marx’s newspaper printed an article about the suspicion that Bakunin was a Russian government spy. Carr (1937a, 164) notes: “This episode served many years later as one of the counts in the charge of malice brought against Marx by Bakunin and his followers.” Carr compares the two thinkers even where Marx was not physically involved. “Bakunin,” Carr (1937a, 184) states somewhat suddenly in comparing him with an editor of Czech newspaper, “went far beyond the most extreme ambitions of the dogmatic and dictatorial Marx.” It is easy to find further examples of both forms in other parts of the book (Carr 1937a, 235, 247, 265).

In the latter part of the book, the plot is also notable in its manner and order of telling the episodes. After finishing the middle part as above, Carr situates the chapter on Marx and Bakunin before the epilogue. One-fourth of the book is dedicated to this part, which sufficiently illustrates the importance of the debate in Bakunin’s life. This revolutionary figure was most productive in his intellectual output before his fight with Marx (Carr 1937a, 327). He was a leading figure in the revolutionary strand. Liberalists of 1840s, such as Herzen, already retreated

and could not communicate with the nihilistic generation of 1860s. Bakunin, who always welcomed anything new, was most vigorous among this inchoate generation, if his romantic spirit was not the same as nihilism (Carr 1937a, 334, 376). As aforementioned, the rumor of 1848, the one that Bakunin was a Russian spy, contributed to the doubt of this collaboration. Bakunin's tentative ally with nihilist Nechaev aggrandized the suspicion (Carr 1937a, 393). Therefore, Carr (1937a, 375) needed to insert the chapter on Nechaev before talking about the actual fight between Marx and Bakunin: "the story of the slowly widening rift between Bakunin and Marx must be suspended while a new character is brought upon the stage."

Compared with such recurrent prescience of the duel, the description of the actual battle is strikingly short. Within Book V of *Michael Bakunin* which titled "Bakunin and Marx," the fight of "Marx versus Bakunin" occurs only in the last chapter: Carr dedicates less than twenty pages for describing it. A contemporary reviewer of the book already realized this strange structure of Carr's story: "Carr does not discuss in detail the controversy between Marx and Bakunin except in one short chapter, and even there does not attempt to analyse the fundamental issues" (Buck 1938, 738). Yet this is not strange once we firmly grasp the aforementioned teleology in Carr's story. As Bakunin was destined to lose, the detail of the conflict was not important.

By the same token, it is natural that the post-debate scene is more dramatic. The young Russian revolutionaries of 1870s tried to bring Bakunin back to the public realm. But Bakunin "was too old and too tired for the life of a political campaigner" (Carr 1937a, 452). The conflict between Marx and Bakunin, which led to the breakup of the First International, is said to have been the beginning of the long antagonism between Marxists and anarchists. By contrast, Bakunin's intellectual life ends here in Carr's narrative. "His name was still held in awe by his young compatriots; but his active share in the Russian revolutionary movement had come to an

end” (Carr 1937a, 456). Bakunin’s actual retirement accompanies the scene where he sends a letter to the International for deactivating his membership. Carr (1937a, 460-61) even dramatizes this event: “These letters written and dispatched, Bakunin had one further task to perform. He visited a tailor and replenished his wardrobe in a style appropriate to his new role as a respectable bourgeois.” As a rebel failed in his project, he needed to return to the old world which he was no longer able to reject.

The peculiar structure of Carr’s narrative in these last phases thus further illuminates its teleological character. Bakunin’s story needed to be tragic as Herzen’s was “appropriately” so. The story of Bakunin is the story of a Russian who was destined to enter the war with a German, only to be defeated. One of the main obstacles for the mutual understanding of Marx and Bakunin was, indeed, their physical origins.

Carr’s literary strategies cannot be overlooked. Carr finds a seed of the conflict already in their first encounter in Paris. In 1844, Marx already showed his intellectual talent and Bakunin admired it. “Bakunin’s perfectly sincere admiration for Marx’s talents did not, however, include any affection for his person” (Carr 1937a, 129). The conflict came from the difference of their personalities. “For Bakunin, Marx’s nature always remained something alien and repellent. Marx was hard, meticulous, and calculating. He practised a scientific socialism professedly based on pure thought; and for Bakunin nothing was good which was not tinged with emotion” (Carr 1937a, 129). Their conflict was natural. Indeed, their coming duel was arranged already when they were born. Carr (1937a, 129) continues: “Between the Russian aristocrat and the Jewish lawyer’s son there was not merely a clash of temperaments, but a lack of any common background of tradition and ideas; and from the outset they neither understood nor liked each other.”

Carr always uses these contrasts to distinguish the two thinkers. By quoting Bakunin's letter to George Herwegh, Carr (1937a, 146) states: "The fundamental, temperamental antithesis between Karl Marx and Michael Bakunin, between the man of study and theory and the man of impulse and action, was thus early defined by Bakunin himself." When both Marx and Bakunin agreed with Proudhon's view of revolution in 1848, it "was temperamentally easier for Bakunin than for Marx to renounce representative institutions" (Carr 1937a, 172). Bakunin was a holder of "the queer illogical fascination" while Marx was "abnormally unimpressionable" (Carr 1937a, 306). Even the breakup of the First International owes its cause to their difference of personality. "Marx, who loved order and precision, had no use for the collaboration of anyone who did not offer unquestioning loyalty and obedience. Bakunin, fundamentally undisciplined, might lead but could never follow" (Carr 1937a, 307).

The Rise of Individualism

The fundamental difference in "nature" predetermined the tragic course of Bakunin's life. Note that Carr's schematic characterization of the two thinkers was somewhat notorious for his contemporary commentators. Carr's "contrast of Marxism and Bakuninism," Samuel Bernstein (1939, 290) critiqued, "sometimes border on the superficial. Marx, he says was a man of 'study and theory,' while Bakunin was one of 'impulse and action.' Any biography of Marx, even the one by Mr. Carr himself, is sufficient to show that Marx's life is the perfect example of the unity of thought and action." Bernstein's (1939, 291) conclusion was that Carr's biography is "a careless one." As for Bakunin's character, Charles Buck (1938, 738) argues that "Carr, perhaps unintentionally, makes Bakunin seem to be somewhat absurd." The teleological character of Bakunin's life was Carr's creation as much as his duel with Marx was destined by this mythologized absurdity.

It is worth mentioning that Carr's characterization of Herzen is also questionable. Carr delineated Herzen, qua old democratic liberal, with Bakunin, qua new radical revolutionary, in the intellectual sphere of the 1860s. However, this view is acceptable only if we ignore the change of Herzen's thought since the 1840s. Herzen is described as if he no longer had as much ambition as Bekunin had in the 1860s: he helped Bakunin only financially. Contrary to this picture, however, it is more convincing to say, according to Karpovich (1939, 381-82), that Herzen was another main player as he shared with Bakunin the radical revolutionary spirits of the 1860s. Isaiah Berlin (1994, 82-113, 186-209), Carr's long antagonist, would later make a similar point. The heroic character of Carr's Bakunin is questionable. It can be the case that Carr was more accurate in interpreting the available sources than these commentators were. Yet the fact that these critiques all focus on Carr's characterization of the thinkers, instead of his usage of materials, is enough to suggest that his interpretation was contestable however empirical his study was. It is sufficient for this present work that Carr implanted his own value into the thinkers he described.

Importantly, it is based on such mythology that Carr illuminates the political and philosophical differences between Marx and Bakunin. The two thinkers start to represent the two major schools of thought in the history of political philosophy. The rest of this section attempts to clarify this point.

On the one hand, the difference of their philosophical orientations is more a stimulus of their mutual hatred than its result. As Bakunin converted from a student of German philosophy to a practical revolutionary, he detested the abstractness of German metaphysics in his mature years. Bakunin's Slavophil thought also prepared his enmity toward German. Marx, an internationalist, discerned a danger in Slavophil nationalism.

On the other hand, however, the difference of their philosophies has its own significance. The following sentences are worth quoting at a substantial length for illuminating Carr's view on this point.

It is an incontrovertible fact that Engels disliked the Slavs quite as heartily as Bakunin disliked the Germans, and that naïve racial prejudice rather than any profound difference of principle was the dividing line between them. But the difference of principle nevertheless existed, and coloured the thought of both. Bakunin clung fast to the romantic belief (he shed it only after the failure of the Polish insurrection of 1863) that democracy and nationalism were twin forces expressing themselves in the same revolutionary impulse. Marx and Engels, being consistent materialists and believing in the social and economic character of revolution, could afford to regard nationalism as a reactionary force. Bakunin, as a nationalist, supported Slav nationalism, though his principles failed to inspire him with any of the same enthusiasm for German nationalism. Marx and Engels, as internationalists, condemned Slav nationalism, though the corresponding phenomenon of German nationalism found them comparably tolerant. (Carr 1937a, 176)

As a sentence in the quotation suggests, Bakunin later realizes that nationalism and democracy do not necessarily come together: "the will-o'-the-wisp of Slav nationalism was relegated to the background of his political ambitions" (Carr 1937a, 286). Especially after his anarchist project in Italy in 1866, Bakunin transferred from "the revolutionary nationalism of his middle years to the revolutionary anarchism of his last period" (Carr 1937a, 320). Yet Marx continued to believe that Bakunin was a Slavophil, who tried to regenerate Europe through the revolution in Russia (Carr 1937a, 368).

The irreconcilable tension between Bakunin and Marx represented two major strands of political philosophies in the era. Carr (1937a, 214) notes that the contemporaries of the two thinkers commonly realized the "deep-seated mutual hatred of German and Slav." The encounter of Bakunin and Marx was a clash between Russian and German. At stake was the relationship between nationalism and democracy.

On the other hand, the competing schools shared their foundation: Hegel. Bakunin and Marx “developed under many of the same influences” and subscribed to the same idea of thesis-antithesis-synthesis (Carr 1937a, 434). It is true that they parted their ways in their interpretation of Hegel. Marx relied on materialist Young Hegelians and embraced a collectivist view of politics. Bakunin owed his interpretation to the extreme idealism of Max Stirner, which was the logical conclusion of romanticism. “Bakunin was, in theory, the most fanatical advocate of freedom, and the most complete individualist, who ever lived” (Carr 1937a, 435). The two thinkers disagreed with each other as to the role of the state. Marx anticipated the disappearance of the state but considered it a useful machine to realize the ideal society. For Bakunin, the revolution always needed to be the liberation from below. Yet, they basically agreed with each other in their intellectual orientation. “Both Marxists and Bakuninists wanted a new social order. But they differed fundamentally over methods” (Carr 1937a, 436). Carr (1937a, 365) notes that they were in agreement as to this point even in the height of their duel: “The difference between Marx and the General Council on the one side, and Bakunin and the commission on the other, was in the last resort one of tactics rather than of principle.”

The dichotomy between Russian Bakunin and European Marx interweaves with the one between Russia and England/Europe introduced in *Dostoevsky*. Carr finally argues that the two thinkers represent the two intellectual origins of his own contemporary political world. On the one hand, “Marx,” along with Bismarck, “clearly demonstrated that there was no necessary connexion between them, the conception of democracy and nationalism as allied forces making for political righteousness dominated the world far into the twentieth century, to be finally dissolved only in our own day by Signor Mussolini and Herr Hitler” (Carr 1937a, 139). The issue concerns the difference between Marx and Bakunin: “On the issue between nationalism and

internationalism history has not yet delivered its final judgment. Nor perhaps has it yet said its last word on the problem of the Slavs of Central Europe. Bakunin triumphed in 1918. But there are still people who share the opinion of Engels” (Carr 1937a, 176-77). Remember the last sentences of *The Romantic Exiles*. Carr’s view was that Marx came after the romantic generation of Herzen and Bakunin. The same view is repeated in *Michael Bakunin*. By characterizing the thoughts of the two romantics in the 1840s as “naïve enthusiasms,” Carr (1937a, 376) claims that the generation of the sixties’ “had not yet discovered the scientific basis for a revolutionary creed provided by Marx.”

Despite the predetermined defeat of the romantics, however, Bakunin and Marx appear as two representative strands of political thought in the early twentieth century. In the final chapter of the book, Carr speculates on their future. Marxists have some advantage since Marx left a clear form of doctrines while Bakunin left only speeches and occasional essays (Carr 1937a, 438). Nevertheless, Carr (1937a, 440) is even sympathetic to Bakunin as a vindicator of individualistic thought: “it is scarcely relevant to speak of his failure to achieve, when the whole idea of achievement was alien to his character and purpose.” It is as if Bakunin’s predetermined defeat was good and appropriate.

Why does Carr appraise Bakunin as such? The intellectual situation might have had a certain affect. As a contemporary commentator of *Michael Bakunin* insisted, there was a renewed interest in anarchism in the 1930s in the Anglophone intellectual world (Sheler 1938, 268). Even aside from this ambiguous mood, the text tells us that Carr considered Bakunin as a representative figure of a major school of political philosophy: liberal individualism. “Bakunin is one of the completest embodiments in history of the spirit of liberty—the liberty which excludes neither licence nor caprice, which tolerates no human institutions, which remains an unrealised

and unrealisable ideal, but which is almost universally felt to be an indispensable part of the highest manifestations and aspirations of humanity” (Carr 1937a, 440). Bakunin was still admirable in the 1930s as a vindicator of individuals.

Against Romance

So far, Carr’s search for the origin of the Russian mentality has reached the point where it marked a turning point in European intellectual tradition. In *Dostoevsky*, Carr found in the thinking of “the Russian of Russians” an alternative form of subjectivity. By way of *The Romantic Exiles*, his investigation of its origin revealed its clearer relation with politics in *Michael Bakunin*. Both Bakunin and Marx rejected utilitarian individualism, as Dostoevsky did. However, these two thinkers represented types of individualism and collectivism respectively. As Carr found in them the two origins of the philosophical currents in his own contemporary world, it has become clearer that he considered his era post-utilitarian.

Still, the individualism of Bakunin was a failure. Revolutionaries needed to wait Marx. Why was the arrival of science an improvement? Did Carr end up embracing Marx? It is necessary to examine these issues before turning to the interwar crisis.

Marx’s Unspectacular Life

As Carr (2000, xvii) once assessed by himself, *Karl Marx* is not written as beautifully as *The Romantic Exiles* or *Michael Bakunin*. Accordingly, Carr’s Marx is not as dramatic as his Herzen or his Bakunin. Carr already described Marx as a dispassionate character in *Michael Bakunin*. In *Karl Marx*, Marx was a man who did not carry any profound affection for his parents to his mature life (Carr 1934, 9). He was a man whose first love was the only romantic experience in the entire course of life (Carr 1934, 9). Marx is the man of theory and generalization. Marx hoped the revolution to occur. His hope always accompanied his reason.

“Marx is the outstanding example in history of the truth, which is sometimes ignored or denied, that fanaticism is as easily compatible with intellect as with emotion” (Carr 1934, 62).

As the main character is not a man of romantic passion, the life story of this figure is not dramatic in its plot. *Karl Marx* is not as literary a writing as *The Romantic Exiles* and *Michael Bakunin* were. Bakunin was destined to fight against Marx. Carr (1934, 224) states in *Karl Marx* that “the force of their personalities, their ambitions, and the conflicting opinions which reflected the conflict of temperament, made them predestined rivals” and the “culmination of the quarrel between them was the last important event in the lives of both.” However, Bakunin appears almost exclusively within about thirty pages of the last chapter of this three hundred page book. The battle with Bakunists was not special for Marx, compared with his conflict with English trade unionists and French Proudhonists (Carr 1934, 190). After shortly describing all three issues as a single event, Carr readily proceeds to talk about the fate of Marxism in his own contemporary world.

Carr plotted the story as such also because he considered Marx to have entered his mature stage very early. “The dominant personality of Marx, capable of inspiring the strongest attachment as well as the strongest repulsion, reached its full stature at a remarkably early stage of his career” (Carr 1934, 18). Carr made a similar evaluation of Marx’s practice of his theory. By 1848, “Marx had now attained the summit of his powers and the zenith of his active career. He had just passed his thirtieth birthday” (Carr 1934, 60). Marx moved from France to England in the succeeding year. All he needed to do afterwards was to apply his already established thought to actual social situations. “The migration to England,” according to Carr (1934, 67), “closed the chapter of adventure, and introduced a period of hardship, study, propaganda, and organization. His principal ideas had already taken shape when he came to London; and the

subsequent development of them was in the nature of elaboration and application rather than of fresh thought.”

Given the lack of dramatic elements in the story, our focus is on how Carr interprets the thought of Marx rather than the plot of the text. Carr provides his evaluations of the thinker at the end of the first part (correctly as the interlude between Marx’s French years and his England years) and at the penultimate chapter of the book. The titles of the chapters are “Marxism: the first phase” and “Marxism: the last phase.” The rest of our analysis scrutinizes these two chapters as well as the final chapter, where Carr situates Marx in his own view of history.

The Fall of Individualism

Carr always gives Marx a modest evaluation. He states, for example, that *Communist Manifesto* was a brilliant writing. Yet it was brilliant as a “rhetorical writing, whose strength lies in its confident and sweeping generalizations” (Carr 1934, 52).

Carr evaluates the core insight of Marx’s system of thought in the same manner. Marx’s originality was his combination of Hegelian idealism and Feuerbachian materialism. French and English philosophies contributed to it. Marx did not share the romantic sentimentalism of French socialists, because of his innate character. “There was nothing in Marx’s character which predisposed him to the sentimental side of Saint-Simonism and Fourierism, or encouraged him to believe in the perfectibility of human nature” (Carr 1934, 71). Yet these socialists taught Marx “the conception of an opposed laboring class waiting to be emancipated” and their thought was “a living, fighting organism” (Carr 1934, 71). The English economists from Adam Smith onwards gave him a thought on economy and society. “From these sources Marx extracted the theory, unfamiliar to German philosophers and unknown in German political life, of labour as the source of wealth” (Carr 1934, 72). Marx thus combined the German philosophy with the French political studies and the English economics. This combination brought him a unique theory: “the

social class-struggle serves to resolve the antinomy between Hegelian dialectic and Feuerbachian materialism” (Carr 1934, 73). As the history of class-struggle is the story of every new society negating the previous one, it consists of a dialectical process.

According to Carr, however, Marx did not solve the antinomy in the philosophical sense. “He did not attempt to defend the legitimacy of transposing the dialectical process from the plane of idealism to that of materialism; he simply assumed it” (Carr 1934, 74). Philosophy slipped off from Marx’s thought. He prioritizes action to metaphysics. Carr, by comparing this thought with Christian faith, concludes that Marx’s theory is for his faith.

Practically speaking, it is an admirable solution. Philosophically speaking—and Marx professed to be a philosopher—it is pure mumbo-jumbo. If it means anything, it means that you cannot be sure of your theory until you have tested it in practice; and Marxism, under the banner of ‘unity of thought and action,’ has tended to degenerate into a species of opportunism whose philosophical basis can be nothing but pragmatism. (Carr 1934, 80)

Marx, a philosopher, betrays his own task.

Carr points out Marx’s further diversion from philosophy. Hegelian dialectics does not anticipate any destinations. It is an infinite process. By contrast, Marx’s theory demands a clear goal: “the notion of infinity is intellectually intolerable to any save the mathematician and the philosopher; and Marx was no more than a distinguished dilettante in philosophy and mathematics” (Carr 1934, 80).

