CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ix

A Note on Sources, Citations, and Abbreviations xv

Introduction. The Vices of Virtue: Liberalism and the Problem of Ruthlessness 1

1 "Squeamishness Is the Crime": Ruthlessness, Ethos, and the Critique of Liberalism 14

2 Between Tragedy and Utopia: Weber and Lukács on Ethics and Politics 40

3 A Just Man: Albert Camus and the Search for a Decent Heroism 68

4 The "Morality of Prudence" and the Fertility of Doubt: Raymond Aron's Defense of a Realist Liberalism 102

5 Against Cynicism and Sentimentality: Reinhold Niebuhr's Chastened Liberal Realism 137

6 "The Courage of . . . Our Doubts and Uncertainties": Isaiah Berlin, Ethical Moderation, and Liberal Ethos 166

Conclusion. Good Characters for Good Liberals?: Ethos and the Reconstruction of Liberalism 197

Notes 223

Bibliography 267

Index 291

INTRODUCTION

The Vices of Virtue

LIBERALISM AND THE PROBLEM OF RUTHLESSNESS

Virtue itself has need of limits.[1]

In that "how" lies all the difference.[2]

HOW DO HUMANITARIAN IDEALISTS become butchers of human beings? How do they convince themselves that they are virtuous in their butchery? This is a question that should trouble those of us who cherish hopes of bettering the world through politics. It is the question of Robespierre, the champion of the rights of man and opponent of the death penalty who presided over the Reign of Terror; the question of György Lukács, the sensitive idealist turned commissar, panegyrist of Lenin, and abettor of Stalin. It is a question raised by countless others who have traveled from humanism to inhumanity, who have embraced murderous causes because they came to believe it morally imperative and politically urgent to do so.

It is easy (at least for some of us) to condemn the French Revolutionary Terrorists, Stalinist secret police, or Maoist Red Guards. But a careful study of the personal roots of these horrors should be an antidote to complacency—as, perhaps, should a moment of self-examination. Few of these political murderers started out as monsters. And readiness to sacrifice individuals in the pursuit of moral causes often takes less dramatic and bloody forms, which many of us could find in ourselves, if we looked. Anyone who feels the force of revulsion against the injustice, cruelty, and oppression of this world should be alert to this temptation; so should those who believe that they have discovered the

truth about how to improve human life (whether this truth is secular or religious, and identified with the political right or left). Ruthlessness—understood as both a feature of action and a quality of thought and feeling that rejects all scruples, doubts, hesitation, and remorse in pursuing some ultimate purpose or serving some paramount principle—possesses an attractive simplicity and strength. It grants a sense of direction and meaning, garrisoning the mind against the terror of uncertainty. It lends a feeling of strength, a patina of psychological power, a glamor of toughness: hence politicians seem never to tire of declaring metaphorical wars—or (for example) announcing the goal of achieving "total domination" through the use of force by "very tough, strong, powerful people."[3] Ruthlessness possesses a self-enforcing psychology: once one has set one's heart on ruthlessness, it can be hard to escape. And the pragmatic arguments for ruthlessness are potent. Within politics—a realm of passionate, often unprincipled, struggle—how can one be effective in urgently pursuing a just cause, especially when faced with the ruthlessness of others, without hardening one's heart, stopping one's ears, getting one's hands dirty?[4]

Many political evils, of course, stem from garden variety villainy—ambition, venality, the appetite for domination or longing for submission. But righteous ruthlessness is particularly troubling, insofar as it can transform apparent virtues into terrible vices. As a disillusioned Communist in Vasily Grossman's *Life and Fate* reflects, the terrible paradox of Communism was that it "freed people from morality in the name of morality"; for the sake of a "fine and noble" cause, it justified killing, crippling, uprooting and terrorizing, and licensed "pharisees, hypocrites, and writers of denunciations." This showed how "the very concept of good" can become "a scourge, a greater evil than evil itself."[5] The combination of idealism and cynicism in the pursuit of noble goals through brutal means is particularly potent in its appeal, and horrific in its consequences.

Liberalism and the Politics of Limits

The tendency to pass from humanitarian idealism to ruthlessness can occur among adherents of diverse political visions and programs. No ideology or party is immune; governments and movements have called for the brutal infliction of death, imprisonment, and material misery in the name of freedom or justice, capitalism or socialism, "growth" or "greatness," and numerous other inspiring slogans. Yet there is a strong affinity between this tendency and *anti-liberal* politics—politics that forcefully rejects liberal principles and seeks to demolish liberal institutions. And while individuals from across the political

spectrum have diagnosed, and proposed prophylactics against, political ruthlessness, there is a strong affinity between liberalism and a propensity to feel horror at political ruthlessness, and to regard combating it as a vital political task. Those who have been repulsed by political ruthlessness have often been driven toward liberalism, whatever their ideological starting point. Indeed, liberalism itself emerged out of reaction against the ruthlessness of the French Revolutionary Terror, and fear of answering reactionary ruthlessness.[6] Not all forms of liberalism are equally concerned with ruthlessness—or able to resist impulses toward ruthlessness on behalf of liberal objectives. While recent liberal theory may not license ruthlessness, it also has little to say about it, having focused largely on questions of justification and institutional principles. Yet not long ago, the practical challenge of ruthlessness inspired a distinctive strand of liberal thinking. I reconstruct, retrieve, and develop that liberalism here.

"Liberalism" covers broad, well-trodden, and contested terrain; any definition is liable to be controversial.[7] It variously denotes support for a mildly redistributionist welfare state combined with significant personal liberty and commitment to the free market, or a political theory defined by the framework of the social contract, or "methodological individualism," or affirmation of the "priority of the right over the good." I do not use liberalism in any of these ways here. Likewise, by "anti-liberalism" I do not mean libertarian, communitarian, civic-republican, conservative, socialist, or perfectionist critics of the foregoing positions, but rather those who reject liberal principles and practices, and seek to overturn them, root-and-branch.[8]

Liberal politics is limited politics—institutionally, normatively, ethically.[9] Institutionally, liberals embrace limits such as the rule of law (enforced through an independent judiciary); charters of guaranteed individual rights; the selection and removal of political officials by popular vote; an internally diverse civil society, endowed with protections against the dictates of the state, and with the power to criticize or resist the state. Beyond this, liberalism inculcates norms of recognizing such limits as legitimate and desirable. It may also encourage internalizing acceptance of limits in undertaking political action, even in the silence of the law. This insistence on limits reflects a commitment to promoting individual liberty, understood as the ability of "[e]very adult . . . to make as many effective decisions without fear or favor about as many aspects of her or his life as is compatible with the like freedom of every other adult";[10] and promoting a society marked by the diversity (and disagreement) that the practice of liberty produces. Liberalism seeks to reduce, as

much as possible, the fear, the frustrating sense of immobility or entrapment, the cramping of character and narrowing of horizons through deprivation or coercion, and the arbitrariness and arrogance of authority, within a society.

Liberalism's "negativity"—its tendency to define itself in terms of what it opposes and seeks to protect against—should not be overstated (as it often is[11]). Liberalism reflects not only fears, but ideals: aspirations to rich individual self-development, and a society marked by greater justice and mutual respect. It does not merely accept diversity (and even discord), but "rejoice[s]" in it, because "it is in diversity alone that freedom can be realized"—for a "free society is not one in which people are merely allowed to make effective social choices among a variety of alternatives, but one in which they are encouraged to do so."[12] Liberal politics is not only a limited, but (as the word's origins suggest) a generous or "magnanimous politics."[13] But this generosity typically takes the form of forbearance and tolerance, which is one reason why it is not always recognized (another is liberals' own failures to live up to their ideals). Liberals do not, like conservatives, stand athwart history shouting "stop." At their best, they stand between vulnerable individuals and the predations of power, and insist on limits—"so far, but no further," as Camus had it. There is more to liberalism than this. But this is liberalism's spine.

Political ruthlessness is naturally opposed to liberalism thus understood. It is defined by an insistence that certain goals or principles override individual rights or liberties and justify the use of unbridled power, the infliction of untold suffering, the obliteration or blighting of countless individual lives. Such ruthlessness poses a serious problem: how can liberals respond effectively to it without emulating it? It also challenges the seriousness and sincerity of liberalism. Is the liberal who refrains from pursuing her goals when doing so seems to require ruthless action really that committed to those goals in the first place?

This liberal vulnerability is evoked whenever people quote (whether wryly, regretfully, or maliciously) Robert Frost's definition of a liberal as one "too broadminded to take his own side in a quarrel." Here Frost identifies liberalism with a feature of character, outlook, and approach—and a consequent deficiency in action. This deficiency may seem fairly harmless, as political vices go—even endearing. But what happens when liberals find themselves in a quarrel with those who oppose liberalism root and branch—and particularly those who oppose it in a way that threatens the basic values and interests that liberals hold dear? What happens, in other words, when liberals come up against political ruthlessness? This question is at the heart of what I call

(adopting a phrase from Isaiah Berlin) "the liberal predicament." The main crux of this predicament can be articulated as: how to combat anti-liberal movements, which are not constrained in the way that liberal movements and regimes are, without either sacrificing political efficacy or betraying basic liberal principles in the name of defending them? Faced with ruthless anti-liberal attacks, to remain a good liberal (in the sense of adhering to liberal principles) threatens to make one a failed liberal. Yet to become ruthless in the fight against ruthlessness threatens to leave one no longer a liberal at all.[14]

It is telling that Frost and Berlin characterized liberalism as they did at roughly the same time.[15] In the twentieth century, political ruthlessness achieved particular salience as a defining challenge for liberalism. As I show in the next chapter, the embrace of ruthlessness was generated and justified by a reaction against liberalism's perceived failings. Liberalism, in turn, was redefined by its encounter with political ruthlessness. This reflects an important, but often neglected, feature of twentieth-century politics: the conflict between liberals and their fiercest opponents in the early- to mid-twentieth century was fundamentally "ethical" in two distinct senses.

First, the terms of this conflict centered, to a significant extent, on questions of *political ethics*. As distinct from moral philosophy, political ethics (as I understand the term) assumes that politics involves its own characteristic means, challenges, burdens, and opportunities; thinking about "political ethics" means beginning from these political phenomena, rather than beginning with a more universal theory of morality and seeking to draw out applications to politics from this "pre-political" moral theory. At the same time, recognizing the porousness, complexity, and inextricability of politics and other facets of life, political ethics approaches questions about how to act politically within a larger context of thinking about how a life should be lived, and what sort of character we should try to cultivate (or what qualities we want to characterize our conduct toward and relationships with others). As distinct from more "architectonic" forms of political theory, political ethics is concerned, not with general moral duties or purposes, or the institutional architecture of politics, but with the conduct, character, and cultivated convictions of individual actors, as these arise in their pursuit of political projects. If political theory on the whole identifies what sort of political order we should seek, political ethics asks what we should and should not do and be(come) in pursuing that order.

