

Two Faces of Liberalism: Kant, Paine, and the Question of Intervention

THOMAS C. WALKER

University at Albany, SUNY

Compared with the realist tradition, relatively few students of international relations explore variations within liberalism. This paper introduces a particular interpretation of Immanuel Kant's evolutionary liberalism and then compares it with Thomas Paine's revolutionary liberalism. Paine was an ebullient optimist while Kant was more guarded and cautious. These different assumptions lead to distinct liberal views on voting rights, how trade fosters peace, and defense policies. The most striking disagreement, and one that endures in contemporary liberal circles, revolves around the question of military interventions to spread democratic rule. Kant advocated nonintervention while Paine actively pursued military intervention to spread democratic rule. Differences between Kant and Paine represent some enduring tensions still residing within the liberal tradition in international relations.

Variations within Two Theoretical Traditions

Any broad research tradition encompasses some inconsistent and contradictory lines of thought. In the study of international relations, realism has long harbored conflicting schools of thought. These include neorealism, offensive and defensive realisms, neoclassical realism, and most recently, democratic realism, all with varying predictions concerning state behavior (Miller 1996; Monten 2005). Responding to these inconsistencies, Vasquez (1997) charged that realism has grown so broad that it has become a degenerative and nonfalsifiable research program. However, exploring different branches within realism need not be degenerative and might contribute to more nuanced understandings of the theoretical tradition. For instance, power transition as first conceived by Organski (1968) predicted that when the material capabilities of the two leading states approach equilibrium, the probability of war dramatically increases. Balance of power theory predicts the opposite: equal capabilities between the two leading states increase the probability of peace and stability (Waltz 1979). Critically exploring these variations may well enhance our understandings of how the distribution of power in the system shapes state behavior—a core concern of realism. Articulating differences, however inconsistent, can lead to richer understandings of realism's breadth, contingencies, and traditions.

Author's note: These ideas were originally presented to the Lifelong Learning Society at Florida Atlantic University. I would also like to acknowledge the challenging and insightful comments offered by Peter Breiner, Cheng Chen, Ben Fordham, David Lake, Jeff Morton, Jun Suk Park, David Rousseau, Marcus Schulzke, Ioannis Stivachtis, and four anonymous reviewers.

In contrast to realism, liberal thought in international relations has not undergone the same degree of differentiation. While less understood, liberalism also shelters various inconsistent branches. Waltz (1962, 331) claimed that there are “two liberal traditions [that] are partly contradictory.” The first tradition assumes “the natural condition of men to be one of harmony.” The second tradition makes “no easy assumptions about the rationality and goodness of man.” Yet these claims by Waltz have been neglected and relatively few studies explore variations and contradictions within liberalism (Doyle 1997; Jahn 2005; Richardson 2001). As a result of this neglect, a nuanced understanding of variations within the liberal tradition has been wanting.

Looking back to the history of political thought provides one way of illuminating these variations within the liberal tradition. In this essay, I revisit the international thought of Immanuel Kant and Thomas Paine. In many respects, these two early liberals reflect Waltz’s “two liberal traditions.” Their differing assumptions about human nature and the idea of progress become most visible and salient on the issue of intervention to spread democracy. Starting with optimistic assumptions about human goodness and progress, Paine’s revolutionary liberalism endorsed military intervention to spread democracy. In his preface to *Rights of Man*, Paine ([1791] 1969, 174) promised to assist the French General Lafayette in a military campaign to rid Germany of despotism and establish “freedom to all of Germany.” While the celebrated German philosopher shared many of Paine’s liberal enthusiasms, Kant was adamantly opposed to the types of interventions advocated by the optimistic American. Three years following Paine’s call to arms, Kant ([1795] 1991, 96) explicitly made the principle of nonintervention one of his Preliminary Articles in his essay *Perpetual Peace*: “No state shall forcibly interfere in the constitution and government of another state.”

I argue that this disagreement over intervention rests upon differing assumptions about human nature and the ease by which political transformation occurs. Given Paine’s assumption that reason and political transformation will occur rapidly, military intervention to topple corrupt regimes may be the most efficient way to achieve a peaceful, democratic world. If, however, one accepts Kantian assumptions that individual reason and political institutions develop slowly, then military intervention cannot hasten democratic governance.

This question of military intervention to spread democracy remains unresolved by contemporary international relations theorists. Hermann and Kegley (2001, 241) concede that “there is little consensus about the ethics of exporting democracy by threat or force of arms.” Doyle (1997, 395) sums up the quandary posed by liberal thinkers:

On one hand, Liberals have provided some of the very strongest reasons to abide by the strict form of the nonintervention doctrine, and on the other hand, those very same principles when applied in different contexts have provided justifications for overriding the principle of nonintervention.

Disagreements over military intervention to spread democracy represent an enduring tension in liberal thought. Exploring their early manifestations in the political thought of Paine and Kant can yield certain insights into the varieties of liberal thought, identify assumptions underpinning varieties of liberalism, and cast new light on how contemporary liberalism is framed in the study of international relations.

I begin by exploring the varied legacies left by Kant and Paine in the discipline of international relations. Kant has been cast as both a realist and liberal. He has also been criticized for a lack of clarity and coherence in his international thought. These critiques dissipate after a careful evaluation of

Kant's evolutionary approach to history, as laid out in his 1784 essay, *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Intent* and some other works often neglected by students of international relations. I then turn to their respective foundational assumptions regarding human reason and progress. Kant's evolutionary liberalism highlights the slow and gradual upward progression of human reason from rather base origins. Paine's revolutionary liberalism is driven by an extreme optimism. These differences shape Kant's and Paine's views on voting rights, political community, free trade, and military power. I next turn to a discussion of their opposing views on the use of military intervention to spread democracy. Finally, I explore how the thought of Kant and Paine relates to contemporary research questions in international relations.

Kant, Paine, and their Uncertain Legacies in International Relations

By some accounts, liberalism has recently emerged as the leading theoretical framework in the study of international relations (Walker and Morton 2005). This rise has sparked a renewed interest in many classical liberal writings. While Locke, Mill, and Bentham each furnish early liberal visions, Paine and Kant provide especially fruitful studies of liberal thought for several reasons. Both were extremely influential: Paine in the popular realm and Kant in the academic realm. As contemporaries of the American and French Revolutions, they were among the first to apply principles of the Enlightenment to international politics. Both envisioned constitutional republics guaranteeing individual rights, elected representation, rule of law, and separation of powers—what today we would roughly refer to as democracies.¹ They also argued that democratic governance would promote peace between states. This peace would be strengthened through international trade and organization. Finally, both were cognizant of the dangers posed by high levels of military spending. Ideas articulated by Paine and Kant in the 18th century help focus the essential elements of liberalism in international relations.

Of all the classics, Kant's political writings, especially *Perpetual Peace*, remain the most frequently cited by students of international relations. While studies of the democratic peace routinely cite Kant as the standard-bearer, few of these studies appreciate the complexity of Kant's thought. Fewer yet recognize the various ways in which Kant has been interpreted by leading scholars of international relations. These conflicting interpretations led Holsti (1985, 26) to conclude that "What exactly Kant had in mind as the ultimate shape of the world remains a matter of some disagreement among experts." Gallie (1978, 9) charged that Kant's *Perpetual Peace* produced "a proliferation of contradictory interpretations which can hardly be matched in the history of political thought." I see four different ways in which Kant has been interpreted by scholars of international relations. Each interpretation can find some textual support.

