

## Chapter 1 : Carl Schmitt - Wikipedia

*Our hope is that the Political Theology Network Mentoring Initiative might even create a space where new research questions and methods will emerge.*

It remains a favourite text for more recent theoreticians, especially those with populist and evangelical tendencies, like Steve Bannon, in the United States. For Schmitt, the sovereign, that entity in government beyond which there is no appeal Exceptional Nonsense; And Exceptionally Dangerous Political Theology is the constitutional playbook for fascism. During this period, the sovereign may not only suspend the constitution, as sovereign dictator he may amend it to suit the situation, that is, to meet a pressing need. One is either friend or enemy. Each category defines the other. The logical loop is airtight. Politics, therefore, has a rather peculiar meaning within this framework. Human beings, Schmitt believes, cannot be made subject to a set of political rules or universal laws because as human beings the content of their lives and threats to those lives cannot be anticipated. Any insistence on law as such imperils the very existence of the people as well as their state. But, critically, rules are there to be broken as necessary to ensure the health and welfare of the state. Not broken by just anyone of course, only by the sovereign, the dictator, the leader, the Fuhrer. The political must be eliminated and replaced by organizational and technical rationality in order to prevail against the enemy. What do these claims have to do with theology? His aim is to restore the legitimacy and strength of power held by medieval, of course Christian, monarchs to the leaders of the modern state. This may sound alien to anyone brought up in modern democratic state. But it is a theory that has been promoted consistently by not just the Catholic Church but by most Protestant sects. This theory is that the source of all power, including political power, is God. Power is distributed, like grace, from this source through various institutions of church and government as if in a series of waterfalls. Each level is granted what they need to carry out their duties, and passes on the degree of power necessary for subordinate levels to do the same. Throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, the Catholic Church fought bitterly against democracy and in favour of monarchy, specifically on the basis of this theory of power. Schmitt, a Catholic, was acutely influenced by Catholic philosophers and theologians who were reacting primarily to the dislocation of ecclesiastical power brought about by the French Revolution. Similarly his persistent efforts to define real Americans as not immigrants nor as Muslims, nor as black people, nor even as members of the Democratic Party, are tactics taken straight from Schmitt. This also explains why so many American Evangelicals are so intensely attached to an obviously vile, mendacious, and corrupt leader. He has, in their view, been appointed by God to clean the stables, to drain the swamp, to overturn the money-changers who are all engaged in the un-godly practice of politics. It is politics which these religious enthusiasts despise, particularly politics which contradict their beliefs in their own Christian superiority. If what is happening appears to be a religious war, this is not illusory. Theology is most powerful where it is least challenged, that is among true believers. But it is a war sparked not by Muslims or immigrants, or black people. Rather it is created by something that has become embedded in the fabric of modern Christianity: It is after all a matter of divine right. As a cradle Catholic myself, I point this out with deep regret.

*Political theology investigates the ways in which theological concepts or ways of thinking relate to politics, society, and culture. The relationship between Christianity and politics has been debated since the time of Jesus, and political theology has been an academic discipline since the 20th century.*

His father was a minor businessman. He studied law at Berlin, Munich and Strasbourg and took his graduation and state examinations in then-German Strasbourg during WWI. They were divorced, though an appeal to the Catholic Church for an annulment was rejected. Subsequently, Schmitt was excommunicated because his first marriage had not been annulled by the Church. She translated several works by her father into Spanish. Letters from Carl Schmitt to his son-in-law have also been published. Beliefs[ edit ] As a young man, Schmitt was "a devoted Catholic until his break with the church in the mid twenties. Rather, Schmitt should be understood as carrying an atheistic political-theological tradition to an extreme. Reich" in which the Social Democratic Party of Germany -controlled government of the state of Prussia disputed its dismissal by the right-wing Reich government of Franz von Papen. Papen was motivated to do so because Prussia, by far the largest state in Germany, served as a powerful base for the political left and provided it with institutional power, particularly in the form of the Prussian police. The court ruled in October that the Prussian government had been suspended unlawfully but that the Reich had the right to install a commissar. Hegel had set an ignominious precedent by according this putative universal class a position of preeminence in his political thought, insofar as the primacy of the bureaucracy tends to diminish or supplant the prerogative of sovereign authority. Hugenberg reasoned that by doing so, the government would thereby be changed, and the Enabling Act would no longer apply, as the "present government" that had been would no longer exist. It was a legal opinion by Carl Schmitt which prevented this political maneuver from succeeding. Schmitt, well known as a constitutional theorist, declared that "present government" did not refer to the specific make-up of the Cabinet when the Act was passed, but to the "completely different kind of government" — that is, different from the democracy of the Weimar Republic — which the Hitler cabinet had brought into existence. Schmitt refused every attempt at de-nazification, which effectively barred him from academic jobs. Despite being isolated from the mainstream of the scholarly and political community, he continued his studies especially of international law from the 1930s on, and he frequently received visitors, both colleagues and younger intellectuals, until well into his old age. In 1934, Schmitt gave lectures in Francoist Spain, two of which resulted in the publication, the next year, of *Theory of the Partisan* Telos Press, in which he characterized the Spanish Civil War as a "war of national liberation" against "international Communism". Schmitt regarded the partisan as a specific and significant phenomenon; during the latter half of the 20th century, he indicated the emergence of a new theory of warfare. Schmitt died on 7 April and is buried in Plettenberg. In this essay, Schmitt compared and contrasted what he saw as the effective and ineffective elements of the new constitution of his country. He saw the office of the president as a comparatively effective element, because of the power granted to the president to declare a state of exception *Ausnahmezustand*. This power, which Schmitt discussed and implicitly praised as dictatorial, [22] was more in line with the underlying mentality of executive power than the comparatively slow and ineffective processes of legislative power reached through parliamentary discussion and compromise. Schmitt was at pains to remove what he saw as a taboo surrounding the concept of "dictatorship" and to show that the concept is implicit whenever power is wielded by means other than the slow processes of parliamentary politics and the bureaucracy: If the constitution of a state is democratic, then every exceptional negation of democratic principles, every exercise of state power independent of the approval of the majority, can be called dictatorship. Although the German concept of *Ausnahmezustand* is best translated as "state of emergency", it literally means "state of exception" which, according to Schmitt, frees the executive from any legal restraints to its power that would normally apply. The use of the term "exceptional" has to be underlined here: Schmitt defines sovereignty as the power to decide the instauration of state of exception, as Giorgio Agamben has noted. Political Theology[ edit ] On Dictatorship was followed by another essay in 1935, titled "Politische Theologie" political theology; in it, Schmitt, who at the time was working

