



BULLETIN

of

The North American Paul Tillich Society

Volume XXXI, Number 4

Fall 2005

Religious Studies Department
336 Bannan Hall

Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, CA 95053

Editor: Frederick J. Parrella, Secretary-Treasurer, NAPTS

Telephone: 408.554.4714

FAX: 408.554.2387

Email: fparrella@scu.edu

Website: www.NAPTS.org

In this issue:

- Annual NAPTS Meeting: Schedule and Banquet Information
- Report of the Tillich Collected Works Project Committee
- "Paul Tillich and Capital Punishment: The Meaning of Power" by Anne Marie Reijnen
- On the Calendar

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NORTH AMERICAN PAUL TILlich SOCIETY

The following schedule includes three parts: (1) sessions of the NAPTS on Friday, November 18, 2005; (2) information about the annual banquet on Friday night; (3) the schedule of the American Academy of Religion Group, "Tillich: Issues in Theology, Religion and Culture."

Bring your Bulletin to the meeting with you for handy reference. Locations are subject to change.

NAPTS SESSIONS AND BANQUET

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2005

9:00 – 10:45 AM (A18–8)

Loews Philadelphia Hotel

Commonwealth A2

Theme: Tillich on Symbolism

Christopher Rodkey, Drew University

Presiding

Donald Dreisbach, Northern Michigan University

Tillich's Symbols and Christology: A Failure of

Nerve?

Robison James, University of Richmond
*Symbol Early and Late: Continuity and
Discontinuity between the German and
American Tillich*

Stephen Murray, Skidmore College
Paul Tillich and the Wrath of God

11:00 AM – 1:15 PM (A18–9)

Loews Philadelphia Hotel

Commonwealth C

Theme: The Early Tillich

Terry O'Keeffe, University of Ulster, Northern
Ireland

Presiding

Jean Richard, University of Laval

Philosophy of History in Tillich's Early Writings

Doris Lax, University of Heidelberg

The Tillich of the Years 1911-1913

Christian Danz, Institute of Systematic Theology,
University of Vienna

The Influence of Schelling's Philosophy of History on Paul Tillich's Early Theology of History

Matthew Lon Weaver, University of Pittsburgh
Religion and Nationalism: Tillich's First World War Chaplaincy Sermons

2:00 – 3:45 PM (A18–52)

**Loews Philadelphia Hotel
Commonwealth A2**

Theme: Tillich and Religious Knowledge

John Thatamanil, Vanderbilt University

Presiding

Mary Ann Stenger, University of Louisville

Experience's Role in Religious Knowledge

David H. Nikkel, University of North Carolina at Pembroke

The Mystical Formation of Paul Tillich

Tabea Rösler, Princeton Theological Seminary

"You Never See with the Eyes Only":

Reconfiguring Paul Tillich's Concept of Personhood

4:00 – 6:30 PM (A18–108)

**Loews Philadelphia Hotel
Commonwealth A2**

Theme: Paul Tillich and Public Theology

Matthew Lon Weaver, University of Pittsburgh,

Presiding

Laura Thelander, Princeton Theological Seminary

Tillich's Ecclesiology as a Source for Public Theology

Jeffrey Keuss, Seattle Pacific School of Theology

Unmoving Movement: Evangelical Worship after the "Emerging Church" and Neo-Correlational Theology

Todd Mei, University of Kent at Canterbury

Paul Tillich and the Ontological Foundation of Freedom and Destiny

Thomas Bandy, Guelph, Ontario

"Is That a Prayer?" The Possibility of Worship in Tillich's Theology of Culture and the Reality of Worship in Postmodern Mission

North American Paul Tillich Society

Annual Banquet (A18–109)

7:00 – 10:00 pm

**Sotto Varalli, Booth Room
231 South Broad Street**

Our distinguished guest speaker:

Ronald H. Stone of the University of Pittsburgh
Address: "Reinie and Paulus: Allied Public Theologians."

The cost of the banquet is \$50 and may be paid in advance or at the banquet. If you pay at the banquet, please bring a check with the exact cost of the banquet with you.

