

The Silent Presence: Germany in American Postwar International Relations

Roesch, F.

Accepted manuscript PDF deposited in Coventry University's Repository

Original citation:

'The Silent Presence: Germany in American Postwar International Relations', in Changing Images of Germany in International Relations: Prussians, Nazis, Peaceniks, ed. by J. Steffek & L. Holthaus, pub 2020 (ISBN 978-1-5261-3571-1)

Publisher: Manchester University Press

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

The Silent Presence: Germany in American Postwar International Relations

Felix Rösch, Coventry University

Introduction

On February 14, 1966, the *Coburger Tageblatt*, a local newspaper from Coburg in Northern Bavaria published an article, mentioning the *American* scholar Hans Morgenthau. The following day, a correction appeared in the *Tageblatt*, after a letter had reached the editor, informing the newspaper that Morgenthau was a native of Coburg.¹ This small episode illustrates a wider phenomenon. The German² (intellectual) roots of scholars like Morgenthau, who were forced to leave Germany during the 1930s³ and often found refuge in the United States, were not noticed anymore after World War II to the extent that they became all but forgotten. Their scholarship was no longer situated in the liberal democratic milieu of Weimar Germany that upheld humanistic educational ideals and was sympathetically critical to Marxist thought, but theirs were connected to an American liberalism turned idealism that lacked the intellectual modesty and self-reflexivity that the Weimar version argued for. In short, émigrés had turned into ‘hyper-American[s]’, as Golo Mann once put it.⁴

The intention of this chapter is to investigate the processes that led to this “silencing”. How was it possible that their German intellectual socialization that continued to inform their political thought became overlooked and indeed no longer even realized? It is argued that German émigrés and American IR constitute a case of successful integration. Before this argument is further expounded, it has to be acknowledged that émigré scholars partly caused this silencing themselves. After their forced emigration, they were at pains to adjust their research and teaching to the different intellectual and historical backgrounds of their American colleagues and students. This not only happened to find employment in a higher education sector that was under severe financial constraints, but also to avoid being perceived as enemy aliens during

World War II. Still, while their own silencing contributed to it, it does not provide a fully satisfying answer.

To this end, their integration into American IR has to move into the focus. Already early contributions on émigré scholars, while intending to account for the intellectual loss that Germany suffered from the exodus of numerous scholars and the resultant gain for the American academic world, implicitly engaged with their integration.⁵ However, these contributions that Catherine Epstein⁶ calls *Beitragsgeschichte* struggled to illuminate their integration much beyond simple dichotomies of loss and gain, and also in later contributions émigrés were treated in a static way. By using concepts like assimilation,⁷ integration was charted as a one-sided effort until émigrés eventually ‘had been absorbed into American society.’⁸ In this sense, Nicolas Guilhot’s reading of émigrés’ turn to IR theory as a ‘realist gambit’, highlighting ‘a case of intellectual irredentism, resisting its own integration into American social sciences’,⁹ evokes images of a failed assimilation, as it implies that these scholars, critical of American behavioralism, deliberately withdrew from mainstream academia.

More recent contributions, by contrast, explained the silencing of the German intellectual background of émigré scholars through acculturation,¹⁰ providing a more nuanced, long-term outlook by considering it as an ‘interactive process embedded in cultural settings that are themselves fluid enough to change.’¹¹ This perspective is sustained by considering the private life of émigrés. Even though their impressions of Germany remained ‘ambivalent’¹², they often kept close personal and intellectual ties with Germany and among themselves, as they could ‘respond to a quotation from Goethe with a quotation from Heine’, as Elisabeth Young-Bruehl¹³ put it for the circle around Hannah Arendt. Acculturation even helps to understand Guilhot’s claim of a realist gambit, as it was ‘at times most successful through opposition to then-current cultural norms’ in the United States.¹⁴

However, the conceptual extensiveness of acculturation makes it difficult to chart the integration of émigré scholars. Including cases of (deliberate) separation (and segregation) from the wider society distracts from the often unintentional assemblages of knowledge exchanges, internal and external developments, and personal networks that brought their successful integration about. Before proceeding, two caveats have to be mentioned: first, some émigrés indeed deliberately withdrew

from American society and academia, as they could not cope with the changed environment and their changed societal status.¹⁵ Still, a significant amount of émigrés had ‘brilliant career[s]’.¹⁶ Second, success is not defined in terms of a linear process, progressing to a pre-defined, static majoritarian position, as is the case with assimilation. Rather, success implies that all involved groups have the opportunity and the urge to participate in wider societal debates. This might include conflicts and occasionally can entail setbacks, but it does exclude segregation and separation. To capture these constellations, the relations between émigré scholars and American IR have to be seen as a functional integration, as developed amongst others by Richard Münch and recently reconsidered by Philipp Ther.¹⁷ Integration in this sense does not have a normative connotation, but accepts that the arrival of immigrants initiates a messy, partly reversible process, meandering without an absolute end. In this process, functional integration also gradually affects the majoritarian position, moving towards the position of émigrés. This is because integration happens through participation in which immigrants have the opportunity to voice their interests and ideas and have them debated. It also means that they can and have to listen to others’ interests and ideas and debate them with the majoritarian society.

Employing this notion of integration to understand how some émigré scholars could academically excel in the United States while at the same time their German roots were no longer noticed, the rest of the chapter proceeds in three steps. First, the spaces that facilitated the integration between émigrés and their American coevals are being investigated. While there were particular places that gave émigrés and American scholars more opportunities to collaborate, referring to them as spaces of integration acknowledges the role that specific people and institutions played in creating them. Spaces are therefore understood as a ‘capacity’, highlighting their ‘becoming, an emerging property of social relationships’.¹⁸ Second, the importance of language and translation is discussed. In order to integrate, people need to be able to speak to each other. This required from émigrés translating the concepts that informed their political thought into English. The final section investigates the moment when each group’s thought started to get affected by the exposure to different kinds of thinking and the multitude of impressions that they made in the

process of integration. It highlights how this exposure influenced IR in the United States for much of the second half of the twentieth century.

Spaces of Integration: New York, Chicago, and Beyond

Reconsidering the integration of émigré scholars in American IR has to begin at the specific spaces in which these processes took place. This might sound trivial. However, without them no integration could have taken place. The different groups would have at best lived next to each other, but they would not have been able to establish cohabitation in the sense of creating common life-worlds.

