

Research Article
Araştırma Makalesi

Bengül GÜNGÖRMEZ

Dr. | Dr.

Uludağ University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Sociology, Bursa-Turkey
bengulg2000@yahoo.com

Re-Thinking on Modern Political Theory: Political Theology and Political Messianism

Abstract

According to modern social theory political science belongs to secular domains of social sciences, it is scientific and it is immune from theology. However, in political theory and political philosophy this view is outmoded and one-sided today. In this paper I will examine the transformation of modern political theory after German political philosopher Carl Schmitt's understanding of modern political theory as "political theology". With this aim, I will evaluate theologico-political leitmotives of modernity and modern political theory such as reason and revelation distinction in philosophy, immanentize the Christian Eschaton, millenarianism (belief that an ideal world will be achieved in the near future), worldly or immanent salvation and particular attention is paid to political messianism and religiosity after secularism.

Keywords

Modernity, secularism, religion, political theology, political messianism.

Introduction

Modernity is political but is political only 'political'? According to modern social theory political science belongs to secular domains of social sciences, it is scientific and it is immune from theology. But new theoretical developments in political sciences and political philosophy show that this intellectual tendency is one-sided and extremely secularist which is outmoded in our day. Especially after German political philosopher Carl Schmitt's *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (Schmitt, 1985), the theological conceptions in the theory of the modern state and the apocalyptic approach which characterizes modern ideologies of the West have called political scientists' attention on a large scale. Schmitt's assessments in his book show that religious and secular utterances can not be clearly separated and contents of religious language continue in modern political theory and will continue to exist in spite of secularism.

Theological Turn” or “Religious Turn” In Social Theory: The Relationship between Religion and Politics

The task of theology and politics are conceived in different ways by different thinkers. For some, politics and theology are distinct activities; politics references public authority and theology references religious experience. For other thinkers theology and politics are essentially similar activities and all politics has theology embedded within it. (Scott, Cavanaugh, 2004: 2) For example, according to Carl Schmitt who is one of the most influential political thinkers of twentieth-century Germany, thinks very similarly to them. In his famous book titled *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, Carl Schmitt writes;

all significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularized theological concepts not only because of their historical development – in which they were transferred from theology to the theory of the state, whereby, for example, the omnipotent God became the omnipotent lawgiver-but also because of their systematic structure, the recognition of which is necessary for a sociological consideration of these concepts. (a.e. 1985: 36)

According to Schmitt, in modern political theory, the 'omnipotent God' reappears as the 'Sovereign', the theological 'miracle' becomes the 'juridical exception', and so on. These statements of Schmitt were challenging for social sciences, especially political science which has the tendency that mentioned above. If all significant concepts of the modern theory of state are secularized theological concepts how can we distinguish science from religion, knowledge from faith, philosophy from religion, knowing from believing and so on? What is the criterion of our objectivity in modern social theory?

With the new developments in political theology today, we can say that these theologico-political questions depend on reason and revelation distinction in philosophy and Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin fervently discuss this question in their political theories. According to Jewish political scientist and philosopher Leo Strauss, reason and revelation division, such modern dichotomies are also connected with modern status of philosophy. Modern thinkers ascribe social and political status to philosophy against religion and myth. Philosophy is first and others follow it. Leo Strauss and other modern

thinkers argue that a modern thinker must choose between Jerusalem and Athens. But for Voegelin, philosophy and religion and also myth – for example, myths of Plato - exist in a relation of mutuality. (Voegelin, 1990a: 195-196; Winterholler, 1997: 106;) (Voegelin, 1990b; 292-294; Strauss, 1993: 112)

Not only philosophers like Schmitt, Strauss and Voegelin, but German philosopher Jürgen Habermas who belongs to the leftist tradition also has exercised a great influence on the debate on faith and reason in a post-Secular age. With the term, “post-secular”, Habermas, emphasizes the social role and importance of religion in modern society. Habermas’ discussion with Cardinal Ratzinger at the Catholic Academy in Munich in 2004 shows us the questions on the relation between faith and reason and on the relation between secular and religious citizens. (Ratzinger, Habermas, 2007) Habermas also contributed to the discussion together with the representatives of the Jesuit School for Philosophy – Norbert Brieskorn, Michael Reder, Friedo Ricken, and Josef Schmidt- which took place in Munich in February 2007. (Cronin, 2010)