The first and most prevalent reading of Kant maintains his position as the earliest Enlightenment liberal in international relations. Doyle (1983, 208) relied on Kant extensively for his early study of the democratic peace and helped lionize Kant as "one of the greatest liberal philosophers" for students of international relations. Russett and Oneal (2000) looked to Kant for their conceptualization of liberalism based on democratic governance, free trade, and commitments to international organizations. Kleingeld (2004)

¹ Both Kant and Paine reserved "democracy" for the form of government practiced in Ancient Greece where citizens were few and ruled directly and without constitutional protection of individual rights. While their distinction is recognized, I adopt the convention of referring to Paine and Kant's republics as democracies.

demonstrated how a world government with some coercive powers is not inconsistent with Kant's international thought, even in spite of Kant's occasional criticisms of global governance. Tesón (1998) relied on Kantian imperatives to argue that international law must be structured to ensure individual rights universally. While points of emphasis may vary, most students of international relations evoke Kant for his democratic, peace-loving, free-trading, and cosmopolitan features.

The second, and lesser-known, reading of Kant places him as a realist. Waltz (1962, 331) depicted Kant as "a theorist of power politics who hid his Machiavelian ideas by hanging round them the fashionable garments of liberalism." This particular reading of Kant is not entirely aerial. Kant provides a battery of realpolitik references. At one point Kant ([1795] 1991, 103) referred to Grotius, Pufendorf, Vattel, and other advocates of international law as "sorry comforters." Kant ([1795] 1991, 103) also pointed out the miseries and injustices within an anarchic international system:

[Instead of abandoning the state of nature] each state sees its own majesty (for it would be absurd to speak of the majesty of a people) precisely in not having to submit to any external legal constraint, and the glory of its ruler consists in his power to order thousands of people to immolate themselves for a cause which does not truly concern them.

Finally, in two of his works, Kant ([1795] 1991, 95; [1797] 1991, 167) acknowledged the possible need to wage preventive war should a neighboring state increase its power rapidly. Part of his reasoning, as will be developed below, rested upon "the right to maintain a balance of power among all states which have active contact with one another." In Waltz's (1962, 340) reading, a somewhat fatalistic Kant leaves us with "a deeper appreciation of the causes of war and the immense difficulty of doing anything about them." All of this, however, stands in stark contrast to the liberal Kant so frequently noted.

A third way of reading Kant is to identify specific ambiguities within his work and try to mitigate or resolve them. Some recent international relations scholarship has taken this direction. Cavallar (2001, 243) argued that "Kant seems to be wavering between a statist and a cosmopolitan approach." Jahn (2005, 178) also explored tensions within the statist and cosmopolitan interpretations of Kant. For Franceschet (2001, 210), "Kant's political philosophy offers an extraordinarily ambiguous foundation for contemporary internationalist theory because of the dualistic doctrine of state sovereignty to which he subscribed." Although many of these ambiguities can be reduced by acknowledging the complexity that runs throughout Kant's political writings, certain questions over sovereignty, world governance, and global obligation do not always find consistent answers.

A fourth way of reading Kant, and the one emphasized in this study, is to place his project within an evolutionary framework. By increasing reason and understanding, the world would slowly evolve into a more peaceful and just order. To demonstrate this evolutionary process, Kant frequently contrasted the world immediately before him (late 18th-century, despotic Prussia and war-prone Europe) with a possible future world toward which we should strive—one where republican states promote freedom, rights, peace, and justice. These two worlds—one realist, the other liberal—constitute two very distinct historical stages in the development of the international system, not a source of ambiguity as sometimes claimed. Kant's central question addresses how the system will slowly evolve from frequent interstate war toward a perpetual peace. To answer this question we must examine the gradualism within Kant's stages of historical development.

Kant's evolutionary approach to stages in history is most evident in his *Idea for a Universal History* (Kant 1784a), *What is Enlightenment?* (Kant 1784b), and *Conjectures on the Beginning of Human History* (Kant 1786). Enlightenment for Kant (1784b, 54) is mankind's gradual "emergence from his self-incurred immaturity."² In *Universal History*, Kant (1784a, 42) argued that "reason does not itself work instinctively, for it requires trial, practice and instruction...one stage to the next." Kleingeld (1999, 66) is among the few to stress this evolutionary learning: "Kant argues that the development of human rational faculties is a learning process" that will be transmitted through education by one generation to the next. On the question of progress in government, Kant ([1784a] 1991, 52) assured that "we shall discover a regular process of improvement in the political constitutions of our continent (which will probably legislate eventually for all other continents)." Progress, for Kant, will evolve in a series of gradual and sometimes meandering stages, slowly moving toward a distant world of peace and justice.

Reading Kant as a gradual, evolutionary liberal helps explain the widely varying interpretations. At times, Kant was prone to pessimism and often alluded to power politics, as Waltz (1962) claimed. Such allusions, however, were reserved for early stages of development when international society is mired in immaturity. Kant was confident that reason and experience would slowly raise international politics beyond the point where power, rivalry, and war were predominant concerns. Kant ([1793] 1991, 90) predicted that in the long run "the distress produced by the constant wars" would one day lead states "to enter into a cosmopolitan" order founded on international right. This final stage of human development reflects all the leading tenets of liberal international thought. In *Perpetual Peace*, Kant elaborated this liberal promise in his discussions of a peaceful federation of republican states, trading with one another, limiting military spending, and helping promote a just world order. This is the liberal Kant depicted by Doyle (1983, 1997). In the conclusion to *Perpetual Peace*, Kant ([1795] 1991, 130) again cautiously warned that any effort to bring about "public right" on a global scale would be "an infinite process of gradual approximation." While Kant was confident that the global community would move toward perpetual peace, he avoided grand prophesies of its rapid onset. Instead, he saw progress in the international realm as a slow, evolutionary process. As a result, he left a very wide path for interpretation. The best way to navigate this path is to emphasize the progressive evolutionary nature of Kant's political thought.

Paine's contributions to the study of international relations have not received as much attention as Kant's. This marginalization is somewhat surprising as many of Paine's ideas on the democratic peace, trade, and international cooperation in *Rights of Man* preceded Kant's. There is, however, an emerging appreciation of Paine's revolutionary liberalism. References to Paine are becoming more prevalent in broad discussions of liberalism (see for instance, Deudney 2007; Owen 1997; Reiter and Stam 2002). Gates, Knutsen, and Moses (1996, 6) noted how Paine "delivered one of the clearest (and most consequential) formulations of the claim that a state founded on democratic principles...must also be, fundamentally, against war." Walker (2000, 51) argued that Paine is the most "faithful representative of the Enlightenment for students of International Relations." In his Trevelyn Lectures at Cambridge, Sir Michael Howard (1978, 29) referred

² There is a question over the translation of "immature." While Nisbett, in Reiss's widely read Cambridge edition of "What is Enlightenment?" (Kant [1784b] 1991, 54), translated "Unmündigkeit" as man's self-incurred "immaturity," other translations refer to man's "self-incurred tutelage" (see Beck 1963, 3; Cassirer 1981, 367). If the latter is a more accurate translation, this raises the question of who should act as protector, guardian, and tutor during this period of "tutelage." As will be seen, this may relate to Kant's reluctance to empower everyone with equal voting privileges until they have reached a degree of "civil independence" or moral maturity. It may also relate to the role of the state's coercive powers to guide individuals toward reason and out of tutelage.

to *Rights of Man* as the single most forceful and original text on liberal internationalism. Every liberal, Howard asserted, “who has written about foreign policy since has been able to provide little more than an echo of Paine’s original philippic.”