While these spaces are important, they did not exist everywhere. With the exception of cities like Chicago, most émigré scholars lived either on the East or West Coast, which offered more opportunities for the newly arrived. Living in the same cities, however, did neither mean that they were an intellectually coherent group nor did it make them into one. Rather, they had a range of different experiences and careers in the United States. For some like Viennese legal positivists, empirical sociologists, and logical empiricists it was relatively easy to find employment at American universities and attract significant research grants, due to their affinities with American behavioralism.¹⁹ Others like Arnold Wolfers and Hajo Holborn, the ‘Wunderkind’²⁰ of Weimar history, profited from their prominent position in Germany.²¹ For most émigrés, however, starting a new life was difficult. They were at the beginning of their career, had only few contacts in the United States, and struggled to adjust to a different academic environment. Before finding his first academic position at Brooklyn College, where he had to teach ‘just about everything under the sun’,²² Morgenthau worked as an elevator boy.²³ John Herz, Ernst Borinski, and Ossip Flechtheim, by contrast, were part of about 50 émigré scholars, who initially only found positions at universities for African Americans, again experiencing racism against themselves and their students.²⁴ When this group of scholars crossed the Atlantic, racial segregation with Jim Crow laws in effect until the 1960s was still common in the United States. Hence, most white American scholars would not have considered accepting such positions, as it might have affected their careers negatively. Even Hannah Arendt had a meagre start, initially working for *Aufbau*, the German-language Jewish newspaper

in New York, the *Review of Politics*, founded by fellow émigré Waldemar Gurian,²⁵ and the Jewish Cultural Reconstruction.

One of the reasons why their integration in the United States was aggravated was that their arrival coincided with the Great Depression. Unemployment rose to an unprecedented scale, affecting also the university sector. Certainly, with Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, the American government tried to attenuate the effects of the Great Depression through financial reforms, work creation schemes, and welfare programs, of which the Tennessee Valley Authority is perhaps the most famous.²⁶ However, the university sector, providing employment only to a relatively small group of people, was not the government's priority and given that university budgets were also strained during this time, new faculty openings reduced significantly. Competing with American colleagues for the few available positions, émigrés, by then not yet naturalized citizens, often found themselves to be unsuccessful. For the same reason, also philanthropic foundations like Ford, Rockefeller, and the Carnegie Corporation of New York were reluctant to support émigré scholars 'because they represented competition for jobs that young American academics would otherwise fill.'²⁷

On top of these financial constraints, émigrés were also affected by anti-Semitism in the United States.²⁸ After 1933, for example, hotels restricted access for Jews, while landlords advertised their apartments with the addition "no Jews".²⁹ Even at universities, some faculty members would openly voice their convictions and many universities like Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Princeton, and Yale used quota systems to minimize the intake of Jewish students and scholars.³⁰ In Morgenthau's papers at the Library of Congress, numerous letters with anti-Semitic content are preserved. At one point, he even complained to Walter Lippmann that 'I receive every day letters with xenophobic ... and anti-Semitic attacks, not to speak of anonymous telephone calls ... This goes to show how thin the veneer of political civilization is.'³¹ Indeed, for Franz Neumann, who like Morgenthau worked for Hugo Sinzheimer in Frankfurt before his emigration, the United States in the 1930s was even more anti-Semitic than Germany.³²

However, despite these obstacles, many émigré scholars made important contributions to American science, and IR is a particular case in point. Reasons for this, ranging from expert knowledge about Germany otherwise unavailable in the United

States to an intellectual open-mindedness particularly among younger American colleagues at times when the United States' self-understanding was challenged, are further detailed below. At this point, it suffices to reflect on the specific spaces that fostered their integration.

Particularly since the outbreak of World War II, expert knowledge that émigré scholars offered came in demand in the United States, as the American government could not source ~~it~~^{them} from elsewhere. Providing 'an arsenal of knowledge' as Udi Greenberg calls it,³³ made these scholars sought after employees at newly founded government institutions, such as the Office of War Information, the Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communication at the Library of Congress, and the Psychological Warfare Division of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Force. Most famous, however, was the Office for Strategic Services (OSS), which was established in 1942. This forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) made ample use of émigrés' expertise, having amongst others Wolfers, Holborn, Herz, Neumann, Ernst Fraenkel, and Hans Speier on its payroll.³⁴ Even Frankfurt School Marxists like Otto Kirchheimer and Herbert Marcuse worked for the OSS. This ideological open-mindedness is remarkable, given that only a few years later Joseph McCarthy took action against (alleged) Communists during the early stages of the Cold War. Even semi-private institutions like the Rand Corporation (initially part of Douglas Aircraft) profited from émigrés. Speier, for example, became the first Director of its Social Science Division in 1948.³⁵

Most, however, were appointed to academic positions, particularly at universities in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and the Bay Area.³⁶ In New York, the entire political spectrum of émigré scholars was represented, as not only members of the Frankfurt School worked at Columbia University before they moved to California, but also more right-leaning scholars like Ernst Jäckh. Perhaps the most well-known, however, is the *University in Exile* at the New School in New York. Indeed, many universities at that time were relieved that the *University in Exile* had been established, as it provided an 'alibi'³⁷ for other universities. They could recommend highly qualified émigrés to this institution, rather than having them to compete with American scholars for the few academic positions available. Its first director, Alvin Johnson,³⁸ sought opportunities to accommodate émigrés who had reached the United States with the help of the

Academic Assistance Council and the Rockefeller Foundation. The latter provided the initial funding for the *University in Exile* and, with Kenneth Thompson later occupying leading positions at the Rockefeller Foundation, it actively encouraged further intellectual exchanges.

Working at the *University in Exile* provided émigré scholars with the space to engage with like-minded American scholars in collaboration to achieve similar cosmopolitan ambitions.³⁹ As Ned Lebow remarks and as confirmed by the New School's Graduate Faculty Meeting Records,⁴⁰ in contrast to the Francophone members of the *École Libre des Hautes Études*, who were also based at the New School, the Germanophone émigrés actively sought this engagement as most of them saw the United States as their new permanent home. Consequently, soon after their arrival, academic outlets were established to facilitate intellectual engagement. At the New School, a workshop on intellectual exile was organized as part of its Graduate Faculty's fourth anniversary celebrations and émigré scholars began publishing *Social Research* in 1934.⁴¹ At Notre Dame, as mentioned, Gurian had founded the *Review of Politics* in 1939 and later *Dissent*, amongst others established by Lewis Coser and Henry Pachter, served a similar purpose.⁴² Quickly, these journals turned into mouthpieces for émigré scholars, allowing them to promulgate their ideas among American academics.

Equally, the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation provided space for integration with its lecture series at the University of Chicago between 1937 and 1956. This so far under-researched lecture series was part of a donation, the terms of which stipulated an increasing knowledge of the American way of life among students. Each year, a scholar was invited to give a series of lectures, and what is important for the argument of this chapter is less that it brought forward some of the most remarkable contributions to political theory in the twentieth century, but rather that many émigré scholars were asked to speak about their views on US politics and culture. Eric Voegelin's *The New Science of Politics* (1952), Leo Strauss' *Natural Right and History* (1953), and Arendt's *The Human Condition* (1958) were first drafted for the *Walgreen Foundation Lecture Series*. Other speakers included the former director of the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik* Hans Simons and Karl Löwenstein.⁴³ To what extent émigré scholars supported each other in being given the possibility to speak at this lecture series, however, is a

question for further research. Correspondence at the Morgenthau Archive indicates that Morgenthau was involved in suggesting potential speakers, as was Strauss.⁴⁴ Establishing spaces, however, where émigrés and their American peers could meet and exchange their thoughts was just a preliminary step towards integration. As the next section shows, to bring about integration as a mutually relational process, language and translation take center stage.