Many accounts of twentieth-century political thought focus on questions of ends, institutions, and policy (the relationship between politics and economics and the proper goals of economic policy; the basis, functions, and

boundaries of the state and political membership; the meaning of concepts such as liberty, equality, justice, authority, or legitimacy).[16] These issues were obviously crucial. But the clash between liberals and anti-liberals also centered on political-ethical questions: how the demands of politics relate to the dictates of personal morality; the relationship between means and ends; the significance of personal character in defining political action. Faced with grotesque horrors—massacre, torture, cynical manipulation, blatant lies, pervasive terror—those I term "tempered liberals" reaffirmed the moral value of scruples—of "inner doubts and hesitations as to the propriety of this or that . . . practice."[17] They also grappled with the ethical challenges that commitment to scruple imposed.

The conflict between liberals and anti-liberals was "ethical," second, insofar as both sides were defined by a *political ethos*: a "stance" or "bearing," formed by patterns of disposition, perception, commitment, and response, which shapes how individuals or groups go about acting politically.[18] The liberals I discuss here, in particular, came to be preoccupied with what the American literary critic Lionel Trilling termed "the morality of morality": reflection not on what course of action should be chosen, but on the *quality* of the moral life lived in pursuit of that course. This quality of moral life, Trilling added, is shaped by the "sensibility" and "manner" through which "political views" are related to the "character of our personal being."[19] These liberals articulated, defended, and exemplified a liberalism shaped by a combination of sensibility, manner, and personal being, with reflection on the "morality of morality."

Retrieving this ethically centered liberalism has two implications for how we think about political theory, and liberal theory in particular. First, it nudges us away from the focus on institutions, and the tendency to think in terms of general principles, which have shaped much recent liberal theory, and toward greater attention to individual character, temperament, and sensibility. In this regard, my account converges with the recent turn of a diverse range of political theorists to the idea of *ethos*—a term I have adopted, and which I clarify in the next chapter.[20] This turn reflects a sense that there is something else, besides "the *formal features* of government" (that is, "institutions, laws, and procedures"[21]), the *general principles* of political morality, or the proper *ends* of politics, to which political theory should pay more attention. Yet the nature of this "something else" often remains obscure. An ethos may be conceived, as William Connolly suggests, as the sensibility or manner through which a "creed" or belief system is applied.[22] I will suggest a more complicated picture: an ethos, as I use the term, encompasses both such a sensibility or temper, and

the larger framework of perception and thought through which it is brought to bear on determining how to hold and act on the creed. To embrace one or another "creed" will influence one toward and away from one or another ethos (or several *ethe*); at the same time, one's ethos will dispose one toward particular creeds. To take ethos seriously is not to neglect the power or importance of theories, doctrines, or arguments. It is, rather, to recognize the important role ethos plays in how these come to be applied—or lived—in political practice. A major claim of this book is that there is something not only paradoxical, but (potentially) self-defeating, and even pathological, about seeking to live a *liberal* "creed" through an illiberal ethos.

Through my analysis of political ruthlessness, and of a line of liberal response to it, I develop an account of ethos that allows us to better grasp what distinguishes liberal and anti-liberal politics, and that may aid us in evaluating different ways of applying and defending liberal ideals. In doing so, I suggest a larger claim: that attending to ethos is vital to understanding what moves and guides individuals, appreciating the quality of their actions, and comprehending what attracts them to, and divides them into, different political camps. In order to understand what was (and is) at stake in the conflict between liberalism and its fiercest enemies, we must, as Amanda Anderson has argued, move beyond blunt ideological labels, defined in terms of doctrines and programs, and attend to contrasting "style[s] and disposition[s]."[23] Politics should be approached, not solely through the question of "who does what to whom for whose benefit,"[24] but also through the additional question of "*how* do they (the actors) do it (the action) to them?" And this "how" should be approached in terms not only of processes of action, but also of the attitudes sustained and the temper and dispositions displayed in actions—qualities that determine the full significance of the action itself. As Andrew Sabl has noted, in politics "Decency"—and much else, both good and bad—"lives in the adverbs: how one intends to exercise power, within what constraints, with what underlying attitudes."[25] The description and analysis of political action should be conducted in a more adjectival and adverbial style than we are often accustomed to practice it.

In addition to suggesting how political (especially liberal) theory may benefit from attending to ethos, my historical account retrieves "another liberalism,"[26] different from those most often encountered in histories of liberalism or discussions of contemporary liberal theory.[27] This liberalism was conceived by those who articulated it as an ethical disposition, irreducible to logically entailed principles or programs. I call this *tempered liberalism*. It is a liberalism tempered—that is, at once chastened, and ultimately reaffirmed and strengthened—by the

crucible of criticism, struggle, and tribulation; a liberalism that is informed by and seeks to maintain a poise of balance between (and maintain its balance *against*) extremes; and a liberalism that centers on personal temperament, seeking not to advance a general theory or program of institutional design or a set of general principles, but to cultivate a particular way of thinking about and engaging in political life. "Tempered" also indicates opposition to ruthlessness—insofar as to be tempered is to be restrained, balanced, circumspect.[28] The ethos of tempered liberalism was not *only* the antithesis of ruthlessness. But rejection of ruthlessness, extremism, and fanaticism was among its central features.

Concerns with both political ruthlessness and liberalism's ability to respond to it—to both counter it effectively and avoid incubating it within liberalism itself—are all too relevant; and I will return to the contemporary resonance of tempered liberalism in the conclusion. But my concerns here are not only contemporary or normative. This is a work of history, which enriches existing accounts of liberalism's past and challenges perceptions of "Cold War liberalism." There has been, among many political theorists and historians, what Jan-Werner Müller calls a "systematic forgetting" of what Cold War liberals "actually said and meant."[29] Narratives of postwar liberalism typically identify one, or some combination, of several tendencies. One is a change of *mood* from a more ambitious and hopeful to a "conservative," gloomy, anxious liberalism, which discouraged political experimentation and effervescence.[30] Closely connected to this is a shift in *political program* from the more "progressive" liberalism embodied in the New Deal (especially in its earlier years) to a combination of "managerial" rule, cultural "consensus," and defense of the status quo.[31] Another story depicts liberalism becoming abstract, individualistic, and privatized; this shift was both substantive (emphasizing personal rights, private interests, and fair procedures rather than civic duties, virtuous character formation, and the common good) and methodological (relying on abstract theorizing rather than "thick" political and social analysis).[32] Postwar liberalism, on this account, was *de-moralizing*, in the double sense of sapping enthusiasm by failing to offer an inspiring ethical ideal and undercutting concern with civic virtue; and *depoliticizing*, encouraging a retreat from civic responsibilities. Finally, critics attribute to postwar liberalism a growing rigidity, as it defined itself against a Communist "other," dug in its heels, and closed its mind.[33] These shifts are seen as fostering "quietism," "defeatism,"[34] "disillusionment," a "celebration of apathy," and "the sickness of complacency,"[35] thereby stifling political imagination and experimentation, and obstructing progress.[36]

These stories, accurate concerning *some* postwar liberalisms, do not capture the full story; they are misleading when applied to tempered liberals, who remained morally robust and politically engaged—and, indeed, stressed the need to cultivate an ethically strenuous set of dispositions, if liberal politics were to be sustained. Nor did tempered liberalism represent a turn to a cramping liberal fundamentalism. This, indeed, is one reason for its neglect. Always too complex, unsystematic, and personal to serve as the basis of a movement or ideology, tempered liberalism was eclipsed both by alternative responses to totalitarianism which offered more robust defenses of the superiority of constitutionalist and capitalist institutions, and the more systematic "high liberalism" of Rawls and others. Subsequent "communitarian" and "realist" critiques of Rawlsian, "individualist," or libertarian variants of liberalism, for all their theoretical and practical importance, have tended to lack tempered liberalism's sense of the existential fragility of liberalism as a political achievement, and the ethical demandingness of liberalism as a political disposition. Recent expositions of liberalism have also neglected tempered liberals' practice of *exemplarity*—their efforts to engage in a noncoercive and nonperfectionist political-ethical pedagogy through the evocation of a liberal ethos, both in their accounts of others and their own conduct and authorial personae.

For Lionel Trilling, the "great vice of academicism" is "that it is concerned with ideas rather than with thinking"—fostering the belief that "some ideas can betray us, others save us," so that we are inclined to "blame ideas for our troubles, rather than blaming what is a very different thing—our own bad thinking."[37] Liberal theory, in our day as in Trilling's, sometimes falls prey to academicism; tempered liberalism provides a corrective. It is certainly no political panacea. But its proponents are too often neglected—or dismissed for what they are confidently, but wrongly, assumed to have said and done. The recovery of what tempered liberals faced and proposed is important both to setting the historical record straight, and setting liberalism on a more fruitful path of political engagement, which grapples with questions of character and the challenges of ruthlessness, and provides a perspective from which to confront the challenges and dangers that continue to face liberalism.

The Shape of Things to Come

In this book I examine four thinkers who contributed to the articulation of tempered liberalism: Reinhold Niebuhr, Albert Camus, Raymond Aron, and Isaiah Berlin. These thinkers shared a sometimes ambivalent but enduring

commitment to democracy, a combination of connection to and departures from classical liberalism, an eschewal of systematic theory—and, above all, a central preoccupation with political ethics and "the liberal predicament," and recognition of ethos as a crucial dimension of politics.[38] They also occupied similar ideological space. All viewed themselves, at least initially, as men of the left; and their liberalism was definitively left of center, affirming both liberal personal freedoms and some version of a "mixed economy" and redistributionist welfare state—and implacably opposed to both Fascism and Communism. Roughly contemporaries (born between 1892 and 1914, and prominent following World War II), they were intellectual and political fellow-travelers (Berlin and Niebuhr were friendly and shared a mutual admiration; Berlin and Aron, and Aron and Camus, knew each other but were cooler in their mutual regard). Each articulated distinctive variations on a tempered liberal vision—and exemplified different versions of how a tempered liberal ethos could be lived.[39] Each recognized ruthlessness as a temptation, to which they were drawn to varying degrees and for various reasons. Each developed (similar) diagnoses of ruthlessness, its attractions, psychological-ethical grip, and dangers; each saw ruthlessness, and the anti-liberal politics and ethos to which it was connected, as an ethical problem that was deep, and not simple. They all faced up to "the liberal predicament": how to respond to anti-liberal ruthlessness without coming to imitate it, thereby betraying liberalism itself—but also without betraying one's responsibility to fight for liberalism effectively. And they all responded to this problem by turning their attention to matters of ethos.

