

A 'Turn to Religion' in International Relations?¹

VENDULKA KUBÁLKOVÁ

...just as humanity was said to be reaching the summit of its development, a feeling emerged in the collective consciousness of philosophers, critics, poets, and theologians...[that] something was being lost, forgotten... the depth of humanity was being overrun by the fiend of mindless material consumption....

Creston Davis (2009)²

Now... the dismissal of [transcendence] is being reconsidered.

Daniel Bell (2006)³

Abstract: The Anglo-American discipline of International Relations defends its main principles and resists with an almost religious fervor any change to them, although the explanation of world affairs has been eluding it since its inception. The article attempts to draw up possibly the first historiography of the IR scholarship about religion in world affairs since the 90s, showing the heightened interest in the subject from most other social sciences and humanities. The article proposes the use of the term 'International Political Theology' to bridge the multiple literatures as well as to underscore the theological commitment of the IR discipline to its basic creeds and dogmas.

Key words: international relations as a discipline, religion in international relations, international political theology

Could we teach physics or chemistry without telling the students in the class that there is a new – or hitherto overlooked – substance in the atmosphere which is, or may be, interacting with the air which we all breathe, and which interferes with laboratory experiments? Even if we personally did not believe in the existence of such a substance, but others were arguing that there was evidence to prove it, would we take the chance that we might be proven wrong, and accept responsibility for not mentioning it to our charges? Could we simply brush aside the question by saying that the 'substance' in question is either not there or must be merely a mutation of something we already know?

In my paper, the 'substance' in question is 'religion'. It is very much a part of the 'atmosphere' of the late modern world. What we refer to as 'religion' has become a significant issue in public discourse in the US as well as a factor in many international conflicts in which the US is involved. My main question is: How are International Relations¹ scholars in the US dealing with this change in the atmosphere? Has it been noticed? Is it recognized as marking an important change in how we understand and talk about the world, or is it dismissed as a mere mutation of what we have already mapped out?

The discipline of IR considers itself to be the chief custodian and self-appointed gatekeeper of what is considered to be 'knowledge' in and of world affairs. It is also the engine for the production and reproduction of that knowledge: IR professors not only write academic treatises for their peers in the scholarly community in order to advance the scholarly knowledge of the subject, but they also generate the textbooks distilling the essence of that knowledge for use in the education of undergraduate and graduate students.

Why should this be of any concern? The relationships of IR scholarship to pedagogy and, no less importantly, to the cultivation of informed public opinion – especially the ability to adjust to change in the world – are ultimately held hostage to professorial self-indulgence no less than to the expenditure of scarce resources for public good.

This short piece is an introductory/preliminary work for a textbook on IR and Religion (with Marsha Cohen, 2010, in progress). It is not a part of it, but it sets the stage for the textbook. This paper begins by explaining why 'disciplines' – the main organizational units of academic enterprise – handle 'alone' the issues that confront not just one of them but many disciplines at once. I begin by outlining here the earlier challenges, which the discipline of IR had to grapple with throughout its existence. My main purpose is to see whether the turn to religion, which happened in many other fields, has reached IR and how the IR discipline has responded to this fundamental challenge. I reiterate a proposal I made in 1998 that a scholarship of religion and IR be treated in the *International Political Theology*, where the fields in question advance in tandem with one another – where one goes, the other must necessarily follow; there is no backpedaling.

ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

The intellectual 'real estate' of most universities is subdivided into lots with demarcated boundaries known as 'fields' or 'disciplines.' The word 'discipline' is derived from the Latin word *discipulus*, meaning a student or follower. A 'discipline' is therefore a branch of knowledge, or a course of instruction, handed down through 'disciples' – people who have dedicated themselves to the absorption and transmission of a particular narrative of knowledge. The number of academic disciplines has

mushroomed at an incredible rate during the last 50–60 years, fructifying the European Enlightenment model of higher education, particularly the 19th century German ideal of a 'research university.'

When students select their courses, they elect to work with specific faculty members who, through their own years of rigorous study, have become 'disciples' in and of their field. Faculty members are expected to provide instruction to students within a distinct disciplinary range of subject matter, to which an appropriate methodology, which is regarded as best suited and most appropriate for that field of study, is applied. The two characteristics required of an autonomous academic discipline are a delineated subject matter and a distinctive, discernible methodology.

Although the specific focus of their research may be the same as or similar to that of colleagues in other fields and subfields, professors of different disciplines often reside in different buildings and corridors. Their books sit on different library shelves and they require different reading lists of their students. They read different journals, belong to different national and international associations, and attend different conferences. They hold PhDs in different fields. Computer generated 'maps of science' provide ample empirical evidence of the interaction between but also the separation of various disciplines and fields⁵.

An example: Awareness of 'globalization' has swept most academic fields. Anthropologists, historians, economists, sociologists and political scientists all participate in their own conferences on 'globalization.' When they occasionally manage to be able to talk to one another, it is neither with comfort nor clarity. Another example is our current concern: religion as a factor of world affairs, which is tackled by theologians and departments of religious studies, sociology, cultural studies, history, philosophy, political science and international studies, but in isolation from one another. Like the proverbial 'blind men and the elephant,' each person or department touches upon the role of faith or religion in world affairs while being limited by their own vocabulary, vantage point and research agenda, their intellectual vision being impaired by disciplinary isolation.

So, in the course of looking at the organization of knowledge in the modern university, certain questions arise. If scholars in different fields are dealing with similar or related research questions, how can the barriers between disciplines be justified? Can scholars in a particular field simply ignore the overlapping work of scholars in other fields who are grappling with the same or similar issues? Should they simply parallel each other's explorations, oblivious to relevant research emerging from outside the boundaries of their own narrow academic niche?

Seen through the prism provided by Michel Foucault, disciplines can be seen as self-policing professional domains where innovation tends to be treated as deviance. This is no less true of the academic disciplines which comprise the Enlightenment-modeled university. Such disciplinary overspecialization leads to parochialism, and

parochialism culminates in narcissism. Scholars cannot afford the time or effort to read outside their own discipline. Even when they can, highly specialized language deters scholarly ventures across disciplinary frontiers. Scholars often answer questions which nobody has asked, and frame their answers in a language which nobody outside their discipline can understand.⁶ Too often, as Somerville puts it, the scholar stands in front of a mirror when he speaks, not noticing that there is no audience⁷.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AS A DISCIPLINE

International Relations emerged nearly a century ago as an academic discipline devoted to the study of world affairs in response to the carnage of World War I. Its founders envisioned the establishment of university departments—including professors, undergraduate and graduate programs, and journals – with a clear purpose and dedicated to a very ambitious agenda: to figure out the causes of world conflicts and discover how to prevent them. The founding fathers of this new academic field argued for their discipline’s intellectual and administrative autonomy on the grounds that the international system composed of sovereign states – an acephalous environment called ‘anarchy’ within which developments in world affairs take place – is unique among all other contexts of social experiences. The challenges faced by the newborn discipline of IR were regarded as unparalleled in other fields of social science, including Political Science.

The history of the 20th century which has given rise to the discipline of IR – its wars, innumerable political crises and economic problems – is well known. What were at the time of WWI thought of as ‘weapons of mass destruction’ – weapons of trench warfare, machine guns, artillery, tanks, submarines and airplanes – all of which could be mass produced by new technologies implemented in the furnaces and factories of industrial Europe and North America, had made the massive carnage of World War I possible. WWII, far from being averted, brought carnage at a still greater scale. With the explosion of the first atomic bombs in 1945, humanity entered the ‘atomic age’. The nuclear weapons developed after World War II enabled those who possessed them to develop into global superpowers. ‘Hot’ war was replaced by the Cold War, so-called bipolarity, tension, anxiety, even a stability of sorts, and a vindication of the claim that states are not just the preeminent social reality of the atomic age, but that states and their nuclear weapons will dominate social reality as far into the future as we can imagine. If they do not, it will only be because ‘deterrence’ failed and a nuclear Armageddon ensued.

After World War II, IR established itself rapidly in a steadily increasing number of universities, particularly within the US.⁸ Befitting the size, power and status the US projects in world affairs, the American model for the study of IR acquired superpower status in academia worldwide, dominating doctoral training and scholarly

publications⁹. A majority of IR scholars in the US have been, and continue to be, protagonists of the approach to IR called 'realism,' focusing on sovereign states as the primary agents in world affairs. According to the most fundamental postulates of classical realism, all states, as unitary actors, amorally seek to maximize their own national power and further their own interests, irrespective of their domestic mode of political organization. Realist IR scholarship within the US long held that the components of national power and interest could be calculated with the precision of natural sciences, and that the potential as well as the consequences of clashes between the powers and interests of states, particularly superpowers, could be scientifically measured and predicted in conformity with the laws of physics.

IR has shown an incredible staying power and resilience to the onslaught on most of its predictions and core postulates. The emergence of the discipline of IR failed to alert the world that another war (WW2) was due. The disintegration of the former Soviet Union also came as a complete surprise to IR scholars in the US, flying in the face of realism's core assumptions and rendering several decades of scholarship out of date. Gorbachev's decision to voluntarily dissolve his Empire and his subsequent actions simply could not fit into any existing theoretical framework¹⁰. Nor were the predictions as to what would immediately follow the emergence of a 'unipolar' world, in which the US is the only superpower, at all accurate. The challenges to the most closely held tenets of IR theory have continued to bring fresh surprises. The nature of conflict, the parties to conflict, and the ends as well as the means of conflict have dramatically changed. So have a number of the discipline's foundational premises.

