



Horyzonty Polityki  
2015, Vol. 6, N° 15

DOI: 10.17399/HP.2015.061501

## Editorial The Dehumanization of the Political Adversary

Nietzsche once said that the calibre of a man can be recognized by what kind of enemies he has. If so, then it must be said that the political struggle in the era of democracy does not give grounds for optimism. Indeed, no one is urged to love his enemies in politics – for then the political weapons would have calmed down. Nevertheless, the forms that party disputes take today, should encourage many political philosophers and political scientists to reflect on the calibre of political opponents and their mutual conflicts; they should take care looking where there is nothing but emptiness: towards the lack of the most important issues like state sovereignty and *raison d'état*.

The subject of this volume fluctuates around the dilemma of Hobbes-Schmitt. Thomas Hobbes and Carl Schmitt seem to be its main characters, even where they are not explicitly remembered. The democratic politics scene, full of conflicts as it is – and not only in Poland – suggests a deeper association with the political philosophy of both thinkers. Hobbes, in a famous passage, convinces us that the urge to power is inscribed in human nature and ceases only with death. It must therefore be treated as an objective feature and not something that can be eliminated by any science or education. At this point, the naked eye can see the whole futility of political correctness education. In a word, the very desire for power is the element of human nature, which should be situated beyond

good and evil, and seen as a reliable and indispensable given in the analysis of political life. On the other hand, Carl Schmitt in many of his works raises the question of how meaningful is today's vilification of the enemy, who appears to his adversary to be no longer an equal public enemy but a beast that must be annihilated.

Reflections of this kind impose themselves forcefully in the interpretation of the political scene, not only in Poland, and not only in the recent past. Propaganda, black legends, in a word, the creation of the image of the enemy are the instruments of political disputes, probably since immemorial epochs. Nevertheless, the democratic market of the mass media ideas generates a situation in which the image of the public enemy becomes blurred and distorted. In the past it appeared in the equivalent persons of sovereigns, which had an identical right to pursue its case for war, as well as mutually respecting their status. Today, however, a respectable *jus belli* of those periods gives way to wars seasoned by ideological venom, camouflaging the danger of civil war. They are usually preceded by a media campaign vilifying the enemy. Many authors have noted today that a modern democratic *jus belli* moves into the realm of party infighting, creating a situation in which concern about *raison d'état* gives way to the *ad hoc* political strategies of hostile groups. The result is a doggedness, a brutalization of the language of politics and unsophisticated emotionalism, which are presented to us every day by the mass media. All this makes for a lack of transparency in relation to political decisions, which are dependent after all on the sovereign, and opens up wide possibilities of unrefined populist demagoguery. Instead of legible reasons we have to grapple with cognitive confusion, which certainly influences not only the professional analyzes of political life, but also the behavior of voters, who showed impatience with the increasingly political manipulation.

The fight against political adversaries is a situation normal and natural; however, its homely and extremely aggressive nature does not confirm the thesis of the Enlightenment that unified demos still sits on the throne of the sovereign, which once took by the violence.

Wojciech Buchner