Machiavellianism Come of Age? Leo Strauss on Modernity and Economics

"Machiavelli's discovery or invention of the need for an immoral or amoral substitute for morality became victorious through Locke's discovery or invention that that substitute is acquisitiveness. .the solution of the political problem by economic means is the most elegant solution, once accepts Machiavelli's premise: economism is Machiavellianism come of age.'"

Whether or not one should speculate about the end of history, the time is ripe for re-examining the philosophical foundations of capitalism and communism. An examination of Leo Strauss's claim that "economism is Machiavellianism come of age" will facilitate comprehension and assessment of Adam Smith and Karl Marx, the philosophers who have had the greatest impact on economic theory and practice. An examination of Smith and Marx will likewise facilitate assessment of Strauss.

Strauss wrote little about Marx and even less about Smith. His recommendations about contemporary politics, however, centered on the "crisis" of liberal democracy, a weakening of resolve and self-confidence from which communism might have seemed immune. Consistent with his claim about economism, Strauss acknowledged that liberal democracy and communism may have shared a common goal: "the universal prosperous society of free and equal men and women" *(C&M 5, LAM* vii). Yet Strauss recommended that social science undertake a "relentless critique of communism" *(Rebirth 6),*

denounced the Soviet Union as "a barbaric and cruel, narrow-minded and cunning foreign enemy," condemned Nietzsche and Heidegger for their abandonment of liberal democracy, and extolled "unhesitating loyalty to a decent constitution and even to the cause of constitutionalism" *(WIPP 27,* 54-5; *LAM 24).* Whatever their similarities, the superiority of liberal democracy to communism is "obvious enough"; liberal democracy belongs to an earlier phase of modernity, and "comes closer to what the classics demanded than any alternative that is viable in our age" *(OT 207, Waves* 98).

Labeling Marx as "that Machiavellian" *(WIPP* 41), Strauss condemned communism in part for its adherence to the principle that the end justifies the means.[2] It seems, moreover, that Strauss's greatest nightmare was a global communist tyranny, which, with the help of modern technology, could permanently extinguish even "the most modest efforts in the direction of thought."[3] He therefore entertained the possibility that war would be preferable to surrender *(Epilog 327),* despite the possible destruction of modern civilization *(WIPP* 69, 84). In condemning communism, Strauss condemned Marx, "the father of communism" *(LAM* 24). He did not, however, praise laissez-faire or Adam Smith.

The controversy generated by Strauss's anti-communism, however, pales in comparison to that generated by the critiques of positivism and historicism interwoven with his revisionist history of Western thought. In Strauss's account, Machiavelli, as the founder of modernity, initiated a "venture" or "project" that precipitated liberal democracy, capitalism, communism, positivistic social science, and radical historicism.[4] Strauss admits that "the teachings of the political philosophers . . . may have played only a minor political role," but he rightly insists that "one cannot know this before one knows them solidly" *(C&M* 9).[5]

John Pocock, who objects in principle to Strauss's efforts to uncover elaborate hidden teachings, takes a more modest view of Machiavelli's influence on the subsequent development of political thought. I can here only sketch the debate between Pocock and Strauss. Pocock would agree with Strauss's assertion that one of the most powerful trends of modern political thought was the revival of

Roman republicanism pioneered by Machiavelli and developed by figures such as Harrington, Spinoza, Sydney, Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Publius *(WIPP* 47). This is the tradition of "civic humanism" that Pocock has elaborated so thoroughly-and influentially.[6] Pocock implicitly dissents, however, from Strauss's claim that Machiavelli's republican legacy was not "comparable in importance" to the economistic "transformation of his scheme ... inspired by his own principle" *(WIPP* 47), for Pocock stresses the opposition between civic humanism and the emerging bourgeois world characterized by parliamentary patronage, public debt, government stocks, the division of labor, standing armies, professionalized bureaucracies, international trade, political arithmetic, and the replacement of inheritable by marketable property.'

To demonstrate Machiavelli's responsibility for "economism," one would have to elaborate, more thoroughly than Strauss did, the "long-range project" elusively delineated by the *Discourses:* for example, the parallels between spiritual and ordinary warfare, the hidden analysis of Christianity in Book II, allegories about Machiavelli's own enterprise in Book III.[6] Pocock is therefore right to wonder whether, from Strauss's point of view, anyone prior to Strauss had fully comprehended the *Discourses;*° full understanding, according to Strauss, requires one to read not only between the lines of the *Discourses* but "as it were between the covers of the *Discourses* and those of Livy's *History"-an* "infinite task."[Io]

Strauss's writings on subsequent modern authors provide little documentation of Machiavelli's influence. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is the relationship between Machiavelli and Hobbes. Whereas the early Strauss identified Hobbes as the founder of modern political philosophy (PPHxv-xvi), the mature Strauss claimed that it was Machiavelli who discovered "the continent on which Hobbes could erect his structure" *(NRH* 177): it was Machiavelli who initiated the campaign against "the kingdom of darkness" *(TM* 231); it was Machiavelli who uncovered terror at the root of the human experience *(TM 90,* 167, 219, *249),* substituted political virtue for human excellence, rejected the *summum bonum* and the primacy of duty, and denied that "man must take his bearings by virtue, by his

perfection, by his natural end." [11] Hobbes's ingenious contribution was the reconstitution of natural law on Machiavellian premises.' [2]

Whatever the gaps in Strauss's proofs of Machiavelli's historical impact, Pocock too quickly dismisses Strauss's allegations that Machiavelli engaged in "a sustained esoteric exercise." Pocock complains that such allegations are inherently non-falsifiable and even uncriticizable, [13] and fails to acknowledge that most of Strauss's arguments about Machiavelli-even about Machiavelli's complex use of Livy-are meticulous, well documented, sustained, and rigorous. Although Pocock asserts that he could go on identifying specific mistakes in Strauss's allegations of hidden intentions, two of the three objections Pocock articulates can be easily refuted, and Strauss's wording could easily be amended to obviate the third. [14]

Pocock concedes that an author may communicate with concealed hints, but suggests arbitrary limits to investigating such communication when he argues that by "studying the language patterns available in the author's time," historians may "discover any means of conveying or revealing esoteric meanings which may then have existed and been recognized." [15] There are two obvious objections to Pocock's position. First, insofar as Machiavelli had access to ancient and medieval books that practiced esoteric writing, he could have learned techniques that were not widely "recognized" by his contemporaries. [16] Second, why assume that a gifted thinker is incapable of employing innovative techniques of indirect communication? Though he belittles Machiavelli's "allegedly hidden teaching of evil," Pocock fails to confront or even to acknowledge Strauss's straightforward accounts of ways that Machiavelli conveyed his challenges to prevailing ideas: by presenting second statements on a subject which, in effect, retract earlier pronouncements that are more orthodox; by sandwiching unorthodox formulations within more conventional ones (a procedure that dominates the structure of *The Prince);* by scattering remarks relevant to evaluating characters like Agathocles, Borgia, Severus, Moses, Hannibal, and Caesar.' [?]

One must sympathize with complaints about Strauss's departures from the straightforwardness directed by contemporary academic conventions, but one must not ignore the problems posed

even by Strauss's more accessible positions for Pocock's own account of Machiavellianism. The biggest challenge is Strauss's depiction of the distance separating Machiavellian opposition to corruption and Machiavellian patriotism from classical republicanism, which treated moral virtue as the purpose of political society, not merely as a means to the common good.[18] Strauss gives a detailed explanation of how Machiavelli's doctrine of republican virtue and his amoral conception of the common good clash with classical teachings about the moral virtues, the good life, the soul, and the best regime.[19] Pocock acknowledges some of these difficulties,[20] and, like Strauss, argues that Machiavelli has moved a considerable distance from orthodox Christianity.[21]

Although the question of Machiavelli's responsibility for the general development of modernity must remain open, Strauss's analysis of Machiavellianism in Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau will prove to be an illuminating framework for understanding and assessing the clash between capitalism and communism.[22]

Lowering the Sights

Machiavelli's principle, according to Strauss, is that "one must lower the standards in order to make probable, if not certain, the actualization of the right or desirable social order or in order to conquer chance" *(WIPP 46-7).* The retreat from virtue, the goal typically posited by classical and medieval political philosophy, dominates the "first wave" of modernity, with the turn towards self-preservation (Hobbes) and property (Locke).[23] The "decisive turn" initiated by Machiavelli identifies philosophy's purpose with, among other things, guiding man "toward the rational society, the bond and end of which is enlightened self-interest or the comfortable self-preservation of each of its members" *(TM 296).*[24] Thus Hobbes's contributions almost sufficed to actualize Machiavelli's primary intention" *(WIPP* 47).

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* follows directly in the footsteps of Hobbes and Locke. Its explicit and dominant purpose is to increase wealth: the "necessaries, conveniencies, and amusements of human life" (WN I.v.1).[25] The first two duties of government are

defense and the administration of justice, the latter consisting primarily in the protection of life and property. The book's exaltation of the means to bodily sustenance and comforts is matched perfectly by its depreciation of the soul, which is essentially ignored, and by its unobtrusive but uncompromising rejection of God. Smith,too, looks to the subhuman rather than the superhuman.[26]

The Wealth of Nations radicalizes the lowering of the sights by taking the economic ends as a given: political economy is the science of *obtaining* wealth *(WN* II.v.31, IV Intro, IV.ix.50). The book's psychological linchpin is the desire to "better one's condition." The "most vulgar and obvious" understanding of betterment is increased wealth (II.iii.28), a goal which the book accepts, without explicit argument, as authoritative. Given that Smith also identifies "the great mob of mankind" as "the admirers and the worshipers" of wealth and power as opposed to wisdom and virtue *(TMS I.iii.3.2),* we may conclude that Smith agrees with Strauss's Machiavelli in "accepting the ends of the *demos* as beyond appeal" and seeking "the best means conducive to those ends" *(TM 296, 127, 260).* Smith seems to assume that there is no resting point-for example, the Aristotelian *polis* which pursues that amount of wealth necessary for the "good life"-between the necessitousness of hunting society and the frenetic motion of capitalism.