Habermas, in the *Peace Prize* speech with the title “Faith and Knowledge”, emphasizes

“the idea that the secularization hypothesis has now lost its explanatory power and that religion and the secular World always stand in a reciprocal relation. Although faith and knowledge are clearly separate from one another, they inherently depend on a constructive coexistence, especially in addressing urgent social questions such as those posed by bioethics. Religion proves to be an important moral resource in this context, according to Habermas, because religious citizens have special Access to potential for justifying moral questions. Its meaning-endowing function provides a moral basis for public discourse and thereby plays an important role in the public sphere. (a.e, 6)

According to Habermas, reason and revelation don’t represent two fundamentally opposed attitudes toward the world. In this context the philosopher and the believer share more with each other than they differ from each other. In his speech, he references the common philosophical-theological tradition extending from Augustine to Thomas. He says that,

Modern science compelled a philosophical reason which had become self-critical to break with metaphysical constructions of the totality of nature and history. With this advance in reflection, nature and history became the preserve of empirical sciences and not much more was left for philosophy than the general competences of knowing, speaking, and acting subjects. With this the synthesis of faith and knowledge forged in the tradition extending from Augustine to Thomas fell apart. Although modern philosophy assimilated the Greek heritage critically in the form of an, if you will, “postmetaphysical” thinking, at the same time it discarded Judeo-Christian sacred knowledge (Heilwissen). (a.e, 16-17)

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, thinkers like Habermas attributed great importance to religious issues in public space. In social thought and theory such interest is called, “religious turn” or “theological turn”. Like thinkers Alain Badiou, Slavoj Žižek writes about the “theological turn” within social theory, especially, in phenomenology. For example, according to such thinkers Levinasian “alterity” is not just ethical but theological. (Arthur, Paul, 2009: 183-189) In fact this “religious turn” or

“theological turn” was not only (re-)evaluating modern theory but also (re-) evaluating the modern Project. Not only these thinkers, but also thinkers from United States of America express the same interest. For example Michael Allen Gillespie says that “the attack on the World Trade Center thus called the modern Project into question, and it did so in a new and unsettling way.” (Gillespie, 2008: 1x)

Political Messianism

Political messianism is a very important theologico-political question in social theory. Christian emancipation of humanity is a religious thema and it is divine but modern political messianism depends on secularisation of the Jewish-Christian emancipation idea. According to this idea, God’s Kingdom is on Earth and we can seek to “immanentize the Christian Eschaton”. With this aim, the modern intellectual pursues, not divine redemption, but immanent salvation: for example, we can see the idea of the immanent salvation in Comte’s new religion of ‘positivism’, in the ‘progressive superman’ of Condorcet, in Marx’s emancipation theory of ‘communism’, in National Socialism’s ideal society that consists of ‘pure German superior race’ etc. (Voegelin, 1975)

After French revolution the spiritual destruction of West was achieved and there was a big vacuum in the spiritual life of humans. Some thinkers wanted to fill this gap with their political theories. For example Comte like political religions of the twentieth century, such as National Socialism and Marxism, wanted to find a solution for Western crisis, namely, a crisis of the spirit in his new religion of positivism. His attempted solution was an attractive one and his Law of Three Stages (the theological stage, the metaphysical stage and the positive stage) which includes positivism with religious enthusiasm quickly diffused to intellectual circles. Voegelin says that,

Comte would be rather insignificant figure in the history of political ideas if he were not the *Fondateur de la religion universielle* an the first high priest of new religion. Pseudo-prophetic charisma is the strength of Comte, and while his church was not much of success, his religious enthusiasm was strong enough to endow a body of ideas, although of dubious scientific value, with the glow of a revelation on whose acceptance depends the salvation of mankind. Comte has not added much as a thinker to the complex of Positivist ideas; he has added to them in his capacity as a religious founder by shifting them to the level of a dogmatic religion. (Voegelin, 1975: 90)

Rethinking on what we understand from the term “secular”, German-Jewish thinker Jacob Taubes who is the writer of *Occidental Eschatology*, says that “the proletariat assumes the role of Christ. In Christ, too, the destiny of Mankind found its ultimate expression.” According to him, “*social economy* is for Marx the *economy of salvation*”. (Taubes, 2009: 184-185) Also another German-Jewish thinker Karl Löwith, who is the author of *Meaning in History*, sees Marx as a Jew of the Old Testament a stature and a messianic. Löwith writes,

