

INOCENT- MÁRIA V. SZANISZLÓ

THE PROCESS OF DEMOCRATIZATION AND POLITICAL COMMUNICATION
IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Inocent- Mária V. Szaniszló

Catholic University Ružomberok, the Institute of Applied Ethics of Prof. Alexander Spesz, Theology Faculty, Košice, Slovakia.
Email: inocentop@gmail.com

Abstract: When we ask modern questions about democracy and democratization, we have to clarify the meaning of these words. It has been 21 years since the Velvet Revolution and we still think that it had to do with democracy and the democratization of our Czechoslovak society in that time, as if the common use of the word “democratization” makes possible the expression or the vindicate one’s own opinion. There is a question whether the majority of our society was thinking this way. In this context it would be very interesting to see the practical purposes of our Church society during the revolution, as hierarchic or as non-hierarchic. Also there are still the voices of some people that echo the unpreparedness of the Church for this modern world, especially when communicating with the faithful and the society.

Key words: East European countries, democracy, democratization, Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church, Polis area of the Church, Hannah Arendt, Paul Valadier, Josef Ratzinger, Wladyslaw Blin, Roger Mager, John McKenzie

If we want to ask modern questions about democracy and democratization of our post-communist society, to which the Church belongs, firstly we must understand and clarify the meaning of these words. It is difficult to evaluate today whether 21 years ago we cared for the democracy of our Czechoslovak civil society, or we cared for its democratization. The word democracy is, according to the dictionary of foreign words, in Slovakia "the principle of equal application of the will of all members of any group," and democratization means "adjusting, organizing something according to democratic principles."¹

The French Jesuit Paul Valadier reminds us how important it is to realize what the term democracy describes today. According to him, democracy reflects:

- not only a form of society (by A. de Tocqueville) taken as a whole social relations influencing policy, but also a social system whose individualistic principle is progressively extended to interpersonal relationships;
- at the same time, the institutional political system in which representative government controls the executive power;
- finally, the concept of democracy may represent a "culture" of respect for the rules of democracy, based on the recognition of democratic principles and values based on human rights.²

As early as the 1940s Sartori noticed that we like democracy as a political system even though we do not exactly know what in fact it really is. The bishop of Vitebsk (Belarus) Wladyslav Blin points out that even though it has already passed more than half a century since the fall of socialism, even today we live in an era of confusion concerning the term democracy.

The very term "demos" from which the concept of democracy derives raises a number of uncertainties. Blin called the problem of definition of people (*demos*) an unsolvable problem for democracy itself. However, as Sartori adds, the modern definition of democracy is based primarily on the traditional interpretation of human rights, particularly on freedom and equality.³

The way to democracy and especially to its application in the Church began to be shown by the Church's social doctrine of the popes in 19th century. Leo XIII is the first papal promoter of liberal democratic views. Despite the fact that this important pope thinks about it in a critical way, he still rejects (after the Church's experience with the French Revolution of 1789) any form of Jacobin's democracy. However, it is noteworthy that at the same time he disavows the forms of stately monarchy that had been accepted and preferred by the Church.

Pope Leo XIII introduced the model of "healthy democracy" in the encyclical *Libertas praestantissimum* of 1888. This model had been drawn up already by St. Thomas Aquinas. According to him, the Church even in that time was already prepared to accept the validity, independence and

sovereignty of any state, regardless of the state form, structure, and its own political system if this state would serve the common good and would protect freedom and human dignity.⁴

Rejection of any governmental omnipotence and totalitarianism, which are incompatible with freedom and human dignity, is particularly seen in *Quadragesimo anno*, the encyclical of Pope Pius XI of 1931. His definition of the subsidiarity principle provided the basis for the construction of democracy in the Church. The principle of subsidiarity in accordance with human dignity, a sense of solidarity, and sense of responsibility advocates the entitlement to human rights and protection against governmental omnipotence of every human being without distinction.

Complete recognition of democracy by the Roman Catholic Church was for the first time realized in a Christmas discourse called "Benignities" by Pope Pius XII⁵. There he spoke about a true "democracy" in which moral quality of the representatives of people during World War II played the important role at that time, because the fundamental political decisions in a democratic state would depend on them.