By concerning himself with exchange-value rather than use-value or utility *(WN* I.iv.13), Smith avoids passing judgments about intrinsic goodness or worth; his books almost completely ignore natural right and natural law.[27] Locke, by contrast, invokes natural law to establish that the end of government is the preservation of property and to specify how property maybe legitimately acquired.[28] Locke's thesis that labor "put the difference of value on everything" supports his defense of private appropriation, money, inequality, the division of labor, and "established laws of liberty to secure protection and encouragement to the honest industry of mankind."[29] Smith, however, by making labor the foundation of a comprehensive theory of exchange value *(WN* I.iv.13-17, I.v.1-2), goes beyond Locke in facilitating the commercialization of society *(TMS* II.ii.3.2), and thus inaugurates modern economics.

Locke's occasional concessions to the traditional view of acquisition as morally reprehensible, according to Strauss, are intended to be signposts of the quietly revolutionary character of Locke's teaching *(NRH* 246-8). This observation suggests an explanation for the notorious puzzles in Smith's books. The Hobbesian and Lockean tone that dominates *The Wealth of Nations is* occasionally punctuated by remarks with a classical flavor: for example, Smith's argument that government should attempt to perfect the "essential .. . character of human nature," not only as a means to order and security, but as an end in itself.[30] The great puzzle, however, concerns the relationship between *The Wealth of Nations* and *The Theory of Moral Sentiments,* for the "sights" of the latter book seem to be aimed much higher: towards wisdom, virtue, love, God, the soul, the afterlife, and benevolence. On perhaps the most essential points, however, even *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* remains firmly within the modern tradition, following Hume (and ultimately Hobbes) in treating the passions as authoritative and in linking nature ultimatelywith preservation rather than perfection; although not always conspicuously, the book explains the higher in terms of the lower, with anticipations of Marx and Darwin.[31]

According to Strauss, Machiavelli's efforts to lower the standards and to conquer chance necessitated his rejection of the ancients' exaltation of the contemplative life and prepared his successors' reorientation of philosophy towards the conquest of nature and the relief of man's estate. Ultimately, "the radical distinction between science and manual labor was to be replaced by the smooth cooperation of the scientist and the engineer" *(LAM* 20). Although the "revolution in natural science" occurred after Machiavelli's time, it was "in harmony with his spirit" *(Waves* 87)-"the brain which can transform the political matter soon learns to think of the transformation of every matter."[32] Machiavelli assumed-but did not demonstrate-the untenable character of teleological natural science.[33]

Like most of his modern predecessors, Adam Smith rejects the monastic vision of contemplation with special vehemence *(TMS* II1.2.34-5). Early in *The Wealth of Nations,* moreover, he tacitly mocks Platonic inegalitarianism and intimates the social niche of the

new type of philosopher.[34]

Natural science succeeded in transforming the world only because the modern economy marshalled the energies of millions of human beings, directed by capitalists, princes, and ministers-and facilitated by scientists and inventors. For both Smith and Marx, the full unleashing and harnessing of this species-power requires a global economy. Essential to Smith's "system of natural liberty" is the removal of barriers to international trade; like Marx, Smith both documents and encourages the globalization set in motion by the great navigational discoveries. Smith thus abandons the classical preference for small, isolated, self-sufficient societies that can superintend the characters of their citizens.

In assessing the heights at which Marx's sights are set, we confront a characteristic paradox. Like Rousseau and Hegel, Marx draws on pre-modern elements in criticizing the first wave but ultimately departs more radically from classical political philosophy. In one respect, Marx remains decisively within the first wave, criticizing capitalism for failing to deliver on its promise of universal freedom, equality, and prosperity.[35] On the other hand, Marx abandons the consumerist vision, and perhaps even the hedonist vision, of the first wave.[36] Marx's famous account of alienation identifies activity, not passive sensation, with human fulfillment; he criticizes labor under capitalism because it stifles the mind as well as the body.[37] Marx's concern for the development of human faculties is Aristotelian; for Aristotle, however, "full development" requires specialization and rigorous training. Marx, like his predecessors in the second wave, substitutes freedom for virtue.[38]

Although Strauss concedes that the capitalist spirit envisions the "limitless accumulation of capital and profitable investment" as a moral duty, he rejects Weber's suggestion that accumulation was praised as an end in itself: no "writer outside mental institutions ever justified.. unlimited acquisition on any other ground than that of service to the common good" (*NRH* 60, n.22). Marx's primary task is to demonstrate that capitalism functions *as if* accumulation were an end in itself and indeed the supreme end (*Capital* 254, 739, 742, 918). Marx thus adapts Aristotle's critique of *chrematistike* (*Capital*

I:4) and Plato's purging of the feverish city. Capitalism sacrifices the workers on the altar of capital; living labor has become a mere means to augment accumulated labor; like God and the state, capital is a human creation that has taken on a life of its own and becomes the oppressor of its creators.

By so contemptuously dismissing the contemplative ideal and the superhuman, however, Marx further radicalized the first wave. Marx plunged into the political thicket with unprecedented vehemence, authoring a document calling for immediate world-revolution; there is no better example of what Strauss calls "the politization of philosophy" *(NRH* 34, *C&M* 44).

The Amoral Substitute for Morality

Machiavelli's lowering of the sights, according to Strauss, compelled him to find an amoral substitute for morality: the desire for glory, which would cause princes to compel "other bad men to become good and to remain good" *(WIPP* 42). Machiavelli's triumphant message is the thesis that the good or patriotic end "justifies every means": in Mandeville's phrase, "private vice, public benefit."

Hobbes vigorously disparaged glory in the name of "concern with solid comfort, with practical, pedestrian hedonism" *(WIPP* 48). The pivot of Hobbes's teaching, Strauss concludes, is power, which is "infinitely more businesslike than glory. Far from being the goal of a lofty or demonic longing, it is required by, or the expression of, a cold objective necessity." The quest for the amoral substitute is "victorious," however, only with Locke's doctrine of property *(WIPP 49).* Smith follows Locke, devoting his gigantic book to explaining and facilitating the acquisition of wealth. He tacitly transforms Lockean "uneasiness" into the desire for "bettering our condition," which drives us from womb to tomb because we are never perfectly content with our situation, and he adopts the "vulgar" tendency to define improvement in terms of wealth.[40]

Strauss's Machiavelli attacks traditional morality partly in the name of man's "essential unprotectedness": "man's primary condition is one of scarcity" or terror *(TM* 167, *249; cf. 90,* 219). This outlook resonates in the violence of Hobbes's state of nature, in the

viciousness of his "right of nature," and in the penury of Locke's "first ages." Both Smith and Locke stress scarcity more than terror; both defend economic acquisition with reference to nature's frugality, the scantiness of our natural inheritance.

Political economy has two ends or purposes-wealth and greatness/power (*WN* II.v.31, IV.ix.50)-but Smith tries to temper his readers' interest in greatness and power. He tacitly combats our ambition to be princes, prophets, or conquerors; he does not identify theft or conquest as "causes of the wealth of nations"; he lambastes the mercantilist notion that trade is a means of "beggaring thy neighbor"; he emphasizes the high costs of war and tries to redirect nations from empire to production and commerce. Smith concedes, however, that defense is of "much more importance than opulence" (*WN* IV.ii.30), and, unlike Marx, he does not foresee an end to competition and war.[41]

After defining exchange value as "command" over the labor of others (*WN I.v.1),* Smith mentions Hobbes's identification of wealth and power, but proceeds to distinguish wealth from civil and military power.[42] The relationship between their doctrines resembles the relationship Strauss describes between glory and power: exchange value is more businesslike and calculable than Hobbesian power. For Hobbes, power is a "present means" to obtain any "future apparent good," and the fear associated with human foresight prompts preemptive strikes in the state of nature. For Smith, money is the form of power that offers a peaceful antidote to our basic anxiety and discontent.[43] Strauss concedes that glory survives in Hobbes and Locke in the form of "competition" (*WIPP* 48); "the modern tradition that emancipated the passions and hence `competition'... was originated by Machiavelli and perfected by such men as Hobbes and Adam Smith" (0T205). Smith's system of natural liberty is designed to unleash economic competition-within a legal framework that enforces debts and contracts and that protects the individual's life, person, and property-on behalf of the wealth of nations: "every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way" (*WN* IV.ix.51). Competition is in fact the antidote to the injustice and inefficiency engen-

dered by governments in bestowing monopolies and special privileges.

Strauss claims that because Machiavelli intended readers of *The Prince* to "go through a process of brutalization in order to be freed from effeminacy," some of the book's outrageous statements are "not meant seriously but serve a merely pedagogic function." Thus Machiavelli

> tries to divert the adherence of the young from the old to the new teaching by appealing to the taste of the young . . . to the taste of the common people: he displays a bias in favor of the impetuous, the quick, the partisan, the spectacular, and the bloody over and against the deliberate, the slow, the neutral, the silent, and the gentle.[44]

The only brutalization conveyed by *The Wealth of Nations* is its pervasive but unobtrusive depiction of nature's stinginess and the various sacrifices that must be made to combat that stinginess. The great length of the book, in conjunction with its understated and soporific tone, likewise suggests that its Machiavellianism is "come of age." Smith consistently favors the "the solid and the profitable" over "the grand and the marvelous" (WN II.ii.77). He even disparages the speculative entrepreneur-who, in Machiavelli's language, seeks spectacular advances *ad uno* tratto-and exalts the bourgeois vision of advancing gradually through a "long life of industry, frugality, and attention"[45] Both of Smith's books strive unobtrusively but relentlessly to minimize the reader's intoxication with "dazzling objects of ambition," "visionary hopes," "extravagant projects," "giddy admiration," "the splendid and showy equipage of empire," and so on. Smith flirts with Stoic and Epicurean visions of tranquillity, although the restless need to better one's condition ultimately vanquishes both Christian and pagan asceticism.