Carr recognizes a linkage between Marx and utopian socialists. “The Utopian socialists believed in progress,” Carr (1934, 74) states, “because they believed, like Rousseau, that man is essentially virtuous and that, once liberated from the chains of the existing social order, he will advance through universal goodwill into a predestined state of perfection. But this was rank idealism.” Since Marx attempted to transcend idealism, he did not share the progressivism of

utopians. This rejection of idealism enabled him to introduce materialism into his theory. Yet, by assuming the end of history, Marx “derived from them, and shared with them, their conception of the primitive state from which man had proceeded and of the future state to which man would eventually attain” (Carr 1934, 81). Marx’s detachment from utopians ends up with his reattachment to them. “On these essential points, Marx himself contributed nothing original, and was content to be the faithful disciple of the Utopian socialists” (Carr 1934, 81). Marx went back to idealism, paradoxically, through his introduction of dialectical materialism. He established primitive communism in his imaginary past and hoped the world to return to it someday in the future (Carr 1934, 82).

Two points are worthy of mention with regard to this assessment. One is that, by connecting Marx with utopian socialists, Carr detects a certain similarity between Marx and Russian revolutionaries who have been discussed thus far. After discussing Marx’s transformation of Hegelian dialectics into the logic of class conflicts, Carr (1934, 75) states: “Hegel had shown that the path of progress was the path of conflict—of a flight to the death from which new life was born. It was in this sense that Herzen the Russian called Hegelianism ‘the algebra of revolution’; and as such Marx used it.” Marx does not disagree with Russians about their revolutionary interpretation of Hegel, despite his hatred of Russians. Remember that Bakunin was idealist in his whole life despite his exposure to reality through Hegel. If Marx did not disagree with Russians about the interpretation of Hegel, it is natural that he ended up an idealist in a significant respect.

Carr also points out the romantic origin of Marxist dialectics in the succeeding paragraph. “Marx imbibed from the Romantics his belief in the creative properties of hatred, and his biting scorn of the bourgeois and the ‘philistine’; and these romantic ingredients, incongruously

compounded with the Hegelian conception of thesis and antithesis, produced the famous doctrine of class-hatred” (Carr 1934, 75). On the other hand, the belief in a prehistoric primitive community was common in Marx’s contemporary world. It was found in Russia: “at the very moment when Marx was elaborating his theories, a certain Baron Haxthausen, a German savant, was engaged in discovering traces of primitive communism in the contemporary Russian countryside” (Carr 1934, 81-82). Marx and Russian revolutionaries were intellectually interlinked with each other through their romanticism.

Next, Carr considers that Marx’s diversion from philosophy contradicts his “scientific spirit.” As I quoted earlier, Carr compares Marx with philosophers and mathematicians. Carr argues that Marx’s faith in finiteness was his diversion from philosophy. Carr uses the word scientific spirit in this context. Marx’s interest in a finite end is “surprising because it runs counter, not only to modern thought, but to the sceptical, scientific spirit which is characteristic to Marxism” (Carr 1934, 80). In *The Romantic Exiles*, Carr characterized Marx’s scientific orientation as Victorian. He now clarifies the meaning of this combination as follows:

Marx himself never admitted the possibility of a doubt. He believed in his creed with the same unquestioning fervour with which his English contemporaries believed in certain religious or moral truths which have since been subjected to the same scepticism. Marx was a typical product of a generation which believed in itself and its works, and which found its main source of inspiration in a firm faith that the future is pre-ordained to be an improvement on the present. It was the sense of inevitable success which gave Marx his overwhelming self-assurance—the famous self-assurance of the Victorian age which posterity has been so eager to mock. (Carr 1934, 78)

Science and Victorianism signify slightly separate issues. Science is the product of skepticism. The primary component of Victorianism is its faith in progress. These two elements apparently contradict with each other. Yet, it is still possible to think about their coexistence unless we deny

the value-laden character of scientific theories. To translate, Marx's method was scientific in its interest in law while the substance of his thought was predicated on his faith. According to Carr (1934, 78), Marx's policy is "the product of profound psychological insight." A renowned intellectual historian of Carr's time already argued that, even in the age of Enlightenment, the religious elements were never absent from rationalist natural philosophies (Becker 1932). Recent historians of science are even more emphatic on this point (for instance, Shapin 1994; Sutton 1995). Science and faith can coexist. Only the form of their linkage changed in the Victorian era.

As such, moral faith occupies an important position in Marx's system of thought. However, the first phase of Marxism still lacked its foundation. It can be discovered in the last phase of Marxism. "The first phase of Marxism created the system, the last provided its moral justification" (Carr 1934, 83).

The major part of the last forty pages of the book is about the fate of Marx and Marxism. Carr put a special focus on *Capital*. He considers that Marx's labor theory of value is basically flawed as it does not reflect the reality. It is rather "a pure abstraction" (Carr 1934, 264). This does not mean that Marx is ranked low as a thinker in the western history of political thought. The logical correctness of thinking is not related to its psychological starting point. Carr (1934, 264-65) employs the analogy of Christianity again:

The Catholic Church has based its system on certain postulates which are refuted by human experience, but believed in by faith. On these postulates, a series of great thinkers... have founded a system of perfect logical coherence. The first step is full of flaws from which faith averts its eyes; the rest is logically flawless. Psychologically, this incongruous juxtaposition of faith and logic has proved itself well adapted to the needs of a large proportion of humanity. Marx, an admirable practical psychologist, has unconsciously adopted the same technique.

Carr goes on to demonstrate the perfect continuity from the labor theory of value to the theory of surplus value. Since he criticized the former, he rejects the practical value of the latter for the same reason: the theory does not fit to reality. It is true that “Marx devotes many eloquent and convincing chapters to prove that this was the case in nineteenth-century England; and the same opinion can reasonably be held to-day” (Carr 1934, 269). Yet this does not guarantee the quality of his theory. Carr (1934, 269) continues: “But these are moral judgments, and have nothing to do with the theory of surplus value propounded by Marx as an economic law.” The importance of Marx resides in his clear documentation of workers’ miserable conditions in capitalist societies, however false and unsophisticated his theory was.

Carr even claims that *Capital* is important not because many people have read it but because the book influenced so many people despite the number of its actual readers. “Nobody, save a handful of specialists and enthusiasts, has read it through. Its power has lain, not in its contents, but in the fact of its existence” (Carr 1934, 276-77). Marx is important as prophet, never as theorist. In fact, according to Carr, *Capital* is even more prophetic because of its flaws in theoretical discussions. “*Capital* is a great book precisely because it is so constantly false to its professed character as a treatise on political economy, and because the prophetic note of righteous indignation so persistently breaks in on the arid course of economic argument” (Carr 1934, 277).

On the other hand, the scientific part of Marxism remained in its last phase. Starting from the fact that Marx’s *Critique of Political Economy* was published in the same year as in Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, Carr (1934, 283) discusses the similarity between the two thinkers as follows: “Both provided a materialist basis for a conception of progress, both subordinated human nature and human happiness to the march of a scientific idea; and Marx soon detected a parallelism

between the survival of the fittest in nature and the class-struggle in society.” Carr (1934, 283-84) also points out that Marx sent a copy of *Capital* to Darwin, and Marx encouraged his disciples to emphasize the similarity between the two. Carr (1934, 300) himself repeats this parallel in the final part of the book.

Marxism established a strong position in the history of intellectual thought through its combination of moral faith and scientific generalization. Marx “constituted a turning point in human thought,” which declared the beginning of “the end of the three-hundred-year period of history to which he gave the convenient, though not entirely appropriate label of ‘bourgeois civilization’” (Carr 1934, 301). Even if “Marx was the genius of destruction, not of construction” and his view of the new world was “even childish” that revealed “the amazing self-contradiction of his whole system,” Marx has his own place in the nineteenth century intellectual thought (Carr 1934, 301). Marx is important because of his attempt to provide the counterpart to individualism. Contrary to the liberal thinkers from Rousseau to Mill, Marx assigned only a minor role to individuals. “Marx was the first important thinker for three centuries who did not deign to pay even lip-service to the fetish of individual liberty.” Carr (1934, 302) continues: “And that is why, if the quality of Marxist doctrine is to be summed up in a single word, that word should be ‘fanaticism.’” It is worth mentioning that the subtitle of *Karl Marx* is “A Study in Fanaticism.”

Beyond Failures

Carr depicted Marx in a less sympathetic manner than he described the lives of Herzen and Bakunin. Yet Marx ended up a significant thinker in history because of his extraordinarily anti-individualist position in the western tradition of political thought. Especially when Marx had some similarity with Russian revolutionaries in terms of philosophical orientations, he appears as another representative figure in the post-utilitarian era.

Karl Marx thus further clarified Carr's view of history. The transition from Bakunin to Marx was not just a shift from romanticism to scientism. Science was rather a method. But science led Marx to a different conclusion both from Mill's and Bakunin's: collectivism. In *Michael Bakunin*, it was still vague how Carr considered the competition between individualism and collectivism. In the end of *Karl Marx*, Carr's characterization is clearer. "In *Capital*, Marx refers to the *régime* of *laissez-faire* capitalism as the world of 'liberty, equality, property and Jeremy Bentham.' It would be a fair parody to describe the world of the twentieth century as the world of mass-production, mass-dictatorship and Marx" (Carr 1934, 302-3).

Marx is clearly connected with totalitarian dictatorship. The analogy between utilitarianism and Marxism is interesting in this regard. Given that Carr was already aware that he lived in the post-utilitarian world, the sentences sound like the prescience of the future fall of Marxism.

Indeed, Carr does announce it.

Even if the near future produces an extension and an intensification of mass-rule, the inveterate tendency of man to individualize himself will ultimately reappear; and, unless all historical analogies are false, a new differentiation of the mass will lead to a new renaissance of humanism. Nobody will care to prophesy when and how this revolution will occur. But when it is consummated, the Marxist epoch of history will have come to an end. (Carr 1934, 303)

Suggestive enough, this is the end of the book.

Marxism, if not exactly the thought of Marx itself, seemed to be the terror in Carr's time. It is not only in the above sentences that Carr implies such view. I suggested at the beginning of my examination of *Karl Marx* that Carr's evaluation of Marx is often modest. After examining the whole book, it appears so modest that we do not have much difficulty in finding more indirect criticisms than appraisals; or, we only find criticisms disguised by ironically phrased appraisals.

Carr certainly exploited rhetorical strategy to denounce Marx. We already saw that a commentator of *Michael Bakunin* criticized Carr's view of Marx as a failed synthesizer of theory and practice. Carr, based on this view, presented Marx as a prophet in *Karl Marx*. Yet even a sympathetic commentator of *Karl Marx* cast doubt on Carr's statement that just a small number of people actually read *Capital* (Woodward 1934, 721). Carr could have overemphasized Marx's prophetic character to clarify his unfortunate relevancy to the interwar world.

To summarize, our investigation of the four biographies have unfolded as follows. Carr found in Dostoevsky the question of irrationality as the fundamental problem to be solved for his contemporary Europe. Carr sought the origins of the question first in Herzen, then his radical successor Bakunin, and finally reached his antagonist Marx. Pure individualism and its negation appeared as solutions. Yet Carr found neither of them as defensible.

The competition between individualism and collectivism is not so much a dialectics between two philosophies of equal importance as a phase of exceptional crisis to transcend. Two years after the publication of *Michael Bakunin*, Carr literary called the interwar era as "crisis." It is time to turn to the book which has the word crisis in its title.

CHAPTER 4 IN THE PRESENT CRISIS

Now that Carr finished introducing all his questions (from the fundamental irrationality of human to its political corollary) as well as some possible erroneous answers to them (religion, romanticism and totalitarianism), he needs to present his own solution. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* attempts at this endeavor. Carr talks little about Russia and Russian thinkers in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. This is not strange, however, since Russia was, as already discussed, just a functional category for Carr to reveal the contemporaneous threat to Europe. What Carr learned from his nineteenth century thinkers were not specific insights but the central problems in the intellectual sphere of his time.

The first section clarifies Carr's historical awareness impregnated within his binary between utopia and reality. Scholars have often recognized this fundamental framework of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* as a theoretical generalization of particular schools of thought. Yet I will argue that the two ideal types also accord with the distinct phases of history in Europe. Because of this historical form of thinking, it is necessary to read *The Twenty Years' Crisis* in history and especially in its relation to the four biographies. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is an inquiry into history and thus shares its starting point with his investigation of nineteenth century revolutionaries.

Once Carr starts criticizing utopianism, it will turn out that his problem intersects with the critiques of utilitarian voluntarism by revolutionary thinkers. Realism comes as a nihilist assault against the economic man. As such, realism is the question that Carr needs to solve: the ramification of human irrationality in politics. These are the topics of the succeeding two sections.

Carr needs to provide his own way to surpass realism. The succeeding sections of the chapter focus on this aspect of Carr's system of thought. It will be clear that, despite his limited appraisal in his biography, Carr follows Dostoevsky's way very closely in its form of thinking. In fact, Carr ends up presenting his own rational belief in man. Yet, by doing so, Carr also goes back to Victorian progressivism.

Escape from Abstraction

The objective of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is, according to Carr (1939a, ix-x), to specify the profound underlining cause of his contemporaneous crisis instead of discussing personal and immediate ones. The result is his dichotomy of "utopia and reality," which was the original title of the book (Haslam 1999, 68; Cox 2001, xi). Scholars in the field of international studies have traditionally grasped this dichotomization as a herald of realism (Measheimer 2005). Recent revisionists rather emphasize the importance of utopianism in Carr (Booth 1991) or its complementary relation with realism (Jones 1998; Molloy 2003). The first interpretation cannot be sustained, given Carr's explicit critiques of realism in the chapter on limits of realism. Yet the second interpretation is not without shortcomings. Both interpretations usually grasp utopianism and realism as mere theoretical categories. By providing two epigraphs from Francis Bacon, however, Carr announces, even before starting his discussion, that he is not interested in purely theoretical ideas. It is a significant flaw to understand utopianism and realism as mere ideal types. Each of them signifies a specific phase of European history. "For Carr," Randall Germain (2000, 325) suggests, "knowledge about human affairs loses its meaning unless it takes an historical form."

This is the starting point for reading *The Twenty Years' Crisis* and is thus needs further clarification. The book starts with the following sentence: "The science of international politics is in its infancy" (Carr 1939a, 3). International politics had been the concern only of

professionals until 1914. The Great War first popularized it. People started to express their objections to it and such objections began to affect political practice after the commencement of the war. "It was the first symptom of the demand for the popularization of international politics and heralded the birth of a new science" (Carr 1939a, 4). A particular ideal is necessary for developing science. Yet the study of international relations has long failed to incorporate analytical elements, which contribute to verify the legitimacy of this ideal. Adam Smith's theory of political economy was based on certain unverifiable generalizations about economic man. Utopian socialists in the nineteenth century did not analyze the nature of class consciousness. A scientific mind appeared only after 1931: this is realism (Carr 1939a, 8-13).

In this narrative, both utopianism and realism are particular historical stages in modern history. Utopianism had been dominant for a long time and realism appeared only recently in the early 1930s. This historical awareness is clear when Carr discusses even most theoretical topics in the succeeding chapter. The second chapter of the book deals with abstract issues such as free will and determinism, theory and practice, and ethics and politics. Yet, in discussing these issues, Carr (1939a, 16-19) quotes thinkers such as Sorel, Hegel, Marx, Jung and William James: all modern.

The historical awareness of Carr comes into yet sharper relief in the distinction between the intellectual and the bureaucrat. As an exemplification of theory-practice dichotomy, this issue is not as abstract as others. As a concrete category, therefore, it has its history. While Carr (1939a, 20-21) refers to "the last two hundred years" of intellectual outlook and intellectuals in "modern times," all his examples are, again, modern figures such as well-known Woodrow Wilson, the intellectuals in pre-War Germany, and the intelligentsia analyzed by Lenin and Mannheim.

Contemporary intellectual historians had already provided a typical view of the Enlightenment which continued to be an orthodox one for the succeeding decades. Kant, after Rousseau, is the culminating point of the Enlightenment according to this view (Lovejoy 1936; Cassirer 1951). Carr (1939a, 34-35), if superficially, shared this view and considered Rousseau and Kant as the predecessors of utopianism of Mill and Bentham. It is in this sense that Carr identified the intellectual with the left (Carr 1939a, 26). According to Stefan Collini (1993), these utilitarian thinkers contributed to create the class called intellectual in nineteenth century Britain. Carr calls them utopians. If the popularization of international politics enables an emancipation of people from elite intellectuals through scientific skepticism, it is a historical process in which these utilitarian intellectuals lose their authoritative status in society.

What is noteworthy in this historical thinking is that Carr distinguishes utopianism and realism in general from their modern variants in particular. Whereas Carr (1939a, 83) finds origins of realism in Machiavelli, Hobbes and other thinkers in earlier centuries, he maintains the distinction of modern realism from its predecessors in terms of its historical awareness. Modern realism would not manifest its political influence, as already mentioned, until 1930s. Similarly, Carr almost exclusively focuses on Victorian liberals in his most detailed critique of utopianism in chapter three. Carr's primary concern in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is modern utopianism and modern realism, not utopianism and realism in general.

Economic Man Leaves

As Carr assesses both phases of history critically, it is necessary to understand their advantages and disadvantages one by one. This is the task of the first half of the book. So our investigation needs to follow Carr's discussion closely. In this process, it will become clear how Carr considered human irrationality as the fundamental problem for his time.

What is the problem of modern utopianism? According to Carr, its dominant mode of thinking took the contemporary shape in the thought of Jeremy Bentham. However, the utilitarianism started to get challenged already by the end of the nineteenth century (Carr 1939a, 31-36). The modern utopianism after the Great War was a strange revival of this dying thought and this revival occurred only accidentally. Modern utopianism regained its power partly because of the popular post-war symptom of seeking the restful place in the past. However, the more significant cause was the rise of the United States. In this context, a Victorian thought became an abstract theory by detaching from its original intellectual context in Britain. “The liberal democracies scattered throughout the world by the peace settlement of 1919 were the product of abstract theory, struck no roots in the soil, and quickly shriveled away” (Carr 1939a, 37-38). The interwar crisis was a delayed reaction to modern utopianism. The arrival of realism was necessity in history as “the belated reflexion of a century past beyond recall” (Carr 1939a, 287).

This understanding implies two points about the nature of modern utopianism. On the one hand, modern utopianism had certain attraction since it reappeared even after people shed sufficient doubts on its validity as a social theory. On the other hand, it had a fundamental deficit since it had started to show its limits already in the nineteenth century before the actual death sentence was handed down to it in the interwar years. What is significant is that these two aspects coexisted in the nineteenth century. In other words, the comprehension of the success of modern utopianism is necessary for understanding its central flaw.

Succinctly put, Carr identifies the primary success of modern utopianism with its ostensible achievement of the harmony between individual and society. Carr titles the first section of chapter four “the utopian synthesis,” the synthesis between private and public interests. According to the utilitarian perspective, it is always good to achieve the greatest good of the

greatest number. On the one hand, this doctrine vindicates the ethical claim that to work for society is unconditionally good. On the other hand, this doctrine provides a reason for the self-interested man to work for his society without sacrificing his own interest. The pursuit of self-interest and that of community-interest are in union (Carr 1939a, 54-56).

Carr finds the origin of this utilitarianism in Adam Smith's thought of the invisible hand. This thought was tenable as long as it contributed to the prosperity within nations as it presupposed a small society with small industries. When it was applied to international field, however, it turned out to be a theoretical justification of imperialist expansionism. Modern utopianism vindicated nationalism through the analogy between national and international: the division of labor can exist among, as it does within, nations. Hegelian, Marxist, and Darwinian philosophies of conflict were potentially subversive to this doctrine. But they were neutralized to rather encourage its survival. As Smith's theory of nation was applied to the international sphere, the idea of the struggle for the fittest appeared as a social theory of international relations. "The harmony of interests was established through the sacrifice of 'unfit' Africans and Asiatics" (Carr 1939a, 64).

