

Freedom Called into Question: Political Subjectivity in Levinas and Barth

A Dissertation Proposal

Presented to the Joint Doctoral Committee of The Iliff School of Theology and the University of  
Denver

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

Submitted by

Michael L. Laminack

January 2020

Advisor: Sarah Pessin

**Thesis: Philosopher Emmanuel Levinas and Christian theologian Karl Barth both articulate a subjectivity founded upon “freedom called into question by the Other,” which reconfigures how political theology conceives the relation between subjectivity and sovereignty.**

**Scope:**

This project pursues the topic of subjectivity in the context of political theology through a comparative analysis of philosopher Emmanuel Levinas and Christian theologian Karl Barth. Despite their disparate contexts and fields, Levinas and Barth develop similar conceptions of subjectivity that emphasize a necessary *interruption* of the subject by the Other. Both thinkers theorized subjectivity in response to the rise of Nazism and the horrors of World War II, and their experiences of social and political breakdown led both of them to diagnose autonomous subjectivity as a central problem. Levinas and Barth each address the problem of autonomy by grounding subjectivity in an interruptive encounter with the Other. For both, the subject is *not* autonomous, but is primordially constituted through an encounter with the Other that interrupts the subject. This interruptive encounter also engenders a similar approach to the political, as Levinas and Barth both emphasize ethics as a precursor for the political. Whereas the autonomous subject encounters other humans as mutual competitors participating in infinite war (a war of all against all), the asymmetrical interruption that characterizes the Levinasian/Barthian approaches orients the subject to infinite responsibility.

“Ethics as first philosophy,” as articulated by Levinas, grounds phenomenological/political subjectivity in a primordial encounter with the human Other. The project approaches Levinasian subjectivity as a continuous development from his 1934 “Reflections on the Philosophy of Hitlerism,” through his mature works *Totality and Infinity* and

*Otherwise than Being*. For Levinas, the encounter with the Other occurs asymmetrically; the Other is *above* the subject, or in a position that transcends the subject. This asymmetry is captured by the phrase “freedom called into question by the Other,” an emphasis that distances the Levinasian subject from the Western philosophical tradition of an autonomous, free subject. Because the Other is “infinite,” the Other transcends the grasp of the subject, but calls the subject to respond. In this way, the primordial encounter with the Other constitutes the subject as subject, and it is this encounter which Levinas refers to as “ethics.” With respect to politics, Levinasian subjectivity does not efface political decision, but emphasizes ethics as a necessary precursor or orientation for decision. Due to the Other’s asymmetry, as well as the relation to the “third,” the subject is infinitely responsible. This is the meaning of Levinas’s phrase “ethics is an optics” for the political; ethics is not politics, but is a necessary precursor to the political. Political decision remains absolutely necessary, but Levinasian ethics also necessitates a pause to reckon with the subject’s responsibility to the Other and the third.

Barth’s dialectical theology conceives subjectivity in a theological register, wherein the Christian deity asymmetrically interrupts the subject. The project approaches Barth’s dialectical theology as a continuous development from his post WWI writings through his mature works in the first two volumes of *Church Dogmatics*. The heart of Barth’s mature theology is his conception of “the Word of God in its threefold form.” The Word of God, in this theology, is the medium through which the subject encounters the Other (God) in an asymmetrical relation. Barth adamantly defended this asymmetrical relation in his many polemical writings against his contemporaries. Based on an asymmetrical encounter with God, Barth’s theory of the subject rejects the Protestant Liberal reliance upon autonomous subjectivity, a reliance which Barth

targeted as a key factor in his colleagues' support for Nazism. Barth theorizes the Word of God as concentric circles, with Jesus Christ at the center, followed by Christian Scriptures, and finally Church proclamation. The dialectical nature of the Word of God entails that the Word bears *both* finite humanity *and* God's self-revelation, and therefore Church proclamation (including theology, sermons, and political activity) requires *constant* scrutiny and revision in light of the infinite responsibility owed to God (and humanity, via the incarnation<sup>1</sup>). With respect to political action, the Word of God interrupts the Christian subject, such that the subject must pause and reckon with the infinite responsibility to God (and humanity) prior to political engagement. In this sense, the interruptive encounter with the Other remains a necessary precursor to politics.