as a professor at the University of Bonn , gave further substance to his authoritarian theories, analysing the concept of "free will" influenced by Christian-Catholic thinkers. Schmitt proposes this definition to those offered by contemporary theorists of sovereignty, particularly Hans Kelsen , whose work is criticized at several points in the essay. A year later, Schmitt supported the emergence of totalitarian power structures in his paper "Die geistesgeschichtliche Lage des heutigen Parlamentarismus" roughly: Schmitt criticized the institutional practices of liberal politics, arguing that they are justified by a faith in rational discussion and openness that is at odds with actual parliamentary party politics , in which outcomes are hammered out in smoke-filled rooms by party leaders. Schmitt also posits an essential division between the liberal doctrine of separation of powers and what he holds to be the nature of democracy itself, the identity of the rulers and the ruled. Although many critics of Schmitt today, such as Stephen Holmes in his *The Anatomy of Anti-Liberalism*, take exception to his fundamentally authoritarian outlook, the idea of incompatibility between liberalism and democracy is one reason for the continued interest in his political philosophy. *The Concept of the Political*[ edit ] Schmitt changed universities in , when he became professor of law at the Handelshochschule in Berlin , and again in , when he accepted a position in Cologne. While churches are predominant in religion or society is predominant in economics, the state is predominant in politics. Yet for Schmitt the political was not an autonomous domain equivalent to the other domains, but rather the existential basis that would determine any other domain should it reach the point of politics e. The political is not equal to any other domain, such as the economic which distinguishes between profitable and not profitable , but instead is the most essential to identity. Schmitt, in perhaps his best-known formulation, bases his conceptual realm of state sovereignty and autonomy upon the distinction between friend and enemy. This distinction is to be determined "existentially", which is to say that the enemy is whoever is "in a specially intense way, existentially something different and alien, so that in the extreme case conflicts with him are possible. Although there have been divergent interpretations concerning this work, there is broad agreement that "The Concept of the Political" is an attempt to achieve state unity by defining the content of politics as opposition to the "other" that is to say, an enemy, a stranger. Additionally, the prominence of the state stands as a neutral force dominating potentially fractious civil society, whose various antagonisms must not be allowed to affect politics, lest civil war result. But dominion can be established, that is, men can be unified only in a unity againstâ€œagainst other men. Every association of men is necessarily a separation from other men Published in , it was also one of his final texts. It describes the origin of the Eurocentric global order, which Schmitt dates from the discovery of the New World , discusses its specific character and its contribution to civilization, analyses the reasons for its decline at the end of the 19th century, and concludes with prospects for a new world order. It defends European achievements, not only in creating the first truly global order of international law , but also in limiting war to conflicts among sovereign states, which, in effect, civilized war. But however critical Schmitt is of American actions at the end of the 19th century and after World War I, he considered the United States to be the only political entity capable of resolving the crisis of global order. *Hamlet or Hecuba*[ edit ] Published in , *Hamlet or Hecuba*: Schmitt uses this interpretation to develop a theory of myth and politics that serves as a cultural foundation for his concept of political representation. It contains an implicit theory of the terrorist, which during the 21st century has resulted in yet another new theory of war and enmity. In the lectures, Schmitt directly tackles the issues surrounding "the problem of the Partisan" figure: Jacques Derrida , in his *Politics of Friendship* remarked: But in *Theory of the Partisan*, it is in the same areas that the topic of this concept is both radicalized and properly uprooted, where Schmitt wished to regasp in history the event or node of events that engaged this uprooting radicalisation, and it is precisely there that the philosophical as such intervenes again. *The Concept of the Political*. University of Chicago Press, ; expanded edition , with an introduction by Tracy B. The text is an elaboration of a journal article of the same title. Duke University Press, *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*. *The Intrusion of the Time Into the Play*. David Pan and Jennifer R. Telos Press , *The Idea of Representation*: Plutarch Press, , reprint of *The Necessity of Politics Meaning and Failure of a Political Symbol*. *On the Three Types of Juristic Thought*. *Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*. *Theory of the Partisan*. *The Tyranny of Values*. *Eine terminologische Untersuchung*, *Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Rechtspraxis*, Fritz Eisler ,

Der Wert des Staates und die Bedeutung des Einzelnen, Die geistesgeschichtliche Lage des heutigen Parlamentarismus, Die Rheinlande als Objekt internationaler Politik, Der Begriff des Politischen, in: Sein Staatsbegriff und seine Stellung in der dt. Der Begriff des Politischen, elaboration of the essay. Die Dreigliederung der politischen Einheit, Der Leviathan in der Staatslehre des Thomas Hobbes, Die Wendung zum diskriminierenden Kriegsbegriff, Eine weltgeschichtliche Betrachtung, Der Einbruch der Zeit in das Spiel, Zwischenbemerkung zum Begriff des Politischen, Die Legende von der Erledigung jeder Politischen Theologie, Aufzeichnungen der Jahre 1669-1675", hrsg. Eberhard Freiherr von Medem, posthum. Das internationale Verbrechen des Angriffskrieges, hrsg. Helmut Quaritsch, posthum.