As such, the success and the problem of modern utopianism reside in the same part of the doctrine: the rational economic model of man. The doctrine of "the greatest good of the greatest number" can logically imply the sacrifice of the group of people who are not counted as "the greatest number." Contrary to the suggestion of recent revisionists (Wilson 1995, 6-7; Rich 2000, 205), in this sense, Carr's analysis is not a mere polemic against those whose ideas he did not share. Carr identifies the problem of modern utopianism with its failure to solve the tension between individual and society.

The problem of modern utopianism is its failure to achieve the goal of political philosophy. A strict continuity from his early biographies to *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is visible here. The problem of modern utopianism is the unreality of the idea that the act of a good rational man leads to a good society. Dostoevsky, Herzen, Bakunin, and Marx all rejected this rationalist model. The problem of utopianism is its lack of awareness about human irrationality. The primary question of Carr and that of his nineteenth century thinkers are identical.

History Rages

If so, however, it is legitimate to suppose that Carr's primary target was realism. Modern utopianism was ignorant of human irrationality. Modern realism made it visible. Then it is modern realist who is a skeptical nihilist. Carr needs to provide the way to overcome realism. The actual story of Carr certifies the correctness of this speculation. The problem for Dostoevsky was to prevent irrational man from being nihilist in politics. In *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, the realist is such a nihilist by casting doubts on the rationality of man. Realism is the form of politics which unleashes the abyss into the world.

To begin with, the interwar crisis is the arrival of realism. The title of the book seems to suggest that the crisis covers the whole interwar period. As Peter Wilson (1995, 7) suggests, however, this is not the case. He claims that the book is about the twelve or fifteen years of crisis when utopianism was influential from 1919 to 1930 or 1933. Wilson is right by discerning the two different phases of the interwar period in Carr's discourse. Yet he is wrong by identifying the first phase as the period of crisis. Carr (1937b) already provided his periodization in *International Relations since the Peace Treaties* two years before *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. According to this text, the crisis starts from the economic disaster and Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931: the subtitle of part three of the book is "The Period of Crisis: The Return of

Power Politics (1930-1933).” This understanding is compatible with my argument so far. *The Twenty Years’ Crisis* is, I would say, either the nine or six years’ crisis.

Therefore, a thorough knowledge about modern realism is necessary to understand Carr’s solution to the problem of irrationality. Scholars have usually agreed that power and self-interest constitute primary attributes of realism (see Vasquez 1998). Yet a more important aspect of realism is its subscription to the deterministic law of history, at least, in Carr’s system of thought. Power and self-interest are two of the variables in this law. The rest of this section is dedicated to discussing this point.

It should be advisable to clarify why self-interest and power are not the most idiosyncratic elements of modern realism. As for self-interest, it is sufficient to remember that modern utopianism started with its (apparent) synthesis between the self- and group-interests. Modern utopianism is based on the assumption of the self-interested man just as modern realism is. In this regard, modern realism did not reject the whole system of modern utopianism. It just suggested that the achievement of harmony in the political world is not an automatic process.

The issue of power is slightly more complicated. By emphasizing the complementary relationship between morality and power in later chapters of *The Twenty Years’ Crisis*, Carr seems to have given much emphasis on power as the primary element of realism. Such a view is possible only when we consider the dichotomy of utopianism and realism to run parallel with the binary of morality and power. According to Carr, however, utopianism and realism each has its own view about the relationship between morality and power. They differ not because one represents morality and the other power. They differ in their conceptualization of morality and power: “the antithesis of utopia and morality is rooted in a different conception of the relationship of politics and ethics” (Carr 1939a, 28). In the realist world, power dominates

morality. In this sense, however, what is more crucial about modern realism is the system where power is considered to dominate morality. The issue of power is only a part of it.

A more fundamental problem is human irrationality which scholars sometime call the human nature assumption (see Freyberg-Inan 2004). As we now know, it entails a uniquely nihilistic implication in politics. Yet in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr prefers the term not nihilism but history to describe it. Behaviors of irrational individuals go beyond their control, just as Raskolnikov could not smartly put his principle into practice. This is the meaning of irrationality. The consequence of individuals' behaviors acquires certain autonomous effects. History advances as if it has its own driving force, which is something like, if not exactly the same as, what Hegel called *Geist*. Indeed, Hegel is one of the pioneering thinkers of political realism in the discourse of Carr (1939a, 84). As Andreas Osiander (1998, 418-21) emphasizes, one of the decisive differences between realism and utopianism resides in their philosophies of history.

To clarify this point, it is worth delving into epistemological differences between two schools of thought. Carr's distinction between utopianism and realism relates to the one between idealism and realism in philosophy. As I already mentioned, representative thinkers of modern utopianism included many idealists in nineteenth century Britain. Carr (1939a, 14) identifies the critic of this strand with "commonly called" realism. Historically speaking, we can guess that this realism is philosophical realism since it arose in the early twentieth century partly as a reaction to idealist philosophies.

To be sure, political utopianism and political realism do not neatly correspond to philosophical idealism and philosophical realism as is easily intelligible from the fact that Hegel is categorized into the realist camp in Carr's discourse. As we will discuss later, Carr is basically

eclectic as for epistemological issues. Yet certain relations are still observable in the text.

According to Carr (1939a, 14), realism “places its emphasis on the acceptance of facts on the analysis of their causes and consequences,” in the field of thought, and “tends to emphasise the irresistible strength of existing forces and the inevitable character of existing tendencies, and to insist that the highest wisdom lies in accepting, and adapting oneself to, these forces and these tendencies,” in the field of action. Carr identified realism with the historicist school of thought in Germany. Karl Popper (2002, 3) would later critique historicism from a perspective of the philosophy of science by defining it as “an approach to the social sciences which assumes that *historical prediction* is their principal aim, and which assumes that this aim is attainable by discovering the ‘rhythms’ or the ‘patterns,’ the ‘laws’ or the ‘trends’ that underlie the evolution of history” (original emphasis). Popper (2002, 46) mentions thinkers including Marx as historicist.

More historically, one of the historicists Carr referred in his text already proposed such view that political realism and realist-positivist philosophy are at once: Friedrich Meinecke’s (1936) *Die Entstehung des Historismus*. Meinecke himself has been considered a pioneer of political realism in international studies. “I have often said that what Morgenthau did was translate Meinecke from German to English,” Kenneth Waltz once stated, for example, “and if you look at the index, you won’t see Meinecke mentioned. I would translate some of Meinecke into the same words that Morgenthau used in *Politics among Nations*. And then Morton Kaplan translated Morgenthau from English into whatever language it was that Kaplan was writing in.” (Halliday and Rosenberg 1998, 386). No reference to *Historismus* appears in the text of *The Twenty Years’ Crisis*. But Carr (1939a, 112) cites, at least, Meinecke’s another major work, *Die Idee der Staatsräson in der neueren Geschichte*, for which *Historismus* is the substantial companion (see Hofer 1957). Both works concern the rise of modern realist state.

Carr even directly refers to the works of philosophical realists. Bertrand Russell is one of the oft-cited figures in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Many of the references are to the political commentaries of this philosopher but at least two of them concern his philosophical discussion. One of them is about the conjunction between words and things, which is the argument of philosophical realism. Carr (1939a, 41) makes this reference in his critique of utopianism. The other quotation is about the relationship between ethics and reality in the middle of the discussion about the relativist character of realism. Russell here considers ethics to be more often a product of reality than otherwise (Carr 1939a, 87). This is a manifestation of philosophical realism, as it points to the primacy of direct experiences over idealist metaphysical thinking in our acquisition of knowledge.

In a similar vein, it is possible that Carr, as a reader of the wide range of literature, learned philosophical realism through the novels of Henry James. As far as the text is concerned, Carr refers to the pragmatism of his brother. Carr (1939a, 17, fn. 1) states that the dichotomy of utopia and reality, at least analogically, accords with William James's pairs of opposites such as rationalist-empiricist, intellectualist-sensationalist, and idealist-materialists. George Herbert Mead (1936, chap. 15), a contemporary commentator, discussed in his lecture of the western tradition of philosophy that realism and pragmatism were two of the similar reactions to idealism.

According to Mead (1936, 328), the fundamental point of philosophical realism is as follows. "In the world of idealistic school the relations [of elements which constitute the world] were always the impressions of the realizing mind, so that relations were taken back to thought of the self." Relations are important in the realist world as well but only inasmuch as they establish laws between causes and effects. Mead continues: "The realist, on the other hand, assumes the relations as simply there. We think them; and if we think them, they must be there,

for we must be thinking something.” The main interest of realism thus resides in the “process of analysis, of breaking up the object of knowledge into its various elements, with the isolation of the connection as well as of the things themselves.” In the idealist world, the self relates it to the world through his own internal idea. Other people can be friends or foes depending on his recognition. As such, the substance of himself changes by becoming friend or foe of others. By contrast, each element is independent in the world of realism. It is only in this atomistic world where we can think of causes and effects as separate variables. If modern realism was scientific and analytical, it could not be so without embracing philosophical realism at least partly.

The word real in realism signifies the attitude to see the world as it is. How can we imagine the world as an objective entity? What is the world as it is? Carr states that modern realism is different from its precursors in that it embraces the idea of progress. If realism believes in the autonomy of history, the world as it is in this school of thought is the one that the law of history creates. This law does not lead the human world to a predetermined goal. As the law is beyond human subjectivity, however, it gives certain objectivity to the shape of the world. Realism is realistic when it observes the (materially) “real” and (historically) “inevitable” clash of interests among nations that utopianism tries to disguise through its holistic view of the world (Carr 1939a, 77).

In this regard, traditional scholars are right to have considered positivism as an element of realism if they have never scrutinized the issue in the original historical context (see Vasquez 1998). Because of the subscription to this philosophy of science, however, the realist world is, as scholars have also frequently suggested, tragic (see Lebow 2003). The law of history impersonally (or scientifically) determines the course of the world’s development. Modern realism is a form of despair since it does not admit the power of individuals to create their own

history. However eagerly a rational man acts to achieve social harmony, history negates such efforts and constantly brings quagmires. Even if individuals are rational, their collective actions are irrational. It is the world of what Reinhold Niebuhr suggests by the title of his book *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932). Carr (1939a, x) manifested his indebtedness to this work in the preface of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. If the acts of man create irrational world, however, can we actually say that such man is rational? From a consequentialist point of view, it is more reasonable to consider that such man is irrational since his behavior results in irrational events. The world of modern realism is the society of irrational men.

Note that the realist rejection of the economic man is a product not of abstract reasoning but of concrete historical experiences. In Carr's historical narrative, modern realism stemmed from European experiences of the Great War, the economic crisis of 1931, and the rise of totalitarian states. "Reflecting on one set of experiences, namely those associated with the most devastating wars within the war-torn Eurocentric context," as John Vasquez (1998, 202) evaluates the later prevalence of realism, "it has generalized one set of traumatic experiences to all experience." Modern realism appeared as a form of skepticism against human rationality when incomprehensibly irrational events recurred. The rapid industrialization made it difficult for individuals to grasp the shape of the society they lived in. Concomitantly, political and economic crises occurred one after another. It was natural for man to feel like losing the sense of independence and autonomy. History advanced in whichever direction he did not ever predict according to the cause-effect law of history. People started to embrace nihilistic view of the world as a result: their actions would not affect where the world would go.

Civilization Recovers

What Carr needs to surpass in realism correctly turned out to be pessimistic nihilism in politics. How does Carr overcome this problem? Revisionists of Carr would say that it is through

the synthesis of realism and utopianism. If so, however, where can we situate this synthetic phase in Carr's history? As Carr provided his theoretical framework within his view of history, he also needed to situate his solution in it. In fact, the synthesis would not become a solution until we would be able to call it utopianism if different from its modern version. This section delves into this issue. Now that we have clarified the substance of modern utopianism and modern realism, it is time to grasp their relation as two phases of history. The problem is that it simultaneously points to two opposite directions.

On the one hand, the relationship between realism and utopianism is very asymmetrical. As realism comes from severe human experiences, it relates to the particularly intersubjective mood of the time. Alternatively put, it concerns the realm of subconscious mind. In discussing the fall of modern utopianism in the late nineteenth century, Carr (1939a, 36) calls its critics psychologists: "The belief in the sufficiency of reason to promote right conduct was challenged by psychologists." We already know that Carr commonly used the word psychologist to signify the thinkers of irrationality such as Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Freud, and Marx. At some points, indeed, Carr grasps the rise of modern realism in analogy with the discovery of unconsciousness (see Molloy, 2003: 284; Gismondi 2004, 437).

As we have discussed in the previous section, modern realism is firmly connected with philosophical reactions to idealist metaphysics. In Carr's (1939a, 87) words, modern realism is relativist and pragmatist. As such, this thought itself originates from particular circumstances. This is the reason why Carr (1939a, 89-90) needs a discussion of how German philosophies gained and lost popularity in nineteenth century England because of her social and intellectual settings. At the end of this discussion, Carr (1939a, 91) states: "The conditioning of thought is necessarily a subconscious process."

Modern realism appeared from the existing world. Since modern utopianism dominated the world before the arrival of modern realism, the latter appears from the former as if the proletarian class consciousness arises from the bourgeois world. By the same token, the problem of modern utopianism is its actual irrationality behind the proclaimed rationality of its principles. “What matters is that these supposedly absolute and universal principles were not principles at all, but the unconscious reflexions of national policy based on a particular interpretation of national interest at a particular time” (Carr 1939a, 111). Just several pages earlier, Carr (1939a, 108) refers to Freud’s interpretation of ancient imperialism to clarify how the nineteenth century idea of internationalism helped conceal the nationalist-imperialist inclinations in the practice of modern utopianism.

Understood as such, modern realism is a subconscious irrational element within rational modern utopianism. As we already examined, the flaw of modern utopianism was destined to become clear once the world became internationalized and no longer territorially expandable: “the international community cannot be organised against Mars” (Carr 1939a, 297). On the other hand, liberal utilitarianism created this deadlock by itself as it contributed to advance world capitalism through the application of its thought to the international sphere. Modern realism appears as a necessary part of the progress of modern utopianism. In other words, modern realism is an auto-critique of modern utopianism. “The relation of totalitarianism to the crisis is clearly one not of cause, but of effect. Totalitarianism is not the disease, but one of symptoms. Wherever the crisis rages,” Carr (1939a, 288) claims, “traces of this symptom can be found.” Carr (1939a, 14) assesses the contemporary phase of the science of international politics as the one “where realism is the necessary corrective to the exuberance of utopianism, just as in other periods utopianism must be invoked to counteract the barrenness of realism.”

Modern utopianism yields its counterpart because of the assumption that the rational economic man naturally establishes social harmony. The rise of modern realism might be gradual. There are times when both realist and utopian ideas coexist, as in the late nineteenth century in Carr's discourse. Yet modern realism does not come up as a dominant body of "ism" before it manages to impregnate its doctrine in the mind of a sufficient number of people. Until then, the logic of realism even contributes to the survival of modern utopianism as it was the case of Darwin and Marx. Until around the early 1930s, modern utopianism was the totality of the world which was capable of neutralizing its critics as its own constitutive parts.

By contrast, the whole world enters the realist phase once realism finds enough supporters. "It is profoundly misleading to represent the struggle between satisfied and dissatisfied Powers as a struggle between morality on one side and power on the other. It is a clash in which, whatever the moral issue, power politics are equally predominant on both sides" (Carr 1939a, 135). Every utopian thought is predicated on unverifiable assumptions. The issue is whether its model man can contribute to the interest of the whole. When he fails to do so, the issue is whether his egoism is still successfully concealed or the scientific analysis already revealed it. The utopian world is always already the world of *Realpolitik* whereas the inhabitants of it are not aware of it. The task of realism, as its auto-critique, is to make this fact explicit. As Carr (1939a, 111) states, "as soon as the attempt is made to apply these supposedly abstract principles to a concrete political situation, they are revealed as the transparent disguises of selfish vested interests" (also see Elshtain 2008, 158).

Utopianism and realism are, as such, two different phases in the history of civilization. Utopianism usually dominates the world. Realism appears occasionally as its auto-critique from

within. Utopianism and realism are asymmetrical when they are understood as distinct stages in history.

On the other hand, however, such asymmetry of the two paradoxically leads to their symmetrical relationship in theory. If realism is a constitutive part of utopianism, we cannot differentiate the two. Scholars are already aware that realism can be utopian. As Stefano Guzzini (1998, 22) points out, realism needs to criticize itself at the end of the day as it needs to be skeptical against itself if it is a consistent form of relativist skepticism. R. B. J. Walker (1993, 22) argues that, since realism has long prevailed the discipline without being aware of its shortcoming, its dominant variant in the United States is actually idealism which is lack of the skeptical mind. In a similar vein, Duncan Bell (2002) states that current forms of realism are ideology.

Such understandings accord with Carr's interpretations of realist thinkers. Marx is a remarkable example (see Wilson 1995, 5). Darwinian evolutionism and Marxist dialectics contributed to the survival of modern utopianism. Hitler employed the same evolutionism to overturn the order of modern utopianism. As he borrowed this strategy from an already failed philosophy, however, it was an "outmoded" maneuver (Carr 1939a, 288). As Carr announced at the end of *Karl Marx*, Hitler needed to fall someday as utopians did.

This understanding is a natural corollary of the aforementioned recognition that realism is a pragmatic theory. What is significant is that the same character can be discerned in modern utopianism as well. Scholars of international studies have not well discussed that utopianism can also be realism. Yet modern utopianism had its own skeptical character in its origin. Carr (1939a, 10) characterizes Adam Smith's theory as "a science of political economy" and notes that this "new science was based primarily on a negation of existing reality." According to Roy Porter

(2000, 87, 201-3), Smith was a critic of his contemporary world by adopting new types of natural philosophy. It is possible to make a similar point about other forms of liberalism. As Raymond Geuss (2002, 322) suggests, the nineteenth century liberalism was primarily a negative phenomenon. It was a set of attempts to reject the “utopianism” of the French revolutionaries without restoring the absolutist dictatorship in the preceding century.

There is no such thought which is perennially utopian or realist. Contexts determine the character of particular thoughts. This is the consequence of the fact that the relativism of realism has its place within the course of history. Since relativism rejects everything absolute, it completely reveals the relativity of utopianism. Remember the discussion about ideology and objectivity in the introduction of this present study. My point was that we still need to think about the degree of objectivity if every discourse is ideological. Yet this means that every discourse is particular and relative, to different degrees. With the arrival of realism, it is still possible to think about a local truth but we cannot think about something universal and perennial. Utopianism loses its apparent absoluteness when its actual relativity is uncovered. If utopianism can claim its absoluteness, it is not because it is really absolute but realism is not yet influential enough to be a critic. Everything is relative in the world of relativism, by definition. Realism just remains as a neutralized part of utopianism as long as it appears as a dominant body of thought.

The coexistence of realist and utopian phases of civilization is thus impossible insofar as realism is pragmatic and relativist. As realism is an auto-critique of utopianism, it might be said that we just call the relativist phase of utopianism as realism. Yet realism readily ceases to be relativistic, as it dominates the world: it turns to be absolute by itself. Realism cannot but be a tentative phase in the history of European civilization. Realism needs to be absolute to relativize

utopianism but thus it transforms itself into another utopianism. The beginning and the end of realism coincide. Realism can be nothing but an exception in history.

If Carr tried to synthesize realism and utopianism for solving the nihilism of modern realism, therefore, this synthetic phase needs to be another utopian phase. It is true that, from part three of the book onward, Carr discusses the future of political community by taking both realist and utopian elements into account. As already discussed, the coexistence of power and morality does not necessarily signify the synthesis of realism and utopianism as two different schools of thought. But Carr simultaneously embraces the utopian principles and the realist belief of mechanical change. Such synthesis leads to his most concrete suggestion: peaceful change. Carr (1939a, 284) explicitly states that peaceful change needs “a compromise between the utopian conception of a common feeling of right and the realist conception of a mechanical adjustment to a changed equilibrium of forces.”