Adjusting to American Academia: Translating German Intellectual Thought

To integrate, people need to be able to talk to each other. To this end, a common language has to be established.⁴⁵ As the émigrés arrived in a country with English being the official language, communication required more efforts from them. They had to learn the language and ensure the translation of their German political thought. For many of these scholars, this meant that they had to demonstrate proficiency in a language they had not studied profoundly prior to their emigration. German humanistic secondary education required the study of Latin and ancient Greek, but it did not arrange for the study of English in a way that enabled practical competence. Consequently, many émigrés had to quickly learn English in their late twenties or early thirties and initially faced significant difficulty in making contributions to American intellectual discourses, as confirmed rather polemically by Carl Zuckmayer; while speaking to students at the University of Zurich, Zuckmayer stressed that learning English was the most daunting task to master.⁴⁶ Indeed, many of the leading figures in early IR retained a strong accent throughout their lives, although they often achieved a linguistic mastery that surpassed many of their native-speaking peers.⁴⁷ Trying to achieve this mastery required significant efforts. Voegelin, for example, mentioned that he had to learn to distinguish the ‘social stratification of language’, meaning that, with the help of American colleagues, he had to acquire the capacity to appropriately address his intended audience by distinguishing different English vernaculars.⁴⁸ However, learning and even mastering a new language is not yet sufficient to establish communication that enhances integration. Rather, people have to align different ‘system[s] of intelligibility’,⁴⁹ meaning that émigré scholars were set with the task of introducing their concepts into a new context and making them common among their American interlocutors. Given that these concepts are defined rigorously and offered

intellectual clarity in one linguistic context, attaining a similar stage at a new linguistic context is challenging.⁵⁰ However, introducing new concepts does not mean that émigré scholars were forced to shape them into coherence, but it means that translation is a 'reciprocal wager'. It rests on the 'desire for meaning as value and a desire to speak across, even under least favorable conditions. The act of translation thus hypothesizes an exchange of *equivalent* signs and makes up that *equivalence* where there is none perceived as such.⁵¹ In doing so, people can experience emotional liberation, as their creativity is being stimulated; they are given the opportunity to critically reflect upon themselves as well as upon their socio-political and cultural backgrounds, thus developing empathy towards others in a new environment.

In their recent delineation of literate ethics, Hartmut Behr and Xander Kirke emphasize the ability to contextualize knowledge in order to avoid misunderstandings or misrepresentations.⁵² In other words, contextuality is a first step towards meaningful translations that cannot be accomplished by a simple transliteration or metaphor.⁵³ Contextuality requires the translator to have a critical understanding about the cultural memory that contributed to the establishment of knowledge in the original context. This kind of memory is situated in the everyday, as it is objectified in cultural artefacts, for example texts, rituals, and ceremonies that have shaped a community over a long period of time. The resulting 'figures of memory'⁵⁴ create a stable, yet gradually changing intellectual horizon to which people refer while creating knowledge. Cultural memory, therefore, acknowledges the hybridity and multi-dimensionality of intercultural encounters and it also recognizes specific spatio-temporal patterns that guide these encounters. Thus, the translation of knowledge into a new context requires its spatio-temporal localization because a thorough understanding of these figures of memory provides the possibility of a deeper understanding about the historical discourses that have shaped knowledge as these figures provide the intellectual framework upon which knowledge is being constructed.⁵⁵

Shortly after their arrival in the United States, the contextualization of their knowledge was still unproblematic for émigré scholars. All of them had received an extensive humanistic education, meaning they were well aware of German figures of memory.

Still, as Pachter recollected, 'our language froze at the point of emigration, or it even became poorer for want of a dialogue with the people who create and develop speech every day.'⁵⁶ It follows that émigré scholars were painfully aware that cultural memory was gradually changing due to the constant reconfigurations of social relationships. In order to retain the ability to contextualize their knowledge, they had to keep engaging with German thought collectives. Substantial engagement with German politics after their emigration is evidenced by many émigré scholars. In addition, many émigré scholars repeatedly returned temporarily to Europe after the end of World War II to retain the connection with their former intellectual horizon. Morgenthau was teaching at the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies from 1950 to 1976, and with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation he spent time at their Villa Serbelloni (Bellagio Center) at Lake Como in Italy.⁵⁷ Equally, Herz frequently crossed the Atlantic and took up visiting professorships at the University of Marburg and the Free University of Berlin.⁵⁸ With the support of the German Academic Exchange Service (*Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst*, DAAD), the University of Heidelberg also regularly invited émigré scholars to give lectures. Some such as Voegelin, Fraenkel, and Arnold Bergstraesser even returned permanently.⁵⁹

In a second step, this contextualized knowledge needs to be introduced into a new context related to existing knowledge. Relationality requires that an understanding about the constellations of the new societal context needs to be developed because for people to make use of new forms of knowledge, they need to be able to relate it to their own cultural memory in order to give it meaning and even consider it for their own life.⁶⁰ However, due to its spatio-temporal contextuality, knowledge resists identical transplantation. It is more likely that knowledge is transformed in the process of introducing it into a new context, as people engage with it through different perspectives. In their effort to remove knowledge from its original context, émigré scholars, therefore, had to demonstrate self-reflexivity and, to paraphrase Brent Steele, contextually reconstruct it by bringing 'it to bear upon ... problems [in its new context] or to speak to debates in a scholarly field.'⁶¹ As mentioned, a metaphrase is not sufficient, as a 'one-to-one' translation does not take the original spatio-temporal context into account. Furthermore, it also lacks the translator's self-reflexivity in terms of the new context as it does not engage in a contextual reconstruction. As Robbie

Shilliam notes, translation is a 'generative act', requiring careful balancing.⁶² The constellations of the original context have to be reflected in the translation, while at the same time meaning adjustments have to take place in order to satisfy the demands of the new context. This careful balancing is evidenced in Arendt's work. For the German editions of some of her most well-known books – *Origins of Totalitarianism* (1950), *The Human Condition* (1958), and *On Revolution* (1963) – Arendt neither commissioned a professional translator nor translated it herself. Rather, she rewrote them, leading to significant changes. This not only allowed Arendt to clarify some of the unresolved questions in the English editions but also enabled her to pursue her primary intention of enhancing the books' readability for her German audience, as she rewrote them with a different cultural context in mind.⁶³

