Introduction

Ambivalent Enmity: Making the Case for a Transcultural Turn in Enmity Studies

Johannes Becke, Nikolas Jaspert, and Joachim Kurtz*

Russia's 2022 invasion of Ukraine puzzled even the most seasoned Russia experts. Throughout the post-Soviet space, one could not have imagined two nations more closely entangled in terms of history and culture, ranging from the shared legacy of the Kievan Rus' and the Eastern Orthodox Church all the way to Nazi German occupation, the liberation by the Red Army, and the chaos of post-Soviet collapse. Core authors of Russian literature like Nikolai Gogol were equally comfortable in Russian and Ukrainian; Ukrainians like Leonid Brezhnev could rise to the highest ranks of the Soviet Union; Ukrainian dishes such as *borscht* became popular all across Eastern Europe and its various diasporas; and for multilingual Ukrainian Jews like Ze'ev Jabotinsky (born in Odessa), the multi-ethnic and multilingual reality of Eastern Europe served as an inspiration for Jewish-Arab coexistence in Israel/Palestine.[1] So what went wrong? How could a pattern of seemingly inextricable historical entanglement be disrupted or even reversed so severely within a few years?

The essays in this theme issue make the case that even pattern-shattering events such as Russia's invasion of Ukraine, which have been called "historical turning points," or *Zeitenwenden*, must be understood as integral parts of dynamic processes of transculturation. We argue for an epistemological reorientation, a transcultural turn in enmity studies. In view of the increase in conflict and polarization in both international and domestic politics, we believe that the phenomenon of enmity deserves to be studied from a fresh

* This theme issue documents discussions of a working group on the topic of "Ambivalent Enmity" initiated at the University of Heidelberg and the Heidelberg University of Jewish Studies (Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg) in Fall 2018. Thanks to generous funding provided by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the group can continue to investigate this subject in a transdisciplinary graduate program studying the dynamics of antagonism in Asia, Europe, and the Middle East from 2023 to 2028. For a brief introduction to this initiative, see https://ambivalentenmity.org, accessed March 22, 2023.

1 Michael Stanislawski, *Zionism and the Fin-de-Siècle: Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism from Nordau to Jabotinsky* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

perspective, a perspective that fully recognizes enmity's transcultural, processual, and deeply ambivalent features. The outlines of such an approach can be summarized in five working hypotheses:

1. Enmity is a driver of transculturation, not an obstacle;
2. Enmity describes a process, not an outcome;
3. Enmity is an expression of ambivalence, not of conclusiveness;
4. The study of enmity requires a transdisciplinary approach;
5. The study of enmity needs historical depth.

To illustrate the value of a transcultural approach to enmity studies, this theme issue offers five case studies focusing on different regions and time periods. Two of the essays were co-written by scholars from different disciplinary backgrounds. The five studies integrate concepts and methodological insights from the humanities and social sciences, and highlight the persistent links between enmity, understood as enduring forms of potentially violent antagonism, and ambivalence, defined as contradictory patterns of emotions, values, and cultural habits. Before introducing the individual contributions, this short introduction will provide definitions of our understanding of enmity and ambivalence and flesh out our working hypotheses in conversation with the existing scholarly literature.

Defining enmity and ambivalence

Let us start by clarifying our understanding of "enmity" and "ambivalence," as well as their protracted relationship. In contrast to the existing literature that defines enmity as mutual hatred and a will to harm other actors,[2] our approach emphasizes the processual, relational, and profoundly ambivalent nature of both enmity and the various modes of what has been called "enemization."[3] In this effort, we build on previous contributions of several disciplines. Peace and conflict studies, for example, has developed both a strong focus on the

2 Rodney Barker, *Making Enemies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Chantal Mouffe, *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically* (London: Verso, 2013); and Douglas P. Fry and Anna Szala, "The Evolution of Agonism: The Triumph of Restraint in Nonhuman and Human Primates," in *War, Peace, and Human Nature: The Convergence of Evolutionary and Cultural Views*, ed. Douglas P. Fry (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 451–474.

3 The term "enemization" has been discussed most fruitfully in Murray Edelman, *Constructing the Political Spectacle* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988). See also Marco Walter, *Nützliche Feindschaft? Existenzbedingungen demokratischer Imperien: Rom und USA* [Useful enmity? Conditions for the existence of democratic empires: Rome and the United States] (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2015).

terminology of "peace" (positive vs. negative) and a productive research agenda that studies the driving causes of conflict (greed vs. grievance) as well as a strong empirical focus on the shifting contours of political violence over time.[4] Sociologists have studied violent conflict and war-mongering as a tool of social mobilization, as a historical source of state-making, and as a negotiating space between civilian and military actors, complemented by an emphasis on non-violent conflict as a driving force of social integration.[5] International law has explored the juridification of military conflict and the "norm spirals" in the domain of human rights law, not least by focusing on international humanitarian law as an attempt to engage in the systematic de-enemization of both civilians and military personnel.[6] Finally, anthropologists have investigated the variety and cultural embeddedness of human violence, often interrogating the field's own entanglement in the history of colonial expansion.[7]

Building on this literature, our understanding of enmity and ambivalence cuts across disciplinary boundaries and starts from the premise that enmity must be unequivocally understood as a transcultural, processual, and profoundly ambivalent phenomenon.[8] This understanding differs significantly from existing approaches in political philosophy that conceive of enmity either as desirable (political realism) or fundamental (political essentialism) to political life. In the broader debates about the nature, origins, and effects of enmity,[9] political realism tends to describe the construction of enemies

4 Paul Collier and Anke Hoeffler, "Greed and Grievance in Civil War," *Oxford Economic Papers* 56, no. 4 (2004): 563–595; and Dietrich Fischer, ed., *Johan Galtung: Pioneer of Peace Research* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013).

5 Georg Simmel, "Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben" [The metropolis and mental life], in *Die Großstadt: Vorträge und Aufsätze zur Städteausstellung* [The metropolis: Lectures and essays for the Metropolis exhibition], ed. Theodor Petermann (Dresden: Zahn & Jaensch, 1903), 185–206; Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard H. Tilly, *The Rebellious Century: 1830–1930* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975); Peter Feaver, *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

6 Thomas Risse, Steve C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, ed., *The Persistent Power of Human Rights: From Commitment to Compliance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and Eyal Benvenisti, *The International Law of Occupation*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

7 Max Gluckman, "The Peace in the Feud," *Past & Present* 8 (1955): 1–14; Ashis Nandy, Shikha Trivedy, Shail Mayaram, and Achyut Yagnik, *Creating a Nationality: The Ramjanmabhumi Movement and Fear of the Self* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); and Susanna A. Throop and Paul R. Hyams, ed., *Vengeance in the Middle Ages: Emotion, Religion, and Feud* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

8 Edelman, *Political Spectacle*; Walter, *Nützliche Feindschaft?*; and Jennifer Mitzen, "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma," *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 3 (2006): 341–370.

9 Barker, *Making Enemies*; Mouffe, *Agonistics*; and Fry and Szala, "The Evolution of Agonism."

as a fundamental feature of social life.[10] From this perspective, antagonistic relationships should not be understood as problematic, but as an acceptable or even desirable source of dynamism, innovation, and political legitimacy.[11] If autocratic political rulers rely on enemy images to justify social mobilization, we should not be surprised that even democratic states have a strong tendency to engage in othering and systematic demonization.[12] In contrast, from a perspective of political essentialism, enmity represents the very essence of all things political. According to this line of thought, the "political" is defined in opposition to an enemy and by nothing else.[13] For Carl Schmitt and his disciples in Europe, North America, and elsewhere, enmity represents the key catalyst for political life. From this perspective, any ambivalent reading of the political enemy would indicate a troublesome blurring of the crucial friend/enemy distinction, indicating a worrisome decline of political order and a likely shift towards civil unrest.[14] By reducing political life to the friend/enemy distinction, political essentialism warns against utopian fantasies of a world without conflict, advocating instead that both domestic and international politics should be organized according to anti-pluralistic, centralized, and authoritarian patterns.[15]

We disagree with both positions. Rather than comprehending enmity as a necessary evil or as the essence of all things political, our approach follows authors like Murray Edelman who emphasize the contingency and plasticity

10 David Nirenberg, "Enmity and Assimilation: Jews, Christians, and Converts in Medieval Spain," *Common Knowledge* 9, no. 1 (2003): 137–155; Nicholas J. O'Shaughnessy, *Politics and Propaganda: Weapons of Mass Seduction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); and Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist, and Alexander M. Martin, ed., *Fascination and Enmity: Russia and Germany as Entangled Histories, 1914–1945* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012).

11 Robert Holt and Brett Silverstein, "On the Psychology of Enemy Images: Introduction and Overview," *Journal of Social Issues* 45, no. 2 (1989): 1–11; Vilho Harle, "On the Concepts of the 'Other' and the 'Enemy'," *History of European Ideas* 19 (1994): 27–34; and Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996).