From the discussion so far, however, it is wide of mark to consider that this suggestion points to the coexistence of realism and utopianism as the two phases of civilization. What coexist in Carr’s system of peaceful change are the elements of modern utopianism and modern realism, not the two different phases of civilization. They cannot be utopianism and realism in general since no such school of thought exists without particular contexts. Peaceful change is a specific system of new utopianism (as a phase of civilization), consisting of the elements of modern utopianism and modern realism (as schools of thought). This new system, which is equipped with self-adjusting function via modern realism, should not be exposed to subversive criticisms. The system would otherwise collapse since the influence of realist relativism does not know its limit.

Therefore, the new utopian phase needs to replace modern realism with another absolute norm. In other words, the synthesis of modern utopianism and modern realism cannot be a solution to the problem of modern realism just because they incorporate both elements. It needs to acquire the intersubjective understanding that such synthetic phase represents the norm.

Political Man Arrives

The future phase of civilization needs be recognized as utopianism. How can it achieve such status then? Considering that the end of modern realism is predetermined already in its arrival, the new civilization needs to appear from modern realism just as modern realism stemmed from modern utopianism. The most important issue for understanding Carr's solution to irrational nihilism is, therefore, what marks the end of modern realism. This section finally clarifies Carr's own answer to the epochal problem in the western intellectual tradition by discussing this issue.

To foreshadow the conclusion, Carr's answer is similar to Dostoevsky's: a rational belief. Yet Carr's belief is not passive, contrary to Dostoevsky's. According to Carr (1939a, 116), realism collapses because "it is clear that mankind as a whole is not prepared to accept this rational test as a universally valid basis of political judgment." The intolerable character of realism is just presupposed. Individuals cannot endure the command of history and need autonomy.

On the other hand, Carr's belief is not religious. To some extent, it is a logical conclusion. Carr is aware, through his reading of Dostoevsky, that irrationality is not the entirety of human mind. His concern is how to not unleash the abyss of human irrationality into the communal life. At stake is not to reject rationality but to change the way of employing it. As modern realism designates the distrust in human rationality, its resolution is the recovery of trust. Carr's belief in man is rational.

Carr's concern of individuals is thus closely interlinked with his view of history. Carr (1939a, 7) recognized political science as a normative study of politics. Utopianism is a normal phase since it is based on the natural tendency of human beings whereas realism rejects such norms. Realism needs to be transcended in the development of science.

Carr suggests this point at around the beginning of his inaugural lecture of the Wilson Chair in Wales in 1936 as well. By delineating Marx, Freud, and Malthus, Carr (1936, 846-47) admits that social inequalities, people's psychology, and the growth of population have contributed to war. Yet he argues that they are not the primary causes with determinative effects. Otherwise, no Wilson Chair is necessary (Carr 1936, 847). The human world cannot be reduced to the law beyond individuals.

Although Carr appreciated Dostoevsky and Freud for their psychological questions, he did not subscribe to their answers. One of the contemporary commentators of *Dostoevsky* suggested that Carr was "perhaps too suspicious" of Freud (Muchnic 1939, 119). The science of international politics cannot be reduced to psychoanalysis since it needs to suggest the way that individuals overcome the relentless power of the law of history through their own actions. The world is run by individuals if the force of history is tremendous. "The responsibility for war and peace rests on every one of us" (Carr 1936, 847).

The substantive argument of the inaugural lecture is also significant in this regard as it deals with public opinion given the above awareness. Remember that the scientific stage of international politics came only after people ceased to trust the small groups of intellectuals. Carr's discussion about public opinion is linked with his understanding of history.

To be sure, Carr is, after all, elitist. He is clear that elites need to enlighten the mass through their discourse (Carr 1936, 847). Given the elite career of Carr, a graduate of Cambridge

and a clerk at the Foreign Office, the creation of the healthy public opinion might have appropriately been a part of his job. This explains the recognition of some revisionists that *Crisis* was propaganda. Carr's jobs at *The Times* can be understood as its practice (Jones 1998, chap. 5; Haslam 1999, 58-64; Jones 2000).

Going back to *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, however, Carr's view of public opinion is ambivalent (also see Chong 2007). On the one hand, he points out that the form of power over opinion is not so different between totalitarian and democratic states (Carr 1939a, 170, 181). On the other hand, he suggests that it is not always possible to force people to subscribe to a particular opinion: "When we set power over opinion side by side with military and economic power, we have none the less to remember that we are dealing no longer with purely material factors, but with the thoughts and feelings of human beings" (Carr 1939a, 183). Individuals are at the center.

Based on this understanding, Carr shows two limits to propaganda. The first one is the existence of objective facts. Carr believes that individuals can discern truth from lies however susceptible they are to propaganda. The other is "the inherent utopianism of human nature," which limits the arbitrary use of power over opinion "even more effectively" (Carr 1939a, 184). Carr then insists the potentiality of people to hold common ideas of value over national interests: international morality. The hallmark of his view of public opinion is the utopian nature of man: individuals are rational and moral.

Carr (1939a, 117) makes a similar statement in his criticism of Schopenhauer's pessimism. According to Schopenhauer, individuals have nothing to do but to contemplate as long as history has its own law. Carr (1939a, 117) contests: "Such a conclusion is plainly repugnant to the most deep-seated belief of man about himself. That human affairs can be directed and modified by

human action and human thought is a postulate so fundamental that its rejection seems scarcely compatible with existence as a human being.” Carr continues to vindicate the ability of individuals to create their own history in his prescriptions to the new utopian era. Carr (1939a, 187, 195-96) needs to lament the lack of the discussion about individual morality in his series of argument about international morality. In his discussion of international law, Carr starts from asking why men obey the law. Carr (1939a, 221) considers that this question corresponds to the fundamental problem of political philosophy, “why men allow themselves to be ruled.”

When modern individualism revealed itself to be imperialist and totalitarian in its practice, it was retaliated by (its own) totalitarianism through the auto-critique by modern realism. Yet, then, another form of individualism should appear and transcend this totalitarianism. The history of civilization is always driven by individual human agency. The scientific stage of international politics came only after its popularization and the arrival of doubt against the small groups of intellectuals.

Carr does not go back to the economic man model. Instead, Carr praises the ability of the new individual: political man. Carr starts his argument in part three of the book by referring to Aristotle for insisting the necessity of community (Carr 1939a, 123). Politics, or the way individuals live together, has been a condition of human from the ancient period. This fact became especially clear in the interwar years with the arrival of modern realism. The problem of old utopianism is its lack of political awareness. This point is most clear in his evaluation of Bakunin. In *Michael Bakunin*, Carr described him as the most relentless defender of the individual in the history of political thought. Yet, in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr criticizes his a-political character. The power that anarchists employ is only spontaneous and excessively individualistic. It can never leads to a political life of individuals. Paradoxically, we cannot find

any autonomous individuals in Bakunin's anarchist system of thought. "Both non-resistance and anarchism are counsels of despair, which appear to find widespread acceptance only where men feel hopeless of achieving anything by political action" (Carr 1939a, 129).

Carr's criticism of Karl Barth's modern theology also clarifies the same point. On the one hand, Barth claims the impossibility of eradicating political evils. On the other hand, he predicates his argument on the separation between morality and politics. Yet, as such, his Christian view is very similar to modern realism in its understanding of the nature of the political sphere: "the doctrine that Christian morality has nothing to do with politics is vigorously upheld by the Nazi régime. This view is basically different from that of the realist who makes morality a function of politics. But," Carr states "in the field of politics it tends to become indistinguishable from realism" (Carr 1939a, 129).

It is true that Carr (1939a, 291-92) seeks establishing a harmony not between individuals or between classes but between nations. Yet this is not a vindication of the nation state as Carr (1939a, 269) "can no longer find much meaning" in such political community. As a product of modern utopian imperialism, the nation state is rather the materialization of the limits of the state (also see Carr 1942, chap. 3; Jones 1998, 20). Liberal utilitarianism failed. Anarchist cannot be a substitute for the former. But Marxist collectivism needs to be overcome. The conflicts among people within national communities were transferred to international community in the twentieth century (Carr 1939a, 291).

The project of modern utopianism, which keeps people away from political evils, just tends to expose individuals to such evils in a more unprepared manner. Carr's call for innately political individuals is an attempt to teach their self-defense. Carr could not expose raw individuals to the power of international politics for the sake of individuals. "Security and emancipation," as Ken

Booth (1991, 539) suggests in his discussion of Carr, “are in fact two sides of the same coin.” Carr was interested in rediscovering individuals as political agents in the age of international society. No one could be ignorant after experiencing the power of history. The central problem for Carr was that of political philosophy in the twilight of modern belief in liberal-individual-rationalism.

History against History

The structure of thinking in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is strikingly similar to the one in Carr's Dostoevsky. After examining the roots of the question in Herzen, Bakunin, and Marx, Carr returned to Dostoevsky for its solution if not in substance but in form. Utilitarian economic man needs to be rejected for its naive view of human nature. Yet modern realism also needs to be rejected as it nihilistically denies all the possibilities of political community, which are vital for human life. Thus we need a rational belief: Carr manifests his love of man.

The crisis of Europe in the interwar years stemmed from the gradual manifestation of human irrationality in the emergence of international politics. Realism, or the negation of human autonomy, is the problem to be solved. It is, only in this sense, understandable that some scholars have recognized Carr's system of thought as a call for emancipation (Booth 1991; Linklater 1997). Carr's fight against the crisis takes the form of the tension between man and nature. At stake is not the nature of animals, plants and so on. It is the nature of man as an irrational entity.

However, this is not the end of the story. Note that he recognized this age-old problem as the duel between two different versions of history. In other words, he set a progressive view of history against determining historicism. In his idiosyncratic discourse, the battle against nihilism was the one against history. When Carr won this battle through his belief in political man, he presented a progressive view of history.

What is significant is that this progressivism is not a byproduct of Carr's system of thought but is actually its core. Carr describes why modern realism needed to come up from modern utopianism. Yet he does not tell how people could achieve the sufficient realist awareness or how widely the awareness should prevail to end the existing utopian era. He just assumes that it naturally occurs in history.

The same is true for the change from modern realism to a new utopianism. The rationality of man is the necessary condition. But it is not clear how people can successfully resist the law of history with their rationality. This mechanism demands clear explanation especially when he started with the assumption that the contemporaneous crisis derived from human irrationality. As already discussed, it is logically correct to recover rationality to tame the effect of its malicious part. Yet the solution needs the clarification of how.

Furthermore, Carr does not talk about why a synthetic phase can be utopianism whereas modern realism cannot. To translate, he does not explain why nihilism is unacceptable. He just assumes the natural tendency of man to seek freedom and he considers it ethically good. Nor does he explain why new utopianism is not recognized as relativism in its relation to modern realism. If realism and utopianism are formally indistinguishable, Carr leaves his readers a certain doubt about the mechanism of the transformation of civilization.

Indeed, the only element which logically ascertains the progress of history is this inseparability of realism from utopianism. In other words, the changes of the phases of civilization are necessary since realism is an exception by definition. The fall of realism was determined from the very beginning when Carr established the dichotomy between utopianism and realism. Therefore, his analytical framework already prepared his answer. Carr's solution is,

ultimately, not so much his belief in political man as his opposition of the progressive history against historicism.

This is a problematic solution since, as we already know from our readings of biographies, progress was the hallmark of modern utopianism in Victorian Britain. It is true that modern realism also embraced the idea of progress. Yet this is a corollary of the fact that modern realism is a version of modern utopianism. What is now problematic about Carr's solution is that he considers man to have the ability of creating the world but does not explain how. Carr seems to return to the natural harmony model of man and society.

To complete our investigation, therefore, it is vital to understand how progressive Carr's view of history is. From the discussion so far, there is no doubt that Carr believes in the possibility of the human world to change. However, it is still not clear how and in which direction the world changes. Although I have repeatedly used the word progress to designate the historical system of thought which Carr established in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, we do not yet know how linear and teleological history would be in this system. For sure, Carr's history of civilization unfolds as an auto-development of utopianism. Yet we have clarified this point just in terms of the form of the history not of its substance. It is now clear that utopianism is the normal phase. Yet it is still unclear how each particular utopian phase differs from each other in its substance. A fuller evaluation of Carr's argument demands a further examination of his view of history.

CHAPTER 5 RELUCTANT RETREAT

My analysis so far has characterized *The Twenty Years' Crisis* as a struggle with the political ramifications of human irrationality. It turned out that, while his apparent solution was the expression of the belief in rationality, this solution was predicated on a particularly progressive view of history. This brings about a significant doubt that Carr might have just retreated to modern utopianism. The present chapter attempts to uncover the substance and implication of this progressivism for finishing our assessment of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.

As the problem of progressivism resides in the possibility that Carr might have returned to the old Victorian world despite his criticism, our starting point is its intellectual culture. More specifically, his progressivism needs to be examined in the context of the British history of science. The entire history of civilization, in Carr's discourse, unfolds as a development of the science of international politics. Therefore, the implication of his view needs be discussed in the history of science. In this regard, it is necessary to pay special attention to the role of Charles Darwin. One of the reasons is that Carr refers to Darwin as a symbolically Victorian scientist of progress. Another reason is that Carr's understanding can conflict with a popular view that Darwin was a thinker of evolution, if evolution is recognized as different from progress by designating an irregular development of species. Remember that Carr criticized the teleological moment of Marx as a betrayal of his own philosophy, at the same time juxtaposing him with Darwin as a Victorian thinker of progress.

It is necessary, on the other hand, to situate Carr in the culture of his own time, which was remarkably distinct from the Victorian intellectual ferment. Indeed, it was in this culture that people started to consider Darwin more seriously as a thinker of evolution than a progressive scholar. The interwar culture had strong bent toward the typically twentieth century themes such

as discontinuity and uncertainty. Still, this culture had certain ambivalent affinity with the intellectual mood of the preceding era.

Between these two cultures, Carr shows his ambivalence in an idiosyncratic fashion. Until this point, my argument needs to be speculative in some crucial respects. One of the fundamental problems is that Carr does not directly talk about progress. To put differently, Carr is not a systematic thinker of progress. I already tried to clarify the system of Carr's thinking in the previous chapter by following his consistent flow of reasoning. In this chapter, I will try to reveal the limits of this system by picking out the irregular parts of it. All I can do is to excavate circumstantial evidence from the text as much as possible and relate it to the contemporaneous discourses. While I have the two cultures above as a theoretical framework, my argument needs to be unsystematic since Carr himself goes back and forth between them. The point is that we cannot uncover what is consistent behind this inconsistency without experiencing his swinging by ourselves. Once we understand the generational tension above, we will attempt to find the place of Carr's ambivalence within the culture of ambivalence in his time.

The text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* will turn out to be an attempt to solve the crisis not so much for Europe as for Britain. The theoretical eclecticism of his idea of progress and his ambiguity of political orientation finally interlink if in a problematic way. My flight from the issue of progress to politics from this point onward is not arbitrary but inevitable. The substances of the two cultures correspond to modern utopianism and modern realism respectively. It is not strange that the two cultures of time in history correspond to Carr's dichotomous concepts. On the one hand, Carr identified the difference of the two schools of thought with their distinct philosophies of history. On the other hand, Carr's theoretical concepts also described the historical stages of Europe. Carr embraced elements of the thoughts of both stages for his new

utopianism. To clarify his position between the two cultural extremes means the simultaneous evaluation of the theoretical basis of his progressivism and the implications of his practical prescriptions. The inquiry into history in this present chapter is completely continuous with the investigation about the tension of Carr's theory in the last chapter. By going deeper into this tension, I will try to identify Carr's ambiguity with his consistently practical concern about British liberalism.

Two Cultures

The argument begins with grasping the basic historical context to situate Carr in terms of the idea of progress. I will juxtapose the progressive culture of Victorian Britain and the anti-progressive movement of interwar modernism. This is a schematic delineation since our starting point is the possible internal conflict of Carr's discourse. While Carr set modern realism against modern utopianism in terms of their conceptions of man and history, he ended up embracing certain notion of progress as a metaphysical idea. As Carr described history in a theoretical fashion by using the two ideal types, utopianism and realism, the historical evaluation of his argument needs to be theoretical when we start our argument from his text. The conflict between progressivism and its antagonism is simultaneously theoretical and descriptive as to the history of Europe, as in the case of utopianism and realism in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.

Victorian Progressivism

Our focus on the Victorian progressivism is Darwin. But it is not necessary to delve into his writings. It is doubtful whether Carr actually scrutinized Darwin and absorbed the insights of this biologist into the text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Although Carr discusses "Darwinism in Politics" in a section of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, he never cites actual words of Darwin. Any citations to the works of Darwin do not appear in the early biographies either. Darwin is important for the present study as a focal point to reveal the implication of *The Twenty Years'*

Crisis by clarifying the tension between progressivism and its antagonist in the era when the work was written.

Aside from the details of biological discussions (see, for example, Coleman 1977), the revolutionary influence of Darwinian thinking owed its idea of change. In a broadly European context, the French Revolution had a significant effect on making people aware of the possibility that their society could change radically at a certain point in their daily lives (see Wagner 1965). As an example of its intellectual influence, Hegelian philosophy of history, by which Carr is said to have been influenced (see Cox 2001), appeared partly as a reaction to the revolution (Ritter 1982). Chapters two and three of this present study already discussed that the romantic revolutionary thought of Herzen, Bakunin, and Marx stemmed from this ferment as well.

Such a current also flowed into the Victorian intellectual life. The Reform Act of 1832 radically transformed the electoral system and deprived the establishment of some of their privileged status in politics. The advancing industrialization and the resulting rise of the social status of individuals already increased the pressure for the reform in the early nineteenth century. However, this act revived the memory of the revolution as it gave a concrete shape to this pressure so the actual lives of people changed (Altick 1973, 91).

In Britain, however, the Enlightenment belief in reason still flourished. This is the context where the utilitarian mode of thought from Bentham to Mill soon became influential (Altick 1973, 8). The early Victorian idea of progress had a connection to its form in the preceding century. British thinkers continued to consider that the correct knowledge was vital for improving the human world, if they were aware of the limit of reason to the extent that they needed to discuss what the correct knowledge was. Notable about the Victorian faith in knowledge was, however, that these intellectuals rather went further back to Renaissance for its

model. The empiricism of Francis Bacon was especially popular as in the case of Mill (Houghton 1957, 2). The Victorian culture of science idealized the empirical search for truth in the age of scientific revolution.

The writings of Darwin were widely discussed in the nineteenth century partly due to this culture. On the one hand, his style of research was empirical in a Baconian sense of the word especially in his early years. “My first note-book was opened in July 1837. I worked on true Baconian principles,” Darwin recollected, “and without any theory collected facts on a wholesale scale, more especially with respect to domesticated productions, by printed enquiries, by conversation with skillful breeders and gardeners, and by extensive reading” (Barlow 1958, 119). On the other hand, he demonstrated the mechanism of change through this style of research. The Enlightenment belief resided in the power of knowledge to advance the human world in a better direction. If Victorian intellectuals maintained this belief even by going back to its origin, it was natural for them to have welcomed the progressive aspect of Darwinism.