Reflecting my concerns with questions of personal character, temperament, style, bearing, and conduct—and echoing their own approaches—my treatment of these figures is "exemplary": I not only reconstruct their arguments, but evoke their personal visions and dispositions, analyze their intellectual style and sensibility, and explore what we can learn from both their practice of political reflection and reflections on political practice. To thus treat them as exemplary is not to claim for them perfection; it is to suggest that we can learn not only from their arguments, but their examples—or, that their efforts to set examples of intellectual engagement and liberal political commitment themselves embody political-ethical arguments, and, taken up critically, can serve as a form of political pedagogy.

Before turning to these individuals, the first chapter clarifies the concept of ethos, explicates the phenomenon of *morally inspired ideological ruthlessness*, and seeks to substantiate my claim that such ruthlessness constituted a central element in twentieth-century political thought and practice, one that

presented a particular challenge for liberalism. In the process, I show how considerations of political efficacy and personal purity intertwined in inspiring ruthlessness; and how the vindication of ruthlessness formed a central part of an ethical critique of liberalism. Chapter 2 then provides a more in-depth exploration of the way in which the imperatives and attractions of realism and moral purism intersected, and how these connected to struggles with and over liberalism, through the stories of two representative figures of the early twentieth century. Max Weber's political ethics anticipated, and in some cases directly informed, tempered liberalism—though Weber remains a politically and ethically ambiguous figure. These ambiguities are reflected in the intellectual and political vicissitudes of Weber's friend György Lukács, who illustrates how impulses toward moral purity and hard-headed realism—and an ethos of intellectual extremism and total commitment—came together to inspire ruthless, anti-liberal politics.

The next four chapters examine four thinkers who, formed by the crisis of liberal democracy between the wars, became leading liberal voices in the postwar period. Despite significant differences of intellectual framework, personal sensibility, and political approach, Camus, Aron, Niebuhr, and Berlin shared a preoccupation with the political-ethical problems raised by the assault on liberalism in their day. All approached politics in terms of the personal choices involved in political action and the importance of ethos in informing these choices—though they varied in the extent to which they approached politics and its ethical demands from the perspective of political leaders (as Aron and, to a lesser degree, Berlin did), or from the perspective of ordinary citizens and committed activists (as Niebuhr and, especially, Camus did). They also differed in how they navigated between the perspectives of engaged political actor and critical intellectual—and their different formulations of a tempered liberal ethos reflect this. None of them were simple or sanguine in their commitment to liberalism; some went through periods of flirtation with anti-liberalism. Each sought to temper liberalism with an awareness of liberalism's drawbacks and defects; and to maintain an ethical equipoise between excessive moral idealism and excessive realism. Each struck this balance differently; their differences complement and temper one another, revealing tensions within tempered liberalism, but also contributing to its overall richness and capacity for self-correction.

In the conclusion I draw out some of these tensions, and the vulnerabilities to which they point. I also draw together the insights of the thinkers I have discussed to offer my own conception of tempered liberalism as a

distinctive political stance from which to interpret and evaluate liberal goals and practices. And I draw on the insights and lessons of tempered liberalism to offer arguments on how to respond to the ethical challenges liberalism recurrently faces.

The reader may ask: why look for answers, or at least matter for reflection, in the pages of twentieth-century history? Is there not a danger of foisting our perceptions of the present onto the past, thus distorting it by remaking it in our own image; or of being captured by the (purported) lessons of this past, so that we are blind to the specific conditions of the present? Ought we not do our thinking for ourselves, based on the circumstances of our own time? To this, three points can be made. First, we must of course do our own thinking for ourselves. But we seldom do such thinking wholly alone: we draw from others, different from ourselves, to sharpen our vision and widen our imaginations. The history of political thought should certainly seek a fuller and more faithful understanding of the past in its own terms; it may also serve to liberate us from the thralldom of received ideas. But it also contributes to our political thinking as a source of good interlocutors, and even models.

Second, drawing on history to inform political judgment and imagination does not depend on discerning exact parallels or establishing simple lessons to be mechanically applied. We should, rather, use the combination of similarity and difference, proximity and distance, to see more clearly *both* the uniqueness of our time and the ways in which we are not the first to encounter certain problems—and that we may be unconsciously emulating follies that we readily recognize in others. Such comparisons need not assume eternal, unchanging verities; but they do posit recurrence. Like the Polish dissident intellectual Adam Michnik, I return to past political and moral thinking "not so that the language of that reign of terror may never repeat itself, but because I'm convinced it will inevitably do so"—if it has not already.[40]

Third, there *are some* respects in which the twentieth century is lamentably relevant. While changes in technology, demographics, the workings of the economy, and the global political order have created a significantly different world,[41] the mid-century world of economic collapse, cultural despair, mass displacement, and ever-looming war seems familiar; so do the responses of demagoguery, dehumanizing hatred of others, fanatical partisanship, a longing for macho "heroes" free of scruple and doubt, a taste for amoral "greatness," and ideological extremism. Twentieth-century politics are, to borrow a phrase from James Joyce, a nightmare from which we are still trying to awake—and into which we often seem to be sinking.[42] Political theory and moral inquiry

should not shrink from confronting that nightmare. In doing so, they may be greatly helped by those who lived through it—and in whom it bred an anxious, but resolute, wakefulness.

My retrieval of a facet of twentieth-century political argument, and of the tempered liberal response, is thus intended to be both of historical interest, and of more than historical interest. The story I tell has a resonance beyond the particular time I discuss. It is a story of the vices of virtue: of how terrible evil can grow out of idealism, benevolence, and conscientiousness. It is also (I hope) a story of how political actors can learn, not (as Machiavelli has it) "how not to be good," but rather better and worse ways to go about trying to be good within the circumstances of politics. It is an argument for modesty, fortitude, forbearance, intellectual flexibility, ethical resolution, and decency as political dispositions—and a reminder that these seemingly humdrum, unheroic qualities may in fact be demanding and necessary virtues. My approach—turning from general ethical problems posed by ruthlessness for liberal politics, to a particular historical period and tendency of thought as a way of thinking about these more general problems—is admittedly, and deliberately, untidy. I have sought to address problems of political ethics through an exploration of history and psychology, which necessarily remains suggestive and open-ended. To deal with matters of ethos rather than concepts or logical systems introduces a necessary degree of imprecision. In a work animated by the conviction that the search for simplicity and purity is delusive and dangerous, a certain untidiness may be a virtue. Readers should not look to obtain answers to all questions raised in this book; the point is rather to show the importance of grappling with the questions—and that some ways of grappling are better than others.

Before proceeding, I wish to clear up a possible misapprehension. In this book I not only reconstruct, but defend, tempered liberalism, and draw on it to criticize a set of impulses often exhibited in anti-liberalism: intolerance, self-righteousness, craving for simplicity and certainty, deafness to dialogue, righteous ruthlessness. This threatens to produce an "anti-anti-liberalism" resembling that which it opposes in dogmatism, self-righteousness, and intolerance. This is a danger to which the thinkers I discuss were keenly alive (though not always immune). Indeed, tempered liberalism was defined by an effort to avoid becoming what it opposed. For my part, I disclaim any moral superiority. I have been preoccupied by the vices just mentioned not only because I feel horror at them, but because I recognize their pull in myself. One is less interested in diseases to which one is immune.

INDEX

absolutism: Camus's critique of, 75–77, 86–87, 96; of ends vs. of means, 22; Lukács's, 57–58, 60; Niebuhr's rejection of, 162–63; in seeking justice, 76, 80–81; Weber's critique of, 48. *See also* extremism; idealism; moral purism; purity
abstraction: Berlin's critique of, 170, 175; Camus's critique of, 79, 84, 89–91; Herzen's critique of, 177–78; liberalism criticized for, 8, 38. *See also* purity; simplicity/simplification
absurdity, 71–73
Adams, Henry, 142
African Americans, 146, 250n40, 251n68, 263n32
Akhmatova, Anna, 172
Alain (pen name of Émile-Auguste Chartier), 105, 109
Algeria, 71, 82, 94–98, 128–29
Algerian People's Party, 71
Allende, Salvador, 122, 246n108
Americans for Democratic Action, 249n4
Anderson, Amanda, 7
anti-Communism, 115–16, 118, 152, 173, 189, 215, 258n96, 258n97
anti-liberalism: characteristics of, 13, 26–27, 35; critiques of, 122; as an ethos, 35–38; on ideological spectrum, 27, 37; left-wing, 27–28, 219–20, 229n60; Lukács and, 1, 11; meanings of, 3, 223n8; and political ethics, 5–6; political ethos of, 6–7; power as chief tool of, 27; as response to failures of liberalism, 26–27, 173, 219–20; right-wing, 27–28, 229n60; ruthlessness linked to, 2–3, 27; Weber and, 40–41. *See also* liberalism; ruthlessness
apocalypticism, 18, 113, 226n18. *See also* millenarianism
Arendt, Hannah, 29, 102, 226n39
Aristotle, 31–32, 33, 68
Aron, Raymond, 102–36; and Algeria, 128–29; Berlin and, 186; Camus and, 82, 102; and Communism, 115–19; compared to other tempered liberals, 10–11; and conscientious objection, 144; on democracy, 111–12; and economics, 245n89; ethos advocated by, 109–10, 113, 118, 121–28, 131, 134, 198; and French politics, 104, 106, 123–24, 128–29, 131; and Gaullism, 123–24; intellectual development of, 103–4; intellectual ethic of, 131–35; and international relations, 125–29; and liberalism, 36, 104–6, 110–11, 120, 124, 126–27, 131–36, 203; and the liberal predicament, 103, 105, 111–12, 119, 122, 124, 129, 135; limits advocated by, 107, 109, 121; and Machiavellianism, 110–16, 121–26, 135; and the New Left, 152, 246n116; Niebuhr and, 153, 156–57, 164; philosophy of history of, 107–8, 116–17; and politics, 102, 105–9, 112–36, 200–201, 209; and prudence, 127–30; and realism, 102, 103, 106–7, 112–13, 119, 125, 129–31, 135; and realism as ethos, 125, 156; reputation of, 102–3; and tempered liberalism, 9–11, 102–3, 133–34; and totalitarianism, 104–5, 110–12, 119–20; and Weber, 106, 109, 130