Certainly, Arendt is an extreme, yet not solitary, example. On the basis of Roger Hart's taxonomy, several linguistic devices can be discerned that were used on a larger scale by émigrés in order to ensure reciprocal waging. One common method through which German philosophical terms were introduced into American academia is calques.⁶⁴ These are 'root-to-root' translations of complex notions. The resulting neologisms are an addition to the existing thesaurus, and once they are codified they lose their direct perceptibility as being loanwords. Calques are evidenced as concepts that enriched intellectual discussions of the Weimar Republic and also guided the ideas of émigré scholars during their careers in the United States. Compassion (*Mitleiden*), worldview (*Weltanschauung*), thought style (*Denkstil*), and world postulate (*Weltwollung*) are such concepts. The latter three were made popular not least through Mannheim's influential *Ideology and Utopia*, and their calques were used frequently by émigré scholars in their own work.⁶⁵ However, as Hart notes, prior to their codification, calques, like metaphrases, require 'lengthy explanations and commentaries' that many émigrés were not prepared or not able to provide.⁶⁶ Morgenthau's case in which he was reminded by Michael Oakeshott about the incommensurability of his concepts, for instance power, objectivity, and rationality, with his Anglophone audience is illuminating here and so are the well-documented consequences of the resulting misunderstandings.⁶⁷

Despite the lack of explanation and the inability or unwillingness to comment on their meaning offers evidence for a second linguistic device that was used more often in

their writings. With the help of semantic extensions and, more commonly, synecdoches as semantic reductions, émigrés also aimed to translate their German knowledge into the American context and to propagate it among their interlocutors. With these devices, émigrés made contributions to ongoing discussions in American academia. Arendt frequently made references to the Federalists and even used the example of town-hall meetings in order to visualize her concept of the civic sphere.⁶⁸ Even more obvious is the usage of these devices in the writings of Morgenthau. He instructed his assistants in Chicago to search for Anglophone examples and references and substitute them for the existing German ones in order to make his writings more accessible for his American audience.⁶⁹ The semantic reduction of *Macht* and *Kraft* or *pouvoir* and *puissance* to power in Morgenthau's American writings can, therefore, be understood as his acquiescence as his concept of power became not only an accepted contribution to IR discourses, but also one that exerts considerable influence still today.⁷⁰

German Émigrés and American IR: a Symbiosis

In this final section, the moment when émigrés' thought started to have an effect on American IR is captured. This section reassures that knowledge is conditioned in space and time, as it is formed in social relationships, and the case of émigré scholars and American IR is no exception: their knowledge sometimes was retained, but more often it was rearranged and altered in processes of collective formation. Eventually, the integration of émigré scholars reached a stage of what has repeatedly been characterized as a symbiosis.⁷¹

This symbiosis was initiated by the will of most émigrés to make a contribution to American intellectual discourses and society at large because, as mentioned, they considered the United States as their new home. Even émigrés like Voegelin, who later returned to Germany, wanted to become Americans, after having 'been thrown out of Austria by the National Socialists.'⁷² Certainly, the expert knowledge that many Weimar scholars offered in the first years after their emigration helped in this regard. During the 1930s and 1940s, émigré scholars offered expert insight on the downfall of the Weimar Republic and the rise of Nazism in Germany that became especially sought after when the United States entered war in 1941.⁷³ Carl Joachim Friedrich and Arendt

are to this day known to a wider public for their work on totalitarianism, not least because it also proved important during the Cold War. Equally, while Neumann and Fraenkel contributed the most insightful elaborations on the NSDAP's infiltration of government institutions, Ernst Cassirer traced the intellectual origins that contributed to the rise of Nazism shortly before his premature death in 1945. Even Hans Kelsen, who in contrast to other émigrés had less of an impact in the United States,⁷⁴ profited from his knowledge regarding German jurisdiction in his work on Communist law. Offering expert knowledge, as mentioned, was not restricted to the academic realm; as many of the émigrés worked for government institutions like the OSS during the War. Occasionally, however, their expertise was also rejected. Morgenthau recollected with bitterness that the American government did not call upon him when expertise on Spain was required, although Morgenthau had close connections to Spanish scholars and politicians since he had worked in Madrid.⁷⁵ Still, offering expert knowledge and their expertise on the rise of Nazism in particular proved indispensable for many émigré scholars as it not only helped them to find entry into American academic discourses, but even more so find employment. Consequently, '[i]t is no exaggeration to say that at that time we [émigré scholars] needed the Nazis as our *raison d'être*', as Pachter accentuated.⁷⁶

However, while the offering of expertise can initiate integration, it cannot sustain it. To this end, émigrés' German knowledge had to gain meaning-value, as Lydia Liu calls it,⁷⁷ in the American context. Through intercultural interplays of adjustment, this can mean that knowledge remains unaltered, but it is more likely that it will be reduced, enlarged, or potentially even changed completely. At this point, it helped that particularly younger American faculty members approached émigrés' German political thought open-mindedly, given that the Great Depression and the United States' entry into the two World Wars had challenged their self-understanding.⁷⁸ As summed up by Holborn, 'America was in a state of crisis. Would the German immigration have happened ten years earlier, its intellectual outcome would probably have been marginal ... as intellectual questions would not have been of much concern in a prosperous country.'⁷⁹ As a consequence, calibrating between external and existing knowledge, American scholars *and* émigrés were encouraged to rethink their commonly accepted knowledge, leading to creative meaning-value reconsiderations.

As argued by Paul Tillich these calibrations, offering ‘a common chance’⁸⁰, were not free of ‘productive misunderstanding[s]’⁸¹ because both sides initially lacked the expertise to contextualize knowledge in its original context. Still, they were productive, as they informed further discourses.

Perhaps the most well-known of these misunderstandings is Kenneth Waltz’s reading of Morgenthau’s contribution to IR. As Waltz stated in the introduction to his article on *Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory*, it was the work that originated out of integration spaces of émigré scholars and American IR that stimulated his thought during the beginning of his career.⁸² One of these spaces, the Rockefeller supported 1954 *Conference on International Politics*, had such a significant impact on the discipline’s theorizing that Guilhot even sees it as the birthplace of IR theory.⁸³ Indeed, this and related conferences like the *Council on Foreign Relations* study group on IR theory that met between 1953 and 1954 were major moments in émigré scholars’ integration. They provided the space to discuss their views on international politics with American interlocutors who belonged to the discipline’s luminaries at that time. Morgenthau and Wolfers participated as well as Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Nitze, and William Fox. Furthermore, as recently highlighted by Adam Humphreys, the insights achieved at these conferences incited young scholars like Waltz to voice their criticism of the dominating liberalism in American IR at that time and to further theorize the ‘pragmatic sensibility’ that informed their thought.⁸⁴ Waltz’s scientism, however, was not free from normative aspirations either, and his reading of Morgenthau was indeed a misunderstanding.⁸⁵ Still, it was “productive” because émigré scholars’ knowledge allowed Waltz to question commonly accepted liberal assumptions and to this day, neorealism has retained a decisive influence on the discipline, at least in the United States. Hence, although the example of Waltz demonstrates that the engagement with émigré thought did not establish more creative and humane world politics *per se*, it did create the space to rethink world politics.