In this sense, Darwin’s thought was not completely new in the nineteenth century. “Far from introducing the idea of evolution *per se* to a totally unprepared public or initiating the religious doubts which were to trouble so many minds in the years to come,” Richard Altick (1973, 226) states, “*The Origins of Species* was largely a brilliant synthesis of many specific ideas already current, with one or two crucial additions.” John Burrow (1968, 19-21) also suggests that it is a-historical to emphasize the influence of Darwin too much since the preceding centuries prepared the nineteenth century evolutionism. This point should not be confused with the denial of the revolutionary importance of Darwinism. Although their arguments suggest historians refrain from overemphasizing the uniqueness of Darwin, it does not deny the fact that Darwin was a remarkable thinker of evolution in Victorian Britain. It suffices for the present

study to understand that Darwin was popular as a thinker of progress in the Victorian world and his progressivism was characteristic in the era. For this purpose, both Altick's and Burrow's argument rather contributes to my argument as it suggests that Victorian Britain was an adequate circumstance for Darwin to present his evolutionism (also see Burrow 2000, 46).

A remarkable aspect of Darwin's thought is that it evoked debates not just in biology but also in wide intellectual fields. Darwinism brought about heated debates concerning this existing intellectual ferment given this possibility of being accepted. This is the aspect of Darwin where his name has remained in history.

Especially because he recognized the mechanism as a process on the surface of the earth, not driven by any metaphysical entities, his argument evoked people's attentions to its religious implication. If our ancestors were apes, why can we think of us as the center of the universe in the great chain of being? The appearance of Darwin was, as frequently said, revolutionary in a similar manner to the so-called scientific revolution in the early modern time. In the seventeenth century, Kepler relegated human beings from the center of the universe by uncovering the solar system and thus endangered Christian conception of the Godly world order (see Koyré 1957).

In this sense, Darwinism had a certain implication for the thinking about social order. It was, therefore, natural that social thinkers started to show their interests in it. What was remarkable was their almost exclusive focus on the progressive aspect of Darwin. As in the above words of Altick, Darwin's achievement resided in his idea of evolution if scholars disagree about the extent of its nobleness. It does not necessarily imply progress but just an organic ability of movement. The idea of natural selection tells how species change but it suggests neither their progress nor whether they have a certain goal to head for.

To be sure, Darwin himself was not totally clear and even confusing about this issue. Darwin, for example, employed the insight of Malthus' principle of population: the growth of the population is faster than the speed that people can expand their production of food. Malthus cast a significant doubt on the Enlightenment progressivism as his principle implied the possibility that the future of the human world would necessarily be worse. The struggle is a condition of human beings. Darwin borrowed the notion of struggle from Malthus. As Gertrude Himmelfarb (1968, 162-63) points out, however, Darwin's application of Malthus, in effect, rather contributed to strengthening the case of eighteenth century rationalists. Whereas Malthus considered the struggle as a condition of human beings which prevents their progress, Darwin grasped it as a sign of eternal progress.

There is an inherent tension between progress and evolution in Darwin's system of thought. What is significant is that Victorian thinkers rarely took the later seriously. The identification of Darwin with progressivism is a particularly Victorian invention in this regard. Darwinism had become triumphant by the 1870s. But people were scarcely concerned about the idea of natural selection. "The metaphor of the struggle for existence," as Peter Bowler (2003, 179) states, "was often applied in ways that do not correspond to the modern idea of natural selection." Social Darwinists such as Herbert Spencer were well known in this regard. What they claimed was not a random advance of the society but a progressive improvement of the contemporary situation. Said otherwise, Darwin, whatever his own intention was, became a tool for those who demanded the idea of progress to vindicate a certain social change. In fact, Darwin himself was rather critical of Spencer in his autobiography (Barlow 1958, 108-9). Darwinism gave Social Darwinists an intellectual weapon to attack the Tory regime nevertheless since they picked out from it just what they needed (Bowler 2003, 218).

If Carr identified Darwin with a progressive Victorian thinker, his understanding accords to this particularly nineteenth century interpretation. Yet Carr also discerned certain subversive elements of Darwin for modern utopianism as well. In this respect, it seems that Carr was aware of the evolutionary aspect of Darwin. Indeed, Darwin started to be understood as a thinker of irregular advancement of human beings already in the interwar years. It is time to turn to this contemporary culture of Carr to clarify the tension within him.

Modernist Decadence

The identification of Darwinism with the idea of progress was a particular rendering in the Victorian intellectual climate. Our contemporary use of Darwinism focuses on the idea of selection which Victorian thinkers rather ignored. This interpretation of Darwin implies irregularity and discontinuities in history since it does not set the goal to reach: the selection occurs at random. Such understanding already prevailed when Carr wrote *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. The so-called modern synthesis between the biology of Darwin and the genetics of Gregor Mendel occurred in the 1920s and 1930s.

As Darwin was both biologist and social thinker in the Victorian time, this change of the view about his thought occurred not exclusively in the small community of natural scientists. It was part of a more general transformation of the European mind which started around the turn of the century: modernism. The movement occurred most notably in literature but also in various fields from art to physical science and mathematics (see Everdell 1997). Although it is both difficult and unproductive to give too much unity to the concept of modernism, Robert Wohl (2002, 604) discusses, “the best way to approach modernism is through its project of negation.” Modernism was a series of reactionary movements which occurred in every field of intellectual and cultural activities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was natural that the notion of progress was especially problematic in this intellectual climate. Stephen Kern (2003)

called modernism “the culture of time and space.” Darwinism, as a call for the intellectual attentions to the irregular aspects of the human progress, belonged to the series of modernist contemplations about the discontinuity and nonlinearity of time (but see Bowler 1994).

To clarify the point, a further examination of the context is necessary. The modernist movement in Britain had become remarkable by the 1920s especially because of the Great War. Paul Fussell’s (1975) classic work has long told historians that post-WWI Europe was plagued by the doubt about the traditional value in every sphere of life (also see Leed 1979). After an inexpressible experience of the war, people started to consider that the world changed irreversibly. The war demonstrated that human species could actually descend (Bowler 2003, 277).

Carr’s contemporary world showed a remarkable tension between progress and its revision in this sense. This is all the more true when modernism was not the dominant school of thought. More recent works of historians tells us a complicated intellectual ferment in the interwar period. On the one hand, the writers in the postwar era still needed to use traditional words and metaphors to describe their experiences in the war (Hynes 1991; Winter 1995). On the other hand, the highbrow writers discussed by Fussell were not necessarily the most popular producers of the contemporaneous discourses. They were influential in blazing the trail for the postmodern writings of the succeeding generations. But middlebrow writers gained greater fame among ordinary citizens as they consciously tried to recover traditional values in the pre-war world (Bracco 1993). Carr discussed the post-war revival of modern utopianism partly as a general inclination of man to seek a restful place in the familiar past. The anti-modernism pointed to this direction. As John Carey (1992) points out, modernism represented, in a way, a form of the class related tension in the decades before and after the turn of the century.

In this connection between intellectual and social issues in modernism, any idea of progress could not but entail certain political expression depending on which strand it appealed for what respect. Notable about *The Twenty Years' Crisis* is that it incorporates this tension. The conflict of Darwin in his own text as well as in Carr's story runs parallel to that between the Victorian culture and the interwar modernism. Modern utopianism was rationalism and progressivism, for which progressive Darwin was its advocate. Modern realism was irrationalism and relativism, for which evolutionary Darwin was its supporter. Considering that these two different schools have their place in Carr's history of civilization, it is reasonable to grasp the tension of its text, if any, as its constitutive part, not the product of Carr's failure.

Carr's social and intellectual standpoint supports this reasoning since it is somewhat ambivalent. For example, Carr did not share the experiences that his contemporary soldiers suffered in the battlefield since he did not go to the war. In this sense, he might not have shared the same feeling which many British modernists expressed. Although historians have extensively discussed the difference of the views of soldiers and civilians, however, it was not necessary to experience the war to live in the interwar culture. As Janet Watson (2004) argues, there were different reactions to the war depending on the issues at stake. The war was not so much the cause but a stimulus of the awareness of uncertainty which modernism represented in the clearest form. Carr realized such untraditional aspect of the world as we have extensively discussed in the previous chapters. The text of Carr, in this regard, had a direct connection with the movement of modernism, whether Carr was aware of it or not. The reason is that the reception of Dostoevsky was a notable part of English literary modernism (De Jonge 1975; Kaye 1999). Carr's biography of Dostoevsky even marked the last phase of the fad of Russian cultures, which started from the late nineteenth century with the gradual arrival of modernism (Muchnic 1939).

The theoretical tension of modern realism and modern utopianism has its connection to the historical conflict between the two cultures in Britain. Scholars have pointed out the ambiguity of Carr's political orientation (see Cox 1999). The same ambiguity appears in his notion of progress here. This is not strange since, as already mentioned, the idea of progress could be a political issue in the early twentieth century culture of modernism. In fact, the epistemological ambiguity of Carr reveals its difficulty most clearly as to the idea of progress. Carr simultaneously subscribes to Victorian progressivism and modernist anti-progressivism as well as liberalism and its criticism. To clarify this point, the next section discusses the tension of Carr by going back to the text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.

Divided Text

Now that we have theoretico-historical context for Carr's progressivism, it is time to estimate the distance between Carr and Victorians about their notions of history. As the objective of this inquiry is to describe the ambiguity of Carr, this section repeats a somewhat frustrating swinging between two different strands of history that I foreshadowed in the previous section. However, the crucial presumption of Carr's text will not be excavated without this absorption into ambiguity. As I will discuss in the following sections, Carr will ultimately subscribe to the set of Victorian ideas both in his epistemological and political orientations. Yet his retreat to this old world needs to be a reluctant one, given the historical circumstance of his time. The text of Carr rejects any immediate labeling of his intellectual standpoint.

In this section, I will try to show the tension of Carr first by delving into the aspect he is closer to the Victorian side and second the aspect closer to the modernist side. The point is not to reduce Carr into one of these two strands by estimating to which Carr is more affiliated with. I will rather attempt to clarify Carr's distance from both sides.

With Victorians

Although Carr does not clearly talk about what kind of progress he seeks, some pieces of circumstantial evidence help clarify his view. The text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis* points to the issue of progress even before the actual argument starts: Carr cites two epigraphs from Francis Bacon's *On the Advancement of Learning* and *Novum Organum*. The actual sentences are worth copying here (Carr 1939a):

Philosophers make imaginary laws for imaginary common-wealths, and their discourses are as the stars which give little light because they are so high.

The roads to human power and to human knowledge lie close together and are nearly the same; nevertheless, on account of the pernicious and inveterate habit of dwelling on abstractions, it is safer to begin and raise the sciences from these foundations which have relation to practice, and let the active part be as the seal which prints and determines the contemplative counterpart.

Two epigraphs suggest the necessity of practical minds for theoretical contemplation. As such, the two quotations from Bacon foreshadow Carr's discussion of the science of international politics in the first pages of the book.

This starting suggests a link between Carr and above mentioned Victorian intellectuals, at least, superficially. Remember that realism and utopianism signify two stages both of science and civilization because theory and practice are at one in Carr's system of thought. Carr does not choose between science and progress. More concretely, the connection between the two epigraphs of Bacon and the succeeding argument in the actual text demands us to turn our eyes to the history of science in order to situate Carr's notion of progress in history.

There is a further circumstantial evidence supportive of Carr's link with Victorianism. Carr (1939a, 34) cites J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress* early in his discussion. The quotation does not relate to the issue of progress but to the thought of Abbé Saint-Pierre, who is said to have been the first advocate of international organization for the peaceful world. Yet the fact that Carr read this book has a unique importance. Not only the book has been influential and is now a classic text on the history of progress. But it is also the only work on the idea of progress that appears in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, except for more general works on the philosophy of history by Hegel, Croce, and others. In this monumental work, Bury (1920, 7) discerned the decisive intellectual rupture between the period before and after the sixteenth century: the idea of progress appears only in the latter period. The two thinkers who marked the turning point were Bodin and Bacon (Bury 1920, 36). The idea of progress became widely discussed in the eighteenth century because of their pioneering efforts (Bury 1920, 128).

As I already discussed in the previous chapter, Carr emphasized the newness of the modern versions of realism and utopianism because of their subscription to the idea of progress. Indeed, Carr's view of history accords very closely with Bury's since what Carr means modern is the same as the range of time in Bury's story. Carr (1939a, 83) emphasizes the difference between realism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and that in the eighteenth century, and then states that both "utopianism and realism accepted and incorporated in their philosophies the eighteenth century belief in progress." More specifically, Carr (1939a, 31-32) finds a disruption in history in the seventeenth century and finds a continuation from the Newtonian science to Bentham and Mill.

Note that this Victorian view is not necessarily a typical understanding of the history of progress, at least, from the present perspective. For example, Robert Nisbet (1980, x) evaluates

Bury's book as "a deeply flawed classic" because it is dismissive of the thoughts up until the late seventeenth century. Nisbet's point is that ancient and medieval philosophies have already prepared the foundational elements of the eighteenth century ideas of progress. It can be said, in this regard, that Carr already showed a Victorian bias when he set his starting point in the modern era.

I will come back to this point later when I will identify the embedded Britishness of Carr's text. In the meantime, it is sufficient to confirm just a potentially Victorian element of Carr in his text. The objective of the argument above is to find the first sign of Carr's inconsistencies. Given this sign, it is time to go deeper into the more substantive aspects of the text to find the points which conflict with the Victorian elements discussed so far.

Carr did not completely subscribe to the Victorian ideal. Bringing back the scheme presented in the previous section, other textual evidence would rather suggest his detachment from it as in the case of his relation with modernism. On the other hand, Carr's view of Darwin is Janus-faced: on the one hand, Darwin is a Victorian thinker of progress; on the other hand, Darwin is a (modernist) critic of Victorian progressivism.

To discuss Carr's progressivism by setting Darwin as a focal point, therefore, it is significant to understand in which aspects Carr discerned the compatibility and incompatibility between Victorians and Darwinians. In this regard, it is important to understand what practical condition changes the view of Darwin in Carr's story. As already argued in the previous chapter, Carr discussed that Hegelian, Marxist, and Darwinian ideas of struggle could be dangerous for the utilitarian school of thinking but it did not become a problem because the international material conditions allowed Britain to keep expanding her territory. The philosophies of conflict were rather neutralized to support Victorian progressivism. What is significant about this

understanding is that Carr detected the limit of the utopian negotiation in material conditions: the lack of space for further territorial expansion. This material cause brings what Carr calls the rise of international politics and the arrival of realism. On the one hand, modern realism appears in the extension of the history of modern utopianism. The final cause of the crisis, the spread of the realist mind among people, is here specified with the material condition. Carr is much more materialist than idealist contrary to some of his words in the text.

This point reveals Carr's ambivalence at the most philosophical level. As already discussed, political realists needed to be philosophical realist in the words of Carr. In this sense, there is an inherent tension in the project of Carr since he tries to pick up elements both from modern utopianism, which is more idealist in its philosophical orientation, and modern realism, which is otherwise. Carr thus needs to establish a certain hierarchical order between idea and material in terms of their influence on the world. The above understanding of the late nineteenth century history signifies that he prioritize matter to ideas, at least, as the drive of the world.

In contradistinction to the aforementioned link between Carr and Victorians in terms of the way to describe the history, such materialist inclination strangely leads Carr closer to the evolutionist interpretation of Darwin. In a way, it is possible to read the story of Carr as if the realism survived because it was fit for the circumstance. Yet a more careful analysis of Carr's story brings us back to the Victorian aspect of Carr's Darwinism. I noted in the last section of the previous chapter that Carr does not explain how modern realism acquires a sufficient number of its supporters. Without any explanation of this mechanism, Carr's story is teleological. What is strange is that the arrival of modern realism depends on the invisible power of history which enabled it, whereas such determining force of history is the idiosyncratic character of modern realism. To be sure, the idea of progress is implanted in modern utopianism. Yet it is realized

through the behavior of rational man. If modern realism appeared in this process, it is a sign of utopian progress.

This understanding does not conflict with Darwinism. Darwin (1859[2006], 468) argued at one point in *The Origins of Species*: “The key is man’s power of accumulative selection: nature gives successive variations; man adds them up in certain directions useful to him.” Carr’s system of thought seems to have certain affinity with this idea when he emphasizes the power of man to overcome the irrational force of history. What is significant, however, is that this understanding of Darwin is a Victorian one in my schematic delineation. I already mentioned that Darwin neutralized the dismal respect of Malthus’s idea of struggle for the progressive notion of evolution. The aspect of Darwin, an advocate of man’s ability to make evolution a progressive process, is exactly the point where Darwin rendered Malthus and ended up vindicating the Enlightenment idea of progress. According to Himmelfarb (1968, 420), the widely different views of Social Darwinists were at one only in that they all sought the way out from the world of eternal struggle. “As mankind adapted itself to the changing conditions of life, a new human nature would develop.” We already know that modern realism is the phase of self-reflection for modern utopianism. Carr’s progressivism is Victorian in this aspect.

With Modernists

It seems that the pragmatist understanding of history led Carr to be a confusing theorist. Lucian Ashworth (2006, 293) discusses that Carr was more idealist in his philosophical orientations. However, what is truly remarkable about Carr is his eclecticism. As above, Carr included Hegel and other idealist thinkers in the realist camp despite political realism’s certain affiliation with philosophical realism. Maybe, the problem is not particularly Carr’s own. The dichotomy between materialism and idealism is not very helpful to grasp the tension within the nineteenth and twentieth century thoughts. Darwin was materialist but Social Darwinists were

more idealist. Some of the interwar Darwinists were materialist and others were idealist. Carr was not the only person who showed confusion. Yet he is remarkable for his theoretical ambiguity. There are thus, as above, both idealist and materialist moments in his story of the transformation of European civilization.

So far, I have clarified the tension of Carr by examining the points where he is relatively closer to Victorian progressivism. Now it is time to the opposite aspects where Carr is more modernist. In this regard, it is not only conceptually helpful but also historically accurate to start from introducing vitalist philosopher Henri Bergson for a better contrast. It helps to further show the ambiguity of Carr's idea of progress at the epistemological level.

Bergson (1911) made one of the most remarkable achievements in the age of modernist evolutionism in his *Creative Evolution*. Bergson vindicated progress but characterized it as an irregular process. His point was that the forces inside the organism of life attempt to resist material conditions. As history unfolds as a culmination of different reactions to different material circumstances, it is a non-linear process if it is ultimately a progress (see Bowler 2003, 320-21).

Carr's contemporary intellectuals recognized the significance of Bergson. In *The Idea of Nature*, which was written during the 1930s and was published posthumously, R. G. Collingwood (1945, 136) described the historical uniqueness of Bergson as follows: "This phase of thought, in which the idea of evolution was worked out as an essentially biological idea, may be conveniently regarded as culminating in the work of Bergson." Collingwood recognizes Bergson as a remarkably new heir of Darwin. As Bergson succeeded the evolutionary aspect of Darwin, Mead (1936, 490-510) needed to emphasize how subversive the idea of Bergson could be against the whole project of rationalist science.

There is no evidence that Carr read Bergson. Yet it is safe to suppose that Carr knew Bergson and touched his evolutionary thought at least indirectly through the Marxist works of George Sorel. By rejecting the utopian aspect of Marx, Sorel emphasized the internal power of man to change the situation. In *Reflections on Violence*, Sorel (1915, 4-6) utilizes Bergson to advocate the necessity of creative resistance to the existing constraints. As Sorel rejected the utopian aspect of Marx, such resistance leads to an irregularly advancing history. On the other hand, because of the same rejection of teleological moment, Sorel needs a certain myth to teach such a creative mind to people. Sorel (1915, 28-36) borrows the argument of Bergson for this point again.

