

APOCALYPSE WITHOUT GOD

Apocalypse, it seems, is everywhere. Preachers with vast followings proclaim the world's end. Apocalyptic fears grip even the nonreligious amid climate change, pandemics, and threats of nuclear war. As these ideas pervade popular discourse, grasping their logic remains elusive. Ben Jones argues that we can gain insight into apocalyptic thought through secular thinkers. He starts with a puzzle: Why would secular thinkers draw on Christian apocalyptic beliefs – often dismissed as bizarre – to interpret politics? The apocalyptic tradition proves appealing in part because it theorizes a relation between crisis and utopia. Apocalyptic thought points to crisis as the vehicle to bring the previously impossible within reach, offering resources for navigating challenges in ideal theory, which involves imagining the best, most just society. By examining apocalyptic thought's appeal and risks, this study arrives at new insights on the limits of utopian hope. This title is available as open access on Cambridge Core.

Ben Jones is the Assistant Director of Penn State's Rock Ethics Institute and has a Ph.D. in political science from Yale University. His research has appeared in the Journal of Applied Philosophy, European Journal of Political Theory, Political Research Quarterly, and other venues, including popular outlets like The Washington Post.



Apocalypse without God

APOCALYPTIC THOUGHT, IDEAL POLITICS, AND THE LIMITS OF UTOPIAN HOPE

BEN JONES

The Pennsylvania State University







Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781009017039

DOI: 10.1017/9781009037037

© Ben Jones 2022

This work is subject to copyright protection. Reuse of any part of this work not permitted under the Creative Commons license detailed below, a statutory exception, or the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements may not take place without written permission of Cambridge University Press.

An online version of this work is published at doi.org/10.1017/9781009037037 under a Creative Commons Open Access licence CC-BY-NC 4.0 which permits re-use, distribution and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial purposes providing appropriate credit to the original work is given and any changes made are indicated. To view this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0

All versions of this work may contain content reproduced under license from third parties. Permission to reproduce this third-party contentmust be obtained from these third parties directly.

This book is freely available in an open access edition thanks to tome (Toward an Open Monograph Ecosystem)—a collaboration of the Association of American Universities, the Association of University Presses, and the Association of Research Libraries—and the generous support of the Pennsylvania State University. Learn more at the tome website, available at: openmonographs.org.

When citing this work, please include a reference to the DOI 10.1017/9781009037037

First published 2022

First paperback edition 2025

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-316-51705-5 Hardback ISBN 978-1-009-01703-9 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



For Peggy Jones, my mother, who first taught me how to hope



Contents

List of Figures		page ix
Pref	ace	xi
Ack	nowledgments	xii
	Introduction	1
	PART I SECULAR APOCALYPTIC THOUGHT	
1	The Hazards of Studying Secular Apocalyptic Thought	21
2	The Paradox of Secular Apocalyptic Thought	39
	PART II HISTORICAL CASE STUDIES	
3	Apocalyptic Hope's Appeal: Machiavelli and Savonarola	61
4	Tempering Apocalyptic Ideals: Hobbes and Pretenders to God's Kingdom	92
5	Reimagining God's Kingdom: Engels and Müntzer	119
	PART III IMPLICATIONS FOR IDEAL THEORY	
6	Ideal Theory as Faith	145



viii Contents	
7 Limiting the Dangers of Utopian Hope	175
Conclusion	191
Appendix: Argument against Ideal Theory's Plausibility Bibliography	198 203
Index	222



Figures

2.1	The catch-22 of ideal theory	<i>page</i> 50
3.1	Execution of Savonarola	89
4.1	Execution of King Charles I	97
5.1	East German stamp of Thomas Müntzer	133
7.1	Angels of death from Revelation 9	178
Ċ.1	Separation of the sheep and the goats	105



Preface

Apocalypse, it seems, is everywhere. Preachers with vast followings proclaim that the world will soon end. Motivated by apocalyptic visions, terrorist groups carry out acts of unspeakable violence. Apocalyptic fears even grip the non-religious faced with the dangers of climate change, deadly pandemics, and nuclear war. But as apocalyptic ideas pervade popular discourse, grasping their logic remains elusive. They increasingly have become disconnected from the religious traditions in which they arose, obscuring the hopes and anxieties that first gave birth to them.

Apocalypse without God argues that we can gain insight into apocalyptic thought by studying it through the eyes of secular thinkers. It starts with a puzzle: Why would secular thinkers find in Christian apocalyptic beliefs – often dismissed as bizarre – appealing tools for interpreting politics? To answer that question, it examines how three theorists with secular conceptions of politics – Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Engels – engage with Christian apocalyptic thought and how such thought still influences politics today. The apocalyptic tradition proves appealing, in part, because it theorizes a special relation between crisis and utopia. A persistent challenge in political philosophy is imagining a path from the imperfect present to the seemingly unattainable ideal society. To solve this challenge, apocalyptic thought points to crisis as the vehicle that creates new opportunities and brings the previously impossible within reach.