*Written in the intense political and intellectual tumult of the early years of the Weimar Republic, Political Theology develops the distinctive theory of sovereignty that made Carl Schmitt one of the most significant and controversial political theorists of the twentieth century.*

Berger continues to make similar claims, insisting that the church must continue to legitimate the state since it embodies justice that is, law and order. Yet he does not believe that Christians should sanctify political institutions or programs. That would constitute political involvement and violate the minimalist and individualistic personal charity by which he and the IRD define social action. Berger attempts to use a functional, value-free definition of religion while simultaneously holding a substantive view of faith. He wants his readers to accept his own ideas in terms of their value content their ideological import, not their social function. But that seems to be the result of his methodological ambiguity. It is the sort of claim that his own sociology of knowledge has taught us to suspect. As meta-sociologist or theologian, Berger and the IRD provide no criteria governing their faith claims except for personal taste or their version of common sensibility. The threat of nuclear annihilation has underscored in a new way the total interdependence and interconnectedness of all humanity. Therefore any exclusive doctrine of national sovereignty would also be a false and destructive dualism. That relationship mandates humans to be responsible not only to God but to the continuance of human life on earth. For the IRD, the human condition of self-preservation and the marked distinction of friend versus enemy not only functions in descriptive but also in normative ways to determine human relationships. Responsibility for others, for the world, and for God quickly become subsumed in a completely individualistic ethic. I believe such a view of persons to be highly manipulative and self-destructive. Social Ethics If God is understood as that reality working through all of life and history, then our social relationships and work will also reflect that universally oriented vision. Hopefully such a vision can transcend our less inclusive loyalties, whether they be ideological, patriotic, or religious. Although the IRD talks of transcendence, the term as they use it tends to function as a mystification of their national security state policies. As the ultimate point of reference, God also has a relativizing function for human life. All institutions and activities cannot be perceived adequately except in relationship to God. The traditional images of God as creator, sovereign lord, and judge express that relativizing dimension. By contrast, the IRD often assumes a holier-than-thou attitude and self-criticism seems entirely lacking. Both concepts include health, economic prosperity, political liberation, psychological freedom, and spiritual salvation in their holistic view of peace and freedom. That humanizing function resides in a positive charter given to all people and their institutions. But the IRD has no positive humanizing charter. Their social ethics function under a model where the sheer rationalization of national security force becomes the prevailing moral norm. Pragmatic and non-moral use of power for strategic interests rule the day. The IRD does include the universal moral norm of human rights. However, even here human rights are viewed as natural rights based upon the ethical principle of non-maleficence. Such a personal rights model that does not encourage the good beneficence leads to few moral norms for the government and cannot demonstrate how personal rights are more important than economic, political, or social rights. Ultimately the adequacy of a humanizing ethic will be its effect on the life of the entire human community. A political theology that inspires greater acts of justice and joy, liberation and hope for all humanity can be called both useful and true. The IRD and all other theologically rooted political activisms must be held accountable to these standards. Richard John Neuhaus, *Christianity and Democracy: A Theological Inquiry* Washington: Berger, *A Rumor of Angels*. Doubleday, , p. Berger, *Facing Up to Modernity*:

## Chapter 4 : Political Theology - Faith of the Faithless

*Accept. We use cookies to improve your website experience. To learn about our use of cookies and how you can manage your cookie settings, please see our Cookie Policy. By closing this message, you are consenting to our use of cookies.*

Repairing Evangelical Political Theology: Getting the State Right Defending Dr. Robert Jeffress and conservative evangelicals requires repairing our evangelical political theology Dr. Such a charge is a damnable lie and mischaracterization, but we should expect no less of the followers of Russell Moore and his progressive fellow travelers who have infiltrated the Southern Baptist Convention. Jeffress views immigrants no differently than abortion supporters view infants. On the one hand it is perceived value to the person and on the other hand it is perceived value to the nation. Carrying this logic to its conclusion presents its absurdity. When hiring someone for a job, may I consider their qualifications? Or, are the situations different? Abortion is a judgement made about life and immigration policy about who gets to share in the benefits of the nation-state. Abortion is about the inalienable right-to-life for the innocent. Immigration policy about the totally contingent place of residence. For the Christian, the state and individuals cannot select who should have a right to life because God explicitly tells us that innocent life must be protected. For the Christian, the state possesses and always has possessed the power over who it allows into its borders. There is no inalienable right to access a land or territory based on any Old or New Testament text. For a good view of what the Mosaic Law said on this subject read Dr. Immigrants, Aliens and the Bible. Going back to the hiring analogy, a business would cease to be profitable if it cannot make judgments on a value to the organization. Likewise, the state would go bankrupt allowing unlimited immigration or open borders as the ranks of entitlement recipients swelled. That is not to say mercy cannot or should not be part of the immigration discussion. However, it cannot be the only consideration. Making it the only consideration is nothing short of setting up a progressive-Christian theonomy in a dangerous attempt to realize the eschaton and usher in a Gospel-Utopia. At heart of such claims is a childish political theology Mercy and Love are good things and with justice are important. However, they cannot be the only considerations when viewing a policy. Evangelicals in general and Baptists in particular need a robust political theology. The state exists to create order, so people can live their lives safely and the church can do its evangelism. Let each of you look not to his own interest, but also to the interests of others. It confuses the purpose of the state with the purpose of the individual and the church. Instead of encouraging the state to do its job creating order by balancing security and justice, evangelicals like Yang and SBC Voices encourage the state to be Gospel-y. Unfortunately, such a political theology harms both the church and the state. The biblical data is clear, the state exists to create order so that Christians can have lives of safety and quiet. Here are a few key texts: Do you want to be unafraid of the authority? Do what is good, and you will have its approval. But if you do wrong, be afraid, because it does not carry the sword for no reason. The service the state renders to God is twofold in helping its subjects toward good and preventing evil. It seems uniform in the New Testament writings that government is given one role and the church another. The focus on the state as a servant to create order is echoed by Peter in his New Testament writings. Love the brothers and sisters. Both Peter in this chapter and Paul Rom. From within the writings of Peter and Paul, the state has a primary purpose—punishing evil. The state is an avenger, according to Paul and because of this enables the quiet life of safety. This requires us to understand the state must be powerful enough to protect itself from inside rebellion and outside invasion. Security then should be part of the political evaluation Christians use when evaluating public policy. Key here is that Christians must recognize God created government for a specific purpose: To punish evil by the power of the sword so that Christians and all people can live quiet lives and this arrangement furthers the spread of the Gospel. However, the best way to fulfill the Great Commission is not to ignore security and economic considerations for the state, but to make sure the state picks the policies that balance justice and security. John Warwick Montgomery warned that even bad law is preferable to disorder. The universal dictum has always been, *crimen omnia ex se nata vitiat*. Yet, this is what, so many evangelicals want when it comes to immigration. They want to reward the perceived weak by