Aron, Raymond, works by: "Democratic and Totalitarian States," 110; "The Future of the Secular Religions," 113; "History and Politics," 114; *Introduction to the Philosophy of History*, 107–8; *The Opium of the Intellectuals*, 116–18; "On Treason," 131
asceticism: Aron and, 131; Camus and, 71, 77, 87; Lukács and, 65; revolutionary, 20, 37, 49; Weber and, 54, 65
Ascoli, Max, 24, 29
Auden, W. H., 26
Augustine, Saint, 154
Auschwitz, 24

Bakunin, Mikhail, 175, 176
Bavarian People's Party, 47
Bavarian Soviet Republic, 21, 47–48
Beauvoir, Simone de, 88, 115
Bell, Duncan, 223n7, 224n10, 224n16
Benda, Julien, *La Trahison des Clercs*, 103–4
Berlin, Isaiah, 166–96; and Algeria, 129; Aron and, 102, 186; and character, 167; on Communism, 28, 173, 189, 258n96, 258n97; compared to other tempered liberals, 10–11; dilemma of personal responsibility vs. personal integrity, 169, 170, 173–74, 186–87; on Fascism, 28; Herzen as model for, 176–79; on horrors of twentieth century, 15; and humanism, 192–94; and idealism, 170, 172; influence of, 166, 196; intellectual development of, 167–69; and irony, 191–92; and liberal ethos, 167, 189–96, 198, 254n5; and liberalism, 28, 166–67, 257n53, 264n59; and the liberal predicament, 5, 169–70; and limits, 189, 259n101; and moderation/modesty, 188–91; and morality, 170; and the New Left, 152; and pluralism, 166–67, 189–96, 259n101; on political efficacy, 182–85; and political ethics, 170, 179, 186; and politics, 169, 173–74, 179, 186–88, 192; and realism, 169–72, 256n29; and Russian Revolution, 24, 167–68; studies of exemplary individuals by, 175–82, 196, 209; and tempered liberalism, 9–11, 166, 195–96; Turgenev as model for, 179–82; and violence, 168
Berman, Sheri, 224n16
Bloom, Allan, 131
Blum, Leon, 104
Bobbio, Norberto, 226n39
Bolshevism: apocalypticism of, 18; Berlin's experience of, 167–68; ethos of, 60, 176; Lukács and, 58–62; Weber's critique of, 49
Bonner, Elena, 212
bourgeoisie, criticisms of, 14, 35, 69, 176, 228n53
Brecht, Bertolt, 63, 212; *The Measures Taken*, 20–21, 22
Brinkley, Alan, 214
Brogan, Denis, 105
Burnham, James, *Suicide of the West*, 29, 30
Butzel, Fred M., 157

Camus, Albert, 68–101; and the absurd, 71–73; and Algeria, 71, 82, 94–98, 128–29; Aron and, 82, 102; compared to other tempered liberals, 10–11; and Communism, 71, 82–83, 85; and death penalty, 75, 78, 89–90; ethos (style of life) advocated by, 70, 72, 74, 81–84, 86–88, 97–101, 198; and heroism, 68–70, 73–74, 88–89, 91–94; intellectual development of, 70–71; and justice, 69, 71–72, 75–76, 80, 96, 100; and liberalism, 25, 69–70; and the liberal predicament, 74; limits advocated by, 4, 83–84, 87–88, 96, 99–100, 107, 240n119; and Lukács, 78; and morality, 73, 84–85, 96, 98; Niebuhr and, 158, 164; particularism of, 84–85, 96; and politics, 69–70, 86, 98–101; postwar positions of, 75–82; and rebellion, 83–87, 89–90, 93, 100, 175; and the Resistance, 70, 73–74; and tempered liberalism, 9–11, 100–102; and violence, 74, 77–83, 86–87, 89–90, 95; and Weber, 86
Camus, Albert, works by: *Caligula*, 72–73; *Les Justes* (*The Just Assassins*), 78–80; "Letters to a German Friend," 73; *The Myth of Sisyphus*, 72; "Neither Victims

Nor Executioners," 76–78, 96; *The Plague*, 88–94; *The Rebel*, 78, 82–84, 96, 107; *The Stranger*, 72
Carr, E. H., 231n110
Castro, Fidel, 186
certainty: action in absence of, 31, 106, 117, 125, 128, 131, 161, 170, 187, 189, 214; psychological desire for, 13, 16–17, 30, 31, 168, 170, 187, 196, 205, 214
Channing, William Ellery, 43
character: Aron and, 121, 127; Berlin and, 167; Camus and, 86; ethos in relation to, 31, 33; exemplification of, 209–11; liberalism and democracy lacking in cultivation of, 120; Lukács on, 60–61; Shklar's "liberal character," 202–3; tempered liberalism and, 209–11; Weber on politics and, 46–47, 49–51, 53–56
charisma, 24, 60
Chartier, Émile-Auguste. *See* Alain
Chile, 122
China, 26
chivalry, 53–54. *See also* honor
choice: Aron and, 106, 108; Berlin and, 186, 190, 191, 192; Camus and, 80, 96; ethos as ground of, 109; ethos exhibited through, 32; political role of, 11; Weber and, 41, 43
Christianity: liberalism in relation to, 138; Niebuhr and, 138–40, 152, 160–61, 163–64, 253n115, 254n134, 254n136; realism linked to, 160–61, 163–65
Churchill, Winston, 182, 185, 188, 209, 257n83
Cicero, 42
Civil Rights Movement, 251n68, 263n28, 263n32
coercion. *See* power; violence
Cohen, G. A., 32
Colby, William, 215
Cold War: Aron and, 115, 119, 129; Berlin and, 189; Camus and, 82–84; as contest of ideals, 205; defense of Communism during, 19; Niebuhr and, 148–52
Cold War liberalism. *See* postwar liberalism
Combat (newspaper), 70, 76, 102
Communism: apocalypticism of, 113; Aron's critique of, 115–19; attractions of, 173; authoritarianism of, 27; Berlin on, 28, 172–73, 189; Camus and, 71; criticisms of, 2; end-maximalism of, 2, 16, 17, 19, 173; ethos of, 37, 38–39, 173; historicism underlying, 17, 61–62; human transformation as goal of, 18, 36, 61, 71; liberalism and, 10, 28–29, 38, 147–48, 172–73; Lukács and, 58–65; Manicheanism of, 20, 62; Niebuhr's critique of, 147–50; political ethos of, 155; purity as ideal of, 62; realism and utopianism combined in, 172–73; ruthlessness of, 36; Sartre's adherence to, 83; as secular religion, 113–14; statements by former adherents of, 14–15, 16, 17, 38, 61
complacency, criticisms of liberal, 8, 137–38, 145, 149–50, 152, 165, 205, 211–12
complexity: Aron and, 103; aversion/insensitivity to, 38, 84, 87, 118, 140, 153, 179, 205; Berlin and, 177, 179, 181, 190; Camus and, 73, 76, 83, 84, 88; liberal acceptance/embrace of, 204–7; of moral/political life, 5, 131, 140, 151, 160, 177, 179, 181, 190; Niebuhr and, 140, 151, 153, 156, 160, 163. *See also* simplicity/simplification
compromise: Aron and, 109, 119, 123, 132; Berlin and, 166, 191; Camus's criticism of, 69, 75, 86; as liberal attribute, 35, 138, 140; Lukács's criticism of, 59–60, 62, 63; Niebuhr and, 138, 140, 146; in politics, 109, 119, 146, 174; purists' rejection of, 59–60, 62, 63, 118, 174
Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), 115, 173, 244n73
Connolly, William, 6, 259n101
conscience: absence/suppression of, 16–17, 22, 37, 68, 80, 98–99, 114, 126, 169, 171, 187; Aron and, 126–27; Camus's advocacy of, 98–100; Niebuhr and, 156, 159
consequentialism, 17–18, 45–46, 50, 55, 60, 79, 114, 145
Constant, Benjamin, 69, 203, 261n14

constitutionalism: democracy and, 121; fragility of, 207; liberal faith in, 9, 25, 207. *See also* institutions
contrition, 137, 138, 150, 157, 159, 164
courage: Aron and, 107, 133; Berlin and, 187–88; Camus and, 72–73, 82, 93–94; as common anti-liberal value, 35, 37; Niebuhr and, 161; tempered liberalism and, 213; Turgenev and, 181; Weber and, 44. *See also* fortitude
Crăiuțu, Aurelian, 200
cruelty, 17, 19, 38, 68, 93, 155, 195, 202, 213
cynicism: Aron on, 110, 112–14; Berlin and, 172, 175, 186; Camus on, 73, 82, 85, 87; idealism blended with, 2, 20; Niebuhr and, 138, 143, 148, 163–65, 252n81; political ruthlessness grounded in, 20; realpolitik associated with, 44; secular religions and, 113–14; tempered liberalism's avoidance of, 31, 39; Weber and, 42, 44, 47. *See also* realism

death penalty, 75, 78, 89–90
decency: Aron and, 133, 136; Berlin and, 170, 184–85, 194; Camus and, 71, 74, 76, 88, 93–94, 101; as concern with means over ends, 22, 23; as liberal trait, 13, 25, 31, 199, 200; as matter of ethical style, 7; Niebuhr and, 146; political efficacy vs. moral, 22, 23, 185; in politics, 23, 44, 54; Turgenev and, 180; Weber and, 54, 130
de Gaulle, Charles, 123–24
dehumanization, 12, 74, 113, 168, 169, 194. *See also* inhumanity
democracy: Aron and, 111–12, 119–20; Camus on, 99; critiques of, 120–21; ethos linked to, 121–22; irresponsibility imputed to governments of, 26; judgment as necessary attribute in, 155–56; liberalism in relation to, 25, 149; Lukács on, 58–60; modesty as value in, 99, 120; Niebuhr and, 154–59; self-destructive tendencies in, 121; skepticism as attribute of, 156; threats to, 155–56; totalitarianism vs., 110–12, 119–20, 205–6. *See also* liberalism
Detroit, 139, 157
dialogue: Aron and, 132; Camus's advocacy of, 77–78, 96, 97; as essential feature of liberalism, 132; Niebuhr and, 162–63
dictatorship, 60, 148, 239n60
dignity: Berlin and, 169, 172; Camus and, 68, 73, 76, 84, 87, 100; Herzen and, 177; as liberal value, 30, 111; Weber and, 41, 52–53, 235n85
dirty hands concept, 57, 58, 127, 142, 145, 151, 186
disillusionment: Camus's warning against, 75, 99; imputed to postwar liberalism, 8; Niebuhr and, 161, 254n122; Weber's warning against, 47, 54
dispositions, 6–7, 19, 31–34, 36, 51–52, 77, 84, 118, 121, 129, 156, 190, 191–94, 204, 207–9, 224n20, 230n92, 231n95
doctrine: adherence to, 16, 62, 167, 170, 176, 186–87; ethos contrasted with, 31, 38–39, 55, 82, 118, 131, 156, 175; freedom from, 66; particularity/experience in contrast to, 84, 92, 100, 170
dogmatism: anti-liberal, 13; Aron and, 119, 156; attractions of, 170; Berlin's opposition to, 170, 175, 187, 189, 195; Camus's critique of, 77–78, 99–100; liberal, 170, 205, 214; liberalism's rejection of, 35, 66, 99–100, 119, 179; Machiavellianism and, 114; Niebuhr and, 156; realism linked to, 200
Dostoevsky, Fyodor, 58
doubt. *See* scruples
Dresden, 24
Durkheim, Émile, 103, 203