Though apocalyptic thought brings to mind doomsday visions, its appeal for political philosophy lies just as much in its visions of utopia. Apocalyptic thought offers apparent resources for navigating challenges that arise in ideal theory, which tries to imagine the best and most just society. By examining apocalyptic thought's appeal and risks, this study ultimately arrives at new insights on the limits of ideal theory and utopian hope.



Acknowledgments

Research for this book began during my time in graduate school at Yale University. There Karuna Mantena and Steven Smith provided helpful feedback and guidance from the start when I was just brainstorming ideas. I also benefited from conversations with John Collins and John Grim, whose wealth of knowledge on religion proved invaluable. I am especially grateful to Bryan Garsten who advised my dissertation, which through much transformation eventually became this book. The Beinecke Scholarship Program deserves special thanks for helping fund my graduate studies during early work on this project.

I am indebted to William Altman, Roland Boer, Daryl Cameron, Chris Costello, Greg Crofford, Kyle Haines, Robynn Kuhlmann, Ben Laurence, Désirée Lim, Lorraine McCrary, Alison McQueen, Shmuel Nili, John Parrish, Emily Ray, Don Thompson, David Wiens, and Arthur Williamson, who all read parts of the manuscript and provided valuable feedback on it. Burke Hendrix, whose work on ideal and nonideal theory deeply influenced my own thinking, was incredibly generous in providing extensive comments on sections of the manuscript and talking through ideas I was wrestling with.

Sheila Denion proofread the entire manuscript, and I greatly appreciate her assistance and attention to detail. Chapter 4 benefited from conversations and correspondence with Patrick Callahan, Harro Höpfl, Al Martinich, and Stefania Tutino. That chapter partly draws on arguments from my article "The Natural Kingdom of God in Hobbes's Political Thought," *History of European Ideas* 45, no. 3 (2019): 436–53, © 2018 Taylor & Francis, available online: www.tandfonline.com/doi/figure/10.1080/01916599.2018.1548810.

I presented research from this project at a number of venues: the New England Political Science Association Annual Meeting (2015), American Political Science Association Annual Meeting (2015 and 2016), Great Plains



Acknowledgments

xiii

Political Science Association Annual Meeting (2015), American Philosophical Association Eastern Meeting (2017), Department of Political Science at the University of Kansas (2017), Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting (2017), Midwest Political Science Association Conference (2018), and Moral Agency Workshop at Penn State (2020). Those audiences introduced me to new perspectives and pushed me to develop what hopefully is a more compelling account of apocalyptic thought's relationship to politics.

Sections of Part I, in particular much of Chapter 2, previously appeared in my article "The Challenges of Ideal Theory and Appeal of Secular Apocalyptic Thought," *European Journal of Political Theory* 19, no. 4 (2020): 465–88, © 2017 Ben Jones, DOI: 10.1177/1474885117722074. The review process for that article played a key role in sharpening the book's argument. I am grateful to the journal's editors and two anonymous reviewers for the care they showed in evaluating the manuscript and for their detailed suggestions.

At Cambridge University Press, I have been fortunate to have a terrific editor in Robert Dreesen. His guidance helped transform my manuscript into the book you see today and improve it in countless ways. Two anonymous reviewers offered extensive and valuable suggestions, which helped bring the different strands of my argument together in more cogent form. I am thankful to the reviewers, Robert, and the rest of the team at Cambridge University Press for their significant investments in the project.

I completed work on this book at the Rock Ethics Institute at Penn State, which provided a rich intellectual environment and could not have been more supportive. Ted Toadvine, the institute's director, deserves special thanks for his encouragement and sage recommendations. A grant from the TOME (Toward an Open Monograph Ecosystem) Initiative at Penn State made this book available in an open access edition. I am thankful for that generous support, and in particular to Ally Laird of the Penn State University Libraries for all the help she provided in answering questions about the grant and application process.

I could imagine no better partner on the journey of writing this book than my wife Mackenzie Jones. As I wrote and rewrote the manuscript, she read various parts of it, which benefited from her insights and suggestions. She also provided the image in Chapter 5. Beyond those specific contributions, her compassion, patience, and encouragement were constant throughout the project's development – both its high and low points – for which I am deeply grateful.

I would be remiss not to mention one other member of our family, our dog Barlow. It's hard to imagine anyone matching his enthusiasm for joining writing sessions in my home office. He spent many hours and long nights at my feet as this manuscript slowly took form, making the lonely task of writing a bit less so.