While Kant’s influence has been most notable in academic arenas, Paine’s ideas gained currency in the popular realm. When Kant published a very limited run of *Perpetual Peace* in 1795, Paine’s *Rights of Man* was already an international best-seller, with several hundred to several thousand copies circulating in many languages (Keane 1995, 301–8). Paine’s humor and accessible style resulted in his works being read aloud as a form of popular entertainment. With this came a heightened awareness of liberal ideas in all sectors of society. Within a year of publishing *Rights of Man*, Edward P. Thompson (1963, 111) noted that “Paine’s name became a household word. There were few places in the British Isles where his book had not penetrated.” Kistler (1962) traced Paine’s significant influence on the development of liberalism within Kant’s Germany. Political leaders advocating rapid democratic political transformations have also been quick to cite Paine. More recently and without elaboration of Paine’s ideas on intervention to spread democracy, Sheikh Ghazi Ajil al-Yawar, the Sunni Arab leader who assumed the interim Presidency of Iraq in 2004 following the American invasion, claimed that Paine was his “favorite philosopher” (Packer 2004).

With these uncertain legacies in international relations—where Kant is read variously by academics and Paine’s thought is considerable in more popular settings, the revolutionary liberalism of Paine has yet to be compared with Kant’s evolutionary liberalism. In the following sections, I show how Kant’s cautious evolutionary approach places his liberal internationalism at clear odds with Paine’s revolutionary liberalism. Exploring these differences in a detailed manner provides a richer understanding of the breadth of the liberal tradition in international relations.

Human Nature and the Idea of Progress

From game-theoretic models to historical case studies, foundational assumptions about human nature and preferences inform all efforts to understand politics. Taking exception to Waltz’s (1959) depreciation of human nature, Lanyi and McWilliams (1966, 8) argued that “*human nature* will remain, if not the basis, at least the starting point of all theories of politics.” While recent scholarship has examined how assumptions over human nature frame realist theory (Freyberg-Inan 2004), few studies have systematically explored the same ramifications for liberalism. Looking to Paine and Kant, revolutionary liberalism can be differentiated from evolutionary liberalism by divergent views of human nature and by differing expectations about progress.

For Paine, individuals are characterized by reason and goodness. Paine ([1794] 1967, 83) presented the individual as essentially moral: “The moral duty of man consists in imitating the moral goodness and beneficence of God manifested in the creation toward all his citizens.” Goodness and moral duty are facilitated, if not ensured, by the harmony of interests that reigns among all people. Individual goodness and harmony, however, have been obscured by corrupt forms of government. Paine ([1791] 1969, 169) noted that “man, were he not corrupted by [non-democratic] governments, is naturally the friend of man, and that human nature is not itself vicious.” While monarchy corrupted societies at all levels, the effects of monarchy were especially acute at the individual level. Paine ([1792] 1908, 286) argued that “the inhabitants of a monarchical country are often intellectually degenerate.” Democratic revolution would free mankind from these corrupting influences and man’s reason would emerge

quickly to transform the world. Paine ([1791] 1969, 230) celebrated this rapid progress in both domestic and international relations:

There is a morning of reason rising upon man on the subject of government, that has not appeared before. As the barbarism of the present old governments expires, the moral condition of nations with respect to each other will be changed. Man will not be brought up with the savage idea of considering his species as his enemy, because the accident of birth gave the individuals existence in countries distinguished by different names.

Perhaps most importantly, Paine ([1791] 1969, 178) predicted that the transition to this “morning of reason” would be swift and he doubted whether “monarchy and aristocracy will continue seven years longer in any of the enlightened countries in Europe.” Paine was confident that Europe would be ruled democratically by the end of the 18th-century. The ease by which political transformation can occur remains one of the distinctive characteristics of revolutionary liberal thought.

Turning to Kant we see a far more cautious, if not dark, initial view of human nature. In one passage Kant ([1795] 1991, 111) attributed war to human nature: “War itself, however, does not require any particular kind of motivation, for it seems to be ingrained in human nature.” In an earlier essay, Kant ([1784a] 1991, 46) asked what could be “constructed from such a warped wood as that which man is made”? Hoffmann (1965) was one of the few to consider the implications of Kant’s often disparaging view of individuals. Hoffmann (1965, 83) questioned whether “the establishment of republics all over the world does not eliminate the problem of war...[since] man’s evil propensities may still prevail.” Hoffmann’s (1965) reading, however, presented an undeservedly pessimistic view of Kant’s view of human nature and largely ignored the slow, gradual evolution that underlined Kant’s thought on progress in the political realm.

While Kant frequently demonstrated dark views of human nature, he remained optimistic about man’s ability to evolve away from his crass disposition and benefit through reason. Kant ([1795] 1991, 112) looked to the careful formation of institutions that would promote man’s goodness and repress the bad: “It only remains for men to create a good organization for the state...and to arrange it in such a way that their self-seeking energies are opposed to one another...so that man, even if he is not morally good in himself, is nevertheless compelled to be a good citizen.” Kant tracked progress in both the social and the physical worlds. But for Kant ([1793] 1991, 89) the prospect for progress “applies even more to moral aims” in the social realm. Moral and political forces, because they can be shaped by society, are more amenable to human volition and progress than those forces stiffened by nature.

The idea of progress has always separated liberals from realists. Keohane (1992, 174) noted how “liberalism believes in at least the possibility of cumulative progress, whereas realism assumes that history is not progressive.” But the mere presence of a possibility of progress does not provide many useful insights to liberalism. However, differentiating Paine’s revolutionary liberalism where progress is rapid, from Kant’s evolutionary liberalism where progress will grind forward slowly, provides considerably more insight into international relations than a simple dichotomy between liberal progress and realist stasis. With this done, we can now turn to how these varying assumptions over human nature and progress influence their respective expectations in world politics.

Democracy, Peace, and the Question of Voting Rights

The importance of democratic republics to world peace, one of the pillars of liberal thought, was emphasized by both Paine and Kant. They were among the first

to articulate why democratic states may behave differently. In *Common Sense*, Paine ([1776] 1986, 80) pointed out that the republics of the world tended to be peaceful: “Holland and Switzerland are without wars, foreign or domestic.” According to Paine ([1776] 1986, 95), this peace resulted from the democratic tendency to “negotiate the mistake” rather than letting regal pride swell “into a rupture with foreign powers.” Paine’s ([1791] 1969, 98) most famous proclamation came in *Rights of Man*, where he acknowledged that “The right of war and peace is in the nation. Where else should it reside, but in those who are to pay the expense.” The similarity of Paine’s words to Kant’s frequently cited passage is striking. Four years after Paine, Kant ([1795] 1991, 100), wrote that “the consent of the citizens is required to decide whether or not war is to be declared, it is very natural that they will have great hesitation in embarking on so dangerous an enterprise. For this would mean calling down on themselves all the miseries of war.” Governance by the people stands as the central principle to a liberal peaceful world order.

While both Paine and Kant agreed that republican government would result in a more peaceful world, they disagreed over who would have the right to vote. Kant’s 18th-century voting public was far more limited than Paine’s. To vote, according to Kant ([1797] 1991, 139–40), one must be an “active citizen” and “must possess civil independence.” Kant’s *active citizen* “must by his own free will actively participate in a community of other people.” But participation alone does not guarantee voting rights. Kant ([1797] 1991, 139) argued that to be “fit to vote, a person must have an independent position among the people.” His ideas on what constituted “civil independence,” however, would result in widespread restrictions on suffrage. Kant explicitly denied the vote to anyone who has “to receive orders or protection from other individuals, so that they do not possess civil independence.” These restrictions included woodcutters, blacksmiths, domestic tutors, apprentices, women, and “all those who are obliged to depend for their living...on the offices of others.” Kant ([1797] 1991, 140) curiously claimed that such a restriction on voting does not “in any way conflict with the freedom and equality as all men as human beings who together constitute a people.” With Kant’s caution toward human nature and reason, he was hesitant to rapidly enfranchise all elements of 18th-century society. Instead, civil independence and the vote would be gradually introduced and expanded.³

Paine, on the other hand, sought a quick transition to universal franchise. In his *First Principles of Government*, Paine ([1795] 1945, 578–9) stated his point succinctly:

The rich have no more right to exclude the poor from the right of voting, or of electing and being elected, than the poor have to exclude the rich... The right of voting for representatives is the primary right by which other rights are protected. To take away this right is to reduce a man to slavery.

