

ARTICLE

ONTOLOGY OF POLITICAL IN PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPT BY CARL SCHMITT: PREDICTIVE POTENTIAL OF EXPLANATORY MODEL

Olga O. Volchkova*, Anton S. Krasnov

Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

The forgotten figure of the German political philosopher, the lawyer Karl Schmitt [2], whose philosophical ideas, due to the circumstances of involvement in the political institutions of Nazi Germany, have not been the subject of extensive and comprehensive study for many years, is mentioned more and more often by the modern academic space. However, the concept of "political", disclosed and supplemented by Schmitt in all his works, is distinguished by the integrity and rationality of reasoning, the assumptions and judgments of the thinker regarding the essence of politics are universal. In this regard, in our opinion, the philosophical-political concept by Schmitt is extremely interesting and undoubtedly has an explanatory and predictive potential. The urgency of referring to Schmitt's works is also caused by the tendency of return to the institutional constructs of the classical period at the moment of disappointment with the post-structural discourse incapable of creating effective theoretical models.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of modern socio-political reality sets new tasks for national states, the conditions for the successful implementation of which are not only in the practical implementation of the developed action programs, but also in the determination of the fundamental theoretical and methodological matrix for political course implementation. Two decades after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the names that mark certain intellectual traditions of the past are mentioned more and more often in the discursive space of modern Russia. In particular, the academic community demonstrates a genuine interest in the "reanimation" of the works by the classics of conservative thought [1]. The primary goal of return to such theories is to analyze the events that took place in Russia and the world, as well as an attempt to explain them from one or another theoretical position. The need to create effective tools to manage socio-political processes at various levels of power is no less important.

One striking example of such a methodological search is the revival of interest in the legacy of a German jurist, an outstanding conservative thinker - Karl Schmitt (1888-1985). Nowadays, Schmitt's previously unpublished works are being actively translated into Russian, and the well-known "Dictatorship" [2], "The Concept of Political" [3] and "The State and Political Form" [4] are released in a new edition.

Karl Schmitt is rightly called the "Machiavelli of the 20th Century". Most of his works were written in an ambiguous period for the world history: from the 1920-ies to 1940-ies, and they are characterized by the absence of sentimental rhetoric and political moralism. The very figure of Schmitt remains multifaceted and ambiguous, Schmitt is defined as "jurist", "political philosopher", "the critic of culture", "theologian" and "catholic intellectual". A number of Russian authors, like most Karl Schmitt contemporaries, label the philosopher as the chief lawyer of the Third Reich who justified the Nazi regime ruthlessly, others try to veil the political ideas of Schmitt, focusing on the religious component of his work. Nevertheless, the political component is the main determinant of all thinker's research. Schmitt writes the following: "The primacy of political principles over all criteria of social existence must be the basis."

The interpretation of political power origins, as well as the system of its implementation, the mechanisms of the state apparatus operation and the peculiarities of national state foreign policy activities - these are the few questions that are answered by Karl Schmitt "political" concept. Evaluating the theory as rational and logical in development, as well as effective in the context of practical application, it is necessary to confirm its high heuristic potential. Analyzing the postulates of Schmitt theoretical concept, the authors attempted to use the model as a research matrix to study the most ambitious foreign policy crises of the 10th and early 11th centuries. [5,6]

METHODS

The study of K. Schmitt heritage is carried out in accordance with the classical methodological postulates, based on the criteria of formal logic, rationalistic attitudes of evidence and the need to determine cause-and-effect relationship between the established facts. Besides, in order to identify the dynamic aspects of "political" concept the authors apply the laws of dialectical logic. In our opinion, the study of K. Schmitt political philosophy provisions is impossible in the context of poststructuralist provisions. It seems logical to study formalized textual arrays, as well as the recorded facts of Schmitt's public activity in the rationalistic aspect only.

KEY WORDS

Karl Schmitt, political, political philosophy, sovereign, state policy, socio-political course.

Received: 19 Oct 2018
Accepted: 13 Dec 2018
Published: 9 Jan 2019

*Corresponding Author
Email:
adelaida389@mail.ru
Tel.: 89063256984

The methodological basis of the research is general scientific, as well as special and interdisciplinary methods. Throughout the study, the authors used the inductive method of information search. The methods of analysis and synthesis, as well as the systematic method and the method of abstraction can be attributed to the most common methodological settings.