Eisner, Kurt, 47–49
end-maximalism: absolutism and, 22; in Communism, 2, 16, 17, 19, 173; ruthlessness grounded in, 17. *See also* means-end relationship
Esprit (journal), 106–7
ethics. *See* morality; political ethics; political ethos
ethos: action in relation to, 216; anti-liberalism as, 35–38; Aristotelian concepts of, 31–32;

Aron and, 109–10, 113, 118, 121–28, 131, 134; Berlin and, 167, 189–96, 254n5; Berlin's characterological studies of, 175–82; Bolshevism as, 60, 176; Camus and, 70, 72, 74, 81–84, 86–88, 97–101; character in relation to, 31, 33; of Communism, 37, 38–39, 173; components of, 32; concept of, 6–7, 31–35; creeds in relation to, 7; democratic, 121–22; exemplary presentation of, 157; explication of, 34–35; Foucauldian conception of, 32; institutions in relation to, 207–8; liberalism as, 35, 121–22, 140, 189–96, 202–3, 206–7; Niebuhr and, 154–65; pluralism as, 190, 259n101; realism as, 125, 156–57; ruthlessness as, 36–38, 216, 218; shaping of, 33; significance of, in explaining individuals' behavior, 6–7, 198; in tempered liberalism, 8, 34, 208–11, 218–21; Weber's, for political action, 46, 50–56. *See also* political ethos

Evangelical Social Congress, 50

evil: good in relation to, 2, 19–20, 48, 59–60; Lukács's confrontation with, 57–60; Manichean view of, 19–20, 62; Niebuhr on, 145–46, 155, 158–61; as outgrowth of idealism, 13

exemplarity: Aron and, 131, 134–35; Berlin and, 185–86, 196; in Berlin's studies of historical figures, 175–82, 185, 196, 209; Camus and, 96–97; ethos and, 157; of heroes, 212; as methodological tool, 10; moral, 85, 263n43; Niebuhr and, 137, 157, 161–62; pedagogical function of, 10, 196, 210–11, 263n43; prudence exhibited through, 128; tempered liberals' practice of, 9, 10, 97, 210–13; Tolstoy and, 196; Weber and, 47, 65, 66, 130

L'Express (newspaper), 115

extremism: Berlin's critique of, 171, 187; Berlin's studies in, 175–76; Camus and the dangers of, 69, 70–75, 84, 88; Lukács's embodiment of, 11, 65–66; tempered liberalism's rejection of, 8; Weber's attitude toward, 41, 45, 48, 65–66. *See also* absolutism; moral purism

fanaticism: of anti-liberal ethos, 12; Aron's critique of, 104, 109, 115–17, 135–36; Berlin's critique of, 168, 170, 171, 172; Camus's critique of, 77, 84, 87; idealism linked to, 20; of ideological adherents, 16, 38; Niebuhr's critique of, 138, 149–50, 152; responses to, 22; secular religions and, 113–14; tempered liberalism's rejection of, 8, 35, 68; value of, 35

fascism: Berlin on, 28; Camus's opposition to, 70–71; human transformation as goal of, 36; liberalism's opposition to, 10; as response to failures of liberalism, 23–24; ruthlessness of, 36

Feiler, Arthur, 24

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 58

Le Figaro (newspaper), 115

Flathman, Richard, 224n20

FLN. *See* National Liberation Front

forbearance, 4, 13, 82, 121, 122, 127, 157, 195, 199, 205, 213, 220, 263n36

Ford, Henry, 139–40

fortitude: as anti-liberal trait, 199; Aron and, 128, 133; Berlin and, 187–88; Camus and, 88; as liberal trait, 13, 199, 211, 214, 259n101; Niebuhr and, 161. *See also* courage

Foucault, Michel, 32

France: and Algeria, 71, 82, 94–98, 128–29; Aron and the politics of, 104, 106, 123–24, 128–29, 131; Nazi-occupied, 70, 73–78, 131, 199

France Libre (journal), 112–13, 124

Frankfurt School, 226n39

freedom/liberty: Aron and, 104, 107, 118, 120–21, 131–32, 134; Berlin and, 166, 195, 259n101; Camus and, 69, 100–101; Communist conception of, 62; defined, 3; and exemplification, 210; individual, 3; as liberal value, 3, 4, 25, 27, 28, 30, 100–101, 120–21, 131–32, 134, 178, 259n101; limits as essential to, 259n101; morality linked to, 140–41; Niebuhr and, 149, 155; Weber and, 41, 42

Freikorps, 50

Freisler, Roland, 27
French Revolutionary Terror, 1, 3. *See also* Jacobins
Frost, Robert, 4, 214

Galileo Galilei, 212
Gandhi, Mohandas, 144–45
George, Stefan, 57
German Democratic Party, 41
German Evangelical Synod, Detroit, 139
Goldmann, Lucien, 60
good/goodness: evil in relation to, 2, 19–20, 48, 59–60; Lukács's ethic of, 57–59; Manichean view of, 19–20, 62
Graham, Billy, 152
Grossman, Vasily, *Life and Fate*, 2
Guilhot, Nicolas, 230n78

Habermas, Jürgen, 40
Halevy, Élie, 104
Hall, Edward, 261n10
Hampshire, Stuart, 22–23, 174, 261n10
happiness, 41, 74, 89, 92–93, 100
hatred, Camus on rejection of, 74–76
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 15–16
Hayek, F. A., 226n39
Hegel, G.W.F., 60, 63, 83, 85, 95, 98, 175
heroism: anti-liberal, 36, 38, 213; attractions of, 12, 53, 70, 212; Berlin and, 188–89; Camus and, 68–70, 73–74, 88–89, 91–94; characteristics of, 213; criticisms of, 188–89, 213; exemplary, 212; Niebuhr and, 161; tempered liberalism and, 212–14; types of, 213; Weber and, 43, 53–54
Herzen, Alexander, 176–79, 181–82, 185, 189, 209, 257n53, 257n54
Hess, Moses, 63
Hiroshima, 24
historicism: Camus's critique of, 77, 85; defined, 17; liberalism and, 18; Lukács's adherence to, 61–62; ruthlessness grounded in, 17–18, 85; skepticism about, 18, 140
history, Aron's philosophy of, 107–8, 116–17
Hitler, Adolf, 27, 41
Hoffmann, Stanley, 103
Holmes, Stephen, 223n8
Holodomor (Soviet terror-famine), 14–15, 35
honor: Aron and, 131, 134; Camus and, 74–75, 77; tempered liberalism and, 202, 212, 213; Weber and, 44, 53
Hoover, J. Edgar, 152
hope: Aron and, 133; Camus and, 73, 91, 100; Christian realism and, 161; criticism of unrealistic, 24, 50; as liberal attribute, 133; Lukács and, 58, 63; optimism contrasted with, 91; value of, 91, 100. *See also* optimism
Howe, Irving, 34
humanism, 1, 14–16, 19, 25, 168, 192–94
humanity, sense of, 28, 158, 166, 169, 182, 193–94, 199. *See also* inhumanity
humility: Aron and, 107, 109, 131, 136; Niebuhr and, 137, 154, 158; skepticism linked to, 178. *See also* modesty
humor, 157–58. *See also* irony; irreverence
Hungarian Communist Party, 60, 62
Hungarian Soviet Republic, 56

idealism: Aron and, 104, 107, 125; Berlin and, 170, 172, 178, 181; critiques of, 20; cynicism blended with, 2, 20; disgust/impatience with, 19; Lukács and, 58, 63; Niebuhr and, 140; realism blended with, 20, 200; ruthlessness as outgrowth of, 1, 13, 16, 20–21, 200; Weber and, 42–43, 45, 48–49. *See also* absolutism; moral purism
ideology: anti-liberalism displayed along spectrum of, 27; Aron's critique of, 108, 116; Camus's rejection of, 70, 80, 99; tempered liberals' opposition to, 211; Weber's critique of, 47–51
individuals: anti-liberalism's appeal to the claims of, 27; Aron on sociopolitical status of, 106, 126; Berlin's dilemma of political responsibility vs. personal integrity for,

169, 170, 173–74, 186–87; Berlin's studies of exemplary, 175–82, 196, 209; Camus on sociopolitical status of, 71, 73, 83–85; common humanity of, 193; ethos as context for behavior of, 6–7, 32–33, 109–10; freedom of, 3; liberalism's focus on, 3–4, 8, 30, 35, 42, 120, 192–93; as locus of morality, 85; Lukács on sociopolitical role of, 57, 61–62, 64; neglect/sacrifice of, for moral or collective ends, 1, 4, 17, 22, 37, 79–80, 84, 89, 92, 96, 139, 175, 192–93, 195; Niebuhr on, as locus of morality, 140; selfish concerns of, 140–41; terror's violation of, 169, 171; transformation of, as Communist/Nazi goal, 18, 36, 61, 71; Weber on sociopolitical status of, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 65, 66
inhumanity, 1, 16, 25, 57, 92, 97, 98, 136, 148, 183, 199. *See also* dehumanization; humanity, sense of
institutions: anti-liberal critique of, 2, 25–27; ethos in relation to, 207–8; liberal reliance on, 3, 9, 25, 26, 29–30, 202, 207–8; liberal theory's focus on, 3, 6. *See also* constitutionalism
integrity: Aron on, 109, 127, 131, 132, 134–35; Berlin on, 169, 172, 173, 182, 186–87; Lukács and, 64, 65; moral, 23, 49, 53, 59; Niebuhr on, 155–57, 165; political responsibility in relation to personal, 64, 103, 127, 132, 134–35, 169, 173–74, 186–87; tempered liberalism and, 199, 215, 216; Weber on, 50, 53, 54, 59, 65
intellectuals, role of, 104, 106, 131–35, 169–72, 177–78, 182, 186
international relations, 125–29, 150–51, 153
International Rescue Committee, 249n4
intolerance, characteristic of anti-liberalism, 13, 20, 52, 63, 77, 79, 86, 99
irony, 158, 191–92, 198, 253n107. *See also* humor; irreverence
irreverence, 177–78, 198–99. *See also* humor
Isherwood, Christopher, 26
Israel, 173–74