Carr cites Sorel several times in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. One of the references is to *Reflections on Violence* (Carr 1939a, 10). Although at a different point where the exact citation is not shown to the reader, Carr (1939a, 115) refers to this argument about the usefulness of myth by mentioning the name of Sorel. If Carr was enthusiastic about teaching the masses a certain utopian myth to overcome the force of history, his method accords with Sorel's and its philosophical basis is Bergsonian evolutionism which emphasizes the inner power of individuals.

Importantly, however, this reference appears in the middle of his criticism about the impossibility of being a consistent realist. The evolutionism of Bergson-Sorel appeals more to the modernist-realist side of thinking. Yet Carr rather uses this evolutionism for its utopian implications of the necessity of norms.

For a clarification of the tension in Carr, the comparison with this evolutionist strand is worth continuing for some more while. Carr's whole system of progress presupposes the new utopian phase as the goal to reach. Carr's system of thought is not as irrationalist or existentialist as to resist the existing order eternally and everyday anew. The objective of Carr is rather a

rational management of the world. In this respect, Carr is more Social Darwinian than Bergsonian.

However, Carr never asserts what the actual shape of the new utopian phase necessarily is because of the predetermined law of history if he discusses that such phase will come because human nature does not allow individuals to eternally tolerate the lack of autonomy. Carr seems to have denied predetermined plan of creation. In this respect, Carr is closer to Bergson than Victorian Darwinians.

To understand this tension fully, it is necessary to pay attention to the structure of Carr's text. Note that *The Twenty Years' Crisis* consists of the two mutually related but slightly different projects. In the first third of the book, the objective of Carr is to present the mechanism of the transformation in civilization. Utopianism evolves itself through its transcendence of realism. On the other hand, the latter part of the book discusses the substance of the new utopian phase given such mechanism. Different from the first half, however, Carr does not talk about the law-like mechanism of history. Instead, he offers his own prescription to achieve a brand new utopian phase. The first half points to the Victorian teleology in form but the second half points to the vitalist lack of teleology in substance.

In short, the whole argument can be rephrased as follows. On the one hand, Carr set an at least tentative goal to reach. He did not go so far as to keep resisting against the establishment in a vitalist form, unlike Sorel or Bergson. On the other hand, Carr did not talk about any final goal as an integral part of his history of civilization. His idea of new utopia can be grasped as a tool to pragmatically improve the current situation. In the final paragraph of the book, Carr (1939a, 307) states that his prescription "too, is a utopia. But," he continues, "it stands more directly in the line of recent advance than visions of a world federation or blue-prints of a more perfect League

of Nations. Those elegant superstructures must wait until some progress has been made in digging the foundations.” Carr attempts to create a new utopia but it does not seem that he considers it as the end of history. As far as the substance of civilization is concerned, his history is not teleological if progressive. Carr does not advocate the eternal fight of man against history, like Sorel. Yet he does not specify the concrete goal such as the eradication of state, like Marx, or the complete end of the struggle for the fittest, like Social Darwinists.

The Heart of the Tear

Carr’s progressivism is, as such, totally eclectic from the theoretical perspective. I argued in the previous chapter that the relation between realism and utopianism is not dialectical when these categories signify the phases of civilization. Now that the logical conflicts between realism and utopianism (as schools of thought) are clear, his embracement of the elements of realism and utopianism in the new utopia is not a product of the dialectical synthesis either. It is rather a poorly integrated aggregation. By using his own words for Marx, Carr’s system of thought is a “pure mumbo-jumbo” (Carr 1934, 80). He embraces both political liberalism and political realism, both philosophical idealism and philosophical realism, and both Victorian progressivism and modernist evolutionism. None of the binaries is synthesized into a higher level of intellectual product.

It can be the case that Carr was simply not concerned about this kind of ambiguity since, he might have claimed, it matters only at the abstract metaphysical level. Theoretical discussions did not mean anything unless they offered specific insights about reality. Carr’s partial acceptance of Sorel might itself show his eclecticism in this regard. Sorel was an unsystematic thinker who tried to reconcile the structuralist system of Marx with the individualist one of Bergson (see Ton 1973). Or Marx was also an unsystematic thinker as Carr himself noticed as above.

The problem is, however, that Carr tried to establish, not destroy, a system even by setting a metaphysical idea of progress at its center. Theoretical eclecticism makes this system unsustainable at a certain level. It is time to go back to the questions I introduced at the end of the last chapter. If the realist force of history is problematic, indeed, we might be able to ask: why can people put up with being forced to progress? Carr proclaimed the fall of realism on the basis that people cannot tolerate the lack of autonomy. But his progressive history is as deterministic as historicism because, we may say, it forces people to employ rationality and progress toward a certain better future. Yet what is better? It is to acquire the autonomy to resist the force of history. Why is it better? This is not a legitimate question since the word progress already implies a movement toward a further good. Despite my argument above, therefore, Carr's teleology in form cannot be differentiated from its substance when his spontaneous inconsistencies are placed within his system. In other words, it is necessary and adequate to consider Carr's history as completely teleological because of his eclecticism.

Remember that *The Twenty Years' Crisis* consists of the two slightly different projects. The fundamental problem is that the normative theory in the second half of the book is not an integral part of his whole mechanism of the movement of civilization in the first half. This is a problem since modern realism was flawed and thus supposed to collapse only according to this mechanistic law of history. The substance of his normative theory needs to be clear in his idea of progress and every normative discussion about individual issues needs to be based on it.

In order to construct such system of thought, however, Carr needed to supply a reason why people cannot tolerate the lack of autonomy and why it is not good. As above, this was the axiom in his narrative. As such, Carr implicitly returned to the ideal of utopian and Enlightenment thinkers for whom human individual freedom was unquestionably good. This is not strange if he

vindicated the British tradition of liberalism by suggesting the continuity of modern utopianism. But it does not mean that he defended this tradition successfully through a logical argument. Naturally, the same question comes up again: why is it better to have freedom than to be determined by history? Carr's system is predicated on certain tautology. Human freedom plays the role of natural right as the axiomatic cause to abide by. Carr's history needs to be progressive because of his liberal defense of positive individualist freedom. Therefore, our final task needs to be the inquiry into the meaning of this axiomatic presupposition.

Being British

Our investigation of Carr's ambiguity ended up revealing his unverifiable moral orientations toward the British liberal tradition. As Carr was supposed to discuss European civilization in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, the succeeding investigation should deal with Carr's positioning in Europe. This section attempts to clarify the meaning of his moral bias by uncovering his fundamentally British character in the intellectual and social settings of the time.

Scholars of international studies have suggested the cosmopolitanism of Carr's style of thinking (see Linklater 1997; Cox 2001). As far as his historical narrative is concerned, however, Carr's discussion of European civilization always derives from a perspective of the English. As I already suggested in the previous chapter, modern utopianism, as a school of thought, was almost exclusively identified with Victorian utilitarianism in the nineteenth century as well as its Scottish predecessors. Also, those who are familiar with Carr's *Britain* (1939b) might realize the striking similarity between the history of Britain in this work and the development of European civilization in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*: both were published in the same year.

If the civilization advances through a series of auto-critiques of utopianism, it can be said that Carr actually tried to vindicate the continuity of British intellectual tradition through his attempt to establish a new utopianism in Europe. In fact, Carr might have been talking from a

Victorian perspective already in his early biographies. Note in advance that this does not mean that there is no such connection as I established between early biographies and *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. It rather suggests that Carr's thinking might have been biased from the beginning.

Saving England

Historically speaking, the problem of irrationality did not necessarily come from outside of Europe. The problem was external more specifically for England. According to a Noel Annan's (1990, 10) recollection of the early twentieth century, the modernist philosophy of irrationality has not received the wide acceptance in Britain while it gained certain popularity in the continental world: "The champions of irrationalism like the Dadaists did not much affect us and we were a little astonished in the sixties when at last, in very different forms, irrationality crossed the Channel." John Keegan (1998, 15) suggests that graduates of European universities shared certain knowledge about ancient and modern authors and constituted a single culture, but only by maintaining that such intellectuals were tiny minority. As Carr repeatedly emphasized in his book, the majority of English people were not yet well prepared for Dostoevsky in the 1930s. It might have been because they were unfamiliar with the world not outside of Europe but just beyond the Channel.

The evolutionary idea of progress became popular in Victorian Britain because it made it possible for the thinkers to negotiate the conflict between British positivism and philosophies of history which mainly derived from German romanticist tradition. The British idea of progress successfully rendered German Idealist philosophy into an empiricist form. Burrow (1968, 272) states (by rephrasing Lovejoy's statement about the eighteenth century biology): "It would be almost equally apt to describe nineteenth-century theories of social evolution as 'the temporalization of Natural Law.'" German philosophies of history were used to vindicate the rationalist theories of ethics, from which Victorian thinkers invented their utilitarianism. The

Victorian idea of progress helped vindicate the British intellectual tradition by neutralizing the subversive effects of continental thoughts.

Michael Freeden (1978, 6-8) would suggest that the definition of positivism here is too loose. By understanding positivism as a connection between ethics and science, Freeden (1978, 8) points out that the British Idealists around the turn of the century transformed it into a more German shape of *Weltanschauung*. Yet this argument by Freeden itself suggests the fundamental continuity of liberal project in the late nineteenth century Britain. Freeden's (1978, epilogue) point is that the combination of ethics and science in liberalism led to the project of social reform by the beginning of the Great War. He would not deny that the philosophies of *Weltanschauung* among British Idealists were yet the English variants of German Idealism.

While I have emphasized the link between Carr's thinking between the early biographies and *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, it did not mean that the latter dealt with the tension between Russia and Europe. The point was that Russia represented an irrationalist school of thought and Europe a rationalist type. My own binary between Victorianism and modernism is a specific historical manifestation of this distinction. The above history tells that these two cultures designate the intellectual conflict between Britain and Europe. In this sense, the tension between Russia and Europe in the early biographies is transformed into the one between Europe and Britain in (or, more appropriately, behind) the text of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. It should be clear that thinkers of irrationality who appear in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* are mostly European: Hegel, Marx, Freud, Spengler, Lukaćs, Croce and so on.

Moreover, Carr's claim for the congruence of theory and practice was not necessarily Russian but very British either in the biographies or in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. The words of Reba Soffer (1978, 1-2) are worth quoting at some length:

The English never had to reply to the seemingly irresistible forces that overwhelmed European intellectuals. Prussian military might, virulent Austrian and French anti-Semitism, anarchistic Balkan and Italian nationalism, and a rising tolerance of violence as an antidote to frustrated reason oppressed European explanations of social and economic, political, and psychological phenomena. Thinkers such as Weber, Freud, Durkheim, and Croce succumbed to a psychological malaise that acknowledged, reluctantly, irrational forces underlying even the most rational behavior and institutions. While it can hardly be denied that the Europeans built more formidable theoretical structures than the English, their melancholy revelation of irrationality resulted ineluctably in a deterministic and pessimistic social theory severed from social practice.

British thinkers brought about a more practical form of social science by the time of the Great War to advocate what Freedman (1978) calls “an ideology of social reform.” It was already mentioned in the last chapter, at least in a passing manner, that the word intellectual had its historical meaning in *The Twenty Years’ Crisis*. Etymologically, the English word intellectual has started to commonly signify the figures who dedicate themselves to the issues in culture and society after the Dreyfus Affair of 1898 (Allen 1986). Yet, as Stefan Collini (1993) discusses, such figures existed already in the mid Victorian period. In fact, Mill was a symbolic thinker as he introduced the socialist awareness to liberalism. Socialism here broadly means the concern about society. Such socialism widely spread by the 1880s, when Sir William Harcourt stated “we are all socialist now” (Freedman 1978, 25-32). Liberal intellectuals were responsible for improving the society. The advancement of industrialization contributed to the spread of professionalization in the British society (Perkin 2002). In the intellectual field, it took a certain form of reformism. The awareness grew toward the beginning of the war. According to the contemporary evaluation of Robert Graves and Alan Hodge (1940[1994], 200): “Before the war the British educational system had been one of the clearest expressions of the class-structure of society.”

The engineering liberalism survived even through the years of the Great War and remained mostly intact in the university education (see Soffer 1994). Cambridge and Oxford played central

roles by explicitly aiming at nurturing elite intellectuals who were supposed to lead the mass.

Carr was in Cambridge in most of the first half of the 1910s. When he provided his elitist view of public opinion, he was like a typical graduate of Cambridge where the ancient form of liberal education was defended against the professionalism of German university system. Carr learned classics both in the public school and Cambridge. Historical studies were considered primarily important for the intellectuals to lead the public.

The British society was especially favorable for the reformist social theory in the 1930s. According to Graves and Hodge (1940[1994], 390), it was the time when engineers and scientists started to think that their insight might help reorganizing democracy: “It began to be realized towards the end of the Thirties that a closer integration of community needs and feelings would make class-war unnecessary and even impossible.” Carr lived in a similar intellectual circumstance where Victorian intellectuals attempted to vindicate British liberalism from continental philosophies. Collini (2006) has recently challenged the prevalent view that the twentieth century British society was lack of intellectuals. His argument is a sequel to the above mentioned discussion about the nineteenth century intellectuals. As the most recent version of this project, Collini (2008, chap. 12), although a bit hesitatingly, discussed Carr as an intellectual in basically the same sense that he called Mill and others as intellectual. We already know that Carr referred to Francis Bacon, not Dostoevsky, when he advocated the unity of theory and practice.

Conquering Europe

In this regard, it is possible to find Carr’s bias in his earlier works. At least, two of Carr’s early interpretations of nineteenth century thinkers illustrate the same symptom: Dostoevsky and Marx. These two thinkers are especially important in this current context. One of them is the

starting point of Carr for his entire project in the 1930s. The other is strangely called “Victorian” German, who presented a theory of progress.

I already mentioned in chapter two that Carr’s reading of Dostoevsky had certain orientalist flavor. In his rendition of Russia, Carr used Europe and England almost interchangeably. This fact necessarily implies that England represents the substance of whole Europe since the latter is geographically larger. To put otherwise, the center of Europe is England. Carr’s apparent Eurocentrism in *Dostoevsky* is, in this sense, actually the Anglo-centrism which depicts the countries in the European continent as the peripheries of England.

Historically, Britain had been in an exceptional status up until around the beginning of the twentieth century. It was partly because of its geographical position. Also, its imperial status relieved her of the demand to actively learn cultural insights from other countries. Until the early twentieth century, Britain ended up culturally and intellectually outmoded. According to the description of the interwar culture by Graves and Hodge (1940[1994], 181), “British *avant-garde* painting and criticism was always two or three steps behind French fashion, and British popular taste two or three steps behind the *avant-garde* painters and critics.”

In this context, the British vogue of Russianness in the early twentieth century was only a part of the increased interests in European culture (Hynes 1968, 345). Besides, such interests were not directed toward Germany in the prewar years (Hynes 1968, 335). The reception of German insights was even delayed. It is possible that Carr, as a British, found the argument of Marx, Freud, and Meinecke as something new in the same way as he read Dostoevsky. If Carr learned his basic view of history through his writing of *Dostoevsky*, it is natural that its bias remained in *The Twenty Years’ Crisis*.

Given this special ignorance of German philosophies by the interwar British, it is not surprising if Carr showed a similarly distorted comprehension of Marx. It has been pointed out that Carr was Marxist. But in which respect was he Marxist? Carr considers *The Twenty Years' Crisis* as a quasi-Marxist work by himself. In his autobiographical sketch: "I've always been more interested in Marxism as a method of revealing the hidden springs of thought and action, and debunking the logical and moralistic façade generally erected round them, than in the Marxist analysis of the decline of capitalism" (Carr 2000, xviii). Based on this methodological interest, Carr (2000, xiii-xix) continues: "I did during these years a lot of reading and thinking on Marxist lines. The result was *The 20 Years Crisis*, which I first planned in 1936-37 and finished early in 1939—not exactly a Marxist work, but strongly impregnated with Marxist ways of thinking, applied to international affairs."

Carr's primary interest in Marx is methodology. Accordingly, we do not see clear class conflicts in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. However, Carr's Marxism is strange even when it comes to methodological aspects. As the fundamental process of civilization is driven by utopianism, we actually do not see revolutionary moments contrary to Marxist progressivism. As I already argued, Carr's system of thought is a type of evolutionism but it is a particularly Victorian version in its form. According to Himmelfarb (1968, 420-23), there is a logically irreconcilable difference between Darwinism and Marxism. It is a particular strand of so-called scientific socialists who considered them compatible. Such socialists were becoming more influential in interwar Britain (Macintyre 1980). In this circumstance, it was particularly British to interpret Marx as a quasi-Victorian. In fact, Sorel was one of the harshest critics of this scientific type of socialist. I have already discussed that Carr was in a more progressive side as to how history proceeds, if not as to where it will reach.

Indeed, scientific socialism was, if not exclusively, British in the sense that it helped mitigate the subversive moments of Marx for the liberal tradition of Britain. Once the modernist impulses of Marx are grasped, it is easy to understand why Carr needed to attempt this maneuver. Approached from the view point of individuals, Marxism is a theory of action. The historically radical part of this theory is its scope of emancipating the range of human actions from the realm of economy. In the words of Marshall Berman (1988, 98), Marx hoped “to heal the wounds of modernity through a fuller and a deeper modernity.” Modernity here means the world of tensions in industrializing societies. There is a wealthy community, on the one hand, while inner lives of individuals are locked away from it, on the other hand (Berman 1988, 43). Marx’s solution was to deepen this tension so it reaches its culminating point to collapse by itself. The problem of capitalism will be solved from its inside by the proletariats.

There is a moment of existentialism in the thought of Marx in this regard, if we understand existentialism as man’s call for the emancipation from the surrounding constraints. The instrumental rationality of the capitalist economists bound people with the impersonally calculated rules of the system. Marx attempts to discard them. “It is as though Marx, not unlike Kierkegaard and Nietzsche,” Hannah Arendt (1993, 25) suggests, “tried desperately to think against the tradition while using its own conceptual tools.” Marxism is a subverting force toward metaphysical abstractness. As Arendt (1993, 39) also argues, “the very concept of dialectical *movement*, as Hegel conceived it as a universal law, and as Marx accepted it, makes the terms ‘idealism’ and ‘materialism’ as philosophical systems meaningless” (italics in original).

Carr evaluated Marx’s thought as an unsystematic amalgam of ideas. If Arendt is right, however, the unsystematic structure of Marxism was natural since Marx tried to destroy the metaphysical system. It might seem that Carr understood this moment of Marx when he

considered Marxism as a school of realism. Carr's theoretical system itself turned out to be a product of eclecticism like Marx's. Yet we already know that Carr returned to his metaphysical ideal of progress to incorporate its elements for his new system. Indeed, Carr must not have denounced Marx for his eclecticism if he himself sought to destroy the metaphysics. Carr's criticism of Marx itself suggests the deep concern about the coherent system in the discourse of Carr.

However explicitly Carr manifested his dislike of abstractness, he still aspired for a metaphysical idea of ethics. He might have wanted to deepen the modernity through modernity as Marx attempted to do. But his endeavor ended up a less subversive and more unclear one. The man of action was revived only within the safely fenced tradition of utopianism. Carr was not so much a revolutionary as a bourgeoisie who happened to obtain *Capital* for some money.

A Long Detour

Our starting point was the possible tension about the progressivism in Carr's system of thought. The investigation so far revealed the coexistence of two different cultures in Carr's text. His ambiguity in these two cultures suggested his eclectic bent in theory. Yet this eclecticism endangered his entire project of establishing a new model of civilization. The goodness of progress was presupposed as an unverifiable axiom in this eclecticism. Cultural and intellectual contexts in history supported to identify Carr as an idiosyncratically British intellectual in the interwar European settings.