One of the most fundamental tenets of realism as well as of the IR discipline, in fact its *raison d'être*, has been called into question: the sharp distinction and separation of domestic and international affairs. While domestic affairs were previously considered to be outside the bounds of, and irrelevant to, the study of IR, it now appears that it is nearly impossible to talk about international affairs without a consideration of the internal dynamics of the states involved in any issue.

Furthermore, while the number of states in the world has more than quadrupled since World War II (there are now over 200), quite a few of them are inconsequential (or indeed 'failed') from a classical realist perspective. Yet it is with and within many of these seemingly inconsequential/'failed' states that many 21st century conflicts are emerging, although these states are not among the major powers to which traditional peace research devoted most of its attention. Alongside states as the main actors, world affairs are increasingly animated, perhaps even dominated, by non-state denizens. Economic giants, including multi-national corporations and super wealthy international elite individuals, can, in many cases, trump the wealth of states. Non-government organizations (NGOs) in the thousands populate the world, often as important surrogates for state action or inter-state international organizations (IGOs). The technology of contemporary warfare continues to surpass all expecta-

tions for human ingenuity. In the early years of the new millennium humanity has realized that it faces new, unanticipated dangers, many of them by-products of globalized capitalism, industrial production and mass consumption.

Another foundational dogma – again indispensable to the IR discipline’s self-definition – was challenged by Wendt’s pronouncement that ‘anarchy is what states make of it’¹¹ – i.e., that there is an acephalous, unique world political structure which can be regarded as objectively given and which is a constant feature of world affairs since 400 B.C. and the era of Thucydides. Conveyed in this famous adage is the sentiment that states could one day reject anarchy (in which case they would cease to be states, for anarchy also continues to make states what they are: in this view, states and anarchy are necessarily ‘co-constitutive’). Furthermore, war itself – organized violence sanctioned as the *ultima ratio* tolerated among sovereign states – is now frequently ‘intrastate’ or ‘civil’. The opponent is not a state, but a faceless opponent who is unafraid to die. World inequality, deadly poverty, hunger and disease draw the attention of scholars from many disciplines.

As a discipline, IR is losing its proclaimed monopoly on understanding the world. The subject matter of this almost 100-year-old field of inquiry has fractured, its many parts scavenged by outsiders. In the 21st century, as unforeseen challenges continue to emerge, it should come as no surprise that all things ‘global’ cannot be intellectually and educationally monopolized by one homogenous group of scholars.

IR scholars outside of the US were somewhat less inclined to adopt realism as the main IR approach or as their theoretical umbrella, and many more have been skeptical about the idea that IR research could be approached ‘scientifically.’ Yet the globalization of Enlightenment-style higher education has meant a proliferation of IR departments whose scholarly practices mimic those of the US. In the US, few IR scholars are regarded as public intellectuals, in contrast to some of the other advanced industrial countries. Nevertheless, it is also the case that think tanks, lobbyists and single issue activists are becoming as important outside the US as they are in it. Professors are most likely to have a public face – although not always a voice – in those parts of the world where higher education is least institutionalized and disciplinary boundaries least enforced.

The name of the field – International Relations – helps its longevity and staying power. University students realize that important, and perhaps transformative, things are happening in the world today. They take courses whose names point specifically to the world affairs offered in departments of IR, International Studies or Political Science. Thus it is critically important to ask ‘To what extent does – and should – the discipline of IR, in the scholarly works and the teaching materials it produces, reflect the profound changes confronting our era?’ There appears to be little discussion at IR conferences, in the US or elsewhere, about what subjects are, and ought to be, covered in undergraduate classes.¹² That decision is essentially left in the

hands of publishing houses and their marketing strategies for the textbooks they produce. Course syllabi generally conform to the chapter outlines in major textbooks, all of which bear a striking resemblance to one another. IR pedagogy does not seem to concern very many of us. The distinction between research and teaching in IR is very sharp, and the gap between the two seems to be growing. The rewards are going to research, and lip service is being paid to pedagogy. As a recent APSIA report pointed out, 'insufficient professional discussion occurs regarding the connections between the production, the transmission, and ultimately, the consumption of knowledge.'¹³ As in many other fields taught in major universities, the teaching of particularly large undergraduate IR courses is often in the hands of the most junior, untenured and underpaid faculty.

RELIGION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The subject of religion as a factor in world affairs is yet another major challenge to the IR discipline, and one of the most recent 'new' developments for which the discipline of International Relations has not prepared. Nor is it catching up – certainly not in so far as IR classrooms are concerned. Although discussions of religion in world affairs have been going for two decades now in other fields, within IR 'claims for the absence of religion in the study of global politics are now so common that they refute themselves.'¹⁴ We are at a stage when the topic should have started percolating into the IR textbooks. Only now has there developed a coterie of 'religion scholars' in IR but their books' strongest features are numerous case studies with the framework proposed being far too esoteric to be suitable for undergraduate unspecialized education. Judging from the number of papers dealing with religion presented at the ISA conventions from 2006 to 2008, this group is still very small but its numbers are growing¹⁵. Thus it seems to be appropriate to talk about a turn to religion, following in the footsteps of turns to religion in literature, history, philosophy, and sociology. Many scholars making this turn across other fields are former Marxists or critical and postmodern theorists – of whom there have been relatively few in IR to start with to lead the way. No wonder that IR is so late in making the turn. '*Je ne sait pas. Il faut croire.*' This is the closing line of one of Derrida's late works (*Memoires d'aveugle*, 1990). Too many scholars in IR 'know' that matters of belief have nothing to do with the world their discipline has made for them.

Since the 1990s the subject of religion has entered the more general discourse of world affairs with a bang, as Gilles Keppel has observed (*Revenge de Dieu*¹⁶). Religion has been dubbed the 'missing dimension'¹⁷ and depicted as 'returning from exile',¹⁸ lurking behind almost all of the new or old features of the post-Cold-War, post-9/11 world, even if most scholars in IR cannot see it or choose to ignore it.

Outside of IR, there is now an embarrassment of riches with regard to books and articles touching upon the strange resurgence of religion in 21st century world affairs.

A comprehensive *interdisciplinary* bibliography has yet to be compiled; such a project is daunting even to contemplate. Religion as a global phenomenon is addressed not just by scholars in many disciplines, but also by journalists, former politicians and statesmen and public figures, in defiance of smug predictions that were made not so many years ago of the imminent – and overdue – demise of religion in the modern world. Many authors previously hostile or indifferent to religion are re-thinking their positions, sometimes in a dramatic fashion, making ‘turns’ to religion in their respective fields, such as literature, sociology, philosophy, and others.

As I remarked above, the turn to religion in IR has been slow: positivist strictures and structures dominated IR scholarship, putting, historically speaking, the Marxist, critical or postmodern scholarship very much on the margin on the grounds that their discourse has never met the positivist standard of the scientific rigor to which the IR discipline has aspired, especially in the US. (From the vantage point of the UK and Europe, this may not be as obvious as to those of us working in the US.) Positivist scholars insist upon the strict standard of ‘use of evidence to adjudicate between truth claims’¹⁹ and assign theories which are not ‘testable’ to the ‘margin of the field’ because it is ‘impossible to evaluate their research program’²⁰. Religion in whatever shape, however it might be defined, is outside the permitted parameters. However much the ‘post’ critics of the IR positivist mainstream in the course of what was called the ‘Third or Fourth IR Debates’ have succeeded in unsettling their mainstream colleagues by scoring philosophical points, they have not succeeded in making much of a dent in the mainstream’s fealty to the ‘scientific’ conduct of inquiry.

Nonetheless, certain concerns introduced by the post-critics of the IR mainstream foretold indirectly the arrival/return of religion getting the IR audiences – even reluctantly – to certain terms and concepts. Perhaps most importantly the return of religion to the radar has forced the placement of ‘modernity’ into a broader context. We tend to forget just how brief the ‘modern’ period (more or less coinciding with the political organization of the world into states) has been in relation to the history of ideas, realizing that many postmodern ideas have been closer to modernity’s precursors. Two hundred years ago or so, religions still provided the dominant modes of thought, and thus many ideas even today have their roots in religion.

Let me mention some examples of postmodern concerns that might have been noted in the IR literature. They reflect an origin in religious ‘pre-modern’ experience and are playing an important part in religion’s return, granting that this was not always the intention of the scholars expressing these concerns.²¹

The entire shift of attention to **the ‘inside’, the ‘insider’s perspective’,** feeling and ‘emotional identification’, which we recognize in some postmodern writings, has religious antecedents. Here we can undoubtedly trace the influences of Romanticism: the movement originating in the late eighteenth century as a revolt against

modernity's rationalism that recalled medieval emotionalism. In philosophy and in art, Romanticism focuses on the irrational and the non-rational, and on feeling rather than thought. For example, originally intended to make believers feel the pain of Jesus, emotionalism would later charge the concept and command of love (*agape*) with emotional force. This emotional force has, in turn, nurtured many secular ideologies, for example, nationalism. The stress on identity, the 'insider's perspective', and the distinction between 'inside/outside', prominent in the work of many post-modernist writers, has always been central to religious thought and practice.