Among the most important private science methods it is necessary to distinguish the method of content analysis, modeling and hermeneutics, which is especially important during the work with document texts and historical sources.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Karl Schmitt introduced the term "political" as the definition of a certain independent social origin, similar and equal to such areas as law, economics, culture, etc. In contrast to Marxism, which regards politics as a "superstructure", derived from the economic basis, and therefore not an independent area of the social, Schmitt implied the presence of a specific ontological origin of "political", and hence the independence of politics as a phenomenon in general [3]. The political origin, from the point of view of Schmitt, lies in a person himself, in relations between people, inside the social. Thus the German thinker does not share the views of the "statesmen" on the emergence of "political" as a different form of social communication between people within the developed state exclusively [6]. Schmitt writes the following: "the concept of the state presupposes the concept of the political," which means that the state already has some essential idea of politics, which allows us not to reduce the "political" to the art of state management." Schmitt also denies other conservative views, in particular, criticizes the narrowly focused positivistic approach to the definition of "political", considers that legal interpretation only is impossible and also believes that the psychological theory of power and "political" origin as its result is rather simple. [7]

Since the "political", from Schmitt's point of view, has its own ontological basis [8], the German philosopher rightly introduces the criteria that distinguish the "political" from the "non-political", from a different kind of social being. According to Schmitt, the political is defined in the friend-foe dichotomy. Globally, the division of humanity into "enemies" and "friends" is the very demarcation line reflecting the entire existential meaning of the political: the readiness to destroy the "enemy" of its political group physically and the readiness to die for its political group. Moreover, it should be noted that "the enemy", as understood by Schmitt, is not an abstract image, and not a specific personal enemy in the person of an individual or a social group, an "enemy" is a public opponent, first of all, an opponent of a state and a civil nation. "Enemies" are two states with opposing, incompatible interests. Contemporaries have often criticized Schmitt for the prominence of the concept of "war" in his political philosophy, suggesting that the antagonistic interests described above lead to an armed conflict invariably. However, the understanding of war as the manifestation of the political seems to be completely wrong to the authors. The war implies "the already existing decision about enemy" and the war "is not the lot of politicians, but of military." The war, according to Schmitt, is not the goal and not the content of politics, however, its real possibility creates a "stress field" for natural, exceptional political behavior in the space of international and interstate relations, the relations not always resolved within the framework of international law, often directly violating them since political interest and the conflict derived from it cannot be resolved in the context of legal field. Let's add that, ultimately, we are talking primarily about the states with the capitalist mode of production, where political interest can often be read as an economic interest. In this context K. Schmitt underestimates the Marxist interpretation of dialectics - the mode of production and secondary phenomena, that is, politics, its institutions, law, and other instruments of a sovereign supremacy, both individual and poly subject.

The issue of contradiction existence within the state itself is interesting, because opposing interests also arise between social groups, ethnic groups and individuals. Very often, during civil wars, ethnic and religious conflicts, the citizens of one state become "sworn enemies", their interests are diametrically opposed, and the only goal in the short term is to destroy the antagonistic group [7]. Schmitt resolves this issue as follows. He does not deny the existence of contradictions within the state, and even emphasizes the necessary heterogeneity of a developed society, however, intra-state clashes can always be resolved by a higher authority using force methods depending on conflict escalation level, as well as by the force of law, although it is at the moment one can question the conditions of power institution prevalence [5]. When internal contradictions reach a crisis mark, a sovereign can intervene in a conflict, the arbitrary decision of which will resolve all contradictions simultaneously. The figure of a sovereign is necessary for a complete understanding of political concept by K. Schmitt, however, this issue is a separate research space, the study of which is not possible within this article.

One of the most striking examples reflecting the concept of political by K. Schmitt is the eventful period from 1946 to 1991, namely the Cold War era - the confrontation between the USSR and the USA, which is flawlessly explained with friend-enemy confrontation concept by K. Schmitt. The antagonism of two states, caused by a significant discrepancy between domestic and foreign policy interests, has passed into the phase of the impossibility of each of the parties to accept the very method and form of being prevailing in the social space of the enemy state over time and, thus, the confrontation manifested by ideological and armed conflicts though indirectly expressed, in particular, the conflicts like the Caribbean crisis of 1962 could threaten the world with a nuclear war, and the collision of the USSR and the United States interests "on the fields" of other states, such as the CEE countries, the states of the Balkans, Afghanistan, as the apogee of an irrational foreign policy, led to the loss of economic and human resources. It should be noted

that, explaining the development of international relations at the end of the 20th century from the standpoint of K. Schmitt concept, we can say that the United States, guided by the principle of "enemy" destruction, took all measures to destroy the Soviet Union in one way or another. After the collapse of the USSR, the political component of the social space of new independent states took shape due to the establishment of independent sovereign states, with their independence, institutionalization of governance mechanisms and the development of a civic nation, and, therefore, at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries, and during the modern period the international community witnesses a series of conflicts between the new republics of the former USSR countries and the active phases of political crises in the CIS.

