

A Shattered Order<sup>1</sup>  
The Apocalyptic Sublime and The Liberal Arts  
An Interdisciplinary Approach  
To the Study of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

Not for Citation

©Judith Mendelsohn Rood  
Professor of History and Middle Eastern Studies  
Biola University  
The Gaede Institute Conversation on War and Peace as Liberal Arts  
February 21-23, 2013

---

<sup>1</sup> The title comes from Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: Belknap/Harvard University Press, 2007), 409. I'd like to thank my Biola University colleagues for helping me to grapple with the issues I write about in what follows, particularly, Prof. Natasha Duquette, whose work on the sublime has opened new vistas for me in my understanding of Jerusalem and eschatology, Prof. Haein Park, who masterfully introduced Taylor's *A Secular Age* to a faculty reading group last semester, Prof. Barry Krammes, who invited me to participate in the Year of the Arts: Sanctuary and Sacred Space, Prof. Rick Langer who has led us to think about our worldviews in new ways, and finally, Prof. Robert Saucy and Prof. Doug Sweeney (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School), both of whom have helped me to explore my thinking about Israel and the Church not as a microcosm, or template, but as a unique relationship that transcends the historical and political realms of this world.

My friend and colleague Natasha Duquette claims that “Christian scholarship has always been a collaborative, pedagogically focused, outward reaching, and restorative activity in tension with corrupt social structures.”<sup>2</sup> Although I might qualify that assertion by saying “at its best,” I want to endorse her effort by asking whether we can continue a “Biblical pattern of aesthetically delightful and ethically convicting collaborative dissent” as we seek to consider the topic of war and peace in the liberal arts.

World War I indisputably ushered in a new epoch of thinking about war. The disenchantment of the secular age was complete. Neither faith nor progress seemed to hold any hope for mankind. The First and Second World Wars had psychological consequences that went well beyond the formal treaties that concluded them. An entirely new body of literature and a new discipline emerged in the aftermath of World War II, reshaping the terms of reference for our understanding of war and peace in the humanities and social sciences. However, without enframing the study of human conflict within a much broader paradigm, the study of war and peace becomes instrumentalized and utilitarian, with the result that often international relations and area studies programs are more about advocacy than analysis.

Using an interdisciplinary, liberal arts approach to orient students to the humane study of the role of religion, and yes, faith, can broaden and deepen the burgeoning field of war and peace. By using the Middle East and the Palestinian-Israel Conflict as a case study, undergraduate students can follow the daily news using the tools of intelligence gathering

---

<sup>2</sup> Natasha Duquette, “Dauntless Spirits: Towards a Theological Aesthetics of Collaborative Dissent,” unpublished paper, Center for Christian Thought, Biola University, 2012. Natasha Duquette is an associate professor and chair of the English Department at Biola University. She has recently co-edited *Jane Austen and the Arts: Elegance, Propriety, Harmony* (Pl: Lehigh University Press) with Elisabeth Lenckos, and her monograph *Veiled Intent: Dissenting Women’s Aesthetic Approach to Biblical Hermeneutics and Social Action* is forthcoming with Wipf & Stock.

(open sources, clipping files) to study diplomatic and political history and to learn how to analyze one of the central international dilemmas of our age. Anything less than a liberal arts approach to the subject will prove inadequate to the enormity of the task.



Marc Chagall, "The Falling Angel" 1923-1947<sup>3</sup>

To illustrate what I mean, let me begin by turning to an image that arrested my attention as I prepared to write about this topic. I was drawn to Marc Chagall's painting, "The Falling Angel" because at first glance I thought it depicted the casting out of Satan from the heavenly realms to the Earth. However, art historian Frederico Zeri, identifies the falling angel as Chagall. He introduces the work this way: "a black sky and a timeless atmosphere," envelope an angel with "long brilliant wings but no longer able to fly; the

---

<sup>3</sup> Image of Marc Chagall, "Fallen Angel," <http://www.madridsurvivalguide.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Marc-Chagall-Fallen-Angel.jpg> <accessed 1/6/12>.

disastrous fall tears down an ancient world of certainties no longer secure. A pendulum clock gone crazy accompanies the descent.” The angel has dropped the clock, the violin hovers, abandoned; civilization has fallen into barbarity. The rabbi, rescuing the Torah from the destruction of the fire, looks back at the burning angel as he flees. Both the angel and the onlooker are falling; the onlooker’s face is the picture of astonishment at the destruction of the angel, which will soon be his fate, too.

Chagall worked on “The Falling Angel” for twenty-five years, returning to it time and again to tell the story of the various episodes of “a long period of his life.” Zeri characterizes these twenty-five years as years of “direct, personal involvement in a sad, cruel age dominated by the brutality of war and by hate.” Chagall was a Jew, and it was as a Jew that he experienced the disruptions of the twentieth century. “The expression of terror and fear on the angel’s face is enhanced by the desperate groping of [her] his (*sic*) hands, vainly seeking support. Spread across the black sky the red wings seem tongues of fire. It is an intense image which the pendulum clock, linking as it does the angel’s fall to the real world, makes even more effective. Mother and Child rise and offer hope.” The startling inclusion of the image of the crucified Jesus as a Jew, wrapped in the tallis, or “prayer shawl” represents the suffering of the Jewish people, forever punished and rejected by the world.

For Chagall, “the angel personifies naïve imagination which once was a shelter, a way out,” but it also represents the artist himself, and, in fact, Zeri went so far as to say that the angel represented Chagall’s soul. Thus the painting is autobiographical, tracing Chagall’s odyssey refracted through his memory of places that he was forced to leave behind. The painting is thus a universal allegory, one that mixes Jewish tradition, biography, and the Christian Europe’s faith in redemption.

Chagall made it clear that the red, falling angel in the painting is not Satan by

depicting *himself* as a female angel. The resulting idea leads us unavoidably to realize that what is important to Chagall is that it is we who are falling, it is humanity—civilization itself—that has fallen. Zeri points out the garish colors Chagall chose to create an atmosphere of “psychic shock” and the unnatural composition of the painting. In his autobiography, Chagall explains, “God, perspective, color, the Bible, shape and lines, tradition and all the things we call ‘human,’ that is love, protection, family, school, education, the words of the Prophets and even life with Christ, all has been lost. Perhaps sometimes these doubts assailed me too, and in those moments I painted an upside-down world....”<sup>4</sup>

It is in this sense that I want to consider what I will be calling in this paper the “Apocalyptic Sublime” to describe the yearning for the eschatological redemption of fallen humanity and the restoration of creation, a hope that the People of the Book, monotheists all, share. We, along with Chagall, live in a shattered world, in part because of the gaping abyss that opened in the aftermath of the First World War. Philosopher Gil Anidjar, who served as Jacques Derrida’s teaching assistant, and who, like his mentor, is an Algerian Jew provides me with a starting point—his very challenging essay “The Theological Enemy.”<sup>5</sup>

The peculiar absence of philosophical writing on the subject of enemy is one that startled Anidjar. He writes,

...as I attempted to access various and no doubt limited, not to say insufficient pathways that would assist and lead me toward accounts of the term “enemy” within the discourse of philosophy, political philosophy, and political science, I was surprised to find only rare and occasional, quantitatively limited discussions. I had to confront, then, something like the disappearance of the enemy, its having vanished from philosophical and political reflections almost from the start, rather than in modern times, as Carl Schmitt argues. To the extent that one would have to subsume the question of the enemy under that of war, one would have to acknowledge that the modern discourse on war identified by Michel Foucault and others is always articulated as historico-political (in a narrow sense of these terms), no longer as philosophico-juridical. The claim to ‘decipher the permanence of war in

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>5</sup> Gil Anidjar, *The Jew, The Arab: A History of the Enemy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), xi-10 only.

society' was thus never simply a philosophical claim. Nor does it engage the fundamental difference between war and the enemy, the excess of the question of the enemy in relation to war.

Anidjar's "discovery" is important. He wrote, "To the extent that this question—the question of the enemy—does, on occasion, emerge, it does so mainly as an institutional issue, made to attend to modes of behavior ('How to treat the enemy'), or mods of engagement ('How to fight, vanquish, or annihilate the enemy'), and finally, to modes of appearance ('faces of the enemy') and identification ('Who is the enemy')." He reflects, after this, that "the question of ontology—'What is the enemy?'—hardly surfaces, and when it does...it is only too quickly rendered almost ephemeral and a testimony to the vanishing, the drawing away of the enemy."