Phenomenology, another source of inspiration for postmodern scholars, also owes much to religious influences, particularly in regard to the shift from the focus on outward appearances to the attention to consciousness, the experience of the body, intuition, perspective, and the engagement requiring empathy, along with careful linguistic textual and historical studies. One might even say that the idea of phenomenologists listening to the inner 'voices' coming from deep within derives from the preoccupation of religions with inner meaning. Religion and art are prime examples of human attempts to find meaning and value in life. A concern for 'emancipation', drawing on the engagement of the Frankfurt School with the work of Sigmund Freud, also resides in large measure in the mind, in knowing, in the understanding of the human predicament as a precondition for, if not the realization of, emancipation itself.

Hermeneutics, named after the Greek god of communication, Hermes, adds 'interpreting' and 'reflecting' as approaches to knowledge. Hermeneutics, not surprisingly, originated in schools of theology, where its methods were developed for the interpretation of sacred texts. At the hands of scholars like Paul Ricoeur, hermeneutics was extended to the search for the 'sacred' in 'texts', the sense of which was allegedly lost through the modern notion of the human being as the centre of the universe. Entering a plurality of 'worlds', Ricoeur argued, helps people to become 'decentered'. Ricoeur's reliance on metaphor, the 'weaving' together of fragments of identity stressed by some feminists, parallels religious practice.

Ricoeur's student **Jacques Derrida** used his teacher's concept of 'play' to show that words interact so that their meanings are never fixed. Like theologians, postmodern scholars 'tell stories', rejecting the obsession with 'theory' and its endless strictly modernist pursuit. Derrida aimed at 'deconstructing' modern, secularized texts, which he terms as 'logocentric', thereby suggesting that the words and ideas of such texts always point to an external reality. It is often overlooked that the goal of Derrida's deconstruction was to create a space for attention to 'sacred' texts. Derrida believed that after the 'deconstruction' of the foundations of Western secular philosophy, Westerners would consider other cultures and religions more relevant.

Finally, I would like to mention that postmodern scholars have addressed the problem of '**incommensurability**': the notion that various theoretical approaches

refer to different realities, as well as the even more intractable problem of the anti-foundationalist view that there is no reality, but only different interpretations of a text in the readers' minds. The consequence of Francois Lyotard's famous anti-foundationalist 'incredulity toward metanarratives' is the belief that there are no foundations outside any individual theory which could serve as a neutral arbiter between competing theoretical accounts. Postmodernism – *like religion* – questions the notion of reality presented by positivist IR texts.

It is possible, of course, to be a romantic/phenomenologist/hermeneuticist without being spiritually inclined. One can live without meditation or prayer, or without any of the disciplines designed to understand the Self and its sense of cosmic connection. To many, the limits 'modern' rationalism imposes on our modes of knowledge are entirely acceptable. The many attempts to compensate for these limits and to fill in this void are not. The religious concern for the soul, as the later section will argue, runs a lot deeper and neither modern nor postmodern scholarship has managed to supplant it.

The glimpses I referred to above are familiar to the IR audience which followed the 'Third / Fourth Debate' in IR. However, now in the first decade of the 21st century, these topics are much more widespread. The current stage of globalization is discussed well beyond the confines of the IR discipline. Anthony Giddens, for example, argues that in this late modern time of many changes, people change. They become reflexive and increasingly willing to change beliefs in order to improve their lives. They do this through critically analyzing their lives. People no longer rely upon another; instead they put their trust in technology – e.g. the automatic pilot on an airplane – rather than the real person. Giddens argues that the circumstances of the moment can provide the conditions for the reemergence of religion. As people become more reflexive, they may feel that secular life becomes meaningless and therefore will return to religion.

Habermas' philosophical writings have also taken a noticeable turn towards religion during the first decade of the new century. Yet it is *tradition*, rather than faith, that he seems to be concerned with. While his earlier philosophy was unambiguously hostile towards tradition, if not religion, in his later writings he is taking a different tack. In his dialogues with Joseph Ratzinger, for instance, he speaks with a lament of what has been lost with the death of traditional religious worldviews. His biographers have tried to explain this as part of his reaction to contemporary world events. Thus his reaction to the attacks of 9/11 are invoked to explain his recent engagement with religious tradition, while his aversion to Nazism and his regret that the church did not intervene explain his early resistance to Christian tradition. Although Habermas' recent work contrasts sharply with his earlier dismissive attitude towards religion, he now appears to be more receptive to it, arguing that in an emerging multicultural global society, the encounter with religion as a contemporary

intellectual formation requires secular thought to engage in a serious reflection on its own origins.

Derrida's turn to religion has been equally noteworthy and influential, particularly within theological studies. Following Derrida the Dutch philosopher de Vries (*Philosophy and the Turn to Religion*, 1999) argues that we cannot properly engage 'recent debates concerning identity and self-determination, the modern nation-state and multiculturalism, liberal democracy and immigration, globalization and the emergence of new media, the virtualization of reality...' (11) unless we recognize that they emerge from and indirectly answer to religious traditions.

Michael Polanyi returns to the great fourth-century patrist St Augustine to argue that far from denigrating the importance of science, it is vital to recognize the indispensable role belief plays in knowing all that we know. There is no knowledge without prior faith. Areas such as morality, religion, and aesthetics, which are not susceptible to scientific demonstration, should not be denigrated as subjective opinion.²² There are powerful arguments from different vantage points casting doubt on the concept of secularization, and a Turkish writer challenges even the ideas of the 'West' and what is 'Western', as most of the 'Western' ideas – she argues – are of non-Western provenance.²³ The debate amongst philosophers, theologians, sociologists and historians is gathering momentum, challenging some of the unexamined ontological, epistemological and methodological pillars and narratives on which the social sciences and IR have been built. The issues most challenged and questioned are the meaning of reason and belief and the relationship between them, and the idea of the West, of modernity and its myths. These issues are all built into the IR discourse. The divisions into disciplines, like levees and floodwalls, are crumbling up and are impossible to hold up with shovels and sandbags. The 'Revenge de Dieu' will eventually lead to us rebuilding our way of looking at and understanding the world.

GOD SELLING / WRITING BOOKS IN IR?

Let me turn now to a survey of the literature on religion – both the IR literature in the discipline and the wider literature on religion that IR scholars (should) have taken into account as they now also write on the subject. Notwithstanding many works that I might have missed, the literature I list is now already an entire library involving dozens of authors (see Table 1 and 2). These authors, hailing from different disciplines, address the same or similar world affairs/IR themes but they have different library codes on library shelves. The non-IR works (Table 2) are written by philosophers, sociologists of religion, historians of religion, political theorists, theologians, international lawyers, and journalists, and the distinction between the writings of Table 1 (*IR and religion*) and those of Table 2 (*Religion and world affairs*) has become very blurred. The latter group, as it writes more and more specifically on IR topics, often shows a lack of knowledge of IR literature.

The authors are a very cosmopolitan group, and not necessarily Anglo-American, as most of IR still tends to be. In addition to prominent sociologists of religion such as Peter Berger, there are well-known Islamicists such as Oliver Roy and Gilles Kepel. There are experts in religion who have pioneered faith-based diplomacy, peace making and reconciliation – an area predating 9/11 in origin, and perhaps the first foray of such experts into IR. We discover very interesting works originating in Scandinavia and the Netherlands. I also list the works of newcomers jumping onto the religion bandwagon. People previously silent on the topic reveal publicly that they discovered God and how much he always mattered in their life and work (see Madeleine Albright's 2006 book, *The Mighty and the Almighty*, following close on the heels of her 2003 memoir, in which the Almighty did not play much of a role).

The interdisciplinary bibliography of literature about religion in world affairs (Table 1) focuses specifically on what IR scholars have written as opposed to what scholars from other disciplines have written about the same subject. My bibliography is chronological to indicate both the progression of topics generating interest and the increased volume of the literature in the aftermath of 9/11. I believe this might be a useful beginning of the work on a composite interdisciplinary bibliography, and we should avoid two problems that typically arise in assembling bibliographies for disciplinary consumption. First, we should avoid duplicating work and 'rediscovering America,' which happens because authors might not be aware of parallel or antecedent work. Second, we should avoid relying on the work of only one or two disciplinary 'interpreters' of the relevant work in other disciplines. This is, in my view, a practice rooted in the common IR scholarly practice of cobbling together second hand quotations. It now seems that those in IR who are interested in religion will only read and quote Scott Thomas, Daniel Philpott, and Jonathan Fox – all IR professors – while unaware of the rich parallel literature outside IR. Notwithstanding the quality of these early IR works, not engaging sources outside IR seems like a breach of common sense that is bound to impoverish our research, understanding and teaching.