Jacobins, 84
Japan, 26
Japanese Americans, 146
Jaspers, Karl, 53
Jeanson, Francis, 83, 98
Johnson, Lyndon B., 152
Jouvenel, Bertrand de, 134
Joyce, James, 12
judgment: Aron on, 106, 109–10, 127, 131; Berlin on, 182–3, 195; Camus on, 84, 88; democratic politics dependent on, 155–56; ethos crucial for, 32, 34; and exemplification, 209, 210; Niebuhr on, 155–56, 159, 162; political, 106, 182–83, 194, 218; Weber on, 51
Judt, Tony, 82, 98
Junger, Ernst, 228n53
justice: Camus and, 69, 71–72, 75–76, 80, 96, 100; critique of absolutist conception of, 76, 80–81; as liberal value, 4, 25, 27, 28; love in relation to, 252n88; Niebuhr and, 143, 154–56, 252n88; Weber and, 53
just war concept, 19, 146

Kant, Immanuel, 43, 262n20
Kateb, George, 80
Katyn, 24
Kautsky, Karl, 57
Kennan, George, 125, 153
Khrushchev, Nikita, 14
King, Martin Luther, Jr., 152, 212, 250n40
Koestler, Arthur, 18, 20, 36, 207
Kopelev, Lev Zalmanovich, 14–15, 16, 38
Kun, Béla, 60

Lenin, Vladimir, 1, 24, 27, 37, 60, 63–64, 85, 176
Lewis, John, 212
liberal character, 202–3
liberal egalitarianism, 202, 204, 206

liberalism: Aron and, 36, 104–6, 110–11, 120, 124, 126–27, 131–36, 203; Berlin and, 28, 166–67, 189–96, 254n5, 257n53, 264n59; Camus and, 25, 69–70; challenges posed by extreme situations for, 89; characteristics of, 3–4, 35, 149; Christianity in relation to, 138; and Communism, 10, 28–29, 38, 172–73; complacency imputed to, 8, 137–38, 145, 149–50, 152, 165, 205, 211–12; critiques of, 4–5, 23–31, 39, 120–21, 122, 139–48, 217, 219; defenses of, 29–30, 197; democracy in relation to, 25, 149; dialogue as essential feature of, 132; diversity and tensions within, 3–4, 53, 88, 138, 149, 206, 208; ethical critiques of, 25–28; as an ethos, 35, 121–22, 140, 189–96, 202–3, 206–7; and Fascism, 10, 23–24; fragility/vulnerability of, 4, 9, 27, 66–67, 89, 135, 168, 203, 214, 220; France and, 123–24; goals of, 3–4; historicism underlying, 18; hypocrisy imputed to, 25; illiberal means in service of, 4, 7, 28, 29–30, 74–75, 129, 135, 170, 205–6, 213–21, 261n10; impotence imputed to, 23, 25–26, 28, 149, 214–18; innocence/naivete imputed to, 25, 141, 147–48; institutional aspects of, 29–30, 202, 207–8; irresponsibility imputed to, 23, 26; left-leaning, 27–28, 169–70; limits as fundamental characteristic of, 3–4, 200; meanings of, 3, 223n7; motivational shortcomings of, 30; negative character of, 4; Niebuhr and, 35, 137–50, 154–65, 203, 207; optimism associated with, 24, 41, 133, 139, 203; origins of, 3; pedagogical function of, 9, 10, 190, 196, 209–11; of personal character/behavior vs. theoretically useful, 225n38; pluralism in relation to, 190, 195–96, 200–201; and political ethics, 5–6; political ethos of, 6–7; positive character of, 4, 178; progressive, 150; purism associated with, 145; realism blended with, 30, 150; realist critiques of, 25–27; relativism imputed to, 30; right-leaning, 228n59; ruthlessness as enemy of, 3, 4–5, 23–28, 215–16, 218–19; tempered liberalism's reconstruction of, 38–39, 201–6, 211–14, 220; totalitarianism and, 9, 29, 30, 34, 36; twentieth-century crisis of, 23–24, 38–39; vulnerability of, 4–5; Weber and, 40–56, 64, 66–67. *See also* anti-liberalism; democracy; liberal predicament; postwar liberalism; tempered liberalism

liberalism of fear, 202–3

liberal predicament: Aron and, 103, 105, 111–12, 119, 122, 124, 129, 135; Berlin and, 5, 169–70; Camus and, 74; defined, 4–5, 29; dilemma posed by illiberal means to liberal ends, 4, 7, 10, 28, 29–30, 74–75, 129, 135, 170, 205–6, 213–21, 261n10; in interwar period, 28–29; overview of, 28–31; tempered liberalism's response to, 31, 205–6, 214–21; Weber and, 42

liberty. *See* freedom/liberty

Libres Propos (magazine), 105

Liebknecht, Karl, 47

limits: Aron and, 107, 109, 121; Berlin and, 189, 259n101; Camus and, 4, 83–84, 87–88, 96, 99–100, 107, 240n119; liberalism based on principle of, 3–4, 200. *See also* moderation; modesty; tempered liberalism

Lincoln, Abraham, 157

Lipmann, Walter, 153

Locke, John, 203

Loewenstein, Karl, 30, 244n52

love: abstraction as inimical to, 84–85, 92; Camus and, 84–85, 87, 92, 157; justice in relation to, 252n88; Niebuhr and, 161; Weber on, 43, 49, 57

Lovin, Robin, 160

Löwith, Karl, 53, 66

Lukács, Gertrud, 61

Lukács, György: absolutism of, 57–58, 60; anti-liberalism of, 1, 11, 65; Camus and, 78; and Communism, 58–65; intellectual development of, 57; and morality, 61–64; as People's Commissar for Education and Culture, 56, 61; and realism, 63–64; ruthlessness of, 56–57; Weber and, 56–60, 64–65

Lukács, György, works by: "Bolshevism as a Moral Problem," 58–60; "On Poverty of Spirit," 58, 60; "Tactics and Ethics," 60; *The Theory of the Novel*, 58
Luxemburg, Rosa, 47, 57, 62

Machiavelli, Niccolò, 13, 20, 40, 110, 130, 174
Machiavellianism, 19, 65, 110–16, 119, 121–26, 135, 184. *See also* realism; realpolitik
MacLeish, Archibald, 147
Maistre, Joseph de, 85, 176
Mandela, Nelson, 212
Manicheanism, 19, 21, 62, 75–76, 148, 155, 206, 215
Mann, Thomas, *The Magic Mountain*, 37
Mantena, Karuna, 34
Maritain, Jacques, 111–12
Marx, Karl, 20, 38, 85, 95, 103, 173, 175, 177, 218
Marxism: Aron's critique of, 115–19; Berlin on, 173, 184; Camus's critique of, 71, 78, 85; Lukács's championing of, 60; Niebuhr and, 140, 148, 161; tempered liberalism vs., 31; Trotsky and, 176; Weber's critique of, 50
masses, 24, 50, 176. *See also* proletariat
Mattson, Kevin, 199
Maurras, Charles, 23–24
May 1968 demonstrations, 124
McCarthyism, 115, 155–56, 207
McQueen, Alison, 214
means, absolutist exaltation of, 22
means-end relationship: Aron and, 108–9, 117–20, 245n92; Berlin and, 168, 189, 195–96; Camus and, 77, 86; Lukács and, 58–59; Niebuhr and, 145, 152; tempered liberalism and, 145, 189, 195–96; Weber and, 52–53, 119–20, 145. *See also* end-maximalism; means
Menuhin, Yehudi, 15
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 19, 25, 115
Michnik, Adam, 12
Mill, John Stuart, 168, 195
millenarianism, 114–16, 146, 161. *See also* apocalypticism
Mills, C. Wright, 216
Mishra, Pankaj, 224n11
moderation: Aron and, 127; Berlin and, 168, 190–91; Camus and, 87–88, 191; connotations of, 225n28; tempered liberalism and, 200. *See also* limits; modesty
modesty: Aron and, 109, 131; Berlin and, 188–89, 191; Camus and, 70, 71, 77, 87–89, 92–94, 99–100; as democratic value, 120; as liberal trait, 13, 99, 200. *See also* humility; moderation; skepticism
monism, Berlin's critique of, 170–71
Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de, 103, 203
Montherlant, Henri de, 228n53
morality: Aron and, 131; Berlin and, 170; Camus and, 73, 84–85, 96, 98; exemplars' epistemic function concerning, 263n43; freedom linked to, 140–41; Herzen's exemplification of, 177, 179; immoral acts committed in name of, 1–2, 14–17; liberalism critiqued on basis of, 25–28; Lukács and, 57–58, 61–64; Niebuhr on, 140–42; politics in relation to, 43–56, 73, 86, 98–99, 103, 106, 112–13, 125–30, 138, 142–47, 153–54, 156, 182–89, 200–201, 217–18, 261n10; quality of life linked to, 6; ruthlessness justified on basis of, 16–17, 19–20; Weber's conception of, 43–56
moral purism: Aron's critique of, 125; Berlin and, 174; liberalism associated with, 145; Niebuhr's critique of, 138, 143–47; realism blended with, 11, 23; ruthlessness in service of, 23; Weber's critique of, 48–50. *See also* absolutism; idealism; purity; self-righteousness
Morgenthau, Hans, 125, 153
Müller, Hermann, 214–15
Müller, Jan-Werner, 8, 224n16
Munich University Free Students' Union, 47–48
Mussolini, Benito, 23