A cursory reading of philosophical and political reflections (what is today called political science and/or political theory, as well as political philosophy) quickly reveals that, over against the friend or the beloved, love or friendship (which have been claimed by the expert discourses of philosophy and politics, but also of ethics, psychology, and others), 'the enemy never becomes a basic concept, barely even a significant operative term. Reasons for the discursive operations of the enemy, the generalization and simultaneous lack of conceptualization of the enemy, may be found in philosophy ('philosophy, when thinking about war, does nothing else than think about peace. It mistakes its objects.... Thus, the discourse on peace becomes, on the philosophical level, the departure of the discourse of war. It becomes the founding underground of philosophy in general'), or they may be found in political reflections that do engage war, but not the enemy, or, alternatively, that address (and even seem to answer) but fail to ask the question of the enemy.<sup>6</sup>

Anidjar seeks to rectify this philosophical failure by exploring the little known literature on what is now known as "political theology." But first, following the lead of Mahmood Mamdani, who studies European colonialism in Africa, Anidjar begins his exploration with the dominant idea that Europeans made ethnicity (race) the legal identity marker in the societies they ruled in order to subdue indigenous populations. The "other" is

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., xxiii-xxiv. The quotation (fn. 23, 168) is from Fathi Triki, *Les Philosophes et la Guerre* (Tunis: Publications de l'Université de Tunis, 1985), 84. Anidjar's footnotes are important and rich, and essential for understanding his essays.

the subject of the legal systems and institutions that defined and controlled the relationship of Europeans with non-Europeans. Thus, Anidjar traces the marking of difference as a secular and legal phenomenon in European history, not a religious—or philosophical one. Still, Anidjar is not satisfied with these explanations of ethnicity as the defining mark of the other. He is concerned with the problem not of alterity, but enmity—hatred of the other, the enemy. That this is his main concern may possibly be because he has observed the recrudescence of anti-Semitism in Europe, or, just as likely, because of the rise in Islamophobia there. Anidjar wants to go beyond the postcolonial discourse on power, to consider religion as the real site of difference, making his an Enlightenment project, once again pointing to religion as the source of “forever war”—and, like the other Jewish philosophers whose thought he surveys, he finds the source of European enmity towards the “Jew, the Arab” in the New Testament.

To get us to this, Anidjar bridges the philosophical discourse on ethnic alterity to religious enmity by accepting Denis Guénoun’s characterization of “[t]he nation as “a theological idea,” one that is “...decisively *the site of the theologico-political difference...*”<sup>7</sup> This move brings religion into the scope of Anidjar’s philosophical investigations of enmity, introducing the field of political theology and ethnicity together by introducing the scholarship on the Apostle Paul into his philosophical investigation. Having laid down these foundations, Anidjar can explore “the modern construction of Islam as “religious fanaticism,” which, he notes, coincides historically with “secularization.” Islam, in contemporary European thought (although decisively not in American thought), “has become an ‘internal exteriority’ an included exclusion...”<sup>8</sup> The problem of religion—now

---

<sup>7</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, xx-xxi.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, xxii.

rescued from the category of unreasoning fanaticism, can now be understood as theological/political and contemplated philosophically, that is, from a secular vantage point. Anidjar allows that the striking absence of writings on the subject of the enemy and enmity in the European tradition may be “no more than philosophical vagueness” but he thinks that it really has come from “a lack of philosophical rigor” which has been “dictated, perhaps even governed, by a vanishing, the insistence of drawing away (which is not quite the absence) of the enemy from any privileged, discursive sphere.” What he is really saying is that philosophy abandoned the study of religion in the secular age, just as the German Catholic Carl Schmitt, who must be considered the founder of modern political theology, had alleged.

Aside from Carl Schmitt’s attempt not so much to revive as to virtually establish the concept of the enemy and to the decision concerning the distinction between friend and enemy as the condition of the political, aside from Jacques Derrida’s groundbreaking reflections on the enemy in *Politics of Friendship*, there is very little to authorize or even enable the claim that one could ever write a history of the enemy.

Anidjar’s indictment of the whole field of philosophy is remarkable. He rightly asks, “Is the question of the enemy a philosophical, legal, or psychological question? Is it a culturally contained, even a historical and (finally?) a political one?” Our author asks, “According to what protocols, then, and in what modalities, has a history of the enemy become impossible?” He argues, “this historical impossibility is contingent upon the condition of religion and politics in ‘Europe,’ a condition that Derrida has elaborated in his writings on the Abrahamic.” Thus, Anidjar, following his mentor, puts the Near East at the heart of the problem.

Nothing authorizes the collapse of the religious (and historically dubious) markers such as Judaism and Islam with ethnic and political markers such as Arab and Jew. Yet already the dissymmetries inherent in the terms (‘Jew’ and ‘Muslim,’ ‘Jew’ and ‘Arab’) are carried by the history that seeks to account for their sedimentation as polarized entities....But there is another reason to invoke ‘the



Jew, the Arab' in the wide range of historical context to which this book appeals. This is a historical reason: that 'Europe,' which can be said to have long confused the terms, to have collapsed Arab and Muslim, Orientals and Semites, Turks and Saracens, and continues to do so to this day, Europe provides here the site, uncertain and fragmented as it is, from which the two figures emerge as enemies. Enemies of Europe and enemies of each other, 'the Jew,' 'the Arab' are undoubtedly arbitrary names. Yet, they are also old names that have strategically and insistently inscribed themselves with an as of yet unaccounted-for necessity in the history—a history of the present if there ever was one—of Europe and the West. "The Jew, the Arab," then. And—as if it were possible—a history of the enemy."<sup>9</sup>

Having focused our attention on the problem of religion and its connection to the concepts of war and peace in European thought, and beyond that, to the centrality of the Middle East to that problem, Anidjar next turns to the work of the French Jewish existentialist, Emmanuel Levinas, the greatest philosophical thinker on alterity, who posed the question, "Does not lucidity, the mind's openness upon the true, consist in catching sight of the permanent state of war?"

A witness to the barbarity of the Second World War, Levinas had concluded that, "[t]he state of war suspends morality: it divests the eternal institutions and obligations of their eternity and rescinds ad interim the unconditional imperatives."<sup>10</sup> Here, I would like to suggest, Levinas is talking about the Catholic natural law theory, although Levinas does not specifically say this. However, by turning to the French discourse on "the Other" Anidjar returns us to the place where philosophically it became possible to state that war is the "space of the political"—this "is what philosophy—the exercise of reason—thinks."<sup>11</sup> He concludes, "In war...in the permanent possibility of war, we find ourselves in a space and time where law is both nullified and maintained and where the enemy cannot be other. In

---

<sup>9</sup> Gil Anidjar, *The Jew, The Arab: A History of the Enemy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), xxiv-xxv.

<sup>10</sup> Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, quoted in *ibid.*, 3.

<sup>11</sup> Anidjar, 4.

war, there are no others, only enemies.”<sup>12</sup> After all of this, Levinas concluded, “Politics...is the very exercise of reason.”<sup>13</sup> Now, Anidjar is ready to turn to the thought of Schmitt, who supported the Nazi regime and its embrace of war as necessity and virtue.

Schmitt defined the political as the “ever present possibility of conflict...the ever present possibility of combat.”<sup>14</sup> Schmitt’s embrace of Nazism, made possible by his reading of Romans, led his colleague and interlocutor, the Jewish theologian Jacob Taubes, to protest to him that Romans is “a political declaration of war.” For Taubes, the Apostle Paul made himself into an enemy of Rome and in that sense reclaims him as a Jewish thinker, but this is not what interests Anidjar. For him, “more importantly, he becomes a thinker of enmity.”<sup>15</sup>

Like Levinas’ philosopher, Paul’s ontology (which is also the end of ontology, even an anti-ontology, a concern for ‘the things which do not exist,’ Rom. 4:17) is an ontology of war and wrath, the obviousness of which makes it, perhaps, as invisible as being itself. Much like Levinas’ assertion that war is the suspended space of indifference, where alterity has no place—the enemy is not the other—Paul’s thought is famously one of *adiaphora*, in-difference. It is only within that space of indifference as the suspension of all obligations that we can recognize the state of war within which Paul writes and out of which he too ambivalently enjoins his followers to care for their enemies. Paul cites Proverbs and recasts a love of enemies that leaves room for the wrath of God. Shower your enemies with love, Paul says, a love that would bury them under a pile of burning coals. “Beloved, never avenge yourself, but leave room for the wrath of God...if your enemies are hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them something to drink; for by doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads.” (Rom. 12:19-20). If being is the permanent possibility of war, if being is being-at-war and being-as-war, then Romans is also a theory—and a history—of the enemy.”<sup>16</sup>

In Romans, quintessentially, Paul asks, “Have I now become your enemy, *ekhthros*, by telling you the truth?” (Gal. 4:16). Indeed, Levinas had written, “Only beings capable of war can rise to peace.” Anidjar glosses the story of Schmitt and Taubes reading the book of Romans

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 5. Taube, ...