The picture is complicated by the explanation offered for the pursuit of wealth in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments.* Here Smith answers questions his political economy does not even raise:

> For to what purpose is all the toil and bustle of this world? What

> is the end of avarice and ambition, of the pursuit of wealth, of power, and pre-eminence? *(TMS* I.iii.2.1)

The answer is that because even the common laborer lives above subsistence, the ceaseless quest for "bettering our condition" is motivated not by ease or pleasure but vanity; being noticed and observed, enjoying "sympathy," "approbation," and "fellow-felling," is what compensates for the toil, anxiety, and mortification of the rat race *(TMS* I.iii.2.1). Although vanity and the desire for honor resemble glory, Smith blends them with love and "esteem" so as to sever their connection (as interpreted by Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Rousseau) with violence, conquest, and war. Smith is thus able to restore a certain measure of Aristotle, Augustine, and Aquinas to his account of moral virtue. Even in *The Wealth of Nations,* Smith concedes that riches are generally pursued for the "parade" (I.xi.c.31), although this remark is drowned out by the book's overbearing focus on the material constituents of wealth.

Smith mentions Machiavelli once *in The Theory of Moral Statements.* After observing that Machiavelli was not a man of "the nicest morality," Smith confronts the Machiavelli dilemma: people tend to be so dazzled by success that they praise and obey the criminals who attain dominion *(TMS* VLi.16). By resuscitating both the conscience and the human need for love, Smith can retort that evil-doers will never escape the "avenging furies of shame and remorse" (I.iii.3.8).

The Theory of Moral Sentiments clashes still more profoundly with *The Wealth of Nations* when Smith describes wealth and greatness as "mere trinkets of frivolous utility," avidly pursued because of the human tendency to value the efficacy of the means (i.e., a system, machine, or economy) by which we achieve certain ends more than the ends themselves. When times are good, we exult in the convenience and power that our possessions represent and forget about our vulnerability and mortality-that we can stave off the summer shower but not the winter storm. Thus, the beggar sunning himself by the side of the road may have more "ease of body" and "peace of mind" than the king *(TMS* IV.1.1,3,8,10). It is difficult to reconcile such statements with *The Wealth of Nations.* Even in

The Theory of Moral Sentiments, however, Smith praises the "deception" whereby nature itself "arouses and keeps in continual motion the industry of mankind": our efforts to subdue the earth, to "invent and improve all the sciences and arts, which ennoble and embellish human life" *(TMS* IV.1.10). Perhaps philosophers, having learned how to die, how to look down on the human things as paltry, are likely to rid themselves of this illusion: Smith describes the perspective that dwells on the winter storm as abstract, splenetic, and philosophical *(TMS* IV" .*8-9)*

The discussion of the natural "deception" prepares the book's sole mention of the invisible hand, which uses the "luxury and caprice" of the rich to promote "the multiplication of the species" *(TMS* IV.1.10). In *The Wealth of Nations,* Smith's sole discussion of nature's wisdom identifies the drive to better one's condition as "a principle of preservation" which maintains the natural progress of the "political body" towards wealth and prosperity (IV.ix.28). Natural liberty, by "securing to every man the fruits of his own industry" (WN IV.vii.c.54), and by causing more and more people to experience the pinch of economic necessity,[47] helps convert the individual's desire for preservation into the wealth of the nation and the multiplication of the species.[48] Smith thus extends the transformation of violent aggrandizement by Machiavellian princes into peaceful acquisition by "the great body of the people."

In *The Wealth of Nations,* Smith politely refrains from distracting us with the "philosophical" critique of humanity's creations. Rather, he employs the "spirit of system" to entice his readers into promoting national prosperity: intellectual models of the social mechanism can stimulate our "interest" in the public welfare more effectively than can discussion of the ends themselves *(TMS* IV.1.11). Smith's political economy is thus a human creation which augments or aggravates humanity's natural intoxication with wealth and the power it embodies. One is reminded of what Strauss says of modernity: "the charm of competence bewitches completely first a few great men and then whole nations and indeed as it were the whole human race" *(TM 297).* Does the Will-to-Power infuse modern social science as well as modern society? Do we tend to forget the

conclusion of Hobbes's depiction of our "perpetual and restless desire of power after power" *(Leviathan* XI)?

Smith's suggestions for promoting public spirit by manipulating the individual's fascination with efficacious means illustrate another of Strauss's claims about Machiavelli's "principle": the necessity of shifting emphasis from moral character to "institutions with teeth in them."[49] Enlightened self-interest, channeled by the free market and the social contract, can replace religion and moral education. Machiavelli , however, emphasized the potential utility, if not the inevitability, of religion. According to Strauss, Machiavelli thought that unrest and repression would be constant in the absence of religious hopes and fears: "only if their desires are thus limited can the many become satisfied with making those small demands which can in principle be fulfilled by political means" *(TM* 230). It is rather Hobbes who provides the first "doctrine that necessarily and unmistakably points to a thoroughly `enlightened,' i.e., a-religious or atheistic society as the solution of the social or political problem" *(NRH* 198).

Whatever the ambiguities of the treatment of religion in books by Machiavelli, Bacon, Descartes, Grotius, Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, *The Wealth of Nations is* thoroughly secular. Whereas Hobbesian enlightenment requires a direct assault on the "fear of powers invisible," Smith virtually ignores the possible existence of such powers, although he admits that government must accommodate itself to popular prejudices regarding bread and the afterlife *(WN* IV.v.b.40). The word "God" never appears, and religion is almost always ridiculed, occasionally loudly, on those occasions where it is not ignored. Smith encourages the unshackling of the desire for wealth, without religious safeguards or the Machiavellian remedy-terror-for corruption.[50] Smith implies that for the great body of people, circumstances naturally breed the appropriate virtues; modest beginnings dictate the bourgeois virtues of honesty, industry, and frugality-traits that involve ample self-denial.[51] The connection between wealth and vanity, moreover, might serve to perpetuate scarcity and therewith industriousness. But there is no guarantee-beyond the impact of an effective administration of

justice conjoined with the discipline imposed by a market economy that acquisition will proceed honestly and legally.

Smith appears to grant religion a role in the maintenance of the social fabric: a multiplication of small religious sects would help maintain the austere morality natural to people of low rank, though not without danger of fanaticism.[52] Smith was apparently prepared to live with the "vices of levity" that afflict the upper ranks (WN V.i.g.12).[53] The benefit brought by sects, however, has nothing to do with people's belief in God, the soul, or another world. Small sects remedy the anomie that afflicts the urbanized masses in a commercial society-the eyes of human beings replace those of God (V.i.g.10). Smith apparently expected his readers to be reconciled with the somewhat dour world depicted in *The Wealth of f Nations,* without hope for a "better world in a life to come" (V.i.g.1). Even the lowly do not require a religious opiate. If Strauss is correct in stating that many post-Machiavelli political thinkers who preceded the French Revolution employed "allusive and elusive writing" in a campaign against "the kingdom of darkness"-a campaign which was more important than the issues dividing them *(TM* 231)-then *The Wealth of Nations* may have been the final salvo.

The Theory of Moral Sentiments, however, invokes God frequently, and treats the afterlife and the soul with unmistakable sympathy. Perhaps religion is necessary to support the book's loftier concerns: happiness, dignity, and a range of moral virtues capped by benevolence. Even here, however, Smith tries to demonstrate that moral virtue emerges naturally through social interaction and adapts to changing socioeconomic circumstances. The prime support for morality remains the human "spectator" and judge. It goes without saying that *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* replaces revealed religion by Deism or natural religion.

Marx's atheism, of course, is still more bold and intransigent. Religion is simply a "defect," the opiate of the people; along with other forms of alienation and fetishism, religion will disappear once the "contradictions" of this world have been resolved with the advent of communism.[54] There will be no yearning for a world beyond this one, no positing of a higher intelligence or purpose to the cosmos.

Marx fits perfectly into Strauss's account of atheism and enlightenment. According to Marx, religion disappears along with scarcity, oppression, war, and the tension between public and private, in a society where "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." Liberalism's "institutions with teeth in them" (Strauss's phrase) can be discarded along with the moral and religious education for which they substituted in the first wave. Social production and individual consumption will be mediated without exchange; individuals both give what they can and get what they need without coercion or even the Smithean appeal to self-interest.[55] Marx's amoral substitute for morality, his solution of the political problem by economic means, is thus public appropriation of the means of production. Even though both "circumstances and men" need to be transformed, in part to purge "the muck of ages,"[56] Marx says nothing about the need for special schemes of intellectual or moral training.

Marx, however, devoted unbounded energy to showing that the liberal-capitalist order of "Freedom, Equality, Property, and Bentham" *(Capital* VI, p.280) does not solve the political problem. The economism of Locke, Montesquieu, Smith, or Bentham is not a substitute for morality but another ruling-class ideology that fraudulently misrepresents the interests of the ruled. The objective, detached language of political economy conceals the oppression of the laborers; their legal freedom and equality mask the underlying reality of wage-slavery; even the liberal state, despite or rather because of its separation of polity and economy-of state and civil society-remains a tool of class domination.[57]

Strauss more frankly confronts these possibilities than one might expect. With an eye towards Locke's contrast between the "rational and industrious" and the "quarrelsome and contentious," Strauss identifies the rational as those who, because of their dissatisfaction with mere necessities, seek to improve on nature's spontaneous gifts; the industrious are the people willing and able to undergo present hardship. Because the "lazy and inconsiderate part of mankind" are the "far greater number," economic progress requires that "the industrious and rational, who work hard spontaneously, take the lead

and force the lazy and inconsiderate to work against their will, if for their own good" *(NRH* 243). The "rational and industrious" resemble the Smithean merchants and manufacturers, who put "into motion the greater part of the useful labour of every society" *(WN* I.)d.p.10).[58] Strauss even acknowledges that the "enclosure" of land may promote the scarcity that induces labor, and infers that genuine abundance requires that individuals be driven to appropriate more than they can use; without money, even the rational and industrious will relapse into "drowsy laziness" *(NRH 244).*