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RELIGION AND IR LITERATURE

So where are we? In Table 1 I list Samuel Huntington's work, which was published not in a scholarly journal but in *Foreign Affairs* (1993), a public affairs journal with a large audience, and later as a bestselling book (1996). While Huntington's dramatic claims about clashing civilizations bring religion to the forefront and provoked much discussion, he muddled many issues with regard to the identification of his religion-based civilizations and lacked clarity with regard to theoretical concerns in IR. Huntington's views struck a chord with many conservative members

of the intellectual and policy communities and may have influenced G. W. Bush's foreign policy. From the point of view of the IR discipline, Huntington did very little. He confirmed the nature of the state system, albeit now 'tinted' with the colors of (misidentified) civilizations. He emphasized the clash between states identified with Islam and the West. For Huntington, this new 'civilizational' clash replaced the ideologically motivated clash of the two Cold War superpowers – democracy/capitalism vs. the communist 'other' – with a new axis of ideological conflict, which is a line that was pursued in a more focused way in Mark Jurgensmeyer's influential 1994 book *The New Cold War? Religious Nationalism Confronts the Secular State*. Altogether different in thrust and tone is *Religion: The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*, which Douglas Johnston²⁴ and Cynthia Sampson edited in 1994 and which showed incredible foresight in alerting to the importance of the subject. The editors are veterans of conflict resolution and peace studies, and both have a pioneering interest in the role of religion in the political arena.

The engagement of self-identified IR scholars with religion began later, when the London School of Economics in conjunction with *Millennium* sponsored a conference on Religions and International Relations in 1998. A number of papers presented at the conference appeared as a special issue of *Millennium*²⁵. With a somewhat different set of contributors, it was published in 2004 with the fitting title *Religion and International Relations: A Return from Exile*. Its editors were the two LSE PhD students, Fabio Petito and Pavlos Hatzopoulos, who convened the LSE conference, edited the *Millennium* special issue and clearly foresaw the importance of the topic before 9/11. Thanks to the LSE initiative, the number of papers and panels on the subject of religion and IR noticeably increased with the ISA Convention in 2001. If we accept the LSE conference as the contemporary beginning of IR's engagement with religion, then it is revealing that it took place in Britain, although some participants who were invited were from the US and the Continent. It is likewise telling that PhD students, neither British nor American in origin, formulated the initial agenda.

In 1998, two US journals, *SAIS Review* and *Orbis*, published special issues dedicated to religion. Neither issue clearly formulated a theoretical agenda for IR, which is a feature that is characteristic of the literature to this day (Haynes, 2004). Nonetheless, both collections provide a wealth of specialized materials on individual world religions and particularly on their role in peace making, faith-based diplomacy and reconciliation. The early works also include long lists of outreach activities, papers, conferences and briefings on the subject of religion and world affairs sponsored by the non-profit Foreign Policy Research Institute (which also publishes *Orbis*), the Pew Foundation, and the government funded US Institute for Peace.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL THEOLOGY (IPT)

It is at this point that I interrupt my overview of the bibliography of the IR writing on religion to introduce the concept of International Political Theology, which I proposed in the 1990s with the intention to create an intellectual space for the literature on the subject of religion and world affairs, which I envisaged would become one of the most important topics of the new millennium. I used the term 'theology' deliberately to shock my colleagues but also to close the gap between IR and the study of religion, albeit now necessarily redefined as a pursuit of 'theos' – 'an absolute and insurmountable point of reference for everything that has impact, validity and permanence'.²⁶ My use of the term 'theology' does not go as far as the political theologians' claim that political theorizing should have its ultimate ground in religious revelations, although such a position is also compatible with my framework. 'Theology' was once synonymous with philosophy and science. Following the understanding of sociologists of religion, I take 'theos' not in its common secular meaning as 'erroneous beliefs in supernatural extraterrestrial existence', but (along with the term 'theology') to refer to the systematic study of discourses concerning world affairs that search for – or claim to have found – a response, transcendental or secular, to the human need for meaning, and the relations amongst these discourses. My purpose is to find a way of bringing the study of religion and the study of IR together – possibly for the first time – in a manner which would minimize their distortion and facilitate their understanding. IPT can accommodate in one framework the pioneering but so far fragmented attempts to come to grips with the significance of religion in IR.²⁷

In this sense, theology – as in International Political Theology – would assume a new role. Theology has been banished from modernity's secularized structure of knowledge; we can hardly be surprised by its return as modernity itself appears to be undergoing a transformation. Tellingly, the secularists reviewing the publications in which I mentioned IPT objected not so much to my proposing a field but to the name I was proposing, a red flag to devout secular humanists. (I forego here any discussion of secular humanism as an unacknowledged religion with devoted adherents.) IPT was intended to welcome, embrace and learn from the scholars outside the IR field and their work. My proposal, of course, offended secularists insofar as it cast doubts on the nature of their work.

In proposing a new field, I put forward a framework in which religions and IR theories would be brought together by virtue of all having to admit just how much of their scholarship is based on acceptance on faith (which I argue in Kubalkova, 1998, 2004) (it is a rational act of 'abduction' along the lines of the scholarly deductive or inductive reasoning that is demanded by modern science) and how much they need to draw on interdisciplinary wisdom. I hastened to say that there is nothing wrong

with acceptance on faith because that too is a form of reasoning, a view supported in the recent research in neuroscience analyzing reasoning and emotions and the impossibility of separating them. I have noticed a growing number of authors (even in IR) going well beyond my suggestions, arguing, in fact, that IR too is based on a dogma, a religion and a theology.

My framework for IPT is constructivist and not of the mainstream positivist variety. The positivist sort of constructivism is methodologically incapable of doing anything but forcing 'irrational' religion into secular and positivist categories, at one end of the spectrum treating it superficially as a culture or identity, at the other end of the spectrum subordinating religion to the existing positivist IR categories. As my overview will show, many writers are reducing religions to religious institutions and categorizing them as elements of transnational civil society or even as distinguishing attributes of civilizations. If the religions engage in violence, so goes the argument, they do so because they believe the ends justify the means or suffer from 'anti-social' socialization.

These simplifications result in a profound misunderstanding of the strength of the passion that many religious people feel, a fervor which infuses religious practices and compensates for their lack of material capabilities. This, in turn, produces surprise when, on occasion, religiously motivated organizations, including governments, act 'irrationally' or 'non-rationally' and with a force at odds with their material strength, thus confounding positivist expectations. For this point, see Juergenmeister's concept of 'cosmic war' as developed in the Rand Study.

In contrast to the social science positivist understanding, most religious people agree that it is impossible to describe the transcendent reality of God in normal conceptual language (and this is certainly the case with Jews, Muslims and Christians). (There is, by the way, an ironic parallel with the postmodernist dislike of modern logocentric metanarratives.) For religions, of course, the transcendental meta-reality does exist, though it cannot be expressed either in ordinary or scholarly language, let alone subjected to social scientific 'tests'. The meaning ascribed to the reality of God is fixed nonetheless by social conventions and can be expressed in everyday language. This rendition is imperfect and requires reflection, interpretation, illumination, repetition, metaphor, and ritualization. Thus Christianity, Islam, and Judaism derive divine meaning from stories (sacred texts), which are constantly read and reread and subjected to exegesis.

The ongoing representation of what eludes representation is required to provide the believer with a map of reality. The map orients the individual and fixes his or her identity in ontological terms. The identity of the believers can only be lost with the loss of faith. Many psychoanalysts and psychologists agree that modernity's malaise, as well as the loss of identity that attends it, comes from its secular nature and the absence of any substitute for religion. Religious belief and the identity which it pro-

vides give meaning to life, driving believers to act unselfishly and make sacrifices for others (and not just for their fellow believers). Believers who fail this test may well feel extreme remorse at their failure.

In the believer's view, the origins of religious experience are beyond the realm of human choice, let alone the 'rational choice' around which most social science discourse revolves. The freedom of conscience that is given such prominence in liberal thought means the exact opposite in religious discourse. At the most fundamental levels of a believer's existence, it means following the dictates (not choices) of conscience, for conscience has no choice but to follow belief (Frohock, 1995: 47, 163). Narrative, myth, normative injunctions, blessings, curses, confession, adoration, metaphor, symbol, analogy, and parable all loom large in religious discourse, as it accommodates both a transcendent reality not confined to sensory experience and the secular, that which could be called the 'divine realm of positivist social science'. There is nothing in the positivist bag of tricks to match this achievement, not that positivists have ever tried it or would ever consider it to be worth trying. The failure to negotiate the problems of incommensurability successfully is not an affliction of positivists only (also see Kubálková, 2000: 688).

SOME COMMENTS ON THE SELECTED IR WORKS ON RELIGION

In my bibliography (Table 1) I draw attention to the seminal article by Daniel Philpott, 'The Challenge of September 11 to Secularism in International Relations,' which was fittingly published in *World Politics*²⁸, one of the main scholarly journals in the US. If we were to identify the beginning of the comprehensive engagement with religion on the part of IR scholars in the US, Philpott's 2002 article would certainly be the starting point. Nevertheless, one of the doyens of IR, Robert Keohane²⁹, constrained any excursions in the IR discipline to the territories of religion not by contradicting the idea that we ought to 'take religions seriously,' but by complicating it to the point of rendering cross-disciplinary thinking impossible. Soon after Philpott published his seminal piece, Keohane chastised his colleagues in the discipline for their parochial philosophical disputes and suggested that 9/11 could best be understood through a synthesis of classical realism, institutionalism, and constructivism – i.e. the mainstream approaches to IR in the US. All of the parties to Keohane's proposed synthesis are positivist and committed to rationalism. Thus, Keohane did not so much pour a bucket of cold water on the early interdisciplinary efforts but placed landmines in the path of anybody planning to take religion seriously and transgress his standards for scholarship in the discipline. Keohane did include constructivism in general in the proposed synthesis, but only constructivism of the mainstream positivist variety, forcing 'irrational' religion into secular and positivist categories and treating it as a culture or identity.