Please make reservations by contacting:

Prof. Frederick Parrella

Religious Studies Department

Santa Clara University

Santa Clara, CA 95053

408-554-4714

[<fparrella@scu.edu>](mailto:fparrella@scu.edu)

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2005

7:00 – 8:30 AM (A19–31)

**Philadelphia Marriott Downtown
Room 304**

North American Paul Tillich Society Board of Directors Meeting

11:45 AM – 12:45 PM (A19–35)

**Philadelphia Marriott Downtown
Room 306**

North American Paul Tillich Society Annual Business Meeting

Matthew Lon Weaver, President

Presiding

**AAR GROUP
TILlich: ISSUES IN THEOLOGY, RELIGION,
AND CULTURE**

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2005

1:00 PM – 3:30 PM (A19-74)

Convention Center 104

Tillich: Issues in Theology, Religion, and Culture Group and Theology and Continental Philosophy Group

Theme: Interrogating Ontotheology: Tillich, Heidegger, Marion, and Caputo

Mary Ann Stenger, University of Louisville

Presiding

Russell Manning, University of Cambridge
*Beyond Being: Tillich, Marion, and Caputo on
 Why God Does Not Exist*

Martin Gallagher, University of Kansas
Tillich and Heidegger on Being

Mario Costa, Drew University
*God-Less Thinking: The Question of Onto-
 Theology in Heidegger and Tillich*

Anthony J. Godzieba, Villanova University
Responding

Saturday, Saturday, November 19, 12005

4:00 PM – 6:30 PM (A19-124)

Convention Center 104B

**Tillich: Issues in Theology, Religion, and Culture
 Group**

Theme: **Public Theology and Democracy**

Darlene Fozard Weaver, Villanova University
Presiding

Marc Krell, University of Arizona
*Constructing a Public Theology: Tillich and
 Buber's Movement beyond Protestant and
 Jewish Boundaries in Weimar Germany*

Jonathan Rothchild, Loyola Marymount University
*Confronting the Powers: Tillich, Stout, and West
 on Democratic Principles and Procedures*

Loye Ashton, Millsaps College
*Christofascism in America: A Tillichian
 Analysis of Christian Reconstructionism*

**REPORT OF THE TILlich COLLECTED
 WORKS PROJECT COMMITTEE**

Dear Colleagues,

At its annual meeting in November, 2004, the Society appointed Mary Ann Stenger Chair of the Tillich Collected Works Project (TCWP). Mary Ann asked Fred Parrella, Ron Stone, John Thatamanil, and me, Sharon Burch, to constitute a work group.

In June of 2005, Mary Ann convened a meeting of the work group in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Although John Thatamanil and Ron Stone were not able to come, Fred Parrella and I joined her for four days of productive work with material from the Til-

Guy Hammond, Virginia Tech Emeritus
*Does the Road of Providence Lead to Freedom?
 George W. Bush, Paul Tillich, and the Theology
 of History*

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 20 2005

4:00 PM – 6:30 PM (A20-124)

Convention Center 106B

**Tillich: Issues in Theology, Religion, and Culture
 Group**

Theme: **God, Being, and God beyond Being**

Robison B. James, University of Richmond, Baptist
 Theological Seminary at Richmond
Presiding

John J. Thatamanil, Vanderbilt University
*Why Tillich Is Not (Just) an Ontotheologian:
 Tillich's Indebtedness to Apophatic Theology*

Lois Malcolm, Luther Seminary
*Mystical and Prophetic: Tillich's Theology of
 the God beyond God Reconsidered*

John C. M. Starkey, Oklahoma City University
God, Being, Tillich, and Neville

John D. Caputo, Syracuse University
Responding

AAR Group Business Meeting

Presiding:

Robison B. James, University of Richmond, Baptist
 Theological Seminary at Richmond
 Mary Ann Stenger, University of Louisville

lich Archive, housed in the Andover-Harvard Library at Harvard Divinity School. We are grateful to Bill Crout who kindly arranged for us to stay in Lowell House, just outside Harvard Yard, and with whom we enjoyed sharing several meals with during our stay. Our work went well, as we shared different areas of in-depth knowledge of Tillich's works, and we were able to lay out ten 600-750-page volumes, based on a chronological organization and a preliminary effort to be inclusive of most writings. We did the initial planning for at least two more volumes.

We created an the outline of the materials that we know will be included in the volumes. We also have a group of selected manuscripts to translate or check. For example, there were handwritten drafts in the Archive boxes that may be the initial text of articles later assigned a title and published. In addition,

there were typescripts that could be the text for an article that appeared in this collection or that one. We have taken on the task of determining if these drafts are identical to the published text or were edited before publication. A number of drafts, both handwritten and typed, are undated. Archivists have organized them by assigning dates arrived at through educated guess work. We have decided to do all that we can to confirm their chronological place by assessing the thrust of the scholarship, language of composition, and our general knowledge of the Tillich corpus.