### **Political Theology and the Question of Subjectivity**

The twentieth century German jurist Carl Schmitt set the stage for contemporary political theology by theorizing the relation between subjectivity and sovereignty. Schmitt, reflecting on Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan*, outlines how the concept of sovereignty immediately stems from Christian theology. Subjectivity likewise depends upon theology, since it requires sovereignty as its founding principle. When Schmitt wrote that the "sovereign is he who decides on the exception," he was addressing the breakdown of parliamentary politics in the Weimar Republic

---

<sup>1</sup> In *Church Dogmatics* II.1 and II.2, Barth expands his insights on the Word of God in its threefold form (from *CD* I.1 and I.2) to a Doctrine of God. Given Barth's emphasis on Jesus Christ as the heart of theology, Barth's doctrine of God deals with the issue of "election," or choosing of humans by God toward either certain purposes and/or eternal life. Election is a defining doctrine for Reformed theology, dating back to John Calvin. Barth critically engages Calvin, and develops an understanding of election that heavily contrasts with Calvin and traditional Reformed theology. This project considers how Barth's conception of the Word of God in its threefold form interacts with his conception of election with respect to the Christian subject. When combined, the two doctrines may suggest an asymmetrical encounter not just with the deity, but also with other humans who are understood as elect through the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

in the face of existential threat exemplified by World War I.<sup>2</sup> In popular parlance, “sovereignty,” often refers to the extent of a nation-state’s power of law. For instance, if Russian fighter planes enter Ukrainian airspace, they impinge upon the Ukraine’s national sovereignty, for it is a show of Russia’s power on Ukraine’s land. With this scenario, news articles would use the word “sovereignty” without much reflection on the theological meanings or political history of the term. When Schmitt uses the term, he includes all of these meanings, with explicit reference to the political philosophy of Hobbes.

Schmitt sought to protect the German nation-state by declaring a “sovereign” who “decides whether there is an extreme emergency as well as what must be done to eliminate it,” and it is the sovereign “who must decide whether the constitution needs to be suspended in its entirety.”<sup>3</sup> Confronted with a state of exception or emergency, the laws of the land must be suspended so that decisions can be made to protect against the dissolution of the nation-state. It is with these descriptions in mind that Schmitt states, “the classical representative of the decisionist type (if I may be permitted to coin this word) is Thomas Hobbes.”<sup>4</sup> This helps add context to Schmitt’s concern about the state of exception, in the sense that World War I represented, in a starkly real sense, “the war of all against all.” In such a scenario, deferral to universal laws (as in the constitutional-parliamentary construction), would risk the destruction of the nation-state. Schmitt situates his concern for sovereignty amidst the modern “onslaught against the political” wherein “American financiers, industrial technicians, Marxist socialists, and anarchic-syndicalist revolutionaries unite in demanding that the biased rule of politics over

---

<sup>2</sup> Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. George Schwab, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 5.

<sup>3</sup> Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 33.

unbiased economic management be done away with. There must no longer be political problems, only organizational-technical and economic-sociological tasks.”<sup>5</sup>

Chantal Mouffe extends Schmitt’s argument by interrogating the tension between the traditions of democracy and liberalism. To elaborate on this tension, Mouffe refers to Schmitt’s decisionism. According to Mouffe, “Schmitt asserts that there is an insuperable opposition between liberal individualism, with its moral discourse centred around the individual, and the democratic ideal, which is essentially political, and aims at creating an identity based on homogeneity.”<sup>6</sup> Democracy requires a determined voting body of citizens, which is the collective *demos* who exert sovereign power. From the broadest perspective, the *demos* of a given nation-state ends at its borders, and thus *necessarily* limits itself from the universal inclusion of all humanity. Schmitt argues, therefore, that liberal democracy fails because the symbolic ordering of social relations (to use Mouffe’s language), i.e., liberalism, *cannot* determine the *demos*. The necessary movement from *all* to *some* that characterizes democracy logically contradicts the liberal commitment to universal human rights. In this sense, “Schmitt highlights the fact that democracy always entails relations of inclusion-exclusion,” and Mouffe asserts that “this is a vital insight that democrats would be ill-advised to dismiss because they dislike its author.”<sup>7</sup>

The necessity of decision, from Schmitt’s perspective, proves that liberal democracy is fatally illogical, and that the symbolic system of liberalism must be abandoned. Against this view, Mouffe argues that “the liberal discourse of universal human rights plays an important role

---

<sup>5</sup> Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 65.