12 Anna Geis, Lothar Brock, and Harald Müller, ed., *Democratic Wars: Looking at the Dark Side of Democratic Peace* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

13 Carl Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen: Text von 1932 mit einem Vorwort und drei Corollarien* [The concept of the political: The text from 1932 with a foreword and three corollaries] (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1996).

14 Schmitt, *Der Begriff des Politischen*. See also Michael Schödlbauer, "Zur Verortung der Feindschaft: Die politische Theologie von Carl Schmitt" [Locating enmity: Carl Schmitt's political theology], in *Ortlose Moral: Identität und Normen in einer sich wandelnden Welt* [Placeless ethics: Identity and norms in a changing world], ed. Hugo Schmale, Marianne Schuller, and Günther Ortmann (Munich: Fink, 2011), 279–322.

15 Jan-Werner Müller, *A Dangerous Mind: Carl Schmitt in Post-War European Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

of enmity.[16] If enemization consists of co-constitutive social processes, the relational logic of enmity can produce profoundly ambivalent patterns of rejection and attraction, of mutual learning and silencing, and of long-lasting transcultural entanglements, both violent and peaceful. For instance, while societies may rely on enmity as an ordering function that informs human world views,[17] representations of enmity in official documents and propaganda, media, and political pamphlets are often ambivalent and subject to historical change.[18] Similarly, immediate contact with declared enemies can lead to ambivalent patterns of cultural learning. As researchers of postcolonial conditions have demonstrated, social and historical actors acquire knowledge about their antagonists as a form of self-demarcation, frequently in a curious combination of explicit rejection and grudging fascination.[19] Their engagement can provoke processes of mimicry, learning from, or even identification with the enemy.[20]

Historical research has similarly shown that transfer processes in Europe and beyond were often driven by the need or desire to learn from antagonistic political systems.[21] It is therefore necessary to analyze the ambivalences that emerge from such processes within and between both dominant and non-dominant societies and societal groups. For example, the notion of hereditary enmity (*Erbfeindschaft*) between nation states as developed and nurtured over

16 Edelman, *Political Spectacle*; and Mitzen, "Ontological Security."

17 O'Shaughnessy, *Politics and Propaganda*; and Ayse Zarakol, *After Defeat: How the East Learned to Live with the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

18 Brigitte Flickinger, "Enemies and *Feindbilder*: Visual Propaganda," in *Enemies and* Feindbilder*: Concepts and Realities of Enemies in History*, ed. Felicitas Dobschütz and Nicole Plöger, 181–207 (Leuven: International Students of History Association, 2000); John Victor Tolan, *Saracens: Islam in the Medieval European Imagination* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002); and Daniel König, *Arabic-Islamic Views of the Latin West: Tracing the Emergence of Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

19 Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983); Sanjay Seth, *Subject Lessons: The Western Education of Colonial India* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); James L. Hevia, *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century China* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003); David-Fox, Holquist, and Martin, *Fascination and Enmity*.

20 Kaitlyn F. Allen and Fathali M. Moghaddam, "Representations of Friendship, Enmity, Conflict Resolution, and Peace Psychology in Introductory Psychology Textbooks," in *The Psychology of Friendship and Enmity: Relationships in Love, Work, Politics, and War. Vol. 1: Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Processes*, ed. Rom Harré and Fathali M. Moghaddam (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2013), 21–44; and Adrian Furnham, "Friendship and Enmity across Racial Boundaries," in *The Psychology of Friendship and Enmity, vol. 1*, ed. Harré and Moghaddam, 73–88.

21 Martin Aust and Daniel Schönpflug, ed., *Vom Gegner lernen: Feindschaften und Kulturtransfers im Europa des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* [Learning from the enemy: Enmity and cultural transfer in nineteenth and twentieth century Europe] (Frankfurt: Campus, 2007).

centuries in Germany and France was accompanied by subtle dynamics of emulation that went hand-in-hand with strategic deployments of a vociferous language of demarcation.[22] Similar observations can be made in the postcolonial world, including the post-Soviet space. The move toward de-Sovietization can be regarded as a fourth wave of decolonization that contributed to the dissolution of one of the last empires of the twentieth century, ended the bipolar world order, and helped to overcome, if only temporarily, the division of Europe that had existed since 1945.[23] When examined on a global scale, however, this narrative of decolonization can reveal deep ambivalences, as recent Ukrainian historiography has emphasized.[24] Outside of Europe, such ambivalences are no less striking. One example can be found in recent Chinese attempts to justify the repression of Hong Kong's democracy movement as a morally and politically justified act of "decolonization" countering the "West's" unabated drive for hegemony.[25]

To throw our conception of enmity into sharper relief, a further clarification is required. Our studies do not confound the antagonistic nature of enmity with agonistic modes of contestation. While agonistic forms of interaction (controversy, competition, contestation) take place within regulated and rule-bound arenas of governance, antagonistic forms of interaction (ranging from non-violent enmity to physical annihilation) tend to question both the "rules of the game" and, ultimately, the adversary's right to exist. Consequently,

22 Ute Daniel, ed., *Frankreich und Deutschland im Krieg (18.–20. Jahrhundert): Zur Kulturgeschichte der europäischen 'Erbfeindschaft'* [France and Germany at war, 18th to 20th century: On the cultural history of European hereditary enmity] (Braunschweig: Historisches Seminar, 2005); Reiner Marcowitz, "Von 'Erbfeindschaft' zu 'Erbfreundschaft' durch 'Europäisierung'? Deutsch-französische Beziehungen 1870/71–1957/58" [From 'hereditary enmity' to 'hereditary friendship' thanks to 'Europeanization'? French-German relations 1870/71–1957/58], in *Deutschland und Frankreich in der europäischen Integration. 'Motor' oder 'Blockierer'? L'Allemagne et la France dans l'intégration européenne: 'moteur' ou 'frein'?* [Germany and France within European integration: Engine or obstacle], ed. Heinrich Siedentopf and Benedikt Speer (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2011), 19–36.

23 On the different waves of decolonization, see, e.g., Fabian Klose, "Dekolonisation und Revolution" [Decolonization and revolution], in *Europäische Geschichte Online (EGO)* [European history online] (Mainz: Leibniz-Institut für Europäische Geschichte [IEG], 2014), accessed August 16, 2022, http://www.ieg-ego.eu/klosef-2014-de.

24 Guido Hausmann and Tanja Penter, "Der Gebrauch der Geschichte. Ukraine 2014: Ideologie vs. Historiographie" [Uses of history. Ukraine 2014: Ideology vs. historiography], *Osteuropa* 64, no. 9–10 (2014): 35–50; and Tanja Penter and Dmytro Tytarenko, "Der Holodomor, die NS-Propaganda in der Ukraine und ihr schwieriges Erbe" [The Holodomor, Nazi propaganda in Ukraine, and their difficult legacy], *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 69, no. 4 (2021): 633–667.

25 Thomas Hon Wing Polin, "Twenty Years Late, Decolonization is Coming to Hong Kong," *Global Times* (June 2, 2017); critically, see Charlotte Kroll, *Carl Schmitt in China: Liberalismus- und Rechtsstaatsdiskurse, 1989–2018* [Carl Schmitt in China: On liberalism and the rule of law, 1989–2018] (PhD dissertation, Heidelberg University, 2020), https://doi.org/10.11588/heidok.00031452.

our understanding of enmity must be distinguished both from the totalizing understanding of Schmitt and from rule-bound forms of interaction between social actors under an omnipresent shadow of authority. But enmity studies thus understood also differs from research on agonistic contestation, a broad field which cuts across the humanities and the social sciences, from museum studies and curating, through history and law to, most prominently, political science.[26] "Agonistic democracy" and "agonistic pluralism," two important areas of political theory, enlist the concept to advocate for an alternative, pluralistic, and productive form of democratic protest, while other domains of research explore its ability to explain deliberative processes.[27] Especially noteworthy from a transcultural point of view, the notion of "agonism" has also been deployed to study oppositional reactions to globalization.[28] Although undoubtedly productive, these explorations of agonism are clearly distinct from studies of enmity. In contrast to the antagonisms at the center of our attention, agonisms denote struggles between adversaries rather than enemies and are rarely premised on radical alterity and the desire of its annihilation. Their oppositional thrust does not necessarily call for open and often violent conflict but may, on the contrary, encourage restraint and cooperation.[29]

Enmity is a driver of transculturation, not an obstacle

Having defined our understanding of both enmity and ambivalence, we may now turn to what exactly we mean by a transcultural approach to enmity

26 For research on agonistic contestation in museum studies and curating, see Markus Miessen and Chantal Mouffe, *The Space of Agonism* (Berlin: Sternberg, 2013); and Alpesh Kantilal Patel, "Towards Embodied, Agonistic Museum Practices: Contemporary Manchester, England," in *From Museum Critique to the Critical Museum: Theory and Practice*, ed. Katarzyna Murawska-Muthesius and Piotr Piotrowski (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 179–192; for historical studies, see, e.g., Ingomar Weiler, "Der Agon, die Agonalität und das Agonale aus der Sicht des Althistorikers" [Agon, agonality, and the agonal from the point of view of an ancient historian], *Leipziger sportwissenschaftliche Beiträge* 49 (2008): 4–26; and André R. Köller, *Agonalität und Kooperation: Führungsgruppen im Nordwesten des Reiches, 1250–1550* [Agonality and cooperation: Elites in the Empire's northwest, 1250–1550] (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2015); for legal perspectives, see Andrew Schaap, ed., *Law and Agonistic Politics* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); and for political theory, see Mouffe, *Agonistics*.