We worked pretty much non-stop for the four

days, but our spirits were high because we could see definite progress. We are keenly aware that even with the time that we dedicated to the endeavor, we barely scratched the surface of what needs to be done. We did set basic principles for deciding what to include or not, tentative criteria for volume editors, and beginning editorial decisions, with more details on those to be presented at the annual meeting in November, 2005.

A major issue is the question of support for this project. Augsburg-Fortress, the press we expect to publish the collected works, suggested that we think of expenses for the entire project in the range of \$300,000 to \$400,000. Their estimate is based on the costs of the Bonhoeffer project, a collected works project that has some similarity to our endeavor. For example, it was necessary to hire translators for the Bonhoeffer German texts, both to check the fidelity of the extant translations and to make sure English equivalencies to German phrases were consistent throughout the translated materials. The scholars working on the Bonhoeffer project found that the work required a general editor in addition to volume editors. These scholars received a stipend for their work. The press has told us that they are prepared to pay for one-time publishing rights for those parts of the Tillich corpus currently under contract with other publishers. Other than that, we are on our own to raise funds.

We have already begun our review of possible funding sources. Your wholehearted support of the project could be made evident by way of a contribution. Checks should be made out to NAPTS and sent to Fred Parrella at Santa Clara University.

Sincerely,

Sharon P. Burch

ADDITIONAL NOTE FROM SHARON BURCH
ON HER WORK IN INVESTIGATING
A SPECIFIC TEXT

Our work in Cambridge this summer consisted of digging through several extensive bibliographies. We found ourselves sometimes at a loss to identify the provenance of a document. There were a number of articles listed that were short, sometimes less than a page. Often we had no context to help us determine how important this comment might be, what it pertained to and how it related to the body of Tillich's work.

Each of us took home a number of citations to investigate. One that ended up in my pile was entitled "Was Soll Mit Deutschland Geschehen?" It was included in Volume 13 of the *Gesammelte Werke*, and there I found its subtitle to be "a) Gegen Emil Ludwig Neueste Rede."

Two things piqued my interest in this short piece. One was that a quick read revealed that Tillich's language was straightforward and uncompromising. Tillich did not soften his critique with the qualifications that often characterize his interchanges. The second was that I couldn't make sense of the English title of Ludwig's article, "Ludwig Asks Fight on German People." It was one of two English phrases in the piece, and it sounded like one of my more awkward translations from the German! Upon further research, Wikipedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org>) revealed that Emil Ludwig was born Emil Cohn in 1881, in Breslau. He moved to Switzerland in 1906, and during World War I worked as a foreign correspondent for the *Berliner Tageblatt* in Vienna and Istanbul. He studied law, but chose a career in writing, and became famous during the 1920s when he produced biographies that combined historical fact, fiction, and psychological analysis. His biography of Goethe was the first to appear, and was widely translated, as was his biography of Bismarck. He became a Swiss citizen in 1932, and emigrated to the US in 1940. After the end of World War II and his return to Switzerland, he went to Germany as a journalist, and is credited with retrieval of Goethe's and Schiller's coffins, which had disappeared from Weimar 1943/44. He died in 1948 in Switzerland.

On July 6, 1942, the comments to which Tillich replied appeared in the *New York Times*. I found a copy of the article, which was indeed entitled "Ludwig Asks Fight on 'German People'," but as you can see, the phrase "German people" is in secondary quotes. Ludwig quoted a Gallup poll that

showed that 70% of Americans felt that they were fighting against Hitler and not against the German people. He wanted to disabuse people of that idea. He declared that the German people had a “war passion” that had led them into two world wars. To protect the world against them, he recommended that arms, education and government be taken out of their hands by an “army of soldiers and an army of teachers,” none of whom would be German. “Religion, history, philosophy all teach principles foreign to the German character and can only be infused gradually....” After victory was clear, Ludwig recommended that Germany be indicted for “political immaturity,” and this flotilla of teachers and soldiers launched to bring about its shift in views. Tillich’s reply to this article appeared on July 17, 1942 in *Aufbau*, a German-Jewish emigrant newspaper published in New York. The newspaper was designed to provide a forum for an exchange of views about culture, economics, social commentary, and intellectual trends. It was independent until January of 2005, when it became a part of Jüdische Medien AG.

I have been able to locate the article written by Frederick Wilhelm Foerster, Professor of Philosophy and Pedagogy at the University of Munich that appeared in *Aufbau* on July 31, 1942 in which he engages the Tillich-Ludwig interchange, a further critique by Alfred Kantorowicz of New York City that appeared on August 7, 1942 with comments by Tillich on the same page (Part B of what appears in the GS) and, on August 14, 1942, Emil Ludwig’s response to the exchange. As fascinating as all this is, I have had to stop. My task was to identify the venue of the piece and determine if it is central to Tillich’s endeavor, and my research has shown conclusively that to be true.