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. 4-5.

together, but he does not seem to absorb Taube's critique of the very polemic with which Anidjar is engaged. The fundamental text in question here is the quote "As regards the gospel, they are enemies—enemies of God!" which Taubes makes clear is the entire point of the Old Testament, and the point of connection between Paul and the Jewish canon.

Anidjar is now prepared to ask whether there is a history of the enemy—since Taubes explicitly links the idea of the enemy of God to history as *Heilsgeschichte*, as the biblical narrative of the history of salvation—and if there is such a history, he asks, where does the "theological enemy" figure in? Who or what is the "enemy of God"?<sup>17</sup> So Anidjar turns to a close study of Romans, where he finds the Apostle Paul writing,

"they...are 'god-haters,' *theostuges*, and 'inventors of evil' (Rom. 1:30) and they know that God's law regarding what they do is to 'deserve to die.' (1:32)." ... "God has given them up" (1:24, 26, 28). "Their throats are open graves (3:13), and they are 'slaves of sin' (6:20). It is well known that the wages of sin is death,' (6:23) and it is quite possible that they are, in fact, dead (11:15). It is something even 'we'—we who were 'enemies,' *ekhroi* (5:10)—knew: 'While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. But now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we are slaves not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit" (7:5-6). This captivity in death is one that resonates with that of a prisoner of war (*aikmalotos, captivus*), and testifies further to the fact that, for Paul, there is indeed a war on."<sup>18</sup>

Anidjar is of course reading this text as a Jew, and as an Arab, and thus 'the internal *and* external theological enemy' of "Europe"; he writes as the objects—I would say, victims, of Europe's hatred—that is, the Jew—and therefore, like Levinas, Taube, and Derrida, he assumes that Paul is writing against the Torah, not the moral law that both Christ and Paul preached, that is its center.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 5. Taubes wrote, "I am a Jew and I have been elevated by Carl Schmitt to the rank of hereditary enemy!" But not by Paul.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>19</sup> Harry Austryn Wolfson, "How the Jews will Reclaim Jesus," *The Menorah Journal* 49 (Autumn, Winter 1962): 25-31. This fascinating article articulates the civilizational position of Judaism to Christianity from a secular viewpoint, and is suggestive of the way that a canonical view of the Scriptures can help us to understand the

Anidjar's treatment of "law" in the sense used by Schmitt and Mamdani is generally understood as the "positive" laws of European states, not the moral law encoded in the *Tanakh* and the New Testament (as Taubes had noted). But it is essential to recognize that Anidjar's view of Paul repeats the still familiar trope among Jewish theologians that it was Paul who "invented Christianity" wholesale out of the teachings of the Jewish Jesus, radically breaking away from Judaism to create a new religion.<sup>20</sup> This mirrors the Christian polemic against the God of the Old Testament, the view that Harnack articulated and which became the theological basis for Protestant anti-Semitism in Germany, and ultimately led the Nazis to resurrect Marcion to create an Aryan Christianity in the Third Reich. Such supersessionism has been widely repudiated since the Holocaust by the Vatican, but Protestants have yet to deal with it, as the latest fascination with "Fulfillment" theology among evangelical theologians sadly demonstrates. While anti-Semites may still privilege Jews as the "enemies of God" most evangelicals have coalesced around what Gregory A. Boyd, author of *God at War* (Intervarsity Press, 1997) calls "the central conviction that the

---

idea that the OT and NT represent a continuous narrative, as interpreted in the evangelical tradition, rather than a supersessionist one.

<sup>20</sup>A controversy broke out as I was writing this paper, showing us how the "war" language of the Bible continues to confound our thinking about war and peace. According to *Catholic Herald*, "This religious context is based upon the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ as recorded in the Holy Gospels: 'He that is not with me, is against me: and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.' (Matthew 12:30)" "SPPX Leader Calls Jewish People 'Enemies of God,'" *Catholic Herald*, 4 January 2013 <http://www.catholicherald.co.uk/news/2013/01/04/sspx-leader-calls-jewish-people-enemies-of-the-church/> <accessed 1/11/13>. "The Vatican repudiated Bishop Bernard Fellay's statement: 'The Vatican reaffirmed its commitment to dialogue with Jews on Monday after the head of a traditionalist breakaway group called them 'enemies of the Church.'" "The Vatican chief spokesman, the Rev. Federico Lombardi, said that it was 'meaningless' and 'unacceptable' to label Jews as 'enemies' of the Catholic Church." "Both Pope Benedict XVI and his predecessor John Paul II personally engaged in dialogue with Jews," he said." "As a sign of their commitment, Lombardi noted the two popes' visits to Jerusalem's Western Wall, Judaism's most sacred site, and to synagogues in Rome and elsewhere." Alessandro Speciale, "Vatican: Calling Jews 'Enemies' of the Church Is Unacceptable," *Sojourners God's Politics Blog* 01-08-2013, <http://sojo.net/blogs/2013/01/08/vatican-calling-jews-'enemies'-church-unacceptable> <accessed 10 January 10, 2013>. Susannah Heschel's work, beginning with her study of Geiger, continues this polemical attitude towards Paul, which characterizes much of the Jewish scholarship on the origins of Christianity and the Jewish Jesus. See my "Shoah/Nakbah: Offerings of Memory and History" in *History (1933-1948): What We Choose to Remember*; Margaret Monahan Hogan, James M. Lies, editors (Portland, OR: Garaventa Center for Catholic Intellectual Life and American Culture/University of Portland, 2011), 411-448 on the question of German Jewish-Christian relations 1870-1945.

world is caught in the crossfire of a cosmic battle between the Lord and his angelic army and Satan and his demonic army.”<sup>21</sup>

Such a view of the canon is the key to understanding, for example, the mytho-poetic power of such popular entertainments as J. R. Tolkien’s *Trilogy of the Rings* and the *Hobbit*. The theological view that most emphasizes eschatology is known as Premillennial Dispensationalism (hereafter PD), a theology, and philosophy of history, that has been under fire for a very long time, particularly in the evangelical scholarship on the Arab-Israel Conflict. (We love to mock the *Left Behind* series because of its depiction of the Rapture and the cosmic conflict that ensues, even though we love to read books of this genre, like Joel Rosenberg’s novels).

The social science literature, particularly the University of Chicago’s “Fundamentalist Project,” has categorized PD as “fundamentalist” in part because of its unapologetically literal, apocalyptic view of warfare as the eternal state of rebellious humanity against God, in part for its certain expectation for worldwide judgment at the Second Coming and the redemption of the just, the restoration of creation, and the enthronement of the Messianic king, but most especially because it asserts that God still has a purpose and a plan for Israel.<sup>22</sup> Politically, and theologically, PD is under fire some theologians claim that this theology underlies and supports both Jewish and Christian Zionism. This is political theology, but it is not self-critical, it declares war on a theological basis against the Jewish people, without understanding the actual state of war, this “war without end.” They

---

<sup>21</sup> Gregory A. Boyd, “God at War,” in Ralph D. Winter and Stephen C. Hawthorne, eds., *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 2009), 100. This reader is used by thousands of evangelicals studying the World Perspectives Course every year. For a classic exploration of the theme of this cosmic battle, read the admittedly outdated but classic book by German theologian Erich Sauer, *The King of the Earth: the Nobility of Man according to the Bible and Science* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans with Paternoster Press, 1962), which he wrote in the aftermath of the two world wars. Walter Kaiser, *The Promise Plan of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008) is a systematic theology which frames this view.

<sup>22</sup> Go to <http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/series/FP.html> for a complete list of this important series.

essentialize the conflict by deploying theology in support of one side over the other. They do not see themselves as combatants, but they have become part of the battle.

If we are to resist allegorizing prophecy, how can believers distinguish between the cosmic, eternal state of war and earthly “wartime” when, “law is suspended, divested, and stripped of its eternity, ...provisionally cancelled, annulled...”<sup>23</sup> Can history and international relations in earthly time be differentiated from what Taylor calls “higher time”? Or must all human conflict be irreducibly understood simply as an inescapable, or, even worse, as conflict against God? Or, is it perhaps better to at least agree that the three monotheistic religions are in a state of war because they dissent over the relationship of the profane and the sacred? Can one religious community legitimately accuse the others of being enemies of God, or does this miss the point of faith entirely? And if the theologico-political is the source of war, what can be done to manage the way we think about war?