27 Paul Alexander Muldoon, "'The Very Basis of Civility': On Agonism, Conquest, and Reconciliation," in *The Politics of Reconciliation in Multicultural Societies*, ed. Will Kymlicka and Bashir Bashir (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 114–135; Edward C. Wingenbach, *Institutionalizing Agonistic Democracy: Post-Foundationalism and Political Liberalism* (New York: Routledge, 2011); James Tully, *On Global Citizenship: Dialogue with James Tully*, ed. David Owen (London: Bloomsbury, 2014); and Marie Paxton, *Agonistic Democracy: Rethinking Political Institutions in Pluralist Times* (London: Routledge, 2020).

28 Mark Wenman, *Agonistic Democracy: Constituent Power in the Era of Globalization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and Duncan Bell, "To Act Otherwise: Agonistic Republicanism and Global Citizenship," in Tully, *On Global Citizenship*, 181–205.

29 Fry and Szala, "The Evolution of Agonism."

studies. Our first working hypothesis, namely our understanding of enmity as a paradoxical driver of transculturation, is based on the insight that even the most violent processes of hostile encounter are embedded in, and results of, transcultural dynamics such as transfers, flows, exchanges, rejections, emulations, translations, adaptations, and other modes of interaction. In this context, knowledge about the enemy's history, language, and society can be deployed for campaigns of demonization and securitization,[30] but intimate knowledge of the other side can also have a normalizing effect, resulting in everyday contact and even collaboration.[31] The logic of ambivalent enmity is to ask: To defeat the enemy, should one not try to learn from them?

By understanding enmity as a driver of transculturation (and not as an obstacle to exchange and interaction), we build on both the relational social ontology of transcultural studies[32] and the pre-existing scholarly literature on antagonistic entanglements.[33] We do not deny the existence of cultures or boundaries between human groups and communities, but rather focus on the dynamics of interaction and exchange that produce and perpetuate them.[34]

---

30 Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

31 Tanja Penter, "Local Collaborators on Trial: Soviet War Crimes Trials under Stalin (1943–1953)," *Cahiers du monde russe* 49, nos. 2–3 (2008): 341–364; and Tanja Penter, "Vergessene Opfer von Mord und Missbrauch: Behindertenmorde unter deutscher Besatzungsherrschaft in der Ukraine (1941–1943) und ihre juristische Aufarbeitung in der Sowjetunion" [Forgotten victims of murder and abuse: Killings of disabled persons during the German occupation of Ukraine (1941–1943) and their juridical assessment in the Sowjet Union], *Journal of Modern European History* 17, no. 3 (2019): 353–376.

32 Monica Juneja and Christian Kravagna, "Understanding Transculturalism: Monica Juneja and Christian Kravagna in Conversation," in *Transcultural Modernisms*, ed. Fahim Amir et al. (Berlin: Sternberg, 2013), 23–33; Monica Juneja, *Can Art History Be Made Global? Meditations from the Periphery* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2023), 1–40; Axel Michaels, Manik Bajracharya, Niels Gutschow, Madeleine Herren, Bernd Schneidmüller, and Astrid Zotter, "Nepalese History in a European Experience: A Case Study in Transcultural Historiography," *History and Theory* 55, no. 2 (2016): 210–233; and Laila Abu-Er-Rub, Christiane Brosius, Sebastian Meurer, and Diamantis Panagiotopoulos, ed., *Engaging Transculturality: Concepts, Key Terms, Case Studies* (London: Routledge, 2019). For earlier iterations, see Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995 [1940]); and Wolfgang Welsch, "Transculturality: The Puzzling Form of Cultures Today," in *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*, ed. Mike Featherstone and Scott Lash (London: Sage, 1999), 194–213.

33 Nikolas Jaspert, *Die Reconquista: Christen und Muslime auf der Iberischen Halbinsel (711–1492)* [The Reconquista: Christians and Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula (711–1492)] (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2019); Monica Juneja, "Global Art History and the 'Burden of Representation'," in *Global Studies: Mapping Contemporary Art and Culture*, ed. Hans Belting, Jakob Birken and Andrea Buddensieg (Stuttgart: Hatje Cantz, 2011), 274–297; and Joachim Kurtz, "Cosmopolitanism in Late Qing China: Local Refractions of a Global Concept," in *Reading the Signs: Philology, History, Prognostication*, ed. Iwo Amelung and Joachim Kurtz (Munich: Iudicium, 2018), 367–388.

34 Pablo Blitstein, "Sinology: Chinese Intellectual History and Transcultural Studies," *The Journal of Transcultural Studies* 7, no. 2 (2016): 136–167; Afef Benessaieh, ed., *Amériques Transculturelles –*

Relations between cultures and other collectives, both friendly and hostile, are understood as mutually constitutive co-productions, even under conditions of harsh asymmetries of power.[35] Thus, by understanding enmity as a particularly close form of interaction, we can expect to uncover particularly profound patterns of transculturation.

This focus on enmity-driven transculturation supports recent attempts in global history to refute the criticism, also raised against transcultural studies, that practitioners tend to "dwell on integration and concord, rather than disintegration and discord."[36] While it is fair to say that conflict, warfare, and enmity have not been central to the interests and concerns of global historians,[37] numerous scholars and initiatives have provided detailed and in-depth studies of resistance to integration, moments of crisis, or the breakdown of connections.[38] Following the example of these studies and Daniel Bell's call to see hostility, aggression, and antagonism as "the most direct form of connection imaginable,"[39] our understanding of enmity as a transcultural phenomenon shifts our attention to the multilayered bonds that have sustained relations between even mortal enemies across languages, cultures, continents, and ages.

Enmity describes a process, not an outcome

Our second working hypothesis emphasizes the processual nature of enmity, with a special focus on the paradoxical patterns of emotions and agency that provoke and sustain hostility over time. In the context of emotions, we build on insights from clinical psychology and advances in the global history of emotions. The spectrum of "ugly feelings"[40] and "unsocial passions"[41] that we

Transcultural Americas (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2010); and Andreas Hepp, *Transcultural Communication* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015).

35 Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische, "What is Agency?," *The American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 4 (1998): 962–1023.

36 Jeremy Adelman, "What is Global History Now?," *Aeon* (March 2, 2017), accessed August 16, 2022, https://aeon.co/essays/is-global-history-still-possible-or-has-it-had-its-moment.

37 Daniel Bell, "This Is What Happens When Historians Overuse the Idea of the Network," *The New Republic* (October 26, 2013), last accessed August 16, 2022, https://newrepublic.com/article/114709/world-connecting-reviewed-historians-overuse-network-metaphor. The essay is a review of Emily S. Rosenberg, *A World Connecting: 1870–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

38 Richard Drayton and David Motadel, "Discussion: The Futures of Global History," *Journal of Global History* 13 (2018): 1–21.

39 Bell, "This Is What Happens."

40 Sianne Ngai, *Ugly Feelings* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007).

41 Adam Smith, *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 6th ed. (London: A. Strahan, 1790).

consider ranges from relatively mild varieties of irritation, aggravation, and resentment to intense forms of loathing, contempt, hatred, and disgust.

Including perspectives adapted from clinical psychology, as exemplified by Tanja Penter and Svenja Taubner's contribution to this theme issue, helps to inscribe affectivity in enmity studies. According to clinical psychologists, violent acts may in fact regulate emotional states, resulting in a feeling of relief for the offender who may often describe aggression as a kind of dissociative, dream-like experience, marked by an impaired sense of self-agency. The mechanism of such modes of aggression can be explained psychoanalytically as a form of projective identification that forces somebody else—the victim and society in general—to feel the emotional states the offender cannot contain.[42] In conversation with such approaches, the contradictory effects of enmity can also be explored from the angles of history and area studies, research fields that have recently begun to accord emotions a greater role.[43] In their view, emotions can motivate and deter actions, form and destroy communities, and allow and disrupt communication. At the same time, emotions have their own histories: the modes in which they are experienced and expressed change as much as the objects to which they are attached and the values ascribed to them.[44] Similar to the basic concepts of social and political discourse,[45] emotions will not and cannot remain stable and uncontested. This also applies to emotions of enmity, which range from estrangement and resentment to contempt and outright hatred.[46] Enmity studies therefore

42 Fritz Lackinger, "Psychodynamische Strukturdiagnostik und Deliktanalyse bei persönlichkeitsgestörten Delinquenten" [Psychodynamic structural diagnostics and crime analysis in delinquents with personality disorders], in *Psychodynamische Psychotherapie bei Delinquenz: Praxis der übertragungsfokussierten Psychotherapie* [Psychodynamic psychotherapy for delinquency: The practice of transference-focused psychotherapy], ed. Fritz Lackinger and Wolfgang Berner (Stuttgart: Schattauer, 2008), 3–37.