<sup>6</sup> Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 39.

<sup>7</sup> Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 43.

in maintaining the democratic contestation,”<sup>8</sup> which requires a view of “democratic paradox.” Schmitt is right to emphasize the illogic of liberal democracy, but he is wrong when he asserts that it is *necessarily* fatal. Mouffe asserts that “Schmitt presents us with a false dilemma: either there is a unity of the people,” which necessitates exclusion of others, “or some forms of division inside the *demos* are considered legitimate,” which institutes the pluralism that dismantles unity.<sup>9</sup> Mouffe instead proposes “to refuse Schmitt’s dilemma, while acknowledging his argument for the need of some form of ‘homogeneity’ in a democracy,” in order to show that “the compatibility of pluralism and liberal democracy requires... putting into question any idea of ‘the people’ as already given, with a substantive identity.”<sup>10</sup> In this sense, the tension between liberal universality and democratic particularity remain in a paradoxical tension, where neither system dominates and political decision remains contestable.

### **Freedom Called into Question**

This project pursues Levinasian-Barthian subjectivity under the overarching themes of political theology introduced by Schmitt and rearticulated by Mouffe as democratic paradox. Through a shared emphasis on “freedom called into question by the Other,” Levinas and Barth theorize subjectivity which affirms Schmitt’s political decision without abandoning the ethical deliberation that characterizes liberalism. Through this articulation of freedom, Levinas and Barth contribute a critical departure from philosophical conceptions of freedom, particularly with respect to autonomy. The language of “freedom called into question” comes from a section title in Levinas’s *Totality and Infinity*. Levinas writes, “To welcome the Other is to put in question

---

<sup>8</sup> Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 10.

<sup>9</sup> Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 54.

<sup>10</sup> Mouffe, *The Democratic Paradox*, 55.

my freedom,”<sup>11</sup> and he elaborates: “The relationship with the Other does not move (as does cognition) into enjoyment and possession, into freedom; the Other imposes himself as an exigency that dominates this freedom; and hence as more primordial than everything that takes place in me.”<sup>12</sup> Levinas’s articulation of freedom called into question presents a fundamental reimagination of philosophical subjectivity. The Levinasian subject is not autonomous, but is dependent upon encounter with the Other for the subject’s own substantiation. Whereas subjectivity grounded in cognition might seek to enjoy and/or possess the Other, the Other incessantly *exceeds* the grasp of the Levinasian subject. In this sense, the Other is *infinite*; the subject desires the Other, but “it is a desire that can not be satisfied.”<sup>13</sup> The infinite exceeds the grasp of totality that defines the autonomous subject.

For Barth, freedom called into question by the Other fundamentally shapes his theology. Barth writes in the preface to the second edition of his commentary on Romans, “If I have a ‘system,’ then it consists in my keeping in mind as constantly as possible what Kierkegaard called the ‘infinite qualitative difference’ between time and eternity, in its negative and its positive meaning. ‘God is in heaven, and thou on earth.’”<sup>14</sup> Barth’s theology affirms the infinite qualitative distinction between God and humanity, and therefore affirms God as wholly Other. It is this commitment, in part, that drove Barth to distance himself from his Liberal Protestant colleagues. The Liberal Protestantism of the time was shaped by Friedrich Schleiermacher’s theology, which responded to rationalist attacks on Christian belief and practice by founding theology upon human religious experience. For Schleiermacher, humans must have a capacity

---

<sup>11</sup> Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: an Essay on Exteriority*, (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2013), 85.

<sup>12</sup> Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 87.

<sup>13</sup> Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 34.

<sup>14</sup> James M. Robinson, ed., *The Beginnings of Dialectic Theology*, (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1968), 94.



for knowing God, and the ability to fulfill God's laws in response. The shortcoming of this theology, as Barth eventually determines, is that revelation falls under autonomous human control. All forms of authority, whether biblical or ecclesial, bow before individual human experience. Out of these concerns, Barth develops his mature theory of "the Word of God in its threefold form," which maintains a dialectic between God as Wholly Other and the human capacity to respond. Thus, in all aspects of life, including theological reflection as well as political praxis, God calls into question the Christian subject, and commands a response from the subject that reflects the prior encounter with the deity.

