

[Note: This is the accepted manuscript of Ville Suuronen “The Rise of the Homme Machine: Carl Schmitt’s Critique of Biotechnology and Utopias,” published in *Political Theory*. Final published version available at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0090591719890831>]

Ville Suuronen, University of Helsinki

The Rise of the *Homme Machine*: Carl Schmitt’s Critique of Biotechnology and Utopias

1. Introduction

In a series of diary-entries from the 1920s Carl Schmitt paints a striking picture about the immense biotechnological revolution of the future. This revolution that becomes possible with “the receding of natural limits” will alter not only the human condition but also the human organism itself. With the “technical completion” of modernity and with the “fanaticism of immanence” that describes this era, Schmitt envisions the development of “a machine born as a human being” (*Menschgeborene Maschine*): “Ultimately, a miserable shred of the human being (*elender Fetzen von Mensch*) clings to the wonderful machine.”¹

However, Schmitt’s very interesting remarks concerning biotechnology remain largely undeveloped throughout the Weimar era,² and this theme is missing entirely from his Nazi-era works. Perhaps it is only the devastating technological destruction of World War II that brings Schmitt’s focus back to this issue. Be as it may, in his *Glossarium*, a kind of “thought diary” that Schmitt kept from 1947 to 1958, Schmitt suddenly begins to address the “burning question concerning the meaning (*Sinn*) of modern technology and the machine”³ in a very detailed fashion. This essay argues that Schmitt’s postwar works, especially his *Glossarium*, develop an original and thus far neglected account of biotechnology and that this account opens a new way of reading Schmitt’s postwar thought.⁴

Despite the popularity of Schmitt's writings in recent decades⁵ his postwar thought has often been interpreted in reductive terms. A broader discussion about Schmitt's postwar thought only developed after 9/11, when Schmitt's narrative about the development and downfall of modern international relations and law in *Der Nomos der Erde* (1950) provided a fruitful scheme for understanding what seemed like a global state of exception.⁶ The focus has remained almost unanimously on Schmitt's analysis concerning the *ius publicum Europaeum*, emerging gradually during the age of discovery, solidified in the treaties of Westphalia (1648) and Utrecht (1713), and ultimately falling apart with World War I. Through two extensive arguments, this article aims to broaden and shift the focus of debate around Schmitt's later *oeuvre*.

First, I maintain that Schmitt's postwar works provide an original historical and philosophical account of the gradual intertwining of technology, human biology and political strategies. I begin retrieving this account through a close reading of the recently published and enlarged edition of Schmitt's *Glossarium*. In his thought diary, Schmitt analyzes how the development of technology and the ensuing eradication of natural limits open up an opportunity for utopian thinking that is no longer content to change the world between human beings, but instead begins to perceive the human body and the human condition themselves as objects of manipulation. Schmitt argues that this quest has its roots in the modern ideologies of progress, born during the Enlightenment period, and applied most clearly by rationalist-humanitarian and positivist doctrines. To determine the growth of utopian thinking, Schmitt offers an original analysis of the classics of utopian and dystopian fiction, spanning from Plato to Thomas More and Aldous Huxley. I demonstrate that Schmitt saw the rise of utopian thinking and the development of biotechnology as revolutionary events that were comparable to the great modern spatial revolution that gradually led to the birth of the *ius publicum Europaeum*. Schmitt paints a picture of the coming technological age as one in which not only the Eurocentric political order disintegrates, but also as an age in which the human being itself now threatens to transform into an artificial *homme machine*.

The subsequent section moves on to argue that in order to counter the rise of biotechnology, Schmitt discovers a counterimage to the age of technological manipulations from a specifically *katechontic Christianity*. In a historical situation in which human beings are about to lose their humanity, Schmitt argues that the only way for human beings to be able to respect their own humanity and that of others is to realize their shared humanity in God, which makes it possible for men to be more than mere animals. I demonstrate that Schmitt not only connects his understanding of the disintegration of the European political order with his narrative concerning the rise of biotechnology, but also argues that, ultimately, it was precisely the same kind of utopian thinking that fueled the destruction of both the European balance of powers and the Western man.

Finally, I analyze Schmitt's diagnosis of the postwar era in one of his lesser-known works, *Die Tyrannei der Werte* (1960). It is argued that by building on his own earlier historical analyses of utopian and dystopian fiction, Schmitt now offers his own dystopic portrayal of how in the twentieth-century politics transforms into radical technological domination and regulation of human life. In an era that is unable to locate the shared humanity of human beings in the image of God, the enemy no longer offers the kind of existential mirror through which one could define one's own identity, but now only incarnates foreign values, which must be destroyed completely. Offering a provocative interpretation of Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche's *Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens* (1920), Schmitt maintains that this work, in fact, emblematically characterizes the dangers inherent in modern utopian thinking that has by now become equally prevalent within the worlds of Western liberalism and Soviet Communism as it had once defined the policies of destruction in the Nazi-state.

Second, after retrieving Schmitt's account about the entanglement of technology, human biology and politics, we move on to offer an interpretation of the meaning and importance of Schmitt's ideas. It is argued that the broad rereading of Schmitt's later *oeuvre* undertaken in this article not only opens

a new way of understanding Schmitt as a political thinker, but also unlocks a novel path to exploring the meaning and histories of biopolitics and posthumanism.

The article concludes by placing Schmitt in a critical discussion with two of the key-theorists from the fields of biopolitics and posthumanism, Michel Foucault and Donna Haraway. I first analyze the essential similarities and differences between Schmitt's understanding of how human biology turns into a political-technological object in the modern era and between the well-known analyses of biopolitics offered by Foucault. I then move on to parse out Schmitt's ideas concerning the development of technology and the "human-machine" in the light of Haraway's notion of the cyborg. It is demonstrated that both Schmitt and Haraway help us to formulate a critique of the notion of biopolitics and argue that it describes nothing else than a preparatory stage for the age of biotechnology. It is also shown that Schmitt's pessimistic depiction of the rise of the *homme machine* uses many of the same arguments from a completely opposite perspective to Haraway's later *Cyborg Manifesto* (1985); what for Haraway enables an entirely new kind of an emancipatory political project, the disappearance of the Western "man," appears to Schmitt as the greatest threat to the future of humankind. Examining in detail how both Haraway and Schmitt understand the rise of biotechnology as an event that destabilizes the basic binaries of Western thinking and how both utilize utopia-literature to highlight this development, it is argued that Schmitt's thinking offers a distinctively conservative-Christian critique of posthumanism.

2. Life, Technology and Utopia in the *Glossarium*, 1947–1958

In one of his earliest notes to the *Glossarium*, Schmitt analyzes how technology becomes total and reaches into all spheres of life. Schmitt calls this point the "totality of the dynamical" and describes it as follows:

We have reached the point in which this dynamical world must constantly destroy the old, and [in which] the free creative power of the human being totally encompasses nature, totally, which also means the physical and psychical nature of the human being. This is the problem of totality, the compulsion to total planning, the total power of the human being, the complete eradication of natural limits.⁷

At this moment in history, in which technology reaches all the way into the “physical and psychical nature of the human being,” Schmitt comments sardonically on the wishes of those who blindly succumb to a naive technological optimism: these “dynamical creators of their own world” take their motto from *Genesis* 1.26: “Let us make man in our image.”⁸ It is in such a world defined by a blind belief in the progress of the whole human race as such that the “necessity to conscious organization, bureaucratization and planning becomes total.”⁹

Illustrative of this historical diagnosis, Schmitt takes issue with the biologist Julian Huxley and his work *Evolution in Action* (1953) which presents an explicitly Darwinist view of humanity and depicts the human being and his development “purely ‘scientifically’.” The Darwinist approach in vogue now appears to Schmitt to be “mythology in its most complete form” and as a new form of “naïve-primitive Hegelianism.” Schmitt even explicitly compares totalizing biological explanations with Greek myths and to the stories of *One Thousand and One Nights*.¹⁰

Closely connected to the question of technology and science is the utopian sphere that opens simultaneously with the unforeseen development of human knowledge and technology: “What is the specific [character] of utopia?” asks Schmitt in one of his notes. He provides the following answer:

It lies therein that Thomas More, who devised the concept of utopia, stood in the great spatial revolution (*Raumrevolution*) of his age and from there onward, jumping to the no-place (*Nicht-Raum*), discovered the U-Topos – something which would have not been possible to an ancient Greek... This looking away from space

(*Raum*) and location (*Ort*), this de-localization (*Ent-Ortung*), is an abstraction from (for an ancient human being eternal) connectedness of localization (*Ortung*) and order (*Ordnung*).¹¹

Schmitt argues that More is the first major Western author who forgoes the idea that law must always be bound to a certain piece of land. With More's utopia the decisive element of law is no longer its boundedness to a fixed region – law and land are no longer given by God or nature – but instead become “accidental, discretionary, freely chosen by man, even made: made by human beings for human beings.” By the expression “utopia,” Schmitt does not simply mean a “random speculative fiction or an ideal construction,” but instead draws on the historical developments that eventually led to the discovery of new continents and to the mapping of the world, a concrete “system of thought built upon the no-longer-being-bound-by-land.”¹² In short, the very concept of utopia is bound to the historical realities that develop at the dawn of modernity.