It is striking that Marx called so strenuously for revolution while saying so little about how public affairs would be conducted under the new order. Marx rejects liberalism but not democracy. In *The Civil War in France,* Marx praises the Paris Commune as the "political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labour." Councilors, magistrates, and judges were elected by universal suffrage for short terms, all revocable by their constituents; they were paid only workmen's wages; the central assembly "published its doings and sayings." The Commune, however, rejected the separation of powers, and Marx fails to recommend other phenomena characteristic of liberal or representative or constitutional democracy: federalism, bicameralism, checks and balances, constitutionalism, the rule of law, judicial review, a Bill of Rights, and multi-party competition.[59] Marx's fervor for pure democracy is menacing because the public power will be drastically enlarged by a revolution that expropriates the bourgeoisie and thereafter attempts to "regulate" or "plan" a global economy. Marx offers no safeguards against majority tyranny because he is confident that there will be no fundamental conflicts or clashes of interest in the classless society. Marx thus radicalizes "the solution of the political problem by economic means." The iron laws of socioeconomic development are leading us inevitably to communism, where there will be no need for institutions to cultivate virtuous leaders or to diminish the dangers posed by avarice and ambition. Marx's deference to the historical "line of march" is dramatically displayed by his refusal-prior to the emergence of the Paris Commune in 1871, almost *25* years after his call for world-revolution-to speculate in

detail about the "public power" under communism. We might speculate that Marx, were he sufficiently Machiavellian to lie profusely for a good cause, may have intended to stir up the revolutionary sentiments of the masses with inflated promises, while securing the flexibility of communist elites-the "most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country"-in the selection of means. The Party, compared to the proletariat as a whole, has "the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement."" Strauss seems to treat Stalinism as the "effectual truth" of Marxism *(C&M* 4-5, *SCR 6-7),* but it would be even easier to nominate Leninism.[61]

Nature and History

Strauss's judgment about Stalinism emerges from his understanding of Marx's philosophy of history. The philosophy of history, for Strauss, is the pinnacle of the second wave; it is Machiavellian because it "shows the essential necessity of the actualization of the right order"-thus vanquishing chance as well as whatever "essentially transcends every possible human reality"-and because the right order is "achieved by blind selfish passion." Thus, "the delusions of communism are already the delusions of Hegel and even of Kant" *(WIPP* 53-4). With respect to history, Adam Smith is perhaps situated on the cusp of the first two waves. Like Marx, he examines "world history" with the precision and abstraction of social science and an emphasis on the mode of production.[62] Smith's accounts of justice and equality ingeniously substitute a mixture of social science-sociology, psychology, economics-and history for Thomistic natural law, the philosophical dialectics of Plato and Aristotle, the social contract, and natural rights.[63] On the whole, institutions are shaped by circumstances and natural necessities into an acceptable form, obviating the need for either philosophy or revelation. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* unfolds primarily to describe and explain human moral sentiments, though it also tries to solidify the voice of the "impartial spectator," which develops within the "human breast" without assistance from philosophy or revelation.

It is nevertheless obvious that neither of Smith's books eradicates transcendence: nature is employed ubiquitously as an authority. Nature for Smith, however, is the nature of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza, Montesquieu, and Hume; it is more supportive of preservation and propagation than it is of happiness or perfection. Smithean nature also expresses itself in the forces that impel our historical development, as in the "natural progress of opulence." Smith, however, presents not the system of natural liberty but "commercial society"-which spawned the misguided practices of mercantilism-as the quasi-inevitable outcome of the natural progress. Political economy, morality, and jurisprudence all need occasional assistance from philosophy.[64] Smith nevertheless strives to present the system of natural liberty as a historical tendency rather than as an ingenious discovery of a prophet or philosopher: with the removal of mercantilist restraints, natural liberty "establishes itself of its own accord," i.e., naturally (*WN* IV.ix.51).

Marx departs from Smith by exalting history at the expense of nature; the two thinkers disagree about what is permanent and what can be changed. Whatever his enthusiasm for technological progress, nature for Smith remains a standard and a constraint, in the form of natural liberty, the natural progress of opulence, the natural distribution of a nation's capital and labor, natural moral sentiments, and so on. For Smith, furthermore, imperfection and evil cannot be eradicated.[65] In Cropsey's words, history is the "fissure, narrow but bottomless, that divides capitalism from communism."[66]

Marx insists that communism is not a philosophical ideal, hatched by some aspiring reformer (*Weltverbesserer*) or "utopian socialist," but the "real movement which abolishes the present state of things"; *Capital* may enable us to lessen the birth pangs of the new society but not to alter the general path of historical development.[67] Marx would rebut an accusation of utopianism by invoking his attempted demonstrations that capitalism is self-destructing-whether or not because of the full-fledged "immiseration" of the oppressed classes-and that capitalism itself has paved the way for the visionary-sounding features of communism: the overcoming of scarcity and the creation of a global economy vanquishing the divisive particularities of family,

religion, and nation. The dominant theme of the *Manifesto is* thus proletarian unity: the workers' interests are fundamentally opposed to the domestic bourgeoisie and fundamentally united with the global proletariat, whose ongoing development prepares the disappearance of classes.

In striving to uncover the "economic law of motion" of modern society, Marx builds upon the scientific aspirations of bourgeois political economy. Marx, however, condemns practitioners of the "dismal science" for attributing inevitability to poverty and conflict, and tries to demonstrate the inevitable disappearance of such constraints. Marx uncovers society's law of motion by imitating the biologist as well as the physicist *(Capital,* pp. 90-1, 101). The bourgeois economists mimic only the physicist in presenting laws of nature that operate everywhere and always, whereas Marx's biological economics uncovers laws unique to the different economic organisms (feudalism, capitalism, etc.); more importantly, it uncovers the laws that dictate the dialectical evolution of one system into another.[6][8] Marx emphatically rejects Smith's implicit thesis *(WN* I) that the produce of labor is divided among capitalists, workers, and landlords by an impersonal nature, rather than by the laws of a particular, changeable "mode of production"; Marx likewise rejects Smith's explicit thesis that nature-aided by capitalist institutions-guarantees the translation of self-interest into the common good.6[9] By emphasizing the productivity of commerce and industry, Smith moderates the physiocrats' exaltation of agriculture, but he largely maintains their insistence on the "rule of nature." Smith combats mercantilist "sophistry" by showing that wealth is not gold and silver but the produce of human labor *(WN* IV.i, IV.iii.c.10). But only Marx combats the capital "fetish" as well, arguing that capital is expropriated labor-power that can and must be reappropriated by its creators *(Capital I:4).*

Marx likewise insists that human character is more plastic, more responsive to changing socio-economic circumstances, than the model of "economic man" allows; human beings are not everywhere and always possessed of the traits attributed to them by Adam Smith: self-love, avarice, ambition, vanity, and "the propensity to truck,

barter, and exchange." Building tacitly on Rousseau's demonstration that history transforms human nature, Marx is again the heir of Strauss's Machiavelli.[70]

One could say that Machiavelli's famous realism has been outlived by his less visible idealism or optimism, his agenda for conquering chance. "That Machiavellian," Karl Marx, adopts both extremes in a form no one could overlook. Marx proclaims, still more loudly than Machiavelli, that religion is the opiate of the people, that justice is built on injustice, that wealth and power are acquired by crime, that society hitherto has been essentially oppressive, and that claims about the common good have been fraudulent-especially the economists' identification of capital accumulation with the "wealth of the nation."[71] In an idealistic vein, Marx replaces Machiavelli's teasing incitement to conquer *Fortuna* with a guarantee that she will be vanquished when the proletariat audaciously beats the capitalists into submission. Recent events, however, have confirmed the demise of communist idealism. Communism is now retreating before the march of "economic man," not to mention his political, philosophical, and religious counterparts. Mainstream economics, by insisting that benefits are linked with costs, that there are always trade-offs and "opportunity costs," calls to mind the classical and Biblical insistence that perfection is not to be found in this world.

Machiavelli attempted to conquer chance, according to Strauss, by initiating "a campaign of propaganda" that "wins over ever larger multitudes to the new modes and orders and thus transforms the thought of one or a few into the opinion of the public and therewith into public power"; the Enlightenment begins with Machiavelli (*WIPP 46, TM* 173). Smith and Marx differ drastically from Strauss in explaining history without reference to the plans and projects of "great men," without reference to the words of prophets or philosophers. For Smith and Marx, the decline of the feudal nobility and the medieval Church, along with the ascendance of natural science and commerce, were by-products of the historical process. Neither thinker offers an irrefutable answer to the question of why ancient civilization failed to develop along the same lines as modern. For both, chance figured prominently: the great navigational discoveries,

inventions such as the compass and gunpowder.[72]

Comparison of Smith, Marx, and Strauss suggests an unusual dialectic. For Marx, the invisible hand is a typical ruse of political economy, masking the "silent compulsion" and "invisible threads" that enslave the proletariat *(Capital,* pp. 899, 719); bourgeois political economy fraudulently attributes natural status and therefore permanence to scarcity and capitalist hegemony. Marx subtitles his great book "A Critique of Political Economy" because of the need to unmask and dethrone the slavemaster who has survived the demystification and overthrow of throne and altar. That slavemaster is capital, an inhuman "vampire" or "animated monster" with an insatiable appetite for appropriating human labor and thereby for stifling human life.[73] Marx's early and late writings display an unmistakable unity: alienation is overcome as the state is reintegrated into civil society, and God and capital are reappropriated by their creators. Marx's criticisms of capitalism, of course, are in a sense balanced by his insistence that it lays the groundwork for communism: "what use is it to lament a historical necessity?" *(Capital* XXIV:3).

The writings of Strauss, like those of Marx, incorporate much critical interpretation of other authors, although Strauss's focus is on modernity rather than capital; for Strauss, the West is in a crisis because it has "become uncertain of its purpose" and has lost its faith in reason,[74] not because of economic "contradictions." Like Marx, Strauss sets out to reveal the true ruler, the hidden prince or regime, of the modern world. But that prince is Machiavelli, the great theorist of invisible government *("uno domino the non veggano").*[75] Strauss turns Marx on his head, suggesting that there are ruling ideas (but not Hegelian *Geist)* behind the "ruling class" or the dominant mode of production.[76] Strauss claims that Machiavelli capitulated to the ends of the *demos.* Might "capital," as the great provider of commodities, be more the servant of the people than their master?