Paine’s ardent optimism regarding human goodness and reason led him to advocate immediate and widespread voting; Kant’s temperate opinion on progress and reason led him to limit the franchise, at least in the early stages of a republic. Differences over who had the right to vote could be traced to Paine’s and Kant’s disagreements over the ease by which individuals can attain reason and goodness. As Paine argued that reason would come quickly to all individuals, universal voting rights could be granted quickly. Kant, on the other hand, was less sanguine on distributing the franchise. A similar rift can be seen between their distinct views of political community.

³ See Mulholland (1990) for a detailed analysis of Kant’s rights and how they apply to individual freedom and the franchise.

Nationalism and Ideas of Political Community

The differences between Paine's revolutionary liberalism and Kant's evolutionary liberalism intensify when we examine their views on political community and nationalism during the 18th century. Paine directed his efforts toward transforming notions of national privilege into the recognition of universal human rights. This is countered by Kant's cautious move toward a distant cosmopolitan right. But for Kant, the global system would long remain one of national attachments and state sovereignty.

Paine's spirited attacks on national attachments are legendary. Paine ([1791] 1969, 250) made his most famous statement amidst the revolution in France: "my country is the world, and my religion is to do good." During the American Revolution, Paine ([1777] 1908, 191) reiterated how his "principles are universal. My attachment is to all the world, and not any particular part." For Paine, a simple unity bound the individual to all mankind. Fierce national attachments should carry little weight with enlightened individuals.

Paine's optimism regarding the formation of liberal institutions was largely a consequence of what he witnessed in America. For Paine, America in the 18th-century was a least-likely but confirming case for a naturally emerging harmony. If individuals from different nations and religions could come to live harmoniously in America, Paine ([1791] 1969, 188) reasoned, these virtues could be instilled throughout humanity:

If there is a country in the world, where concord, according to common calculation, would be least expected, it is America. Made up, as it is, of people from different nations, accustomed to different forms and habits of government, speaking different languages, and more different in their modes of worship, it would appear that the union of such a people was impracticable.

Paine ([1791] 1969, 182) stressed how America's "settlers are emigrants from different European nations, and of diversified professions of religion, retiring from the governmental persecutions of the old world, and meeting in the new, not as enemies, but as brothers." The peaceful diversity that Paine observed in America would serve as his model of a new democratic world founded on international brotherhood. Paine's commitment to ensuring the rights of all humanity, regardless of national attachment, stands at the forefront of his revolutionary liberalism in international relations.

Turning to Kant, we see a distant aspiration for a cosmopolitan order, one that evolves after many stages of his universal history. When discussing the early stages of human development, Kant's orientation frequently revolved around the well-being of individual nation-states and their unique polities. He saw each 18th-century nation-state as a unique and autonomous entity that could not be merged or absorbed by another. According to Kant ([1795] 1991, 94) "a state, unlike the ground on which it is based, is not a possession (patrimonium). It is a society of men, which no-one other than itself can command or dispose of. Like a tree, it has its own roots..." For Kant, each nation was unique in law, custom, and history, rendering cosmopolitan understandings premature. This division of the world into nation-states has been decreed by nature. In contrast to Paine's universal brotherhood, Kant ([1795] 1991, 113) argued that "nature uses two means to separate the nations and prevent them from intermingling—linguistic and religious differences." He also argued that isolation and autarky might, in some instances, be a wiser policy than interacting with other nations. Kant ([1795] 1991, 106–7) applauded the efforts of 18th-century Japan and China to limit contact with the western powers. As a result of this national uniqueness, each nation

should rule itself and no authority above the nation-state could effectively rule diverse peoples.

Kant therefore approached the idea of global governance gingerly. In addition to his famous barb against international law advocates as “sorry comforters,” Kant ([1795] 1991, 113) argued that a situation of “many independent adjoining states...is preferred to an amalgamation of separate nations under a single power...for laws progressively lose their impact as the government increases its range, and a soulless despotism...will finally lapse into anarchy.” A commitment to global governance would require some level of explicit and universal agreement on rights. Yet Kant’s discussion of “cosmopolitan right” was quite minimal. In the subtitle to his “Third Definitive Article of a Perpetual Peace,” Kant ([1795] 1991, 105) stated that “Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality.” By hospitality, Kant meant the “right of a stranger not to be treated with hostility when he arrives on someone else’s territory.” The confined view Kant took toward universal rights and international law was, however, not permanent. True to his evolutionary approach, Kant ([1784a] 1991, 51) frequently pointed to the future possibility of “a perfect civil union of mankind,” which could involve a more active global governance.⁴

National sovereignty, universal rights, and international law stand as another difference between evolutionary and revolutionary liberalism. While Kant’s concept of sovereignty is not as rigid as the realist view, it does not call for an immediate recognition of universal rights of man to the extent put forth by Paine and other revolutionary liberals.

Free Trade and Peace: Slightly Different Causal Processes

The peaceful effect of trade remains central to the liberal research tradition. Even on this core liberal claim, differences between Paine’s ebullience and Kant’s caution can be detected. Paine was arguably the first popular proponent of free trade as a means of promoting peace. In the widely circulated *Rights of Man*, Paine ([1791] 1969, 234) asserted:

In all my writings, where the matter would permit, I have been a friend of commerce, because I have been a friend to its effects. It is a pacific system, operating to cordialize mankind, by rendering nations, as well as individuals, useful to each other...If commerce were permitted to act to the universal extent it is capable, it would extirpate the system of war.

Paine frequently pointed to how trade promoted international understandings, thereby working to “cordialize” mankind. Paine considered how interaction and experience would foster learning and understanding between different nations. Economic interaction would work to acquaint nations with one another and reduce misunderstandings that might lead to conflict. Trade would not only produce wealth but it would also reduce conflict by promoting understanding and unveiling the harmony of interests between free trading nations.

While Kant was also a friend of international commerce, his reasoning was somewhat distinct from Paine’s. A less utopian and more pragmatic Kant posited that trade leads to peace because of the vested interests of

⁴ Several recent works challenge this reading of Kant’s apprehensions with international law (see Tesón 1998; Cavallar and Reinisch 1998; Kleingeld 2004). While applying Kant’s ideas on ethics to a global setting reinforces these conclusions, his political works explicitly critique international law as it was practiced in the 18th-century. This, of course, does not preclude Kant’s idea of the gradual evolution of a more law governed federation of states. However, relative to Paine, Kant’s commitment to global justice remains limited, as will be shown when discussing intervention.

international financiers and businessmen. Kant ([1795] 1991, 114) claimed that “the *spirit of commerce* sooner or later takes hold of every people, and it cannot exist side by side with war. And of all the powers (or means) at the disposal of the power of the state, *financial power* can probably be relied on most” [emphasis is Kant’s]. Kant envisioned “financial power” and business interests as forces working to mediate all wars throughout the world. According to Kant, business concerns would grow into effective transnational agents for international peace due to interests, not morality. To preserve wealth generated through trade, Kant ([1795] 1991, 114) argued, “states find themselves compelled to promote the noble cause of peace, though not exactly from motives of morality. And wherever in the world there is a threat of war breaking out, they [trading states] will try to prevent it by mediation.” Low level conflicts, so long as they did not interfere with trade and transit, would be of little concern to these business interests. Given the broad liberal consensus on the importance of trade to peace, it is not surprising that differences between Paine and Kant would be so slight. More drastic differences emerge when we turn to military policies.