The fundamental premise of the *Communist Manifesto* is not the antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat as two opposite facts; for what makes them antagonistic is that the one class is the children of darkness and the other the children of light. Likewise, the final crisis of the bourgeois capitalist World which

Marx prophesies in terms of a scientific prediction is a last judgement, though pronounced by the inexorable law of the historical process. Neither the concepts of bourgeoisie and proletariat, nor the general view of history as an ever intensified struggle between two hostile camps, nor, least of all, the anticipation of its dramatic climax, can be verified “in a purely empirical way.” It is only Marx’s “ideological” consciousness that all history is a history of class struggles, while the real driving force behind this conception is a transparent messianism which has its unconscious root in Marx’s own being, even in his race. He was a Jew of Old Testament stature, though an emancipated Jew of the nineteenth century who felt strongly antireligious and even anti-semitic. It is the old Jewish messianism and prophetism... (Löwith, 1950: 44)

All thinkers mentioned above shows the religious and messianic (Tubes, 1982: 595-600; Gray, 2007) characteristic of the modern political theory from Comte to Marx. These thinkers see history through the lens of the apocalypse which means “the world is coming to end”. (Hall, 2009: 3) If we use Marx’s and Engels’ apocalyptic words; “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx, Engels, 2008: 6), and they can conclude that “if class conflict could be eliminated, history as we know would come to end... After the end of history would come the earthly utopia,” (Hall, 2009: 134) namely communism. Also like for Marxists, worldly heaven is true for Comte’s positivism and for National Socialists’ Nazism, for ‘progressive superman’ of Condorcet and for Islamic, Christian or Jewish Fundamentalism or scientism and so on.

Despite the fact that modernity is a completely secular Project and politics is immune from theology, not divine salvation but ‘immanent salvation’, ‘eschatology’, ‘millenarianism’ and ‘modern messianism’ were theologico-political leitmotifs of modernity and modern political theory. According to Gillespie who is the author of the book with the title, *The Theological Origins of Modernity*, the modernity project wanted to eliminate religion but in fact it developed a new view of religion or theology for society, He says that:

This opposition to religion in the modern age, however, should not be taken as a proof that its core modernity is antireligious. It is certainly true that modernity has consistently struggled against certain forms of religious doctrine and practice, including the cult of the saints, teleology, the natural law teachings of scholasticism, the geocentric vision of the natural World, and creationism.. Modernity is better understood as an attempt to find a new metaphysical/theological answer to the question of the nature and relation of God, man, and the natural World that arose in the late medieval World as a result of a titanic struggle between contradictory elements Christianity itself. Modernity as we understand and experience it, came to be as a series of attempts to constitute a new and coherent metaphysics/theology. (Gillespie, 2008: xii)

Gillespie’s arguments tell us modernity is not breaking off from the Christian tradition but it is the continuation of it in new ways. To him, old scholastic divisions continue in the new forms, for example in language but sometimes we can not apprehend this continuation clearly. For example, the division of ‘nature and supernatural’ which Enlightenment thinkers defend enthusiastically is a ‘scholastic division’ that the theologians of the Middle Ages constructed before the Age of Enlightenment.

Conclusion

The death of God, in Nietzsche, does not mean the end of the gods or liberation from God. The death of God, with Jean-luc Nancy words “involves the death of death, the negation of negation, the end of being separated from God, the divinization of Humanity, the absolutizing of its knowledge and its history” (Nancy, 1991: 110-150). If modernity and secularism produced a new form of religion – with the term of political religions, divinization of humanity, immanentization of Christian Eschaton, messianism, millenarianism, worldly apocalypse or gnosticism, Voegelin, Schmitt, Taubes, Gillespie, Löwith, Nancy and other modern thinkers argue this - we have to call rational modern Project and secularism in to question.