I would argue that the answer to these questions is precisely what we have seen in international history since the world wars: the development of the humane study of international relations springs from the attempt to secularize war and to treat it as mundane instead of holy. This is not relativism, but it is an attempt to humanize conflict, and to devise political—and military—systems to manage conflict. Indeed, this system, for all its ills and tragic failings, seems to be working on some level. The growing recognition of the role of religion in the field of IR is an important development, but without grasping political theology as ideology, the role of faith can be essentialized and universalized, with the result that dissenting minorities, in the community of nations or within a state, by claiming to be “exceptions” deserving the freedom to exercise their particular identities, may lose their political right to difference, and become “the enemy.”

---

<sup>23</sup> Anidjar remarks that Freud called this state “wartime,” 4.

In order for us to avoid confusing the cosmic with the earthly wars of this age, today's diplomacy attempts to avoid framing human conflict as ideological "wars of righteousness" in the words of historian Herbert Butterfield. This leading British historian turned his attention to the nascent field of international relations during the Cold War.<sup>24</sup> A Christian, he was concerned that foreign policy develop as a science, based upon diplomatic history, and critiqued the ideological character of the Cold War. Although he came to appreciate theory after becoming involved with American foreign affairs scholars, he insisted upon the need for historical sensibility in foreign relations, and helped to shape the early years of the discipline in the U.K., the U.S., and Canada.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> C.T. McIntire, *Herbert Butterfield: Historian as Dissenter* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004). Surprisingly, in their important new survey *International History and International Relations*, Andrew J. Williams, Amelia Hadfield, and J. Simon Rofe ignore Butterfield's influence on the two disciplines.

<sup>25</sup> Andrew J. Williams, Amelia Hadfield, J. Simon Rofe's *International History and International Relations* provides an excellent starting point for liberal arts students to learn about the study of war and peace. The textbook is divided into seven chapters, and begins with a very helpful introductory chapter. While all of the topics are related to war and peace, the first chapter, "History and International Relations" is a historiographical survey of the two disciplines and their symbiotic relationship. The next two chapters, "War" and "Peace" are touchstones for our conversation, while the following chapters, "Sovereignty," "Empire," "International Organization," and "Identity" are all helpful corollaries. "The central task of this book," the authors write, "is to show how the discipline of history can be of cardinal use to the student of international relations (IR)."<sup>25</sup> I fully endorse their task, and for this reason, I now turn to the subject of the pedagogy of war and peace in the liberal arts. They suggest that "political scientists and historians actually have three key aspects in common. First, both disciplines are looking for causes (rather than merely change). Indeed, it is history that has the greatest heritage in treating causes as the central imperative."<sup>25</sup> They assert, "In both approaches, therefore, one finds that 'broad patterns become clear only through a mastery of the details...the details are never there for their own sake, but for the sake of patterns, the turning points, and causes they reveal and the broad interpretations and theses they undergird.... Thus while 'the primary goal of the historian is to explain the particular, but they often do so with resort to the general', increasing amounts of political theory...explain the general by making specific use of the particular...."<sup>25</sup> They note a "burgeoning interest in political theorists to appreciate both the historical content of a given episode and the need for its appropriate treatment when 'rendered' in political theory terms."<sup>25</sup> This has been true especially in interdisciplinary fields, such as Middle Eastern Studies, where both disciplines are necessary for understanding the complexity of war and peace. What is interesting about this text is that the authors recognize the convergence of diplomatic history, international relations and international history with the field of global, or world history.

In the programs I have developed, World Civilizations I and II, along with introductory courses to American history and government, form the foundation for all upper division courses. The student is introduced to the broad outlines of world history, focusing not only on political history, but also socio-economic and cultural history, along with geography and the concepts they will need to understand politics and history at higher levels: historical concepts and methodologies, the importance of perspective and conflicting viewpoints, periodization, critical use of sources, and the importance of ideas, individuals, civilizational contact and conflict, progress, change, continuity, and material culture and environment.

To bring these ideas to life, primary sources are the basic portals into past worlds. What is remarkable about these primary sources is that in most undergraduate texts they are generally literary and religious. Rarely

However, on the level of philosophy, the only way for us to do this is to follow Taylor, who, by distinguishing “higher time” from earthly time, provides us with a key to unlock the mysterious power of the Apocalyptic in the popular imagination. Although we live in a secular age, the Bible (and the Qur’an—which extends biblical ideas of political and social justice into the temporal order, in the real sense of the theologico-political) remains at the center of our monotheistic views of war and peace. The Holy Scriptures continue to shape our “social imaginary” concerning conflict in the Middle East, as a plethora of popular books on the subject has made clear to even the most biblically illiterate.<sup>26</sup> Taylor beautifully and expansively describes how the anthropocentrism of our secular age has led to the “marginalization of higher times” which had been, in previous ages, “central to both individual morality and public order.” The “sense of a cosmic disposition of things in morality, society, and world” has waned in our culture. This is why eschatology still holds a fascination for believers—not because they wish for destruction, but because of the hope that after the apocalypse, all will be restored. What remains at the core of our “social imaginary” is the medieval practice (Jewish, Christian, Muslim) of the allegory to interpret

---

do students encounter treaties or diplomatic correspondence. Therefore, when I teach courses on the history of the ME, and especially in my course on the Arab-Israel conflict, I use documents, and shift into a Rankean world, one that most world historians have little interest in, despite the fact that more and more the eclipse of diplomatic history is recognized as a weakness in IR and area studies programs. For our new course on War and Civilization, we will be using Kegan’s anthology of war literature, and resorting to Stephen Morillo, Jeremy Black, and Paul Lococo, *War in World History: Society, Technology, and War from Ancient Times to the Present* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009) as a tertiary source for students to begin their research on the history of war for their particular topics of choice.

<sup>26</sup> Charles Kimball, *When Religion Becomes Evil: Five Warning Signs* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002), especially chapters 4, 5, and 6 is an especially good introduction to this problem. Gershom Gorenberg, *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount* (Oxford University Press, 2000) is a deeper exploration of the problem. Nur Masalha, *The Bible and Zionism: Invented Traditions, Archeology, and Post-Colonialism in Palestine-Israel* (London: Zed Books, 2007) pulls no punches in pointing to the problem, although he could well have traced the way that modern Islamists have used the Qur’an to make their claim on Israel. But it does no good to blame the books, it’s the interpreters who politicize them to assert their own interests. At this point, it seems like a standoff, and the challenge for diplomats and statesmen is to resolve to see the conflict realistically and not ideologically, based upon international law and morality. A tall order. Blessed are the peacemakers, who recognize that war has not solved this conflict, even when it has been from beyond Israel’s borders.



the biblical narrative of the cosmic conflict between God and Satan ahistorically.<sup>27</sup>

Anthropocentricism and secularization have undermined our sense of God's "ordering presence." For most, the scientific demonstration of "the vast, unfathomable universe in its deep abyss of time" has obscured "the sight of this ordering presence altogether...."<sup>28</sup>

Science, with its focus only upon the material world,

seemed to make life shallow, devoid of deep resonance and meaning; it seemed to exclude the transports of devotion, of self-giving, to deny a heroic dimension to our existence, it reduces us by enclosing us in a too-rosy picture of the human condition, shorn of tragedy, irreparable loss, meaningless suffering, cruelty and horror. ... We are tempted to draw the limits of our lives too narrowly, to be concerned exclusively with a narrow range of internally-generated goals. In doing this we are closing ourselves to other, greater goals. These may be seen as originating outside of us, from God, or from the whole of nature, or from humanity; or they might be seen as goals which arise indeed within, but which push us to greatness, heroism, dedication, devotion to our fellow human beings, and which are now being suppressed and denied.<sup>29</sup>

And Taylor sees this "shallowness" accelerated in modernity as a result of the horrors of war. The "myth, of war," that is, the myth of the heroic, of the righteousness of war has "created a radical discontinuity in history, that we are cut off from the order enjoyed by our predecessors by an impassable gulf." Importantly, Taylor points to "the sense of living in a shattered order has remained at some level as a truth of experience."<sup>30</sup> This feeling, except by people who live in the awareness of their being in an "existential state of war," can no longer justify war as righteousness, a problem that Butterfield's critics warned him of, and which he later modified as a result.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> See Judith Mendelsohn Rood, "The Consequences of Disobedience: Global Metanarratives in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Historiography," unpublished paper, presented at the Evangelical Theological Society, 2007.

<sup>28</sup> Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age*, 375.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 338-9.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 408-9 citing Samuel Hynes' work, *A War Imagined* (London: Pimlico, 1990).