Military Spending, Paine’s Nonprovocative Defense, and Kant’s Preventive Wars

The dangers of both military alliances and high levels of military spending are prevalent in all liberal international thought. Some of the earliest critiques of these realpolitik behaviors can be found in the works of Paine and Kant. These critiques tend to follow two distinct lines of argument. First, devoting too much national treasure to the military comes at the expense of social spending and may undermine liberal values in the domestic realm. Second, arms buildups may spark insecurity and suspicion by neighboring states. Rather than enhancing security through deterrence, as realists argue, arms buildups may spiral to war. A closer examination of Paine and Kant, especially on the second critique, demonstrates agreement over the problems associated with military spending but it also shows significant differences in their respective solutions. Paine advocated arms control and nonprovocative defense structures. While Kant generally agreed, he also highlighted the right to wage a preventive war against any neighboring state undergoing rapid militarization.

The first critique of military buildups focuses on the financial burdens imposed on the population. As a result of high military spending, Kant ([1784a] 1991, 51) argued, “the world’s present rulers have no money to spare for public educational institutions or indeed for anything which concerns the world’s best interests (for everything has already been calculated out in advance for the next war).” Paine voiced similar concerns. In the final parts of *Rights of Man*, Paine ([1791] 1969) advocated reduced military spending in order to fund old-age pensions and universal education. Paine ([1807] 1945) called for a navy composed of small gunboats and local militias because of their relatively low costs, their democratic character, and their nonthreatening nature. Paine ([1782] 1908, 281) was also concerned with how an emphasis on military values might corrupt democratic political institutions. These critiques of military spending remained a staple for liberal thought from the Enlightenment through Wilson’s “Fourteen Points,” which called for, in Point IV, the lowest level of national armaments “consistent with domestic safety” (Link 1966, 77).

The second critique of high military spending warns of the dangers associated with increases in power, known widely as the “spiral model” (Jervis 1976). This view maintains that efforts to increase one’s security by obtaining defensive weapons may be perceived as offensive by a neighboring state. Even benign military

buildups may increase a sense of insecurity and mistrust between states. In this vein of thought, Paine warned against Pitt's military buildup of British forces during the 1787 crisis with the Dutch. Through such buildups, Paine ([1787] 1908, 66) contended, "the sparks of ill will are afresh kindled up between nations, the fair prospects of lasting peace are vanished." Paine's solution, and one endorsed by nearly all subsequent liberals, was arms reductions.

Kant shared Paine's concerns with how increased military preparation could threaten neighboring states. Armies, according to Kant ([1795] 1991, 94) "constantly threaten other states with war by the very fact that they are always prepared for it...the armies are themselves the cause of wars..." Kant ([1797] 1991, 168) later argued that any shift in power "would create a threat to one state by augmenting the power of another." Kant, however, was not so quick to suggest easy solutions like universal arms reductions. In a momentary realpolitik lapse, Kant ([1795] 1991, 95; [1797] 1991, 167) argued that in an anarchical system, states must either balance power or launch "preventative attacks" against those states undergoing rapid military buildups. Kant ([1795] 1991, 102) emphasized how "nation-states may be judged in the same way as individual men living in a state of nature, independent of external laws; for they [nation-states] are a standing offence to one another by the very fact that they are neighbors." In *The Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant ([1797] 1991, 167) again stressed how uncertainty over intentions would lead states to balance power and even launch preventive wars:

Apart from an actively inflicted injury (the first aggression, as distinct from the first hostilities), a state may be subjected to *threats*. Such threats may arise either if another state is the first to make *military preparations*, on which the right of *anticipatory attack* (*ius praeventionis*) is based, or simply if there is an alarming increase of power (*potential tremenda*) in another state which has acquired new territories. This is an injury to the less powerful state by the mere fact that the other state, even without offering any active offence, is *more powerful*; and any attack upon it is legitimate in the state of nature. On this is based the right to maintain a balance of power among all states which have active contact with one another (emphasis is Kant's).

Even in *Perpetual Peace*, Kant ([1795] 1991, 95) noted how any increase in power might "compel them [opposing states] to mount preventive attacks." With few exceptions (see Orend 2000), Kant's references to realpolitik solutions have been ignored by recent scholarship.

For Kant, however, these challenges to peace would not be a permanent feature of international relations. They would be especially acute in the early stages where the international system is characterized by anarchy, threats, violence, and instinct rather than by reason, rights, and the pursuit of justice. As human reason developed, states would move closer toward the perpetual peace for which Kant is best known.

On the issue of military preparedness, we see a basic level of agreement between Paine and Kant on the dangers posed by increasing power. While both recognized the opportunity costs and dangers of military preparedness, Kant did not propose easy solutions like arms control that hinge on optimistic assumptions of cooperation between states. Instead, Kant ([1795] 1991, 102) acknowledged that the international system was developing slowly from a precarious "state of nature." In such a system, Kant reasoned, military force and relative capabilities would remain salient features for a time. For Paine, military force would quickly grow obsolete, hastened by widespread democratic revolutions. The facile, revolutionary nature of Paine's liberalism is, once again, at odds with the slowly evolving, less utopian liberalism laid out by Kant.

Kant's Nonintervention and Paine's *Descent Upon England*

The most striking difference between Paine and Kant can be found on the question of military intervention to promote democratic rule. While Kant opposed such action, Paine was a strong advocate of military intervention to spread democracy. In his 1792 dedication of *Rights of Man*, Paine promised to join the French general Lafayette in "the Spring Campaign" that would "terminate in the extinction of German despotism, and in establishing the freedom of all Germany." Paine's justification for a military intervention was clear: "When France shall be surrounded with revolutions, she will be in peace and safety." France's national security, Paine reasoned, depended upon extending democracy to neighboring states, even by force of arms.

Paine tried to justify intervention in England with the same national security logic. Paine ([1798] 1945, 1,403) argued that "there will be no lasting peace for France, nor for the world, until the tyranny and corruption of the English government be abolished, and England, like Italy, becomes a sister Republic." Again, Paine presented a vision of an interdependent world where all democracies would be faced with constant threats from nondemocratic states. The solution was to foster or force democratic governance the world around.

Paine publicly advocated intervention in England. While still an active member of the French Assembly, Paine ([1798] 1945, 1,404) offered a "small patriotic donation" of "five-hundred livres" to help finance a French-led "descent" on England. According to Paine's ([1804] 1908, 680) account, Bonaparte was to command the descent. "By agreement between him and me, I was to accompany him...to give the people of England an opportunity of forming a government for themselves, and thereby bring about peace." Paine never considered this an *invasion* but rather the effort to help lead the English people away from an oppressive tyranny. Paine envisioned how a liberated English people would quickly join the family of democratic nations and help usher in a new period of global peace and prosperity.

Paine's use of the term "descent" provides the fitting image of coming down from above to assist with establishing an enlightened and just form of government. Implicit in Paine's ideas on intervention is an inferiority of the target nation. For Paine ([1792] 1908, 286), "the inhabitants of a monarchical country are often intellectually degenerate and are distinguished for their servile disposition." Such people need urging, if not stern guidance, to achieve freedom. What ensued was a messianic zeal bent on transforming the world into democracies—or "to begin the world over again," as Paine ([1776] 1986, 120) promised in *Common Sense*. Similar pretensions have characterized motives for democratic military interventions since Paine's initial efforts.

The military interventions that Paine championed, however, would be relatively small by 18th-century military standards. The descent on England, for instance, could be funded by "small patriotic donations." No large naval vessels would be needed. Instead, Paine ([1804] 1908) advocated the use of his small gunboats to be rowed across the channel. For Paine, military force could topple governments but could not transform societies. Rather, as was the case in England, military force would free progressive factions from within to bring about rapid political transformation. Thompson (1963) chronicled Paine's collaborations with various English reformers seeking to democratize the regime. Once in England, persuasion and reason would prove more valuable than military might.