Smith's position is harder to determine. The invisible hand is the hand of an impersonal nature, whose empire, as displayed in both Smith's books, is ubiquitous." The exaggerated character of Smith's erasure of individuals (for example, Jesus Christ) from world-history,

however, suggests that he might be concealing a hidden prince, or at least his own ambitions as an "unarmed prophet." Smith states that founders of "sects and parties" have sometimes "brought about the greatest revolutions, both in the situations and opinions of mankind" *(TMS* VI.iii.28). In the essays he arranged to have published after his death, furthermore, Smith suggests that the "invisible chains" of nature are not so much discovered by philosophy as invented ("Astronomy" IV. *76).* If Strauss is right about the origins of modernity, it is not easy to determine whether Smith was an unwitting dupe or a co-conspirator, a foot-soldier or an officer. It is almost incontrovertible, however, that Marx's historical materialism was sincere. If Strauss is right, Marx was an unwitting minion of Machiavelli, and both Smith and Marx have helped to render their prince's hand invisible.[$] Even if Strauss is right, however, we cannot dismiss the possibility that modernity escaped the fetters imposed by its founder to take on a life of its own as an economic-technological steamroller; there could now exist social dynamics with a power or importance unknown to pre-modern times. [79] If there are such dynamics, we cannot prejudge the question of who has best described them. According to Marx, Smith, as "the quintessential political economist of the period of manufacture" *(Capital XIV:3),* was of limited relevance to the era of "machinery and giant industry."

According to Strauss, the ancients' disparagement of democracy derived not from moral principles that differ from those of the present day but from their fear of freeing technology (the arts) from moral and political control. [80] In the absence of sophisticated technology, the oppression of some may be the price of the liberation of others, because virtue requires leisure and training. Thus Rousseau, despite his love for democracy and equality, also praises slave-societies like Sparta and Rome. Marx, because of his historical materialism, cannot condemn the ancients, who "excused the slavery of one person as a means to the full human development of another." Marx does, however, ridicule the Christianized capitalist apologists who "preach the slavery of the masses in order that a few crude and half-educated parvenus might become `eminent spinners,' `extensive sausage-makers' and `influential shoe-black dealers' *(Capital*

pp. 532-3). Under pre-capitalist forms of class oppression, the imposition of labor was "restricted by a more or less confined set of needs."[81] More than any other modern philosopher, Marx documents the dehumanizing effects of modern machinery on those who work with it, and demands that social control of technology be reinstituted. It seems, however, that the gradual march towards the realm of freedom" would require indefinite technological progress.[82] The "full and free development of every individual" *(Capital,* p. 739) would require a dramatic extension of education and leisure, not to mention sophisticated medical care.

Marx rejects the labels of prophet, legislator, and philosopher, presenting himself as a mere spokesman for the historical movement of the "immense majority." When "reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of knowledge loses its medium of existence," although the communist citizen dabbles in "criticism" after eating the dinner acquired by hunting and fishing during the day.[83] It nevertheless seems that the four volumes of Capital-drawing on erudite traditions in literature and philosophy as well as political economy-might remain a philosophical bone in the throat of a hungry proletarian. In Marx's words, "there is no royal road to science, and only those who don't dread the fatiguing climb of its steep paths have a chance of gaining its luminous summits."[84] The intellectual challenges of running a modern economy have surely been a wedge for the hierarchical, bureaucratic domination of communist societies by communist parties.

Assessing Strauss's Critique of Modernity

Strauss's defiance of the conventions of contemporary scholarship renders him difficult to judge. Whether one worships or despises him, one must acknowledge that his writings are eminently heterogeneous, requiring judgment on a host ofparticular issues that do not necessarily stand or fall together: his interpretation of individual authors, acutely sensitive to rhetorical nuance; his articulation of basic political and philosophical issues, often emerging from comparisons between the authors he studies; his praise of the ancients; his account of the pedigree of ideas; his remarks about Western

history; his practical prescriptions. One must nevertheless wonder about the decision made by the author of the first book about Strauss (written in English) to "ignore any serious contribution Strauss might have made to the history of political thought.[85]

According to Irving Kristol, neoconservatism combines Strauss with Hayek and Friedman,[86] i.e., with economists of a libertarian bent. One wonders why Strauss has not been comparably combined with Keynesianism, environmentalism, or Scandinavian-style socialism. In any case, Strauss indicated little or no concern for the sorts of economic issues that agitate contemporary American politics: inflation, unemployment, trade and budget deficits, tax reform, industrial safety, minimum-wage legislation, strikes, union-busting, health insurance, deposit insurance, leveraged buyouts, rent control, environmental regulation, and so on. As we have seen, however, Strauss may have helped explain the emergence of a world in which such matters are politically urgent: a world consumed by the quest for economic growth and technological progress. Strauss, along with many others, has alerted us to the danger of unshackled technology and the vulgarity of consumerism. He has combated consumerism by articulating a broad range of alternatives to it, including study of the treasures buried in "great books." His explanation of the ultimate sources of the technological-economic explosion, moreover, clashes so profoundly with the ruling ideas of the contemporary academy, that it might never have been formulated by anyone else. But we do not know that his explanation is correct; Pocock, Gunnell, and other critics cannot be faulted for pointing out the gap between the statement of Strauss's account of modern history and its proof. Furthermore, even if Strauss's account is correct, he has hardly provided a plan for regaining control of technology.

Strauss is correct in claiming that modern science has multiplied human power without commensurately increasing human wisdom, and we may add the ecological nightmare to the nuclear nightmare he addressed.[87] Preventing such evils, and others, will require inculcation of "the virtues of self-restraint"-and perhaps even the "sacred . . . divination that not everything is permitted" *(NRH* 130)-whose deterioration Strauss lamented. Strauss also has articu-

lated the dangers of understanding the human in terms of the subhuman, the high in terms of the low. Strauss reminds us that the things we have made pale in comparison to the things we have not made-including ourselves. But even if the birth of a puppy dwarfs the accomplishments of Shakespeare, [88] has not modernity enabled us better to comprehend nature's ways? Does Darwinism, moreover, lead necessarily to nihilism?[89]

By suggesting that Machiavelli represents a "fundamental alternative" *(TM* 14, 78, 167), Strauss concedes that modernity is a fundamental alternative; in reopening the quarrel between ancient and modern, Strauss may simply be discharging his philosophical responsibilities. Strauss complains that the modern project had to end in "the oblivion of eternity" *(WIPP* 55, *NRH* 176). Whatever this means, is it manifestly worse than the extinction of life on earth? Though it must be granted that technology is likely to hasten our demise, can Athens (rather than Jerusalem) persuade us that our ultimate extinction could be prevented or even postponed without modern technology?[90] Strauss emphasizes the ancients' sober awareness of the natural cataclysms that periodically destroy civilizations; according to Stephen Holmes, their "reasoning about natural catastrophes plainly suggests that the habitable earth is doomed to extinction and will eventually perish with all remnants of mankind."[91] Strauss complains that Engels was "deceptively and deceivingly appeased . . . by the prospect of a most glorious future, of the realm of freedom, which will indeed be terminated by the annihilation of the human race and therewith of all meaning but which will last for a very long time,"[92] Strauss elsewhere quotes (in German) the following passage of Engels:

> Nothing is imperishable except the uninterrupted process of becoming and perishing, of the endless ascent from the lower to the higher . . . . We do not have to consider here the question as to whether this view agrees with the present state of natural science, for at present natural science predicts a possible end to the existence of the earth and a certain end to the inhabitability of the earth.[93]

Strauss disparages Engels postponement of the question about the destruction of the earth, but Strauss, too, postpones it.'

While modernity may have killed God and threatened to erase philosophy from earth, it maybe the only path to the permanence of either philosophy or faith. Should we blame ourselves for undertaking such a noble gamble? Is it so difficult to conceive of "the modern venture as an enterprise meant to be reasonable" *(TM* 298)? People will continue to disagree about whether Strauss had an agenda for remedying the ills of modernity; they will disagree more strenuously about his wisdom. But there is no mistaking his intention to restore forgotten vistas of excellence and edification.[95]

Peter I. Minowitz
Santa Clara University

NOTES

1. Leo Strauss, *What is Political Philosophy?* (New York: The Free Press, 1959), p. 49; subsequently abbreviated as *WIPP.* Other works of Strauss will be abbreviated as follows: *C&M = The City and Man* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964); *Crisis* ="The Crisis of Our Time" or "The Crisis of Political Philosophy" in Harold J. Spaeth, ed., *The Predicament of Modern Politics* (Detroit, MI: Univ. of Detroit Press, 1964), pp. 41-54, 91-103; *Epilog* = "An Epilogue," in Herbert J. Storing ed., *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962), pp. 307-327; *HPP = History of Political Philosophy,* ed. Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey, 2nd edition (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973); *LAM =Liberalism Ancient and Modern* (New York: Basic Books, 1968); *NRH = Natural Right and History* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1953); *OT = On Tyranny* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1968); PAW = Persecution and the Art of Writing (New York: The Free Press, 1952); *PPH = The Political Philosophy of Hobbes,* trans. Elsa Sinclair (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1952); *Rebirth = The Rebirth of Classical Political Rationalism,* ed. Thomas Pangle (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989); S&A = *Socrates and Aristophanes* (New York: Basic

Books, 1966); *SCR = Spinoza's Critique of Religion* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965); *Studies = Studies in Platonic Political Philosophy,* ed. Thomas Pangle (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983); *TM = Thoughts on Machiavelli* (New York: The Free Press, 1958); *Waves* = "The Three Waves of Modernity" in *Political Philosophy: Six Essays by Leo Strauss,* ed. Hilail Gildin (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975), pp. 81-98. Three previously published essays will be cited from the *Rebirth* collection: "Social Science and Humanism" (pp. 3-12), "Relativism" (pp. 13-26), and "Progress or Return" (pp. 227-270).

2. Strauss, *TM* 13-14; Strauss here also praises the United States as "the bulwark of freedom" and states that Americanism is the "opposite" of Machiavellianism. Cf. Larry Peterman, "Approaching Leo Strauss," *The Political Science* ReviewerXVl (Fa111986): 324-5, 337-9, 348.

3. Strauss, *OT 226, 26;* cf. *NRH* 23, *Rebirth* 42, PAW 56, *WIPP* 38, *LAM viii.*

4. Strauss, *C&M* 3-4, *Crisis* 41, 44-5, *NRH* 34, *TM* 298. Were Strauss alive today, he would surely add feminism and deconstructionism to the list.