With the Second Vatican Council, the Church began to use other tools to better implement access to civil democracy. Article 75 of *Gaudium et Spes* represents all previous efforts to find that concept of democracy which is appropriate to the Christian faith. We find here such elements as the sovereignty of the people, equality before the law, separation of powers, the need for political parties, respect for diversity of views (pluralism), suspicion of danger of very high concentration of governmental power, and so on. Concurrently are mentioned Catholic emphases: the moral basis of natural moral law, the principle of subsidiarity, the common good, active participation, civil education, political courage, and charity.⁶ Also, a young Joseph Ratzinger underlines the opinion that the very concept of democracy should also include a significant religious heritage, making it also the task for the Church. Among the main points of possible democratizing efforts he includes fraternity, functional understanding of authority, charisma, collegiality, synodality, and the people of God. Nevertheless, Ratzinger emphasizes that the public, social, and political explosiveness of the Gospel will not operate by prescribed form, but rather as a liberal vocation that unifies the faithful and liberates them to their own initiative.⁷

One of the important statements of democracy as the political system of the Church following the social encyclicals of Leo XIII and his followers were the reflections of John Paul II, who himself experienced several totalitarian regimes and clearly knew that dictatorships are always associated with abuse of power and violence (actual and structural) and that citizens under such regimes are not subjects of social life but objects of manipulation. Blin refers principally to the fact that this system contributes to contempt of human dignity and violations of human rights.⁸

In the encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* John Paul II. believes that democracy can contribute to the development of the whole person and all people, but later in the encyclical *Centesimus annus* art. 46 he adds that the principle of majority without moral spirit does not guarantee the establishment of fair state forms. Majority rule in a democracy always has to protect the minority or underprivileged groups, and has to respect the moral approaches that guarantee fair state in the form. Only then is it possible to create a successful "social welfare state."⁹ At this point there is a place for a useful social doctrine of the Church, the independent Church, which is not afraid to raise its voice in prophetic criticism if it deems it necessary.

The popes clearly criticized lack of references to absolute and universally valid values in democratic ideals, because in their view a person is dependent on the moral and natural law. They protested against the understanding of democracy which would serve only as a method or technique for creating political order without any connection to irreplaceable values (such as freedom or human dignity). A democracy which is not based on the morality of its citizens and their beliefs in faith, in freedom, in conscience, in human personhood, can lead, as Ratzinger well states, to tyranny, especially if the state is driven to perfection at any cost.¹⁰

Many people, and not only the younger who have been raised in the time of media saturation, are increasingly asking questions about possible involvement in the process of democratization of the Church today (especially in Central Europe). However, at the same time many of them point out the current unpreparedness of the Church, especially in communication with the faithful and with society. If we do not want to repeat the decline of the Western European church in the 1980s, when at least half of its members resigned due to the very weak social dialogue, it would be useful to think about the sense of sharing, dialogue, power, and authority in this, one of the oldest institutions in the world. The Church is not a beginner in this, even though it seems so at first sight. It has come a very long way toward acceptance of democracy as a system, and also as a method of communication.

The democratic element called dialogue, by which the Church leaders would orientate themselves in society through knowing about the joys and pains of their congregants, can lead to confidence and faith in today's society. These are the words of Pope Benedict XVI, who, even as Cardinal Ratzinger in his reflections about connecting to Europe, said that one who fights for Europe, fights for democracy (but associated to *eumonia*).¹¹

Even Pope Paul VI attempted to analyze the role of the Church, as well as that of the pope, based on democratization, and consequently on some form of dialogue. In the encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* he writes: "Dialogue is evangelization ... the Church must enter into dialogue with the world in which it lives. It has something to say, a message to give, a communication to make."¹² The pope understands the transcendental

origin of dialogue in God's intentions.¹³ There is recognition that the development of dialogue leads to deepening of knowledge, renovation of expressions, discovery of elements of the truth in others' opinions, and makes wise teachers.¹⁴ He also sees dangers in making dialogue, and particularly highlights the importance of truth: "The effective apostle is the man who is completely faithful to Christ's teaching. He alone can remain unaffected by the errors of the world around him, the man who lives his Christian life to the full."¹⁵ Hence with this beneficial advice to dialogue in the Church, he exclusively combines dialogue with obedience.¹⁶