Thus it should not come as a surprise that social scientists, including the majority of IR scholars, are prone to reducing religion to religious institutions and categorizing them as elements of transnational civil society or expressions of general cultural tendencies. The religious faithful are always presumed to act instrumentally even when committing acts of terrorism; if they engage in violence, they do so because they believe the ends justify the means. Notwithstanding the differences between the main approaches to IR (neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism and positivist forms of constructivism), they all approach religion in much the same way. Territorially exclusive sovereignty means that there can be no power above the state, anarchy is a necessary condition among states, and states have an abiding primary concern for security and power. The remarkable work of Jeff Haynes fits into this category by treating religion as a 'soft power', following the concept of Joseph Nye. So does the work of Jonathan Fox, who is committed to an empirical approach. The book of Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, which she styles as a general theory of religion and IR (the first of its kind), ignores the key features of religion and much of the literature outside the IR field³⁰. Hanson goes further, 'proposing a very complex theoretical post-Cold War paradigm based on the interaction between the contemporary globalization of the political, economic, military, and communication systems and the significant role of religion in influencing politics' (17), in short the 'political and EMC' systems (by which he means the political plus the economic, military, and communication systems) in the world today (Hanson, 2006).

For the study of religions, it is very important to appreciate that IR theories without exception assume the knowability of the 'objective' world; that is to say, IR defines the world as consisting of that part of reality which can be observed with one's senses or plausibly extrapolated from what we observe to the exclusion of the metaphysical. Furthermore, IR assumes that we, as observers, have no impact on what we observe; language simply represents what we observe. IR also assumes that reality is stable and that the social and natural worlds are inseparable and therefore subject to the general laws of a 'Newtonian' universe. IR aspires to a universalism by virtue of having formulated models and theories that are applicable everywhere; context is treated as a methodological inconvenience. Given these assumptions, it would be difficult for Keohane to take religion seriously, no matter how sincerely he wished to do so.

There are individual works which challenge the IR canon. It takes the courage of a senior scholar of Ann Tickner's stature to politely contradict Keohane, which she did in an article (available on the Internet but not yet published) that was ironically intended to be in a festschrift for Keohane³¹. A leading feminist in IR, Tickner argues that accommodating religion will not be possible unless IR's disciplinary space is broadened. She identifies the work of Morgenthau, especially his 1946 book *Scien-*

*tific Man Versus Power Politics*³², and the non-mainstream linguistic constructivism of the variety I have proposed in my International Political Theology as two of the three main avenues to be pursued. In *Scientific Man Vs. Power Politics*, Morgenthau pointed to a disillusionment with modernity and its association with secular rationalism, a disillusionment which is central to contemporary fundamentalist thinking in a variety of religions. Morgenthau disputed the liberal claim that in a liberal society, reason, revealing itself in the law of economics, would reign and of necessity bring about harmony, the welfare of all, and world peace. Liberals believed that this would come about through reason, which has its own inner force, and independently of human intervention (Morgenthau, 1946: 25). In a severe indictment of liberalism and rationalism, Morgenthau was strikingly pessimistic about the ability of scientific reasoning to solve social problems. Suggesting that man's nature has three dimensions – the biological, the rational and the spiritual, he concluded that the rationalistic or instrumentalist conception of man, which is portrayed by liberal social science, has completely disregarded the emotional and spiritual aspects of life (Morgenthau, 1946: 122). Unsurprisingly, the third avenue Tickner proposes is engagement with feminist theologians who see the omission of religion and the neglect of gender as reflecting a general highly regrettable condition.

Despite the thickening list of literature on the subject, the interest in the subject of religion and IR is increasing very slowly. The number of papers presented at ISA gatherings until 2008 on the subject of religion was statistically insignificant. At the San Diego 2006 ISA annual meeting, which attracted 3000 participants, only 3 out of 720 (!) panels with 3000 participants were devoted to the subject. As a rule, the few papers on religion at such conferences are produced by a small group of scholars from outside North America, and the information they present hardly ever finds its way into the IR classroom.

To the extent to which scholars in IR do take religion seriously, they are divided on how to proceed. As I have already indicated, some scholars argue that IR can accommodate religion within existing theoretical frameworks and supporting assumptions (Keohane, 2002; Fox, 2004; Fox's earlier work with the exception of Fox, 2001). Other scholars, myself among them, argue that we need to reconceptualize the foundational myths and assumptions on which the discipline has been built, not least by interrogating the meaning and accuracy of our understanding of secularity and thus of modernity. Such efforts implicitly threaten IR as a stand-alone discipline and demand that we rethink the scope of IR as a subject and 'globalize' it.

There are those who point to the tremendous potential of religions to help humanity not only to resolve conflict but also to lead humanity out of the apparently intractable problems that modernity has brought with it. Madeleine Albright echoed this view when she suggested not only that religion and politics are inseparable, but that their partnership, when properly harnessed, can be a force for justice and peace.

Other eminent scholars agree, including the international legal scholar Richard Falk and the sociologist of religion Peter Berger, who once championed the secularization thesis but now publicly denounces it.

There is an abiding and dangerously under-theorized association of religion (either of all religions or of the religion of the 'other') with violence and all evil. 9/11 and the so-called War of Terror account for most of what little interest most scholars in IR have in religion. As Robert Jervis, a leading scholar in the US, has remarked, 'Terrorism grounded in religion poses special problems for modern social science, which has paid little attention to religion, perhaps because most social scientists find this subject uninteresting *if not embarrassing*' (my emphasis)³³. Not just embarrassed, the vast majority is silent. Nothing said, nothing changes. Until we have an overview of what we know so far, it will be hard to set an agenda.

IN CONCLUSION

In the piece I have obviously tried to do too much. My main point is the need to overcome disciplinary approaches to the key issues of the world, and I reiterate my proposal of a common ground which I call International Political Theology. In conclusion I would like to return to the points I made at the beginning of this paper and in its title. We were 'breathing the air' long before Galileo started asking questions about the atmosphere. Yet the last new substance in the air was only discovered about 120 years ago. What does or does not exist – an ontological issue – does so irrespective of whether or not we have the methodological tools to know about it, much less to change it, or to choose to talk about it.

Sociologists and historians of religion argue that creating or constructing gods is one of the human universals, a practice going back 14,000 years to the ancient world of the Middle East. All major religions share strikingly similar views of transcendental reality. *Homo sapiens* is inherently *homo religiosus*, a species in need of finding a system of beliefs essential to the self-definition of individuals within any society. A unique arrangement of political society was institutionalized in Europe in 1648, when the Peace of Westphalia enshrined the fundamental principle of *cuius regio eius religio* – the exclusion of issues of faith – from relations among sovereign states. International Relations, an academic discipline that emerged in the early 20th century, adopted the Westphalian moment as the model and motto of its foundational myth, and the 'rigors' of social science as its method. Religion was ontologically and axiologically excluded from its purview, and its birth from religion was ignored, as Daniel Philpott pointed out in his seminal work (2001).

There is a great deal to be done in order for the parochialism of disciplines to be overcome and the disciplinary levees to be broken. The need to study world affairs in the 21st century from a more holistic, comprehensive, and inter- or trans-disciplinary perspective requires that the discipline of International Relations be recast in

order to remain relevant. If those engaged in studying the 'return' of religion to IR begin to see themselves as a part of a larger interdisciplinary community of IPT, there is a chance for IR's recognition that religion has, like the air we breathe, been there all along. Religion can't 'return' to IR. It never left.

ENDNOTES

¹ As usual I would like to thank Nicholas Onuf for his great help and his most useful suggestions for this paper. My thanks also go to Marsha B. Cohen for suggestions and help with editing. Rachel Roberts prepared an overview of the most frequently used IR textbooks from the point of view of their attention to religion and culture, the starting point of the paper. Melissa McCaughan provided me with the figures of the numbers of papers dealing with religion and IR at ISA conventions.

² Davis, Creston (2009) 'Introduction: Holy Saturday or Resurrection Sunday? Staging an Unlikely Debate', in Slavoj Žižek and John Milbank (authors), Creston Davis (ed) *The Monstrosity of Christ: Paradox or Dialectic?* Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press: 3.

³ Daniel Bell cited in *ibid.*: p. 5.

⁴ The standard usage is that International Relations (IR) is capitalized when it refers to the IR discipline (also International Studies) and non-capitalized when it is a synonym of 'world affairs' in the 'real world'.

⁵ See the 'maps of science' produced in a study of over a billion user interactions recorded by the scholarly web portals (clickstreams) of some of the most significant publishers, aggregators and institutional consortia. This resulted in a reference data set covering a significant part of the world-wide use of scholarly web portals in 2006, including those related to humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Bollen, Johan, Herbert Van de Sompel, Aric Hagberg, Luis Bettencourt, Ryan Chute, Marko A. Rodriguez, and Lyudmila Balakireva (2009) 'Clickstream Data Yields High-Resolution Maps of Science'. Online: www.plosone.org/article/info:doi/10.1371/journal.pone.0004803.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Sommerville, C. John (2006) *The Decline of the Secular University*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: p. 6.