The integration of émigrés, however, not only affected American scholarship, but also their research changed. Living in a different continent caused a shift in the topics they were concerned about. Certainly, anti-Semitism, the Holocaust, and the worry about democracies remained a constant driver of their thoughts,⁸⁶ but their critique of behavioralism and the unchallenged belief in scientific progress of which

Morgenthau's *Scientific Man vs. Power Politics* (1946) and *Science: Servant or Master?* (1972) are maybe the most famous examples in IR only developed in this detail after experiencing it in the United States.⁸⁷ Indeed, many émigrés highlighted that their marginal position helped them to contribute to major American discourses during the mid-twentieth century, as they were able to see the issues at stake from a different perspective. Being an immigrant, however, also affected the approaches they engaged with. This is most obvious in the case of the *Institut für Sozialforschung*, commonly referred to as the Frankfurt School. Before their emigration and in the first years after it, members of the Frankfurt School like Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, and Marcuse mainly worked within the tradition of Continental European philosophy, sociology, and psychoanalysis.⁸⁸ However, partly due to dwindling financial means, gradually its members used methods that were more common in the United States such as survey research. Thomas Wheatland even speaks of a 'marriage of social philosophy and empirical research' in this regard.⁸⁹ While Wheatland argues that this happened mainly to 'camouflage' their Critical Theory underpinnings,⁹⁰ I am more inclined to follow Eva-Maria Ziege who showed that the confrontation with American society during their exile in New York and California also led to significant changes in their theorizing that opened their work up for methods they would have previously not considered. This is evidenced in some of their major empirical projects during their American years, such as *Antisemitism among American Labor* (1944-1945) and *The Authoritarian Personality* (1950) as part of the *Studies in Prejudice* series.⁹¹

As these examples highlight, the functional integration of émigré scholars into American IR eventually created a symbiosis. Gaining gradually insights into both historical and intellectual horizons allowed them to fuse their experiences, enabling them to make significant contributions to American intellectual discourses.⁹² As Johnson put it solemnly in commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the New School, 'it was the purpose of the organizers of the New School to draw together in close relations this body of true Americans and true scholarship, that the Republic might take no permanent injury from the obscurantists and reactionaries.'⁹³ To demonstrate this intellectually stimulating and mutually benefiting symbiosis, a case in point is Morgenthau's contribution to the conceptualization of the national interest, a topic that dominated American foreign policy discourses in the mid-twentieth

century. Morgenthau's contribution demonstrates that speaking to an audience does not mean that one has to conform to mainstream assumptions. Rather, an émigré scholar like Morgenthau often contributed to discourses in sympathetic opposition, as he approached intellectual questions with a different epistemological perspective as well as socio-political values and experiences.⁹⁴ Morgenthau understood the national interest as an epistemological tool that could be used to capture the multitude of interests within a political community, which then have to be taken into consideration by political decision makers in formulating a common good. With his interpretation of the national interest, Morgenthau criticized attempts for reification within American academia and the wider general public. Guilhot's reading of these scholars in taking a gambit and creating IR theory as a 'separatist movement'⁹⁵ is, therefore, too ambitious. Certainly, émigré scholars were critical of American academic discourses, but this did not mean that they were restraining themselves from contributing to these discourses or that they rejected American democracy. On the contrary, with their different perspectives and subsequent oppositional stances, they aimed to reinvigorate these discourses and they focused on the thought collective that was becoming the most important field of American social sciences.⁹⁶

Conclusion

Elsewhere, I have urged to break the silent presence of Germany in American IR and this chapter investigated this issue in more detail.⁹⁷ This silence is curious given that many of the key figures like Morgenthau during the early years of the discipline's institutionalization in the United States were refugees from Germany, but, as this chapter has shown, their successful integration quickly established them as American scholars. Many émigrés had impressive careers and in cooperation with their American peers – sometimes through productive misunderstandings – they were able to influence the discipline's discourses for many years to come. However, it should not be forgotten that productive as their integration may have been, the resulting discourses, were often not free of 'ironic, tragic, and [sometimes even] brutal consequences.'⁹⁸

With the recent revival of classical realism and the historiographic turn in IR, the intellectual origins of their work moved into the limelight again.⁹⁹ Experiencing the

downfall of the Weimar Republic, turning from a liberal democracy that attracted creative intellectuals (*Kulturschaffende*) globally into a brutal totalitarian dictatorship that organized a genocide on an unprecedented scale and set the world on fire within a few years, these changing images of Germany were thoroughly enshrined in the scholarship and political activism of people like Morgenthau, Herz, and Arendt in the United States to an extent that current IR scholarship finds inspiration in their thought. In the political realities of twenty-first century international politics, their thoughts on populism,¹⁰⁰ the protection of republican ideals,¹⁰¹ and nuclear deterrence¹⁰² led to important interventions, and it even helped cosmopolitan scholarship ‘to stay sober’.¹⁰³

¹ Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Hans J. Morgenthau papers, 1858-1981, Container 185

² Referring to the émigrés as Germans does not mean that all of them were born in this country, but they were from Central Europe (*Mitteleuropa*). However, the term “Germany” has been chosen in accordance with Johan Galtung’s notion of a common intellectual style (Johan Galtung, ‘Structure, Culture, and Intellectual Style: An Essay Comparing Saxon, Teutonic, Gallic and Nipponic Approaches’, *Social Science Information*, 20, 1981)

³ Reference to the 1930s is important, as it excludes scholars who had arrived earlier in the United States like Robert Strausz-Hupé, Carl Joachim Friedrich, and Nicolas Spykman. It also excludes ‘the second generation’ of émigrés like Heinz Eulau, Walter Laqueur, and Raul Hilberg (Andreas W. Daum, Hartmut Lehmann, and James J. Sheehan (eds.), *The Second Generation. Émigrés from Nazi Germany as Historians*, New York, Berghahn, 2016)

⁴ Golo Mann in Joachim Radkau, *Die deutsche Emigration in den USA. Ihr Einfluß auf die amerikanische Europapolitik 1933-1945*, Düsseldorf, Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag, 1971, p. 219; all translations are by the author

⁵ For example, Radio Bremen, *Auszug des Geistes. Bericht über eine Sendereihe*, Bremen, Heye & Co., 1962; Anthony Heilbut, *Exiled in Paradise: German Refugee Artists and Intellectuals in America, from the 1930s to the Present*, New York, Viking, 1983; Lewis Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1984

⁶ Catherine Epstein, ‘*Schicksalsgeschichte: Refugee Historians in the United States*’, in Hartmut Lehmann and James J. Sheehan (eds.), *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 117

⁷ For example, H. Stuart Hughes, *The Sea Change. The Migration of Social Thought, 1930-1965*, New York, Harper & Row, 1975; Otto P. Pflanze, ‘The Americanization of Hajo Holborn’ in Lehmann and Sheehan (eds.), *An Interrupted Past*; George Steinmetz, ‘Ideas in Exile: Refugees from Nazi Germany and the Failure to Transplant Historical Sociology into the United States’, *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Sociology*, 23, 2010