ignoring the law and rewriting the rules to favor their preferred class. This is fraught with danger because it confuses the purpose of law. Law is not meant to realize the eschaton. But this assertion is anything but clear. The appeals to the Old Testament seem answered by Prof. One of the key arguments against a general understanding of welcoming all foreigners is that the most often used verse in the Old Testament in support is Leviticus. So, the Law commanded Jews to welcome people like Ruth who followed the lawful path into the theocracy. In any case, on the issue of immigration there seems to be a significantly muddled ethical picture from the Bible. Otherwise, like abortion, there would be clarity in the biblical record. Instead, when questioned on any issue Dr. What does this mean for government? It would result in absurdities. Would justice be served if the government turned the other cheek to open rebellion? Should the state forgive the felon 70 times 7? Though prison reforming advocates in evangelicalism sure seem intent on pushing that as part of their prison reform agenda. These are principles for individuals. The principles governing the state are to foster order so that all of us are empowered to carry out those acts of love and mercy. Evangelicals must firmly resist confusing the purpose of the state with the purpose for the Christian. Otherwise, the state cannot do its job protecting us. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, vol. Yale University Press, , Holman Bible Publishers, , 1 Pe 2: Baker Books, , Holman Bible Publishers, , 1 Ti 2: Howard Marshall and Philip H.

Chapter 5 : The Political Theology of Trump – An und für sich

*Kahn offers a political theology that has at its center the practice of freedom realized in political decisions, legal judgments, and finally in philosophical inquiry itself. Paul W. Kahn is a distinguished political and legal theorist who has written many important books on the American political imagination before.*

What is the Gospel? Too many elite evangelical thinkers make the Gospel into a means of social justice and transformation. The Gospel is about salvation – getting man right with God. Unfortunately, political theology is a tool of division where elites attack others. Disagree with their political view and get steamrolled on Twitter. The snobbery coming out of Christianity Today or Evangelical Twitterati showcases the modern elite view of Christianity as a system that requires social justice. Disagree with them and feel their wrath. Like a hateful tweet from James K. Smith directed at Falwell See image. Falwell provoked a backlash from evangelical and non-evangelical conservative elites with one tweet: There is no easy out. You must be just in all your dealings, individual and political. First, there is a clear dividing line recognized in the Bible between personal ethics and political power. Otherwise, why is Caesar given some things and God reserved some things? Second, to claim the state has one purpose – order and security – and the individual Christian another set of duties – mercy, charity, love – is not to claim a Christian rejects viewing his political responsibilities through the lens of the Bible. To assert there are different jobs for the Christian and government is not to assert a bifurcation of Christian ethics. Keeping the state in its proper, limited role is following a Christian ethical approach to politics. Christians generally affirm a deontological moral system. For this, there are many attempts to answer the question, but the best answer arises from Graded Absolutism as explained by Dr. For the Christian, loving God and loving neighbor are important commands. For the state, justice is a greater command than mercy. Romney is a good man who held to many political policy views in line with evangelical Christians. Yet, evangelicals would say Romney had a defective view of Christ. For Christians, a defective view of our Lord and Savior puts one in violation of the Greatest Commandment. Yet, when one considers the purpose of government, Romney was the far superior candidate within the specific context of a secular American political election. Caesar can do whatever he wants! Falwell is pointing out the Gospel is for persons and not for the state. The Gospel transforms individuals. We must remember this important truth. Social programs, no matter how well-intentioned, soup kitchens, no matter how helpful, and tax policy, no matter how just, will accomplish nothing to save souls. A focus on Jesus is an offense. What then is the Gospel? The gospel is this by virtue of its content, its subject, Jesus Christ. It is He Himself who is its effectiveness. This is what the angel Gabriel announced to the Virgin Mary, what the prophets preached to the world and what all the apostles truthfully proclaimed. Rather, the works of Christ were to save men and gave all of creation the promise of a future eschatological status where believers are reconciled with God. The teaching of Jesus was not preserved as an ethical or legal system. Jesus did not set his teachings as a legal system. It is only through the Holy Spirit that we can grow to become more like our Savior. We have the Holy Spirit to guide us in theological matters, but not on specific policy issues. Therefore governing is harder, because it cannot be ruling over things that are certain, and must act, so to speak, in the dark. How many B2 bombers to procure, or the appropriate number of immigrants would be far from certain based on divine revelation. Logos Research Systems, Inc. Holman Bible Publishers, , 1 Co InterVarsity Press, , Baker Books, , – Doubleday, ,

**Chapter 6 : The Sorry State of Evangelical Political Theology - Sovereign Nations**

*The Political Theology Network Mentoring Initiative is designed to gather and equip the next generation of leaders in the field. The PhD students selected take an interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, or even anti-disciplinary approach to their studies.*