⁸ According to UNESCO, after India, the US has the second largest number of higher education institutions in the world: a total of 5,758, a significant proportion of which have a core of arts and science departments, a belt of professional schools and a penumbra of extramural programs and activities. The US also has the highest number of higher education students in the world: 14,261,778, or roughly 4.75% of the total population. Quoted on: www.aneke.com/universities.html.

⁹ Jordan, Richard, Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael J. Tierney (2009) 'One Discipline or Many? TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in Ten Countries', Williamsburg, Virginia: Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) Project; The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations; The College of William and Mary; February.

¹⁰ Kubálková, V. (2001) 'Soviet "New Thinking" and the End of the Cold War: Five Explanations', in V. Kubálková (ed) *2001 Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.

¹¹ Wendt, Alexander (1992) 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization* 46 (spring): 391–425.

¹² Mayall, James (1998) 'Globalization and International Relations', *Review of International Studies* 24: 84.

- ¹¹ Dibbern, J. Eric and Daniel J. Whelan (2005) 'U.S. Undergraduate General Education Curriculum Review', paper prepared by J. Eric Dibbern and Daniel J. Whelan for the APSIA schools and directors meeting on Dec 3, 2005. See also the brief given to the discussants of this paper.
- ¹⁴ Philpott, Daniel (2001) *Revolutions in Sovereignty: How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- ¹⁵ The counts and the percentages of papers dealing with religion in the ISA Conferences 2006–2009 are as follows: 2006: 3,079 papers (.003%); 2007: 3,095 papers (.004%); 2008: 4,123 papers (.006%); 2009: 3,969 papers (.009%).
- ¹⁶ Kepel, Gilles (1994) *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism in the Modern World*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- ¹⁷ Luttwak, Edward (1994) 'The Missing Dimension', in Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson (eds) *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ¹⁸ Petito, Fabio et al. (eds) (2004) *Religion in International Relations: A Return from Exile*. Palgrave.
- ¹⁹ Katzenstein, Peter, Robert Keohane, and Stephen Krasner (1998) 'International Organization and the Study of World Politics', *International Organization* 52 (4): 678.
- ²⁰ Keohane, Robert (1989) *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Westview: 173–174.
- ²¹ See Kubáľková, V. (2000) 'Toward International Political Theology', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 29 (3): 675.
- ²² For an analysis and bibliography of Michael Polanyi's work on this subject, see Michell, Mark T. (2005) 'The false dilemma of modernity', *Modern Age*, www.thefreelibrary.com/_/print/PrintArticle.aspx?id=141083196.
- ²³ Bilgin, Pinar (2008) 'Thinking Past "Western" IR?', *Third World Quarterly* 29 (1).
- ²⁴ Douglas Johnston, Ph.D., Founder and President, International Center for Religion and Diplomacy, is a distinguished graduate of the United States Naval Academy and holds an M.A. in public administration and a Ph.D. in political science from Harvard University. Cynthia Sampson is an Associate at the Institute for Peace Building, Eastern Mennonite University.
- ²⁵ Vol. 29, No. 1, January 2000.
- ²⁶ Burkert, Walter (1991) *Greek Religion: Archaic And Classical*. Wiley-Blackwell: 272.
- ²⁷ Kubáľková, V. (2000) 'Towards an international political theology', *Millennium* 29 (1): 675–676.
- ²⁸ Philpott, Daniel (2000) 'The Religious Roots of Modern International Relations', *World Politics* 52 (2).
- ²⁹ Keohane, Robert O. (2002) 'The globalization of informal violence, theories of world politics, and the "liberalism of fear"', in R.O. Keohane *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*, pp. 272–287. New York: Routledge.
- ³⁰ In her book (Hurd, 2007) and several articles anticipating its publication, Elizabeth Shakman Hurd claims to have developed a new approach to religion and international relations that challenges the realist, liberal, and constructivist assumptions that religion has been excluded from politics in the West. Her focus is on secularism as a form of political authority in its own right, and she describes two forms of secularism. There is no indication of her citing or having any awareness of the work of Giorgio Agamben, Alain Badiou, Terry Eagleton, Jürgen Habermas, Slavoj Žižek, etc. regarding religions, secularism and secularization, etc.

- ¹¹ Tickner, Ann (2005) 'On Taking Religious Worldviews Seriously', presented at the Robert Keohane Festschrift Conference, Princeton University, unpublished but available online.
- ¹² Morgenthau, Hans J. (1946) *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ¹³ Jervis, Robert (2002) 'An Interim Assessment of September 11: What Has Changed and What Has Not?', *Political Science Quarterly* 117 (1): 37.

Table 1: Religion and International Relations Discipline Bibliography

<p>Early works and authors that IR theorists now cite as directly relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Augustine. • 'Christian realists' including Raymond Niebuhr and Hans Morgenthau. • Early English School (Martin Wight, Herbert Butterfield). • The works on ethics: in fact, the return of an interest in ethics constitutes a back door to the discussion of religion under the heading of natural law. • Bozeman, Adda (1960) <i>Politics and Culture in International History</i>. Princeton: Princeton University Press. • Burns, Arthur Lee (1979) 'Injustice and Evil in the Politics of the Powers', in Ralph Pettman (ed) <i>Moral Claims in World Affairs</i>, London and New York: Croom Helm and St Martin. • Gong, Gerrit W. (1984) <i>The Standard of 'Civilization' in International Society</i>. Oxford: Clarendon Press. • Lapid, Yosef and Friedrich Kratochwil (eds) (1996) <i>The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory</i>. • Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner ('religion' is not mentioned but the discussion of 'culture' opens the door to a potential discussion of religion). • Morgenthau, Hans J. (1946) <i>Scientific Man Versus Power Politics</i>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. • Nardin, Terry (1996) 'Interpreting the Islamic Ethics of War and Peace', in Terry Nardin (ed) <i>The Ethics of War and Peace</i>. Princeton: Princeton University Press. • Nardin, Terry (1998) 'Islamic Ethics in International Society', in David R. Mapel and Terry Nardin (eds) <i>International Society: Diverse Ethical Perspectives</i>. Princeton: Princeton University Press. • Piscatori, James P. (1986) <i>Islam in a World of Nation States</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Waltzer, Michael (1977) <i>Just and Unjust Wars</i>. New York: Basic Books. <p>Early indications of interest (after the Cold War's end) in the 1990s:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huntington, Samuel (1993) 'The Clash of Civilizations?', <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 72 (Summer 1993). The clash of civilizations thesis was originally formulated in an article with the intention to expand it into a book. • Huntington, Samuel (1996) <i>The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order</i>. New York: Simon and Schuster. • Juergensmeyer, Mark (1994) <i>The New Cold War? Religious Nationalism Confronts the Secular State</i>. California: University of California Press.
--

- Luttwak, Edward (1994) 'The Missing Dimension', in Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson (eds) *Religion, the Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rubin, B. (1994) 'Religion and International Affairs', in D. Johnston and C. Sampson (eds) *Religion, the Missing Dimension in Statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press.

SYMPOSIA, CONFERENCES, SPECIAL JOURNAL ISSUES:

As Philpott pointed out in his *World Politics* article in 2002, International Relations scholarship is indeed secularized: in his survey of articles in four leading International Relations journals (*International Organization*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *World Politics*, and *International Security*) over the period 1980–1999, he finds that only six or so out of a total of about sixteen hundred articles featured religion as an important influence. There are, however, important exceptions, which he lists. *Orbis* and *Millennium* have each published special issues on religion and international organization within the last four years, the latter theorizing innovatively about the role of religion.

The 1998 LSE Millennium conference entitled *Religions and International Relations*, 27 May 1998, to coincide with the special issue of *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* on the subject of religions and international relations, deals with issues such as the resurgence of religion in global politics, theorizing religions in international relations, and the historical role of religions in different international systems. For a list of participants, see the below citation for the special issue of *Millennium*. **Religions and International Relations**, *Millennium* 29 (1) (Jan 2000).

Papers presented at the conference: Petito, Fabio and Pavlos Hatzopoulos 'Silete Theologi in Munere Alieno: An Introduction'; Chan, Stephen 'Writing sacred IR: an excavation involving Kūng, Eliade, and illiterate Buddhism'; Eisenstaedt, S.V. 'The reconstruction of religious arena in the framework of "multiple modernities"'; Hasenclever, Andreas and Volker Rittberger 'Does religion make a difference? Theoretical approaches to impact of faith on political conflict'; Kubáľková, Vendulka 'Towards an international political theology'; Esposito, John L. and John O. Voll 'Islam and the west: Muslim voices of dialogue'; Lynch, Cecelia 'Dogma, praxis, and religious perspectives on multiculturalism'; Osiander, Andreas 'Religion and politics in western civilisation: the ancient world as matrix and mirror of the modern'; Smith, Anthony D. 'The "sacred" dimension of nationalism'; Thomas, Scott M. 'Taking religious and cultural pluralism seriously: the global resurgence of religion and the transformation of international society'; Tibi, Bassam 'Post-bipolar order in crisis: the challenge of politicised Islam'; Volf, Miroslav 'Forgiveness, reconciliation, and justice: a theological contribution to a more peaceful social environment'; Dalacoura, Katerina 'Unexceptional politics? The impact of Islam on international relations'.

