



POLITICAL FRIEND AND FOE

Megan Elizabeth Mccome,¹ Karen Larsen²

Washington State,
United State of America (USA)¹⁻²

Email: Meganelizabeth.@gmailcom¹⁻²

Received: January 1, 2021; **Revised:** February 5, 2021; **Accepted:** March 31, 2021

Abstract

The Concept of the Political is the extension of Der Begriff des Politischen in: Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik vol. 58, no. 1, 1927, 1-33. Schmitt contended that the political enemy need not be morally evil or aesthetically ugly...But s/he is, nevertheless, the other, the stranger...Neither violence ends violence in Mathew 26:52) nor wars end wars because no state was ever well prepared or empowered to enforce the violence termination; compromises led to peace treaties either being the losers or the winners but peace treaties were slightly above ceasefires to await new violence even wars; proxy wars or violence and conflicts were always possibly propelled; and new generations rejected their national histories and insulted their historical lessons. The best strategy to raise better global friendship and global harmony is the adage of Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus (4-5th Centuries AD): Si vis pacem, para bellum (If you want peace; prepare for war).

Keywords: Political concept, Friend-foe distinction, Political friend, Political foe

Introduction

Schmitt contended that the political enemy need not be morally evil or aesthetically ugly...But s/he is, nevertheless, the other, the stranger... However, s/he could at any time embrace worldly evil plastered with aesthetical beauty



since s/he were aliens after Cleisthenes footed the Athenian democracy in around 508BC, even friends favored to becoming foes. So, thus most underground political deals ended with “Be my friends or else my foes” coated with sheepish friendship. Schmitt’s *The Concept of the Political* has de facto been endeavored to enrich and to achieve state unity by defining the content of politics as opposition to the “enemy”; lest welcoming civil war. How would he ascertain national unity with such antithesis logics?

Certainly, neither violence ends violence (Mathew 26:52) nor wars end wars (Amav, 2008). Violence and wars dragged death and death drove to cycles of vengeance and weapon inventions for mightier assaults even atomic bombs to devastate lives. Like Herfried Münkler (2019) who said breeding revenge and counter revenge, could not be dismissed through legal intervention offered by a neutral third party, because neutral third parties in civil war were unfound. Humiliation must first be avenged and violence must be returned before any peace negotiations could begin. Another four reasons, why modern political violence never ends were no state was ever well prepared or empowered to enforce the violence termination; compromises led to peace treaties either being the losers or the winners but peace treaties were slightly above ceasefires to await new violence even wars; proxy wars or violence and conflicts were always possibly propelled; and new generations rejected their national histories and insulted their historical lessons.

The Friend–Foe Distinction

In the friend–foe distinction, it was unexpected when Franklin Roosevelt in 1939 reacted in the face of blamable political action of the Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza. The decisive reciprocation of the elites was more or less depending on who was responsible. If the rulers of an enemy parties violated human rights, s/he would be severely condemned, while, if the human rights violators were the rulers of the allied countries, they were justified, or at least not disgraced, for instance. In foreign policy, Franklin Roosevelt’s pronouncement in 1939 to the Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza was still valid: “He may be a son of a bitch, but he’s our son of a bitch”. Here Roosevelt even admired dictatorship of the Nicaraguan president but attacked Adolf Hitler. At present, the Washington never reproached the Philippine Presidents like

Ferdinand Marcos (1965-1986), Rodrigo Duterte (2016-2022) and Bongbong Marcos (2022- present) after 33 years of his father's death.

The political was found in any social reality distinguished in the friend-foe distinction. Accordingly, people were grouped as friends and enemies so as to exist politically. The friend-foe distinction was autonomous, but religious, economic, ethnic or any other antagonism could also claim it, argued Schmitt (1932, p.28).

Although politically antagonistic, Schmittian concept inspired Hans Morgenthau to model his realistic international relations theory and the US foreign policy. Morgenthau concurred on the point of "the political is the core of society", but not with Schmittian concept of the friend and foe distinction. However, the strong influence of friend-foe distinction at the level of the international relations, Morgenthau regarded that friend-foe distinction was unlike logical frame as "other pairs of the same degree taken from the spheres of morality, economy, or politics" Morgenthau furthered that in the other realms, this dichotomy was demarcated by neither moral value nor economic value, whereas the Schmittian political concept asserted, "the foe can equally be of political value as politically without value, and the same can be said for the friend."