<sup>31</sup> Zionists, who experienced rebirth out of the ashes, have accepted the fact that warfare remains a necessary, heroic, and successful response to war without end in a Hobbesian conflict with an anti-Semitic enemy;

Our sense of living in a shattered order has pervaded our understanding of war, and has forced us intellectually to recoil from it, while the necessity of violence to protect life and freedom has remained an unavoidable. Ethics fail, people think, because war nullifies morality. Or does it? How then can we regain our courage from a philosophical understanding of enmity? Protestations against injustice, the longing for peace, and the desire for reconciliation fail in the state of war. International law and just war theory fail to prevent some wars, and wars don't convince those who oppose violence that it can be righteousness. This explains the profusion of peace studies and the increasing literature on peacemaking. Biblical literalism seems to call for warfare, yet warfare is perceived as an evil, although perhaps admittedly a necessary one. Can Taylor's differentiation of higher time and secular time help us to reframe the popular understanding of Scripture by shifting our understanding of the meaning of apocalyptic hope? I believe it can.

Taylor shows us how our fascination with the natural world and its sometimes terrible physical beauty awakens us to the "sight of 'Excess', vast, strange, unencompassable" which "provokes fear, even horror" as it "breaks through...[our] self-absorption and awakens our sense of what is really important...our capacity for heroic affirmation of meaning in the face of a world without telos..."<sup>32</sup> Our terror and fear at the sublimity of nature has been a theme in Western literature. And it is in literature's discovery of the sublime that we discover a new vantage point for understanding the cosmic warfare at the heart of the holy scriptures of the three monotheisms, without resorting to allegorization [or aestheticization! (Taube)], and, especially, without making earthly enemies into demonic ones

---

Zionism is understood by its adherents as a national liberation movement dedicated to righting a historic wrong.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

(Trachtenberg).

Taking my cue from my colleague Natasha Duquette’s study of the sublime in eighteenth and nineteenth century literature, I hope to show that the liberal arts can help us to gain new insight into enmity by recovering the political meaning of the Sublime. By deploying Duquette’s bracing analysis of Edmund Burke’s “division between the sublime and the beautiful and its theological implications” we can employ what she terms “a scriptural model of . . .collaborative pedagogy” for studying war and peace as liberal arts. By reframing our understanding of the apocalyptic and the role it ought to play in our understanding of normative morality and realism in international relations, we find that the sublime can restore our sense of awe and hope in the providential sovereignty of God over history. The sublime “generates a state of humility, fear, and wonder: an awareness of humanity’s finitude in contrast to divine omnipotence.”<sup>33</sup>

According to Duquette, in the 1759 addendum to his magisterial *Philosophical Enquiry Into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful* Edmund Burke “added a section titled ‘Power’ within which he quotes from the Book of Job and the Psalms in order to inflect his aesthetic system with theological meaning. In doing so, Burke draws a hard line between the Old Testament and the New, as his system does not allow for any areas of overlap.” Here she uncovers the theological polemic in Burke’s ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful, and shows us how art and literature help us to understand the transcendent meaning of historical events.

This has theological consequences, as Burke draws an absolute divide between the sublime as powerful and terrifying, manifested in Old Testament “justice” . . .and the beautiful as weak and comforting, displayed in New Testament love. . . . He thus creates a seemingly unbridgeable gap between Judaism and Christianity, between justice and love. He writes, “Before the Christian religion had, as it were, humanized

---

<sup>33</sup> Duquette, “Dauntless Spirits.”

the idea of the Divinity, and brought it somewhere nearer us, there was very little said of the love of God”.... Burke associates the beautiful with the closeness of loving friendship in contrast to the sublime sternness of a distant and punishing father. As cultural historian Jonathan Lamb points out, for Burke “Unmodified power is God, and God is terrible”.... Burke’s biographer Fred Lock agrees, claiming the *Philosophical Enquiry* as “at bottom a theological work” ... where Burke’s God is “the terrible Jehovah of the Old Testament”.... Due to Burke’s insistence on the “wide difference” ... between the sublime and the beautiful, there is no room for paradox....”

This is largely due to Burke’s scriptural blind spots. He ignores the multiple references to God’s “lovingkindness” in the Psalms and Jeremiah, for example. In attempting to restrict Christianity to the beautiful he occludes powerful moments of sublimity in the New Testament, from which he does not quote even once in his *Enquiry*. British scholar Ben Quash, in a recent address at Biola, critiqued the sublime but then presented the transfiguration as one possible example of Christian sublimity. The crucifixion and resurrection are also sublime events – both terrifying and awe-inspiring. In Matthew 28, the women run from the empty tomb with “fear and great joy” (28:8), a paradoxical mixture of emotions that resists Burke’s neat polarities.

Burke, like Anidjar, was caught in the supersessionist polemic between theological enemies—the Jew and the Christian. Blind to the continuous narrative of the Scriptures, even the study of the sublime becomes, for Burke, theological. However, by viewing the Scriptures canonically, the sublimity of the OT is joined to the sublimity of the New, exemplified most obviously in the magnificent book of Revelation. The apocalypticism that characterized the intertestamental period of the Second Temple is the immediate context of Christ’s incarnation and gospel. These apocryphal writings from this era were written in a time of war, and it was at this time that the “...Messiah, “who came and, as one says, became the neighbor,”<sup>34</sup> also became the enemy of all, but, equally, the savior of all.

For he must reign until he has put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. ...When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to the one who put all things in subjection under him, so that God may be all in all. (1 Corinthians 15:25-28).

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 10. Anidjar is quoting Peter Abelard, *Expositio ad Romanos*, vol. 2, 494 (fn. 49, 178). Anidjar mentions Thomas R. Yoder Neufeld, “Put on the Armour of God”: *The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1977), 76, 85-6 in connection to the Book of Ephesians, *ibid.*, fn. 24, 175.

Anidjar leaves Schmitt and Taube, and so it is here that we leave him, but let us stay with Taube's restoration of Paul as a Jewish thinker, and the continuity of the OT and the New in the Christian canon a bit longer.

Duquette, echoing Reinhold Niebhuur, asked whether there is not a Yeatsian "terrible beauty" in the cross? Can this "terrible beauty," be understood as a historical moment of *kairos*, when the Divine penetrated the mundane? Is this not sublime? Perhaps understanding the sublimity of the Cross is the further clue leading us to a new vantage point from which to contemplate earthly wars and suffering, and ultimately, Armageddon? For if we agree that the biblical canon provides a single, sweeping narrative that shows the interpenetration of higher times and the mundane, could not a new category, let's call it the "Apocalyptic Sublime," help us to accept the veracity of prophecy, while at the same time restraining us from the temptation of acting to preempt God's judgment through calamity? Can we not understand the present Age, [aeon, dispensation, period, epoch], as it were, *ad interim*, when through His spirit, God enables us to find the good, the beautiful, and the virtuous even in the midst of war? Indeed, has he not given us "beauty for ashes" even as we still live in that tension between promise and fulfillment?<sup>35</sup>

However, when scripture becomes an unfiltered basis for political action, the sublime may easily degenerate into the "grotesque" which "a false sublimity"<sup>36</sup> Duquette writes, "In his *Enquiry* Burke defines the grotesque as ridiculous. He notes that in all paintings of Hell, for example, the effect is not terrifying but rather "ludicrous." ...The grotesque is a

---

<sup>35</sup> Judith Mendelsohn Rood, "Shoah/Nakbah: Offerings of Memory and History" in *History (1933-1948): What We Choose to Remember*; Margaret Monahan Hogan, James M. Lies, editors (Portland, OR: Garaventa Center for Catholic Intellectual Life and American Culture/University of Portland, 2011), 411-448 and "Beauty for Ashes," unpublished paper, 2007.

<sup>36</sup> Duquette, "Joy Unspeakable": Sublimity, Suffering, and Freedom in Edwards and Wheatley," unpublished paper, Biola University Center for Christian Thought, 2012.

distortion of the sublime that does not inspire reverential awe, or fear of the Lord, but rather disdain or horrified disgust.” In his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* Duquette highlights Burke’s hellish imagery:

Every thing seems out of nature in this strange chaos of levity and ferocity, and of all sorts of crimes jumbled together with all sorts of follies. In viewing this monstrous tragic-comic scene, the most opposite passions necessarily succeed, and sometimes mix with each other in the mind; alternate contempt and indignation; alternate laughter and tears; alternate scorn and horror.” . . . This horror is not the reverential fear or astonishment of the sublime, however; it is mixed with a contempt that verges on disgust and prompts the laughter of scorn. Burke does not represent the revolution as sublimely awe-inspiring but rather as a grotesque mixture of the horrific and the ludicrous. Burke recognized any apparent sublimity in the revolution as false or distorted. . . .

