

ANARCHY
AND DISCIPLINE:
ON REALISTIC THEORIES
OF INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS OF HANS
MORGENTHAU
AND KENNETH WALTZ

SUMMARY

The aim of my book is to compare the classical grand theories of international relations of Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz. The interpretation stemming from this comparison cannot overlook the context of their creation. The direct context of the creation of Morgenthau's and Waltz's realistic theories were International Relations in the United States constituting a part of a broader social practice of social science. This is why the hypothesis adopted and verified in the book was: "The general context of theory creation by Morgenthau and Waltz is determined by the genesis and specificity of American social science, whereas the specific context is determined by the discipline of International Relations that developed during the great debates; both contexts had a significant structuring influence on these theories, resulting particularly in their scope reduction".

The basic method I adopted to verify the above hypothesis is the empirical-deductive method consisting of formulating a research problem and a corresponding hypothesis, i.e. "provisionally" determining the characteristics of the studied section of social reality. The next step is confronting such a hypothesis with empirical material in order to find whether it is true. Another important issue are explication and operationalisation, which allow determining the

meaning of the terms used in the narration and the way of using them during research that the narration communicates. The next methodological aspect of the work present in this book is the analysis and synthesis method used to structure and organise the research process. It allowed me to split the research problem into a set of specific questions organising particular chapters. The second step of this method is synthesis, which generalises particular factors considered as important during the verification of the hypothesis arising from the analysed research problem that leads to its adoption or rejection. Moreover, I used the historical-comparative method, as an important element of my work is the comparison of Morgenthau's and Waltz's theories interpreted and criticised in a time sequence: Morgenthau's theory first, then Waltz's theory. Thus, it is a diachronic comparison. The history of International Relations as American social science also determines the contexts of creation of the two theories, which required reconstructing them with particular emphasis on the history of political science as a discipline from which the American International Relations emerged. I also used the case study method – I treated Morgenthau's and Waltz's theories as separate cases of International Relations theories, but since the aim of their analysis is to prepare the ground for their synthetic comparison, the case study method is used only for a part of the issues covered by the dissertation.

In the first chapter, I presented the textbook version of the 1st debate in International Relations taking place during and after the Second World War. Its dominant approach in the newly formed discipline was political realism. This simplified vision was criticised by the so-called discipline history revisionists, who pointed out to several simplifications and myths translating into inadequate – in their opinion – description of reality by the advocates of traditional narration of the history of the discipline using the great debates approach. However, I presented a possibility of treating the great debate nominally, as indicators of the most important issues for the discipline on a given stage of development. I used this approach to International Relations in subsequent parts of the book. Then, I described the genesis and early stage of American social science, in particular political science and the contents belonging to International Relations emerging from this discipline. Against this background, I presented the thought of Morgenthau and Waltz,

the subject of which, in particular Morgenthau's criticism of social science expressed in *Scientific Man versus Power Politics* and Waltz's summary of the 1st great debate in *Man, the State and War* belongs to the 1st great debate in International Relations.

In the second chapter, I described the 2nd great debate in International Relations, which took place in the 1950s and 1960s. One of its sides were the classics, scholars of rather older generation, approaching International Relations from the perspective of law, history, and philosophy, who postulated aligning the method of International Relations with more strict methods of more developed social and natural sciences. I reconstructed the most important propositions of the debate participants and found that despite considering methodology its most important subject, it turned out to be surprisingly intellectually shallow, as it almost did not include the problems of philosophy of science. Against this background, I presented fragments of the wider thought of Morgenthau and Waltz. The first one actively participated in the debate, whereas the second adjusted his language to increasingly rigorous requirements of the language of social science, which penetrated the discourse of International Relations.

In the third chapter, I analysed the proper theory of international relations of Hans Morgenthau described in his *Politics among Nations*. First, I analysed its meta-theoretical bases, and I found that this approach served to build a theory allowing understanding the reality of international relations as an area of social reality. Next, I presented particular categories used in the theory, such as human nature, state, power, politics, and international system, as well as other categories appearing in *Politics among Nations* (foreign policy, ethics of responsibility, national interest) bringing what I call the normative theory of foreign policy of a state. This analysis allowed me to indicate the influence of the context of creation of this work, i.e. American social science during the first decades after the Second World War, on Morgenthau's theoretical construction.

In the fourth chapter, I extensively discussed the bases of Waltz's theory presented in *Theory of International Politics*, in particular in terms of inspiration he took from the philosophy of science of his time. I indicated several categories crucial for determining the meta-theoretical characteristics of Waltz's work, which allowed me to state that his theory was meant mostly to explain international

relations. Next, I analysed the contents of his proper theory, including theoretical terms such as balance of powers, (like) unit, system, structure, politics, capabilities (power), and interdependence, and proposed two possible Waltz's theory readings, narrow and wide, which, confronted with traditional criticism of *Theory*, allowed me to present my original interpretation of this work. This interpretation revealed the traces of foreign policy theory, although Waltz himself denied its presence in his work. Noticing this discrepancy between Waltz's declarations and my reading allowed me to indicate the influence of context of theory creation on the work.

In the fifth chapter, I synthetically compared the two theories in terms of the categories they use and the contexts of creation of both theories, as well as the influence of these contexts on them. It provided me the grounds to determine what political realism as a theory of international relations meant for each author. Moreover, I pointed out that the scope these theories, despite their common roots in realist philosophy of politics, was increasingly reduced (they had less to say about international relations as an area of social reality): Morgenthau's theory turned out more abundant than Waltz's, but its contents was limited in comparison with political realism philosophy due to its specific language. Given the above, I assume that the hypothesis: "The general context of theory creation by Morgenthau and Waltz is determined by the genesis and specificity of American social science, whereas the specific context is determined by the discipline of international relations that developed during the great debates; both contexts had a significant structuring influence on these theories, resulting particularly in their scope reduction" was proven as a result of my research presented in this book.

In the closing remarks I have tried to show how Morgenthau's and Waltz's takes on grand theory can be considered realist. Most crucially I have compared their work with the ideal type of realism as a political theory (philosophy of politics). The interesting finding was, that although their theoretical works were developed as a part of social science, they still pass the test of being also a philosophy of politics, which in turn attest to their timeless relevancy.