5. Hiram Caton, in a recent book praised by John Pocock along with other respected historians, has provided the sort of detailed documentation necessary to sustain the conclusion that the modern world has been forged by philosophers leading an assault on Mt. Olympus. Following D'Alembert, Caton identifies Bacon and Descartes as the paramount conspirators; Caton draws on Strauss, but ignores Strauss's Machiavelli. See Caton, *The Politics of Progress: The Origins and Development of the Commercial Republic, 1600-1835* (Gainesville, FL: Univ. of Florida Press, 1988).

6. See, for example, Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 211, 317, 384-95, 401-2, 441, 484, 504, 507, and *Politics, Language, and Time* (New York: Altheneum, 1973), pp. 80-107, 129-33, 146-7.

7. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment, pp.* 425-6, 430-2, 441, 443, 450-1, 454, 458-9, 461, 464, 499-500, 507; also see Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ.

Press, 1985), pp. 48-9, 66-70, 78-9, 103-115. For an outstanding study of Smith drawing on Pocock's categories, see Donald Winch, *Adams Smith's Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978).

8. Strauss, *TM 26,* 38-40, 52, 102, 104, 106, 118, 121, 132, 141, 153-4,168-9,172-4,181-3,188, 205, 297, 303-4 n.48, 305 n. 68, 311 n. 16, 312 n. 22, 312-13 n. 24, 314-15 nn. 35-6, 316-17 n. 47, 317 n. 58, 318 n. 61, 320 n. 89, 323-4 n. 157, 325 n. 169, 326 n. 179, 327 n. 183, 327-8 n. 187, 328-9 n. 192, 332 *n.* 54, 334 n. 73, 337-8 n. 122, 344 *n.* 198. Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., in *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1979), has developed many of Strauss's suggestions.

9. Pocock, "Prophet and Inquisitor," *Political Theory 3* (November 1975): 388, 391.

10. Strauss, *TM* 121, 104; cf. 141 and 303-4 n.48. Although Strauss identifies Spinoza and Rousseau as key sources for the conversion of Machiavellianism into "democratic theory proper," he claims that they misunderstood *The Prince (TM* 294, 26).

11. Strauss, *NRH* 177-9, *Waves 87, WIPP* 180, *HPP 273; TM* 221-2, 234-46, 253-6, 258-9, 265, 280-1, 293-5; cf. *PPH* 121-5.

12. Strauss, *NRH* 179. Pocock, needless to say, stresses the distance between Machiavelli and Hobbes *(The Machiavellian Moment,* p. 380). Strauss acknowledges that Hobbes never refers to Machiavelli, but credits another "pupil" of Machiavelli-Spinoza-with translating Machiavelli's "more subdued attack on traditional political philosophy" into "the less reserved language of Hobbes." Strauss points to the paraphrasing of Machiavelli in the beginning of Spinoza's *Political Treatise,* but does not reveal that Machiavelli is mentioned only in the fifth and tenth chapters of the *Treatise (HPP* 273-4). The practice of esoteric writing, of course, makes historical influence more difficult to demonstrate. There are scholars who think that Locke's *Second Treatise is* closer to Hooker than to Hobbes (who is never mentioned). Given the almost total silence of *The Closing of the American Mind* about Strauss, such scholars might conclude that his influence on its author was negligible.

13. Pocock, "Prophet and Inquisitor," pp. 386,392-3, 388-9. Is it conceivable that someone could offer a comparably complex

interpretation of hidden messages in *Soul on Ice, Mein Kampf,* or the writings of Lyndon Larouche?

14. Strauss states that Machiavelli, in *Discourses* II:5, was "declaring" that religions have a life span of between 1666 and 3000 years *(TM 32),* whereas Machiavelli says only that religions change "two or three times every five or six thousand years." Although agreeing with Strauss on the larger points-that Machiavelli is hinting at the eternity of the world and the secular origins of Christianity-Pocock claims that, because of the numerological controversies (concerning Biblical prophecy) that raged in Machiavelli's day, Machiavelli would have refrained from using the number 1666 ("Prophet and Inquisitor," pp. 396-7). Later in *TM (p.* 170), however, Strauss closely paraphrases Machiavelli's wording without mentioning the numbers derived from the calculation. Pocock's objection to the first formulation *(TM 32)* can be met by changing "declaring" to "indicating" ("implying" would be too weak) or to "tacitly claiming." For Strauss, of course, such linguistic distinctions are never trivial. But Strauss mentions 1666 to show that Machiavelli was suggesting that Christianity might be defeated in the near future-a point Pocock overlooks while belittling the prospect that Machiavelli ever performed the calculation.

15. Pocock, "Prophet and Inquisitor," p. 390. Pocock elsewhere recommends keeping an open mind about "the relation of ideas to social reality," and cautions historians not to overemphasize the "social and political context" *(Politics, Language, and Time,* p. 105-6).

16. In challenging Strauss's apparent presupposition that the writers he examines were members of a "tradition," John Gunnell inadequately considers the form that would be taken by a tradition of philosophers addressing society in a "politic" manner (Strauss, *WIPP* 31-2, 93-4). Gunnell makes powerful arguments against assuming the existence of a "tradition" of political theory, but says little to refute its existence. See Gunnell, "The Myth of the Tradition," *American Political Science Review* 72 (March 1978): 122-134; "Political Theory and Politics," *Political Theory* 13 (August 1985): 339-61; *Between Philosophy and Politics* (Univ. of Massachusetts

Press, 1986), pp. 21-2, 95-8, 108, 113, 115. Cf. Strauss, *LAM* 7 and *SCR* 27, and Nathan Tarcov, "Philosophy and History: Tradition and Interpretation in the Work of Leo Strauss," *Polity* XVI (Fall 1983): 5-29.

17. Strauss, *TM* 24, 26, 42-4, 46-7, 56-61,107-8,114,160-4,180-1,187,189, 204-5, 231-2, 240, 242-3, 245-6, 302 n.26, 303 n.33, 310 n.53, 325 n.165, 330 n.17, 331 n.30, 334 n.73. On scattering, cf. Quentin Skinner, *Machiavelli* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1981), p. 85. Strauss portrays *The Prince* as a "subtle web" that includes "shocking frankness of speech" *(TM* 69). In condemning Strauss's sympathy for the view that Machiavelli is a teacher of evil, Pocock and Skinner-along with many other scholars-overlook Strauss's argument that some of *The Prince's* uglier pronouncements and insinuations are not intended to be taken seriously *(TM* 81-2).

18. On Machiavelli's disconcerting tendency to adopt a neutral stance between princes, tyrants, and republics, see Strauss, *TM* 111, 127, 227, 265-276, 278, 283, 293.

19. Strauss, *TM* 221-2, 234-46, 253-6, 258-9, 265, 280-1, 293-5. Cf. *WIPP* 42, 290-1. Also see Clifford Orwin, "Machiavelli's Unchristian Charity," *American Political Science Review 72* (December 1978): 1217-22, 1226-27, and Thomas Pangle, *The Spirit of Modern Republicanism* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1988), pp. 29, 30-3, 54-7, 63-6, 102, 112-14. On the difficulties of sustaining even republican virtue, see Strauss, *TM* 261-2, 278.

20. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment,* pp..159,177,194, 212-13, 217-18. Cf. Skinner, *Machiavelli, pp.* 2, 36, 39, 44-5, 54, 65, 73-4; and *The Origins of Modern Political Thought vol. I* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 87, 93, 131.

21. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment,* pp. 84,114,190-4, 202, 213-17, 461, 492, 550. Cf. Skinner, *Machiavelli,* pp. 25-6, 30, 63. Skinner tacitly follows Strauss in speaking of Machiavelli's "eloquent, indeed epoch-making," silence about Judgment Day (p. 38).

22. If time permitted, we would also examine developments in philosophy and political economy between Smith and Marx-such figures as Bentham, Say, Malthus, Ricardo, Mill, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel-and Smith's debt to post-Machiavellian theorists such as

Grotius, Pufendorf, Mandeville, Montesquieu, Hutcheson, Ferguson, James Steuart, Hume, and the Physiocrats. Strauss identified Montesquieu as the thinker who most profoundly understood the relationship between Machiavellianism and economism *(WIPP 49),* but wrote very little about Montesquieu.

23. The first wave was begun by Machiavelli, the second by Rousseau, and the third (radical historicism) by Nietzsche (Strauss, *WIPP* 50; *Waves* 83-4, 89, 94).

24. The economic goals, along with the efficacy of capitalistic institutions in procuring them, are anticipated by Machiavelli as well as Hobbes *(Discourses 11:2, Prince* XXII; *Leviathan* XIII,)(XI, *XXX* [New York: Penguin Books, 1968, pp. 184, 186, 227, 264, 376, 386-*7]; De Cive* XIII:4-6,14.) Pocock and Skinner pass over these passages in Machiavelli. Cf. Strauss, *TM* 261.

25. Smith's works will be cited according to the system developed by the editors of the Glasgow Edition of the *Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith,* published by Oxford University Press (1976-1980). *WN = An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations,* first published in 1776; *TMS = The Theory of Moral Sentiments,* first published in 1759; *LJA* and *LJB = Lectures on Jurisprudence,* student notes from 1762-3 and 1766, edited by R.L. Meek, D.D. Raphael, & P.G. Stein. Three essays will also be cited from Smith's posthumously published *Essays On Philosophical Subjects. Astronomy =* "The Principles which lead and direct Philosophical Enquiries; illustrated by the History of Astronomy"; *Physics* = "The Principles... ; illustrated by the History of the Ancient Physics"; *Logics =* "The Principles . . . ; illustrated by the History of the Ancient Logics and Metaphysics."

26. Cf. Strauss, *TM 78,* 297, and SCR 30 on "the systematic effort to liberate man completely from all non-human bonds." For a much more detailed interpretation of religion, political philosophy, and economics in Adam Smith, see my forthcoming *Profits, Priests, and Princes* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993).