These remarks must be understood in the light of Schmitt's distinction between land and sea as two fundamentally different elements, developed in *Land und Meer* (1942). In contrast with the largely historical portrayal of *Land und Meer*, in *Glossarium* Schmitt uses this opposition to analyze the situation of the twentieth century. He writes that the modern human being “treats the surface of the earth (*Erdoberfläche*) like the mariner (*Schiffer*) treats the sea, not like the land-bound human being (*Landtreter*) treats the earth (*Erde*).” The wide-reaching claim at the heart of Schmitt's historical depiction of the modern world in these terms is that “modern industry is the continuation of the transition from land to sea.”¹³ What does Schmitt mean by these statements? In distinction to earlier ages, Schmitt argues, “human beings now create for themselves their own, artificial world, the world of technology” – an enterprise that Schmitt calls “a dangerous adventure.” This new world is no longer given to us and it is no longer outside of the reach of our self-conscious control, but rather appears as a determined product of human labor. The world of technology “has no limited piece of land as a localization of a holy place” (*hat kein abgegrenztes Stück Erde als Verortung eines*

Heiligtums). In this new world, human beings are not interested in taking care and cultivating their land (*Pflege*), but only in its “instrumental usage” (*Ausbeutung*). What this transformation entails is that, increasingly, everything in this world begins to appear to us as nothing more than mere “*Rohstofflagern*,” usable stocks of crude material.¹⁴

This profound transformation has deep consequences for politics and for political subjects themselves, because it begins to alter the very conditions on which human existence, and therewith politics, has thus far been possible. When nature ceases to be a hindrance and a limitation to human action, the human being may now in an entirely new way “create himself a world from a rational point of view”:

With advancing technology, utopia therefore also advances into ever more audacious dimensions. It eventually encounters the last limit of nature, the nature of the human being itself, and constructs a body politic (*Gemeinwesen*) consisting of human beings whose nature has been standardized according to plan (*planmässig genormten Menschen*). This is the consequence of the Brave new world [sic], whose major importance lies in the fact that human nature has been changed according to plan by human beings... Education, breeding, [and] eventually also fabrication of the *Homunculus*.¹⁵

After this penetrating analysis of how technological development encroaches on the very nature of man and potentially transforms it into a mere *homunculus* – a term that Schmitt applies throughout his *Glossarium* entries as a sardonic description of the artificially created humanlike creature –, Schmitt then moves on to give a short analysis of some of the best-known examples of utopian and dystopian literature that reflect these developments historically.

While Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1516) is still based on “classical-humanistic” presumptions, in Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) Schmitt finds an artificially created fictional world that is conceived

entirely from the imaginary point of view of an isolated individual. Taking one more step forward, Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), by portraying magical characters like giants, envisions a fantastical transformation of human nature itself. However, it is only with Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) that a vision of a scientifically planned and mastered human nature arises. In short: "Thomas More brings the de-localization (*Ent-Ortung*) at the beginning of the geographical *Raumrevolution*; Huxley [brings] the de-humanization (*Ent-Menschung*) at the beginning of the technical *Raumrevolution*. For we are only entering the age of technology." What follows in the coming age of technology and total planning is a "consequential de-localization in the most total way possible," which eventually also "incorporates the naturally given facts of the human *Physis* and *Psyche* to its delocalizations."¹⁶ For Schmitt, the author who defines the post-war era is thus Huxley, whose *Brave New World* is discussed throughout Schmitt's *Glossarium*.

Schmitt locates the intellectual roots of all utopias to Plato's *Republic*. However, he emphasizes that Plato's thought cannot be understood as utopian in the same sense as the modern examples, because his thought is not yet scientific, global or detached from the specifically Greek *topos*. Plato's utopia is meaningful only in the superficial sense that it already prefers an ideal construction over factual reality and thus imagines an *ideal end* for human life and politics. For Schmitt, the totalitarian state is the most consequential utopia of this kind¹⁷ – an idea that echoes, although from an entirely contrary perspective, with Karl Popper's famous work *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1944).

Elsewhere, Schmitt completes this historical account of utopian thought by noting that the "decisive metaphysical step," which lies at the beginning of the "mechanical age" can be dated to René Descartes, who is the first thinker to understand the human body as a *mechanism* with a soul. In terms of politics, it is Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1651) that "carries over" this mechanistic conception of the human body to the heart of a modern understanding of the state and politics: the leviathan, by dominating individual lives in the name of peace, security and order, becomes the *machina machinarum*, and as such the "prototypical work" of modernity.¹⁸ However, the crucial point here

remains that while Hobbes still took for granted that “*plena securitas in hac vita non expectanda*” – that complete security is not to be expected in this (earthly) life – the kind of thinking characteristic of later utopians in the centuries after More and Hobbes takes its bearings precisely from striving toward an *eternal* and *global* peace. The essential feature of this kind of utopian thinking, as Schmitt understands it, is the conscious “organization toward the elimination of *Angst*; *securité*.” What the birth of modern utopian literature illuminates is precisely this “utopian character,” the striving toward complete peace and security, which equally defines “rationalism, enlightenment, positivism.”¹⁹

This analysis of utopias and of the gradually intensifying mechanization of human nature in modernity can be understood in the light of Schmitt’s arguments in *Der Begriff des Politischen* (1932), where he holds that all political theories can be divided according to their positive or negative anthropology, and that all genuinely political theories must presuppose the idea that human beings are evil, unpredictable beings.²⁰ While he points to anarchists as the bearers of a supposedly destructive conception of a good human nature in *Der Begriff des Politischen*, the technical *Ent-Menschung* that Schmitt refers to in his *Glossarium* is something much more radical than a mere denial of human evil. What Schmitt aims to show in his thought diary is that when technology becomes incorporated into the human body, all anthropological categories threaten to become meaningless as such.

Schmitt believes that the common advocacy of humanism after World War II is only a reflection of the anxiety that arises from the fact that “the human *physis* is lethally threatened by technology and the natural sciences. It will now get serious with the *homme machine* – with syringes, injections and prostheses.”²¹ The widespread talk about humanism is, then, nothing more than the other side of the anxiety that “the body will now really become a machine, a function” – an “interchangeable” (*auswechselbar*) object among others.²²

These thoughts are developed to their logical conclusion in Schmitt’s last major work *Politische Theologie II* (1970), which ends with an overwhelmingly gloomy prognosis about the threat of a

posthuman world. Now Schmitt argues that modernity is already completely defined by an enormous “process-progress” and by a “purely worldly-human science”:

The new human being that produces itself in this process is not a new Adam, and also not a new pre-Adamite and even less a new Christ-Adam, but rather the unprestructured, contingent product (*Jeweils-Produkt*) of itself, that is, [the product of] the process-progress that has been set into operation and is kept in operation by the human being. The process-progress does not only produce itself and the new human being, but also the conditions of possibility for its own self-renewal (*Neuheits-Erneuerungen*); that means the opposite of creation out of nothingness, namely the creation of a nothingness as the condition of possibility for the self-creation of a continuously new worldliness.²³

The new man of technology is not the Christian individual, created *ex nihilo*; rather, this human being is one who constantly redefines the axioms of its own recreation. Carl Schmitt’s final verdict about the faith of humanity is that we are inevitably traveling toward a posthuman world – a world we do not and cannot know, because it defies and destroys all human-bound and earth-bound categories of traditional Western thought. Schmitt describes the transformation that this new “age of security” produces in the human being itself as follows:

Today the human being, with the help of technology, creates for itself the world that surrounds it (*Umwelt*): The human being ceases to be a vulnerable creature (*gefährdetes Lebewesen*) and reaches an improbably high age in complete security with well-organized maintenance. But precisely in this way the human being also ceases to be a vulnerable creature, who remains “open” and is not bound to a surrounding world. The human being becomes an animal like other animals. No

wonder that there has never been so much talk about humans and humanity than today.²⁴

Schmitt's references to the human being as a "*gefährdetes Lebewesen*" can be interpreted as an implicit reference to the philosophical anthropology of Arnold Gehlen, who had famously argued that the human being is a *Mängelwesen* – an essentially "lacking creature," who can resist his own incompleteness only by creating an artificial world of culture.²⁵ It is precisely these kinds of anthropological arguments, taken up by Gehlen and other German thinkers of the same era like Max Scheler, Helmuth Plessner and Ernst Cassirer that in different ways aimed to ground the distinctions between human beings and other living creatures by positing the *differentia specifica* of man in the fundamental "openness" of his nature, which according to Schmitt may now lose their meaning entirely.²⁶

As Schmitt emphasizes, he was always "disgusted by a world made by human beings for human beings" and by a world in which everything happens "*malthusianisch=pazifistisch*."²⁷ To Schmitt, the postwar world was not one where freedom had been reestablished after a totalitarian catastrophe, but rather was one in which we were witnessing the birth of a new kind of "age of un-freedom."²⁸ If Schmitt's late works offer a defense of "humanism" (a word Schmitt always loathed) in the sense that decisionism now increasingly pertains to the *decision to be human*, as Diego Rossello has recently argued,²⁹ then this must be understood not in the conventional sense of the term "humanism," but rather, as I will demonstrate in the next section, as a conservative-Christian defense of the "openness" of human nature, poised against the utopian ideologies of progress and planning.

3. A Counterimage to Technology: On the Katechonic Functions of Christianity in Schmitt's Postwar Thinking

This section aims to demonstrate that Schmitt's renewed interest in Christianity in his *Glossarium* arises as an attempt to discover a counterimage not only to the disintegrating Eurocentric order but also to the internally related issue of technological dehumanization, which I analyzed in the previous section. To demonstrate this, I offer a novel interpretation of Schmitt's concept of the *katechon*. While this concept, which emerges into Schmitt's thinking with his 1942 work *Land und Meer*, is usually understood as a further development of his supposedly continuous catholic thinking³⁰ or as a way of resisting the dissolution of the Eurocentric imperial order³¹, I argue that we should also perceive the crucially important role this notion plays in Schmitt's attempt to discover a counterimage to the age of biotechnology that was threatening to destroy the human organism itself. I maintain that what after 1942 gradually develops into the defining philosophical core of Schmitt's later works is a specifically *katechontic Christianity*, polemically poised not only against the dissolution of *ius publicum Europaeum*, but rather *against all forms of utopian thought in general*: the political utopia of a unified One-World *and* the technological utopia of the "human-machine."³²

As is commonly known, in Schmitt's postwar works his critical horizon remains bound to the presupposed age of nontotality that the *ius publicum Europaeum* had institutionalized with its clear distinctions between the enemy and the criminal on the one hand, and between civilians and combatants on the other.³³ Describing how the balance of European powers of the modern era was located between two totalities, those of "theology and technology," Schmitt writes:

Between theology and technology, that means between two totalitarian domains.

Theology is necessarily totalitarian due to its substance, its outcome. Technology is totalitarian due to its method, its function. The result is always totality. There, in-between stands the jurisprudence (*Rechtswissenschaft*) of Occidental rationalism; it is not totalitarian, but rather *ad alterum*; its institution is the state, which distinguishes between public and private law; it guards the law (*Recht*), the law is *ad alterum*. *Audiat et altera pars*. This is unknown to both theology and

technology. For the theologians *altera pars* is the enemy, the <devil,> for <a technician> it does not exist.³⁴

The era of European public law began by bringing an end to theological disputes, which were by nature total. This concrete order witnessed its end with the rise of another kind of totality, the universal totality of technology, which no longer distinguishes between different truths of religious revelation, but offers its destructive power to anyone willing to harness it in the name of humanity. According to Schmitt, this transformation sees its absolute point of development in the human body itself:

The humanization of war is, like humanity itself, double-edged and has two poles. At the positive pole it is a limitation and moderation of war; at the negative pole it [is] a de-humanization of the enemy as the utmost appearance of a war of destruction. The humanization of war means first and foremost de-deification, reduction to a purely human relation devoid of any balances... and devoid of any restraints and concerns, which arise out of transcendental forces and powers. On the basis of sheer humanity (*reinen Humanität*), the mere *homo homini homo*, the humanization of war has no long duration. Considerably more, the human being becomes the highest entity of all; he becomes god and animal, and the enemy must then be simply treated as an animal, because he cannot be seen as a transcendent being (*weil man ihn nicht vergöttlichen kann*).³⁵

In a world that has lost its most traditional distinctions – the position of the human being above animals and beneath gods – war too loses its basic distinctions. The human being becomes both god and animal: In his self-understanding and will at technological mastery, he strives to become superhuman; in the reality of wars and conflicts, which the rhetorical devices of humanitarian

ideology can only attempt to hide, he becomes an animal and sub-human. *This* is the reality of the *homo homini homo* and the reality that the gradual rise of utopian literature reflects.

It is in this historical context that Christianity makes a curious reappearance in Schmitt's *Glossarium* (but only there and not in his other postwar works). In distinction to his 1923 book *Römischer Katholizismus und politische Form*, Schmitt no longer portrays Catholicism as the great *complexio oppositorum* that could unify different peoples under one banner nor as the defender of the European *civitas humana* against the barbarian Bolshevik masses. In contrast, Catholicism is now increasingly supported as a metapolitical belief system whose aim is to guarantee the immunity of the human body and life from political-technological interventions.

As Schmitt emphasizes, in distinction to the reality of the *homo homini homo*, for a believer, God is “completely” and “totally” Other (*Andere*) – God is “total alienation” (*totale Entfremdung*). As Schmitt now argues, it is “*exactly this [alienation] that the human being needs, in order to be human,*” in order to “alienate himself from the animal to a human being.”³⁶ Schmitt now explicitly contrasts the “secret” of God's providence and his “unknowable plan” with the “earthly god” and his conscious plan. Christianity and its mystery now emerge as the concrete counterimage to the age of planning and human manipulation.³⁷ On the one hand, utopian thinking is described as the most intensive affirmation of what Martin Heidegger's agnostic philosophy termed as *in-der-Welt-sein* and as a system of thought defined by a “humorless planning” that “hollows out the heavens.”³⁸ On the other hand, Schmitt points to Augustine's *Civitas Dei* as a nonutopic work that manages to exclude all utopian considerations because it is grounded in the notion of a transcendent hereafter.³⁹ In distinction to Schmitt's earlier works that celebrate Catholicism for its ability to offer a model for political representation, in his *Glossarium*-entries Catholicism offers a rather different model: the image of shared humanity in God – an image that is now poised against the age of technology and biotechnological manipulations.

This is closely related to the fact that Schmitt is more than just another thinker critical of “nihilism” in some superficial sense. For Schmitt the modern world is not simply devoid of transcendence, but is instead “incapable of gods,” *gottunfähig*.⁴⁰ Instead of simply criticizing secularization, Schmitt argues that in order to be human, human beings need a higher realm, a realm of mystery and transcendence to alienate themselves from the animal. Just as the nontotality of the *ius publicum Europaeum* guides Schmitt’s international thought in the figure of the *Grossraum* that now replaces and augments the nation-state and its sovereignty,⁴¹ Christian dogma reappears as a paradigmatic example of a mindset that affirms the realm of human biology as something that should never become an object of conscious human manipulation. It is crucial to note that distinct from his earlier works, Schmitt’s postwar Catholicism expressed in his *Glossarium* is a specifically *katechontic* form of Christianity, because it does not have God as its undeniable starting point, but rather as its *telos* that allows man to alienate himself from the animal and thus shield his humanity.