Banda and Cluverius (2018, p. 91) contended it was surprisingly possible to verify an analogous approach in the affective polarization theory. The affective polarization with regards to the political leader evaluation was quite common among key-informants with greater extreme ideological commitments and higher levels of political interest. Iyengar et al., (2019) found that affective polarization was not only bridged to partisan identity but also linked with ideological polarization, and could be minimized by mechanisms that invigorate the national identity. Consequently, it was found that the ideologically centrist elector with cross-identities represented a gradually smaller electorate percentage.

José Manuel Rivas and Asbel Bohigues (2022) investigated "Friend or foe? When political Elites Evaluate Foreign Leaders" covering to identify the determinants of foreign leader evaluations and test the friend-foe logic to understand how the attitudes of political elites in international politics may be



driven. The logic of the political friend-foe is operational and important to applying the proximity, leadership and the elite leadership theories on foreign relationship, polarization and the smoldering antagonism. The theoretical contribution bridged to proximity spatial models and evaluated by the survey data of the Schmittian friend-foe logic. They found that new questions were posited e.g. is the friend-foe logic constant throughout the years? Is there a similar effect among voters? And what about national leaders? Future research should be weighed on soft power, geographical distance, and development indicators of the foreign leader's country, among others. Leaders were the very key in the international relations, impacted by Hugo Chávez and Pope Francis' expression. Eighteen Latin American parliaments determined which factors were behind the evaluations but relying on a friend-foe approach of politics, as measured by the ideological distance between the legislator her/himself and the leader. The results pointed that this friend-foe logic was the main predictor when it comes to the evaluation of elites by elites in the international arena. The relevant and constant prognosticator to evaluate foreign leaders by elites was indispensable on the friends-foes distinction.

All politics is about the power of sovereignty and by this man is political who seeks to exercise some degree of power or dominance in life. Schmitt has adopted the Catholic idea of Original Sin and Augustine's doctrine of *libido dominandi* and politicizes it, or secularizes, it. Here it means man does in fact have a lust for domination and this constitutes an essential aspect of his human nature.

Who is the Political Friend?

Schmitt as a pluralist met many societies, many human beings, many beliefs, and many cultures, which produced political aims and ends because plurality was the natural constitutive worldly composition. However, this plurality generally led to antagonism and conflict. Conflict and struggle gave meaning in life to humans and propelled history like it did in Hegel because man lusted for dominance, s/he clashed with the "other" wherein either these opposing forces achieved the friendship status or the enemy status. In Hegelianism: the friend-enemy were those who were part of the community and those who were not part of the community. The friend-enemy was foundational

to discern oneself. By Hegel, one only knew oneself through the other. The “other” was nearly always becoming an enemy as the “other” stood away from one and one’s community or the “other” was possible an ally but was endlessly potential enemy. This was pluralist consequence or real stranger. If we were not monists then by definition there must be differentiation.

Due to pluralism was the natural order, Schmittian political friendship theory was that two different communities could possibly be “friends” and “alliances” through respecting each other cultures with non-transgressive intention but engagement in trades with possible longterm friendships/alliances. However, friend-enemy distinction was not static, said Schmitt (1932, pp.29-30). Just being enemies imply not being everlasting enemies (Schmitt 1932, p.37). Friendship honored and accepted the frontiers in so far as both parties did not infringe frontiers of each other. If as such, both nations would wage wars and became enemies.

A friend was therefore usually defined as a member of a body or a fellow compatriot but its DNA also flew double-meaning: a member of the same collective body or political party (true friend) or a person outside the collective body or the political party (temporal friend or ally) but associated without qualm. However, s/he could be an enemy, had s/he been not part of the collective body or political. A friend had to share the identical values unlike an ally who was not just sprouting any apprehensions.

Who is then the political enemy?