Some of today’s “Christian Zionists” no longer adhere to the circumspect philosophy of history of PD, instead, they have converted it into a political theology to support the policies of the Israeli government, rather than supporting the Jewish people as witnesses to their faith in the Jewish messiah. Evangelical attacks on Christian Zionism for supporting Israel, however, reveals the persistence of the polemic against the exceptionalism of the Jewish people in this age. Yet while it is true that today’s populist Christian Zionists lack what we have called elsewhere “biblical realism” their support for Israel as the homeland of the Jewish people demonstrates a dissent from the supersessionism of European Christianity.<sup>37</sup> As a philosophy of history, PD represents takes seriously the

---

<sup>37</sup> Some evangelical theologians concerned about social justice and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict have identified Christian Zionism as the real culprit in the conflict, which is also the central claim of the Muslim Brotherhood, and Hamas, its Gazan branch. Surprisingly, these have gained the support of the American government despite the fact that our support for dictatorships and Islamist movements in the past has proven disastrous in the long run. Sadly, those advocating for the Muslim Brotherhood have apparently forgotten its WWII alliance with the Nazis, just as the American foreign policy establishment failed to recognize the Ba’athist entanglement with them. These apparently opposite movements—one socialist and nationalist, the other Islamic and transnational, were both at their heart anti-Western anti-colonial movements. However, since the *Fundamentalisms Project* has dominated the emergent field of religion and politics in the social sciences, especially in the field of international relations, the biblical literalism of Christian Zionism is categorized as “fundamentalist” along with the other fundamentalisms in world religion, and therefore theology is understood more and more as a tool to be deployed in pursuit of power—that is, simply an ideology. See Judith and Paul Rood, “Is Christian Zionism Based on Bad Theology?” *Cultural Encounters* 7 (2011): 37-48.

sublimity of the apocalyptic return of Christ, the terrible moment of judgment of the fallen world and its redemption. At the same time, PD attaches importance to this age as the one in which we test our ability to love God and neighbor, and our enemies. The messianic hope is a sublime hope, one that accepts the realities of war in expectation of the ultimate reconciliation of mankind with God.<sup>38</sup>

It is the book of Ephesians that best helps us to understand the cosmic war that Paul is writing about, and how God has equipped us to serve his purposes on Earth. Rather than the story of war, we read a story of liberation and reconciliation, redemption and restoration:

In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, in accordance with the riches of God's grace<sup>8</sup> that he lavished on us. With all wisdom and understanding,<sup>9</sup> he made known to us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in Christ,<sup>10</sup> to be put into effect when the times reach their fulfillment—to bring unity to all things in heaven and on earth under Christ. ... that you may know the hope to which he has called you, the riches of his glorious inheritance in his holy people,<sup>19</sup> and his incomparably great power for us who believe. That power is the same as the mighty strength<sup>20</sup> he exerted when he raised Christ from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly realms,<sup>21</sup> far above all rule and authority, power and dominion, and every name that is invoked, not only in the present age but also in the one to come.<sup>22</sup> And God placed all things under his feet and appointed him to be head over everything for the church,<sup>23</sup> which is his body, the fullness of him who fills everything in every way. **2 As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins,<sup>2</sup> in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air, the spirit who is now at work in those who are disobedient.<sup>3</sup> All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our flesh<sup>[a]</sup> and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature deserving of wrath.<sup>4</sup> But because of his great love for us, God, who is rich in mercy,<sup>5</sup> made us alive with Christ even when we were dead in transgressions—it is by grace you have been saved.<sup>6</sup> And God raised us up with Christ and seated us with him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus,<sup>7</sup> in order that in the coming ages he might show the incomparable riches of his grace, expressed in his kindness to us in Christ Jesus.<sup>8</sup> For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith—and this is not from yourselves, it is the gift of God—<sup>9</sup> not by works, so that no one can boast.<sup>10</sup> For we are God's handiwork, created in Christ Jesus to do good works, which God prepared in advance for us to do.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, remember that formerly you who are Gentiles by birth and called "uncircumcised" by those who call themselves "the circumcision" (which is done in the body by human hands)—<sup>12</sup> remember that at that time you were separate from Christ, excluded from citizenship in Israel and foreigners to the covenants of the promise, without hope and without God in the world.<sup>13</sup> But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far away have been brought near by the blood of Christ.<sup>14</sup> For he himself is our peace, who has made the two groups one and has destroyed the barrier, the dividing wall of hostility,<sup>15</sup> by setting aside in his flesh the law with its commands and regulations. His purpose was to create in himself one new humanity out of the two, thus making peace,<sup>16</sup> and in one body to reconcile both of them to God through the cross, by which he put to death their hostility.<sup>17</sup> He came and preached peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were near.<sup>18</sup> For through him we both have access to the Father by one Spirit.<sup>19</sup> Consequently, you are no longer foreigners and strangers, but fellow citizens with God's people and also members of his household,<sup>20</sup> built on the foundation of the**

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone. <sup>21</sup> In him the whole building is joined together and rises to become a holy temple in the Lord. <sup>22</sup> And in him you too are being built together to become a dwelling in which God lives by his Spirit.

<sup>6</sup> This mystery is that through the gospel the Gentiles are heirs together with Israel, members together of one body, and sharers together in the promise in Christ Jesus.

<sup>7</sup> I became a servant of this gospel by the gift of God's grace given me through the working of his power. <sup>8</sup> Although I am less than the least of all the Lord's people, this grace was given me: to preach to the Gentiles the boundless riches of Christ, <sup>9</sup> and to make plain to everyone the administration of this mystery, which for ages past was kept hidden in God, who created all things. <sup>10</sup> His intent was that now, through the church, the manifold wisdom of God should be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly realms, <sup>11</sup> according to his eternal purpose that he accomplished in Christ Jesus our Lord. <sup>12</sup> In him and through faith in him we may approach God with freedom and confidence. <sup>13</sup> I ask you, therefore, not to be discouraged because of my sufferings for you, which are your glory. (Ephesians 1: 8-10. 2: 1-22, 3:1-13).

Re-envisioning eschatology from the generous perspective of “collaborative dissent” urged by Duquette might allow those of us who teach the Arab-Israel conflict to reframe the debate over the political role of eschatology—Jewish, Christian, and Muslim—to understand the political theology underlying the conflict. Deploying the category of the Sublime to interpret scripture may help us to reorient ourselves to the horror of war and chaos, and to recover the generosity and compassion that fuels this hope for redemption among earnest believers who read their bibles, and yes, even the Qur’an, with simple faith and trust in God’s goodness, lovingkindness, and trustworthiness.<sup>39</sup> These are the kinds of believers who, during the Holocaust, were moved to help the Jews because they recognized the cosmic dimension of the evil that had encompassed Europe.<sup>40</sup> Thus, rather than understanding the Bible, or the Qur’an, as a problematic proof text for war without end in human civilization, we can instead read it better as a source of wisdom. The Bible can then help us to glimpse what is beyond what we see, allowing us to understand “the principalities

---

<sup>39</sup> I read the Qur’an as an extrabiblical text that emerged out of its times, an apocalypse shaped by the religious ideas of Jewish Christians, Jews, and Christians in Arabia in the context of the Byzantine-Sassanian wars. See Fred M. Donner, *Muhammad and the Believers* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

<sup>40</sup> Pierre Sauvage, *Weapon of the Spirit*, film, 1985 on the Huegenots of Chambon-Sur-Lignon, France, tells this story, one that was repeated also among Polish Catholics and Albanian Muslims during the *Shoah*. See also Norman H. Gershman, *Besa* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2008), Robert Satloff, *Among the Righteous* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006).



and powers” described in Ephesians, and to better put on the “armor of God” as we dwell in a world which we cannot fully apprehend—let alone control.

<sup>10</sup> Finally, be strong in the Lord and in his mighty power. <sup>11</sup> Put on the full armor of God, so that you can take your stand against the devil’s schemes. <sup>12</sup> For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms. <sup>13</sup> Therefore put on the full armor of God, so that when the day of evil comes, you may be able to stand your ground, and after you have done everything, to stand. <sup>14</sup> Stand firm then, with the belt of truth buckled around your waist, with the breastplate of righteousness in place, <sup>15</sup> and with your feet fitted with the readiness that comes from the gospel of peace. <sup>16</sup> In addition to all this, take up the shield of faith, with which you can extinguish all the flaming arrows of the evil one. <sup>17</sup> Take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. (Ephesians 6:10-17)

“A world afflicted by amnesia will in the end forget what it means to have political courage. Even the ability to differ between good and evil, between terrorist and victim, between truth and untruth, requires that mankind has courage. Courage does not begin with physical courage or mental greatness, but begins with the critical ability to differentiate between certain facts, and yes, even accord a certain hierarchy of morals in morals.” –Iranian dissident Afshin Ellian quoted in the *International Jerusalem Post*, December 28, 2012.