The online recording of the LSE conference: www.fathom.com/feature/35550/index.html.

Orbis – Special Issue, Volume 42, Issue 2 (Spring 1998)

- Hurst, G. Cameron III 'The enigmatic Japanese spirit';
- Kurth, James 'The Protestant deformation and American foreign policy';
- Langan, John, S. J., 'The Catholic vision of world affairs';
- Lynch, Edward A. 'Reform and religion in Latin America';
- McDougall, Walter A. 'Introduction';
- Radu, Michael 'The burden of eastern Orthodoxy';
- Sicherman, Harvey 'Judaism and the world: *The holy and the profane*';
- Sivan, Emmanuel 'The holy war tradition in Islam';

Waldron, Arthur 'Religious revivals in communist China'.

SAIS Review, Volume 18 (Fall 1998)

Appleby, R. Scott, 'Religion and Global Affairs: Religious "Militants for Peace";

Bacevich, Andrew J., 'Introduction';

Esposito, John L., 'Religion and Global Affairs: Political Challenges';

Little, David, 'Religion and Global Affairs: Religion and U.S. Foreign Policy';

Marostica, Matthew, 'Religion and Global Affairs: Religious Activation and Democracy in Latin America';

Marshall, Paul A. 'Religion and Global Affairs: Disregarding Religion';

Mayotte, Judith A., 'Religion and Global Affairs: The Role of Religion in Development';

Nasr, Seyyed Vali Reza, 'Religion and Global Affairs: Secular States and Religious Oppositions';

Rickard, Stephen A., 'Religion and Global Affairs: Repression and Response';

Sachedina, Abdulaziz Abdulhussein, 'Religion and Global Affairs: Islamic Religion and Political Order'.

AFTER 9/11:

World Politics, Volume 55, Number 1, October 2002

Fish, M. Steven 'Islam and Authoritarianism';

Philpott, Daniel 'The Challenge of September 11 to Secularism in International Relations'.

Brown Journal of International Relations, Summer/Fall 2005, Vol. XII, Issue 1 (Special issue): Christianity in IR

Falk, Richard 'The Christian Resurgence and World Order';

Kubálková, Vendulka 'International Political Theology';

Mansbach, Richard 'Calvinism as a Precedent for Islamic Radicalism';

Sanneh, Lamin 'Prospects for Post-Western Christianity in Asia and Elsewhere'.

2005–2006: Netherland Chapter and Free University, Amsterdam Lecture series on Religion, Development and International Relations (2005–2006)

With Peter Berger, Jonathan Fox, Scott Thomas, Karen Armstrong, Abdullah An-Na'im, Riffat Hassan, Thomas Pogge, Oliver Roy and Hans Opschoor participating.

Goldewijk, Berma Klein (2005) 'Religion and International Relations: Global Justice, Rights and Intercultural Agreements on Dignity – "but don't ask why"', Introductory paper for the series published on the Internet.

Books and articles on Religion and IR from the late 1990s (not only from the IR discipline):

• Haynes, Jeff (1994) *Religion in the Third World*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

- Haynes, Jeff (1998) *Religion in Global Politics*. London: Longman.
- Rubin, Barry (1990) 'Religion and International Affairs', *Washington Quarterly* 13 (2).
- Rudolph, Susanne and James Piscatori (1997) *Transnational Religion and Fading States*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Books and articles on Religion and IR from the 2000s:

- Albright, Madeleine (2006) *The Mighty and the Almighty: Reflections on America, God, and World Affairs*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Almond, Gabriel A., R. Scott Appleby and Emmanuel Sivan (2003) *Strong Religion: The Rise of Fundamentalisms around the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beyer, Peter (2006) *Religions in Global Society*. Routledge.
- Bosco, Robert (2009) 'Persistent Orientalisms: the concept of religion in international relations', *Journal of International Relations and Development* 12 (1): 90-111.
- Butler, Jennifer (2006) *Born Again: The Christian Right Globalized*. Pluto Press.
- Byrnes, Timothy A. and Peter J. Katzenstein (eds) (2006) *Religion in an Expanding Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carlson, John D. and Erik C. Owens (eds) (2003) *The Sacred and the Sovereign: Religion and International Politics*. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Clarke, Peter (2006) *New Religions in Global Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Dark, K.R. (ed) (2000) *Religion in International Relations*. NY: St Martin Press.
- Diamond, Larry, Marc F. Plattner and Philip J. Costopoulos (2005) *World Religions and Democracy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dijkink, Gertjan (2004) 'When Geopolitics And Religion Fuse', Paper for the Pan-European International Relations Conference 'Constructing World Orders'. The Hague, 9-11 September 2004. The Netherlands: Department of Geography, Planning & International Development Studies, University of Amsterdam.
- Falk, Richard (2001) *Religion and Humane Global Governance*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fox, J. (2000) 'Is Islam More Conflict Prone than Other Religions? A Cross-Sectional Study of Ethnoreligious Conflict', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 51 (3).
- Fox, Jonathan (2001) 'Religion as an Overlooked Element in International Relations', *International Studies Review* 3 (3).
- Fox, Jonathan (2003) 'Counting the Causes and Dynamics of Ethnoreligious Violence', *Totalitarian Movements & Political Religions* 4 (3).
- Fox, J. (2004) 'Religion and state failure: An examination of the extent and magnitude of religious conflict from 1950 to 1996', *International Political Science Review* 25 (1): 55-64.
- Fox, Jonathan (2004) *Bringing Religion Into International Relations*. Palgrave.
- Gardner, Gary (2006) *Inspiring Progress: Religions' Contributions to Sustainable Development*. W.W. Norton.
- Gopin, Marc (2004) *Between Eden and Armageddon: The Future of World Religions, Violence, and Peacemaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gregg, Heather Selma (2004) *The Causes of Religious Wars: Holy Nations, Sacred Spaces and Religious Revolutions*. MIT PhD dissertation.
- Hanson, Eric O. (2006) *Religion and Politics in the International System Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haynes, Jeffrey (2004) 'Religion and International Relations: What are the Issues?', *International Politics* 41(3): 451–462.
- Haynes, Jeffrey (2005) 'Religion and International Relations after "9/11"', *Democratization* 12 (3): 398–413.
- Haynes, Jeffrey (2007) *An Introduction to Religion and International Relations*. Pearson.
- Haynes, Jeffrey (2007) *Religion and Development: Conflict or Cooperation?* Palgrave.
- Haynes, Jeffrey (2008) *The Handbook of Religion and Politics*. Routledge.
- Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman (2004) 'The Political Authority of Secularism in International Relations' *European Journal of International Relations* 10 (2): 235–262.
- Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman (2007) *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Johnston, Douglas (ed) (2003) *Faith-Based Diplomacy: Trumping Realpolitik*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Juergensmeyer, M. (2003) *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark (2005) *Religion in Global Civil Society*. Oxford University Press.
- Kratochvil, Petr (2009) 'The Religion-Politics Nexus in East-Central Europe: Church in the Public Sphere of Post-Secular Societies' (presented at the IPSA/AISP 2009 Congress, Santiago de Chile).
- Kratochvil, Friedrich (2005) 'Religion and (Inter-)National Politics: On the Heuristics of Identities, Structures, and Agents', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 30 (2).
- Lilla, Mark (2007) *The Stillborn God, Religion, Politics and the Modern West*. Alfred Knopf.
- Lincoln, Bruce (2003) *Holy Terrors: Thinking about Religion after September 11*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Luoma-aho, Mika (2006) 'Personhood of State, Political Theology of IR and the Actual Crusade'. Online: www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/8/0/3/9/pages180394/p180394-1.php.
- Luoma-aho Mika (n.d.) 'Political theology of international relations'.
- Maunder, James (2005) 'Universally Acknowledged, Uniformly Ignored?: Religion and International Relations Theory', *Polity@Carleton* 1 (2).
- Michael, Michális S. and Fabio Petito (eds) (2009) *Civilizational Dialogue and World Order: The Other Politics of Cultures, Religions, and Civilizations in International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart (2004) *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.
- Petito, Fabio et al. (eds) (2004) *Religion in International Relations : Return from Exile*. Palgrave.
- Pettman, Ralph (2004) *Reason, Culture, Religion*. Palgrave.
- Philpott, Daniel (2000) 'The Religious Roots of Modern International Relations', *World Politics* 52 (2).