43 Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns, *Doing Emotions History* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2014); Jan Plamper, *History of Emotions: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Jan Slaby and Christoph von Scheve, ed., *Affective Societies: Key Concepts* (London: Routledge, 2019); Benno Gammerl, Philipp Nielsen, and Margrit Pernau, ed., *Encounters with Emotions: Negotiating Cultural Differences since Early Modernity* (New York: Berghahn, 2019); and Margrit Pernau, *Emotions and Modernity in Colonial India: From Balance to Fervor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

44 Ute Frevert, "Was haben Gefühle in der Geschichte zu suchen?" [What do emotions have to do with history?], *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 35, no. 2 (2009): 183–208.

45 Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck, ed., *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Vol. 1* [Basic concepts in history: A lexicon of political and social language in Germany] (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972).

46 Holt and Silverstein, "Enemy Images"; Bernd Greiner, Christian T. Müller, and Dierk Walter, ed., *Angst im Kalten Krieg* [Fear during the Cold War] (Hamburg: Hamburger Editionen, 2009);

need to place a stronger and empirically grounded emphasis on the affects that cause, reflect, and shape the ambivalences of enmity and stress its procedural character.

Patterns of agency in the context of enemization are no less ambivalent. By retracing the specific processes of enemization, we can distinguish how even the most cynical framing of enemies for political purposes "conflict entrepreneurs" tends to involve a hidden fascination, high levels of intense engagement, and *prima facie* contradictory processes of cultural learning and oppositional brokerage.[47] Typically, these ambivalent patterns of agency stand out most clearly in frontline social actors that are involved in face-to-face encounters with the enemy and its representation, or in modes of generation and circulation of knowledge about the enemy: academia, the media, the military, intelligence services, or the arts.[48] Often these frontline social actors rely on mimicry, camouflage, and strategic emulation (or indeed "learning from the enemy"). To give just two examples: In the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Zionist militias systematically adopted the dress-code and nomadic customs of Palestinian Arab Bedouins throughout the 1920s as a form of self-indigenization and self-orientalization.[49] After the emergence of the State of Israel, Middle Eastern Jews were frequently deployed in Arab countries in the framework of intelligence missions and to this day the Israeli security forces operate "Arabized" undercover units.[50] Similar and comparable forms of emulation can be observed throughout history in other locations. For example, medieval Roman Catholic orders, such as the Dominicans, adopted core elements of the religious movements they were

---

Monika Schwarz-Friesel, "Antisemitische Hass-Metaphorik: Die emotionale Dimension aktueller Judenfeindschaft" [Antisemitic hate metaphors: The emotional dimension of contemporary anti-semitism], *Interventionen: Zeitschrift für Verantwortungspädagogik* 6 (2015): 38–44; Monika Schwarz-Friesel and Jehuda Reinharz, *Die Sprache der Judenfeindschaft im 21. Jahrhundert* [The language of anti-Semitism in the twenty-first century] (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013); and Erika Kuijpers and Cornelis van der Haven, ed., *Battlefield Emotions 1500–1800: Practices, Experience, Imagination* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

47 Nikolas Jaspert, "Mobility, Mediation, and Transculturation in the Medieval Mediterranean: Migrating Mercenaries and the Challenges of Mixing", in *Engaging Transculturality*, 136–152.

48 David C. Engerman, *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Ivan Kurilla and Victoria I. Zhuravleva, ed., *Russian / Soviet Studies in the United States, Amerikanistika in Russia: Multiple Representations in Academic Projects* (London: Lexington, 2016).

49 Israel Bartal, *Ḳozaḳ u-Vedyi "'am" ye-"arets" ba-le'umiyut ha-Yehudit* [Cossack and Bedouin: Land and people in Jewish nationalism] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2007); and Yael Zerubavel, "Memory, the Rebirth of the Native, and the 'Hebrew Bedouin' Identity," *Social Research* 75, no. 1 (2008): 315–352.

50 Yonatan Mendel, *The Creation of Israeli Arabic: Political and Security Considerations in the Making of Arabic Language Studies in Israel* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

created to combat, whilst their "enemies," the Cathars, picked up traits of the new brethren that persecuted them.[51]

Enmity is an expression of ambivalence, not of conclusiveness

Our third working hypothesis substantiates our understanding of enmity as a profoundly ambivalent phenomenon, as a process marked by contradictory patterns of emotions, values, and cultural habits. In this context, the term ambivalence must be distinguished from ambiguity, i.e., uncertainty about the meaning of something.[52] To date, the paradoxical logic of ambivalence, which we propose to relate to enmity studies, has been probed most productively by scholars in psychology, sociology, and postcolonial studies, but it is also beginning to find resonance in historical research and area studies.

In psychology, the ambivalence of enmity becomes tangible in the coexisting efforts to approach and avoid an enemy who, as the hated other, is feared or rejected yet remains at the center of attention. Such efforts are required for a subject to create identity, organize belief systems, and contain helplessness and unbearable affects.[53] This notion of ambivalence can be linked back to psychoanalytical studies on subject constitution,[54] where the term originally described a pathological tendency towards a defective regulation of emotions, namely the development of two "contradictory emotions, co-existing unconnectedly."[55] The inability to hold ambivalence

51 Uwe Brunn, *Des contestataires aux "cathares"*: *Discours de réforme et propagande antihérétique dans les pays du Rhin et de la Meuse avant l'Inquisition* [The Cathars' adversaries: Reform discourses and anti-heretical propaganda in the Rhineland and the Meuse area prior to the Inquisition] (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2006); Daniela Müller, *Ketzer und Kirche: Beobachtungen aus zwei Jahrtausenden* [Heretics and the church: Observations through two millennia] (Münster: LIT, 2014).

52 Thomas Bauer, *Die Vereindeutigung der Welt: Über den Verlust an Mehrdeutigkeit und Vielfalt* [The disambiguation of the world: On the loss of ambiguity and diversity] (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2018).

53 Peter Fonagy, György Gergely, Elliot L. Jurist, and Mary Target, ed., *Affect Regulation, Mentalization, and the Development of the Self* (London: Karnac, 2002); Kurt Lüscher, "Ambivalenz: Eine soziologische Annäherung" [Ambivalence: A sociological approach], in *Ambivalenzen erkennen, aushalten und gestalten: Eine neue interdisziplinäre Perspektive für theologisches und kirchliches Arbeiten* [Recognizing, enduring, and shaping ambivalences: A new interdisciplinary perspective for theological and ecclesiastical work], ed. Walter Dietrich, Kurt Lüscher, and Christoph Müller (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 17–67; and Jan-Willem van Prooijen, *The Psychology of Conspiracy Theories* (London: Routledge, 2018).

54 Frauke Berndt and Stephan Kammer, "Amphibolie – Ambiguität – Ambivalenz: Die Struktur antagonistisch-gleichzeitiger Zweiwertigkeit" [Amphiboly – ambiguity – ambivalence: The structure of antagonistic-simultaneous bivalence], in *Amphibolie – Ambiguität – Ambivalenz* [Amphiboly – ambiguity – ambivalence], ed. Frauke Berndt and Stephan Kammer (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2009), 7–30.

55 Eugen Bleuler, "Die Ambivalenz" [Ambivalence], in *Festgabe zur Einweihung der Neubauten 18. April 1914 (Festgabe der medizinischen Fakultät)*, ed. Universität Zürich (Zürich: Schulthess, 1914), 96–106.

within one's mind and the need to externalize parts of the mind into others (as dissociated parties of the self) is frequently considered to lie at the center of psychopathology, for instance, as a cause of the inability to cope with adverse experiences such as physical abuse.[56] In contrast, the capability to successfully deal with ambivalence is understood as a core element of human identity formation as an "*homo ambivalens*."[57]

In sociology, ambivalence is treated as inconsistency of social roles, modes of behavior, and normative frameworks.[58] Ambivalent forms of behavior are understood here as effects of modernization[59] that result in behavioral patterns resisting the planning designs of modern statehood[60] and the demands of economic rationality.[61] For Zygmunt Bauman, the problematic of ambivalence is frequently crystallized in the person of the stranger[62] and, especially in Europe, in the figure of the Jew.[63] Even more pertinent to our perspective, authors in postcolonial studies have questioned the stability of asymmetric power relations generated by unequal patterns of cultural diffusion. According to this perspective, ambivalence refers to a dynamic element of instability that introduces paradoxical effects into processes of hierarchical ascription and self-attribution, either as a consequence of internalized racism[64] or as

56 Fonagy et al., *Affect Regulation*.

57 Kurt Lüscher, "Menschen als 'Homines ambivalentes'" [Humans as 'homines ambivalentes'], in *Ambivalenzerfahrungen* [Experiences of ambivalence], ed. Dieter Korczak (Kröning: Asanger, 2012), 11–32.

58 Robert K. Merton and Elinor Barber, "Sociological Ambivalence," in *Sociological Theory, Values, and Sociocultural Change: Essays in Honor of Pitirim A. Sorokin*, ed. Edward A. Tiryakian, 91–120 (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963).