Once, Bruno Latour said that “we have never been secular at all”. If Post-Enlightenment thought was in fact Christian and the apocalyptic vision of Christianity was converted to modern political theory as an immanent apocalyptic vision and utopia we have to re-think on Modern Project and have to change our understanding of the human being especially one with an autonomous (human) reason. Also we have to call modern political theory, which is quasi-scientific and objective, in to question. So, not divine salvation but ‘immanent salvation’, ‘eschatology’, ‘millenarianism’ and ‘modern messianism’ are themes of modern political ideologies. For example, as Gray says, immanent salvation of scientism, worldly salvation of communist movements, quasi-democratic salvation of the Third World or Islamic, Jewish and Christian salvation of the fundamentalist movements and salvation of women that is defended by the feminist theologians imitate divine salvation of monotheist religions. After the death of God - the God of theologians, believers, and philosophers – religion return to us on its own terms or masks such as positivism, scientism, communism or fascism. We can not deny religious experiment of the messianic expectations in modern society. This is a spiritual justification of secular power.

Finally we can conclude this paper with Taubes. Taubes who was Schmitt’s pupil and admitted that reading Schmitt’s *Politische Theology* was a “turning point in his years of study”, says that we can undermine the spiritual justification of secular power not with “positive political theology” but “negative political theology” as philosophical-theological approach, because this makes us think of the link between divine and secular powers.¹ Negative political theology can alert us against secularization of paradise, the attempt to bring down the Kingdom of God to earth or against pseudomessiahs in (post) modern society.

¹ Negative political theology is a new approach in theology. For negative political theology of Taubes see Taubes Jacob, (2013) *To Carl Schmitt: Letters and Reflections*, New York: Columbia University Press. Also see, Bulhof Ilse N., Kate Laurens Ten ed. (2000), *Flight of the Gods, Philosophical Perspectives on Negative Theology*, New York: Fordham University Press. According to this book, the thinkers of the negative theology in the Middle Ages were Dionysius the Areopagite, John of the Cross, Eckhart, Anselm of Canterbury, Thomas Aquinas..

Modern Politikayı Yeniden Düşünmek: Politik Teoloji ve Politik Mesihçilik

Özet

Modern sosyal teoride entelektüeller arasındaki genel eğilim, politikayı bir “bilim” olarak teoloji, tarih gibi diğer sosyal bilim disiplinlerinden bağımsız, ayrı ve sosyal bilimlerin seküler alanına dahil olarak görme eğilimidir. Bu bildik yaklaşımın aksine günümüzde politika biliminde ve özellikle de politika felsefesinde ortaya çıkan yeni entelektüel gelişmeler ile birlikte yukarıda ifade edilen bakışın oldukça tek taraflı olduğu ve bir tür dinselliği içinde barındırdığı düşünürler tarafından ifade edilmeye başlandı. Bilhassa Alman politika filozofu Carl Schmitt’in *Politik Teoloji: Egemenlik Tasarımı Üzerine Dört Bölüm* adlı çok önemli eseri yaylandıktan hemen sonra modern devlet teorisinde kullanılan teolojik kavramlar ve Batı ideolojilerinin apokaliptik (tarihi bir aşamada durduran ve kıyametçi) yaklaşımları politik bilimcilerin ilgisini çok daha fazla çekmeye başladı. Schmitt’in eseri kendisinden kaçınılmaya çalışılan dinsel dilin modern teorilerde devam edip etmediği meselesini ele alıyordu ve Schmitt tarafından modernitedeki sekülerizm iddiasına rağmen dinsel dilin modern teoride varlığını devam ettirdiği ileri sürülüyordu. Schmitt’in söylediği üzere söz gelimi modern devlet teorisinde kadim “kadir-i mutlak Tanrı” kavramı “egemen devlet” kavramına, teolojik bir kavram olan “mucize” kavramı ise, “istisna hali” gibi modern ve politik bir kavrama dönüşüyordu. Schmitt’in “modern teorinin bütün önemli kavramlarının sekülerleşmiş teolojik kavramlar olduğu” iddiası ile birlikte bu türden ifadeler sosyal bilimler ve bilhassa da politika bilimi için meydan okuyucuydu çünkü Schmitt’in iddia ettiği üzere eğer modern devlet teorisinin bütün önemli kavramları kökeninde teolojik ise ve dinselliği barındırıyorsa bilimi dinden, felsefeyi dinden, bilgiyi inançtan, ya da bilmeyi inanmadan vb. nasıl ayırabiliriz? sorusu sosyal bilimcinin cevaplamak zorunda olduğu ve kendisinden kaçınılamayacak bir soru olacaktı. Bir diğer önemli soru da şudur: Sosyal bilimlerde objektiflik kriterimiz bu noktadan sonra ne olabilir?