On the occasion of finding answers to the question of democratization in the Church, we must not forget the concepts of power, authority, and their use, because one of the issues to address to the Church is its understanding of power. One of the authors who were concerned with the issue of the Church's authority and the appropriate dealing with it is Karl Gabriel. He seeks a sociological answer, looking at the phenomenon of a long tradition of ecclesiastical power. Unlike Weber and Foucault, with their dominant enforcement power that lies in exercising their own will by force, Gabriel finds a theory of Hannah Arendt, which is based on mutual consent and authorization of the members of some social society.¹⁷ To this theory a model focused on commands and obedience is not sufficient, because a concept based on such an authority would not be suitable for the Church.¹⁸ At the same time, the importance of power in the Church must also be acknowledged: "Church without the authority would become a church that ceases to exist as a social group."¹⁹ The Church will always have groups on global levels and through their common action at the level of dioceses, parishes, and within specific groups on the parish level that will protect the power "in their effective social existence, dependent on the consent of members of the group."²⁰

According to Gabriel, even bishops, as formal bearers of power in their bishoprics, are able to exercise this power only if they find people of consent in the church.²¹ In this context, as well as for the pope, a problem arises for bishops: how to achieve the acceptance of the acquired power by ecclesial community, without simply resorting to the formal authorization of actions from above.²² The essential question to us is how to maintain the functioning of this common religious community, thus how to keep it in dialogue.

In the future there may be another, similar phenomenon of a power vacuum in the Church. It may be caused by the fact that without the mutual consent of the members of the Church, no new formation of power in the Church will arise. This points out that the Church of modern times has solely focused on "authority, as an undeniable recognition of" its right to obedience.²³

Arendt sought for power confirmed by people; she wanted to avoid the means of violence, which she considers one of the typical responses to

the loss of power.²⁴ Gabriel supports this thesis, saying that where recognition and support is missing, forms of power gain significance (in Foucault's terms) – and this referred to the Church, as well as to society.²⁵

Another author who energetically undertook the reform of the Church according to the theory of H. Arendt was the Canadian theologian Robert Mager.²⁶ Mager fights for more space for laity in the Church, especially greater participation in decision-making. He respectfully describes Arendt's view to highlight freedom in policy and governance. At the same time he reveals the logic of the private sector for the Church. Thus, on the one hand, there is an attempt for a public dialogue with the world, even an attempt to leadership or the right alignment of the world, and on the other hand, the language and logic of family and fraternity that on the contrary belong to the private sector.²⁷ Mager emphasizes that exactly this model of fraternity shows religion's disaffection to the world. Citing L. Boff, Mager says that the Church demands a private logic on the way to maintain its power, and wants to establish a real public dimension of its power on the basis of this logic. The Church maintains control of the aspiration for equality and decision-making according to the document *Christifideles laici*.²⁸ Thus, what is essential in the practice of power in the Church is the status of equality in the Church, according to Mager. Simultaneously, this equality exceeding the opposition clergy-laity allows finding freedom for Christians, and this freedom must be actively manifested and used by them. The whole effort of the Church, the whole "politics" in the Church (democratization, *sensus fidelium*, changes of ordinand's services, freedom of speech, etc.,) is living space, which is based on the equality of believers and focused on fulfilment in freedom.

Here, however, it is worth realizing that the issue is not whether the Church should be showing up and giving itself to the world through the Spirit in order to gain power. Not at all. Showing the Church to the world is a constructive dimension of God's action, who takes upon himself humanity in Jesus Christ in order to seize the profane dimension through the Holy Spirit and make history. Therefore the Church is involved in the dynamics of giving up its ownership of God, of truth, and of the future in favor of searching for God in the world, just because this is its heritage, its *kléros*, where implementing power.²⁹ In this sense, power in the Church doesn't have any political and practical sense. Power in the Church in this sense is just a method that helps people (assembly, community) to seek God in the world.