- Philpott, Daniel (2001) *Revolutions in Sovereignty: How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Philpott, Daniel (2002) 'The Challenge of September 11 to Secularism in International Relations', *World Politics* 55 (1).
- Scott, Thomas (2005) *Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations*. Palgrave.
- Seiple, Robert A. and Dennis R. Hoover (eds) (2004) *Religion & Security: The New Nexus in International Relations*. Rowman and Littlefield Institute for Global Engagement.
- Seiple, Robert and Dennis R. Hoover (eds) (2004) *Religion and Security: The New Nexus in International Relations*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Taylor, Charles (2007) *A Secular Age*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Tickner, Ann (2005) 'On Taking Religious Worldviews Seriously', presented at the Robert Keohane festschrift conference, Princeton University, unpublished but available online: www.princeton.edu/~hmliner/Conference_files/KEOHANE/tickner.pdf.
- Treverton, G., H. Gregg, D. Gibran & C. Yost (2005) *Exploring Religious Conflict*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.
- Wilson, Erin (n.d.) 'Secularism and the West', ANU. Online: rspas.anu.edu.au/ir/Oceanic/OCIS/Papers/Wilson.pdf.

Table 2: Selected works from outside the IR discipline that assert the growing global role of religion in International Relations by historians of religion, sociologists of religion, theologians, philosophers, journalists, and scholars of Peace Studies, divinity, political theory, ethics, religion, and religious studies.

- Many publications of the United States Institute for Peace.
- Ninian Smart, the founder of religious studies as an academic discipline: his work on issues of the interface of religion and world affairs.
- Armstrong, Karen (1994) *A History of God: From Abraham to the Present, the 4000 Year Quest for God*. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Armstrong, Karen (2001) *The Battle for God*. Ballantine Books.
- Appleby, Scott and Martin Marty (eds) (1991, 1993, 1994, 1995) *The Fundamentalist Project*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bakkevig, Trond (2007) 'Religion and Politics in the International System Today', *Journal of Peace Research* January.
- Barber, Benjamin (1995) *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism Are Reshaping the World*. New York: Times Books.
- Berger, P.L. (1969) *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Berger, P. L. (1996) 'Secularism in retreat', *The National Interest* 46: 3-12.

- Berger, P. L. (1999) *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*. Washington, D.C.: Erdmann/Ethics and Public Policy Center.
- Carlson, John D. and Erik C. Owens (eds) (2003) *The Sacred and the Sovereign: Religion and International Politics*. Georgetown UP.
- Casanova, Jose (1994) *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Catherwood, C. (1997) *Why the Nations Rage: Killing in the Name of God*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Cavanaugh, William (1995) 'A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House': The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State', *Modern Theology* 11 October.
- Clarke, Gerard (2006) 'Faith Matters: Faith-Based Organisations, Civil Society and International Development', *Journal of International Development* 18.
- Dallmayr, Fred (2003) *Dialogue Among Civilizations*. Palgrave.
- Ellingsen, Tanja (2007) 'Bringing Religion into International Relations', *Journal of Peace Research* January.
- Esposito, J. L. (1992) *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Esposito, John L. (1995) *The Islamic Threat: Myth or Reality?* 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fasolt, Constantin (2006) 'History and Religion in the Modern Age', *History and Theory*, Theme Issue 45 (December): 10–26.
- Fuller, Graham E. and Ian O. Lesser (1995) *A Sense of Siege: the Geopolitics of Islam and the West*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Gardner, Gary (2006) *Inspiring Progress: Religions' Contributions to Sustainable Development*. Worldwatch Institute.
- Helble, Matthias (2006) 'On the Influence of World Religions on International Trade', *Journal of Public and International Affairs* Spring.
- Hoffmann, B. (1993) "'Holy Terror": The Implications of Terrorism Motivated by a Religious Imperative', RAND Distribution Services. 2001.
- Hunter, Shireen (1998) *The Future of Islam and the West: Clash of Civilizations or Peaceful Coexistence?* Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Iannaccone, Laurence R. (1995) 'Voodoo Economics? Reviewing the Rational Choice Approach to Religion', *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34 (1).
- Jenkins, Philip (2007) *God's Continent: Christianity, Islam and Europe's Religious Crisis*. Oxford University Press.
- Kepel, Gilles (1994) *The Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity, and Judaism in the Modern World*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Lewis, B. (1990) 'The Roots of Muslim Rage', *The Atlantic Monthly* September: 47–60.
- Lilla, Mark (2007) *The Stillborn God: Religion, Politics and the Modern West*. Alfred Knopf.
- Little, David (2005) 'Phenomena of Faith: Religious Dimensions of Conflicts and Peace', *Harvard International Review* Winter.
- McCutcheon, Russell T. (1998) 'Redescribing "Religion" as Social Formation: Toward a Social Theory of Religion', in Thomas A. Idinopulos and Brian C. Wilson (eds) *What is Religion? Origins, Definitions, and Explanations*, pp. 53–73. Leiden: Brill.

- Nexon, Daniel H. (2006) 'Religion, European Identity, and Political Contention in Historical Perspective', in Timothy A. Byrnes and Peter J. Katzenstein (eds) *Religion in an Expanding Europe*, pp. 256–82. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, Pippa and Ronald Inglehart (2004) *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*. Cambridge UP.
- Nussbaum, Martha (2002) 'Religious Intolerance', *Foreign Policy* September/October.
- Pasha, Mustapha Kamal (2003) "'Fractured Worlds": Islam, Identity, and International Relations', *Global Society* 17 (2): 111–120.
- Said, Edward W. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Seiple, Robert A. and Dennis R. Hoover (eds) (2004) *Religion & Security: The New Nexus in International Relations*. Rowman and Littlefield, Institute for Global Engagement.
- Shupe, Anson (1990) 'The Stubborn Persistence of Religion in the Global Arena', in Emile Sahliyeh (ed) *Religious Resurgence and Politics in the Contemporary World*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Smart, Ninian (1983) 'Religion, Myth and Nationalism', in P.H. Merkl and N. Smart (eds) *Religion and Politics in the Modern World*. New York: New York University Press.
- Smart, Ninian (1996) *Dimensions of the Sacred: Anatomy of the World's Beliefs*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Smart, Ninian (1999) *Atlas of World Religions*. Oxford University Press.
- Smock, David R. (1995) *Perspective on Pacifism: Christian, Jewish, and Muslim Views*. United States Institute of Peace.
- Taylor, Charles (2007) *A Secular Age*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Turner, Brian S. (1990) *Religion and Social Theory*, 2nd ed. London: Sage (a useful summary of the views of Karl Marx, Max Weber, etc. on religion).

Notes on Contributors

YUKI ABE is Research Assistant at European Institute, Sophia University, Tokyo, Japan.

JAN HANSKA works as officer of the Finnish Defence Forces and is PhD Student in the Department of Political Studies at the University of Tampere, Finland. He is writing his doctoral dissertation on the concept of prophetic politics.

JEFFREY HAYNES, professor, is Associate Head of Department, Department of Law, Governance and International Relations, London Metropolitan University, London, UK. He is the author of 25 books, the most recent of which are: *The Handbook of Religion and Politics* (editor, Routledge, 2008); *Religion and Politics in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. Secularisation, democracy and citizenship* (editor, Routledge/ECPR Studies in European Political Science, 2009); *Religion and Politics: Critical Concepts* (four volumes) (editor, London, Routledge, 2009).

KAREL HLAVÁČEK is currently a student of theoretical sociology at Charles University in Prague. He holds an Ing. in International Relations from the University of Economics in Prague. He was an intern at the Parliamentary Institute of the Parliament of the Czech Republic and the IIR. He is interested in theoretical questions of social sciences like the nature of knowledge and its implications for social sciences.

PETR KRATOCHVÍL works as the Deputy Director of the Institute of International Relations. He is a member of the US-based International Studies Association, a member of the European Commission's expert pool Team Europe, a consultant for the European Parliament, and the IIR's official representative to the European Consortium for Political Research and to the Trans-European Political Studies Association. His research interests cover theory of international relations, the religion-politics nexus, international political philosophy, Eastern Europe and European integration. He has published about fifty monographs, edited volumes, book chapters, and articles, among others in *Journal of International Relations and Development*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, and *Journal of Communist and Post-Communist Studies*.

VENDULKA KUBÁLKOVÁ is Professor of International Studies and Assistant Provost for University-Wide International Studies. Her research and teaching interests include Theory of International Relations, Post-Soviet Studies and Religion and Culture in World Affairs in addition to pedagogy and the use of IT in professional education on International and Global Studies. She has held appointments in England, New Zealand, and Australia as well as being Senior Fulbright Professor at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley. Professor

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Kubáľková is the lead co-author/co-editor, author and editor of many books, and her articles have appeared in numerous journals and edited volumes.

NATAŠA KUBÍKOVÁ is a PhD candidate at the Institute of Near Eastern and African Studies, Charles University, Prague. She holds an MA in International Relations from the Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague. She also studied at Uppsala University, Sweden. She specializes in the modern history of the Middle East and political developments in the region and focuses on political Islam and Islamic political parties.

MIKA LUOMA-AHO is a Doctor of Philosophy (Newcastle upon Tyne) and a University Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Lapland, Finland. He is currently writing a monograph tentatively titled 'International Relations as Political Theology'.

DANIEL SCHNEIDER is currently working on obtaining his master's degree in European Studies at the European University Viadrina in Frankfurt (Oder), focusing mostly on the issues of European security. He was an intern at the IIR.

ALENA SVOBODOVÁ is studying at Wheaton College, Massachusetts, majoring in Russian Studies and International Relations. Currently, Alena is spending the year studying abroad in Moscow at the Russian State University for the Humanities. She was also an intern at the IIR.