CONCLUSION

The epoch of the 20th century confirmed the correctness and the relevance of the political concept put forward by Schmitt. The collapse of the Soviet Union clearly demonstrated the validity of international relations and global political cataclysm perception as a zero-sum game, in which there are winners and losers invariably, and thus the friend-enemy dichotomy still seems to be extremely relevant.

The beginning of the 11th century, the map of modern geopolitical conflicts also allows to confirm the correctness and deep explanatory potential of this concept. As Schmitt argued, "there are no eternal friends and eternal enemies." In this regard new centers of political conflicts and dichotomous confrontations between sovereign states appear in a new dynamic international space. Former friends become enemies with the change of domestic political or foreign policy interests and form hatred to an antagonist, using the techniques of information and sometimes armed struggle. Thus, the real policy and the analysis of the international political situation provides us with a rich empirical material to test the theoretical concept by Karl Schmitt and, undoubtedly, the heuristic and the prognostic potential of Schmitt ideas can be uncovered during further study [8].

Besides, modern socio-philosophical, as well as political science studies turn to the problem of political ontological base determination, and through the study of large informational arrays they come to the conclusion that the thesis about the policy derivation from other fields and conditions of society and a man life is not true. Therefore, the authors consider it is necessary to study the works of the classic political philosopher Karl Schmitt more thoroughly [9].

The modern political world, as Schmitt predicted, is the plurimum full of conflicts and interstate confrontations in contrast to the universe. The number of political conflicts at the beginning of the 21st century has doubled in comparison with the 20th century. The confrontation between two largest conglomerates has been replaced by numerous regional conflicts, armed clashes of established sovereign states, pursuing exclusively independent interests and searching for their own "enemies", new challenges and threats faced by the humanity of the new era. One way or another, the political lies at the basis of all these conflicts and confrontations, the level of conflict potential and tension on the international arena directly depends on the degree of political development in sovereign states. [10]

They transform the forms of the social element manifestation, and hence the forms of political manifestation, they change the role of law and the degree of institutionalization of formal and informal relations between the citizens of one state, the ontological roots of the political are more difficult to describe and analyze, as they are hidden behind a series of different information flows, a unified identity - the fruits of globalization, they mimic the specific features of social being and the legal field more and more. Nevertheless, the appeal to the ontology of the "political" in general and politics, as a set of management technologies, in particular, in our opinion, seems to be the key to the successful implementation of both internal and foreign policy interests by the state, and, therefore, to the successful development.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

None

REFERENCES

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>[1] Filippov AF, Schmitt K. Flourishing and catastrophe Schmitt K Political Theology Collection. 259-314.</p> <p>[2] Schmitt K. [2005] Dictatorship. From the origins of the modern idea of sovereignty to the proletarian class struggle Trans. from German by Y. Korints ed. by D Kuznitsyn. SPb.: Science. 326.</p> | <p>[3] Schmitt K. [1992] The concept of political The issues of sociology. 1:35-67.</p> <p>[4] Schmitt K. [2010] The state and political form. M.: Publishing House of the State University Higher School of Economics. 272.</p> <p>[5] Schmitt K. [2015] Political romanticism K Schmitt. M.: Praxis. 460.</p> |
|---|---|

- [6] Mises LV. [2011], Omnipotent Government: The Rise of the Total State and Total War (1944; Indian opolis: Liberty Fund, 2011). 352.
- [7] Gavin R. [2016] The Problem of Political Foundations in Carl Schmitt and Emmanuel Levinas, Palgrave Macmillan UK. 270.
- [8] Carl S. [2005] Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty, George Schwab, trans, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 36.
- [9] Anton S. [2000] Enemies: A Love Story, Lingua Franca, May/June.
- [10] Žižek S. [1999] Carl Schmitt in the Age of Post-Politics, in The Challenges of Carl Schmitt, Chantal Mouff ed. 18-37.