Another "democratic" element that belongs to the tradition of modern authentic theological sources of God's appearance is also "the consensus of the faithful" (*consensus fidelium*³⁰). In this case it concerns the possession of theological belief and the gift of God. This belief from its very nature requires a deep agreement of heart and spirit with the Church. This means that God's people are unmistakably connecting to faith under the guidance of the Magisterium of the Church through the

supernatural sense of faith (*sensus fidei*). It is a feeling all the people from the bishops to "last" of the lay faithful.³¹

The above-mentioned dialogue between the Church and the world can better help to illustrate the concept of Church as sacrament. Mager finds the concrete form of public space in the Church in three points. The first is (in Arendt's theory) to maintain tension in the Church between those who depend on public space and what should remain private. In the second point he refers to the need, even in the Church, to strictly distinguish authority from power, and to encourage appropriate tension between them. The last point according to Mager is promotion and return to pluralism in the Church, which are understood to mean equality and diversity, by which the social equality of all its members (regardless of gender, character, race, etc.) gains ground.³²

In conclusion, Mager proposes the establishment of new Church structures based on two principles: synodality and subsidiarity. Following Arendt, he is in favor of the establishment of religious order, which must cooperate in order to balance the accumulated power between laypeople and the authority of holy services in the Church.³³ In order to find an answer to this vision, Mager recommends going the way of psychology, but his whole idea seems very idealistic and in need of practical confirmation.

Let us also reflect on the post-Vatican II thoughts of U.S. Bible specialist John L. McKenzie.³⁴ McKenzie argues that although it is natural to understand the authority of the Church as a kind of power, in the light of the New Testament this understanding of ecclesiology is seen to be mistaken.³⁵ Furthermore the line between the implementation of power and outright tyranny is extremely fine and can be determined only after an exact definition of the ecclesiastical authority.³⁶ To this end McKenzie cites the famous American theologian John M. Todd, who claims that the power supporting a dual evolution is the only legitimate human power. In this sense, the exchange of existence, of owned items and services for the benefit of everyone, is indispensable for the evolution of individual and common life. Any power that claims the right to exceed this condition is tyrannical and undermines individual and communal life.³⁷

Karl Rahner also confirms that the power to dominate does not belong to the Church, because its goal is to bring their subordinates into a status of spiritual maturity in which they are no longer liable.³⁸ McKenzie emphasizes that the Church is a liberal, consensual community; therefore it is not a case of a natural state community. The Church is fundamentally different from other communities in its objectives and means, which are specific goals of the Church.³⁹ This power in the Church, even if understood in political terms, must therefore not be assimilated with the state. Any similarities are only analogical.⁴⁰

Although the concept of power and various elements of the internal structure of the Church are not state-owned, they are still under the

influence of culture, nation, and state, in which the Church exists and fulfils its mission. Regardless of where it exists the Church must still avoid two dangers: an escape from culture (the world) and profanisation (secularization).⁴¹

The magisterium of the Church is not authorized to tell people what to do, but rather to enable them to find a solution. McKenzie continues with the view that the competence of power of the Church is faith and morals⁴² and its mission is, according to the New Testament, proclamation of the Gospel and giving the sacraments.⁴³ The Church is not competent to control the field of science and morality. If the power of the Church is permeated by its objective, the mission of the Church will be unique and its competency will be complete.⁴⁴

Therefore, the last and the most real justification of the power, as pointed out by McKenzie, is just freedom. Power is freedom, and in this sense it is also force. Power cannot survive if it does not protect the freedom of both leaders and subordinates. If power does not accept freedom, it will be forced to defend a position that it was not entitled to take. But if power recognizes the freedom of subordinates it will ensure its own freedom, it will strengthen a confidence which comes from the voluntary consent of the subordinates, and their power will join the power of those who are governing. Consequently, power and freedom are the real of power.⁴⁵

Relations between power and freedom are determined by love for the Christian community. Love does not restrict freedom, but rather is the fullness of it. A Christian in the Church does not act under duress, command, or obligation, but because of the fact that the power of the Spirit is the “driving engine” of his or her actions. At the same time, nobody is able to lead others without being accepted by his or her subordinates. This acceptance is a voluntary act of consent that must be earned.⁴⁶

Public opinion also has its place when exercising power, because one does not fight against a decision when one has participated in its promulgation. Therefore public discussion is always healthier than private (private discussion is often disposed to injustice, wrong language, and sharp and unsubstantiated claims).⁴⁷ In McKenzie’s words, the real change in the Church will be when the Church recognizes the right and power that belong to believers because of the constitution of the Church, and not because of the generosity of the Pontificate.⁴⁸