59 Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991).

60 James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

61 Neil J. Smelser, "The Rational and the Ambivalent in the Social Sciences," *American Sociological Review* 63, no. 1 (1998): 1–16.

62 Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*; Rudolf Stichweh, *Der Fremde: Studien zu Soziologie und Sozialgeschichte* [The stranger: Studies in sociology and social history] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2010).

63 Zygmunt Bauman, "Allosemitism: Premodern, Modern, Postmodern," in *Modernity, Culture and "the Jew"*, ed. Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), 143–156; and Johannes Becke, "Beyond Allozionism: Exceptionalizing and De-Exceptionalizing the Zionist Project," *Israel Studies* 23, no. 2 (2018): 168–193.

64 Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (London: Paladin, 1970); and Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, "The Zionist Return to the West and the Mizrahi Jewish Perspective," in *Orientalism and the Jews*, ed. Ivan Davidson Kalmar and Derek Penslar (Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2005), 162–181.

an outcome of hybridization and "creolization."[65] More recently, theoretical insights into the nature of ambivalence have begun to inspire historical studies, and not only of European developments. To cite just a few examples, scholars have drawn on these approaches to explore the ambivalent status of social groups and their evolving identities,[66] the definition and proliferation of norms and values,[67] or the paradoxes of memory in social and political conflicts.[68]

Building on these diverse inspirations makes it possible to critically and systematically examine the dynamic linkages between ambivalence and enmity. This can only be achieved by developing a transcultural and historically informed approach to enmity studies. Such an approach builds on and develops findings from postcolonial studies and social studies of identity. Postcolonial scholarship remains an important point of reference for our research because it has revealed the paradoxical logic of intimate contact, mutual attraction, and simultaneous rejection that characterizes asymmetric power relations such as the colonizer/colonized dialectic.[69] From this perspective, enmity and ambivalence do not contradict one another (as both Schmitt and Bauman would claim) but need to be recognized as closely interrelated concepts and phenomena. While acknowledging this necessity, our studies strive to guard against replicating unwarranted simplifications that mar many postcolonial works.[70] Instead of perpetuating static or reductive binaries, we aim to trace the contradictory transcultural dynamics underlying even the most violent processes of hostile interaction.

---

65 Edward Kamau Brathwaite, "Creolization in Jamaica," in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 202–205; and Johannes Becke and Avi Shilon, "Caribbean Zion: A Creolization Perspective on Jewish-Israeli Cultures," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 49 (2022), accessed August 16, 2022, https://doi.org/10.1080/13530194.2022.2105814.

66 Michael Wildt, *Die Ambivalenz des Volkes: Der Nationalsozialismus als Gesellschaftsgeschichte* [The ambivalence of the people: National Socialism as social history] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2019); and Timm Beichelt, Clara Maddalena Frysztacka, Claudia Weber, and Susann Worschech, ed., *Ambivalenzen der Europäisierung: Beiträge zur Neukonzeptionalisierung der Geschichte und Gegenwart Europas* [Ambivalences of Europeanization: Contributions toward a new conception of Europe's history and present] (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2020).

67 Jan Eckel, *Die Ambivalenz des Guten: Menschenrechte in der internationalen Politik seit den 1940ern* [The ambivalence of good: Human rights in international relations since the 1940ies] (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).

68 Christopher Ames, *Mired in History: Victimhood, Memory, and Ambivalence in Okinawa Prefecture, Japan*, (PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 2007).

69 Nandy, *Intimate Enemy*; Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994); and Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (London: Souvenir, 2016).

70 Robert Irwin, *Dangerous Knowledge: Orientalism and Its Discontents* (Woodstock: Overlook Press, 2006); and Olúfẹ́mi Táíwò, *Against Decolonization: Taking African Agency Seriously* (London: Hurst, 2022).

Any attempt to grasp the ambivalent or even paradoxical effects of enmity must also engage research on social identity. Recent examples of the close linkages between enemization and identity construction include the rise of identitarian and nativist movements in many European and non-European countries that are openly hostile to multiculturalism, minorities, immigrants, "foreign" religions, and alternative ways of life.[71] Conspiracy theories and identitarian narratives often focus on singling out enemies within or beyond one's own imagined community.[72] Our studies therefore draw on four established approaches to studying social identity. These include, firstly, the sociological and historical schools of symbolic interaction that have stressed the constitutive function of interaction in fashioning the individual self and the forging of groups.[73] Secondly, we draw on psychological literature that regards personal identity as a fundamental organizing principle allowing us to distinguish between self and others. Identity formation in this perspective is a lifelong process of psychological work and performance. Strenuous effort is required to create a sense of continuity in one's self,[74] a process that can easily fail, both for individuals and groups. Thirdly, we take into account the work of historians and social scientists who have revealed ethnic, national, religious, and gender identities as communicatively mediated constructs.[75] Finally, we consider the work of scholars who have examined identities as

71 Edward Anderson and Arkotong Longkumer, *Neo-Hindutva: Evolving Forms, Spaces, and Expressions of Hindu Nationalism* (London: Routledge, 2020); Ruth Wodak, *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean* (London: Sage, 2015); and Mark Juergensmeyer, *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*, 4th ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017).

72 Michael Butter and Peter Knight, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Conspiracy Theories* (London: Routledge, 2021).

73 A classic study is Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Center, 1959). More recently, see Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, Tim Neu, and Christina Brauner, ed., *Alles nur symbolisch? Bilanz und Perspektiven der Erforschung symbolischer Kommunikation* [Is it all just symbolic? Results and perspectives of research into symbolic communication] (Köln and Weimar: Böhlau, 2013); and Richard T. Serpe, Robin Stryker, and Brian Powell, ed., *Identity and Symbolic Interaction: Deepening Foundations, Building Bridges* (Cham: Springer, 2020).

74 Erik H. Erikson, *Identity and the Life Cycle* (New York: International Universities Press, 1959).

75 Marcus Pyka, "Geschichtswissenschaft und Identität: Zur Relevanz eines umstrittenen Themas" [Historiography and identity: The relevance of a contested topic], *Historische Zeitschrift* 280, no. 2 (2005): 381–392; Herbert Willems, *Identität und Moderne* [Identity and modernity] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1999); Werner Rammert, Gunther Knauthe, Klaus Buchenau, and Florian Altenhöner, ed., *Kollektive Identitäten und kulturelle Innovationen: Ethnologische, soziologische und historische Studien* [Collective identity and cultural innovation: Anthropological, sociological, and historical studies] (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2001); and Bernard Giesen, *Die Intellektuellen und die Nation, Band 2: Kollektive Identität* [Intellectuals and the nation, vol. 2: Collective identity] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1999).

social constructs dividing individuals and groups and setting one against the other,[76] and shown that walls are erected and prisons built in the name of identity as part of a divisive "politics of enmity."[77]

Our working hypothesis that enmity must be analyzed as an inevitably ambivalent relationship synthesizes these inspirations. Extending the insights sketched above, our studies aim to counter simplistic accounts of enmity and the structures along which it is constructed and understood. Certainly, there is plenty to suggest that enmity implies a reduction of complexity. Many theorists have argued that categories such as "nation" or "race" are monolithic cultural constructs that conceal intrinsic variance.[78] In an increasingly interconnected world, this line of argument claims, enemization emerges as a response to multiplying identities, promising to provide orientation and secure a collective sense of belonging. As a result, images of enemies bear similar features of homogenization or simplification. Populism has been shown to bring together manifold claims under a common umbrella, establishing a chain of equivalence and construing an "empty signifier."[79] One of the most powerful of these signifiers is the identification of clear-cut, tangible, and invariably oversimplified enemies. Without denying the merits of such accounts, our case studies demonstrate that relations of enmity generate highly complex linkages, driven not by reduction, but by ambivalence.

The study of enmity requires a transdisciplinary approach

Our fourth hypothesis demonstrates that our understanding of enmity as a transcultural, processual, and ambivalent phenomenon relies on a transdisciplinary approach. Both the humanities and the social sciences are needed to dissect the different stages of enemization, which can be divided analytically into (a) knowledge production, (b) representation, and (c) encounter. The three stages are often linked in a feedback loop: Experiences of hostility drive the generation of knowledge about real or perceived enemies; the knowledge gathered is mediated and weaponized in representations of antagonistic relationships; and these representations of enmity in turn shape the attitudes, behavior, and perceptions of individual and institutional actors in future encounters. In practice, expressions of enmity are not typically so neatly

76 Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Lies That Bind: Rethinking Identity* (New York: Liveright, 2018).

77 Joseph-Achille Mbembe, *Politiques de l'inimitié* [The politics of enmity] (Paris: La Découverte, 2016).

78 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); and Stuart Hall, "The Question of Cultural Identity," in *Modernity and its Futures*, ed. Stuart Hall, David Held, and Anthony McGrew (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 274–316.