Appendix One: Interdisciplinary Program in the Humanities in Middle Eastern Studies: A Preliminary Curriculum for Teaching Middle Eastern Studies (in addition to language study, a sine qua non).

I. Historical Geography (unit on Geography, below).
II. Theology and War (This Paper) A. Eschatology, Secularization, and the Apocalyptic Sublime
III. Primary Sources (Treaties, Speeches, Novels, Art, Architecture) A. History of Jerusalem in Literature, Art, and Architecture: Sacred Space and Holy War Historical Films and Documentaries Ibn Battuta, Arab-Syrian Gentleman, Midaq Alley, Guests of the Sheikh
IV. Philosophy and War: Phenomenology and the Discovery of the “Other” in the Interwar Period Reflections on the Impact of the French Revolution and Kulturkampf in German and European History: Understanding Religion and Ideology Before WWI Antisemitism and The Philosophical Discovery of the Other: Husserl and Edith Stein’s Early Phenomenology and Existentialism, Samuel Moyné, <i>The Origins of the Other</i> Anidjar, The Jew, the Arab
V. Pre-Islamic Jewish History, History of Arabia, Arab Christianity, Herod and the Ghassanids (Donner, Muhammad and the Believers), Arabian Jewish Christianity!
VI. History of Islamic Civilization (Lapidus, Cleveland, Smith) Survey of the History of the ME and Islam I and II Niall Ferguson <i>War of the Worlds</i> , Thomas Snyder, <i>Bloodlands</i>
VII. International Relations/International History (Historiography, Theory) A. History: Butterfield and the Emergence of International Relations 1. Diplomatic History 2. Current Events (The Clipping File) 3. Real time Simulation (Arab Israel Conflict Course) B. Political Science and War: International Relations and Ethics C. International History and International Relations D. Just War Theory: Walzer 1. Patterson How to End War E. Human Rights: The Rules of Engagement and Terrorism (Jihad in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century) 1. Islamic Reconciliation: Moroccan Truth and Reconciliation Process
VIII. Psychology and War: The Soul and the Other (Edith Stein)--Empathy A. Stein on Empathy and the Phenomenology of the Soul: Encountering the Face of God in the Other (future project)
IX. Israel and Zionism, Arab Nationalism and the Modern Middle Eastern State System (Political Thought)
X. Framing the history of the Arab-Israel Conflict as an Interdisciplinary Case Study A. Minorities in the ME in the Post-WWI Era: The Ottoman Jihad and its Twentieth Century Successors after the fall of the Caliphate 1. Arab and Jewish Nationalism: The “Tanzimat” Renewed under the League of Nations and the British Mandate 2. Israel as a “Sovereign Millet” and the UN as failed “secular” caliphate? B. The Muslim Brotherhood as Alternative to Secular Power: 1924, 1933, 1987
XI. Religious Freedom and Persecution: Apostasy; Women’s Rights, Minority Rights A. The Changing Landscape of Religion in the Middle East
XII. Service Learning Course: International Relations, Religious Freedom, and Reconciliation Internships Faustin Nshamboura Unbutu and Transformation (Rwanda) (Educational Ministry) Musalaha (Reconciliation Ministry) Institute for Global Engagement Sisters in Service International Justice Ministry Magi Ministries Hope for Ishmael/Seeds of Hope (Jericho) Steve Beck Educational Ministries in North Africa

## Appendix II. Historical Geography and the Holy Land: Synopsis of 2010 CCT Presentation

Palestinian theologian Mitri Raheb has been pondering what a theology written from the perspective of the Palestinian living under Israeli occupation would look like. Keenly aware of the geography of the Holy Land, he noted that “Israel is at the periphery of five world powers that have existed throughout history: Egypt, Assyria/Babylon, Iran, Egypt, and Turkey manifested in one polity or another. As such, Israel is the battlefield for these competing powers, and they compete for control in Israel politically, socially, culturally, economically, religiously, and culturally. As a result, the people of this land reflect the influence of each of these powers biologically, politically, socially, economically, religiously, and culturally.”

This geographical reality has always meant that trying to live a normal life in this country has been impossible. Even during the period that the Jewish people had political sovereignty, they were at war, and ultimately, the inhabitants of this land were powerless in the face of the great empires surrounding them.

The Bible is filled with questions about where God is in all of this? Why is He silent in the face of the suffering of His people? Why does He not act? Why do the evil prosper? God is hidden here, while the gods of the great empires are visible. God’s Temple is destroyed, and He never returned visibly to His people, He doesn’t speak. His people are exiled, and still, He is totally silent. But this silence is broken by the Incarnation; God is there with us, but to be the king of his people, he has to share in his people’s suffering; he has to be defeated as they have been defeated.

To be their kinsman-redeemer, he has to defeat death itself, and in doing so, he defeated all of the geopolitical enemies of Israel by triumphantly creating a new community that lives not by the sword, but by faith. He transformed the idea of the kingdom from one limited by borders to one that encompasses the whole world, centered in Jerusalem. He transformed the battlefield of the world into a Holy Land at the geopolitical center of His Kingdom. The powers that divided the land, set boundaries, dictated policies, and subdued the people. Your enemy brought new people into the land to be your enemies. It is always your enemy who has the power. Your neighbor represents the one who is oppressing you, who is different than you, threatens you and your way of life. In this new kingdom, you are forced to recognize the humanity of your enemy, that the enemy is meant to be your brother; indeed your neighbor is your brother. This is possible only through faith in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the power of His son’s saving grace.

The people of the Land of Israel have sought liberation in five ways throughout history: first, by living by the law, in the sense of what today is thought to be the Shariah, Islamic Law through theocracy; second, through retribution; third, by accommodation to the powers; fourth, by becoming proxies or subcontractors to one or more of the superpowers; or fifth, through piety. By creating a new community consisting of Jews and Gentiles, Jesus taught a sixth way. Unlike the five divisive strategies tried by the Jewish people, Raheb argues that Jesus created a unified kingdom that erased the religious barriers between the people of the land. Rather than a physical kingdom with borders, he created one without borders, centered

first in Jerusalem, then in Judea, Samaria, and throughout the whole world, a kingdom of his witnesses testifying to His ways, His commandments, His will.

This is a kingdom that rules not by might, but by spirit. A new spirit. And it is the spirit that is at stake in this country. For Raheb, the Bible reads as if it is written today. What are the spiritual values of the Israelis and the Palestinians? For Israel to be whole, the people of the land—Israeli and Palestinian, Jewish, Christian, and Muslim, need spiritual freedom. Those who seek to rule by setting up a theocracy have always failed abysmally. Everyone today is suffering from the political divisions between Israel and the Palestinians, and this suffering will not end they recognize one another as their neighbors, equal in the sight of God and men.

The theologian's geostrategic insights are remarkable, although his interpretation of the Kingdom obviates the existence of the Jewish nation, and, indeed, he questions the very notion that European (Ashkenazi) Jews are true descendants of the Judeans, bringing in the question of the conversion of the Khazars in the Middle Ages, often deployed by anti-Semites who seek to undercut the connection of these immigrants to Israel. His vision is amillennial, the kingdom he sees universal, with no need for international relations because there is no longer a need for polities. There is no sense of an international order constituted by the nations, among them, the Jewish nation, in Israel. This Christian view mirrors the Islamic one, that seeks the establishment of a universal caliphate, one controlled by Islam. Both the Christian and the Muslim views are ahistorical. It is clear that the five geopolitical powers that Raheb has clearly discerned in the history of the region do not play a political role in his eschatological vision. In the Muslim view, ultimately, Islam will triumph and supersede all of these powers.

### Appendix III. Autobiographical Note

Arguably, I've been engaging the very real enemies of my people, namely anti-Zionists, especially Muslim and Christian Arabs, my whole adult life. I've stepped outside the camp in order to try to understand my enemies, and in the process have found that they have little interest in understanding me. I have found that when I engage others I am accepted because I show respect for their human dignity, despite my revulsion at their hatred for the Jewish people's right to a homeland.