### **Levinas and Barth in Historical Context**

Another central point of comparison for Levinas and Barth is their experience of World War II and the atrocities of the Third Reich. Levinas and Barth both actively resisted Adolf Hitler's National Socialism, both broke ties with colleagues who supported Nazi power, and both sought answers to the theoretical problems that preempted Hitler's rise to power. Levinas fought for the French Army, and narrowly survived detainment in a Nazi prisoner of war camp. Most of his extended family were exterminated in death camps, while his immediate family were protected by his academic colleagues. Nazi atrocities profoundly impacted Levinas's life and scholarship, but his theoretical engagement with Nazi antisemitism predated the holocaust. In his 1934 essay "Reflections on the Philosophy of Hitlerism," Levinas argues that political liberalism fails to account for human embodiment, a failure which invites and encourages the development of the racial determinism exemplified by Hitlerism. Autonomy obscures embodiment by rejecting any limiting authority over the subject, which problematizes the subject's involvement in religious, cultural, or familial community. While rejection of these authorities can lead to

positive outcomes (for instance, the freedom to interrogate traditional values and practices), wholesale rejection of those authorities paradoxically encourages assent to deterministic theories. The overarching purpose of Levinas's philosophy is to address this failure within Western political philosophy, and to conceive of a subjectivity that does not encourage assent to determinism (racial or otherwise).

Levinas develops his ethical philosophy, which culminates in his mature works *Totality and Infinity* and *Otherwise Than Being*, as a correction to the breakdown of political liberalism. Freedom called into question by the Other problematizes not only autonomous subjectivity, but also the intricate systems of ethics and politics grounded in autonomy. Ultimately, Levinas's ethical philosophy suggests a paradoxical political practice that recognizes the excedence of the Other. The Other exceeds the boundaries of any and every ethico-political situation, such that every political decision must eschew totality or finality. This is what Levinas means when he states that "ethics is an 'optics,'" <sup>15</sup> for the political. There can be no one-to-one calculus of ethics to politics from the standpoint of Levinasian ethics, given the excedence of the Other.

Barth was a central figure in the *Kirchenkampf*, or the struggle between the Third Reich and the Confessing Church (a coalition of churches who resisted ecclesial Nazi control). Barth's role in the *Kirchenkampf* reveals the driving orientation of Barthian theological subjectivity toward political praxis, which is an often overlooked aspect of Barth's theology. The importance of political praxis for Barth's theology is partly revealed through his infamous dispute with fellow dialectical theologian Emil Brunner. One of the terminal differences between Brunner and Barth is Barth's emphasis on concrete political praxis as a necessary component of theology.

---

<sup>15</sup> Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 23.

Brunner's lack of concern for political praxis allows him to address natural theology without respect to the political context of the time, during which a faction of Nazi-supporting church leaders were gaining power. This growing faction referred to themselves as the "German Christians"<sup>16</sup> (*Deutsche Christen*). As has been noted elsewhere,<sup>17</sup> Barth directly references the German Christians five times throughout *Nein!*, a point that should draw attention to the political context of Barth's argument. Barth's theology is often misread as an attempt to respritate Christian theology to a premodern or precritical state. Barth's reply to Brunner, often used to support such misreadings of Barth, in fact exemplifies Barth's intention to actively correct pre- and post-reformation theological mistakes that lead to catastrophic political consequences. At the outset of his response, Barth asserts that "the real danger seems to me to lie in a future attitude of the Church and of theology which is informed by the spirit of many on both sides to-day who are undecided and ready for compromise."<sup>18</sup> The word "compromise" reveals the political dimension of Barth's theological interest. While due emphasis has been given to the theological dimension of Barth's argument, it is crucial to recognize that *the political and theological dimensions are directly interrelated*. For Barth, theology *must* recognize its political ramifications, and indeed shape how the Christian subject orients herself to the political. In the

---

<sup>16</sup> Arthur C. Cochrane, *The Church's Confession Under Hitler*, (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962), 9. Cochrane details the actions of the Confessing Church, a group of church leaders who stood against the German Christians and Hitler. Barth was a driving force of the Confessing Church.