79 Ernesto Laclau, *On Populist Reason* (London: Verso, 2005).

divided into temporal and causal steps, but rather intermingle simultaneously. Ambivalences create tensions at every stage of these interconnected processes; without them, conflict entrepreneurs would not need to work so persistently to multiply grievances, bolster suspicions, suppress uncertainties, streamline narratives, and construct reductive and sufficiently unambiguous images. A comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of antagonism therefore needs to consider all three dimensions and determine their specific significance on a case-by-case basis. But how could a transdisciplinary approach to all three stages of enemization be put into practice?

(a) Knowledge production: The phenomenon of knowledge production about enemies (both real and imagined) calls for the close cooperation between specialists in intellectual history, historians of intelligence apparatuses, and social scientists specializing in particular conflict regions. The call to "know your enemy" will be raised in any community that faces entrenched competition over economic, cultural, or symbolic resources.[80] Typically, this knowledge is produced by a set of institutions, discourses, and social practices that range from informal networks sharing perceived threats to various forms of pseudo-science and formal institutions of "enemy studies." While enmity generally plays a key role for the establishment and maintenance of social and political cohesion,[81] knowledge about the enemy that is produced, shared, and contested in situations of social conflict stands out for its ambivalence.[82] Knowing the enemy can be the cause of both anxiety (about their capabilities) and exuberance (on knowing their weaknesses).

The systematic production of knowledge about alleged enemies is by no means an exclusively modern phenomenon but can be traced back to medieval and ancient times.[83] A case in point is the translation of fundamental texts of Islamic lore into Latin by Christian scholars of the twelfth century—in order to "fight with words not with weapons," as the monk Peter the Venerable famously

80 Giovanni Sartori, "The Essence of the Political in Carl Schmitt," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 1, no. 1 (1989): 63–75.

81 Barker, *Making Enemies*.

82 Edelman, *Political Spectacle*.

83 Andrew T. Alwine, *Enmity and Feuding in Classical Athens* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015); Ingrid Hartl, *Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik: Das Aufeinandertreffen von Christen und Muslimen* [Images of enemies in the poetry of the Crusades: Encounters between Christians and Muslims] (Bern: Peter Lang, 2009); Martin Völkl, *Muslime – Märtyrer* – Militia Christi*: Identität, Feindbild und Fremderfahrung während der ersten Kreuzzüge* [Muslims – Martyrs – *Militia Christi*: Identity, enemy image, and foreign experience during the first Crusades] (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011); and Almut Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben: 'Türkengefahr' und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450–1600* [Describing the enemy: 'The Turkish Danger' and European knowledge about the Ottoman empire 1450–1600] (Frankfurt: Campus, 2003).

put it.[84] The entanglement between conflict and knowledge production is particularly well documented in the context of the Cold War.[85] Transnational comparisons have established similarities and differences in studying enemy mentalities throughout the major armed conflicts of the past century.[86] Scholars of totalitarian regimes have revealed that such mentality studies, for example of Jews and Roma in Nazi Germany, border on pseudoscience produced for the specific needs of broader audiences.[87] The nexus between knowledge production and ambivalence has also been documented for colonial settings. Cases in point include studies of anthropology as a colonial science[88] and research on anti-colonial forms of knowledge production about the "intimate enemy."[89]

(b) Representation: Deciphering representations of enmity can involve a broad diversity of research fields, ranging from the histories of art

84 James Kritzeck, *Peter the Venerable and Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); Tolan, *Saracens*.

85 Władysław Bułhak, "Similar but Not the Same: In Search of a Methodology in the Cold War Communist Intelligence Studies," in *Need to Know: Eastern and Western Perspectives*, ed. Władysław Bułhak and Thomas Wegener Friis (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2014), 19–43; Engerman, *Know Your Enemy*; Thomas P. Bernstein and Hua-yu Li, ed., *China Learns from the Soviet Union, 1949–Present* (Lanham: Lexington, 2010); and Kurilla and Zhuravleva, *Russian / Soviet Studies in the United States*.

86 Christiane Reinhold, *Studying the Enemy: Japan Hands in Republican China and Their Quest for National Identity, 1925–1945* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Zachary Shore, *A Sense of the Enemy: The High-Stakes History of Reading Your Rival's Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Gil Eyal, *The Disenchantment of the Orient: Expertise in Arab Affairs and the Israeli State* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006); and Uriya Shavit and Ofir Winter, *Zionism in Arab Discourses* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

87 Dirk Rupnow, Veronika Lipphardt, Jens Thiel, and Christina Wessely, ed., *Pseudowissenschaft: Konzeptionen von Nichtwissenschaftlichkeit in der Wissenschaftsgeschichte* [Pseudoscience: Conceptions of the non-academic in the history of science] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2008); Alan E. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); Michael Zimmermann, ed., *Zwischen Erziehung und Vernichtung: Zigeunerpolitik und Zigeunerforschung im Europa des 20. Jahrhunderts* [Between education and annihilation: Politics toward and research about gypsies in twentieth-century Europe] (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2007); Klaus Michael Bogdal, *Europa erfindet die Zigeuner: Eine Geschichte von Faszination und Verachtung* [The European invention of gypsies: a history of fascination and contempt] (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2011); Frank Reuter, *Der Bann des Fremden: Die fotografische Konstruktion des 'Zigeuners'* [The spell of the stranger: The photographic construction of the 'Gypsy'] (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2014); and Tanja Penter, "Das Wissen über die 'Zigeuner' (*cygane*) im Zarenreich" [Knowledge about 'gypsies' (*cygane*) in Czarist Russia], in *Imperien, Nationen, Regionen: Imperiale Konzeptionen in Deutschland und Russland zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* [Empires, nations, regions: Imperial conceptions in early twentieth-century Germany and Russia], ed. Andreas Wirschung and Aleksandr Oganovič Čubar'jan (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2018), 91–108.

88 George W. Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1991); and Hyung-il Pai, ed., *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

89 Nandy, *Intimate Enemy*.

and literature to media studies. The ascription of enmity depends on the presence, real or imagined, of a threat that incites fear and loathing of the opponent and, almost as often, fosters unity and a sense of purpose among peers. There are few communities that do not relate what they are or aspire to become to enemies that reflect what they are not or struggle to leave behind. While representations of enmity are not the most important element in assertions of collective identity, they add a critical edge to discursive self-constructions and their stabilizations.[90] They invite prolonged and intimate engagement and may result in enduring but inevitably ambivalent entanglements that shape the histories and identities of all involved parties[91] and may become an indispensable part of their sense of self.

Relations of enmity are nurtured and sustained by cultural practices of representation that are instrumental in defining, portraying, or enacting relationships as either undesirable, volatile, hostile, or dangerous. As many studies have shown, depictions of enemies and their relations to "us" in literature, arts, media, and popular culture are crucial to creating and disseminating typified images and rousing powerful emotions.[92] Ritualized performances of enmity, either decrying the opponent's depravity or celebrating a community's purity, similarly serve to enhance cohesion and fortify resilience in times of threat or uncertainty.[93] They normalize a language of alterity that is essential to marking and othering enemies within or without.[94] Visual and media representations provide further clues to identifying difference; historical narratives legitimize claims of the inevitability or transhistorical nature of cultural rivalries and political

90 Mitzen, "Ontological Security"; and Bahar Rumelili and Ayşe Betül Çelik, "Ontological Insecurity in Asymmetric Conflicts: Reflections on Agonistic Peace in Turkey's Kurdish Issue," *Security Dialogue* 48, no. 4 (2017): 279–296.

91 Nayoung Aimee Kwon, *Intimate Empire: Collaboration and Colonial Modernity in Korea and Japan* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).

92 Günther Blaicher, ed., *Erstarrtes Denken: Studien zu Klischee, Stereotyp und Vorurteil in englischsprachiger Literatur* [Frozen thinking: Studies on clichés, stereotypes, and prejudices in Anglophone literature] (Tübingen: Narr, 1987); Hugo Dyserinck, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Erforschung ethnischer Stereotypen* [Collected essays on ethnic stereotypes] (Bonn: Bouvier, 1993); Klaus Hödl, ed., *Der Umgang mit dem "Anderen": Juden, Frauen, Fremde, …* [Dealing with the 'other': Jews, women, strangers, …] (Wien: Böhlau, 1996); and David Stahl and Mark Williams, ed., *Imag(in)ing the War in Japan: Representing and Responding to Trauma in Postwar Literature and Film* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

93 John Nelson, "Social Memory as Ritual Practice: Commemorating Spirits of the Military Dead at Yasukuni Shinto Shrine," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 62, no. 2 (2003): 443–467.