Paine's enthusiasm toward these types of interventions relate directly to his optimism regarding human nature and reason. Tyrannical forms of government rob individuals of their natural goodness. For Paine ([1791] 1969, 182), once "governmental persecutions" are removed mankind will come together "not as enemies, but as brothers." Paine's ([1791] 1969, 178) excessive optimism is most

evident in his predictions that republican governments would establish themselves across Europe within seven years. In Paine's worldview, if individuals were given the opportunity to reason freely, they would promptly embrace democracy, peace, and justice. Led by lofty views of human reason and goodness, revolutionary liberals continue to envision rapid global transformations.

In direct opposition to Paine, Kant issued a firm warning against interventions to shape domestic political institutions. Kant made the principle of nonintervention one of his *Preliminary Articles of a Perpetual Peace*.⁵ Kant ([1795] 1991, 96) was explicit that "No state shall forcibly interfere in the constitution and government of another state." Kant defended the principle on the following grounds:

The interference of external powers would be a violation of the rights of an independent people which is merely struggling with its internal ills. Such interference would be an active offence and would make the autonomy of all other states insecure.

The principle of sovereignty protected against the rampant interventionism that characterized Europe during the Thirty Years War, a historical precedent surely not missed by Kant. In Kant's view, sovereignty was to be respected and such respect was in the interest of all states.

Kant reiterated that even the most despotic states should be protected from outside interference. Kant ([1795] 1991, 118) argued that "no state can be required to relinquish its constitution, even if the latter is despotic." Any governing constitution, Kant continued, is "better than none at all, and the fate of premature reform would be anarchy." In keeping with his gradual and evolutionary approach to political development, Kant saw any rush toward rapid transformations as counterproductive and potentially dangerous.

While republican states are discouraged from actively intervening, Kant still envisioned one republic leading the way to perpetual peace. But this would be done by example, not by force: "For if by good fortune one powerful and enlightened nation can form a republic (which is by its nature inclined to seek perpetual peace), this will provide a focal point for a federal association among other states" (Kant [1795] 1991, 104). Through a process of gradual approximation, Kant's federation of republican states and perpetual peace would slowly expand.

Kant did offer some specific conditions under which intervention could be justified. Intervention, Kant ([1795] 1991, 96) cautioned, could only take place if a state had been "split into two parts, each of which set itself up as a separate state and claimed authority over the whole. For it could not be reckoned as interference in another state's constitution if an external state were to lend support to one of them, because their condition is one of anarchy." In yet another reference to power politics, Kant allowed a neighboring state to intervene militarily and assist one faction—its favored faction—in a civil war. However, in the absence of state failure or civil war, the principle of state sovereignty must be honored, at least until global society matures.

Kant's prohibition against intervention in *Perpetual Peace* relates directly to his gradualism in *Universal History*. While we can expect the gradual expansion of constitutions that protect individual rights, the process of democratization cannot be accelerated by outside intervention. Political institutions must evolve slowly and indigenously because "reason does not itself work instinctively, for it requires trial, practice, and instruction" (Kant [1784a] 1991, 42). Perhaps as an acknowledgment to the challenges of applying reason to the realm of politics,

⁵ While there is no clear indication that Kant was responding to Paine's revolutionary rhetoric, it would have been impossible for Kant not to be well acquainted with Paine's *Rights of Man*. By most estimates, at least 300,000 copies of *Rights* were in circulation around Europe and translated into all the major languages by 1793.

Kant ([1797] 1991) sought to limit the franchise initially. But Kant ([1784a] 1991, 52) was confident that in the end, “we shall discover a process of improvement in the political constitutions of our continent.” For Kant, the slow path to peace would take much longer than the seven years prophesied by Paine.

On the issue of intervention, liberals in the tradition of Kant are far more restrained and cautious. While Paine advocated military intervention to bring freedom to all people who suffer the injustices brought about by nondemocratic governance, Kant realized that freedom and justice would not come about easily or immediately. As an extension of his cautious faith in democratic processes, Kant reasoned that a just society could not be imposed by forces outside the actual polity. The ebullient Paine, on the other hand, saw no virtue in patience when rights were being trod upon. Like many of the divergences between Paine and Kant, their opposing views of intervention to spread democratic institutions raise perennial questions for research in international relations. To some of these questions we will now turn.

Echoes of Paine and Kant in Contemporary International Relations

Many questions explored by Paine and Kant remain salient to the current liberal research program in international relations. Many of their claims have been supported empirically, which is a relatively infrequent outcome in the study of international relations (Vasquez 1998). For instance, the prediction that democratic governance would expand has been supported by Gurr, Jagers, and Moore (1990), among others. Kant’s prediction of a slow expansion of democracy fits the empirical evidence better than Paine’s. Most noteworthy, however, is the conjecture that democracies will be peaceful with one another. This has been widely confirmed by a number of scholars (Doyle 1983; Rousseau 2005; Russett 1993; Chernoff 2004 for a recent review). Kant’s concerns with the evolutionary nature of the democratic peace has been explored and supported by Cederman (2001) and Mitchell, Gates, and Hegre (1999). The deluge of research supporting the democratic peace led Levy (1988, 662) to conclude that the “absence of war between democratic states comes as close as anything we have to an empirical law in international relations.” Paine ([1776] 1986, 95) first posited these peaceful proclivities in his *Common Sense* and Kant ([1795] 1991, 100) predicted the same in “Perpetual Peace.” Paine ([1791] 1969), however, was the first to emphasize the dyadic nature of the democratic peace (i.e., democracies may not be more peaceful, but will be peaceful with one another).

In addition to the democratic peace finding, democratic states demonstrate uniqueness in other realms. In their study of democratic effectiveness in war, Reiter and Stam (2002, 62) noted Paine’s assertion that democratic soldiers “would be worth ‘twice the value’ of a soldier of a monarchy.” Their findings largely coincide with Paine’s expectations. Fordham and Walker (2005, 154) examined the claim, made by both Paine and Kant, that democracies would devote less of their resources to the military. Fordham and Walker (2005, 154) concluded that “democratic states allocate a smaller share of their national resources to military uses than do autocracies.” All of the above studies supported Paine’s and Kant’s assertions that republican regimes would tend to behave differently in the international system than authoritarian states.

Readings of Kant have also contributed to an expanded liberal research agenda by highlighting variables besides regime type. For instance, Russett and Oneal (2000) look directly to Kant to broaden liberalism to include variables like international organization membership and trade flows. Russett and Oneal (2000, 154) find that increased trade tends to reduce militarized disputes between states, as Paine and Kant predicted. Barbieri (2002), on the other hand, offers some caveats regarding this relationship. These empirical studies, however,

could benefit by recognizing Paine's and Kant's distinct causal paths between trade and peace. Kant, as previously noted, based the association between trade and peace on the rational pursuit of self-interested actors (i.e., business interests). Taking a different tack, Paine emphasized how trade would lead to friendly understandings, thereby exposing a harmony of interests shared by all free peoples. In Paine's view, trade could reduce both the likelihood of war and all other types of international conflict as well. For Kant, trade works primarily to reduce the likelihood of war. This distinction has some ramifications for research on trade and international conflict. To assess the Kantian claim the dependent variable would be war that interrupts trade or serious militarized disputes that interrupts trade; lower level militarized interstate disputes would not be relevant since they would not likely jeopardize trade flows. To assess Paine's claims about the emerging harmony of interests through international trade, interstate disputes at all levels would be examined since any dispute would indicate the lack of cordial and harmonious relations between states. While Paine saw trade as a way to foster international harmony and understanding, Kant envisioned trade as a way to limit war. The question of how free trade will transform relations between states in a peaceful and positive manner has remained a central theme in liberal international relations theory—ranging from Mitrany ([1943] 1966) view of economic integration to the Washington Consensus. However, the divergence between Paine and Kant clarifies possible causal processes driving this relationship. For Kant, trade would only dampen the most serious conflicts. Paine saw trade as a means of exposing a harmony of interest and dampening all types of conflict and misunderstanding.