For Schmitt, the enemy were the member of forces, a member of societal communities, or a person terrorizing the entire state sovereignty, or the self-sovereignty. Schmitt clarified that enemies exist even before the rise of the state or various norms of social organizing and decision-making (Schmitt, 1932, pp. 37- 39). At the very beginning of human existence there has always been something, or someone, that threatened existence. Enemy came from the 9th century Latin word *inimicus* [bad friend], and an “enemy” was a strong word, and “emotions associated with anger, hatred, frustration, envy, jealousy, fear, distrust, and possibly grudging respect”. But since humans were beyond early primeval existence state, and now lived in the era of nation-state sovereignty.



The foe was chiefly the force that threatened what humans had achieved in this historically political evolution. This was also because the foe leading to conflict, was necessary to the worldly nature meaningful to life and without the enemy life would be meaningless and shallow. To be without foes, and powerless to decide who to be included or excluded as a member of the political body, was at all not to be political. Since man was political, and partially human nature; all who attempted to alleviate conflicts and transformed foes into “rational players” whom one could coax to refuse qualms with, were nihilists out to demolish the political nature of man. Here, Schmitt made it evident that liberalism attempted to eliminate all conflict and, in doing so, would destroy human nature and make man’s life miserable for he would not be political at all, which is to say he would cease being human if he ceased being political (Schmitt, C. 1932, p.49).

So, who the enemy was? She was someone who endangered the national sovereignty or was deemed by public to be the foe whether or not actually intimidating the national sovereignty because enemy existence was part of the political. “Men were not enemies, by nature” teleologized in Rousseau’s Social Contract but enmity if rivaled on materials but not in the sense of metaphysics or ontology, anyone could be and this concept was the cornerstone for the Schmittian existential communitarianism to distinct real friends from real foes (Schmitt, C. 1932, p.83). Man being political was a social beast or public beast. A Man never had individual but public foe who threatened private, public and order well-being, public safety, and public works. Being social beast, man resided in public quarter, all his enemies were de facto public enemies and by reason, social was human nature. Man lusted for power, domination and control. By his lust for power, he bred conflict and it led man to meet some foes.

Critiques of the Concept of the Political

The dictator like Adolf Hitler has been empowered to engage in decisionmaking of extraordinary events regardless of ordinal laws and constitution to normalize the situation but could not refer to the populace or formal authorization under the dilemmas between the former non-existence of constitution and the new constitution was yet to be enforced while public will could not be generated by the formal procedures. Still, any dictators have claimed to legitimately exercise public constituent power (CT, 1928/2008,

pp.136-139). Schmitt viewed that it was possible to assume the populace existence before framing any optimistic constitution. Here Schmit is unclear to elaborate public prior existence to any constitutional scheme and how it matters that public political existence before any constitutional ideology and it can found a cornerstone to dictatorship sovereignty. In fact, had there been no citizens there could not be no authority, no constitution, no empowerment except self-empowerment, no law or even lawlessness, mercilessness and ruthlessness like an animal kingdom.

Schmitt specifically concentrated only the political in the aspect of friend-enemy distinction in his *Concept of the Political* in 1932. He contends that friend-enemy distinction is public and not personal or private though there are personal enemies but they are not political phenomenas. He asserts that:

Politics involves groups that face off as mutual enemies (pp. 28–29). Two groups will find themselves in a situation of mutual enmity if and only if there is a possibility of war and mutual killing between them. The distinction between friend and enemy thus refers to the “utmost degree of intensity ... of an association or dissociation” (pp. 26, 38. The utmost degree of association is the willingness to fight and die for and together with other members of one’s group, and the ultimate degree of dissociation is the willingness to kill others for the simple reason that they are members of a hostile group (pp. 32–33).

(Schmitt, 1932 pp.28-29; 26, 38; 32-33)

Political enmity possibly differs in origins either different spheres of values or different ethics (good, bad, beautiful, ugly, etc) or different economies or different profit or loss or different languages or different ethnics or cultures or religions or collective identities or even different hostile groups (Schmitt, 1932 pp.25- 27) all those different groups would play any roles to create the political friends and foes and reciprocally fight (Schmitt, 1932 pp.37-38) When conflicts strike; distinction never ends or disappears but polymerase chain reaction (PCR). In politics, friends can end friends and foes can end foes, if and only if interests (gains) and powers serve as in Franco-German in The Elysée Treaty of 1963. Lord Palmerstone says.