94 Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak, *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism* (London: Routledge, 2001).

conflicts; and institutionalized attempts at shaping collective memory,[95] such as *lieux de mémoire* or museums dedicated to traumatic events, condition emotional responses and instill lasting resentment.[96]

Efforts to stage enmity are no less marked by ambivalences than knowledge production about enemies or experiences gained in actual encounters with them. Historical reenactments no longer aim for authenticity but focus rather on creating "affective communities" that share a fortified sense of belonging through common enemies.[97] Even parochial expressions of enmity are of necessity exercises in transculturation that provoke ambivalent psychological and social responses.[98] Displays of enmity depend on competing interpretations of shared symbolic resources, be they textual, artistic, or theatrical. They are riddled with ambivalences emerging from unacknowledged cultural continuities and shared traumatic experiences, and often betray doubts that undercut efforts to ostracize opponents unambiguously. Insecurities extend to the forms of expression that are mobilized to portray enemies and legitimize hostile actions, as the considerable body of literature that probes constructions of alterity[99] and the making of enemies has demonstrated.[100]

---

95 Aleida Assmann and Jan Assmann, "Kultur und Konflikt: Aspekte einer Theorie des unkommunikativen Handelns" [Culture and conflict: Aspects of a theory of non-communicative action], in *Kultur und Konflikt* [Culture and conflict], ed. Jan Assmann and Dietrich Hardt (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1990), 11–48; and Aleida Assmann and Sebastian Conrad, ed., *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices, and Trajectories* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

96 Pierre Nora, ed., *Les lieux de mémoire* [Realms of memory], 7 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–1992); Bhaskar Sarkar, *Mourning the Nation: Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009); and Kirk A. Denton, *Exhibiting the Past: Historical Memory and the Politics of Museums in Postsocialist China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014).

97 Iain McCalman and Paul A. Pickering, ed., *Historical Reenactment: From Realism to the Affective Turn* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

98 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979); Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit, *Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies* (New York: Penguin, 2004); and Ivan D. Kalmar and Derek J. Penslar, ed., *Orientalism and the Jews* (Waltham: Brandeis University Press, 2005).

99 Gerd Baumann and André Gingrich, ed., *Grammars of Identity / Alterity: A Structural Approach* (New York: Berghahn, 2004); and Anja Becker and Jan Mohr, ed., *Alterität als Leitkonzept für historisches Interpretieren* [Alterity as a guiding concept of historical interpretation] (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2012); Hinrich Fink-Eitel, *Die Philosophie und die Wilden: Über die Bedeutung des Fremden für die europäische Geistesgeschichte* [Philosophy and the savage: The significance of the stranger for European intellectual history] (Hamburg: Junius, 1998); Wolfgang Eßbach, "Über soziale Konstruktionen von Biographien" [The social construction of biographies], in *Biographien und Interkulturalität: Diskurs und Lebenspraxis* [Biographies and interculturality: Discourse and lived practice], ed. Rita Franceschini (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2001), 59–68.

100 Rolf-Peter Janz, ed., *Faszination und Schrecken des Fremden* [Fascination and fear of the other] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001); Günter Figal, "Fremdheit und Feindschaft: Erörterungen zur Grenze des Ethischen" [Alterity and enmity: Discussions of ethical boundaries], in *Gewalt verstehen* [Understanding violence], ed. Burkhard Liebsch and Dagmar Mensink (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003),

(c) Encounter: Actual encounters between enemies can be fruitfully explored through the collaboration between specialists in international relations, historians and organizational sociologists or linguists. Inciting or sustaining enmity does not require face-to-face interaction, but actual encounters add poignancy to what is known and expected of real and imagined enemies. It is therefore necessary to scrutinize the spaces, circumstances, and effects of such meetings. Analyses of direct contacts between declared opponents confirm that enmity must be understood as an immediate social relationship—a "*soziale Nahbeziehung*."[101] Studying the immediate contexts in which such relationships evolve, the dynamics of the social interrelations they enable, and the psychological impact they have upon individuals and groups affords detailed insights into the ambivalences of hostile encounters. The different modes of antagonistic interaction uncovered in studies of enmity-in-action can be positioned analytically along a wide scale of "applied" or "practiced" forms of enmity. This scale extends from different forms of physical violence (war, torture, physical abuse, killing, etc.) and aggressive appropriation (captivity, enslavement, etc.), through structural violence (psychological warfare, legal segregation, societal marginalization, linguistic stigmatization, etc.) and intellectual controversies (public polemics and disputes), to diplomacy and the often painful but inevitable negotiations between declared enemies.[102]

The immediate experience of a personal encounter often provokes ambivalent reactions: to suffer physical violence or emotional distress at the hands of others will generally strengthen feelings of enmity or even hatred. However, coming into contact with other individuals or groups can also foster processes of appropriation, imitation, or emulation. For example, it can strengthen the cohesion of warrior classes across enemy lines due to shared military values. Medieval chivalry based on common admiration for

256–286; and Barak Kushner, *The Thought War: Japanese Imperial Propaganda* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005).

101 Gabriele Jancke and Monika Bernold, ed., *Feindschaft* [Enmity] (Essen: Klartext, 2010).

102 David Berger, *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue: Essays in Jewish-Christian Relations* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2010); Bertram Turner, "Überlappende Gewalträume: Christlich-islamische Gewaltwahrnehmung zwischen Polemik und Alltagsrationalität" [Overlapping spaces of violence: Christian and Muslim perceptions of violence between polemics and everyday rationality], in *Gewalt im Mittelalter: Realitäten – Imaginationen* [Violence in the Middle Ages: Realities and imaginations], ed. Manuel Braun and Cornelia Herberichs (Munich: Fink, 2005), 225–250; Alex James Novikoff, *Dialogue and Disputation in Medieval Thought and Society, 1050–1350* (PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2007); Nicoline Hortzitz, *Die Sprache der Judenfeindschaft in der Frühen Neuzeit (1450–1700): Untersuchungen zu Wortschatz, Text und Argumentation* [The language of anti-Semitism in the early modern period (1450–1700): Lexical, textual, and argumentative analyses] (Heidelberg: Winter, 2005); and Evgeny Roshchin, "Friendship of the Enemies: Twentieth Century Treaties of the United Kingdom and the USSR," *International Politics* 48 (2011): 71–91.

soldierly prowess thus became an ideal in seemingly opposing societies; the "Red Baron" and other German "heroes of the skies" were grudgingly admired by the allies in the First World War, to cite one example.[103] Intensification and normalization are therefore both characteristic effects of enemy contact. Contact reveals the ambivalent relationship between established notions of the enemy and personal or collective experiences, both psychological and physical, that take place in concrete circumstances. Examining enmity-in-action by foregrounding social practices (actions) as well as their impact upon individuals and groups (experiences)[104] thus helps to uncover specific norms of conduct and their translation into the concrete behavior of agents. This in turn allows us to reconstruct the impact of physical contact with a declared enemy on representations of adversity.[105] In order to adequately interpret specific modes of behavior, one needs to consider the educational backgrounds, professional careers, and personal networks of individual actors.[106] Language, too, is a relevant marker of face-to-face interaction. Studies in this area therefore need to investigate modes of *a priori* stigmatized interaction in their specific settings, that is, their social as well as political or spatial frameworks.[107]

The study of enmity needs historical depth

Our fifth and final hypothesis emphasizes the necessity of historical depth for a deeper understanding of enmity. Any attempt to analyze enmity comprehensively is doomed to fail if limited to current modes of antagonism.[108]

---

103 Richard W. Kaeuper, *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); and Dan Hampton, *Lords of the Sky: Fighter Pilots and Air Combat, from the Red Baron to the F-16* (New York: HarperCollins, 2014).

104 Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963).

105 Yvonne Friedman, *Encounter between Enemies: Captivity and Ransom in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); and Hans Henning Kortüm, ed., *Transcultural War: From the Middle Ages to the Twenty-First Century* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2006).

106 Nicholas J. Wheeler, *Trusting Enemies: Interpersonal Relationships in International Conflict* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018).

107 Goffman, *Stigma*; Zarakol, *After Defeat*; and Charlotte Epstein, "Stop Telling Us How to Behave: Socialization or Infantilization?," *International Studies Perspective* 13, no. 2 (2012): 135–145.

108 Hans Michael Bernhardt, "Voraussetzungen, Struktur und Funktion von Feindbildern: Vorüberlegungen aus historischer Sicht" [Preconditions, structure, and function of enemy images: Historical considerations], in *Feindbilder in der deutschen Geschichte: Studien zur Vorurteilsgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* [Enemy images in German history: Studies on the history of prejudice in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries], ed. Christoph Jahr, Uwe Mai, and Kathrin Roller (Berlin: Metropol, 1994), 9–24; and Ragnhild Fiebig-von Hase and Ursula Lehmkuhl, ed., *Enemy Images in American History* (Providence, RI: Berghahn, 1996).

Historical studies are necessary to understand the particularities of adversarial relations in specific moments and regions and to inoculate our research against the twin fallacies of methodological presentism and experiential Eurocentrism. Only they can uncover the emergence and construction of enmity around the globe by tracing specific "biographies of hostile ascriptions" of shorter or longer duration—some enduring to this day.[109] To give just one example, in recent years, religion and race have gained renewed currency as instruments of division and accelerants of aggression. But the intensity and efficiency with which both can be deployed by state and non-state actors can only be assessed through transtemporal comparisons with past societies in which religion and race were prominent political and cultural vectors.[110]

Extending the timeline of investigation is also useful to counter the tendency to tie enmity studies exclusively to the existence of the modern state. Including the Middle Ages and the early modern period in our research expands the reach of transcultural enemy studies to polities that were far less coherently organized in administrative and political terms. This had immediate effects on the modes and functions of the adversarial relationships that developed within and between them. When citizenship was far less consistently articulated than today, for instance, certain groups (religious or ethnic minorities, particular professions, etc.) could easily be singled out as supposed enemies, as the case of the Ottoman Empire (among many other examples) shows.[111] Current tendencies to question citizenship are once again sharpening our awareness of such issues.[112] In the Middle Ages and the early modern period, political stakeholders or merchants who conducted maritime violence could be labelled

109 Manuel Becker, "'Geschichte als Argument': Ein Stiefkind der neueren geschichtspolitischen Forschung" ['History as argument': A neglected theme of recent studies on the politics of history], *Jahrbuch für Politik und Geschichte* 5 (2014): 173–187.

