

Conclusion

As was stated in the introduction, scholarship on Hegel and Schmitt has rarely related their political thought to one another. This neglect prevented Hegel's solution to the modern problem of political sovereignty from seeing the light of the day. Followers of Schmitt's critical views tend to remain bound to an intellectual debate that is limited to a discussion of short-term solutions to the modern problem of democracy. On the other hand, the few authors who worked on both Hegel and Schmitt took up a historical perspective either to update some aspects of Schmitt's solution by drawing from Hegel's political thought or to reduce Hegel's political thought to Schmitt's. For instance, authors such as Hannah Arendt, Leo Strauss, Andreas Kalyvas and Chantal Mouffe adopted Schmitt's critical view without paying attention to Hegel's analysis of political liberalism. Other authors, including Kervégan and Cristi, extensively worked on Schmitt and Hegel but did not examine Schmitt's theory of politics from a Hegelian point of view.

I defended the view that Hegel's tripartite division of powers offers a more satisfactory solution to the liberal predicament than Schmitt, for whereas Schmitt conceived of a unilateral executive power as a sovereign power, Hegel defends the constitutional monarchy as a genuine conception of political sovereignty. Accordingly, I bring Hegel's account of the modern state to bear on the problem for which Schmitt tried—and failed—to find a solution. Schmitt rightly showed that the problem of political sovereignty arises from the irreconcilability of mass democracy and liberal parliamentarism in liberal political theories. Schmitt, however, took the principle of liberal parliamentarism for granted, while, for him, the central problem in liberal political theories is that the principle of mass democracy cannot be reconciled with the former. Thus, in Schmitt's view only a theory of politics that allegedly overcomes the totalitarian tendencies of mass democracy seems sufficient to overcome the threat posed by mass democracy on the stability of a political order. Whereas Hegel, like Schmitt, claims that the immediate identity of the state and the division of powers tends to become totalitarian, for Hegel, liberal parliamentarism is not free from problems either, namely, an authoritarian tendency. Hegel, thus, argues for a solution that precludes the possibility of an authoritarian sovereign power, since he conceives of a sovereign power not as a mere decision-making power on the 'friend and enemy' distinction, as suggested by Schmitt. In the *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel argues that the division of powers within a political state must be mediated by a concrete universal will that functions as their higher unity, namely, the constitutional monarchy. Thus, in my view, both modern pro-liberal contemporary states and political theorists could profit from evaluating their position in light of Hegel's conception of the tripartite

division of powers. More specifically, Hegel's defence of the constitutional monarchy suggests that the modern problem of political sovereignty could be solved.

In my view, modern pro-liberal states can draw some lessons from this book as regards the problem of overcoming the liberal predicament. The political elites who designed Schmittian authoritarianism as a solution to political problems were inspired by Marx rather than Hegel. Yet, seen from the perspective of Hegel, two outstanding problems preclude Schmittian authoritarianism from establishing a stable political order. First, instead of the estates or a set of corporations as conceived by Hegel, the state distinguishes the friend and enemy. As Hegel suggests, the protection of the particular interests of different social groups, rather than friendly groups, should be taken as the foundation for the state's formation. For only in this way can the social sphere of freedom be harmonized with the state. Second, the principle of political sovereignty is not recognized. The states defined along friend and enemies lines do not really care about the sustainability of the state. But, as Hegel claims, the constitutional monarchy is a key power that maintains the stability of the state by overcoming the opposition between the universality and particularity of state's freedom. Thus, contemporary states, which follow Schmittian views in a way, would benefit a lot if they could remedy the two outstanding problems of authoritarianism in light of Hegel's conception of corporations and the constitutional monarchy, thereby securing democratic sovereignty.