<sup>17</sup> Jordan J. Ballor, "The Aryan Clause, the Confessing Church, and the Ecumenical Movement: Barth and Bonhoeffer on Natural Theology, 1933–1935," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 3 (August 2006): 263–80. Ballor writes, "In a very concrete and important way, then, Barth saw the Barmen Declaration as a sort of confessional companion piece or expression of his position contra Brunner. And it is on this point that he ventures further than Bonhoeffer in his understanding of the declaration. For Barth, the declaration, 'taken seriously, contained in itself a purifying of the Church not only from the concretely new point at issue but from all natural theology'." In a footnote, Ballor adds that "Barth makes explicit reference to the German Christians five times in his angry reply to Brunner."

<sup>18</sup> Brunner and Barth, *Natural Theology*, 68.

same sense that ethics is an optics for the political for Levinas, theology is an optics for the political in Barth's understanding.

Barth clearly articulates the interrelation of theology and politics when he describes how, "ever since about 1916, when I began to recover noticeably from the liberal-political pre-war theology, my opinion concerning the task of our theological generation has been this: we must learn again to understand revelation as *grace* and *grace as revelation* and therefore turn away from all 'true' or 'false' *theologia naturalis*." Barth's rejection of natural theology reflects a theological *and* political response to modern theology and the experiences of World War I. From Barth's perspective, any commitment to natural theology invites a theology of compromise which submits the authority of Christ to the authority of the State. The German Christians, in their avid support of Hitler's National Socialism, are simply another product of such compromise. No matter Brunner's personal political stance regarding the German Christians (he did not support the movement), it is clear that the German Christians welcomed Brunner's arguments as a boon for their own stance. As Barth notes, "the loud applause of K. Fezer, O. Weber, P. Althaus and all the other half- or three-quarter 'German Christians' was the thanks [Brunner] earned for this."<sup>19</sup> Brunner's defense of natural theology reaffirmed the groundwork for German Christian support of National Socialism.

### **Barthian/Levinasian Subjectivity and Political Theology**

Freedom called into question by the Other rearticulates subjectivity in a manner that corresponds to Mouffe's democratic paradox. The primordial encounter with the Other calls into question the autonomous self, as well as any political system founded upon that self. Comparison

---

<sup>19</sup> Brunner and Barth, *Natural Theology*, 72.

of Levinas and Barth therefore contributes a political subjectivity that corresponds to the inclusion/exclusion paradox theorized by Mouffe via Schmitt. Levinasian ethics and Barthian theology both produce a subjectivity that elicits a “paradoxical orientation” toward political praxis. It is an “orientation” because it is not a defined praxis, and it is “paradoxical” because the ethical deliberation remains indeterminate (unlike ethical systems or absolute norms). For Levinas, ethics is an “optics” for the political, meaning that the ethical encounter with the Other does not and cannot lead to a static politics. Levinasian subjectivity orients a “paradoxical” ethics which eschews universal laws or normative values. Ethical-political decisions depend upon encounter with the Other, as well as the third (the Other’s Other), and therefore cannot claim finality or universal systematization. In a similar fashion, Barth develops an ethics through a dialectical ecclesiology. The emphasis on “dialectics” emphasizes the persistent calling into question of the Church by God. Barth rearticulates Protestant (in this case, Reformed) doctrines, including that of election, in a way that substantiates a calling into question by God as well as the human Other. Barth’s rearticulation of Christian ethics also eschews universal laws and normative values, since assertion of such universals by humans would negate the infinite qualitative distinction. Barthian ethics are fundamentally dialectical, and therefore can be considered “paradoxical.” In the same sense that ethics is an optics, Barth’s theology likewise substantiates paradoxical orientation towards political praxis.

### **Methodology**

This project pursues the nexus of subjectivity and politics through an analysis of subjectivity in the ethical philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas and the dialectical theology of Karl Barth. In order to trace the continuous development of Levinasian subjectivity, the project begins

with the “Reflections on the Philosophy of Hitlerism” essay, and works through the early works *On Escape* and *Existence and Existents* through the mature *Totality and Infinity* and *Otherwise Than Being*. The project will also engage secondary texts on Levinas from Sarah Pessin, Leora Batnitzky, Simon Critchley, Robert Bernasconi, and others. The analysis of Levinasian subjectivity will establish: 1) Levinas’s criticism of liberalism and autonomous subjectivity; 2) Levinas’s development through the concepts of “escape” and “hypostasis”; 3) Levinas’s mature subjectivity as “ethics,” “freedom called into question by the Other,” ethics as an “optics” for the political, and the subject’s relation to the third. Together, these concepts provide the basis for “paradoxical orientation” toward the political.