**What Should Happen to Germany?
Against Emil Ludwig’s Newest Speech**
by Paul Tillich

In the July 6th New York Times, under the heading “Ludwig Asks Fight on German People,” a speech by Emil Ludwig is quoted that should cause all decent German Jews in America to resolutely and visibly distance themselves from Ludwig. A statement like “Hitler is Germany” and talk about the Germans as “warrior people” is taken from the arsenal of the most foolish anti-Semitic propaganda, only this time it is directed not against the Jews, but against the Germans. An evil that appears at a particular time and in a particular group of a people is attributed to the entire people. Against this method,

against which we the non-Jewish friends of Jews inside and outside of Germany have fought a hard battle for the sake of which many of us are emigrants, this method is now directed against us by a Jewish writer. If he is right, then we were wrong; then the possibility is taken from us to go on fighting. It is the obligation of our Jewish friends to decide this issue. Not much need be said about the first conclusion drawn by Ludwig. Questions about the occupation, the transition period, and German disarmament are serious political issues which have nothing to do with Ludwig’s psychology of the Germans and which must be settled by serious political leaders. I am not sure these leaders are going to make the thieves and robbers in Germany happy by appointing only American and English police. Silly, however, is the proposal to send over an army of American teachers to instruct the Germans in “morality.” To support it Ludwig writes, “Religion, history, philosophy all teach principles foreign to the German character.”

This sentence—replacing only the word “German” with “Jewish”—can be found in every anti-semitic mudslinging pamphlet. It descends to the same level. It is not worth discussing factually in view of German mysticism, the Reformation, Leibniz, Kant, Goethe, etc.

But in conclusion I want to say one thing. Every word cited from Ludwig signifies a dishonoring of many unknown persons who, unlike Ludwig in safety reviling the German people rather than living in daily peril among them, struggled for the soul and the future of that people. Americans who for years assisted those who thus struggled will be grateful for the assignment to go to them as morality instructors. They will ask to hear from them what they have experienced in the depth of their suffering and will keep quiet. *Gesammelte Werke*, volume 13, 278-288; *Aufbau* July 17, 1942.

(I am deeply grateful to Durwood Foster for this translation. His help was invaluable.)

**PAUL TILlich AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT:
THE MEANING OF POWER**

ANNE MARIE REIJNEN

“Whoever condemns anyone to eternal death condemns himself, because his essence and that of the other cannot be absolutely separated.”¹

Paul Tillich did not write directly about the death penalty, as far as I know. However, he did attempt to shed some light on a cognate problem: the

meaning of power. It is therefore feasible, I believe, to construe a Tillichian *criteriology* of “just punishment.” In contrast with a widely held Christian interpretation of power which identifies it with *hubris*, if not outright evil, Tillich’s perspective, in the text from the German period that I will analyze, is more complex. Also, a sermon in the 1955 collection, *The New Being*, shows—as so often with Tillich—the fundamental continuity within his thought. But first, we must establish the legitimacy of our question (capital punishment) within a theological discourse. This short paper is part of a larger project tentatively called *The Cross and the Sword: A Theological Investigation of Capital Punishment*. I start with a few questions. Is it a paradox that one of the world’s most overtly “Christian” nations is at the same time so sanguine about inflicting irreversible punishment, alone among all the other nations of the West? Or is there, on the contrary, an unspoken link between the two characteristics of the contemporary United States of America? If such is the case, we must search for the symbolic meanings of (ultimate) punishment. In other words, I ask how the many faces of the Crucified have shaped popular conceptions of redemptive suffering. Some theologians, like Mark Taylor, believe that the way of the Cross is the antidote to “gulag America.”² He refers to the work of René Girard, among others, who contend that the passion was the sacrifice to end all sacrifices.

I believe it to be more fruitful and interesting to explore the ambiguity of the Cross. For the crucifixion fuels the ‘blood theology’ of much popular religion, yet it also inspires a vision of the sanctity of human life, even in the presence of the enigma of radical evil. But first, a few words about the context might be in order: the contemporary debates about the role of religion in the *agora* of public life.