Nagy, Imre, 63
Nanjing, 24

National Liberation Front (FLN) [Algeria], 95, 97, 129
National-Social Association, 41
Naumann, Friedrich, 41
Nazism: apocalypticism of, 18, 113; Aron's exposure to, 104, 106, 115, 121; authoritarianism of, 27; Camus's opposition to, 73–74, 75; human transformation as goal of, 36; Manicheanism of, 20; Niebuhr and, 146; Occupation of France, 70, 73–78, 131, 199; political ethos of, 155; rise of, 121; ruthlessness of, 36; as secular religion, 113–14
Nechayev, S. G., *Catechism of a Revolutionary*, 37
neoliberalism, 203–4, 206, 262n25
New Deal, 150
New Left, 152, 246n116
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 137–65; and American policies, 138, 146, 149–52; and Aron, 153, 156–57, 164; and Camus, 158, 164; and Christianity, 138–40, 152, 160–61, 163–64, 253n115, 254n134, 254n136; and the Cold War, 148–52; compared to other tempered liberals, 10–11; and democracy, 154–59; and ethos, 154–65, 198; on freedom, 140–41; and humor, 157–58, 178; influence of, 137, 163, 165, 250n40; intellectual development of, 137–40; and irony, 158, 253n107; and justice, 143, 154–56; and liberalism, 35, 137–50, 154–65, 203, 207; on morality, 140–42; and pacifism, 138, 143–46, 149, 160, 250n35; political ethics of, 138, 153–54; and politics, 159, 209; and power/coercion, 141–45, 149, 154–55, 250n40; prophetic voice of, 152–54, 156–57, 164–65; and realism, 138, 145, 153–57, 160–61, 163–65; self-criticism practiced by, 159, 164; and tempered liberalism, 9–11, 138, 163–65; utopianism critiqued by, 148–50; and Weber, 156–58, 164–65
Niebuhr, Reinhold, works by: *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, 140, 249n13
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 25, 71, 100, 176, 233n42
nihilism, 18–19, 72, 77, 84, 88, 107, 113, 125, 130, 179
Nixon, Richard, 152
Nizan, Paul, 104
nonviolent resistance, 144, 250n40

Oakeshott, Michael, 226n39
O'Donovan, Nick, 51
optimism: hope contrasted with, 91; as liberal trait, 24, 41, 133, 138, 139, 203; Niebuhr and, 138. *See also* hope
Orwell, George, 193, 210

pacifism: Aron and, 105, 106; Niebuhr and, 138, 143–46, 149, 160, 250n35; Weber and, 47–48
Paganon, Joseph, 105
panmoralism, 43, 64, 86, 232n25
Pareto, Vilfredo, 110, 176
Parks, Rosa, 212
parliamentarianism, 26
particularism, of Camus's morality, 84–85. *See also* individuals
Pasternak, Boris, 172
paternalism, 141, 178, 193
pedagogy, liberalism and, 9, 10, 190, 195–96, 209–11
perfectionism: Aron on, 114; Camus on, 85–86; critiques of, 9, 49, 52, 85–86, 114, 152, 159, 170–72, 191, 210; liberal, 3, 208; Niebuhr on, 152, 159, 170–72; pluralism opposed to, 191; utopianism and, 148–49; Weber on, 49, 52
pessimism: Aron and, 104, 114, 117, 120; Camus and, 91, 99–100; Christian, 161; Herzen and, 179, liberalism and, 133, 202; Niebuhr and, 153–54, 161; Niebuhr's critique of, 153; Weber and, 40, 41, 47, 54, 66, 67
Phoenix Program, 215
pluralism: anti-liberal rejection of, 84; Aron and, 108, 117, 189; Berlin and, 166–67, 189–96,

259n101; Camus and, 92, 189; epistemological/methodological, 201; ethical, 166, 201, 261n10; as an ethos, 190, 259n101; existential, 201; France and, 124; liberalism in relation to, 190, 195–96, 200–201; Niebuhr and, 149, 189; of tempered liberalism, 209; value of, 190–92; Weber and, 43, 53, 189
political ethics: Aron and, 105, 125; Berlin and, 170, 179, 186; Camus's conception of, 87; defined, 5; intellectual ethics in relation to, 132–35; of liberal-democratic institutions, 208; in liberalism vs. anti-liberalism conflict, 5–6; Niebuhr and, 138, 153–54; ruthlessness and, 17; salient issues in, 6; tempered liberalism and, 31, 198; Weber's conception of, 50–56
political ethos: Alain's, 105; Berlin and, 184; defined, 6, 32; doctrines and programs in relation to, 7, 155; in liberalism vs. anti-liberalism conflict, 6–7; Niebuhr and, 155–57; political theory and, 31–32; regimes and, 121–22; tempered liberalism as, 208–9. *See also* ethos
political realism. *See* realism; realpolitik
politics: anti-liberal, 2–3, 27; Aron and, 102, 105–9, 112–36, 200–201, 209; Berlin and, 169, 173–74, 179, 186–88, 192; Camus and, 69–70, 86, 98–101; effective leadership in, 182–85; elite vs. mass interests in, 24; judgment in, 106, 182–83, 194; modesty in expectations for, 99; morality in relation to, 43–56, 73, 86, 98–99, 103, 106, 112–13, 125–30, 138, 142–47, 153–54, 156, 182–89, 200–201, 217–18, 261n10; Niebuhr and, 159, 209; ruthlessness as ground of, 17, 20, 36–37; Schmitt's conception of, 227n28; tempered liberalism and, 209, 216–18; Turgenev and, 179–81; of understanding vs. of reason, 108–9; virtuoso vs. visionary, 182–84, 257n77, 257n79; as a vocation, 46–47, 51, 54–55; Weber and, 43–56, 65–66, 86, 130, 217. *See also* political ethics; political ethos
Popper, Karl, 17, 226n39
postwar liberalism: in America, 149–50; characteristics of, 8; criticisms of, 8; varieties of, 204–6
power: anti-liberal politics based on, 27; defined, 18; liberal naivete concerning, 141–42, 145; limitations on, 4; Niebuhr and, 141–45, 149, 154–55, 250n40; realist use of, 19–20
Prieto, Indalecio, 213–14
progressive politics, 114
progressivism, 150, 161, 203, 262n23
proletariat, 37, 59–64, 117–18, 143, 148, 176. *See also* masses
Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, 69
prudence: Aron and, 109, 127–30, 247n140; Camus and, 79, 101; Niebuhr and, 143; tempered liberalism and, 214, 220; Weber and, 44, 53
psychological satisfactions: of alternatives to tempered liberalism, 31, 185; of certainty, 13, 16–17, 30, 187–88; of heroism, 12, 53, 70, 212; of ruthlessness/anti-liberalism, 2, 10, 38, 175
purity: Berlin and 170, 172, 174; Camus and, 69, 72, 73, 76–77, 81, 83, 86, 87, 93, 237n19; Communism's fixation on, 62; dangers of quest for, 13, 23, 200; liberal pretensions to, 25; Lukács and, 58, 59, 61, 62; Niebuhr and, 144, 145, 146, 151, 159, 161, 163, 250n40; ruthlessness in service of, 11, 18, 19, 22, 23; tempered liberal rejection of, 198, 200; Weber's criticism of longing for, 48. *See also* absolutism; abstraction; moral purism; simplicity/simplification
purposive rationality, 52–53, 86, 119–20

racism, 28, 95,146, 249n21, 250n40
Ramsey, Paul, 153
rationality. *See* reason/rationality
Rawls, John, 9, 201, 204, 206, 224n20, 229n67, 262n20

realism: Aron and, 102, 103, 106–7, 112–13, 119, 125, 129–31, 135; attitudes and dispositions associated with, 19, 43; Berlin and, 169–72, 256n29; Camus's critique of, 73, 76–77, 85–87, 96; Christian, 160–61, 163–65; critiques of, 20; defined, 18–19; as an ethos, 125, 156–57; features of, 43, 73; idealism blended with, 20; ideology linked to, 19; in international relations, 125–26, 153; interwar, 19; liberalism blended with, 30, 150; liberalism critiqued from standpoint of, 25–26; Lukács on, 63–64; meanings of, 171; moral purism blended with, 11, 23; Niebuhr and, 138, 145, 153–57, 160–61, 163–65; in postwar America, 153; power as chief tool of, 19–20; in recent political thought, 204; ruthlessness grounded in, 18–19; tempered liberalism in relation to, 204, 230n78; Weber and, 40, 42, 43, 44–45, 49. *See also* cynicism; Machiavellianism; realpolitik
realpolitik: cynicism associated with, 44; ideological commitments of, 19; Lukács and, 56, 58, 63–64; tenets of, 43; Weber and, 40, 42–45. *See also* Machiavellianism; realism
reason/rationality: Aron and, 123, 133–34; Camus and, 77; liberal faith in, 24, 25, 30, 140, 141, 203; limits of, 203; politics of, 108–9. *See also* purposive rationality; value rationality
rebellion, Camus's conception of, 83–87, 89–90, 93, 100, 175
reform, critique of, 142–43
regimes, 121–22
relativism, 30
Resistance, French, 70, 73–75, 131, 199
responsibility: Aron and, 106–7; Berlin and, 173–74; Camus and, 83–84, 86, 96, 99, 100; Lukács and, 61, 64–65; Niebuhr and, 160; tempered liberalism and, 199; Weber and, 41, 46, 50–56, 65
rights: anti-liberal rejection of, 4, 27; Aron and, 104, 106, 131; Camus and, 70, 83, 86, 92, 96, 101; Herzen and, 176, 179; liberal advocacy of, 3, 8, 42, 70, 131, 216; liberal violation of, 30
Robespierre, Maximilien, 1
romanticism, 42, 48–50, 54, 58, 98, 234n60
Roosevelt, Franklin, 182, 185, 209, 257n83
Rosenblatt, Helena, 206
Rosenblum, Nancy, 202, 210, 263n41
Russell, Bertrand, 35
Russian Revolution, 24, 167–68
Rustin, Bayard, 212
ruthlessness: anti-liberal politics linked to, 2–3, 27; Aron and, 104–5, 113, 114, 116, 117, 122, 136; Berlin's critique of, 168–70; Camus's opposition to, 72, 74, 77, 85, 96; challenge posed by, 4–5; characteristics of, 2, 4, 15–16, 36; of Communism, 36; dangers of, 2; end-maximalism underlying, 17; ethical grounding of, 17, 19–20; ethos of, 36–38, 216, 218; failure of imagination as source of, 80; of Fascism, 36; historicism underlying, 17–18, 85; idealism as target of, 20; idealism devolving into, 1, 13, 16, 20–21; ideological grounding of, 17; incidental vs. normative, 16; liberalism's struggle against, 3, 4–5, 23–28, 215–16, 218–19; Lukács's, 56–57; moral justification of, 16–17; of Nazism, 36; political grounding of, 17, 20, 36–37; practice of, by moral agents, 1, 14–17; psychological/intellectual satisfactions of, 2, 10; realism underlying, 18–19; in recent culture and politics, 219; as response to failures of liberalism, 5; self-enforcing quality of, 2, 17; tempered liberalism vs., 8, 215–16, 218–19; valorization of, 2; Weber and, 41, 43, 44, 48–49; *See also* anti-liberalism