With respect to Barth, the project focuses on his writings during the interwar period, through his mature theology in volumes I and II of the *Church Dogmatics*. The analysis will also emphasize Barth’s writings against Nazism in the Church, through texts such as *The Church and the Political Problem of our Day*, *Against the Stream*, *Word of God and Word of Man*, *The Epistle to the Romans* commentary, as well as his engagements with the other dialectical theologians. Analysis of Barth will engage with the secondary research of Bruce McCormack and George Hunsinger and some of their students, including Amy Marga, Kimlyn Bender, and Sigurd Baark. The analysis of Barth’s theological subjectivity will establish: 1) Barth’s criticism of liberalism and autonomous subjectivity; 2) Barth’s development of dialectical theology in light of political praxis; 3) Barth’s mature doctrines of the Word of God and Election, with emphasis on how these concepts orient the Barthian subject toward politics.

In order to establish the connection between subjectivity and politics, the project relies on key insights from the field of political theology. The texts utilized include Thomas Hobbes’s

*Leviathan* and Carl Schmitt's *Political Theology*. More recent texts will include Chantal Mouffe's *Democratic Paradox* and Alain Badiou's *Theory of the Subject*, among others.

## **Rationale**

This project seeks to contribute to the understanding of political subjectivity for political theology and political philosophy. Whether or not it is recognized as such, political subjectivity is a key issue at the heart of the contemporary political tumult. It is disturbing, yet unsurprising, that multiple Western democracies trended toward ethno-nationalism in the years following the 2008 financial crisis (as evidenced by the UK "Brexit," the 2016 U.S. presidential election, and the 2018 Brazil presidential election, among other examples). The importance of this research is to contribute to a critical correction to the conception of political subjectivity in Western democracy in order to avoid the turn to nationalism and racism in the face of crises.

## **Chapter Outline:**

- 1. Staging the Problem: Autonomy, Hitlerism, and the Breakdown of Political Liberalism**
- 2. A Brief History of Autonomy**
- 3. Escaping Autonomy: Levinas and Ethics as First Philosophy**
- 4. Dialectical Theology and the Infinite Qualitative Distinction**
- 5. The Paradoxical Ethics of Freedom Called in Question**
- 6. Paradoxical Ethics and Neoliberalism**

## **Statement of Bibliographic Method**

Sources for this project have been assembled through searches at the libraries of the University of Denver, the Iliff School of Theology, and Baylor University. Databases searched include

Philosopher's Index, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, ATLA Religion, and PhilPapers. Searches through Google Scholar were also performed. Keyword searches included: philosophical subjectivity, political subjectivity, political subject, emmanuel levinas, emmanuel levinas AND subjectivity, levinas AND heidegger, levinas AND immanuel kant, levinas AND kant (after attending a lecture on literature review at the University of Denver Anderson Commons, I learned how to search for references to Kant in the writings of Levinas), martin heidegger, rudolf bultmann, heidegger AND bultmann, levinas AND Barth, karl barth AND political subjectivity, karl barth AND subjectivity, karl barth politics, karl barth socialism, karl barth AND other, karl barth ethics, karl barth barmen declaration, karl barth nazi, karl barth heidegger, karl barth And rudolf bultmann, karl barth AND emil brunner, karl barth AND friedrich gogarten, zwischen den zeiten, barth zwischen den zeiten. I have also made extensive use of the bibliographies in Hunsinger's *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*, as well as Bruce McCormack's *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology*.