Given Carr's relativistic attitude to theoretical concepts, it might be difficult to label him completely as Victorian despite his strong inclinations to the possibility and goodness of human progress. Yet it might be less difficult to call him Edwardian, although he was slightly more optimistic than the label signifies. Samuel Hynes (1968, 348) describes the character of the Edwardian intellectual mind as follows: "The dominant mood was rather a mixed one: nostalgia

in those who looked backward, apprehension in those who looked toward the future.” After Einstein, the British in the 1920s started to use the word relativity out of its original context in physics (Graves and Hodge 1940[1994], 86-87). The elegant skepticism started to become the sign of the sophisticated intellectual mind (Houghton 1957, 180). Bury, from whom Carr learned the history of the idea of progress, represented such skeptical mind as well. Bury’s discussion ended with the suggestion that the idea of progress might be relative as a doctrine. He asks: “does not Progress itself suggest that its value as a doctrine is only relative, corresponding to a certain not very advanced stage of civilization; just as Providence, in its day, was an idea of relative value, corresponding to a stage somewhat less advanced?” (Bury 1920, 352).

The British started to acquire a skeptical attitude to their tradition. Yet the Victorian period might have still been too close as the past to observe in a detached manner even for a person like Carr, who was well aware that there was the world outside of Britain and whose objectivity in research has been praised by his contemporary intellectuals. “I do not believe that we are at a sufficient distance from the Victorian age,” G. M. Young (1936[2002], 160) stated only three years before the appearance of *The Twenty Years’ Crisis*, “to judge with perfect fairness its prevalent philosophy in a matter where only the utmost vigilance can prevent our thought from being at once clouded and coloured with, often unconscious, emotion.” To accept Young’s evaluation, *The Twenty Years’ Crisis* was not an abnormal work for the contemporaries who spent their youth mostly at around the turn of the century and entered the intellectually productive stage of their life in the interwar period.

Liberalism was at the center of Carr’s thinking and his entire project in the 1930s concerned its revision. What is remarkable about Carr is that he employed rhetorical maneuver not to spread the realist doctrine but to vindicate modern utopianism. For example, liberal

utopianism became rootless partly because America disconnected its idea from the British context. At stake is not necessarily the legitimacy of the British tradition but the detachment of utopianism from it. In this story, a logical possibility is saved that the authentic British liberalism can be revived if approached in an appropriate manner.

Also remember that the skepticism against abstract metaphysics was a Russian trait in Dostoevsky. The same mind was implanted in realism in *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. It is possible to say that Carr is skeptic since he absorbed this line of realism. As we already know, however, the doubt about metaphysics is also a characteristic element of British empiricism. The scientific mind of realism was not totally alien to the English to begin with. By identifying skepticism with the realist mode of thinking, and thus an idea external to the British intellectual tradition, Carr provided a lip service to the arising European forms of thinking.

It is not significant whether Carr was actually conscious of these points. What we need to concern is these possibilities that the text contains, at least, implicitly. It is necessary to ask why *The Twenty Years' Crisis* took a roundabout approach to discuss the situation of the time. A historical form of thinking was an indirect approach to the crisis. A part of the reason might have been Carr's private inclinations to this mode of thought as well as the classic education he enjoyed in his youth. Yet if he wanted to use history as the exemplar of the necessity of both realist and utopian thoughts, it necessarily failed in its function not to tell how modern utopianism was flawed but to tell how modern realism would necessarily collapse. The reason is simply that no one had yet seen the end of modern realism. If Carr needed history as mere empirical evidence, indeed, he might have been able to draw how utopian and realist phases have come one after another in the history of western civilization preceding the modern period. But he did not perform any investigation of this kind since his subject concerned something he

considered new and idiosyncratic to his era. His concern was not primarily in the past but was in the present and the future. His discussion of how civilization proceeds thus needed to end with the prescription of how it would advance, indeed, in theory. In this sense, Carr did not have an urgent reason to employ the historical form of thinking that he adopted even if his interest was in the profound, not immediate, cause of the crisis. As such, the most remarkable use of history turned out to be its rhetorical function.

He might have been able to focus on the political regime of the new era if he just needed to provide a prescription. Yet such attempt was also difficult since the left intellectuals did not have much choice. Different from Carr's description, the tradition of liberalism was not a single line of the development of utilitarian voluntarism. As we discussed above, socialism was already a constitutive part of liberalism because of the advance of its own capitalist project. Liberalists could not stay at an idealist stage and needed to ponder on the actual economic inequalities (Freeden 1978, 64). A part of the project of British Idealism was a further incorporation of socialist concerns about the class inequality for the achievement of more concrete forms of human rights. Yet such socialist liberalism was, as Ernest Barker (1915, 11) stated around the commencement of the Great War, rather a restoration of the *Republic* of Plato. It just reminded people of the fact that man was a social being. Freeden (1978, 27) states by discussing the late nineteenth century liberalism: "the truth of socialism was in the perception that man was a social being. There had always been some socialism since society come into being." And the consequence of the development of its line of socialist liberalism was the failure to prevent the war.

Both classical and socialist types of liberalism already failed somehow when the war ended. Yet the former was worse since its reapplication gradually showed the limit toward the

commencement of another war, as Carr criticized it as a groundless. By contrast, socialist liberalism might still have left some space for improvement given the width of the range it covered as above. Interwar liberalists were forced a negative choice. Socialist forms of liberalism were less invalid. Or its advancement might have been the only (negative) option to revive the liberal project, which, anyway, contributed to the progress of the world for more than a century. In fact, this form of liberalism might have been the only reasonable way to negotiate the malicious effects of the market economy especially when Carr considered the economic crisis of 1931 as the decisive point where history started to show its merciless force. “Collectivism seemed to be a way of making life safer for everyone and less susceptible to the roulette wheel of the market” (Annan 1990, 13).

It may be possible to say that, whatever Carr intended, it was part of the rhetoric of his text to describe the pre-war liberalism as the thoroughly classical type. Socialist liberalism needed to be available as an option so its end needed to have been not announced yet. It is in this sense that the integrity was the vice for Carr (Haslam 1999) and he felt it his duty to tell a lie (Jones 1998). Carr’s intellectual standpoint was radical but for a conservative purpose (Wilson 2001). The discourse about liberalism needed to be indirect. In return, his rhetorical approach itself points to his trust in liberalism. Given the eclectic character of the text, the rhetoric is the only tool to find consistency in it.

CHAPTER 6 EPILOGUE

The outline of the story was this. Carr's early works from *Dostoevsky* to *The Twenty Years' Crisis* were a single series of struggle with the epochal crisis in the European intellectual tradition. Carr first exposed himself to the problem of human irrationality in his reading of Dostoevsky. This Russian author attempted to solve its nihilistic ramifications in politics through a rational belief in God. The meaning of life can be known by suffering the everyday agonies. Carr rejected this answer as a solution to his own world. Yet he accepted the question by rendering it so it could have direct relevance to the interwar era. Russia became a mirror of twentieth century Europe, or actually, England.

Leaving Dostoevsky, Carr turned his eyes to other Russian figures such as Herzen and Bakunin as well as their antagonist Marx. Early romanticists ended up being divided by the personal passion and the universal love. They could not establish the harmonious relation between them. Bakunin's individualism did not provide the solution to this tension either since its implication was too atomistic as a political philosophy. By contrast, Marx was too anti-individualistic to give an appropriate status for the participants of politics. Carr realized that he could not rely on the historical figures to solve the problem of the present.

Carr needed to find his own answer to the crisis in the interwar years. He could not be satisfied with the old utilitarian model for the same reason his nineteenth century thinkers could not. Yet he already learned that the problem is irrationality and its political ramifications. The voluntarist model of politics misestimated the power of the subconscious part of man. The crisis in the 1930s was the result of this ignorance. To resist the impersonal force, Carr needed to invent the model of political man. Everyone had to be prepared for the possible irrationality of the collective act.

By teaching people the way of self-defense, however, Carr ended up manifesting the modern utopian belief of human progress. The world advances in a better direction whenever this political man exploits his ability to the full extent. At bottom, it is not different from the model of economic man: a good man's good intention brings society good.

Carr was ambivalent in this aspect. On the one hand, he emphasized the uncertainty of the future by turning his eye to the power of human irrationality. On the other hand, he relied on the power of rational man to break the path to a better future by his own ability. This eclectic attitude was symptomatic in his system even at the epistemological level. Materialism, philosophical realism, and philosophical idealism assert their legitimacy at different parts of the mechanism of history he described. Political realism and political liberalism coexist. A teleological idea of progress and the evolutionist claim of irregularity in history appear one after the other. The only coherent core behind this amalgam was the ethical appeal to the liberal idea of individual freedom. As such, however, the ambiguity of the work was its constitutive element. Rhetoric integrated the text. It was a sign of sincerity in the culture of turmoil. *The Twenty Years' Crisis* turned out to be an idiosyncratically British vindication of the freedom of individuals.

What is the significance of this historical anecdote to us living in a different era? Two primary insights are noteworthy for international studies. One of them is about the political standpoint of Carr and his time. At the end of the last chapter, I mentioned the difficulty of liberalism in the early twentieth century. The war announced the failure of both traditional and socialist liberalisms. Some of Carr's favorite intellectuals in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* share this difficulty.

Harold Laski is a remarkable example. Carr (1939a, 115, 124, 226) cites the works of Laski several times in *The Twenty Years' Crisis* and all the references are meant to support his

own discussion. Since scholars have usually recognized Laski as a “red professor” not only in the interwar period but even beyond it, this fact apparently adds a circumstantial evidence for the scholarly observations which describe Carr’s sympathy for totalitarianism as a corollary of his logic (Kaufman 1996, 322-23; Wilson 2000, 183; Falk 2002, 105). However, recent studies of Laski generally agree that he has been considered an advocate of communism just because of the dominant bias in the Cold War period. Revisionists in the last two decades share the opinion that Laski was actually one of the most nuanced liberal thinkers in the twentieth century (Kramnick and Sheerman 1993; Newman 1993; Lamb 2004). We already discussed that nineteenth century liberals gradually incorporated socialist concerns into their thoughts. Laski’s socialism was, in a crucial aspect, an extension of liberalism in the late nineteenth century (see Freedman 1986, 295-313). Laski was critical of liberalism because of his liberal ideal.

While not a British intellectual, Mannheim had a similar intellectual inclination. According to Charles Jones (1998), Carr and Mannheim shared the critical idea of positivist epistemology of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It is difficult to accept this argument without some reservations since it is now clear from the discussion in the previous chapters that Carr’s theoretical orientation was more complex. Still, I think the two thinkers were closer in their political orientations. As an arguably critical theorist of the Frankfurt School, Mannheim was against the utilitarian understanding of politics. The criticism of instrumental rationality was needed since it bound individuals with their own reason. In the industrialized societies, rationality was employed against the freedom of man. Mannheim’s criticism of the positivist epistemology was inseparable from his concern about human freedom in this respect. David Ketler and Volker Meja (1995, 17) assesses the political inclination of Mannheim as follows: “His critiques of rationalism, ahistoricism, and individualism address substantive points of

liberal doctrine requiring adjustment, but the liberal elements constitute the structure and plan of his inquiry. Judged by his own indicators, his style of thinking is predominantly liberal.” Both Mannheim and Carr were concerned about the way of using reason, not its rejection. Carr (1939a, 21) criticizes Mannheim’s dismissive attitude toward the mass. Given that Mannheim advocated the classless character of intelligentsia, however, he shared with Carr the awareness about the problem of class inequality. Although the two scholars differed as to their methods, both aspired for the emancipation of individuals from the constraints of old rationalists’ irrationalities.

It was not strange for liberalists to be critical of their classical ancestors in the age of crisis. In the introductory chapter, I referred to the possibility that Carr might have not needed to criticize the works of interwar idealists in the 1930s. As in the last chapters, Carr used the dichotomy of utopianism and realism for historical and theoretical senses. He did not intend it to be a pejorative label. Given that Carr was primarily interested in criticizing nineteenth century utilitarianism, it was not necessary for him to reject interwar idealists from the right start. It was not strange that Carr criticized only the earlier works of idealists, not their later works. I do not denounce the achievement of the recent revisions about interwar idealists. They have excavated the long ignored social democratic concerns of the interwar theorists. Yet the insight of the revisionists should not be used to emphasize how Carr misunderstood these early theoreticians. It rather points to the widely recognized difficulty of liberalism, which Carr shared with them.

This being said, the other related issue concerns the meaning of international studies in the western tradition of political studies. It is crucial to obtain the above understanding about the intellectual situation in the inception of the modern international studies. Carr is significant in the history of international studies for his awareness of the significance of individuals in the age of its twilight. My argument started with the dissatisfaction with the lack of historical awareness of

the existing works. I discussed that it is necessary to go beyond the field of international studies for international studies. What I found through this expedition was Carr's concern about the problem of human irrationality in the western tradition of political philosophy. The appearance of international politics marked the twilight of this tradition. More appropriately, the rise of international politics was considered to have certain relation with the twilight of the western intellectual tradition. The manifestations about the sense of the crisis were observable everywhere in among the contemporary intellectual discourses in the post-Great War period (Koselleck 2006, 397). The end of a tradition was perceived by the era. Situated in this mood, *The Twenty Years' Crisis* discussed politics at its demise.

It is a different issue whether such understanding is historically accurate from the present perspective. Yet this point brings a question worth pondering: what can we say about international politics after Carr? At the very beginning of this study, I announced that international politics is the form of politics which reveals the limit of politics. The story concludes by restating this issue. My final remark starts from the comparison between Carr and Morgenthau. Both scholars have been recognized as the earliest theorists of the contemporary studies of international politics. Morgenthau is especially relevant for the present discussion, compared with other possible classical scholars, since recent studies of his thought usually goes beyond the field of international studies and relate him with philosophers such as Nietzsche, Weber and Schmitt. I will not delve into Morgenthau deeply since this is not the place of examining his thought. My comparison is rather casual. Yet it is sufficient to illuminate the implications of Carr's thinking for the innate problem of international politics.

Carr and Morgenthau started from the same concern but ended up reaching different solutions. Robert Schuett (2007) recently discussed how Morgenthau reused his early

unpublished discussion of Freud in his *Scientific Man versus Power Politics*. Morgenthau borrowed from Freud the idea of ego instincts to discuss the world of struggle. Carr and Morgenthau both started from human irrationality and its ramifications in international politics.

The discovery of irrationality led both Carr and Morgenthau to the rejection of the economic man of utilitarian liberalism. The world could be the place of recurrent wars and quagmires if people continued to follow its ideal. Observing this danger, Morgenthau (1946, 202) advocated everyday solution of the problem by advocating political ethics as the norm of doing (lesser) evil. In other words, Morgenthau tried to prevent the actualization of the potential crisis by attempting to solve the problems from within the new world of realism.

When Carr discussed political man, it seemed that he agreed with Morgenthau about the form of ethics in the new era. Yet Carr rather chose to believe in the ability of irrational men to appropriately employ their rational part of mind. His aim is to go beyond the world of realism to escape from the already actualized crisis. Morgenthau (1948b, 134) needed to criticize Carr as a believer of utopia, who could easily (re)turn to an idealist dictator. If Carr was interested in leading the mass to what he thought the right direction in order to ascertain his belief in human rationality, he was, indeed, quite a dictator as much as those nineteenth century intellectuals whom he criticized were.

Morgenthau's argument sounds more plausible by accepting the evil as evil. He does not pretend that people can totally overcome such evil, contrary to utilitarian rationalists who believed they could. In the world of Morgenthau, an individual appears as a hero who relentlessly faces all the problems he has. He is almost a materialization of Nietzschean superman. As Christophe Frei (2001) suggests, Morgenthau was heavily influenced by Nietzsche indeed.

However, Carr's project was to transcend this Nietzschean world. From a different view, Morgenthau's model is rather conservative as it is strangely similar to the rationalist model. When the utilitarian thinkers consider that the economic men automatically achieve the harmony of interests, individuals do not have autonomy despite the assumption that the voluntary acts of the good man leads to the good of the whole society. Individuals are actually destined to behave in a certain predetermined way to increase wealth both in private and public spheres. By the same token, the hero of Morgenthau embraces the force of history as given. Morgenthau's pragmatic solution is a corollary of his persistent subscription to realism.

According to Mead (1936, 359), philosophical realism and philosophical pragmatism lead to the same practical consequence due to their rejection of idealist teleology: "Progress is not toward a known goal. We cannot tell what the goal is toward which we are moving, and we do not test our movements or direct them according to any fixed goal that we can set up. What we do do, in the face of difficulties or problems, is to seek solutions." All problems for Morgenthau's hero are problems only inasmuch as he accepts the relentless law of history which limits the range of his possible behavior. Morgenthau's political animal is actually a slave of everyday bureaucratic duty. Unlike Nietzschean superman, he does not try to eternally transcend the existing value for higher value.

Around the same time when both Carr and Morgenthau started to present their discussion, Arthur Lovejoy (1936) described the history of the western thought as the change of the balance of the tension between this-worldly and other-worldly concerns. In this axis, both Morgenthau and Carr belong to the former side of the tradition by focusing their attention on the role of individuals in politics. Yet Morgenthau is relatively more this-worldly when he criticizes Carr's utopianism. However, Morgenthau's extra this-worldly approach ends up with the subjugation of

individuals to a transcendental power called history. Carr's limitedly this-worldly solution is more emancipative in this regard. The difference, we may say, is that Morgenthau stayed with the primitive stage of Raskolnikov and Carr embraced the teaching of Alyosha. Individuals, in the world of Carr, subscribe neither to the law of rationality nor to the law of history. True, they still live in these two laws. Yet they have autonomy within these constitutive structures.

It is not my intention to say that Carr was right and Morgenthau was wrong just because of this schematic delineation. As we already saw, the system of Carr was possible only when he gave an unconditional trust in the mercy of progress. Carr's belief in the ability of individual is naive and, we may say, unverifiable. Given that Carr ultimately went back to the old world if via a long detour, Morgenthau, a scholar with stronger inclinations to realism, was right by criticizing the possible utopian dictatorship of Carr's model. As Jean Bethke Elshtain (2008, 157) suggests, Carr's ideal of international community might be "dangerous and even silly."

Furthermore, Morgenthau's pragmatism is anyway a thought of progress. We do not know where we can finally reach after the daily fights against evils. As far as we solve the problems, however, we move from the existing situation to another one if within the same horizon. The world is, at least, not static. It is progress wherever the destination is. Ultimately, Carr versus Morgenthau is not progress versus non-progress but the conflict between two views of the advancement of the world. Indeed, Carr suggested that modern realism embraced the idea of progress. The issue was that this idea of progress was something similar to the vitalist evolutionism which Carr embraced only partly.

The world needs to be improved by the hands of individuals. Yet individuals no longer seem to have such power. If we try to teach them their ability, they end up becoming a slave of history and cease to be autonomous. If we try to set another field where people can be

autonomous, we cannot but make it groundless. The traditional solution to the relationship between individual and society is no longer available. Politics is the art of life of individuals. Yet individuals cannot grasp their position in the vast field of international society. They cannot tame the power of this society through election or other procedures whereas its ruling force spreads over the entire surface of the globe. Politics is still the art of individuals but more in a negative way.

The problem is linked with the chief concern in what Fred Dallmayr (1981) calls the post-individualist era, when the possessive form of subjectivity has been shaken first by Nietzsche and Freud, then by phenomenologists, and finally by critical theorists and post-structuralists. Indeed, the possessive individualism has its root in the thought of John Locke, who was also the pioneering thinker of the modern British tradition of political philosophy whose decline Carr was primarily concerned about. Voluntarism ceased to be the option toward the beginning of the Great War. The human world moves in whichever direction nevertheless. On the other hand, it is already counterintuitive to believe in the omnipotence of God who enables the virtuous circle. But the world would become meaningless if we accepted the totally determining power of the structural force which does not have intimate relation with the activity of individuals. International politics appears in the twilight of subjectivity.