1. What is the proper public use of Christianity?

The copula between the judiciary system of a nation *and* Christian “justice,” between political theory *and* theology, between the conscience of the believer and the public square is highly problematic. Tertullian famously (or infamously) asked: “what has Athens to do with Jerusalem?” We might wonder: what has Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School for political studies to do with the Center of Theological Inquiry? In the past, as Duncan Forrester points out in his book *Christian Justice and Public Policy*, “a theological approach, or at least an explicitly theological dimension to the discussion, was almost universal in western political thought.” Augustine, Aquinas, Luther and Calvin sought “to

relate the gospel to the public realm.”³ A double nexus of an almost organic nature existed, unquestioned, between the two. “Policy and authority, it was almost universally assumed, were to be legitimated, authorised and shaped by Christian belief, and political theory was often seen as little more than a satellite of theology. That faith had to do with the shaping and guidance of society was assumed almost as universally as is it today in Islamic societies.”⁴

That alliance, it seems, has been broken. It has been said that, “the entire western legal tradition has been transformed by separating it from its ancient religious foundations.”⁵ Seeds of this new approach were sown long ago. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), the Dutch jurist and diplomat of Calvinist origin, has been used to mark a turning point, with his assertion that the postulates of political theory derive from the principles of reason rather than faith and divine order: they are *etsi Deus non daretur*. “Political commitments are now to be bracketed off from one’s religious convictions; they belong in the private sphere; and public life must now be shaped by something other than the varying and often conflicting particularities of religious belief.”⁶ But as Forrester is himself quick to point out, “We tend to read back too easy an account of the cumulative triumph of the secular.” In 1984, Richard John Neuhaus, a Lutheran who was then on the verge of converting to Roman Catholicism, wrote a controversial book called *The Naked Public Square*.⁷ Twenty years later, Mary Ann Glendon, professor of law at Harvard University, summarizes what was at stake for Neuhaus: the United States, while calling itself a democratic society, was systematically excluding the values of the majority of its citizens from policy decisions. He contended that to rule out of bounds in public life religiously grounded moral beliefs not only does injustice to America’s “incorrigibly religious” citizenry but also saps the very foundations of our democratic experiment.⁸ Reflecting on the work of Neuhaus, Professor Glendon writes: “State-sponsored secularism, legally tightening its control, is ever more openly intolerant of rival belief systems.”⁹

Speaking broadly, the triumph of the secular order over theocracy characterizes the post-French revolution, modern state of affairs that now prevails in most western countries. But there is no status quo, for this separation is constantly under pressure in a great number of western democracies, as shown in the few samples of dissenting thought I adduce. In-

deed, different parties attack the constitutional provisions for various, sometimes opposing reasons: religion should have even less of a public role, some say, while others believe that the separation has now gone too far and that the balance of power should be corrected, in order to allow citizens who also happen to be Muslims or Christians to shape the laws that rule the state. Regarding the interpretation of the topic of capital punishment, I believe it is wrong to exclude considerations related to the realm of ultimate concern.

Politics in the United States of America show more examples of the resistance of political theory to secularization than Western Europe. On behalf of the majority of the US Supreme Court, Justice William O. Douglas wrote, in 1951, "We are a religious people, whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."¹⁰ Half a century later, many citizens on this side of the Atlantic would still think that axiom to be an adequate description of their state of mind. Yet the axiom would be strongly contested by most European citizens, as the battle over the preamble of their new constitution shows. Very recently, it is true that Alabama chief Justice Roy Moore lost his job for refusing the federal court order to remove the monument inscribed with the Ten Commandments from the courthouse in Montgomery. Thus, technically, his voice is a dissenting one. But it has kept, or regained, a strong popular backing and appeal. Many believe, as Roy Moore said in an interview with *Newsweek*, that, "The battle is not over—the battle to acknowledge God is about to rage across the country." If he is elected governor of Alabama, Moore will "defend the right of every citizen of this state, including judges, coaches, teachers, city, county and state officials, to acknowledge God as the sovereign source of law, liberty and government."¹¹ As for international relations, the explicitly religious self-understanding of the mission of the current president is probably the element that most alienates even former European allies of the United States.

One of my quandaries in discussing the death penalty as a theologian is that, on the one hand, I favour a stricter separation of the State and its judicial system and God, theology, the Scriptures, and the churches on the other. Tolerance and pluralism on the ground require the strict neutrality of the State in matters of religion. Yet religious interpretations, especially relating to guilt and retribution, seem to resist those forces that would separate the realms of profane, pluralist society and the confessional

sphere. Both abolitionists and partisans of the retention of the death penalty, but also criminals and the relatives of their victims and many of those involved in the prison system, not only prison chaplains, frequently use religious categories to interpret crime and punishment, evil and redemption. Therefore, in spite of my sympathy for secularity, I take it to be a serious challenge for today's theologians to participate in the ongoing conversation. In spite of the multitude of sometimes strident voices that speak of conflicting holy causes and of God's own armies, we should resist the temptation to withdraw from the *agora*. We should not let only old forces of secularism pitch the battle with the new forces of conservative and reactionary folk-religion: there must be a third way. I still believe public theology of the more progressive kind to be legitimate and effective. Lessons have been learnt in the meantime. Theology no longer views herself as the Queen of the sciences. As Jeffrey Stout argues, "It must take its place among the other voices, as often to be corrected as to correct."