## Provisional Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- . *The Kingdom and the Glory: For A Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government*. Translated by Lorenzo Chiesa (with Matteo Mandarini). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Barth, Karl. *The German Church Struggle: Tribulation and Promise*. Kulturkampf Association, 1938.
- . *How I Changed My Mind*. Edinburgh, UK: Saint Andrew Press, 1969.
- . *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day*. 1st edition. New York, NY: Scribner, 1939.
- . *Community, State, and Church: Three Essays*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1960.
- . *Church Dogmatics, Vol 1.1, Sections 1-7: The Doctrine of the Word of God, Study Edition 1*. New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Batnitzky, Leora. *Idolatry and Representation: The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig Reconsidered*. Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- . *Leo Strauss and Emmanuel Levinas: Philosophy and the Politics of Revelation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Bender, Kimlyn J. *Confessing Christ for Church and World: Studies in Modern Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014.
- . “Søren Kierkegaard and Karl Barth: Reflections on a Relation and a Proposal for Future Investigation.” *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 17 (3), 2015.: 296–318.

- Bergo, B.G. *Levinas between Ethics and Politics: For the Beauty that Adorns the Earth*. New York, NY: Springer, 1999.
- Bernasconi, Robert. "Heidegger and the Invention of the Western Philosophical Tradition," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 26 (1995): 240–54.
- . "Opening the Future: The Paradox of Promising in the Hobbesian Social Contract," *Philosophy Today* 41 (1997): 77–86.
- . "The Violence of the Face: Peace and Language in the Thought of Levinas," *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 23, 6 (1997): 81–93.
- . "The Third Party: Levinas on the Intersection of the Ethical and the Political," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 30 (1999): 76-87.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Liberal and Anti-Jewish." In *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann*, 20:373–411. Studies in Jewish History and Culture, 2009.
- Busch, Eberhard. *Karl Barth: His life from letters and autobiographical texts*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1976.
- . "The Covenant of Grace Fulfilled in Christ as the Foundation of the Indissoluble Solidarity of the Church with Israel: Barth's Position on the Jews During the Hitler Era." <http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~ebusch/princeton.pdf>, n.d.
- Busch, Eberhard, and Martin Rumscheidt. "'Doing Theology as If Nothing Had Happened'—The Freedom of Theology and the Question of Its Involvement in Politics." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 16, no. 4 (December 1, 1987): 459–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000842988701600408>.

- Butler, Judith. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2005.
- Cahill, Charlie. "Rescuing the Individual: The Kierkegaard Renaissance in Weimar Germany." ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2016.
- <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1797588608/?pq-origsite=primo>.
- Caygill, Howard. *Levinas and the Political*. Philadelphia, PA: Routledge, 2005.
- Cochrane, Arthur C. *The Church's Confession Under Hitler*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962.
- Congdon, David W. "Is Bultmann a Heideggerian Theologian?" *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 70 (1), 2017: 19–38.
- Critchley, Simon. *The Faith of the Faithless: Experiments in Political Theology*. New York, NY: Verso Books, 2012.
- . *Infinitely Demanding: Ethics of Commitment, Politics of Resistance*. New York, NY: Verso Books, 2014.
- . *The Problem With Levinas*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- . *Specters of Marx: The State of Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*. Translated by Peggy Kamuf. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.
- . *The Gift of Death & Literature in Secret*. 2nd Edition. University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- . *Acts of Religion*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Trouble With Strangers: A Study of Ethics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 2009.

- Gibbs, Robert. *Correlations in Rosenzweig and Levinas*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Hand, Séan. *Emmanuel Levinas*. Routledge Critical Thinkers. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.
- Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A. V. Miller and J. N. Findlay. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- . *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*. Translated by H.B. Nisbett. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Held, Shai. “The Promise and Peril of Jewish Barthianism: The Theology of Michael Wyschogrod.” *Modern Judaism* 25 (3), 2005a.: 316–26.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*. Edited by Michael Oakeshott. 8th ed. New York: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1971.
- Horowitz Asher and Gad Horowitz, Editors. *Difficult Justice: Commentaries on Levinas and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Hunsinger, George. *Karl Barth and Radical Politics*. 2nd Edition. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017.
- . *Karl Barth, the Jews, and Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018.
- Johnson, William Stacy. *The Mystery of God: Karl Barth and the Postmodern Foundations of Theology*. 1st Edition. Columbia Series in Reformed Theology. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- . “God’s Ordering, Providing, and Caring for the World: Grace as ‘Gift of Death.’” *Theology Today* 54 (1), 1997: 29–42.