The Church does need to keep some things in secret. Secrets of ecclesiastical power lie in the fact that they concern a power whose strength is the power of love. If the religious institution uses any power other than the power of love, it ceases to have a Christian and religious character. McKenzie concludes that order and discipline do not say anything about the fulfilment of the Church’s mission. Recognition of faith as the real basis of ecclesiastical power is, according to him, the only

guarantee against the decline of Church's power, which may cause secularization and transformation of the power structure. Just as faith is necessary for the acceptance of authority, it is also necessary for its implementation.⁴⁹ Public opinion in the Church is one of the channels by which the Spirit speaks. Power is the limb of the body, and if it is to achieve the fullness that appertains to it, it needs the fullness of the body to fulfil every person in Jesus Christ.⁵⁰

Znoj, as cited by Norbert Bobbi, points out many defects of democracy.⁵¹ First he remarks on a democratic society, "an eccentric society" where it is not the free and autonomous individuals who determine the stream of politics, but different groups or classes in which the individual is just a small link in a long causal chain.⁵² The elected representative in parliament representing the whole society becomes only a party member, advocating for some special interest group. Democracy is unable to end the oligarchic power. That is to say that in democracy the political elite also work to maintain control of power, even after changes in government. This so-called "invisible power" does not answer to the public in a democracy. Real democracy is bureaucratic. Moreover, instead of developing education and cultivating people, real democracy faces political indifference and economic consumerism.

Ratzinger also points out the defections of democracy. To the forefront he puts the contemporary inability of democracy to come to terms with the imperfections of human concerns in so-called "free communities." The good doesn't consist in an ethical human effort in the positive use of freedom, but rather is predetermined through the structure without the possibility of opposition. Therefore a "free community" must be independent from ethos. Morality in such a society becomes unnecessary, even unwise. This view is supported by the loss of transcendence, the belief that this earthly life is all there is. After all, Marx taught that one must refuse transcendence and be released from false reassurance in order to build a perfect world.⁵³

Ratzinger responds to these views with Augustine's *City of God* and his answer to those who consider Christianity in politics to result in anarchy. Christianity as a political force has a few critical elements. The first is Messianic dynamism, which is focused on the unconditional nature of "empire" through which the citizen must not withdraw from political involvement, nor may the Christian fight his or her country. The second, Catholic theology has come to the recognition of profane, no messianic state by denying righteousness just from acts and criterion of holiness only from grace and by acceptation of Aristotle and his idea of natural moral law. The third, the Christian faith rejected the classical idea of tolerance, because it did not want to recognize the gods of the Pantheon. Therefore Christianity, despite having a small number of believers from the beginning, has exercised its right to public space and has taken a stand on the legal state level. It is here where its greatness lies as the antipole of

political totalitarianism.⁵⁴ Regarding this Ratzinger affirms that in the political sphere Christianity avoided messianism and inclines to rationality and ethos by the fact that although the New Testament knows the political ethos, it contains no political theology.⁵⁵

To support the sense of dialogue in a democracy, we present the view of the famous German philosopher Habermas, who says that the paradigm of democracy (in sense of the practice of self-determination) is not the market but dialogue.⁵⁶ The sense of this dialogue should be in a general consensus and searching for possible solutions.⁵⁷

One of the world's most important recent Dominican Bible scholars interested in democracy in the world is Benedict Thomas Viviano. Viviana is aware of the constant threat to humans that comes from original sin, which in this case gives rise to the abuse of power. Yet he is also convinced that modern democratic systems are the best way to limit this abuse of power. Viviano therefore considers it necessary to create a theology of democracy.⁵⁸

Viviano (after Schillebeeckx) points out that democracy is not a magic cure for all the pain of the world; moreover, it has many defections. He shows that while on one hand, Churchill considered democracy the worst form of government, with the exception of all of the alternatives, on the other hand R. Niebuhr argued that "democracy is a method of finding appropriate solutions to irresolvable problems."⁵⁹ To Viviano all these things lead to the fact that a good responsible and stable democracy must be dependent on relations of trust, reciprocity, and cooperation. In this the humble and courageous realism of the Gospel should be a good guide.⁶⁰