2. Paul Tillich on Power and State, Applied by Us to Capital Punishment

The apostle Paul could, *prima facie*, be taken to defend "law and order," since he wrote: "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities; for there is no authority except from God...if you do wrong, you should be afraid, for the authority does not bear the sword in vain! It is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer."¹² From his early adulthood, Paul Tillich had also grappled with the problem of a more or less strong State and the role of Christianity within, or above, such a State. In a lecture from 1929 called "Constraint and Freedom in Social Life. The Philosophy of Power," given for two local Kant societies, he offers insights that in my judgment are relevant to our discussion of the death penalty, albeit indirectly.¹³ Tillich here applies a highly speculative, ontological grid to the discussion, similar to the method used in his much later work, *Love, Power and Justice. Ontological Analyses and Ethical Applications*.¹⁴ The continuity in Tillich's thinking about power is manifest. In 1955, in his sermon about Romans 8, "Principalities and Powers," Tillich uses the language of myth to analyse the power of power.

Another principality, angelic and demonic at the same time, is power. It has the severe manly beauty that we see in some pictures of the great archangels. It is itself a great angel, good and evil, just as love is a mighty principality, and it

is the builder and protector of cities and nations, a creative force in every human enterprise, in every human community, in every human achievement. It is responsible for the conquest of nature, the organization of states, the execution of justice.... World history is the realm in which the reign of the angel of power is most manifest in all its glory and in all its tragedy.¹⁵

Part of the difficulty for any translator of the 1929 lecture resides in the profusion of German nouns, related but subtly different. The basic polarity, in my opinion, is force as power and authority (*Macht*) and force as violence and authority (*Gewalt*). The English word "power" encompasses those two dimensions of authority and of violence, as appears from a conference given in 1956, "Shadow and Substance: The Price and Opportunity of Power."¹⁶ Power (*Macht*) is the place where constraints find their origin, and it enters into tension with freedom. But since this is an ontological essay, Tillich has to probe deeper and ask whether it is not a characteristic of being to possess power. Power is not something that has been added on to our experience like newspapers or broadcasting, Tillich declares: we must take into account the possibility that to think of being is to think at the same time of power.¹⁷ To be is in fact *the power to be*, which he calls powerfulness (*Mächtigkeit*), that is the capacity of being-with and the power to differentiate oneself from other forms of being. To be, then, is to actively differentiate oneself (*sich aktiv abheben*), by dint of a specific powerfulness, from being sucked into mere being-togetherness.¹⁸ This dynamic is relative, always depending on the other: a tree differentiates itself differently amidst the forest or in the middle of a field. Being realizes itself relatively to Being-With.¹⁹ In Tillich's view, "power" is not a perversion in itself; ontologically, "Power as powerfulness in the sphere of freedom is always meaningful powerfulness (*sinnhafte Mächtigkeit*)."²⁰ Examples of such meaningful powerfulness might be the greatness of artistic form, the clarity of scientific analysis or the profundity of religious proclamation, but these are not the expressions favoured by Tillich in this context. The idea as pure thought is powerless. It receives power through the process of entering into and uniting with a form of being (*Seinsgestalt*), through the marriage, in other words, of ideality and reality. Such a marriage is to be seen in Marx and socialism, according to this 1929 paper. Power is now understood as the coming together of *powerfulness and meaning, in the sphere of freedom*.

To be part of society is to possess power and to recognize it. Nor is it possible to conceive of ourselves first as individuals who hold no power for to the extent that we are, we have power.²⁰ The most fundamental recognition in our social being is geared towards the Law (*Rechtsmächtigkeit*): *it is the recognition that is identical with our being accepted into the sphere of freedom*. Such acceptance occurs in two manners: the first sets limits on our own "powerfulness." Here, we *acknowledge* others as parts of the social order, in a formal way, beings who are endowed with reason, and in a "pathetic" way, all those who have the countenance of human beings; or in legal terms, personhood.²¹ The second manner *excludes* a large number of these from the capacity of determining one's own being, classically, women and slaves. Persons such as these are not just "disenfranchised" members of society: in fact, they do not belong to society. Rather, they are objects at the disposal of society or its members. This goes to establish once more, according to Tillich, the definition of power: it is the combination of recognition and being within society.²² Now the *form* of power that pertains to a social group is the "state-like" (*das Staatliche*). Groups always possess a structure that is "statelike," but the State proper is a separate structure that has acquired autonomous meaning, and which could also cease to exist.²³

To summarize what Tillich has done thus far: power is the realization of freedom, as being-in society. The condition for such positive appraisal is that the notion of powerfulness (*Mächtigkeit*) be diffused with meaning and that it be coupled with the acknowledgment of limits. Now we may wonder what defines the antithetical figure ("bad power," as it were). That is the topic of the following paragraph about power-as-violence (*Gewalt*).