- . “Rethinking Theology: A Postmodern, Post-Holocaust, Post-Christendom Endeavor.”  
*Interpretation* 55 (1), 2001: 5–18.
- Laclau, Ernesto. *On Populist Reason*. London, England: Verso, 2005.
- Lehmann, Paul L. “Karl Barth, Theologian of Permanent Revolution.” *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 28, no. 1 (1972): 67–81.  
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lsdar&AN=ATLA0000737890&site=ehost-live>.
- Lettini, Gabriella. “The ‘Allergy to the Other’: Christian Theology and Its ‘others’ in Modern Western Theological Discourses.” ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2004.  
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/305134178/?pq-origsite=primo>.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. "Reflections on the Philosophy of Hitlerism." Translated by Seán Hand.  
*Critical Inquiry* 17, no. 1 (1990): 62-71.
- . *Difficult Freedom: Essays on Judaism*. Translated by Sean Hand. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- . *Existence and Existents*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis, forward by Robert Bernasconi. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2001.
- . *On Escape*. Translated by Bettina Bergo. Introduced and Annotated by Jacques Rolland. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- . *Totality and Infinity: an Essay on Exteriority*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2013.
- . *Otherwise than Being, or, Beyond Essence*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2016.

- Mangina, Joseph L. *Karl Barth : Theologian of Christian Witness*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- McCormack, Bruce L. *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development, 1909-1936*. New York, NY: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- . *Orthodox and Modern: Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *The Democratic Paradox*. New York, NY: Verso, 2000.
- Novak, David. "Karl Barth on Divine Command: A Jewish Response." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 54 (4), 2001: 463–83.
- Oshima, Sueo. "Theology and History in Karl Barth: A Study of the Theology of Karl Barth in Reference to the Philosophy of Martin Heidegger." ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 1970. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/302460164/?pq-origsite=primo>.
- Pessin, Sarah. "From Mystery to Laughter to Trembling Generosity: Agono-Pluralistic Ethics in Connolly v. Levinas (& the Possibilities for Atheist-Theist Respect)," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, November 2016.
- . "America's Love Problem: How Oprah's Call to Friendship Feeds Bannon's Call to Racism (or: On Three Strains of Liberal Lovesickness)." *Political Theology Network*, August 13, 2018. <https://politicaltheology.com/americas-love-problem/>.
- . *Trembling Agency: Levinas' Phenomenology of Pause and Pardon*. (Forthcoming).
- Podmore, Simon. "The Anatomy of the Abyss: Kierkegaard, Modernity and the Self before God." ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2005.
- <http://search.proquest.com/docview/301666987/?pq-origsite=primo>.

- Raschke, Carl A. *The End of Theology*. Revised Edition. Aurora, CO: Davies Group, 2000.
- . *Force of God : Political Theology and the Crisis of Liberal Democracy*. Insurrections. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2015.
- . *Critical Theology : Introducing an Agenda for an Age of Global Crisis*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016.
- Rashkover, Randi. *Revelation and Theopolitics: Barth, Rosenzweig, and the Politics of Praise*. New York, NY: T&T Clark International, 2005.
- Robinson, James M., Editor. *The Beginnings of Dialectic Theology*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1968.
- Root, Andrew. “Practical Theology as Social Ethical Action in Christian Ministry: Implications from Emmanuel Levinas and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.” *International Journal of Practical Theology* 10 (1), 2006: 53–75.
- Rosenzweig, Franz. *The Star of Redemption*. Translated by Barbara E. Galli. University of Madison, WI: Wisconsin Press, 2005.
- Schmitt, Carl. *The Concept of the Political: Expanded Edition*. Translated by George Schwab. University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- . *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Translated by George Schwab. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005 (1922).
- Smith, Steven. 1980. *The Argument to the Other : Reason beyond Reason in the Thought of Karl Barth and Emmanuel Levinas*. American Academy of Religion Academy Series ; No. 42. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

Vries, Hent de. "The Kierkegaardian Moment: Dialectical Theology and Its Aftermath." *MLN Bulletin* 128 (5), 2013: 1083–1114.

Vries, Hent de and Lawrence E. Sullivan, Editors. *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-Secular World*. New York, NY: Fortress Press, 2006.

Westphal, Merold. *Postmodern Philosophy and Christian Thought*. Edited by Merold Westphal. Indiana Series in the Philosophy of Religion. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999.