⁸ Hughes, *The Sea Change*, p. 1

⁹ Nicolas Guilhot, ‘The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory’ in Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), *The Invention of International Relations Theory. Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2011, p. 130

¹⁰ For example, Herbert A. Strauss, Hans-Peter Kröner, Alfons Söllner, and Klaus Fischer, ‘Wissenschaftstransfer durch Emigration nach 1933’, *Historical Social Research*, 8, 1988, p. 115; Mitchell Ash and Alfons Söllner (eds.), *Forced Migration and Scientific Change. Émigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996; Markus Lang, ‘Vom Political Scholar zum Global Citizen? Perspektiven der Emigrationsforschung’ in Frank

Schale, Ellen Thümmler, and Michael Vollmer (eds.), *Intellektuelle Emigration. Zur Aktualität eines historischen Phänomens*, Wiesbaden, Springer VS, 2012, p. 244

¹¹ Mitchell Ash and Alfons Söllner, 'Introduction: Forced Migration and Scientific Change after 1933' in Ash and Söllner (eds.), *Forced Migration and Scientific Change*, p. 12

¹² Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Hans J. Morgenthau papers, 1858-1981, Container 178

¹³ Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt. For Love of the World*, New Haven, Yale University Press, p. xiv

¹⁴ Ash and Söllner, 'Introduction', p. 12

¹⁵ A tragic example is Gustav Ichheiser. Having spent eleven years in a mental hospital, he was 'reduced almost to a vegetable', eventually committing suicide. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Political Theory and International Affairs: Hans J. Morgenthau on Aristotle's the Politics*, Westport, Praeger, 2004, p. 41

¹⁶ Christoph Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography*, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 2001, p. 74

¹⁷ Richard Münch, 'Elemente einer Theorie der Integration moderner Gesellschaften. Eine Bestandsaufnahme', *Berliner Journal für Soziologie*, 5, 1995; Philipp Ther, *Die Außenseiter. Flucht, Flüchtlinge und Integration im modernen Europa*, Berlin, Suhrkamp, 2017. Although David Kettler and Thomas Wheatland do not call their approach "functional integration", highlighting the continuous transatlantic assemblages speaks the same language as Ther (David Kettler and Thomas Wheatland, 'Contested Legacies: Political Theory and the Hitler Era', *European Journal of International Political Theory*, 3, 2004)

¹⁸ Alberto Jiménez, 'On Space as a Capacity', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9, 2003, p. 140

¹⁹ John G. Gunnell, *The Descent of Political Theory. The Genealogy of an American Vocation*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1993, p. 183; Hughes, *The Sea Change*, p. 34

²⁰ Alfred Vagts in Pflanze, 'The Americanization of Hajo Holborn', p. 171

²¹ Both were professors at the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik* (Gerhard A. Ritter, *German Refugee Historians and Friedrich Meinecke, 1910-1977: Letters and Documents*, Leiden, Brill, 2010; Rainer Eisfeld, 'From the Berlin Political Studies Institute to Colombia and Yale: Ernst Jaekch and Arnold Wolfers' in Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*)

²² Hans J. Morgenthau, 'Postscript to the Transaction Edition: Bernard Johnson's Interview with Hans J. Morgenthau' in Kenneth W. Thompson and Robert J. Myers (eds.), *Truth and Tragedy. A Tribute to Hans J. Morgenthau*, New Brunswick, Transaction Books, 1984, p. 367

²³ Richard Ned Lebow, *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests, and Orders*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 219

²⁴ Gabrielle Simon Edgomb, *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee Scholars at Black Colleges*, Malabar, Krieger

²⁵ Ellen Thümmler, 'Totalitarian Ideology and Power Conflicts – Waldemar Gurian as International Relations Analyst after the Second World War' in Felix Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations. A European Discipline in America?*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014

²⁶ Udi Greenberg, *The Weimar Century. German Émigrés and the Ideological Foundations of the Cold War*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2014, p. 51. Helge Pross reports that, from the 27.000 scholars working at American universities, 2.000 were made redundant between 1930 and 1933 (Helge Pross, *Die Deutsche Akademische Emigration nach den Vereinigten Staaten 1933-1941*, Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 1955, p. 49)

²⁷ Claus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile. Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*, Amherst, University of Massachusetts Press, 1993, p. 78

²⁸ Marjorie Lamberti, 'The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany in America: Philanthropy and Social Change in Higher Education', *Jewish Social Studies*, 12, 2006, p. 159

²⁹ Eva-Maria Ziege, *Antisemitismus und Gesellschaftstheorie. Die Frankfurter Schule im amerikanischen Exil*, Frankfurt, Suhrkamp, 2009, p. 57

³⁰ Daniel Bessner, "'Rather More than One-Third had no Jewish Blood": American Progressivism and German-Jewish Cosmopolitanism at the New School for Social Research, 1933-1939', *Religions*, 30, 2012, p. 108

³¹ Hans J. Morgenthau, *Letter to Walter Lippmann*, May 6, 1965 (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Hans J. Morgenthau papers, 1858-1981, Container 36)

³² Richard Ned Lebow, 'German Jews and American Realism' in Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*, p. 221