It is rather astonishing that some studies have taken at face value Schmitt’s own claim that the battle around “*katholische Verschärfung*” forms the secret hermeneutic key to his *whole* work.⁴² The matter is certainly more complex. Instead of accepting Schmitt’s own apologetic self-stylizations that aim to weave in a nonexistent consistency into his own thinking, we should bear in mind that Schmitt’s “chameleon-like” life in theory and politics is defined by numerous changes and caesuras.⁴³ In his *Glossarium*, Schmitt himself now intentionally begins to blur the lines between his personal faith and his own thinking, and in doing so, he now also begins to describe his own faith in completely new terms: “For me the Catholic faith is the religion of my fathers. I am not solely a Catholic of faith, but also through historical origin (*Herkunft*), if I may say so, *according to race (der Rasse nach)*.”⁴⁴ On another occasion, Schmitt elaborates on this statement in greater detail, declaring, “*je suis catholique de race*” and noting that the Catholic faith forms “*mon centre inoccupable*.” Schmitt then continues to explain that, for him, Catholicism is not merely an “idea,” but rather, “a historical event: The

incarnation of the son of God. For me Christianity is not, in the first place, a doctrine, not a morality, not even (forgive me) a religion: it is a historical event.”⁴⁵

What is the meaning of this purposefully oxymoronic expression, *Katholik der Rasse nach, catholique de race*, which clearly posits the universality of Christianity in an oxymoronic relation with the particular, the nonuniversal: the race? How can anyone be a “catholic of race,” a catholic on the sole basis of his background, traditions, ancestry and birth – his *Herkunft* –, when the dogma itself emphasizes that no one is born as a catholic and that anyone can become one through baptism? Is this not *sheer blasphemy* that equally undoes the meanings of both, Catholicism and race?

Such an undoing is precisely Schmitt’s purpose. It should be clear that we are no longer dealing with a catholic thinker in the strict sense of the word. To use Schmitt’s own expression with which he describes his faith, we are now engaged in analyzing the thoughts of “a catholic lay-man” (*katholischer Laie*)⁴⁶, who is not interested in religion due to its substance, but rather in the image of God provided by religion – an image that every truly humane politics according to Schmitt must presuppose. In the case of Schmitt, this God is the Christian God, who also represents the Western tradition against the machine destructive of all traditions. Instead of being a political doctrine of direct influence, as Catholicism still was in Schmitt’s 1923 study, he now frames his faith as a kind of a self-evident and metapolitical presupposition that grounds his thinking. It is for this reason that Schmitt can claim that Catholicism offers the hermeneutic key to his whole work, even though faith plays close to no role at all in Schmitt’s other postwar writings apart from his *Glossarium*.

This self-consciously oxymoronic notion, Catholicism of race, is also deeply apologetic. It aims to gather into one single expression both Schmitt’s Catholic faith with which he was born and grew alienated from during the mid-1920s⁴⁷ as well as his apologetic attempt to rename and resignify, in a supposedly nonracist manner, the biological and *völkisch* vocabulary he had used in his Nazi-era writings. In Schmitt’s *Glossarium*, Christianity is now reappropriated into a defense of “humanism,” and, simultaneously, race is de-radicalized into a purposefully obscure historical-cultural statement.

It is precisely in this sense that Schmitt now *appears* to make critical remarks about “malicious biologism” and the idea of a “*biologisches Recht* of which we have certainly had enough,” and *seems* to explicitly dissociate his concept of *nomos* from all biological connotations in his *Nomos der Erde*.⁴⁸ Such passages certainly do not reflect a complete renouncement of racism. Instead, they simply disclose the reconfiguration of the kind of biologically motivated racism Schmitt had endorsed in his Nazi-era writings into a kind of *racism of culture and the spirit*. In this way, Schmitt subtly and yet self-consciously contaminates his elaborate critique of biotechnology and utopian thinking with the history of his own Nazi-involvement.⁴⁹ In distinction to the Nazi-era terminology that could solely be expressed in German, as Schmitt emphasized,⁵⁰ it is now equally possible to be a “Catholic of race” in both German and French. Subtly, and yet noticeably, the superiority of the German *Volk* thus transforms into a superiority of the European *nomos*.⁵¹

4. Schmitt’s Dystopia: The Modern Tyranny of Values and the Destruction of the Unworthy Life

This section aims to show that one of Schmitt’s lesser-known works, *Die Tyrannei der Werte*, takes the central ideas developed in his other postwar works to their logical conclusion. In what follows I read this work as a dystopic depiction of twentieth century politics, which describes how both the Eurocentric legal and political order and the traditional understanding of humanity that had made this order possible begin to transform into a world of utopian unity. I argue that it is this constellation that Schmitt now describes with the notion “tyranny of values.”⁵²

Schmitt’s central argument in *Die Tyrannei der Werte* is that modern society is witnessing an “irresistible economization” of all spheres of life. Everything and everyone are turning into objects with a specific value.⁵³ The loss of absolute standards situates everything on a scale of relativities and ethical debates transform into a marketlike competition between different value systems.⁵⁴ Schmitt

analyzes this development through the lens of modern value philosophy. He argues that *Wertphilosophie* arises as a response to the crisis of nihilism that comes to the light of day in the nineteenth century.⁵⁵ Schmitt quotes Heidegger's words as testimony: "In the nineteenth century talk about values becomes common and thinking in values customary... The value and that which has value (*das Werthafte*) becomes the positivist replacement for the metaphysical."⁵⁶

Schmitt argues that this reliance on values is equally important to the ideologies of liberal capitalism and socialism; both grow from a philosophy of history that stems from the Enlightenment period and presupposes the human ability to perfect itself endlessly.⁵⁷ The crucial historical point that grounds Schmitt's other arguments in the work is that the rise of value philosophy is in fact simultaneous with the rise of *Lebensphilosophie*. From 1848 onward, we have witnessed an "osmosis and symbiosis of value philosophy and life philosophy."⁵⁸ When this fundamental fact is realized, it is no longer enough merely to claim that capitalism and communism are similar. Now also Nazism must be included. The convergence of value and life penetrates *all* modern ways of thinking.

It is precisely in this sense that Schmitt notes in his *Glossarium*: "The animal that develops from an ape to a human being, is the plebe who arrives during the nineteenth century; this was made possible by the European situation after the first generation of 1848, which accounts for the tremendous success of '*The Origins of Species*'."⁵⁹ Every modern political ideology understands the modern man to be the fully secular ape-man, a product of evolution. If for Hegel the notion of the species still referred to an unchanging concept, Schmitt notes that "with *The Origins of Species* 1859 the new age is born: the new world." In this world of democracy we encounter a new conception of humanity as something that is not created as complete and perfect, but as one that constantly develops and may also *be perfected* in the course of history. Schmitt argues that it is this presupposition that unifies all modern ways of thinking from liberal democracy to Stalinism and Hitlerism.⁶⁰ All modern political ideologies not only affirm the selfevident transformation from dynastic legitimacy to popular, democratic legitimacy, but on a deeper level, they are equally interested in transforming and guiding

their own subjects, the ape-men, to an ever-greater perfection. Against those who claimed that the faith in the *Übermensch* and in the perfection of human race was a phenomenon specific only to Nazism, Schmitt argues provocatively that these ideas were actually equally influential among *all* modern ideologies: “this super-man is the self-evident consequence of the faith in the human being, who creates his own destiny and makes himself rise above himself.”⁶¹

Schmitt continues to examine how the “pair of twins” value/life appears especially in modern German intellectual history. As emblematic examples, Schmitt examines the works of Max Scheler and mentions Eugen Dühring’s *Der Werth des Lebens* (1865), Heinrich Dietzel’s *Vom Lehrwert der Wertlehre und vom Grundfehler der Marxschen Verteilungslehre* (1921) and Heinrich Mitteis’s *Der Lebenswert der Rechtsgeschichte* (1947).⁶² The most important single example, however, is Karl Binding and Alfred Hoche’s *Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens* (1920), which is today often seen as one of the key works that would later allow the Nazis to justify their policies of destruction.⁶³ More than any other study, Schmitt sees that it is this work that most clearly prepared the way toward the “horrible praxis of destruction of life unworthy of life” twenty years later. The interesting point for Schmitt is that in 1920 it became possible to demand the destruction of unworthy life “in all humanity and gullibility.” According to Schmitt, Binding and Hoche were both “liberal human beings of their own time” and both were driven by the “best, humane intentions.”⁶⁴ Schmitt locates the utmost point of convergence of *Lebensphilosophie* and *Wertphilosophie* in the racist thought of National Socialism: “in the value system and dictionary of the racist worldview, value and life appear intimately bound to each other at the highest point.” It was Hitler who declared that the German was of “incomparable value” and that the German people embodied the “highest value upon this earth.” The leading Nazi ideologist, Alfred Rosenberg represented a similar position.⁶⁵