In his two essays Carl Schmitt described a specific approach called by him a political theology. What is political theology? At first sight they seem to resemble those with all other concepts constructed within the social sciences. Repeated attempts to create one, unifying definition show that the scope of the concept depends on the position of the researcher, and therefore strongly differs in the range of inclusion and exclusion of the phenomena. Hence it can be said that different disciplines are now carrying out research in the field of political theology without even being aware of it. Certainly philosophy, sociology, theology, anthropology etc. Yet, this broad sense of political theology is not sufficient. Undoubtedly, he contributed to the revival of interest in it; however, he does not make him the author of the concept or the pioneer of the type of reflection recognized as political theology. Greeks pointed out the different ways of praising the gods, what was later expressed in the form of *theologia tripartita*, the triple theology or three types of theology. This division is commonly attributed to Stoics, but the sources allow us to assume that this scheme was rather an element of common knowledge than specific to Stoic thought. Lieberg The most clear conceptual frame of *theologia tripartita* was coined by Varro and Quintus Scaevola, which we know from St. Augustine. However, the classification of different kinds of theologies Augustine adopted from Varro: Having in mind this peculiar origin of political theology as a concept, we can move on to its interpretation in the 20th century. Jan Assmann, who analysed political theology in a polemic against Schmitt, suggests that there are two main forms of political theology: This concept circulates then in two forms: Even assuming the clarity of the descriptive version, it always appears in a concrete political context. Obviously, concepts can be used polemically as intellectual weapons. Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political* However, Schmitt did not take over the concept of political theology from the ancient or early Christian period, but from Mikhail Bakunin, who aimed it against Giuseppe Mazzini and Bakunin. Therefore this kind of political theology is a historical hypothesis on the process of emerging concepts, and will be discussed further at a later point. The vision of social and political order is a reflection of the interpretation of Revelation. The common ground for institutional and appellative political theology is of course faith. As a result they differ from the juridical, which is based on science and human reason. Exclusion of this aspect of his oeuvre often leads to misunderstandings because political theology is the underlying principle of his understanding of the socio-political world. This method is easily visible in all his works; however, only two of them are dedicated directly to this issue. These two essays, *Politische Theologie* and *Politische Theologie II*, make a chronological frame for all of his works: Analogies between theology and jurisprudence are already present in the short essay on the relation between state, law and individual *Der Wert des Staates und die Bedeutung des Einzelnen*, written in 1934. The core part can be summarized as a set of the following hypotheses: The social structure of society is analogous to its metaphysical vision of the world. *Political Theology*, This analogy has a synchronic and diachronic character. On the one hand, it means the historical evolution of concepts; history of concepts; on the other, the similarity of the structure of concepts in both fields. Mehring Schmitt begins the description of his approach with two critical steps, rejecting earlier attempts. Schmitt begins then with describing what sociology of concepts is different from. Firstly, it differs from materialism and spiritualism, both of which make the same mistake of assuming that two spheres, the spiritual and the material, in the end reduce to one another. Schmitt thinks of this as psychology. The third step is positive. The aim of sociology of concepts is to find the basic radically systematic structure of legal concepts, which could be compared to the social structure of an epoch and its conceptual changes. Schmitt seems to leave aside the question of whether concepts are the reflection of reality or reality is created by concepts. A sociological approach to the concept is to define this identity. In the first case the direction of the relation is clearly indicated, whereas in the second it is not. In *Politische Theologie* Schmitt sketches the main transformations in understanding God, state and law since the 17th century, which were reflected in changes

within the system of concepts. This idea was modified when the place of a theistic approach was taken over by the deistic, which resulted in the image of ruler who sets the machine of laws and then does not interfere. Even during the Enlightenment, the vision of a sovereign dominated, although it gradually had been losing its influence. This meant the destruction of the theological justification of political power, as power was thought to come from below and not from above. Since the 19th century, we have been witnessing, as Schmitt says, the process of immanentisation, which comes out in two characteristic elements: When all transcendent references are excluded, then legitimacy based on the will of God, where God is the ultimate source of political power, has to be modified and transformed into an immanent version. In this book, he examined dictatorship from antiquity until the turn of 18th and 19th centuries, with special attention to the period between the 14th and the 19th century. The history of dictatorship began in ancient Rome when, during times of danger and riots that could threaten the state, the *Senatus Romanus* appointed a dictator, who was an institution within the republican system designed for its defence. He was appointed for a defined period of time up to six months, but usually the person resigned earlier, in order to remove the threat. His position was based on the existing law; he could neither revoke the laws, nor enact his own. It was therefore clearly an instrument designed to protect the political order of the Roman republic. This understanding, which prevailed until the Renaissance, was not applied to the political orders of early modern states, but existed within the history of ancient civilizations. Scholars and glossators saw dictatorship rather as a historical institution than a problem in the field of law. Nonetheless, Machiavelli observed the crucial aspect of dictatorship in his commentary on the History of Rome by Titus Livius, although he still declared dictatorship an institution typical of the Roman republic. Schmitt takes over this observation, but goes further. The first commissars were sent in the 13th century by the pope. All acts of the commissars were regarded as acts of the pope himself and were based on a special task commissio, unlike the acts of ordinary church officials, which were based on law *lex*. It was commonly accepted that God is the source of all power, constantly intervening in the world, so the king in the state had the same position and his commissars were only the instruments of intervention. With the coming of the Enlightenment, the vision of God has been steadily changing towards the deistic view Descartes, Malebranche: God created the world, set its laws, and since then the world has been functioning independently as a great and complicated machine. With this rationalism in the metaphysics, the vision of the state and dictatorship also changed. As a consequence, the idea of despotism rational came into existence. If the enlightened knew the truth, they should bring real! In this regard the division between the legislative and executive the balance of powers made no sense, since it put an obstacle before reasonable actions. At the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries in France the classical understanding of dictatorship had moved from the commissar type to the sovereign type. During the French Revolution, the difference between the commissar dictatorship, which was based on the existing laws and constitution, and the sovereign dictatorship became clearly visible. Sovereign dictatorship denies the value of the existing political and social order and aims at introducing the new, true and right one, which would make possible the existence of a real constitution. The real constitution exists therefore only in the future, but at the same time is the basis for the actions of a dictator. The shift from this kind of dictatorship to a dictatorship of the proletariat postulated by Marxist theory was possible because of Rousseau, who in the place of one dictator put the people as a whole. In the end, the growing influence of the liberal view of the state led to the restriction of dictatorship by means of a law describing both the conditions of a state of exception which replaced the concept of dictatorship and all means that might be used when it is proclaimed. This vision is far from the earlier version that assumed the impossibility of specific regulations because it is impossible to predict all the situations that could pose a threat to the state and political order. He traces the changes in meanings of words and puts them in the context of shifts in the metaphysical view of the world. This approach inspired Reinhart Koselleck, now considered the most important representative of *Begriffsgeschichte* differences between *Begriffsgeschichte* and *Ideengeschichte* are extremely interesting on the methodological level, but will not be discussed here. The essay from appears to be an answer to many of them under the guise of a dispute with Erik Peterson and Hans Blumenberg. It is, however, not certain whether they are the real target of his reply. Schmitt stated in a note in *Politische Theologie II*: Although his theory can be seen in that way, it is certainly not the whole truth about