The difference between Paine and Kant on the issue of military intervention illuminates a question that has long troubled students of international relations. Cavallar and Reinisch (1998) relied directly on Kant in their study of intervention and peacekeeping in failed states. In their examinations of how ideas of intervention have evolved over time, Donnelly (1995) and Finnemore (2003) discussed the growing acceptance of humanitarian intervention in global society. Walzer (1995, 55) noted the "small but growing number of people on the left who now favor intervening, here and there, driven by an internationalist ethic." These new advocates of intervention, according to Walzer (1995, 55), opposed the practice during the Cold War. However, the specific conditions justifying intervention remain murky at best. Normative theorists struggle over the question. Rawls (1999, 62), for instance, did not allow liberal peoples to intervene in the domestic affairs of what he terms "decent peoples" (i.e., those nonliberal, and often nondemocratic states). However, in the case of outlaw states, Rawls (1999, 81) advocated active intervention: "Liberal and decent peoples have the right, under the Law of Peoples, not to tolerate outlaw states...Outlaw states are aggressive and dangerous; all peoples are safer and more secure if such states change, or are forced to change, their ways." Rawls did not stipulate the precise type of force and the length of time required to enact this change. Nor did Rawls appreciate how decent peoples might be recast as outlaw states to justify intervention.

With the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, liberal discussions over the issue of military intervention to spread democracy have grown both more salient and pointed. The recent liberal division follows along the lines of Paine and Kant. Some accentuate revolutionary liberalism and posit intervention as a liberal imperative. Vasquez (2005, 311) critically noted how "liberal foreign policy" includes both "the spread of democracy" and the "doctrine of armed humanitarian intervention." In response to the American invasion of Iraq, Owen (2005, 1) stated that "The defining act of Bush's presidency was grounded in a theory that...democracies do not fight one another." Owen, however, wrongly associated intervention with the democratic peace and liberalism more broadly.

Interventions cannot be tied to all liberals, as demonstrated by Kant's evolutionary liberalism. Armed intervention to spread democracy and global peace remains a unique feature of revolutionary liberalism.

Many contemporaries have taken on a Kantian, evolutionary approach to the question of intervention to spread democracy. Rhodes (2003, 141), for instance, argued that the emergence of a liberal society is a "process inseparable from great, long-term, historical developments in culture and economics." The emergence of liberalism "happens—or fails to happen—not because a hegemon wills it, but because of organic developments within human consciousness and societal operations..." (Rhodes 2003, 141). These developments cannot be accelerated by military intervention. Russett (2005, 395) denied any association between liberalism and intervention: "Most democratic peace theorists, moreover, do not endorse democratic regime change by great-power external military intervention." While the empirical evidence of the interdemocratic peace can be compelling, it simply does not speak to how liberal democratic regimes emerge and the role that military intervention might play in this emergence. As a result, efforts to democratize by force are beyond the pale of evolutionary liberalism. Instead, such efforts reside with the revolutionary liberal's optimistic assessments of human nature and easy political transformation.

Conclusion

This comparison of Kant's evolutionary liberalism and Paine's revolutionary liberalism achieves several ends. First, this study demonstrates the continuity of liberal thought reaching back to the Enlightenment. Paine and Kant are emblematic of a broad liberal consensus as well as a certain liberal discord. All liberals share a broad faith that democracies will remain at peace with one another and free trade will contribute to that peace. Liberals also share a general mistrust of military spending as a means to achieve security. While liberals agree that a democratic world will be a more peaceful world, they disagree over marshalling military force to achieve this end. I have argued that the sources of this disagreement—as it is represented in the thought of Paine and Kant—are rooted in their respective foundational assumptions in human nature. Paine's optimism facilitates military intervention to spread democratic institutions. Kant's evolutionary liberalism, with its emphasis on gradual institutional development, draws the opposite conclusion. These two distinct but still liberal visions continue to invite reflection by students of international relations.

Second, on a broader theoretical front, this comparison of Paine and Kant welcomes a better understanding of the relationship between realism and liberalism. With this refined understanding, even some of the long-established realist critiques of liberalism become clearer. Many of the most poignant passages of Edward H. Carr's (1939) and Hans Morgenthau's (1946, 1948) critiques of liberalism take easy aim at aspects of natural harmony, the ease of international cooperation, and the inherent goodness of man. While these critiques may be fitting for the most utopian aspects of Paine's revolutionary liberalism, they miss the mark of Kant's more cautious approach to liberal internationalism. For Kant, the path to perpetual peace would never be easy, quick, or inevitable. By entitling his most famous essay *Toward Perpetual Peace*, Kant was highlighting the struggle toward a distant and perhaps unachievable end. The final stage of evolution of a global society might never be attained. But to strive toward this end differentiates his liberal thought from realism. And to admit that such an end might never be achieved due to certain aspects of the human condition differentiates his approach from the revolutionary liberalism of Paine. If this reading of Kant is correct, the long-entrenched dichotomy between realism and liberalism in international relations theory may be misplaced.

Kant's evolutionary liberalism offers a middle way between the two extremes of liberal utopianism and the pessimism of realism. While durable, the simple dichotomy between utopian liberalism and the fatalism of realpolitik was never terribly compelling. Morgenthau's (1948, 17) claim that "the drives to live, to propagate, and to dominate are common to all men" is no more helpful than Paine's (1794, 83) opposite claim that the "moral duty of man consists in imitating the moral goodness and beneficence of God." Kant's (1798, 181) view that human nature is a "mixture of evil and goodness in unknown proportions" leads us away from simplistic, deterministic explanations. And in acknowledging differences between Kant's evolutionary liberalism and Paine's revolutionary liberalism, a more nuanced spectrum of international relations theory begins to emerge.

References

- BARBIERI, KATHERINE. 2002. *The Liberal Illusion: Does Trade Promote Peace*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- BECK, LEWIS WHITE. 1963. *Kant: On History*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- CARR, EDWARD H. 1939. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. London: Macmillan and Company.
- CASSIRER, ERNST. [1918] 1981. *Kant's Life and Thought*. Translated by James Haden. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- CAVALLAR, GEORG. 2001. "Kantian Perspectives on Democratic Peace: Alternatives to Doyle." *Review of International Studies* 27 (2): 229–248.
- CAVALLAR, GEORG, AND AUGUST REINISCH. 1998. "Kant, Intervention and the Failed State." *Kantian Review* 2: 91–106.
- CEDERMAN, LARS. 2001. "Back to Kant: Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace as a Macrohistorical Learning Process." *American Political Science Review* 95 (1): 15–32.
- CHERNOFF, FRED. 2004. "The Study of the Democratic Peace and Progress in International Relations." *International Studies Review* 6 (1): 49–78.
- DEUDNEY, DANIEL. 2007. *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory From the Polis to the Global Village*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- DONNELLY, JACK. 1995. "State Sovereignty and International Intervention: The Case of Human Rights." In *Beyond Westphalia? State Sovereignty and International Intervention*, ed. Gene Lyons and Michael Mastanduno. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- DOYLE, MICHAEL. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs (Part I)." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12 (3): 205–235.
- DOYLE, MICHAEL. 1997. *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism and Socialism*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- FINNEMORE, MARTHA. 2003. *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- FORDHAM, BENJAMIN, AND THOMAS WALKER. 2005. "Kantian Liberalism, Regime Type, and Military Resource Allocation: Do Democracies Spend Less?" *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (1): 141–157.
- FRANCESCET, ANTONIO. 2001. "Sovereignty and Freedom: Immanuel Kant's Liberal Internationalist Legacy." *Review of International Studies* 27 (2): 209–228.
- FREYBERG-INAN, ANNETTE. 2004. *What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations and its Judgment of Human Nature*. Albany, NY: State University of New York (SUNY) Press.
- GALLIE, WILLIAM B. 1978. *Philosophers of Peace and War: Kant, Clausewitz, Marx, Engels and Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GATES, SCOTT, TOREBJORN KNUTSEN, AND JONATHAN MOSES. 1996. "Democracy and Peace: A More Skeptical View." *Journal of Peace Research* 33 (1): 1–10.
- GURR, TED R., KEITH JAGGERS, AND WILL MOORE. 1990. "The Transformation of the Western State: The Growth of Democracy, Autocracy, and State Power Since 1800." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 25 (1): 73–108.
- HERMANN, MARGARET, AND CHARLES KEGLEY. 2001. "Democracies and Intervention: Is There a Danger Zone in the Democratic Peace?" *Journal of Peace Research* 38 (2): 237–245.
- HOFFMANN, STANLEY. 1965. *The State of War*. New York: Praeger.
- HOLSTI, KALEVI. 1985. *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*. Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin.
- HOWARD, MICHAEL. 1978. *War and the Liberal Conscience*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