Politik teoloji alanındaki gelişmelerden yola çıkarsak yukarıda ifade edilen teolojik-politik meselenin büyük ölçüde akıl/vahiy ayrımına ya da dikotomisine dayandığını ifade edebiliriz. Bu meseleyle ilgili olarak yazılarında iki önemli politika filozofu, Yahudi düşünür Leo Strauss ve Alman-Avusturyalı düşünür Eric Voegelin polemige girmişlerdir. Strauss bu ayrımı kesin olarak savunurken Voegelin bu ayrımı reddetmiş ve ikisi arasında kesin olarak bir seçim yapamayacağımızı ileri sürmüştür. Leo Strauss, yazılarında düşünürün Atina ve Kudüs arasında mutlaka bir seçim yapması gerektiğini ifade ederken Voegelin Strauss’un iddiasının aksine akıl ile vahyin karşılıklı ilişki içinde olduklarını ve dolayısıyla bunların arasında bir dikotomiye yol açacak şekilde bir ayrım yapılamayacağını ileri sürmüştür. Yalnızca Leo Strauss değil, Habermas gibi soldan gelen düşünürler de bu tartışmaya daha sonradan katılmışlardır. “Post-Seküler” terimiyle Habermas çalışmalarında dinin modern toplumdaki rolünü vurgulamıştır ve Münih’te teologlarla karşılıklı girdiği bir tartışmada akıl-inanç meselesini seküler ve dindar yurttaşların arasındaki ilişki bağlamına oturtturarak Voegelin’in yaklaşımına benzer şekilde karşılıklı bağımlılık ve ilişki ekseninde değerlendirmiştir.

Amerika'daki 11 Eylül saldırılarından sonra yalnızca Habermas değil, Alain Badiou, Slavoj Žižek gibi soldan gelen başka bazı düşünürler de kamusal alandaki din meselesine büyük önem attılar. Sosyal düşünce ve teorideki dine olan bu ilgi ve entelektüel dönüşüm, düşünürler tarafından sıkça “dine dönüş” veya “teolojiye dönüş” olarak adlandırıldı. Amerikalı bir entelektüel olan Michael Allen Gillespie'nin de çalışmasında ifade ettiği üzere söz konusu entelektüel ve politik gelişmeler, modernite projesinin bugüne kadar denenmemiş ve alışıldık olmayan bir tarzda sorgulanmasına da yol açtı.