his theologico-political position. In *Politische Theologie II*, Schmitt analyses the legend of the destruction of political theology which come into existence because of a work by Erik Peterson, *Monotheismus als politisches Problem*. Peterson claims that political theology "is impossible for Christianity and every attempt to create it is a kind of heresy. The debate between Schmitt and Peterson refers rather to the theological aspect of this method and will not be further discussed here. In the context of political theology as a sociology of concepts the last, extremely short part of the book, which was added later, is an answer to Hans Blumenberg and seems to be more important in the context of conceptual history. He tried to solve the problem with the concept of reoccupation *Umbesetzung*, which meant that the new concepts which came into existence in modernity took the functions, not the content, of the previous theological concepts. For Schmitt legitimacy is based on law *ius*, *Recht*, whereas legality on the act of the law *lex*, *Gesetz* and modernity characterises itself as a resignation from the former. In principle, Blumenberg is interested in the self-authorization of man and his desire to know Schmitt and Lepper 39; Schmidt, *Political Theology II*, which is fundamentally immanent. Summary The way Schmitt understands political theology as a method of the sociology of concepts, or rather, history of concepts may provide helpful insights into the different disciplines, both in the humanities as well as in the natural sciences. Regardless of the theological aspects of this method, the demand to always have in mind concepts and the context of their deployment is the key to understanding our life-world as well as earlier historical periods. It could enrich the work of scholars working with different problems, especially connected with the socio-political sphere. Her main fields of interest are political theology, political philosophy, and German and Austrian philosophy and literature. Works Cited Assmann, Jan. *City of God [De Civitate Dei]*. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Internationales Organ der Anarchisten deutscher Sprache Carl Schmitt und die Folgen. *Der soziologische und der juristische Staatsbegriff*. Hans Joas and Peter Vogt, Berlin: *Was ist politische Theologie?* Freiburg im Breisgau; Basel; Wien: *Monotheismus als politisches problem*. *Der Wert des Staates und die Bedeutung des Einzelnen*. *The Concept of the Political*:

**Chapter 7 : Political Theology: An Introduction by Michael Kirwan**

*POLITICAL THEOLOGY. POLITICAL THEOLOGY is one in a series of attempts made by Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians since the 1950s to come to grips with the foundations of Christianity in light of the twentieth-century crisis of culture.*

After World War I, theology had reached a kind of equilibrium wherein the Protestants were constellated about the three giants, Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, and Paul Tillich, and the Catholics were still operating under the auspices of the scholasticism evoked by Pope Leo XIII in 1879, when he called for a renewal of Thomism. These deficiencies were registered within the mainly academic context of European and North American theology through the increasing influence of the nineteenth-century "masters of suspicion," Karl Marx and Friedrich Nietzsche. In his unforgettable image of the "last man," Nietzsche had limned the outcome of the liberal democratic and socialist solutions to the political problem. This radical crisis of meaning and value was explored during the 1960s in a variety of Christian theologies: Philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer, whose *Truth and Method* became required reading for theologians in the 1960s and 1970s, resumed the meditation of Martin Heidegger upon the crisis indicated by Nietzsche and formulated the issue as follows: Since all normative traditions have been rendered radically questionable, hermeneutics the auxiliary science of interpretation has become a universal issue. However, the challenge of hermeneutics to theology is usually diffused in one of two ways. In academic theology hermeneutics is trimmed down to conventional scholarly dimensions, whereafter theology is subjected to subdisciplines that divide up the data on Christian religion for ever more minute and critical study. Alternatively, hermeneutics may be subsumed within a transcendental-metaphysical reflection as in Rahner or a wholly ontological reflection as in process theology. These responses to the issue of a universal hermeneutic as formulated by Gadamer—fragmenting on the one hand, and totalizing on the other—bore the earmarks of that sort of interpretation that Marx, in his famous eleventh thesis on Feuerbach, said needed to be supplanted by practice. It became a real question whether theology was anything more than either a species of intellectual history or an academically domesticated speculation without any practical bearing or importance. During the 1960s and 1970s this question became inescapable. At the same time a common awareness was starting to emerge of the spiritual impoverishment arising from what were cynically labeled state-controlled monopolies in the East and monopoly-controlled states in the West. In the developing nations, dissatisfaction spread at the popular, grass-roots level in opposition to the dependence engendered by colonialist and imperialist policies of advanced industrial societies. In brief, the stage was set for theology to shift from hermeneutical methods of mediating Christianity with contemporary cultures to new approaches known as political or liberation theologies. By it was already manifest that there were two distinct originating points for political theology: It is clear that both styles of theology are seeking to come to terms with the universal hermeneutic problem as portrayed by Nietzsche, Heidegger, Gadamer, and Paul Ricoeur. The leading exponents of political theology in Europe, the German Catholic J. There is no split between change and interpretation: Human and even revolutionary change is at root interpretative; and, especially when it comes to the reality of God, interpretation is primarily a matter of practical reorientation conversion and concrete action transformation of individual and collective life. Liberation theologies emanate less from the academic superstructure than from basic communities at the popular level. In liberation theology the experiences of political and social oppression and of massive poverty have provoked a reading of the Bible and a celebration of ecclesial sacraments that are immediately political in the sense of being directly linked to the issue of emancipation from "structural" sin. Bourgeois social, political, and economic theories do not adequately explain the institutionalized schemes of recurrence that define the Latin American experience of oppression. This approach places liberation theologians under a double constraint since, on the one hand, genuine evangelical experience of God and faith in Jesus Christ Liberator is for them the wellspring and motive for social critique and action in a way that neither Marx nor Lenin could envisage, and, on the other hand, the theoretical weaknesses in Marxist analysis and practice sometimes threaten liberation theology with collapse back into the posture of the secularist dialectic of enlightenment. Added to this, liberal democratic