27. Although Smith is generally regarded as the father of modern economics, Ricardo is credited with having purged economics of the philosophical and historical encumbrances that delayed its emer-

gence as a pure social science dominated by precise, abstract models. The vision of consumer sovereignty that underlies most economic models is egalitarian and libertarian: "What is to be produced is determined by the aggregate decision of individuals or households, as consumers, in accordance with their taste" (Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* [New York: Basic Books, 1986], p. 223). Ricardo's *Inquiry into the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* ends on a strangely philosophic note: "value in use cannot be measured by any known standard; it is differently estimated by different persons." *Cf.* Strauss, *NRH* 3-6, *Epilog* 324, *WIPP* 89-90, and *C&M* 10 on the Machiavellian "neutrality" of contemporary social science.

28. Strauss argues that although Locke's later followers eschewed "the phraseology of the law of nature," Locke "still thought that he had to prove that the unlimited acquisition of wealth is not unjust or morally wrong" *(NRH 246).*

29. Locke, *The Second Treatise of Government,* sections 37, 40, 42-8.

30. Smith, *WN* V.i.f.60-1; for other striking vestiges, see *WN* II.iii.41-2, V.i.a.14, V.i.f.30.

31. Cf. Joseph Cropsey, *Polity and Economy* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1957), pp. 2, 27, 39-45, 99; *HPP,* pp. 609-11, 615-16, 624, 627. On the passions, cf. Strauss, *TM* 259.

32. Strauss, *TM 297;* cf. 168, 175, 222, 252-3, 267-8, 279, 294. Strauss supports his claims about the "hidden kinship" between Machiavelli and modern natural science *(WIPP* 47) with brief references to Bacon *(Waves* 88), including Bacon's mention of Machiavelli in his 13th essay *(TM* 176) and his praise of Machiavellian realism in *The Advancement of Learning (PPH* 88,125). According to Jerry Weinberger, Bacon's scientific agenda emerged from an esoteric response to the esoteric Machiavelli. See Weinberger, *Science, Faith, and Utopia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1985), pp. 36-7, 85-7, 92-100, 107-8, 110-11, 115, 121, 127-9, 136-142, 147, 150-3, 155-7, 161-2, 175-6, 200, 211, 216, 222-4, 253-4, 288, 299-301, 303, 308, 310, 312-13, 317-19. On the relationship between Machiavelli and Bacon, also see Howard B. White, *Peace Among the*

Willows (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968), pp. 17, 37, 39, 46-7, 52, 75-6, 104-5, 112, 125-6, 197, 208, 215, 234, 247-9. On connections between Machiavelli, Bacon, and Descartes, see Richard Kennington, "Descartes and Mastery of Nature," in S.F. Spicker, ed., *Organism, Medicine, and Metaphysics* (Boston: D. Reidel, 1978), pp. 201-223. Concerning Bacon's influence on early political economists-including William Petty, the founder of "political arithmetic," and John Locke-see David McNally, *Political Economy and the Rise of Capitalism* (Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press, 1988), pp. 36-55, 58-60.

33. Strauss, *Waves 87.* Cf. *WIPP 47, NRH* 179.

34. Smith, *WN* I.i.9, I.ii.4-5. Cf. *WN* V.i.f.26, 28, 31,34, 51, 55; *TMS* I.ii.2.6, III.2.20, 35; Vl.iii.31; *LJA* vi.40-3; "Astronomy" IV.67, 76. Cf. Strauss, *C&M 49,* 131-3; *OT* 213; *NRH* 143; *PAW 7-8.*

35. Nietzsche, by contrast, ridicules the whole vision of the comfortable and well-fed "herd"-the last men. Cf. Strauss, *Waves 97, Rebirth* 21, 41-2, *OT* 223, *Studies 32-3,* 190, *S&A 7.*

36 Strauss described Hobbes's "political hedonism" as a doctrine that "revolutionized human life everywhere on a scale never yet approached by *any* other teaching" *(NRH* 169). Strauss's accounts of the differences between ancient and modern materialism/hedonism also illuminate the status of Epicureanism in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Strauss, *TM* 291-2; *NRH* 112-15, 167-76, 188-9; *LAM* 96, 122, 131; *C&M* 42).

37. On this point, Marx quotes Smith extensively *(Capital* XIV:5), for Smith is hardly the capitalist apologist he is often perceived to be. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to *Capital* are to volume one, translated by Ben Fowkes (New York: Random House, 1976); chapter numbers (in Roman numerals) and section numbers will occasionally be employed to facilitate the use of different editions. References to other writings of Marx and Engels are to Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader,* 2nd ed., (New York: W.W. Norton, 1978).

38. Cf. Strauss, *WIPP* 51, *NRH* 129-30, *TM 297.*

39. For a more detailed analysis of this thesis, see Strauss, *TM* 14, 44, 234-5, 258-9, 265, 269-70, 281, 286-9, 292, 296; on glory, also see

TM 134, 206-7, 230, 248-52, 256, 272, 282. Strauss stresses that Machiavelli doesn't always insist that the end be "good or patriotic" *(cf.TM* 67-8 and271 with 79-80). On Mandeville's debt to Machiavelli, consider *The Fable of The Bees* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1924), vol. I, p. 39.

40. The thesis of restless dissatisfaction is almost a touchstone of modern philosophy (Machiavelli, *Discourses* I:37, II:Proem; Hobbes, *Leviathan* XI; Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* 1I:21,29-31; Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* III.ii.2). Cf. Strauss, *TM* 230, 251, 278; cf. *NRH* 251 on "the joyless quest for joy." Hume's version frames the problem that political economy must solve: the "avidity . . . of acquiring goods and possessions" is "insatiable, perpetual, universal, and directly destructive of society."

41. Cf. Strauss, *WIPP* 238, *C&M* 5-6, 73, 155-60, 237-40; *NRH* 106, *Crisis* 42-3, 46-7.

42. This is the sole mention of Hobbes *in The Wealth of Nations.* The cited passage prepares Hobbes's notorious claim that a man's value or worth is "his Price . . . so much as would be given for the use of his Power" *(Leviathan X).* The anticipation of consumer sovereignty is obvious. Hobbesian power likewise preserves the Machiavellian neutrality between moral virtue and vice (Strauss, *NRH* 193-6, *WIPP 49, PPH* 169).

43. Rousseau removes war from the state of nature by removing foresight along with vanity and dependence, all of which Smith tries to restore in a peaceful, capitalist form.

44. Strauss, *TM* 81-2; cf. 127, 132, 287; *cf. Discourses* I:53.

45. Smith, *WN* I.x.b.38. If Locke's political teaching is the "prosaic version of what in Hobbes had a certain poetic quality" (Strauss, *WIPP* 49), *The Wealth of Nations is* aprosaic version of what in Locke had a certain poetic quality.

46. Cf. Smith, *TMS* 111.3.4 on "the vanity of all the labours of man." On philosophy as learning to die, see "Logics" 4, *TMS* I11.13; Plato, *Phaedo* 64a, *Republic* 485a-486b, 604b-c, *Laws* 803b; Strauss, *OT* 211-12, 217. Cf. Strauss, *TM* 191, 197, 207.

47. Smith, *WN* Lix.20, I.xi.b.5, ll1ii.12,36, III.iv.13, IV.ii.4, IV.v.b.3-4, V.i.e:30, V.i.f.50,53. But cf. Intro. 4, Li.10.

48. Cf. Smith, WNI.viii.23, 39-40, I.xi.b.1; *TMS* II.ii.3.5, VI.ii.2.4.

49. Strauss, *WIPP* 43, *Waves 87; Cf. WIPP 46-7, TM* 281, *LAM* 20-1, *NRH* 193. For a contrasting view, see Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, vol.* I, p. 175, and Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment,* pp. 459, 487.

50. On the corruption bred by wealth and the remedies for it, see Strauss, *TM* 257, 261, 267-8, 278. Smith would surely sympathize with Montesquieu' claim that commerce encourages princes to govern with wisdom and goodness *("la bontē")* rather than *"les grands coups d'autorite";* moderation will reign instead of Machiavellianism *(De L'esprit des Lois,* XXI:20).

51. See WN I.viii.41, I.x.b.38, I1.iii19-20, III.ii.7, III.iv.3,19, IV.vii.c.61; *TMS* I.iii.2.5, V.2.3, VI.i.6, 11-12. On self-denial, cf. Strauss, *WIPP* 281, *NRH* 188, *TM* 190, 269, *C&M* 48, *Crisis 48.*

52. Smith, *WN* V.i.f.61, V.i.g.1, 8,10-15, 34, 36-8. Smith's cynical analysis of Church organization and priestly ambition draws on Machiavelli, both explicitly (V.i.g.2) and implicitly-compare the whole discussion of Catholicism in *Discourses* III:1 with Smith's brief recapitulation; cf. *Prince* IX and *Discourses* 1:5, I:55, 11:2. In advising the sovereign about religion, Smith emphasizes the techniques for properly "managing" the clergy (WN V.i.g.16-20, 26-30).

53. On gravity, levity, and severity, see Strauss, *TM* 185, 193, 206-7, 241, 257, 261, 285, 289, 294.

54. Marx, "On the Jewish Question," pp. 31, 45, 52; "Contribu - tion to the Critique of Hegel's *Philosophy of Right,"* p. *54; Capital* I:4, p. 173; "1844 Manuscripts," pp. 84-5.

55. Marx, "Critique of the Gotha Program," pp. 530-1. Cf. *Manifesto* (p. 486) on the abolition of buying and selling *(Schachers).*

56. Marx, *The Civil War in France, pp.* 635-6; *The German Ideology,* p. 193.

57. Marx, *Capital,* pp. 279-80, 680, 719, 799, 899; cf the famous account of fetishism in Chapter I, Section 4.

58. As Robert Heilbroner observes, the task from which Smith requires that the sovereign abstain-"superintending the industry of private people"-is performed energetically, albeit in a somewhat decentralized fashion, by capitalists under the discipline of "market

forces and the universalized quest for income" *(Behind the Veil of Economics* [New York: W.W. Norton, 1988], pp. 139-40, 31; cf. Strauss, *TM* 260; Pangle, p. 63). Smith concedes that the division of labor makes everyone dependent on the "assistance of great multitudes," but finds this preferable to the more personal and political form of dependence characteristic of feudal and shepherd societies, where the wealthy landowner or herdsman is both general and judge (WN I.ii.2, III.iv.5-12, V.i.b.7). Locke and Smith both emphasize that a lowly Englishman is richer than an American or African king *(Second Treatise* 41, *WN* I.i.11). *Cf. WN* Intro.4, I.viii.8,13, II.i.4, III.iv.11-12, IV.vii.a.3, and Locke, *Some Considerations of the Lowering of Interest, and the Raising the Value of Money,* in *Works,* vol. V (London: Thomas Tegg, 1823), pp. 57, 71.