For sure, it is possible and even easy to find more sophisticated presentation of the same question in other twentieth century intellectuals. Carr was not the first rate philosopher at all. Judging from the argument in the previous chapter, his discussion was even terrible.

Still, Carr is significant at least for the field international studies since he has been recognized as its pioneer for the very text which he provided to tackle with the same question as more praiseworthy thinkers still discuss. International politics appeared as the epochal question

of political philosophy first in his time and he recognized its significance. Carr uncovered the difficulty of politics in international politics.

There is probably no definite answer to this question so it is wide of the mark to attempt to achieve the immediate insight in the discourse of Carr. His primary significance is historical, and, in this regard, the problem is that the field of international studies has long been unaware of the fact that Carr grappled with such question. In the 1970s, Carr expressed to Stanley Hoffman (1977) his reluctance to have been recognized as a pioneer of international studies. He sure had a legitimate right to manifest such feeling. The Second Debate in the 1960s was just a strange revival of the school of thought which he already criticized in 1939. Both structuralism and behavioralism reduced the act of individuals to the law of the world beyond them. Worse still, Carr's enemies, realists, were now said to prevail after equipped with such determining force. These self-claimed realists even suggested their intellectual connection with him. They even willingly eradicated the autonomy of individuals and thus the possibility of politics. Methodologically, historical and rhetorical discourses started to be excluded from the discipline as illegitimate tools for academic discussions. Carr could have shared the feeling of the decline of political philosophy discussed by his contemporary critics of behavioralism.

As indirect heirs to post-behavioralists, recent critical theorists might claim that they are aware of the problem. Intellectual historians have suggested the continuity between modernists and post-modernists in terms of their concern about the various facets of indeterminacy of our social world (see Megill 1985; Berman 1988). Their approaches might indeed be better by grappling with it more directly and consciously. The introduction of the agent-structure problem is one of the clear evidence that they know its significance in the contemporary problem of political philosophy.

Yet even in this movement against structuralism in the field, it is rare that individuals are given the appropriate status as the active participants of politics. When linguistically oriented theoreticians claim the death of the author, individuals dissolves into the web of discourses. Roxanne Lynn Doty (1997) once criticized the lack of the attention to agents in the debate from a post-structuralist perspective. However, it does not seem that the discussion has remarkably advanced since then. In fact, critical theories might be closer to realism than usually considered given their subscription to skeptical mind as well as their appraisals of Nietzsche and other twentieth century thinkers (see Sterling-Folker and Shinko 2005).

The fundamental problem of the field of international studies is that it has moved backward by misunderstanding the problem which was correctly presented in its inception. It does not seem that the situation has been remarkably improved even in the current scholarship. The limit of politics in international politics is still the enigma which does not have the space it deserves. In this sense, Carr still plays the pivotal role in the history of international studies.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allen, Peter. 1986. "The Meanings of 'An Intellectual': Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Usage." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 55 (Summer): 342-58.
- Altick, Richard. 1973. *Victorian People and Ideas: A Companion for the Modern Reader of Victorian Literature*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Annan, Noel. 1990. *Our Age: English Intellectuals between the World Wars—A Group Portrait*. New York: Random House.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1993. *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ashcraft, Richard. 1980. "Political Theory and the Problem of Ideology." *Journal of Politics* 42 (August): 687-705.
- Ashworth, Lucian. 1999. *Creating International Studies: Angell, Mitrany and the Liberal Tradition*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ashworth, Lucian. 2002. "Did the Realist-Idealist Great Debate Really Happen? A Revisionist History of International Relations." *International Relations* 16 (April): 33-51.
- Ashworth, Lucian. 2006. "Where Are the Idealists in Interwar International Relations?" *Review of International Studies* 32 (July): 291-308.
- Barkawi, Tarak. 1998. "Strategy as a Vocation: Weber, Morgenthau and Modern Strategic Studies." *Review of International Studies* 24 (December): 159-84.
- Barker, Ernest. 1915. *Political Thought in England: From Herbert Spencer to the Present Day*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Barlow, Nora. (ed.) 1958. *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin, 1809-1882*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Becker, Carl. 1932. *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bell, Duncan. 2002. "Anarchy, Power and Death: Contemporary Political Realism as Ideology." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 7 (June): 221-39.
- Bergson, Henri. 1911. *Creative Evolution*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Bernstein, Samuel. 1939. "Review of *Michael Bakunin*." *Political Science Quarterly* 54 (June): 289-91.
- Bernstein, Richard. 1983. *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Berlin, Isaiah. 1994. *Russian Thinkers*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Berman, Marshall. 1988. *All that Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice." *International Affairs* 67 (July): 527-45.
- Bowler, Peter. 1994. "Darwinism and Modernism: Genetics, Paleontology, and the Challenge to Progressionism." In *Modernist Impulses in the Human Sciences, 1870-1930*, ed. Dorothy Ross. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 236-54.
- Bowler, Peter. 2003. *Evolution: The History of an Idea*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bracco, Rosa Maria. 1993. *Merchants of Hope: British Middlebrow Writers and the First World War, 1919-1939*. Oxford: Berg.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1938. "Review of *Michael Bakunin*." *International Affairs* 17 (September-October): 738-39.
- Burrow, John. 1968. *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burrow, John. 2000. *The Crisis of Reason: European Thought, 1848-1914*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bury, J. B. 1920. *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth*. London: Macmillan.
- Butterfield, Herbert. 1981. *The Origins of History*. New York: Basic Books.
- Carey, John. 1992. *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Carr, E. H. 1931. *Dostoevsky, 1821-1881: A New Biography*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Carr, E. H. 1933. *The Romantic Exiles: A Nineteenth-Century Portrait Gallery*. London: Victor Gollancz.
- Carr, E. H. 1934. *Karl Marx: A Study in Fanaticism*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
- Carr, E. H. 1936. "Public Opinion as a Safeguard of Peace." *International Affairs* 15 (November): 846-62.
- Carr, E. H. 1937a. *Michael Bakunin*. London: Macmillan.
- Carr, E. H. 1937b. *International Relations since the Peace Treaties*. London: Macmillan.

- Carr, E. H. 1939a. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Politics*. London: Macmillan.
- Carr, E. H. 1939b. *Britain: A Study of Foreign Policy from the Versailles Treaty to the Outbreak of War*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Carr, E. H. 1942. *Conditions of Peace*. London: Macmillan.
- Carr, E. H. 2000. "An Autobiography." In *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Michael Cox, pp. xiii-xxii. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cassirer, Ernst. 1950. *The Problem of Knowledge: Philosophy, Science and History since Hegel*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cassirer, Ernst. 1951. *The Philosophy of Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chan, Stephen. 2003. "A Problem for IR: How Shall We Narrate the Saga of the Bestial Man?" *Global Society* 17 (October): 385-413.
- Chong, Alan. 2007. "Lessons in International Communication: Carr, Angell, and Lippmann on Human Nature, Public Opinion and Leadership." *Review of International Studies* 33 (October): 615-35.
- Coleman, William. 1977. *Biology in the Nineteenth Century: Problems of Form, Function, and Transformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collingwood, R. G. 1945. *The Idea of Nature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Collingwood, R. G. 1994. *The Idea of History: With Lectures, 1926-1928*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collini, Stefan. 1993. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Collini, Stefan. 2006. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collini, Stefan. 2008. *Common Reading: Critics, Historians, Publics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, Michael. 1999. "Will the Real E. H. Carr Please Stand Up?" *International Affairs* 75 (July): 643-53.
- Cox, Michael. 2001. "Introduction." In *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Politics*, E. H. Carr. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, ix-lviii.
- Dallmayr, Fred. 1981. *Twilight of Subjectivity: Contributions to a Post-Individualist Theory of Politics*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Darwin, Charles. 1859[2006]. "On the Origins of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life." In *From So Simple a Beginning: The Four Great Books of Charles Darwin*, ed. Edward Wilson. New York: W. W. Norton, 449-760.
- Davies, R. W. 2000. "Carr's Changing Views of the Soviet Union." In *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Michael Cox. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 91-108.
- De Jonge, Alex. 1975. *Dostoevsky and the Age of Intensity*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. 1997. "Aporia: A Critical Exploration of the Agent-Structure Problematique in International Relations Theory." *European Journal of International Relations* 3 (September): 365-92.
- Dryzek, John, and Stephen Leonard. 1988. "History and Discipline in Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 82 (December): 1245-60.
- Dunne, Tim. 1998. *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 2008. "On Never Reaching the Coast of Utopia." *International Relations* 22 (June): 147-72.
- Everdell, William. 1997. *The First Moderns: Profiles in the Origins of Twentieth-Century Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Falk, Richard. 2002. "Shafts of Light: Hedley Bull and E. H. Carr on International Relations." *International Journal of Human Rights* 6 (Summer): 103-9.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books, 76-100.
- Freeden, Michael. 1978. *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Freeden, Michael. 1986. *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought, 1914-1939*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Frei, Christoph. 2001. *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Freyberg-Inan, Annette. 2004. *What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations and Its Judgment on Human Nature*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Fussell, Paul. 1975. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Germain, Randall. 2000. "E. H. Carr and the Historical Mode of Thought." In *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Michael Cox. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 322-36.

- Geuss, Raymond. 2002. "Liberalism and Its Discontents." *Political Theory* 30 (June): 320-38.
- Gismondi, Mark. 2004. "Tragedy, Realism, and Postmodernity: *Kulturpessimismus* in the Theories of Max Weber, E. H. Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, and Henry Kissinger." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 15 (September): 435-64.
- Goldfischer, David. 2002. "E. H. Carr: A 'Historical Realist' Approach for the Globalization Era." *Review of International Studies* 28 (October): 697-717.
- Graves, Robert, and Alan Hodge. 1940[1994]. *The Long Week-End: A Social History of Great Britain, 1918-1939*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Guzzini, Stefano. 1998. *Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy: The Continuing Story of a Death Foretold*. London: Routledge.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1990. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Halliday, Fred, and Justin Rosenberg. 1998. "Interview with Ken Waltz." *Review of International Studies* 24 (July): 371-86.
- Haslam, Jonathan. 1999. *Vices of Integrity: E. H. Carr, 1892-1982*. London: Verso.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. 1968. *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Hofer, Walther. 1957. "Einleitung des Herausgebers." In *Die Idee der Staatsräson*, Friedrich Meinecke, pp. vii-xxx. München: R. Oldenbourg.
- Hoffmann, Stanley. 1977. "An American Social Science: International Relations." *Daedalus* 106 (Summer): 41-60.
- Houghton, Walter. 1957. *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Huysmans, Jef. 1999. "Know Your Schmitt: A Godfather of Truth and the Spectre of Nazism." *Review of International Studies* 25 (April): 323-28.
- Hynes, Samuel. 1968. *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hynes, Samuel. 1991. *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture*. New York: Atheneum.
- Jervis, Robert. 1994. "Hans Morgenthau, Realism and the Scientific Study of International Politics." *Social Research* 61 (Winter): 853-76.
- Jones, Charles. 1998. *E. H. Carr and International Relations: A Duty to Lie*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jones, Charles. 2000. "'An Active Danger': E. H. Carr at *The Times*, 1940-46." In *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Michael Cox. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 68-87.
- Karpovich, Michael. 1939. "Review of *Michael Bakunin*." *American Historical Review* 44 (January): 380-82.
- Kaufman, Robert. 1996. "E. H. Carr, Winston Churchill, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Us: The Case for Principled, Prudential, Democratic Realism." In *Roots of Realism*, ed. Benjamin Frankel. London: Frank Cass, 314-53.
- Kaye, Peter. 1999. *Dostoevsky and English Modernism, 1900-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keegan, John. 1998. *The First World War*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Kern, Stephen. 2003. *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880-1918: With a New Preface*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kettler, David, and Volker Meja. 1995. *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism: The Secret of These New Times*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. 2004. *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. 2006. "Crisis." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67 (April): 357-400.
- Koyré, Alexandre. 1957. *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Kramnick, Isaac, and Barry Sheerman. 1993. *Harold Laski: A Life on the Left*. New York: Allen Lane.
- Kratochwil, Friedrich. 2006. "History, Action and Identity: Revisiting the 'Second' Great Debate and Assessing its Importance for Social Theory." *European Journal of International Relations* 12 (March): 5-29.
- Lamb, Peter. 2004. *Harold Laski: Problems of Democracy, the Sovereign State, and International Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lapid, Yosef. 1989. "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era." *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (September): 235-54.
- Lebow, Richard Ned. 2003. *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests, and Orders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leed, Eric. 1979. *No Man's Land: Combat and Identity in World War I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Linklater, Andrew. 1997. "The Transformation of Political Community: E. H. Carr, Critical Theory and International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 23 (July): 321-38.
- Long, David, and Peter Wilson. (eds.) 1995. *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-war Idealism Reassessed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lovejoy, Arthur. 1936. *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Macintyre, Stuart. 1980. *A Proletarian Science: Marxism in Britain, 1917-1933*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McKeon, Michael. 2002. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1936. *Movements of Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mearsheimer, John. 2005. "E. H. Carr vs. Idealism: The Battle Rages On." *International Relations* 19 (June): 139-52.
- Meinecke, Friedrich. 1936. *Die Entstehung des Historismus*. München: R. Oldenbourg.
- Megill, Allan. 1985. *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mirsky, D. S. 1931. "Preface." In *Dostoevsky (1821-1881): A New Biography*, E. H. Carr. London: Allen & Unwin, page numbers unavailable.
- Molloy, Seán. 2003. "Dialectics and Transformation: Exploring the International Theory of E. H. Carr." *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 17 (Winter): 279-306.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1946. *Scientific Man versus Power Politics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1948a. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1948b. "The Political Science of E. H. Carr." *World Politics* 1 (October): 127-34.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1972. *Science: Servant or Master?* New York: Plume.
- Muchnic, Helen. 1939. *Dostoevsky's English Reputation, 1881-1936*. New York: Octagon Books.
- Murray, Alastair. 1997. *Reconstructing Realism: Between Power Politics and Cosmopolitan Ethics*. Edinburgh: Keele University Press.
- Neumann, Iver. 1996. *Russia and the Idea of Europe*. London: Routledge.

- Neumann, Iver. 1999. *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Newman, Harold. 1993. *Harold Laski: A Political Biography*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. 1932. *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Nisbet, Robert. 1980. *History of the Idea of Progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Osiander, Andreas. 1998. "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited." *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (September): 409-32.
- Perkin, Harold. 2002. *The Rise of Professional Society: England since 1880*. London: Routledge.
- Pichler, Hans-Karl. 1998. "The Godfathers of Truth: Max Weber and Carl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics." *Review of International Studies* 24 (April): 185-200.
- Popper, Karl. 2002. *The Poverty of Historicism*. London: Routledge.
- Porter, Roy. 2000. *The Creation of the Modern World: The Untold Story of the British Enlightenment*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Quirk, Joel, and Darshan Vigneswaran. 2005. "The Construction of an Edifice: The Story of a First Great Debate." *Review of International Studies* 31 (January): 89-107.
- Rich, Paul. 2000. "E. H. Carr and the Quest for Moral Revolution in International Relations." In *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Michael Cox. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 198-216.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1988. *Time and Narrative, vol. 3*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ritter, Joachim. 1982. *Hegel and the French Revolution: Essays on the Philosophy of Right*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Rohde, Christoph. 2004. *Hans J. Morgenthau und der weltpolitische Realismus*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Rose, Gideon. 1998. "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy." *World Politics* 51 (October): 144-72.
- Said, Edward. 1994. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Scheler, Michael. 1938. "Review of Michael Bakunin." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 199 (September): 268.
- Scheuerman, William. 2008. "Realism and the Left: The Case of Hans J. Morgenthau." *Review of International Studies* 34 (January): 29-51.

- Schmidt, Brian. 1998a. "Lessons from the Past: Reassessing the Interwar Disciplinary History of International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 42 (September): 433-59.
- Schmidt, Brian. 1998b. *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Schmidt, Brian. 2002a. "On the History and Historiography of International Relations." In *Handbook of International Relations*, eds. Walter Carlesnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons. London: Sage, 3-22.
- Schmidt, Brian. 2002b. "Anarchy, World Politics and the Birth of a Discipline: American International Relations, Pluralist Theory and the Myth of Interwar Idealism." *International Relations* 16 (April): 9-31.
- Schuett, Robert. 2007. "Freudian Roots of Political Realism: The Importance of Sigmund Freud to Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Power Politics." *History of the Human Sciences* 20 (November): 53-78.
- Shapin, Steven. 1994. *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Soffer, Reba. 1978. *Ethics and Society in England: The Revolution in the Social Sciences, 1870-1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Soffer, Reba. 1994. *Discipline and Power: The University, History, and the Making of an English Elite, 1870-1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Sorel, Georges. 1915. *Reflections on Violence*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Sterling-Folker, Jennifer, and Rosemary Shinko. 2005. "Discourses of Power: Traversing the Realist-Postmodern Divide." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 33 (June): 637-64.
- Suganami, Hidemi. 2008. "Narrative Explanation and International Relations: Back to Basics." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 37 (December): 327-56.
- Sutton, Geoffrey. 1995. *Science for a Polite Society: Gender, Culture, and the Demonstration of Enlightenment*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Talmon, J. L. 1960. *Political Messianism: The Romantic Phase*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Taylor, Charles. 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Thies, Cameron. 2002. "Progress, History and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of the Idealist-Realist Debate." *European Journal of International Relations* 8 (June): 147-85.

- Ton, James Jay Hamil. 1973. "Georges Sorel and the Inconsistencies of a Bergsonian Marxism." *Political Theory* 1 (August): 329-40.
- Vasquez, John. 1998. *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wagner, Fritz. 1965. *Der Historiker und die Weltgeschichte*. München: Karl Alber Freiburg.
- Walker, R. B. J. 1993. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1990. "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory." *Journal of International Affairs* 44 (Spring-Summer): 21-37.
- Wasiolek, Edward. 1978. "Review of *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt, 1821-1849*." *Comparative Literature* 30 (Winter): 92-94.
- Watson, Janet. 2004. *Fighting Different Wars: Experience, Memory, and the First World War in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, Hayden. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wilson, Peter. 1995. "Introduction: The Twenty Years' Crisis and the Category of 'Idealism' in International Relations." In *Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis: Inter-war Idealism Reassessed*, eds. David Long and Peter Wilson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-24.
- Wilson, Peter. 1998. "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate.'" *Review of International Studies* 24 (December): 1-16.
- Wilson, Peter. 2000. "Carr and His Early Critics: Responses to *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1939-46*." In *E. H. Carr: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Michael Cox. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 165-97.
- Wilson, Peter. 2001. "Radicalism for a Conservative Purpose: The Peculiar Realism of E. H. Carr." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 30 (January): 123-36.
- Wilson, Peter. 2003. *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf: A Study in Twentieth-Century Idealism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Winter, Jay. 1995. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wohl, Robert. 2002. "Heart of Darkness: Modernism and Its Historians." *The Journal of Modern History* 74 (September): 573-621.
- Woodward, E. L. 1934. "Review of *Karl Marx: A Study in Fanaticism*." *International Affairs* 13 (September-October): 721.

Young, G. M. 1936[2002]. *Portrait of an Age*. London: Phoenix Press.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1989. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kuniyuki Nishimura was born in Japan. Upon graduating Kyoto University with a Bachelor of Laws degree in 2003 and a Master of Arts degree in political science in 2005, he moved to Gainesville, Florida to pursue his PhD in political science at the University of Florida. He completed his dissertation in 2009.