Testifying to the fundamental importance of Binding and Hoche’s book for Schmitt, he also analyzes the work in several other texts.⁶⁶ In *Theorie des Partisanen*, Schmitt highlights that the “destruction of unworthy life” is as the most extreme form of absolute enmity and he notes that from a historical

perspective it is “the repudiation of real enmity, [which] opens the way to the work of the destruction of absolute enmity.”⁶⁷ Binding and Hoche’s book is also evoked in the *Glossarium*, where Schmitt notes that “every word of the title is totalitarian” and continues that “Orwell should have noticed where we live and he too [lives]: *Freigabe der Vernichtung! Lebensunwertes Lebens*.”⁶⁸ The fact that Schmitt underlines the German word “*Freigabe*” – literally meaning letting something go free – means that he wants to emphasize the absurdity that the destruction of unworthy life could be conceptualized, precisely by liberals, not as a particularly deviant intrusion into the realm of individual liberty but could be seen as *a form of freedom*. Even George Orwell’s dystopian visions had not seen fully the radical consequences of this fact. Finally, in a lesser-known essay from 1960, Schmitt notes that the title of Hoche and Binding’s text is, in fact, “characteristic” for all value-based thinking.⁶⁹

The crux of Schmitt’s critique is that any thought-system based on values necessarily leads to a worldview in which one is forced to define both the worthy and its opposite, “the unworthy, which must be excluded from the value-system.”⁷⁰ Thus, the modern loss of standards and the simultaneous instrumentalization of reason “opens up imagination-defying possibilities for the devaluation of the valueless and for the elimination of the unworthy.”⁷¹ In modernity, this discrimination is also increasingly connected to science as “utopia becomes scientific... and science becomes utopian, as is especially evident in the statements of famous biologists, biochemists and evolutionists.”⁷²

We find an illustration of this totalitarian logic from one of Schmitt’s *Glossarium* entries that comments on Peter F. Drucker’s popular work *The End of Economic Man* (1939). Here Schmitt describes how the nature of modernity necessitates us “to find a total enemy.” It is also here that Schmitt writes the often-cited words: “precisely the assimilated Jew is the true enemy.”⁷³ However, it is just as often overlooked that these words are actually a summary of paragraphs from Drucker’s book.⁷⁴ While many of Schmitt’s notes in his *Glossarium* are ferociously anti-Semitic – a continuation of his numerous anti-Semitic remarks in his prewar diaries⁷⁵ – here Schmitt’s words actually display

a certain curious ambivalence. While we have very legitimate reasons to believe that Schmitt agreed with the substantial content of Drucker's words in some sense, we may also assume that he, in fact, also criticizes the kind of absolute enmity that Nazis displayed toward the Jews. After all, as shown in the previous section, Schmitt writes these words during a time when he aims to distance himself from his previous espousal of Nazi-ideology. What Drucker's words *also* illustrate is how in the age of total planning and progress the Jews serve as the model of an ideal total enemy. When Judaism is no longer understood as a religion, but as an immutable ethnic category, it becomes something that one cannot change: while the communist can change his political views, "Jews will remain Jews," as another indirect loan from Drucker continues. Thus, Schmitt agrees with Drucker's conclusion that the assimilated Jew, the one who attempts to refuse what he cannot refuse *in the eyes of the Nazis*, becomes the absolute enemy. For a Nazi, the Jew *incarnates* the absolutely unworthy and such an absolute enemy cannot be fought by traditional means, but only destroyed and wiped out.⁷⁶

This is exactly the critical point of *Die Tyrannei der Werte*: today we no longer have equal enemies, the *justus hosti*, but only total ones that incarnate different value-systems: "Every concern for the enemy disappears, and becomes worthless, when the battle against this enemy is a battle for the highest values."⁷⁷ This work depicts the modern world as a realm of complete and utopian immanence in which the "philosophy of absolute humanity" is realized in practice; a world in which progressive humanism has become totalitarianism and vice versa.⁷⁸ From this perspective, *Die Tyrannei der Werte* reads like an ironic reinterpretation of Schmitt's own earlier works, *Politische Theologie* and *Begriff des Politischen*. Just as political theology is now transformed into mere self-deification of the human being on the technological and rhetorical levels, balanced enmity is abolished and replaced by a world of infinite progress and absolute justice. *This* is the equally dangerous and illusionary world to which the philosophy of absolute humanity leads us.

Once again, instead of taking Schmitt's criticisms of modernity at face value, it should be obvious that Schmitt is also engaged in an apologetic venture. In portraying Binding and Hoche's work on the

“life unworthy of being lived” and even the Nazi policies of destruction not as exceptions, but rather characteristic of modernity as such, he effaces the important distinctions between liberalism, communism and Nazism, which are, after all, radically different “value systems.” In portraying them all as equally defined by the Enlightenment philosophy of progress, Schmitt can now offer a *seemingly* honest critique of his own Nazi-involvement and, at the same time, justify it as somehow inevitable.

5. In Conclusion: Rethinking Biopolitics and Posthumanism with Schmitt

This article has demonstrated that Carl Schmitt’s postwar works are not only focused on narrating the dissolution of the *ius publicum Europaeum*, as is often argued, but also on the simultaneous and equally important technological dehumanization of the Western man. On the one hand, analyzing the accelerating intertwining of technology, human biology and political strategies in the modern era, Schmitt examines how the basic presupposition of Western political rationalism – the anthropocentric idea of man – becomes challenged by a new kind of technological utopianism that aims to transform human nature itself. On the other hand, Schmitt also draws a dystopian image of the modern political world as defined by a new kind of “tyranny of values” – a world in which the Eurocentric world order disappears, and the balanced existential enmity of former centuries threatens to become replaced by totalitarian destruction. While Schmitt analyzes the development of utopian thinking in the light of the classics of Western utopian and dystopian literature from More to Huxley, he portrays the rise of value-based thinking through the example of Binding and Hoche’s work on “life unworthy of being lived.” As also shown above, Schmitt’s critical analysis of biotechnology was motivated by the hope of finding a philosophical counterimage to the emerging age of biotechnology. I argued that Schmitt

finds this counterimage from his espousal of katechonic Christianity: from the idea that all truly humane politics must take its bearings from the shared humanity of men in God.

In this concluding section, I suggest that Schmitt's ideas concerning the rise of the *homme machine* are best interpreted and positioned through contemporary discussions concerning biopolitics⁷⁹ and posthumanism.⁸⁰ Although Schmitt himself never uses either of these concepts directly, by placing Schmitt in a discussion with Michel Foucault and Donna Haraway, I argue that Schmitt clearly prefigures the central problems of these discussions and also offers an original way of understanding the histories of biopolitics and posthumanism. It is argued that Schmitt's anthropocentric defense of the "Western man" offers a conservative-Christian alternative to Foucault's and Haraway's narratives of modernity.

Let us begin with Foucault and his notion of biopolitics. If for Foucault the modern human being, in distinction to Aristotle's notion of man as a *zoon politikon*, was "an animal whose politics places his existence as a living being in question," as Foucault proclaimed in *The History of Sexuality*,⁸¹ the threshold of modernity that interested Schmitt was a rather different one. While Foucault analyzed how the "human being" became the subject of political, scientific, medical and other strategies (while being simultaneously framed and defined through these practices), Schmitt became interested in the human being only when the anthropocentric paradigm seemed to have already reached the point of implosion. This threshold was the one that marked the beginning of an entirely new posthuman age of biotechnology and "unfreedom." When Foucault, in the well-known last paragraphs of his *Les mots et les choses* (1966), envisions the image of man drawn in sand that could perhaps just as easily vanish as it had appeared,⁸² he is referring to something essentially different than Schmitt, who in his *Glossarium* entries would race ahead of Foucault by exploring how the "human being is *long since* lost."⁸³ When seen from the perspective of Schmitt's later works, the modern intertwining of life and politics, as described by Foucault's notions of biopolitics, appears as nothing more than a necessary

epiphenomenon of a much broader and gradually accelerating process of delocalizations and dehumanizations fueled by utopian thinking and technological development.