- JAHN, BEATE. 2005. "Kant, Mill, and Illiberal Legacies in International Affairs." *International Organization* 59 (January): 177–207.
- JERVIS, ROBERT. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1784a] 1991. "Idea for a Universal History With a Cosmopolitan Purpose." In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1784b] 1991. "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?" In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1786] 1991. "Conjectures on the Beginning of Human History." In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1793] 1991. "On the Relationship Between Theory and Practice in International Right." In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1795] 1991. "Perpetual Peace." In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1797] 1991. "The Metaphysics of Morals." In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANT, IMMANUEL. [1798] 1991. "The Contest of Faculties." In *Kant's Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KEANE, JOHN. 1995. *Tom Paine: A Political Life*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- KEOHANE, ROBERT. 1992. "International Liberalism Reconsidered." In *The Economic Limits to Modern Politics*, ed. John Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KISTLER, MARK. 1962. "German–American Liberals and Thomas Paine." *American Quarterly* 14 (1): 81–91.
- KLEINGELD, PAULINE. 1999. "Kant, History, and the Idea of Moral Development." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 16 (1): 59–80.
- KLEINGELD, PAULINE. 2004. "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's Defence of a League of States and His Ideal of a World Federation." *European Journal of Philosophy* 12 (3): 304–325.
- LANYI, GEORGE, AND WILSON CAREY McWILLIAMS. 1966. "Theories of World Politics." In *Crisis and Continuity in World Politics*, ed. George Lanyi and Wilson Careys McWilliams. New York: Random House.
- LEVY, JACK. 1988. "Domestic Politics and War." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18 (3): 653–673.
- LINK, ARTHUR. 1966. "Wilson's Fourteen Points." In *An American Primer*, ed. Daniel Boorstin. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- MILLER, BENJAMIN. 1996. "Competing Realist Perspectives on Great Power Crisis Behavior." *Security Studies* 4 (Spring): 309–357.
- MITCHELL, SARAH, SCOTT GATES, AND HALVARD HEGRE. 1999. "Evolution in Democracy-War Dynamics." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43 (6): 771–792.
- MITRANY, DAVID. [1943] 1966. *A Working Peace System*. Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books.
- MONTEN, JONATHAN. 2005. "The Roots of the Bush Doctrine." *International Security* 29 (1): 112–156.
- MORGENTHAU, HANS J. 1946. *Scientific Man vs. Power Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- MORGENTHAU, HANS J. 1948. *Politics Among Nations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- MULHOLLAND, LESLIE. 1990. *Kant's System of Rights*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- OREND, BRIAN. 2000. *War and International Justice: A Kantian Perspective*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- ORGANSKI, A. F. K. 1968. *World Politics*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- OWEN, JOHN M. 1997. *Liberal Peace, Liberal War: American Politics and International Security*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- OWEN, JOHN M. 2005. "Iraq and the Democratic Peace." *Foreign Affairs* 84 (6): 1–5.
- PACKER, GEORGE. 2004. "Wars and Ideas." *The New Yorker*, July: 9–11.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1777] 1908. "The Crisis." In *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. D. E. Wheeler. New York: Vincent Park and Company.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1782] 1908. "Letter to the Abbé Raynal." In *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. D. E. Wheeler. New York: Vincent Park and Company.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1787] 1908. "Prospects of the Rubicon." In *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. D. E. Wheeler. New York: Vincent Park and Company.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1792] 1908. "An Essay Written to Aid New Republicans in Their Opposition to Monarchy." In *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. D. E. Wheeler. New York: Vincent Park and Company.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1804] 1908. "To the People of England on the Invasion of England." In *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip Foner. New York: The Citadel Press.

- PAINE, THOMAS. [1795] 1945. "Dissertation on First Principles of Government." In *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip Foner. New York: The Citadel Press.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1798] 1945. "To the Council of Five Hundred." In *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip Foner. New York: The Citadel Press.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1807] 1945. "Of the Comparative Powers and Expense of Ships of War, Gun Boats, and Fortifications." In *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip Foner. New York: The Citadel Press.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1794] 1967. "Age of Reason." In *The Writings of Thomas Paine*, Vol. 4 ed. M. D. Conway. New York: AMS Press.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1791] 1969. *Rights of Man*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.
- PAINE, THOMAS. [1776] 1986. *Common Sense*. London: Penguin Books.
- RAWLS, JOHN. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- REITER, DAN, AND ALLAN STAM. 2002. *Democracies at War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- RHODES, EDWARD. 2003. "The Imperial Logic of Bush's Liberal Agenda." *Survival* 45 (1): 131–154.
- RICHARDSON, JAMES. 2001. *Contending Liberalisms in World Politics: Ideology and Power*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- ROUSSEAU, DAVID. 2005. *Democracy and War: Institutions, Norms, and the Evolution of International Conflict*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- RUSSETT, BRUCE. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- RUSSETT, BRUCE. 2005. "Bushwhacking the Democratic Peace." *International Studies Perspectives* 6 (4): 395–408.
- RUSSETT, BRUCE, AND JOHN R. ONEAL. 2000. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence and International Organization*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- TESÓN, FERNANDO R. 1998. *Philosophy of International Law*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- THOMPSON, EDWARD P. 1963. *The Making of The English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books.
- VASQUEZ, JOHN A. 1997. "The Realist Paradigm as a Degenerating Research Program." *American Political Science Review* 91 (4): 899–912.
- VASQUEZ, JOHN A. 1998. *The Power of Power Politics: From Neoclassical Realism to Neotraditional*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- VASQUEZ, JOHN A. 2005. "Ethics, Foreign Policy, and Liberal Wars: The Role of Restraint in Moral Decision Making." *International Studies Perspectives* 6 (3): 307–315.
- WALKER, THOMAS C. 2000. "The Forgotten Prophet: Tom Paine's Cosmopolitanism and International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (1): 51–72.
- WALKER, THOMAS C., AND JEFFREY S. MORTON. 2005. "Re-Assessing the 'Power of Power Politics' Thesis: Is Realism Still Dominant?" *International Studies Review* 7 (2): 341–356.
- WALTZ, KENNETH. 1959. *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- WALTZ, KENNETH. 1962. "Kant, Liberalism, and War." *American Political Science Review* 56 (2): 331–340.
- WALTZ, KENNETH. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. New York: Random House.
- WALZER, MICHAEL. 1995. "The Politics of Rescue." *Social Research* 62 (1): 53–66.