- ³³ Greenberg, *The Weimar Century*, p. 93
- ³⁴ Lebow, 'German Jews and American Realism'; Radkau, *Die deutsche Emigration in den USA*
- ³⁵ Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, p. 175; David Kettler and Thomas Wheatland, "'Has Germany a Political Theory? Is Germany a State?'" The Foreign Affairs of Nations in the Political Thought of Franz L. Neumann' in Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*, p. 106
- ³⁶ Radio Bremen, *Auszug des Geistes*, p. 88; Gerald Stourzh, 'Die deutschsprachige Emigration in den Vereinigten Staaten: Geschichtswissenschaft und Politische Wissenschaft', *Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien*, 10, 1965, p. 74; Wilhelm Bleek, *Geschichte der Politikwissenschaft in Deutschland*, Munich, C. H. Beck, 2001, p. 251; Joanna Vecchiarelli Scott, 'Alien Nation. Hannah Arendt, the German Émigrés and America', *European Journal of Political Theory*, 3, 2004, p. 168
- ³⁷ Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, p. 76
- ³⁸ Alvin Johnson, 'The Intellectual in a Time of Crisis', *Social Research*, 4, 1937, pp. 284-285
- ³⁹ Gunnell, *The Descent of Political Theory*, p. 187; Bessner, "'Rather More than One-Third had no Jewish Blood'", p. 100; William E. Scheuerman, 'The (Classical) Realist Vision of Global Reform', *International Theory*, 2, 2010
- ⁴⁰ Lebow, 'German Jews and American Realism', p. 221; The New School Archives, *Graduate Faculty Minutes*, May 25, 1943 (Container 1, The New School Archives, Graduate Faculty Meeting Records, NS.02.11.01)
- ⁴¹ Alvin Johnson, 'Fourth Anniversary. The Graduate Faculty of Political Science and Social Science', *The New School For Social Research Bulletin*, 11, March 29, 1937 (The New School Archives, NS030102_bd370329)
- ⁴² A further example is the short-lived magazine *Measure*, which was published by the Committee on Social Thought at the University of Chicago and edited by the art historian Otto von Simson (Stourzh, 'Die deutschsprachige Emigration in den Vereinigten Staaten', p. 75)
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 59
- ⁴⁴ Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Hans J. Morgenthau papers, 1858-1981, Container 178; also Alfons Söllner, *Deutsche Politikwissenschaftler in der Emigration: Studien Zu Ihrer Akkulturation Und Wirkungsgeschichte*, Wiesbaden, Westdeutscher Verlag, p. 19
- ⁴⁵ Lydia H. Liu, 'Introduction' in Lydia H. Liu (ed.), *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, Durham, Duke University Press, 1999, p. 1
- ⁴⁶ Carl Zuckmayer, 'Amerika ist anders', *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, 16, 1948, p. 455
- ⁴⁷ Lebow, 'German Jews and American Realism', p. 179; Lamberti, 'The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany in America', p. 179; Guilhot, 'The Realist Gambit', p. 130; Richard Ned Lebow, 'Karl Deutsch and International Relations', *International Relations*, 23, 2014, p. 288; Peter Marcus Kristensen, 'Revisiting the "American Social Science" – Mapping the Geography of International Relations', *International Studies Perspectives*, 16, 2015, p. 248
- ⁴⁸ Eric Voegelin, *Autobiographical Reflections*, Columbia, University of Missouri Press, 2011, pp. 86-87. The philosopher Robert Ulich made similar remarks in an interview in 1958 (Radio Bremen, *Auszug des Geistes*, p. 42)
- ⁴⁹ Xavier Guillaume, 'Agencement and Traces', in Michele Acuto and Simon Curtis (eds.), *Reassembling International Theory*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 108
- ⁵⁰ Daniel Jacobi, 'On the "Construction" of Knowledge and the Knowledge of "Construction"', *International Political Sociology*, 5, 2011, p. 97; Stefano Guzzini, 'The Ends of International Relations Theory: Stages of Reflexivity and Modes of Theorizing', *European Journal of International Relations*, 19, 2013, p. 536
- ⁵¹ Lydia H. Liu, 'The Question of Meaning-Value in the Political Economy of the Sign' in Liu (ed.), *Tokens of Exchange*, p. 34; emphasis in the original
- ⁵² Hartmut Behr and Xander Kirke, 'People on the Move – Ideas on the Move. Academic Cultures and the Problematic of Translatability' in Rösch (ed.), *European Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*, pp. 29-30
- ⁵³ Liu, 'The Question of Meaning-Value', pp. 19-20
- ⁵⁴ Jan Assmann, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, 65, 1995, p. 129
- ⁵⁵ Jacobi, 'On the "Construction" of Knowledge', pp. 96-97
- ⁵⁶ Henry Pachter, 'On Being an Exile. An Old-Timer's Personal and Political Memoir', *Salamagundi*, 10-11, 1969-1970, p. 18. Irma Thormann, Morgenthau's wife, made a similar remark after their emigration to the United States: 'I have retreated like a hedgehog into myself ... having little interest in others. I have lost the ability to act ... because I cannot put experiences into context anymore ... This ability is

rooted in the Fatherland (*Vaterland*), ... the country that gave us culture' (Irma Thormann, *Letter to Unidentified Woman* (Leo Baeck Institute Archives, Hans Morgenthau Collection, AR 4198, Container 2, Folder 9).

⁵⁷ Hans J. Morgenthau, 'Letter to Charles A. McClelland', March 16, 1949 (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Hans J. Morgenthau papers, 1858-1981, Container 185)

⁵⁸ John H. Herz, *Vom Überleben. Wie ein Weltbild entstand*, Düsseldorf, Droste, 1984, pp. 150-156

⁵⁹ Sebastian Liebold, 'Arnold Bergstraesser und Fritz Caspari in Amerika' in Schale, Thümmeler, and Vollmer (eds.), *Intellektuelle Emigration*. For a critical reading of Bergstraesser, see Rainer Eisfeld, *Ausgebürgert und doch angebräunt: Deutsche Politikwissenschaft 1920-1945*, Baden-Baden, Nomos, 1991, p. 79

⁶⁰ Jacobi, 'On the "Construction" of Knowledge', p. 96; Behr and Kirke, 'People on the Move – Ideas on the Move', pp. 32-33

⁶¹ Brent Steele, 'Context and Appropriation: The Risks, Benefits and Challenges of Reinterpretive Expression', *International Politics*, 50, 2013, p. 741

⁶² Robbie Shilliam, *German Thought and International Relations. The Rise and Fall of a Liberal Project*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, p. 13

⁶³ Verena Jung, 'Writing Germany in Exile – the Bilingual Author as Cultural Mediator: Klaus Mann, Stefan Heym, Rudolf Arnheim and Hannah Arendt', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25, 2004; p. 532; Sigrid Weigel, 'Sounding Through – Poetic Difference – Self-Translation: Hannah Arendt's Thoughts and Writings between Different Languages, Cultures, and Fields' in Eckart Goebel and Sigrid Weigel (eds.), *Escape to Life. German Intellectuals in New York. A Compendium on Exile after 1933*, Berlin, De Gruyter, 2012, pp. 71-73. Also Hans-Jörg Sigwart, *The Wandering Thought of Hannah Arendt*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016

⁶⁴ Roger Hart, 'Translating the Untranslatable: From Copula to Incommensurable Worlds', in Liu (ed.), *Tokens of Exchange*, pp. 60-61

⁶⁵ Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution*, London, Penguin, 1973, p. 75; Eric Voegelin, *Modernity without Restraint*, Columbia, University of Missouri Press, 1999, p. 60; Hans J. Morgenthau, *Political Theory and International Affairs*, pp. 100-101

⁶⁶ Hart, 'Translating the Untranslatable', p. 61

⁶⁷ Hans J. Morgenthau, *Letter to Michael Oakeshott*, May 22, 1948 (Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Hans J. Morgenthau papers, 1858-1981, Container 44). Also William Bain, 'Deconfusing Morgenthau: Moral Inquiry and Classical Realism Reconsidered', *Review of International Studies*, 26, 2000; Hartmut Behr and Amelia Heath, 'Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique: Morgenthau, Waltz, and Neo-Realism', *Review of International Studies*, 35, 2009; Felix Rösch, 'The Human Condition of Politics: considering the Legacy of Hans J. Morgenthau for International Relations', *Journal of International Political Theory* 9, 2013. For similar experiences of Karl Deutsch, see Jan Ruzicka, 'A Transformative Social Scientist: Karl Deutsch and the Discipline of International Relations', *International Relations*, 28, 2014