and orthodox Christian misunderstanding and opposition perhaps unwittingly force the practitioners of liberation theology into increasing partisanship with secularist Marxist-Leninists. Both European political theology and Latin American liberation theology have the Marxist orientation toward overcoming specifically bourgeois biases. In other advanced industrial countries like the United States and Canada, the Marxist analysis of structural sin in terms of class yields to three other emphases: Like the liberation theologies of Latin America, each of these orientations struggles with the ambivalence between its roots in Christian religious experience and the terms of power and legitimacy as these terms were first formulated by secularist Enlightenment thinkers. Miscomprehension and unfavorable criticism force them, too, into stances ever more indistinguishable from their secularist counterparts. But then, reactions to such extremes among their cohorts have also led to recoveries and discoveries of Christian meanings and values. Another increasingly prominent aspect of political theology is being explored by Ernest Fortin and James V. Schall, students of political philosopher Leo Strauss — Straussians bring out the tension between Christianity and liberal and socialist democracies. They tend to render Christianity as utterly apolitical; as a result, whereas liberation theology tends to flatten out into Marxism, Straussian political theory is perhaps too content with Platonic or Aristotelian reasons for espousing liberal democracy at the cost of solidarity with the poor. The work of political scientist Eric Voegelin —, as demonstrated by his multivolume *Order and History* —, makes the tension of human existence — lived out in "the in-between" "metaxy" as expressed paradigmatically in noetic and pneumatic differentiations of consciousness — normative for practical and political thought and action. Lonergan, by demanding that the criteria of authentic performance in science, in scholarship, and in ordinary living be reconnected with the criteria for being authentically human thematized in his notions of religious, moral, and intellectual conversion, has given political theologians a useful framework for the mediation of saving meaning and value in history. His stance toward the future in the light of the past, along with his germinal but still little-known work in economics, Lamb suggests, provides Christians with the first genuine alternative to either Marxist or liberal democratic political and economic theory. Whatever may be the fate of political theology as we know it, its reintegration of earlier forms of theology — emphasizing retrieval of past meaning and doctrinal and systematic restatement — into foundational, practical, and political questions about the right way to live can only be salutary for the practice of faith in society both now and in the future. Many contemporary theologians believe that political theology is, in fact, the chief symptom and response to the paradigm change theology is undergoing. *Faith in History and Society: Toward a Practical Fundamental Theology*. Translated by David Smith. New York, Translated by Robert Wilson and John Bowden. Uses themes from critical social theory as transposed into the perspective of the interaction between Father and Son in the crucifixion. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra B. An extended commentary on the intrinsic nexus between language and life-form as the key to initiating a reflection upon and transformation of life-practice and to our becoming subjects instead of objects of history. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation*. Translated and edited by Caridad Inda and John Eagleson. Probably the classic text embodying the demarche of liberation hermeneutics, it correlates biblical texts on emancipation with the contemporary social situation as brought to light through Marxist social theory. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*. A semiannual journal devoted to feminist research, discussion, and dialogue in all areas of religious studies, with articles regularly by all the leading theorists as well as newcomers. *New Woman, New Earth*. Here one of the most solid theorists not only retrieves many feminist motifs centrally important to secular feminism but goes on to use them to show how the concerns of feminist social critique are of intrinsic value to other emphases related to racism, ecology, and so forth. *In Memory of Her: Black Political Theology* West, Cornel. *An Afro-American Revolutionary Christianity*. A brilliant work from the second generation of black theologians that brings the emancipatory thrust of black theology into dialogue with a large number of influential "discourses," including those of Jacques Derrida. *A Documentary History*, — An excellent "background" with all the most influential statements and figures, along with bibliography. *Miscellaneous Works* Fiorenza, Francis S. *An Inquiry into Their Fundamental Meaning. Toward a Theology of Social Transformation*. A difficult yet rewarding look at the possibilities of a comprehensive, differentiated, yet committed framework for the tasks articulated by Metz, the Latin Americans, and the critical social theorists

to be found in the thought of Bernard J. A Study of Human Understanding Reprint, San Francisco , The best elucidation to date of the foundations of theology as practical and political in a differentiated society. Natural Right and History. The best available account of the moral and political revolution from the classic tradition of natural right and natural law to the modern horizon of natural and human rights , along with its profound ambiguities. Six Essays by Leo Strauss. Edited by Hilail Gildin. Order and History, vol. Baton Rouge , La. God of the Oppressed. The Desire of Nations: Rediscovering the Roots of Political Theology. Ellis, Marc, and Otto Maduro, eds. The Bible and Liberation: Political and Social Hermeneutics. Martyrdom and the Politics of Religion: New York and London,

**Chapter 8 : Political Theology Research Papers - calendrierdelascience.com**

*Political Theology* There is one other source worth investigating in this reinterpretation of the role of the Introduction to Christianity: Erik Peterson. Again, Peterson's name only appears once.

Posted on March 28, 2017, 4: With the election of Donald Trump, the erosion of evangelical unity around shared political goals has accelerated dramatically. Whatever center or core there once was in the evangelical movement, evangelicalism has splintered into warring camps, and different players are vying for attention, influence, and power. The complexity of the situation precludes simple answers. But to my mind, the lack of a center—that is, the absence of shared goals—is largely explained by two factors: Eschewing power, these leaders developed or acquiesced to a declinist or defeatist narrative and a pessimistic political theology of perpetual ecclesiastical foreignness: Naturally this political theology of decline and witness could not but condemn Trump and his evangelical supporters. Regardless of the evangelical political interests Trump could meet and has met as President, evangelical support for him violates the first principle of the declinist narrative: It is not a matter of what one can achieve, but how one achieves it or how one attempts to achieve it; and one should not achieve any political end by means of an immoral man. Throughout this torrent of condemnation, few evangelical NeverTrump commentators cared to present a systematic treatment of politics, either as political theology or political theory. The election tore apart the already ripped tapestry of evangelical political unity. And despite going on listening tours after their humiliating defeat in November, the NeverTrump evangelicals have doubled-down on their gospel-witness theology, widening the rift in evangelicalism even more. A traditional Presbyterian political theology is simply not the same as most Baptist political theologies, for example. But these differences were transcended by a common approach to policy. From the pulpit and in the pews, evangelicals were once socialized into good political policy, from the evils of abortion to the necessity of low taxation; and this socialization was so common that it formed the evangelical identity. The pending demise of this unity however left a vacuum of thought in evangelicalism. On what ground are we united as evangelicals? Since the distinctive traditions of political thought never mattered in old evangelicalism, most people lacked the requisite knowledge for a meaningful discussion between competing Protestant traditions. Nothing was left to fill the widening gap. Evangelical discourse then began focusing on what one might consider mere protestant principles as a means of filling the gap, constituting a shift in the nature of evangelical political socialization. So the church can claim to be political but not partisan. Evangelical leaders have simply changed the nature of political socialization. It is a kit-bag of rhetorical devices. Mention one of these lines in association with some policy and the socialization kicks in to lend support to some policy or to reject some policy. The process of political socialization does not involve the presentation of an evangelical political-theological framework, nor a coherent system to understand or engage political phenomena. There are few distinctions, if any at all, given to the average evangelical. No attempt is made to distinguish between the principles, roles, ends, and nature of the civil and ecclesiastical spheres, for example. There is no detailed treatment of the two kingdoms or natural law, and nothing but contempt is shown to political principles that the Protestant reformers considered the orthodox positions on the role of civil magistrate in religion. What characterizes evangelical political commentary today is the repeated re-sorting of these lines in application to selected recent political events in order to cue support for some action or inaction as part of a particular program of witness. Evangelical political thought, at least at the popular level, revolves around a particular set of rhetorical devices. The average evangelical has no framework or theological system through and by which to evaluate these rhetorical devices. They are stuck in ignorance and channeled into right action by means of political socialization. They are triggered into certain beliefs; they are not convinced by careful, systematic thought. Indeed, most of the pajama-boy woke evangelicals fail to realize just how conditioned and programmed they are to tweet from cues built into intra-evangelical discourse. Baptized ignorance and sentimentality drives them to repeat these lines, and they proselytize others by social pressure and shaming. This is the sorry state of evangelical political commentary: No one considers that perhaps American political parties are large coalitions of competing interests and ideologies and therefore are entities