As we have seen, Schmitt painted a picture of the disappearing human being and Eurocentric world order by describing the emerging “twin-brotherhood of pacifism and Malthusianism.”⁸⁴ This profound crisis consisted equally of the downfall of the spatial-judicial ordering based on the state, which was now withering away at the face of the rise of economics, morality and humanitarianism (the framework of “pacifism” and spatial “delocalization”), as it did of the simultaneous depletion of basic anthropological hierarchies caused by the rise of utopianism and its *homme machine* (the framework of “Malthusianism” and physical “dehumanization”). What Schmitt’s katechonic Christianity performs polemically in an eschatological register against “Malthusianism,” the telluric figures of the partisan and the *nomos* aim to achieve against the rise of “pacifism”; both strive to hinder the accelerating process of totalization and dehumanization.

The differences between Schmitt and Foucault crystallize in the latter’s ignorance of technology⁸⁵ and to Schmitt’s original use of utopia and dystopia literature. Only Schmitt’s story of modernity is one in which human beings, “make themselves at home in (the vicinity of) technology,” *sich der Technick anheimgeben*.⁸⁶ For Schmitt, “the machine is the tool that is proper to Utopia” – a tool that in its mergence with man gradually “dethrones and de-localizes the human being.”⁸⁷ For him, the machine represents the “unleashed activism of an unleashed this-worldliness.”⁸⁸ Every step on this path of technology is a step away from God, from his unknown plan. While Foucault saw the historical roots and the prelude to biopolitics in the Christian pastorate,⁸⁹ Schmitt argued that biologically construed discrimination of the enemy, the idea that life itself could or should be manipulated as well as the liberal notion of historical progress that fueled all such particular developments, were not a secret affirmation of pastoral power in a new economic-moralistic disguise, but indeed *the* phenomena that showed our steps *away from Christianity*, the phenomena that most

clearly revealed the *Gottunfähigkeit* of modern man.⁹⁰ From a Schmittian perspective, the era of biopolitics is nothing else than a momentary prelude to the age of the *homme machine*.

These differences between Foucault and Schmitt lay the ground for understanding the very surprising similarities between Schmitt's warning narrative concerning the rise of the "human-machine" and Donna Haraway's celebratory and ironic notion of the cyborg. Schmitt's arguments, in fact, clearly prefigure many of the same ideas that Haraway produces in her 1985 *Cyborg Manifesto* from a diametrically opposed perspective.⁹¹ Schmitt would have completely agreed with Haraway, who proclaimed that "Foucault's biopolitics is a flaccid premonition of cyborg politics" and that "Foucault's *Birth of the Clinic*, *History of Sexuality*, and *Discipline and Punish* name a form of power at its moment of implosion."⁹² From this perspective, biopolitics is at best an intermediary stage in a broader process that does not lead or even cause the formation of the "human being," as maintained by Foucault, but rather appears as a necessary part in a much broader, constantly accelerating process that eventually obliterates the most basic presuppositions concerning humanity. Haraway's cyborg, like Schmitt's "human-machine" is not the subject of biopolitics; it at best "simulates politics"⁹³ if the phenomenon is understood in terms of previous human history.

What Haraway praises as the "cyborg," "a hybrid of machine and organism" and "a myth faithful to feminism, socialism and materialism,"⁹⁴ is almost identical with Schmitt's portrayal of the *homunculus*, the artificial *homme machine* that produces its own conditions of non-natural existence. What could be more monstrous to Schmitt, who always pleaded for clear conceptual distinctions and prided himself on being able to produce them, than Haraway's "*pleasure* in the confusion of boundaries," her argument that in the late twentieth century we are witnessing "three crucial boundary breakdowns," those between human and animal, between the new animal-human and the machine, and the boundary of the physical and the non-physical?⁹⁵ To a conservative Christian, who always took for granted the unique position of the human being in the universe and the dominating position of men in society, a possible "world without gender," "without a genesis," a "world without end,"

and without “salvation history”⁹⁶ was indeed *the* threat made possible by technology. What for Schmitt emerges as a world in chaos, appears to Haraway as one potentially filled with new categories of liberation.

The deepest connection between Haraway and Schmitt lies in their opposite ways of appropriating the genre of utopian and dystopian science fiction to understand the (post)modern era. Indeed, Haraway posits her own work within this tradition and names the works of Joanna Russ, Samuel R. Delany, James Tiptree Jr., John Varley, Octavia Butler and Vonda McIntyre as the sources for a new kind of utopian and dystopian imaginary that allows us to question the ordering principles of Western societies.⁹⁷ While Schmitt claims that the works of More, Defoe, Swift, Butler, Huxley and Orwell reflect the growing utopianism and rationalization of the world and portray this growing influence as a virus that threatens to erase the political rationalism of the Western tradition, Haraway creates her own canon of utopists precisely to challenge our conceptions of anthropocentric normality. Ultimately, by aiming to transgress all seemingly self-evident binaries the cyborg stands against the core claim of Schmittian political existentialism, “the manic compulsion to name the Enemy.”⁹⁸

These differences disclose clearly how and why Schmitt and Haraway disagree about what makes human life meaningful. Schmitt always thought that he had “found the only concrete category of existentialism: Friend and enemy.”⁹⁹ The basic idea that penetrates Schmitt’s political existentialism is indeed the following notion: “I think, therefore I have enemies; I have enemies, therefore I am,” which is to Schmitt nothing less than “the quintessence of everything of what can be thought about thinking and being (*Sein*); it is concrete thinking as such (*schlechthin*).”¹⁰⁰ Playing with Descartes’s cogito-argument, Schmitt would define the existential nature of his own thinking with the maxim: “*Distinguo ergo sum*”; I distinguish, therefore I am.¹⁰¹

All of this is merely a reflection of the fact that Schmitt’s conservative-Christian thinking and his diagnosis of modernity is defined by an abyssal horror toward a world that no longer makes distinctions. Politically speaking, Schmitt always thought that the emerging “One World” was

“terrifying” because it would no longer have an *Ausland*, an “outland” that could provide a “way to freedom” and offer a “space (*Spielraum*) for the free trial of strength.”¹⁰² Schmitt’s fear that the pluriverse of different states and peoples could be replaced with a nonpolitical universe was always accompanied by an equally abyssal fear against the eradication of private and social differences. This is why Schmitt bemoans in his diaries that “the equality of man and woman can obviously only be realized on the level of the woman”¹⁰³; that “the emancipation of the Negroes has happened in a way that the whites have become Negroes,”¹⁰⁴ and that the emancipation of the Jews has happened in a way that “the Christians have become Jews.”¹⁰⁵ Although Schmitt himself always emphasized that the political enemy is not the private enemy, in his diagnosis of modernity Schmitt’s personal opinions, which are not only conservative but also anti-Semitic and racist, nevertheless clearly converge with the basic axiom of his political thinking: the tendency to *equalize all differences and existing hierarchies with meaning*.

The arguments of Haraway’s ironic essay must be seen in contrast to these existential presuppositions that define not only Schmittian thinking but certain forms of conservative thinking in general. Haraway challenges the idea that a meaningful human life could only be lived by affirming *each and every existing difference and hierarchy* as meaningful or inevitable. It is equally self-evident that from the point of view of Schmittian *Begriffsrealismus*, Haraway’s critique is just a heap of meaningless words that lack the polemical qualities of truly political concepts. As this comparison with Haraway demonstrates, the fact that Schmitt defined utopian thinking as determined by “humorless planning” stands in contrast to his own fully humorless acceptance of the most traditional Western hierarchies. Without realizing it himself, in his late works Schmitt in fact comes to occupy and utilize the very same concept of humanity he had always loathed. There is indeed a certain inescapable irony that the same man who in his *Glossarium* would harness the image of the Christian God in order to defend the humanity of the Western human being was still the same intellectual

adventurer who had previously declared and would continue to declare in a self-satisfied manner:
Whoever invokes humanity, wants to cheat.