So I want to thank the organizers for the opportunity to begin to sketch out my overall views on war and peace in the liberal arts. If you're interested in reading more of what I've written I've attached a bibliography of my related writings, but you will find that most of my theological work is unpublished. I've only been writing about my personal connection to war for the past three years. The twentieth century was a traumatic one for my great-grandparents, grand-parents, and my father, and for that reason, it was traumatic for me and shaped the way that I see the world. So the study of war for me is a personal one, and my focus has been, as a victim of war without end, the consequences of war and its aftermath.

I first encountered the Arab-Israel conflict in grade school during the Six Day War, when my rabbi taught a few classes in Hebrew school showing us maps of Israel and her neighbors to show us how small the Jewish state is and how her neighbors threatened her very existence. By 1973, I had studied *Wounded Knee* and followed the Viet Nam war with great interest. My dad, the refugee from the Holocaust, is a real American patriot, and served in the American army in Germany during the earliest years of the Cold War.

My interest in the problem of war sharpened during the October War, known also as the War of Yom Kippur. My awareness of Israel as a nation under siege dates from that war, and in 1974, when I was 16, I traveled to Israel as a student with the Jewish youth group United Synagogue Youth. This pilgrimage was an important goal to me, and I worked hard to earn a scholarship to go on the trip. It was there that I discovered the Palestinians, and this discovery shaped my major in college and my graduate studies.

At New College (FL), where I fell in love with historiography, I was able to shape an interdisciplinary program in History and Middle Eastern Studies, and spent a year at Hebrew University, wrestling with my identity as a Jewish American woman in the light of twentieth century history. I spent a summer interning at the State Department Egypt Desk during my senior year, and that fall began my graduate work on an M.A. in Contemporary Arab Studies at Georgetown, where I focused on international relations and Arabic language. I was dissatisfied with my program at Georgetown because the program actively advocated Arabist policies, and lacked historical depth. However, the opportunity to study with Palestinians and other Arab students and faculty, as well as Israelis and other American and European students, was unparalleled. Professors Hisham Sharabi and Ibrahim Ibrahim both had read the German Jewish intellectuals I loved, and our shared sense of exile deepened my desire to understand Palestinian history. They encouraged me to continue my studies in Ottoman and Modern Arab history, with an emphasis in diplomatic history at the University of Chicago. There, I returned to history, and sought to adapt Rankean historiography as a way to distance myself from the passions of the Arab-Israel Conflict, and to ask bigger and deeper secular questions about the conflict. I chose to focus my dissertation on the Muslim Community in the Ottoman Province of Damascus before Zionism based upon the Islamic Court Records of Jerusalem. In my book, *Sacred Law in the Holy City* (Brill Academic Press,

2004) I attempted to show how political theory and diplomatic history, international relations, socio-economic and legal history, and, in particular, the history of land tenure in the Ottoman Empire could be combined to excavate the local, regional, and global dimensions of the origins of the Modern Middle East, and to fully understand the long term conditions that gave rise to the conflict between Israel and her neighbors. Although I didn't elaborate upon my understanding of Islamic law in that study, I alluded to natural law as the paradigm for interpreting the policies of Muhammad Ali in Syria and the Ottoman legal regime. My assumption was that at that time at least, there were shared, universal beliefs about good government and justice that would make it possible for me to understand the reasons for rebellion in the 1830s. Today's Islamist thought, however, bears no connection to the Shafi'i, Maliki, and Hanafi interpretations of Islamic law that I studied. Today's Islamist thought is not purely Hanbali, or Wahhabi; instead, it is a xenophobic amalgam dating from the Crusades (as much against the Mongols as against Europe!) through the Third Reich and the Cold War, particularly its last phase, the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan.

Judith Mendelsohn Rood (Ph.D. in Modern Arab History (Diplomatic and Ottoman History my two other fields) University of Chicago, 1993, M.A. in Arabic and International Relations, Georgetown, 1982). Website: <https://sites.google.com/site/jmendelsohnrood/>. I welcome your comments and queries: [judith.rood@biola.edu](mailto:judith.rood@biola.edu) 714-262-9030

My Books and Articles Relating to War and Peace

“Apostasy and Freedom in the Muslim World,” *LCJE Bulletin*, 2011.

“Is Christian Zionism Based on Bad Theology?” with Paul W. Rood, *Cultural Encounters* 7 (2011): 37-48.

"Shoah/Nakbah: Offerings of Memory and History" in *History (1933-1948) : What We Choose to Remember*; Margaret Monahan Hogan, James M. Lies, editors (Portland, OR: Garaventa Center for Catholic Intellectual Life and American Culture/University of Portland, 2011), 411-448.

“ Hamas and the Islamicization of the Arab-Israel Conflict: New or the Same Old Story,” *Journal for the Association for the Study of the Middle East and Africa*, Winter 2011, Submitted.

“The Historian and the Claims of Memory: A Review Essay for *Fides et Historia*” *Fides et Historia*, Fall 2010.

“What We Choose to Remember: Jerusalem in World History,” *History News Network* (online e-zine), <http://hnn.us/articles/125435.html>, April 19, 2010.

“What do Muslims Really Think about Israel?” *The Review of Faith and International Affairs*, Winter 2008, 6:37-41. <http://www.cfia.org/ArticlesAndReports/Articles.aspx>

“Intercommunal Relations in Jerusalem during Egyptian Rule (1834-1841) Part Two” *Jerusalem Quarterly*, Spring 2008, 34: 78-88.

“Intercommunal Relations in Jerusalem during Egyptian Rule (1834-1841)” *Jerusalem Quarterly*, Autumn 2007, 32: 32-41.

“A Reflection Upon Our Witness in the Muslim World,” *Mishkan*, Spring 2008, 54: 39-53.

“The Time the Peasants Entered Jerusalem: The Revolt Against Ibrahim Pasha in the Islamic Court Sources,” *Jerusalem Quarterly*, Summer 2006, 27: 28-42.

“A Mideast Opportunity We Must Seize: Saudi Deal on Palestinian Government a Chance to Undercut Iran, al-Qaida,” *Orange County Register*, March 5, 2007.

“The Underground Railroad in Walled Lake, Michigan: The Banks Homestead,” *Sacred History Magazine*, January/February 2007: 40-51.

“Beauty for Ashes: Towards a Biblical Metanarrative of World History,” unpublished Faculty Theology Integration Seminar Paper written under for Drs. Wayne Grudem and Michael Wilkins, June 30, 2006. Current book project.

“Is the Dome of the Rock a Mosque?” *Sacred History Magazine*, January/February 2006:40-41, 43-45,48-9, 75.

*Sacred Law in the Holy City: The Khedival Challenge to the Ottomans as seen from Jerusalem, 1829-1841*, Leiden: Brill, 2004.

“The Palestinian Culture of Death: *Shari’ah* and *Siyasah*—Justice, Political Power, and Capital Punishment in the Palestinian National Authority,” *The Cultural Lives of Capital Punishment*, edited by Austin Sarat, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005, 231-248.

“Why and How Should Christian Students Study World Religion?” *Council of Christian Colleges and Universities Advance*, Spring 2003, 7-8.

“Mehmed Ali as Mutinous Khedive: The Roots of Rebellion,” *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, Vol. 8, 2002. Republished in Jane Hathaway, ed. *Mutiny and Rebellion in the Ottoman Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2002, 115-128.

“Response to Terrorism Must Include Knowledge,” *Detroit News*, September 25, 2001, <http://detnews.com/2001/editorial/0109/25/a09-302396.htm>.

“Law, Government and Family: Muhammad Ali, Marriage and Procreation, 1835,” in *Essays on Ottoman Civilization*, Proceedings of 1996 CIEPO Conference, Prague, 1996, 317-30.

“The Beginning of the End of Sunni Preeminence: Muhammad Ali and Jerusalem,” *Arab Studies Journal*, Spring 1996, 86-95.

“The Pana Tax, Conscription and the Rural-Urban Alliance against Muhammad Ali in 1834: The Case of Jerusalem,” ed. Daniel Panzac, *Histoire Economique et Sociale de l’Empire Ottoman et de la Turquie (1326-1960)*, Paris: Peeters, 1995, 415-25.

### **Scholarly Works Extensively Using *Sacred Law in the Holy City***

Gudrun Krämer. *A History of Palestine: From the Ottoman Conquest to the Founding of the State of Israel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008. First published as *Geschichte Palästinas: Von der osmanischen Eroberung bis zur Gründung des Staates Israel*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck oHG, 2002.

Khaled Safi, *The Egyptian Rule in Palestine: 1831-1840: A Critical Reassessment*. Berlin: Mensch & Buch Verlag, 2004 (Ph.D. Freie Universität of Berlin, 2003, Supervised by Gudrun Krämer, Professor of Islamic Studies).