Violence is power imposed, in the face of its refusal, resulting in the depletion of powerfulness (i.e., capacity) of the other. Violence can come forth from an individual who resists his or her obligation to partially renounce power, that is, to recognize constraints and acknowledge limits, thus betraying the original meaning of licit powerfulness.²⁴ In such a case, it is the collective body of society that will counteract by imposing the power that supersedes the individual. One may extrapolate from this point and venture that this represents the justification of the repression of violent crime by the judiciary, ostensibly acting on behalf of the common good. But Tillich goes on to describe another kind of violence, perpetrated by the group that is invested with power.

When, betraying the original meaning of this power, they exploit their position and pervert it to a senseless powerfulness, such actions also cause counteraction, namely *resistance* of various kinds. Resistance includes the inner refusal to submit to tyranny (“inner exile”) and external revolutionary reaction.

In the life of nations, the measuring stick is Being endowed with power and meaning (*selbstmächtig* and *sinntragend*); violence is that which opposes those two elements. In nature, specifically the animal kingdom, this intention (meaningfulness) is lacking and cannot be betrayed. Although all living beings live off others, non-human animals are incapable of violence as defined above, since they can neither acknowledge power and meaning nor refuse to do so.

3. Is There a Case against Capital Punishment?

We now arrive at a crucial part of Tillich’s analysis, from which an application to today’s problem of capital punishment may not be altogether far-fetched. Violence is the use of power to the extent that the powerfulness of the other is depleted, leading to a depletion of being itself, for the original meaning is corrupted. Therefore, violence in fact manifests the limits of power in the very power that resorts to violence. Tillich gives the following example, which was very pertinent in the interbellum: the extermination of a conquered people yields less power, even for the victors, than their integration into a greater power structure. The reason for this, according to Tillich, is that you cannot exterminate the powerfulness (*Mächtigkeit*) of a living entity. The meaning that pertained to it and transformed its powerfulness into power can never be annihilated.²⁵ It will continue to manifest itself by purely negative resistance. Sabotage by the oppressed persists even after their physical obliteration, Tillich believes, for, in mythical terms, their “spirit” (*Geist*) will haunt the victors, ultimately undermining the power of the latter. If we accept this premise, we shall say that the violence committed against death row inmates (the detention preparatory to execution and the death penalty itself) is destructive of them but equally destroys the powerful, and maybe the entire social fabric. The agent of violent repression possesses considerable powerfulness but lacks the meaning that would persuade and which, in the sphere of freedom, is the only means that makes acknowledgement possible. The need to exercise violence in spite of a lack of meaning is ultimately a cause of distress for all. Therefore, says Tillich, it is wrong to interpret pacifism as a sign of weakness. For to renounce violence

and to resist it is the expression of a higher powerfulness.

Every act of violence breeds violence through resistance. That could only be avoided if the meaningfulness of power were manifest in every moment of actualisation of power. Such is not the case, tragically. Yet, we continue to seek meaning *amidst* the struggle for power. It cannot be counted on and it is constantly being corrupted. Because of the dynamic nature of reality, this tragic cannot be avoided, because reality has to unfold itself in the act.²⁶

What is the public use of Christianity? Surely it is not the one described by justice Roy Moore, to form a coalition of all those who see God as the source of law, liberty and government. But Christians cannot excuse themselves from the debate in the public square concerning crime and punishment. They might join the forces that advocate the abolition of capital punishment. Next, such coalitions of people of good will must examine the alternatives, some of which are not desirable. Sentences for life-long imprisonment without parole may spell out a fate akin to death, beyond hope of redemption in the here and now, forever cutting off human beings from the possibility of becoming part of society again. We are reminded of Tillich’s warning: “whoever condemns anyone to eternal death condemns himself, because his essence and that of the other cannot be absolutely separated”.