⁶⁸ Hannah Arendt, *Denken ohne Geländer. Texte und Briefe*, Munich, Piper, pp. 243-245

⁶⁹ Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau*, p. 219; Shilliam, *German Thought and International Relations*; p. 194

⁷⁰ For example, Robert Schuett, '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, 2007; Ty Solomon, 'Human Nature and the Limits of the Self: Hans Morgenthau on Love and Power', *International Studies Review*, 14, 2012; Felix Rösch, 'Pouvoir, Puissance, and Politics: Hans Morgenthau's Dualistic Concept of Power?', *Review of International Studies*, 40, 2014; Vassilios Paipais, 'Between Politics and the Political: Reading Hans J. Morgenthau's Double Critique of Depoliticisation', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 42, 2014. On the rhetoric of realism, see Daniel J. Levine, 'After Tragedy: Melodrama and the Rhetoric of Realism', *Journal of International Political Theory* (advance publication; doi: 10.1177/1755088218790987; accessed August 15, 2018)

⁷¹ Greenberg, *The Weimar Century*, pp. 7, 158; Radkau, *Die deutsche Emigration in den USA*, p. 214; Hughes, *The Sea Change*, p. 31. Gerald Stourzh and Carl Mayer called it an 'osmosis' (Stourzh, 'Die deutschsprachige Emigration in den Vereinigten Staaten', p. 61; Radio Bremen, *Auszug des Geistes*, p. 198)

⁷² Voegelin, *Autobiographical Reflections*, p. 85

⁷³ Bleek, *Geschichte der Politikwissenschaft in Deutschland*, p. 252

⁷⁴ William E. Scheuerman, "'Professor Kelsen's Amazing Disappearing Act'" in Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*

-
- ⁷⁵ Morgenthau, 'Postscript to the Transaction Edition', pp. 356-357
- ⁷⁶ Pachter, 'On Being an Exile', p. 18; emphasis in the original
- ⁷⁷ Liu, 'The Question of Meaning-Value', pp. 19-20
- ⁷⁸ Stourzh, 'Die deutschsprachige Emigration in den Vereinigten Staaten', pp. 60-61
- ⁷⁹ Radio Bremen, *Auszug des Geistes*, p. 191
- ⁸⁰ Cited in Radkau, *Die deutsche Emigration in den USA*, p. 49
- ⁸¹ Paul Tillich, 'Mind and Migration', *Social Research*, 4, 1937, p. 303. Stuart Hughes called them a 'creative misinterpretation' (Hughes, *The Sea Change*, p. 31)
- ⁸² Kenneth Waltz, 'Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory', *Journal of International Affairs*, 44, 1990, p. 21
- ⁸³ Guilhot, *The Invention of International Relations Theory*
- ⁸⁴ Adam R. C. Humphreys, 'Waltz and the World: Neorealism as International Political Theory?', *International Politics*, 50, 2013, p. 863; critical Scheuerman, 'The (Classical) Realist Vision of Global Reform', p. 270
- ⁸⁵ Behr and Heath, 'Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique'
- ⁸⁶ Ziege, *Antisemitismus und Gesellschaftstheorie*; Robbie Shilliam, 'Morgenthau in Context: German Backwardness, German Intellectuals and the Rise and Fall of a Liberal Project', *European Journal of International Relations*, 13, 2007; Douglas Klumeyer, 'Beyond Tragedy: Hannah Arendt and Hans Morgenthau on Responsibility, Evil and Political Ethics', *International Studies Review*, 11, 2009; Felix Rösch 'Crisis, Values, and the Purpose of Science: Hans Morgenthau in Europe', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 30, 2016
- ⁸⁷ Hartmut Behr, 'Scientific Man vs. Power Politics: A Pamphlet and Its Author between Two Academic Cultures', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 30, 2016
- ⁸⁸ Shannon Mariotti, 'Damaged Life as Exuberant Vitality in America: Adorno, Alienation, and the Psychic Economy', *Telos*, 149, 2009, p. 169
- ⁸⁹ Thomas Wheatland, *The Frankfurt School in Exile*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2009, p. 202
- ⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 206
- ⁹¹ Ziege, *Antisemitismus und Gesellschaftstheorie*
- ⁹² Vecchiarelli Scott, 'Alien Nation', p. 170 ; Pachter, 'On Being an Exile', pp. 49-50
- ⁹³ Alvin Johnson, 'Twenty-Five Years of the New School', *New School Bulletin* 1, December 27, 1943 (The New School Archives, NS030102_bull0107)
- ⁹⁴ Knud Erik Jørgensen, 'Continental IR Theory: The Best Kept Secret', *European Journal of International Relations*, 6, 2000, p. 15. On recent debates about the national interest, see Michael C. Williams, 'What is the National Interest? The Neoconservative Challenge in IR Theory', *European Journal of International Relations*, 11, 2005
- ⁹⁵ Guilhot, 'The Realist Gambit', p. 130
- ⁹⁶ Vibeke Schou Tjalve and Michael C. Williams, 'Rethinking the Logic of Security: Liberal Realism and the Recovery of American Political Thought', *Telos*, 170, 2015
- ⁹⁷ Felix Rösch, 'Introduction: Breaking the Silence: European Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of an American Discipline' in Rösch (ed.), *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*
- ⁹⁸ Greenberg, *The Weimar Century*, p. 5
- ⁹⁹ Many of the émigrés who made their career in American IR had affinities to an intellectual position that is now referred to as classical realism. For this reconsideration, see for example: Christoph Rohde, *Hans J. Morgenthau und der weltpolitische Realismus*, Wiesbaden, VS Verlag, 2004; Seán Molloy, *The Hidden History of Realism. A Genealogy of Power Politics*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006; William E. Scheuerman, *Hans Morgenthau. Realism and Beyond*, Cambridge, Polity, 2009; Oliver Jueteronke, *Morgenthau, Law and Realism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2010; Jana Puglierin, *John H. Herz: Leben und Denken zwischen Idealismus und Realismus, Deutschland und Amerika*, Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, 2011; Felix Rösch, *Power, Knowledge, and Dissent in Morgenthau's Worldview*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015; Nicolas Guilhot, *After the Enlightenment: Political Realism and International Relations in the Mid-Twentieth Century*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2017
- ¹⁰⁰ Hartmut Behr, 'The Populist Obstruction of Reality: Analysis and Response', *Global Affairs*, 3, 2017
- ¹⁰¹ Vibeke Schou Tjalve, *Realist Strategies of Republican Peace*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008; Vibeke Schou Tjalve, 'Realism, Pragmatism and the Public Sphere: Restraining Foreign Policy in an Age of Mass Politics', *International Politics*, 50, 2013

¹⁰² Rens van Munster and Casper Sylvest, 'Reclaiming Nuclear Politics? Nuclear Realism, the H-Bomb and Globality', *Security Dialogue*, 45, 2014

¹⁰³ William E. Scheuerman, *The Realist Case of Global Reform*, Cambridge, Polity, p. 150