¹ Carl Schmitt, *Der Schatten Gottes. Introspektionen, Tagebücher und Briefe 1921 bis 1924*, ed. Gerd Giesler, Ernst Hüsmert and Wolfgang H. Spindler (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 2014), 501, 527; cf. 512, 524, 532, 547. All translations from Schmitt's texts are my own.

² For similar remarks as quoted above, see Carl Schmitt, *Tagebücher 1925 bis 1929*, ed. Martin Tielke and Gerd Giesler (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 2018), 354, 359, 447, 453.

³ Carl Schmitt, *Glossarium. Aufzeichnungen aus den Jahren 1947 bis 1958*, ed. Gerd Giesler and Martin Tielke (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 2015), 99

⁴ Previous research on technology in Schmitt has focused on the Weimar period, for example, John. P. McCormick, *Carl Schmitt's Critique of Liberalism: Against Politics as Technology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

⁵ On Schmitt's influence, see Dirk Van Laak, *Gespräche in der Sicherheit des Schweigens. Carl Schmitt in der politischen Geistesgeschichte der frühen Bundesrepublik* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002); Jan-Werner Müller, *A Dangerous Mind: Carl Schmitt in Post-War European Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003); Alain de Benoist, *Carl Schmitt: Internationale Bibliographie der Primär- und Sekundärliteratur* (Graz: Ares, 2010); Jens Meierhenrich and Oliver Simons (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Carl Schmitt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

⁶ For example, Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law 1870-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Louiza Odysseos and Fabio Petito (eds.), *The International Political thought of Carl Schmitt: Terror, Liberal War and the Crisis of Global Order* (London: Routledge, 2007).

⁷ Schmitt, *Glossarium*. 8.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., 32.

¹⁰ Ibid., 333; cf. 521.

¹¹ Ibid., 35.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 221.

¹⁴ Ibid. Despite clear differences, which cannot be analyzed here in detail, Schmitt's understanding of the totalizing nature of technology comes close to Martin Heidegger's (who Schmitt refers to on numerous occasions in his *Glossarium*) analysis of the logic of the *Gestell*, the all-encompassing instrumentality of "enframing," which transforms everything, including human nature to an enormous "standing reserve" (*Bestand*) which can be utilized at will. See Martin Heidegger, "Die Frage nach der Technik," in *Vorträge und Aufsätze*, ed. Friedrich Wilhelm von Hermann (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2000), 5–36.

¹⁵ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 35–6.

¹⁶ Ibid., 36. Schmitt also refers to Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* (1872) and its description of "biologically-based criminalization of illness" to which "we can still barely laugh after our own experiences" (Ibid., 90). Elsewhere, Schmitt notes that George Orwell's "vision of future" in his *1984*, "appear to many, at least potentially, already present in all their technical requirements." Carl Schmitt, "Dreihundert Jahre Leviathan," in Carl Schmitt, *Staat, Grossraum, Nomos*, ed. Günter Maschke (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1995) (from now on SGN), 152.

¹⁷ Ibid., 36.

¹⁸ Carl Schmitt, "Der Staat als Mechanismus bei Hobbes und Descartes," in Carl Schmitt, *Staat, Grossraum, Nomos* (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 1995), 139, 141, 145. In addition to the great machine, the leviathan was also a symbol of the *magnus homo*, the great animal and the mortal god, all transformations which for Schmitt represent "the full completion of reformation" in Hobbes. Carl

Schmitt, “Die Vollendete Reformation: Bemerkungen und Hinweise zu Neuen Leviathan-Interpretationen,” *Der Staat* 4(1) (1965): 51–69 (54, 65).

¹⁹ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 71.

²⁰ Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen* (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 2009), 55–7.

²¹ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 185.

²² Ibid.

²³ Carl Schmitt, *Politische Theologie II. Die Legende von der Erledigung jeder Politischen Theologie*. (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 1996), 97. On the context of these arguments, see Timo Pankakoski, “Reoccupying Secularization: Schmitt and Koselleck on Blumenberg’s Challenge,” *History and Theory* 52 (May 2013): 214–245.

²⁴ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 367.

²⁵ Arnold Gehlen, *Der Mensch: Seine Natur und seine Stellung in der Welt* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2016).

²⁶ Ernst Cassirer, *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964); Helmuth Plessner, *Die Stufen des Organischen und der Mensch: Einleitung in die philosophische Anthropologie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975); Max Scheler, *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1975). On this tradition, see Joachim Fischer, *Philosophische Anthropologie: Eine Denkrichtung des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg: Verlag Karl Alber, 2016).

²⁷ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 200, 191. Schmitt is referring to Thomas Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798).

²⁸ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 227.

²⁹ Diego H. Rossello, “‘To be human, nonetheless, remains a decision’: Humanism as decisionism in contemporary critical political theory.” *Contemporary Political Theory* (2017) 16(4): 439–458.

³⁰ For example, Günter Meuter, *Der Katechon: Zu Carl Schmitts fundamentalistischer Kritik der Zeit* (Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1994)

³¹ For example, Julia Hell, “Katechon: Carl Schmitt's Imperial Theology and the Ruins of the Future,” *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*, 84:4 (2009), 283–326.

³² Schmitt himself connects these issues by stating: “God is dead means: The space (*Raum*) is dead, the corporeality (*Körperlichkeit*) is dead” (Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 141).

³³ As Carlo Galli emphasizes, instead of one-sided nostalgia, Schmitt’s analysis is genealogical. See Carlo Galli, *Janus’s Gaze: Essays on Carl Schmitt* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015), 133. On the problems of Westphaliacentric narratives, see Benno Teschke, *The Myth of 1648 Class, Geopolitics, and the Making of Modern International Relations* (London: Verso, 2003).

³⁴ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 238. While Ionut Untea argues that Schmitt’s post-war writings led him to draw elements from medieval thought, this quoted passage illustrates how deeply Schmitt remains rooted to the neutrality of *ius publicum Europaeum*. See Ionut Untea, “New Middle Ages or New Modernity? Carl Schmitt’s Interwar Perspective on Political Unity in Europe,” in Mark Hewitson and Matthew D’Auria, eds., *Europe in Crisis: Intellectuals and the European Idea 1917–1957* (New York: Berghahn, 2015), 155–168.

³⁵ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 205; c.f., 372.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 372 (my emphasis).

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 216–7.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 82, 84–85.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁴¹ On the state-*Grossraum-nomos* nexus, see especially Reinhard Mehring, “Der ‘Nomos’ nach 1945 bei Carl Schmitt und Jürgen Habermas,” *Forum historiae iuris* (30. April 2006), available at

<http://www.forhistiur.de/2006-04-mehring/>; Stuart Elden, “Reading Schmitt geopolitically: Nomos, territory and Großraum,” *Radical Philosophy* 161 (May/June 2010): 18–26.

⁴² Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 124. Well-known interpretations of Schmitt as a catholic include, Meier, Heinrich, *Die Lehre Carl Schmitts. Vier Kapitel zur Unterscheidung Politischer Theologie und Politischer Philosophie* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1994); Meuter, *Katechon*, 1994; Andreas Koenen, *Der Fall Carl Schmitt. Sein Aufstieg zum “Kronjuristen des Dritten Reiches”* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995).

⁴³ Reinhard Mehring, “Wie fängt man ein Chamäleon? Probleme und Wege einer Carl Schmitt-Biographie,” *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte* 3, no. 2 (2009): 71–86.

⁴⁴ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 99 (my emphasis).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁴⁶ Schmitt, *Tagebücher 1925–1929*, 342.

⁴⁷ On Schmitt’s gradual alienation from the church, see especially Schmitt, *Der Schatten Gottes*, 58, 98, 129, 339, 502; Schmitt, *Tagebücher 1925–1929*, 8, 35, 43, 70, 74, 128, 192–3, 207, 210, 224, 250, 274, 299, 318, 341–2, 347, 396–7, 431–2, 444.

⁴⁸ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 15, 38; Carl Schmitt, *Der Nomos der Erde im Völkerrecht des Jus Publicum Europaeum* (Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 2011), 39.

⁴⁹ On Schmitt’s Nazi engagement, see Koenen, *Carl Schmitt*; Ellen Kennedy, *Constitutional Failure: Carl Schmitt in Weimar* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 11–37; Reinhard Mehring, *Carl Schmitt: Aufstieg und Fall* (München: C.H. Beck, 2009), 304–436.