110 Höfert, *Den Feind beschreiben*; and Hartl, *Das Feindbild der Kreuzzugslyrik*.

111 Henning Sievert, "Family, Friend, or Foe? Factions, Households, and Interpersonal Relations in Mamluk Egypt and Syria," in *Everything is on the Move: The Mamluk Empire as a Node in (Trans-) Regional Networks*, ed. Stephan Conermann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 83–125; Donald J. Kagay, "The Essential Enemy: The Image of the Muslim as Adversary and Vassal in the Law and Literature of the Medieval Crown of Aragon," in *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Perception of the Other*, ed. David R. Blanks and Michael Frassetto (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 119–136; Hannes Möhring, "The Christian Concept of the Muslim Enemy during the Crusades," in *Transcultural Wars from the Middle Ages to the 21st Century*, ed. Hans-Henning Kortüm (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2006), 185–193; Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, "The 'Turkish Yoke' Revisited: The Ottoman Non-Muslim Subjects between Loyalty, Alienation, and Riot," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 93 (2006): 177–195; and Hakan Karateke, H. Erdem Çıpa, and Helga Anetshofer, ed., *Disliking Others: Loathing, Hostility, and Distrust in Premodern Ottoman Lands* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2018).

112 Costica Dumbrava, *Nationality, Citizenship and Ethno-Cultural Belonging: Preferential Membership Policies in Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); and Frederick Cooper, *Citizenship, Inequality, and Difference: Historical Perspectives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 2018).

as "pirates," only to morph back into acknowledged members of society when political and social circumstances changed.[113] Borders and frontiers also showed stark ambivalences, and even the enemization of the non-human—nature in general and certain plants or animals in particular—developed distinct traits due to the scarcity of reliable knowledge.[114]

Case studies of ambivalent enmity

The five case studies in this theme issue highlight exemplary cases of ambivalent enmity in distinct time periods and regions. They examine intentionally diverse forms of enemization and approach their material from different disciplinary angles. They do not and cannot attempt to provide a comprehensive inventory of the ambivalences of enmity; rather they aim to illustrate the richness of the forms, expressions, and effects of hostile relationships and highlight the dynamics of antagonism throughout history.

Our collection begins with an examination of the ambivalences of enmity and amity in Israel/Palestine from the advent of Zionism to today. Juxtaposing intertwined but often contradictory developments on both sides, Derek J. Penslar reviews attempts to define this fateful relationship by a variety of state and non-state actors and traces the ways in which these interventions continue to shape mutual perceptions. Composed as a keynote address for the official opening of our graduate program in the immediate aftermath of the October 7 Hamas massacre, his careful analysis underscores the necessity of continuing scholarly engagement with the dynamics of enmity even in the darkest historical moments.

The second article takes on the challenge of transdisciplinarity. Historian of Eastern Europe Penter and clinical psychologist Taubner join forces to elucidate the complex psychology of enmity. Their autopsy of the diary of a young Ukrainian woman during the time of the Nazi German occupation captures dynamic affective investments, ranging from hostility to friendship and even romantic longing, and relates their changes to both political realities

113 Nikolas Jaspert and Sebastian Kolditz, ed., *Seeraub im Mittelmeerraum: Piraterie, Korsarentum und maritime Gewalt von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* [Piracy in the Mediterranean: Pirates, corsairs, and maritime violence from Antiquity to the Modern Age] (Paderborn: Fink, 2013); and Thomas Heebøll-Holm, Philipp Höhn, and Gregor Rohmann, ed., *Merchants, Pirates, and Smugglers: Criminalization, Economics, and the Transformation of the Maritime World (1200–1600)* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2019).

114 David Abulafia and Nora Berend, ed., *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); Wojciech Falkowski and Andrzej Janeczek, ed., *Frontiers and Borderlands* (Warsaw: Fundacja Centrum Badań Historycznych, 2011); Nikolas Jaspert, "Military Orders at the Frontier: Permeability and Demarcation," in *The Military Orders. Vol. 6.2: Culture and Conflict in Western and Northern Europe*, ed. Jochen Schenk and Mike Carr (Oxford: Ashgate, 2016), 3–28; and Nikolas Jaspert, "The Mediterranean Other and the Other Mediterranean: Perspectives of Alterity in Medieval Studies," in *Otherness in the Middle Ages*, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz and Ian Wood (Turnhout: Brepols, 2021), 37–74.

and adolescent psychological development. The ambivalences visible in the young woman's painful conflicts of loyalty and identity reflect not only the fog and horrors of war but they also mirror the much more mundane struggles and uncertainties of coming-of-age in volatile times.

Shifting the focus to South Asia, art historian Monica Juneja examines how art objects and architectural remains become enmeshed in the dynamics of enmity. Scrutinizing appropriations and emulations of monumental remains of past empires in South Asia and discussions about their place in post-colonial India through a transcultural lens, her contribution uncovers material evidence of the mutually constitutive relationship between enemization and identity construction. Even moments of iconoclasm and usurpation can thus be revealed as processes that betray dialectic ambivalence: while sites and symbols of the enemy are violently attacked and destroyed, their aesthetic is surprisingly knowledgeably emulated in the very objects designed to take their place.

Probing the link between ambivalent enmity and the politics of anti-modern radicalism, political scientist Johannes Becke and sinologist Joachim Kurtz trace and compare unacknowledged transcultural inspirations in two radical forms of cultural and political revivalism that have recently gained prominence in contemporary Israel and China. Both the Israeli Temple Movement and the muscular political Confucianism of mainland Chinese neo-traditionalists claim to restore and revive a pre-modern social order, often based on apocalyptic visions of a struggle for ethno-cultural survival. Ironically, however, both depend on learning from their enemies to realize their goals and both draw on a globally shared repertoire of radical ideologies and modes of expression. In a pattern of mimetic isomorphism, their organizational templates and rhetorical strategies mimic other radical movements that oppose the "decadence" of modernity and Westernization. The case study thus illustrates how different strategies and discourses of enemization operate as ambivalent drivers of transculturation.

Finally, international relations specialist Sebastian Harnisch asks how, when, and why states have ordered killings of political enemies outside their proper jurisdictions. Applying a comparative approach informed by recent advances in role theory and studies of norm transformation to state-directed assassinations, he proposes to regard politically motivated killings beyond borders as calculated acts of defiance aiming to restore dominant status roles of autocratic governments vis-à-vis critical citizens and the liberal international order. Distinguishing two variants of defiant political murder, exemplified by targeted killings initiated by Russia and North Korea, Harnisch argues that these deliberately spectacular acts of violence achieve their goals as symbolic stagings of enmity directed at domestic as well as global audiences.

Conclusion

What may be learned from our theme issue beyond the analytical results of individual case studies? We argue that only a transcultural, regionally diverse, and historically informed approach can unlock the full potential of enmity studies. Such an approach provides the tools to demonstrate that linkages between enmity and ambivalence are by no means exclusive features of modern, let alone exclusively European, communities and states. Ambivalent constructions of enmity have relied on real or imagined histories and depictions of injustice, conflict, and oppression in many parts of the world and in diverse time periods. By tracing the genealogies of such representations, their staging and perpetuation as well as their effects on actual interactions with perceived enemies, the case studies in this issue show that enmity is driven by a profound tension between the constitutive role of forging collective identities and maintaining internal unity on one hand, and its destructive potential to fuel outward aggression on the other. This approach allows us to transcend lessons learned from postcolonial studies. A transcultural account of the ambivalences of enmity complicates a flattened understanding of power asymmetries. To cite only one example, non-dominant or non-state groups (often labelled as "minorities") with a long history of state evasion[115] understandably maximize their polytactic potential,[116] that is, their capability of building flexible alliances in contexts of frequent power shifts. Consequently, their histories usually evade simple dichotomies such as colonizers and colonized.[117] Relying on the more fine-grained typology of interaction developed in historical and transcultural studies may help to inspire further research that problematizes static binaries of domination and resistance and highlights the relational, processual, and paradoxical character of enemization and de-enemization. At the same time, it highlights the dynamics of antagonism as an indispensable but as yet understudied dimension of transculturation.

115 Scott, *Seeing Like a State*.

116 Georg Elwert, "Switching of We-Group Identities: The Alevies as a Case among Many Others," in *Syncretistic Religious Communities in the Near East*, ed. Krisztina Kehl-Bodrogi, Barbara Kellner Heinkele, and Anke Otter Beaujean (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 65–85.

117 Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*.