“We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow” (Lord Palmerstone (1848, col.122).

Political communities or parties should imperatively rule out or intervene aggressive conflicts among their members and their national fellows rather than fueling or sponsoring them both in parliament and in public places (Schmitt, 1932 pp 37–45). However, one should never judge enemy extrinsically either being moral or immoral, either justifiable or unjustifiable and etc except to reasonably defend threats, assaults and deserved fights. (Schmitt, 1932 p 27). Conflicts constituted by two parties or two countries should be ended by the two parties or the two countries; they cannot delegate them to the third parties (Schmitt, 1932 pp.45-53). If as such Ukraine –USSR war will continue since the mediation of the third-party welcomes real political conflicts and would spread and divide this globe into bipolarity while welcoming new cold war era after the Fall of the Berlin Wall, North Korea vs Japan with South Korea, threats in Taiwan and Spratly Islands where China can control the deep- sea routes between the east-west regions.

Exclusion from outsiders through distinction of friend-enemy would survive the specific political community. Had the community members strongly shared their identity enough to catalyze them to fight and to sacrifice their lives to preserve their community; they were capable then to retain to exercise their sovereign dictatorship in the name of its members. Analogically, the individual interests and the collective interests in self-security, the political society simply enjoys not its biological existence; it may extinct though its each individual member survives and the distinction of friends-enemies is not just a reaction to the intimidation of the designed existence, but it dynamically generates its members’ political identity while determining its community members based on their willingness to be its patriots and chauvinists ready to fight the non-allies, says Mouffe (1999, pp. 49–50; Schmitt, 1932 p.46). These are the reasons why Schmitt respond to the challenges of non-involvement in the distinction of friends–foes that life would be meaningless, insignificant and shallow.

Being political implies one must unavoidably have the capacity to separate foes from friends and admits that s/he shall perpetually have enmity and

enemies and the enmity existence offers him/her real life meaning and “life hard choices”. Schmitt also says:

“A valid meaning is here attached to the word sovereignty, just as to the term entity. Both do not at all imply that a political entity must necessarily determine every aspect of a person’s life or that a centralized system should destroy every other organization or corporation.” The defense of sovereignty gives us meaning both individually and, more importantly, collectively the dissolution of the friend-enemy distinction is the dissolution of the political. It is the dissolution of man’s political nature. “These dissolutions aim with great precision at subjugating state and politics, partially into an individualistic domain of private law and morality, partially into economic notions. In doing so they deprive state and politics of their specific meaning.” (Schmitt 1932, p.72).

Man inherits political DNA: war lover and willing to war and victory to conquer. A Man political instinct moves into two routes, i.e. Toward life meaning is founded and found in the friend-enemy distinction or toward nihilism (destructiveness). By DNA, man and woman lust for political power, political domination and political control. Had a country failed, it meant that the country surrenders to their foes – the anti-peace and anti-economic prosperity. One can promise peace and prosperity but to achieve them requires the entire world to coherently involve. We have witnessed the promises of peace, prosperity and equality from UN (1945), NATO (1949), USA, USSR, EU (1993) and now China is lobbying in 2023 to offer peace and economic prosperity. But what we have in return are pieces of disunity and disharmony, conflicts, wars, starvation, invasions, poverty, deprivations, drugs, development and other paradoxical promises.

Conclusions

The Concept of the Political is the extension of *Der Begriff des Politischen*, in: *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* vol. 58, no. 1, 1927, 1–33. Schmitt contended that the political enemy need not be morally evil or aesthetically ugly...But s/he is, nevertheless, the other, the stranger... Neither violence ends violence in Mathew 26:52) nor wars end wars because no state