⁵⁰ Carl Schmitt, *Völkerrechtliche Großraumordnung mit Interventionsverbot für raumfremde Mächte. Ein Beitrag zum Reichsbegriff für Völkerrecht*, in Carl Schmitt, SGN, 296–7.

⁵¹ A similar change occurs in the case of Martin Heidegger. See Jacques Derrida, *Of Spirit. Heidegger and the Question*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991). On Heidegger’s antisemitism in the light of his recently published *Black*

Notebooks, see Peter Trawny, *Heidegger und der Mythos der jüdischen Weltverschwörung* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2015).

⁵² As is the case with the question concerning biotechnology, Schmitt's first reference to the problem of "tyranny of values" dates back to a 1924 diary entry. See, Schmitt, *Der Schatten Gottes*, 375.

⁵³ Schmitt, *Die Tyrannei der Werte* (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 2011), 12–4.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 24, 37.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 38.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 14–7; Carl Schmitt, "Die Einheit der Welt," in Carl Schmitt, *SGN*, 500–3. On biopolitics in soviet Socialism, see Sergei Prozorov, *The Biopolitics of Stalinism: Ideology and Life in Soviet Socialism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016).

⁵⁸ Schmitt, *Die Tyrannei*, 17.

⁵⁹ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 162.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 328.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁶² Schmitt, *Die Tyrannei*, 17, 22, 51.

⁶³ For example, Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 136–43; Roberto Esposito, *Bios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, trans. Timothy C. Campbell (London: University of Minnesota Press, 2008): 13–44.

⁶⁴ Schmitt, *Die Tyrannei*, 52.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 17–8.

⁶⁶ Schmitt mentions this book already in a diary-entry from January 1922: "Humanity: Read Binding, the right to die. I do not want to read, I want to live." A few months after, Schmitt also notes interestingly: "the philosophy of humanity (*Humanität*), the most atrocious betrayal of humankind (*Menschheit*)." (Schmitt, *Der Schatten Gottes*, 46, 61.)

⁶⁷ Schmitt, *Theorie des Partisanen. Zwischenbemerkung zum Begriff des Politischen* (Berlin: Duncker & Humboldt, 2010), 80 note 49, 95–6.

⁶⁸ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 229.

⁶⁹ Carl Schmitt, “La oposición entre comunidad y sociedad como ejemplo de una distinción bimembre. consideraciones sobre la estructura y el destino de tales antítesis,” trans. Alexis Emanuel Gros, *Anacronismo e Irreupción. Revista de Teoria y Filosofía, Politics Clásica y Moderna*, 4(7) (2014): 171–188 (186).

⁷⁰ Schmitt, *Die Tyrannei*, 19.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 20.

⁷³ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 14.

⁷⁴ See the commentary of Gerd Giesler and Martin Tielke, in Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 410.

⁷⁵ Antisemitism is so prevalent in Schmitt’s diary notes that it would be almost impossible to enumerate each antisemitic remark individually. This is especially the case after his 1928 move to Berlin. See Schmitt, *Tagebücher 1925 bis 1929*; Carl Schmitt, *Tagebücher 1930–1934*, ed. Wolfgang Schuller (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011). On Schmitt’s antisemitism, see Raphael Gross, *Carl Schmitt und die Juden: Eine Deutsche Rechtslehre* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000).

⁷⁶ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 14, 410. On the absolutization of the religion of Judaism into an ethnic category, see Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, 1994), 79–88.

⁷⁷ Schmitt, *Die Tyrannei*, 51.

⁷⁸ Schmitt elaborates the connection between humanism and totalitarianism in his *Der Nomos der Erde*, where he notes that it is during the eighteenth century that a “philosophy of absolute humanity” makes a breakthrough: “Only with the human being of absolute humanity does his specific new enemy, the non-human (*Unmensch*) appear as the other side of the same concept. The separation of the non-human from the human being was followed by the still much deeper division in the nineteenth

century: that between the super-human (*Übermenschen*) and the sub-human (*Untermenschen*). Just as the human being [brings] the non-human, so does the super-human immediately bring with it through dialectical necessity the sub-human as its hostile twin into the history of mankind.” (Schmitt, *Der Nomos*, 72–3). On this dualistic nature of humanism in Schmitt, see Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations*, 432–6.

⁷⁹ On biopolitics, see Thomas Lemke, *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*, trans. Eric Frederick Trump (New York: New York University Press, 2011). That Schmitt was familiar with the notion of biopolitics is proven by the fact that he published a review of Rudolf Kjéllen’s *Staten som livsform* (1916) that pioneered this concept. See, Carl Schmitt, Review of Rudolf Kjéllen, *Der Staat als Lebensform* (1924), *Wirtschaftsdienst* (1925) 10:1010. Although Schmitt is occasionally used within the context of biopolitics-research, this has been, thus far, very non-analytic. For example, Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer*; Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001); Achille Mbembe, “Necropolitics,” trans. Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture*, 15, no. 1 (Winter 2003): 11–40; Giorgio Agamben, *State of Exception*, trans. Kevin Attell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005). Drawing on Schmitt post-war writings, my intention is to show that like many have argued is the case with Hannah Arendt’s well-known analyses of totalitarianism and the modern human condition, Schmitt was analyzing the same phenomena – the same nexus around life, politics and Western modernity – that Foucault and others have analyzed later in different terms. On studies that make this case for Arendt, see André Duarte, “Biopolitics and the dissemination of violence: The Arendtian critique of the present,” *HannahArendt.net* 1 (2005): 1–15; Miguel Vatter, “Nativity and Biopolitics in Arendt,” *Revista de Ciencia Política* 26 (2006): 137–59; Kathrin Braun, “Biopolitics and Temporality in Arendt and Foucault,” *Time & Society* 16 (2007): 5–23; Claire Blencowe “Foucault’s and Arendt’s ‘insider view’ of biopolitics: A critique of Agamben,” *History of the Human Sciences* 23 (2010): 113–30; Ville Suuronen, “Resisting Biopolitics: Hannah Arendt as a

Thinker of Automation, Social Rights, and Basic Income,” *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 43(1) (February 2018): 35–53.

⁸⁰ On posthumanism, see Francesca Ferrando, “Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Antihumanism, Metahumanism, and New Materialisms: Differences and Relations,” *Existenz* 8(2) (2013): 26–32; Andy Miah, “A Critical History of Posthumanism,” in Bert Gordijn and Ruth Chadwick, eds., *Medical Enhancement and Posthumanity, The International Library of Ethics, Law and Technology, vol 2.* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2008), 71–94. Schmitt has thus far not been discussed in this context. However, I do not mean to single out Schmitt as a unique predecessor to these discussions, since many of his contemporaries, like Heidegger (see endnote 14), Sigmund Freud and Alexandre Kojévé developed similar ideas. See for instance Freud’s thoughts on the “prosthetic god” (*Prothesengott*) and Kojévé’s reflections on “post-historical” civilization. Sigmund Freud, *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur* (Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1930), 49–53; Alexandre Kojévé, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel. Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 158–162 footnote 6. For broader historical context, see Benjamin Lazier, “Earthrise; or, The Globalization of the World Picture,” *The American Historical Review* 116, no. 3 (June 2011): 602–30.

⁸¹ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality. Vol. 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 143.

⁸² Michel Foucault, *Les mots et les chose: une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), 398.

⁸³ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 185 (my emphasis).

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 189.

⁸⁵ See Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Creation of the World or Globalization*, trans. Francois Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: SUNY, 2007), 93–5.

⁸⁶ Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 40.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 63.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 157.

⁸⁹ Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population, Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*, trans. Graham Burchell (New York: Picador, 2009).

⁹⁰ Schmitt's historical portrayal thus comes closer to Mika Ojakangas, *On the Greek Origins of Biopolitics: A Reinterpretation of the History of Biopower* (London: Routledge, 2016).

⁹¹ Donna Haraway, "Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s," *Socialist Review* 80 (1985): 65–108

⁹² Ibid., 66, 69.

⁹³ Ibid., 82.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 65.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 66, 68–70

⁹⁶ Ibid., 67.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 66, 97–99.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 68.

⁹⁹ Schmitt, *Glossarium* 151; cf., 61.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 265.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 240.

¹⁰² Ibid., 28.

¹⁰³ Schmitt, *Tagebücher 1925 bis 1929*, 366; cf., Schmitt, *Glossarium*, 336.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 124.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 269, 282, 321.