Sabl, Andrew, 7, 208, 209
Sakharov, Andrei, 212
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 25, 68–69, 83, 95, 115, 118
Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr., 150, 203
Schmitt, Carl, 26, 102, 129, 227n28, 247n148
Schumpeter, Joseph, 67

scruples: antiliberal opposition to, 12, 19, 27, 59, 61, 113, 135, 149, 173, 199; Aron and, 109, 113, 117, 135–36; aversion to, 14–15; Berlin and, 170, 184, 187–88; Camus and, 71, 73–74, 82, 84, 90–91, 98; moral absolutism and, 117, 200; moral value of, 6, 207, 209; ruthlessness opposed to, 2, 12, 16, 20, 36, 44; tempered liberalism and the defense of, 6, 209, 217, 220; tolerance as outgrowth of, 136
secular religions, 113–14
Seidler, Irma, 57
self-criticism, 101, 156, 159, 160, 164
self-discipline, 22, 41, 54, 60, 72, 110, 112, 191, 213
self-righteousness: of absolutist positions, 13; Aron's avoidance of, 133, 135; Berlin's avoidance of, 186, 188, 195; Camus's critique of, 80, 81, 96, 97; cruel behavior justified by, 17; Niebuhr's critique of, 138, 145–47, 148, 150, 152, 161, 165; purity and, 23; ruthlessness and, 2, 17, 219; tempered liberal opposition to, 202, 206, 208; Weber's critique of, 52, 54–55. *See also* moral purism
Sendler, Irena, 212
sensibility: Aron's, 106; Berlin's, 169, 172; Camus's, 68, 96; as component of an ethos, 6, 32, 34, 70, 198; fanatical, 171; Herzen's, 177; liberal, 134, 163, 177, 182; and political efficacy, 184, 185; ruthless, 15–16, 36; Weber's, 66, 106
sentiment/sentimentality: Berlin and, 171–72, 176; Camus and, 157; criticism of liberal, 28, 35, 36, 37, 39, 145, 203; as impediment in politics, 16, 21, 43, 98; Niebuhr and, 140, 143, 145, 147, 154, 165, 203
September 11, 2001 attacks, 215
Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet*, 16
Shklar, Judith, 24, 30, 202–3, 207, 209, 213, 229n63
simplicity/simplification: attractions of, 2, 13, 31, 84, 153, 187, 205; dangers of, 13, 184; rejection of, 34–35, 76, 83, 125, 180. *See also* abstraction; complexity; purity
sin, 138, 141, 146, 147, 155, 160–61
skepticism: about historicism, 18, 140; Aron and, 107, 131, 133, 136; Berlin and, 172, 260n113; Camus and, 71; as democratic attribute, 156; Herzen and, 177, 178; intellectuals' tendency toward, 133, 177–78; as liberal trait, 18, 119, 122, 131, 133, 160, 177–78, 196, 198, 211; Niebuhr and, 156, 165. *See also* humility; modesty
Social Gospel, 140
Socialist Party (United States), 137
Société Française de Philosophie, 110
solidarity: Camus and, 70, 73, 84, 92, 96, 100; as component of politics, 24, 44, 100; liberalism and, 100; Lukács and, 61–62
Somary, Felix, 67
Soviet Union. *See* Cold War; Communism
Spanish Civil War, 70, 92, 193, 213–14
Spender, Stephen, 17, 61
squeamishness, 14, 35, 81, 90, 133, 164, 204
Stalin, Joseph, 1, 14, 35, 63
Stalinism, 38, 62–63, 148
Sternhell, Ze'ev, 134
Stewart, Iain, 123
Strasser, Gregor, 18, 227n20
Strauss, Leo, 40, 102, 226n39, 229n63
style, as element of an ethos, 7, 10, 31, 32, 33–34, 37, 69, 70, 87, 98, 124, 126, 131, 167, 198, 210. *See also* ethos
success, as criterion of action, 18, 44–45, 67, 73, 77, 83, 85, 123, 173, 183
Sugihara, Chiune, 212

temperament. *See* character; dispositions
tempered liberalism: Aron as exemplary of, 9–11, 102–3, 133–34; attractions of alternatives to, 31; Berlin as exemplary of, 9–11, 166, 195–96; Camus as exemplary of, 9–11, 100–102; characteristics of, 10, 201–2; criticisms of, 216; defined, 7–8, 225n28; diversity and tensions within, 31, 138, 166; ethos's role in, 8, 34, 208–11, 218–21; exemplarity as means of, 9, 10, 97, 210–13; humility as attribute of, 159;

tempered liberalism (*continued*)
liberalism reconceived and reconstructed by, 38–39, 201–6, 211–14, 220; liberal predicament addressed by, 31, 205–6, 214–21; and means-end relationship, 145, 189; moderate vs., 225n28; neglect of, 9; Niebuhr as exemplary of, 9–11, 138, 163–65; Niebuhr's Christian basis of, 163–64; overview of, 198–201; pluralism of, 209; and political ethics, 31, 198, 202; and politics, 209, 216–18; postwar, 261n10; in postwar period, 9; realism in relation to, 204, 230n78; ruthlessness vs., 8, 215–16, 218–19; scruples embraced and examined by, 6, 138; skepticism of, about historicism, 18; value of, 9, 12–13, 206, 211–14, 218, 221; Weber as exemplary of, 11, 40, 53, 66, 200. *See also* limits
Les Temps Modernes (journal), 83, 115
terror-famine, Soviet, 14–15, 35
terror/terrorism: Aron's critique of, 123, 128–29; Berlin's critique of, 169, 171, 195; Camus's critique of, 86; Lukács's praise of, 58. *See also* violence
Tocqueville, Alexis de, 69, 103, 135, 195, 203
Todorov, Tzvetan, 199
tolerance: criticisms of, 19, 30, 57, 179; doubt as grounds for, 136; as liberal value, 4, 35, 89, 117, 119, 122, 129, 132, 159, 168, 195, 199, 203, 209. *See also* intolerance
Toller, Ernst, 27, 48–49, 63, 234n62; *Masse Mensch* (*Masses/Man*), 21–22
Tolstoy, Leo, 180, 196
totalitarianism: Aron's critique of, 104–5, 110–12, 119–20, 135; Berlin's critique of, 169; character of, 110–11; democracy vs., 110–12, 119–20, 129, 132, 205–6, 224n16, 228n38; liberal responses to, 9, 29, 205–6; Niebuhr and, 149, 155; as response to failures of liberalism, 24, 30, 36
treason, 19, 131
Trilling, Lionel, 6, 9; *The Liberal Imagination*, 38–39
Troeltsch, Ernst, 42
Trotsky, Leon, 19, 26, 29, 176, 227n20
Turgenev, Ivan, 179–82, 185, 188, 209; *Virgin Soil*, 180–81
twentieth century: crisis of liberalism in, 23–24, 38–39; horrors of, 15, 16–17; promises of, 15; realism and moral purism in, 11; ruthlessness vs. liberalism in, 5, 10–11; value of studying, 12–13

Union for Democratic Action, 137, 249n4
United States: constitutionalism in, 207; contemporary crises of liberalism in, 220–21; foreign policy of, 150–51; Niebuhr's criticisms of, 138, 146, 149–52, 155; postwar liberalism in, 149–50. *See also* Cold War
Uritsky, M. S., 168
utopianism: Berlin's critique of, 170, 171; hard vs. soft, 148–49; liberalism associated with, 25; Lukács and, 58, 63–64; Niebuhr's critique of, 148–50

value pluralism, 92, 108, 166, 167, 174, 189–94, 196, 200, 201, 208, 243n27, 256n47, 258n99, 259n100, 259n101
value rationality, 52
Vichy regime, 131, 199
Vietnam War, 151–53, 215
violence: Aron and, 117–18; Berlin and, 168, 195; Camus and, 74, 77–83, 86–87, 89–90, 95; ideological justifications of, 20, 22, 26, 27; imputed to liberalism, 25; Lukács and, 58; Niebuhr and, 143–45; strategic (consequentialist) use of, 26; Weber and, 44. *See also* terror/terrorism
virtue ethics, 33, 230n94
virtuoso politicians, 182, 257n77, 257n79
visionary politicians, 182–84, 257n77
Voegelin, Eric, 229n63

Wallenberg, Raoul, 212
Walzer, Michael, 96
Weber, Marianne, 65

Weber, Max: anti-bureaucratic thought of, 41; and anti-liberalism, 40–41, 65–66; Aron and, 106, 109, 130; character of, 53, 66, 67, 130; and ethic of conviction, 45–46, 48–49, 52, 55–56; and ethic of responsibility, 41, 46, 50–56, 65; and ethos for political action, 46, 50–56; and idealism, 42–43, 45, 48–49; intellectual development of, 42–43; and liberalism, 40–56, 64, 66–67; and the liberal predicament, 42; Lukács and, 56–60, 64–65; Niebuhr and, 156–58, 164–65; and politics, 11, 43–56, 65–66, 86, 119–20, 130, 217; and realism as ethos, 44, 156; and realpolitik, 40, 42–45; on Russia, 42; struggle as basis of worldview of, 41, 43; and tempered liberalism, 11, 40, 53, 66, 200; and Toller, 21
Weber, Max, works by: "The Nation State and Economic Policy," 43; "Politics as a Vocation," 45–48, 54, 56, 60, 64, 214, 234n62
Weil, Simone, 69
Weimar Republic, 41, 121
Weizmann, Chaim, 173–74, 182, 184–85, 188
Wells, H. G., 28
White, Morton, 163
Williams, Bernard, 31, 200, 226n7, 261n10
William the Silent, 94
Wilson, Woodrow, 151
World War I, 15, 21, 24, 44, 47, 58, 103, 139, 143, 160
World War II, 14, 15, 63, 65, 93, 103–4, 115, 128, 137, 146, 169, 257n83

Zagzebski, Linda T., 210, 263n43
Zaretsky, Robert, 88
Zimmermann, F. F., 231n110
Zionism, 173–74, 214