necessarily requiring compromise and imperfect results. Evangelical intellectuals have no theory of political parties and party participation. But they have their lines, and the average evangelical has nothing to say against them. Is the Christian identity the same in species as the national one such that the former is an alternative and in competition with the latter? Perhaps the Christian identity, as an identity oriented to heavenly life, is complementary to an earthly one, such that one could be a Christian American, having dual identities with each pointing to a particular mode of belonging. But this thought, though perfectly consistent to my mind with classical Protestantism, is never considered or refuted. It is precluded from being true, because the set of available rhetorical lines in evangelicalism do not permit the classical distinctions that would make dual identities possible. All of these lines might fit into some coherent political theology, but it is never presented in any systematic way. They merely grab the attention of evangelicals who are socialized to respond either positively or negatively to the policy or action linked to the line. On the issue of immigration, perhaps it is the Christian duty to ensure, in the interest our neighbor, the continuity of culture by limiting immigration. But what justifies the dichotomy between power and principle? So if civil power is divinely sanctioned for human use, then why must Christians, who are just as human as non-Christians, avoid power? Evangelical intellectuals however repeatedly juxtapose principle and power without providing any framework through which to understand either. It is not clear to me what this adjective does to these nouns. Moreover, what is the gospel precisely? Is it the means for the salvation of souls, or is it this and a new set of earthly commands related to social and political duties—a type of neo-nomianism? Plenty of Protestants have narrowed the Gospel only to the salvation of souls. Calvin argues that Christ added nothing to the Law of God see his commentary on Mt. Ultimately what explains the gospel-as-adjective is the rhetorical force it adds to the noun it modifies. It serves to form a hierarchy of concerns and thereby accomplishes a few things, providing a considerable amount of power to evangelical leaders: On matters of civil justice, the Christian presence on earth is like a superhero perched on a building waiting to save the day. He takes no interest in the necessities of day-to-day order, statecraft, and mundane policy. But he does swoop down and save the day, or at least he attempts to save the day and makes sure he look good in the attempt. It secures the idea that the institutional church is a separate polis or political society, as if both the church and state are not two species of the same genus of order as classical Protestants argued, but the same. That is to say, they are both political orders of the same type and therefore always in tension, competition, and conflict; the church as institution is an alternative earthly society. The church then is to order itself as an alternative order to demonstrate to the world the transformative power of the gospel. Ultimately, blurring these distinctions and others, evangelical leaders gain significant leeway to engineer and equip their followers with a particular vision of witness. This seems obvious to evangelicals today. The most obvious problem is that for Reformed orthodoxy heavenly life is qualitatively and in some ways fundamentally different than earthly life. For example, there is no marriage or childbirth in heaven or in the eschaton. So it seems that transforming the church into heaven-on-earth would require ending marriage and childbirth. See here for a demonstration of the problem. Since this is likely not desirable, one must either reject the principle as I would suggest or propose some distinction. It follows from this that, in the civil realm, Christians are always in foreign territory and ought to act as foreigners: It is evident that there is no surface coherence in the set of rhetorical devices employed by evangelical leaders, making the resulting program of witness largely ad hoc—a product of platform engineering. Evangelicals are not given reasons for believing this or that political position or view of power, but cued into belief by these rhetorical devices. Evangelicals, after all, have nothing else but the set of disparate lines to evaluate the issues involved. Indeed, their political theology just is the rhetorical devices repeated and parroted by evangelical leaders. But the arbitrary nature of the evangelical political kit-bag leads to a power struggle. The battle on the surface in evangelicalism is a matter of who controls the content of that kit-bag—a competition over the slogans that will dominate evangelical political socialization. On one side there is the old American buzzwords and phrases, such as freedom, give me liberty or death, the American dream, etc. Indeed, they must actively exclude, because the very basis of their power is nothing but the social acceptability of a largely arbitrary set of rhetorical devices. And it is not surprising that they have adopted the identity politics and rhetoric of the rest of Western respectable discourse. They reject visible power and external control only to wield the power

of internalized control—the principal social power of our modern, liberal world—and yet they call such power heavenly. From framing techniques to shaming, they have adopted not the power of heaven however, but the rhetorical power of modern liberalism. Responding to these evangelicals requires an unconventional approach. One might consider writing essays responding to evangelical posts like those at The Gospel Coalition. But we must realize that TGC posts cannot be refuted directly. They persuade others not with good and proper reason and evidence indeed, many TGC political posts are egregiously and blatantly question-begging but by utilizing both evangelical tropes and rhetorical devices and the broader socio-rhetorical privileges of Western society. Such blog posts are impervious to rational argumentation because they do not rely on reason at all, but on playing the right rhetorical game by means of a handy set of lines, words, shaming devices, etc. Two responses to the dominant forces of evangelicalism are required. The first is, as I said, a critique of the nature of the discourse and the second is a return to political theology and political theory. I could go on and on with this. But my main point is this: Moreover, stop trying to refute evangelical intellectuals like those at The Gospel Coalition. They merely trigger others into belief. Our task is to expose this. Go to the rhetoric.

### Chapter 9 : Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty by Carl Schmitt

*Taubes' understanding of political theology is, however, very different from Schmitt's, and emphasizes the political aspect of theological claims, rather than the religious derivation of political claims.*