Modern politika teorisinde bir diğer önemli teolojik-politik mesele “politik mesihçilik” meselesidir. Politik veya modern mesihçilik hareketi Hıristiyan kurtuluş teolojisinin dünyevileşmiş versiyonudur ve Tanrı Krallığı'nı bu dünyada politik olarak gerçekleştirmeyi vaat eder. Bu gayeyle modern entelektüel ilahi bir kurtuluşun değil, dünyevi kurtuluşun peşinde koşar. Bunu Comte'un pozitivism olarak yeni dininde, Condorcet'nin ilerlemeci üst-insanında ve Marx'ın komünizm teorisyle Nasyonal Sosyalizmin ari Alman ırkından oluşan üstün Alman toplumunda görebiliriz. Fransız Devrimi ertesinde, Kilise'nin kamusal alandaki gücünü yitirmesi neticesinde dinin kamusal alandan özel alana doğru çekilişyle birlikte ortaya çıkan spiritüel boşluk sözü edilen düşünürler tarafından ortaya konan politik teorilerle doldurulmak istenmiştir. Comte yeni politik dini “pozitivism”le bu krize bir çözüm bulmak isterken Marksizm ve Nasyonal Sosyalizm de Comte'la aynı saikten doğdu ve Batı'daki entelektüelleri süratle etkisi altına aldı. Yeni politik teorilerin ve akımların karakteri büyük ölçüde dinsel ve mesihçiydi. Bu teorilerde tarih “şimdiye kadarki tarih” ve “şimdiden sonraki tarih” olmak üzere ikiye bölündü ve teorilerin sahipleri tarihi indirgemeci bir anlayışla entelektüel bir inşaya dönüştürdüler. Söz gelimi Marx'a göre “tarih yalnızca sınıf çatışmalarının tarihi”ydi ve buradan hareketle anlaşılmalıydı. Eğer şimdiye kadarki tarihte hüküm süren sınıf çatışmaları ilga edilebilirse bildiğimiz şekliyle tarih son bulacak ve dünyevi bir cennet ya da ütopya başlayabilecekti. Bu aynı zamanda tarihin sonu da demektir. Tarihin sonu, yani komünist toplum. Yalnızca Marx'ın komünist toplumu değil, Comte'un pozitivist toplumu gibi Nasyonal Sosyalistlerin saf Alman ırkından oluşan gelecekteki toplumu da savunanların teorileri bu mesihçi niteliğe sahipti. Günümüzde de bilimperestlikte yahut İslamcı, Hıristiyan ve Yahudi köktenci hareketlerde bu politik mesihçi yaklaşımı, seküler kurtuluş teolojileri olarak görebiliriz. *Modernitenin Teolojik Kökenleri* adlı kitabın yazarı olan Amerikalı düşünür Gillespie'ye göre modern proje dini elimine etmek istese ve tamamen seküler bir proje olarak ortaya çıksa da ilahi değil, dünyevi kurtuluşu, eskatolojik düşünceyi, binyılcılık ve modern mesihçiliği teolojik-politik motifler olarak içinde barındırmaktadır. Yine ona göre modern politika ve modern düşünce dini elimine etmek isterken toplum için yeni bir tür din ve teolojiyi geliştirmek durumunda kalmıştır. Bu bakımdan modernite sekülerizmiyle teolojik bir sürekliliği taşımaktadır ve doğrudan doğruya teolojiden, örnek verilecek olursa söz gelimi Aydınlanma ile birlikte sıkça gündeme gelen doğal ve doğa üstü gibi ayrımlar modern ve Fransız Devrimi ertesi bulunmuş ayrımlar değil, kökeninde skolastik düşünceden alınan teolojik ayrımlardır.

Netice itibarıyla, Alman düşünür Nietzsche Tanrı'nın ölümünden bahsederken aslında Tanrı'dan tamamen özgürleştiğimizden bahsetmiyordu. Tanrı'nın ölümü ile birlikte Tanrı'nın yerini Jean-Luc Nancy'nin deyişiyle, hümanizmin kutsallaştırılması, insanın bilgisinin ve tarihinin mutlaklaştırılması almıştır. Voegelin, Schmitt, Taubes, Gillespie, Löwith, Nancy ve diğer düşünürlerin ileri

sürdüğü üzere, modernizm ve sekülerizm söylenildiği gibi – politik dinler, hümanizmin kutsallaştırılması, Hıristiyan Öte Dünya fikrinin içkinleştirilmesi ve dünyevileştirilmesi, mesihçilik, binyılcılık, dünyevi kıyamet ya da gnostisizm terimlerinden anlaşılacağı üzere - yeni bir tür din üretmiş ise rasyonel olduğu addedilen modernite projesini ve sekülerizmi tekrar sorgulamak gerekir. Bruno Latour “hiçbir zaman seküler olmadık” derken, Post-Aydınlanmacı düşüncenin gerçekte Hıristiyan olduğuna, teolojik kökenlerine ve Hıristiyanlık’ın apokaliptik vizyonuna sahip olduğuna işaret ediyordu.