¹ Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, vol. III (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), 409

² Mark Taylor, *The Executed God. The Way of the Cross in Lockdown America* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

³ Duncan B. Forrester, *Christian Justice and Public Policy* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 10f

⁴ *Ibid.* 12

⁵ *Ibid.*, 13

⁶ *Ibid.*, 15

⁷ Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984)

⁸ Mary Ann Glendon, “The Naked Public Square Now: A Symposium,” *First Things* 147 (November 2004), 3.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *The New York Times*, Tuesday October 4, 2005

¹² Romans 13: 1-4 (NRSV)

¹³ "Zwang und Freiheit im sozialen Leben (Philosophie der Macht)," November 1929, in *Religion, Kultur, Gesellschaft*, Unveröffentlichte Texte aus der deutschen Zeit (1908-1933), 2. Teil, Ergänzungs- und Nachlassbände zu den Gesammelten Werken XI. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

¹⁴ 1954, Main Works/Haupt Werke, Vol. 3, *Writings in Social Philosophy and Ethics*, edited by Erdmann Sturm (New York and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 538-650

¹⁵ Paul Tillich, *The New Being* (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1955), 55

¹⁶ In James Luther Adams, ed., *Paul Tillich, Political Expectations*, translated by James Luther Adams, Victor Nuovo, et al., with an introduction by James Luther Adams (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 115-124

¹⁷ ...sondern wir rechnen mit der Möglichkeit, daß wenn wir das Sein ganz rein denken, bloß als Sein, wir dann Macht mitdenken müssen (234)

¹⁸ "Sein heisst also: sich aktiv gegenüber dem Eingesogenwerden durch das Mitsein in einer bestimmten Mächtigkeit abheben" (235)

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 236

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 240

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, 241

²³ *Ibid.*, 242

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 244

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 245

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 247.

In addition to the discussion of the subject named above, there will also be a discussion of Tillich's understanding of religion. Spontaneous discussion on this subject is invited.

We recommend the following text as preparation for this discussion: Paul Tillich, *Philosophy of Religion*, GW, ed. R. Albrecht, Vol. 1, *Early Works* (Stuttgart 1959), 297-364.

Since the number of participants must be limited we urge those interested to apply as soon as possible. Write to:

Prof. Dr. Christian Danz
Institute for Systematic Theology
Protestant Theology
University of Vienna
Rooseveltplace 10
Austria 1090 Vienna
email: christian.danz@univie.ac.at

ON THE CALENDAR

Deutsche Paul-Tillich-Gesellschaft International Ph.D. Colloquium on Paul Tillich

The German Paul Tillich Society will meet from 27 to 29 January 2006 in an international Colloquium of Ph.D.'s at the Protestant Theological Faculty of the University of Vienna. All those who have concentrated upon the thought of Paul Tillich in their doctoral dissertations, past or present, are welcome. In this way all aspects of Paul Tillich's thought will be discussed.

The Colloquium will be chaired by the substitute chairman of DPTG, Professor Christian together with the Chairman of DPTG Prof Werner Schussler (Professor of Philosophy at the Theological Faculty Trier) and Prof Erdmann Sturm (Protestant Theological Faculty University of Munster).

A Reminder: Dues for the 2005 Year were due with the Summer Issue.

Please send your dues to the Secretary Treasurer at your earliest convenience, or, if you are attending the annual meeting in Philadelphia, you may give it to him in person.

Thank you very much.

Coming in the Winter Bulletin:

- The Report from the annual meeting in Philadelphia and the new officers of the NAPTS
- The Banquet Address by Professor Ron Stone
- The Papers from the Meeting of the Society

Please note: if you are presenting a paper in Philadelphia, please send it via email or disk to the secretary treasurer for publication in Volume 32 (2006) of the NAPTS Bulletin.

Thank you.

The Officers of the North American Paul Tillich Society

President

Matthew Lon Weaver, University of Pittsburgh

President Elect

Terence O’Keeffe, University of Ulster

Vice President

Ron Stone, University of Pittsburgh

Secretary Treasurer

Frederick J. Parrella, Santa Clara University

Past President

John Thatamanil, Vanderbilt University

Board of Directors

Term Expiring 2005

Doris Lax, Deutsche Paul-Tillich-Gesellschaft

Ron MacLennan, Bethany College

Stephen Butler Murray, Skidmore College

Term Expiring 2006

Loye Ashton, Millsaps College

Rachel Sophia Baard, Villanova University

Sharon Peebles Burch, San Rafael, California

Jonathan Rothchild, University of Chicago

Term Expiring 2007

Kelton Cobb, Hartford Seminary

Jean Richard, Association Paul Tillich d’Éxpression Française

Darlene F. Weaver, Villanova University