59. Cf. Marx, "Gotha Program" (p. 538) on the "democratic republic," *Manifesto (pp.* 494-5) on the "liberal movement," and *Capital X:7 (p.* 416) on the "rights of man." Also see "On the Jewish Question," pp. 33-6, 40-5.

60. Marx & Engels, *Manifesto, p.* 484. As revolutionaries, Marx and Lenin were aware of some of the literary techniques Strauss counts among the tools of esoteric writers. See Marx, "Gotha Program," p. 538, and Lenin's discussion of "Aesopian language" in the Preface to the Russian edition of *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism.* On Marx's use of Socratic irony and other rhetorical techniques in *Capital,* see Robert Paul Wolff, *Moneybags Must be So Lucky* (Amherst, MA: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1988).

61. "If Marxism is only the truth of our time or our society," as implied by Lukācs, "the prospect of the classless society too is only the truth of our time and society; it may prove to be the delusion that gave the proletariat the power and the spirit to overthrow the capitalist system, whereas in fact the proletariat finds itself afterwards enslaved, no longer indeed by capital, but by an ironclad military bureaucracy" (Strauss, *Rebirth* 21).

62. Unlike Marx, Smith adopts elements of Burkean gradualism and prescriptivism.

63. On Smith's approach to such matters in his jurisprudence lectures, see Winch, pp. 46-146, Knud Haakonssen, *The Science of*

a Legislator (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981), pp. 83-189, and Richard Teichgraeber, *Free Trade and Moral Philosophy* (Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1986), pp. 121-69.

64. Strauss observes about Hobbes: "The right social order does not normally come about by natural necessity on account of man's ignorance of that order. The `invisible hand' remains ineffectual if it is not supported by the *Leviathan* or, if you wish, by the *Wealth of Nations" (NRH* 200-1).

65. Smith, *WN* IV.ii.43, IV.iii.c.9, IV.v.b.53, V.i.f.51; *TMS* Vl.ii.2.15-17. Strauss implicitly attributes the transformation of communism into Stalinism to the unreasonableness of the endeavor to vanquish all evil and to eliminate the need for "coercive restraint" *(C&M 5, Crisis 46-7).*

66. Cropsey, *HPP,* p. 628; Smith "anticipated the mechanisms of the philosophy of history . . . but not its ends; good through ill and reason through folly, but no Elysium at a rainbow's end" (625). Cf. Cropsey, *Polity and Economy,* pp. 40, 62-3.

67. Marx, *Manifesto, pp.* 485, 497-8; *The German Ideology,* p. 162; *Capital,* Preface, pp. 91-2. Ironically, Marxism may have prompted reforms that contributed to the survival of capitalism. Cf. Cropsey, *HPP,* p. 775.

68. Marx, *Manifesto,* pp. 477-8, 487; *The German Ideology, p.* 162; *Capital* XXV:3-4 and XXXII.

69. See i.e., Marx, *Capital* VI. Smith's analysis of the phenomenon Marx calls surplus value begins a chapter *(WN Lvi)* whose title-"Of the Component Parts of Price"-uses the terminology of economics to mask a politically charged investigation. By finding politics beneath the apparently objective or external forces that distribute goods and make values commensurable, Marx stands with Aristotle against the economists of the "first wave." Cf. *Capital* I:3, pp. 151-2.

70. Strauss, *TM 222,* 252-3, 267-8, 279, 297.

71. Marx, *Capital,* XIV:5, XXVI; cf. Strauss, *TM* 127-8, 131-2. Smith's "realism" is displayed in his Rousseauean (if not Mandan) statements about oppression and wealth *(WN* V.i.b.2,12), his erasure of God and Jesus, and his cynical portrayals of priests, popes, nobles,

landlords, merchants, and manufacturers. Smith thus differs from his friend Burke, who denounced the Enlightenment's war against "pleasing illusions" and "decent drapery."

72. Smith credits gunpowder for modern civilization's greater resistance to "barbarian" invasions, though his account delicately obscures a crucial difference between ancient and modern civilization: that only the latter is organized for systematic economic and technological progress. Smith implicitly follows Machiavelli's account of the price Rome paid for its liberal admission of foreigners to citizenship *(WN* IV.vii.c.75, 77; V.i.a. 35-6). See Strauss, *TM* 118, 181, 261-2, 298-9, and my article, "Invisible Hand, Invisible Death," *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 17 (Winter 1989): 305-15. One wonders what Machiavelli thought about the printing press.

73. Marx, *Capital,* pp. 254-5, 302, 342, 375-6, 381, 481, 548, 772, 798-9, 929. As Trotsky says of communism, the human race will have "ceased to crawl on all fours before God, kings and capital" *(Literature and Revolution* [New York: Russell & Russell, 1957], p. 255).

74. Strauss, *C&M 3, Crisis, Waves* 81, 98; *Rebirth* 17.

75. Machiavelli, *Discourses* II:21 *(Il Principe E Discoursi* [Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, 1960], p. 341). Cf. Strauss, *TM* 102, 119, 168-9. Cf. Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders, pp.* 126,139-40,157-8,170,184, 254-60, 269, 295-8, 316-19, 324, 342-3, 412; *Taming the Prince* (New York: The Free Press, 1989), pp. 139-42, 147-8, 280; "Machiavelli's New Regime," *Italian Quarterly* XIII, #52 (1970): 63-95.

76. When Marx claims that the "value" of labor-power, unlike that of other commodities, "contains a historical and moral element" *(Capital 275,* 341, 376), he implicitly concedes that habits, opinions, and expectations can disrupt the "economic laws of iron necessity." Cf. Smith, *WN* I.viii.15,21-4; I.xi.c.7, V.ii.k.3.

77. Despite his praise for "the system of natural liberty," Smith seems indifferent to the more spiritual forms of freedom contemplated by Augustine, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Marx, and Nietzsche. Cf. Cropsey, *Political Philosophy and the Issues of Politics* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 7-8, 78-88.

78. Cf. Strauss, *TM* 45, 136, 150, 287-8.

79. Strauss concedes that we inhabit "a kind of society wholly unknown to the classics," to which the classical principles "as stated and elaborated by the classics are not immediately applicable" *(C&M* 11). Cf. *WIPP* 15, *Studies* 29, *PAW* 55-6, *TM 232,* 295, and Peterman, p. 335.

80. Strauss, *WIPP 37, NRH* 23, *C&M* 37-8, *TM* 298-9, *Rebirth* 235, OT 224-6.

81. Marx, *Capital X:2,* p. 345. Ancient writers like Plato, Thucydides, and Xenophon were oriented towards use-value rather than exchange value, and thus recommended the division of labor as something that improves the producer as well as the product *(Capital* XIV:5, pp. 486-8).

82. Marx, *Manifesto,* p. 490, "Gotha Program," p. 531, *Capital,* vol. III (New York: International Publishers, 1967), pp. 819-20; Engels, "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific," p. 715; Lenin, *State and Revolution V,* p. 79.

83. Marx, *The German Ideology,* pp. 155, 160.

84. Marx, *Capital,* p. 104 (Preface to the French edition). The first two volumes of *Capital* barely mention "communism," "socialism," "revolution," or the *Manifesto.*

85, Shadia Drury, *The Political Ideas of Leo Strauss* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), p. 114.

86. Kristol, *Reflections of a Neoconservative* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), p. xii.

87. Strauss, *Rebirth 22-3,* 270, *LAM* 5-6. Cf. *TM* 298-9 on the "essential defect of classical political philosophy."

88. Strauss, Letter to Karl L~with, 8/20/1946, *Independent Journal of Philosophy* IV (1983): 112-13.

89. On the philosophical status of modern natural science, see Strauss, *Crisis* 42, *NRH* 7-8, 171-4, *LAM* 22.3, *Waves 87, WIPP 26,* 38-40; *Rebirth* 7-8, 22-3, 42-3, 235, 268-70; *Epilog* 315, *C&M 2,* 42-3; on evolution, see *Crisis 92.*

90. Francis Fukuyama, despite the patriotism and anti-communism of his essay on "The End of History," feels that the "unabashed victory of economic and political liberalism" will be "a very sad time" *(The National Interest* 16 [Summer 1989]: 3, 18)-as sad as the end

of humanity? On the technological prospects for preserving and propagating intelligence, see Freeman Dyson, *Infinite in All Directions* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), pp. *50-3,* 91-121, and Gregg Easterbrook's discussion of environmentalism in *The New Republic,* 4/3/1990, p. *27.*

91. Holmes, "Truths for Philosophers Alone?" *Times Literary Supplement* (December 1-7, 1989): 1320.

92. Nietzsche, according to Strauss, was here the realist, sensing that there might be "something infinitely more terrible, depressing and degrading in the offing than *foeda religio* or *l'infame:* the possibility, nay, the fact that human life is utterly meaningless and lacking support, that it lasts only for a minute which is preceded and followed by an infinite time during which the human race was not and will not be" (Strauss, *Studies* 180).

93. Strauss, *NRH,* p. 176, n. 10; Strauss translates the passage in a posthumously published essay *(Rebirth 238). Cf.* Marx, *Capital X:5,* p. 381.

94. Strauss, *LAM 40, 84-5, 98; TM* 193, 197, *207, 299; Rebirth 236-8. Cf.* Mansfield, *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders, pp. 38-9.*

95. Strauss, *LAM 5-6, 8, 63-4; NRH 32, 35, 318; WIPP* 11, *31-2; Studies* 157; *C&M* 180; *TM* 120-1, 192-3, 231, *298-9.*