Yalnızca Gillespie ve Latour değil, *Kara Ayin: Apokaliptik Din ve Ütopyanın Ölümü* kitabının yazarı John Gray’in de söylediği üzere bilimzmin dünyevi kurtuluş projesi, komünist hareketlerin dünyevi kurtuluşu, Üçüncü Dünya ülkelerinin sözde demokratikleşme vasıtasıyla kurtuluşları, Hıristiyan, Yahudi ve İslami köktencilerin kurtuluş projeleri ve nihayetinde kadınların kurtuluşunu savunan feminist teolojiler tek Tanrılı dinlerin kurtuluş projelerinin modern dönemdeki imitasyonu, yani taklididirler. Nietzsche tarafından Tanrı’nın ölümünün ilanının ertesini modern düşünürlerin teorilerinde sosyal düşünceden adeta kovulmuş olan din pozitivizm, bilimizm, komünizm ya da faşizm olarak değişik kılıklar ya da maskeler altında geri döndü. Modern toplumdaki mesihçi tecrübeyi görmezden gelmek bu manada mümkün değildir. Mesihçilik dünyevi iktidarın spiritüel olarak meşrulaştırılması anlamına gelir. Bu meseleyi değerlendirmeyi ünlü politika filozofu Alman düşünür Jacob Taubes’nin fikirlerinden hareketle bitirebiliriz. Gençliğinde Schmitt’in öğrencisi olmuş ve onun *Politik Teoloji* adlı eseriyle karşılaşmasını hayatında bir dönüm noktası olarak gören Taubes, politik teoloji ile alakalı felsefi yaklaşımında “pozitif politik teoloji”yi değil, “negatif politik teoloji”yi entelektüel bir çıkış noktası olarak görür. Negatif teoloji sayesinde politik gücün ve iktidarın spiritüel meşrulaştırılmasını tespit edebilir ve değerlendirebiliriz. Yine negatif teoloji yoluyla ilahi ve seküler güçler arasındaki ilişkiyi anlayıp dinsel ütopyayı politik eylem vasıtasıyla sekülerleştirme girişimlerinin farkına varabiliriz. En nihayetinde Taubes’ye göre negatif politik teoloji bizi öte dünyaya ait olan Tanrı Krallığı’nı modern dünyada kurma girişimlerine ve modern olduğu kadar sahte de olan günümüz mesihlerine karşı uyarıcı bir yaklaşım da olacaktır.

Anahtar Sözcükler

Modernizm, sekülerizm, din, politik teoloji, politik mesihçilik.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CRONIN Ciaran (2010), *An Awareness of What is Missing, Faith and Reason in a Post-Secular Age*, Jürgen Habermas et al., trans., Cambridge: Polity Press.
- ARTHUR Bradley, PAUL Fletcher, ed. (2009) "Introduction: On a Newly Arisen Messianic Tone in Philosophy", *Journal for Cultural Research*, 13: 3-4.
- BULHOF Ilse N. KATE Laurens Ten ed. (2000), *Flight of the Gods, Philosophical Perspectives on Negative Theology*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- GILLESPIE Michael Allen (2008), *The Theological Origins of Modernity*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- GRAY John (2007), *Black Mass: Apocalyptic Religion and the Death of Utopia*, London: Allen Lane.
- HALL, John R. (2009), *Apocalypse, From Antiquity to the Empire Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- LOWITH Karl (1950), *Meaning in History, The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History*, Chicago: Chicago Press.
- MARX Karl, ENGELS Friedrich (2008), *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow: Open Source Socialist Publishing.
- NANCY J.L. (1991) "of Divine Places", trans. M. Holland, *The Inoperative Community*, ed. P. Connor, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p.110-50.
- RATZINGER Joseph, HABERMAS Jürgen (2007), *The Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- SCHMITT, Carl (1985), *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. George Schwab, USA: The MIT Press.
- SCOTT Peter, CAVANAUGH T. William, (2004), *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- STRAUSS Leo, (1993), "The Mutual Influence of Theology and Philosophy", Peter Emberley & Barry Cooper, ed., *Faith and Political Philosophy, The Correspondence Between Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin, 1934-1964*, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- TAUBES Jacob (1982), "The Price of Messianism", *Journal of Jewish Studies*, vol.33, no:1-2, p. 595-600.
- TAUBES Jacob (2009), *Occidental Eschatology*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- TAUBES Jacob (2013), *To Carl Schmitt: Letters and Reflections*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- VOEGELIN Eric (1990a) "Gospel and Culture", *Published Essays 1966-1985, The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin*, vol.12, ed. Ellis Sandoz, Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, p. 195-196.
- VOEGELIN Eric (1990b), "Response to Professor Altizer's 'A New History and a New but Ancient God?'"', *Published Essays 1966-1985, The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin*, vol.12, ed. Ellis Sandoz, Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, p.292-294.
- VOEGELIN Eric (1975), *From Enlightenment to Revolution*, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Winterholler Helmut, (1997) "Nachwort", *Eric Voegelin, Evangelium and Kultur: Das Evangelium als Antwort*, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.