was ever well prepared or empowered to enforce the violence termination; compromises led to peace treaties either being the losers or the winners but peace treaties were slightly above ceasefires to await new violence even wars; proxy wars or violence and conflicts were always possibly propelled; and new generations rejected their national histories and insulted their historical lessons. The political was found in any social reality distinguished in the friend-foe distinction. As such, it is to exist politically to achieve autonomy and other antagonistic instructions could also claim it. In Schmittian political friendship theory, it is that two different communities could possibly be “friends” and “alliances” through respecting each other cultures with non-transgressive intention but trade engagement with possible longterm but friendship could be temporal. “Men were not enemies, by nature” teleologized in Rousseau’s Social Contract but if rivaled on materials and by human lusts of political power, political dominance and political control; these unavoidably drew conflicts and enmity. Human breeds political DNA or loves and will to war, and craves to conquer. Political instinct of man moves into two routes of life meaning and toward nihilism (destructiveness). Had a country failed to distinct friends and foes; the country surrenders to their foes-the anti-peace and anti-economic prosperity. One can promise peace and prosperity but to achieve them requires the entire world to coherently involve. We have witnessed the promises of peace, prosperity and equality from UN (since 1945), NATO (since 1949), USA, USSR, EU (since 1993) and now China is lobbying in 2023 to offer peace and economic prosperity. But what we have in return are pieces of disunity and disharmony, conflicts, wars, starvation, invasions, poverty, deprivations, drugs, devil-lopment and other paradoxical promises.

Suggestions

St. Matthew inscribes “Put your sword back in its place,” Jesus said to him, “for all who draw the sword will die by the sword” or Violence never ends violence. (St. Matthew, 26:52; Gospel). Amav Manchanda (2008) write in his " The Forever War/Tell Me How This Ends “Wars never end wars. This could be witness in WW I; WW II, cold wars and threat of WWW III. In any wars, there must be winners and losers but the best strategy is “If not win; befriend because the more we forward in wars the more disasters both deserve. “Peace [so far] never gives peace but global pieces; so choose be my friend or otherwise my

foe” (Prakob Chaibuntan, 2023). Finally, the adage of Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus (4-5th Centuries AD) would help raise better global friendship and global harmony, he introduces: “Si vis pacem, para bellum” (If you want peace; prepare for war).



References

- Iyengar, Shanto; Leites, Yphtach; Levendusky, Matthew S.; Malhotra, Neil; Westwood, Sean J. (2019), **“The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States”**, Annual Review of Political Science, 22: 129-146. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034.
- Levendusky, Matthew S. (2018), **“Americans, not partisans: Can priming American national identity reduce affective polarization?”** The Journal of Politics, 80, 1: 59-70. DOI: 10.1086/693987.
- Lord Palmerstone, (1848). **“Remarks in the House of Commons’ in Hansard’s Parliamentary Debates,”** Vol. 97, col. 122.
- Mouffe, C., 1999b, **“Carl Schmitt and the Paradox of Liberal Democracy,”** in **The Challenge of Carl Schmitt**, C. Mouffe (ed.), London: Verso, pp. 49-50.
- Prakob Chaibuntan, Dr. (2023). **Handouts for Summer Courses 2023 for Matayomsuksa IV & V:** Marie Upatham School, Sampran: Nakhonpathom Province. 6 June-6 April 2023.
- Publius Flavius Vegetius Renatus. (4th Century). **“Epitoma Rei Militaris (Book 3)”** (in Latin). The Latin Library; Renatus, Flavius Vegetius;
- Rivas, J.M and Bohigues, A. (2022). **Friend or foe? When political Elites Evaluate Foreign Leaders.** REVISTA BRASILEIRA DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS (RBCS). vol. 37 n° 109. e3710904 2022, pp.1-34. DOI: 10.1590/3710904/2022.
- Safstrom, Carl Anders (2018). **Carl Schmitt: The Friend-Enemy Distinction**, WorldPress, Online. Retrieved 7 April 2023, from: <https://hesiodscorner.wordpress.com/2018/03/24/> / 24 March 2018.
- Schmitt, Carl. (1932). **The Concept of the Political.** Translated and with an Introduction by George Schwab; with Leo Strauss’s Notes on Schmitt’s Essay, trans. by J. Harvey Lomax, with a New Foreword by Tracy B. Strong, pp. 25 27; 28-29; 29-30; 32-33; 37-39; 43-44; 49; 83.
- Slomp, G., (2009). **Carl Schmitt and the Politics of Hostility, Violence, and Terror**, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 21–37.