Young Ratzinger himself, in a reflection to Hans Mayer, says that although the Church must not adopt party democracy, it must adapt one of the essential elements of modern democracy, i. e. the independent custody of rights.⁶¹ Ratzinger defends democracy in the Church following the classical model of parish-presbyter-episcopate, with which the Church has rich experience.⁶²

In the new valuation of his article 30 years later, he emphasizes that, as in 1968, the word "democracy" is perceived as a cure for everything, but today there is a threat that a certain procedural part of it could result in a dictatorship of the majority. Consequently, he emphasizes that fundamental human rights must never be the subject of a democratic vote.⁶³

Ratzinger's definition of democracy speaks about the system, which is shown in the reciprocal limitation and preservation of freedom, and has regard for the protection of the rights and dignity of the individual, but simultaneously it also enables the cooperation of all who serve the common good (both from the material and formal points of view). The Pope reminds that those who speak about the democratization of the Church today must not have in mind only the principle of majority, but also the multifaceted image of democracy in which can be found analogies

and commonalities. Individual tools such as shared freedom or natural law must serve the common goal to protect and thus work for the good of the group as well as the individual. The good of the Church as seen by God is the Gospel, and is faith as seen by people. The aim of the constitution and law order of the Church has to be the fact that faith is given to all people as a genuine light and power by which to live.⁶⁴ Ratzinger describes democratic mechanisms this way: a control of power through law, inviolability of law by power, and standardization of law through ethos.⁶⁵

With Maritain we can underline that the limitation of democracy only to its procedural part would lead to the exclusion of the citizen from the political scene.⁶⁶ Thus Maritain classes democratic pluralism among the elements that characterize democracy, while he recommends teaching democratic pluralism at schools.⁶⁷ Maritain, citing Bergson, who said that "democracy is the essence of the Gospel and love is its engine," judges that democracy can succeed only with citizens armed with strong moral and religious beliefs.⁶⁸ Valadier, despite recognizing the existence of democratic elements that are incompatible with the nature of the Catholic Church, confirms that there are some democratic elements that are perfectly compatible with those of the Church.⁶⁹

Democracy as such is not compatible with the Church, because the Church is not based on free discussion of the undetermined community, but on the founding speech of Christ, and is generally structured and legitimate as long as she expands the Word and remains faithful to the Word. According Valadier Church can not be understood and to understand itself as a political society, but society as salvation and grace. Christ entrusted the mission of mercy and love for all human beings until the end of times. Therefore its structure must reveal this message and realize its origin.⁷⁰

Valadier is convinced that only by loyalty to its constitutive elements can the Church better respond to the democratic aspirations of the faithful. Therefore it will certainly not imitate or import democracy in its entirety, but will appreciate the essential and necessary elements that enhance the credibility and viability of the Church. Valadier also proposes (according to the model of democracy) more control of power in the work of the Church, even though no one doubts that the Church is a real law community. Yet he wants law to protect the rights of believers, especially in the face of possible abuse of power in the Church. At the same time concern must be shown for protecting religious freedom and human rights.⁷¹

Ratzinger concludes that despite searching for other models of democracy today, only a democratic pluralism based on Greek and Christian heritage is able to survive.⁷² In order to survive, the state must recognize the right to faith in public space and must not restrict religious tolerance. This belief, however, must be guided by the strength of public belief in Christian truth.⁷³ Christian values have significantly contributed

to consolidate democratic state. The state must recognize the existence of truth that cannot be subordinated to consensus, which is being enabled and preceded by this *being*.⁷⁴ According to Ratzinger, democracy is available where conscience and responsibility are available.⁷⁵

The aim of this study was, firstly, to remove fear from the combination of the concepts of democracy and the Church, and secondly, to raise real interest in the members of this mystical body of Christ. Perhaps in the 21st century we will be able to renew a dialogue so much needed which on one side, develops evangelism following the encyclical *Ecclesiam Suam* while remains open to all who the Spirit of God guides on the way of faith, and on the other side, a dialogue as a source utilized by many the others who are on the edge or in a position outside to us but still constituting an exceptional assembly we called the Church.

Notes:

¹ Vlasta Petráčková, *Slovník cudzích slov* (Dictionary of Foreign Words), (Bratislava: SPN, 1997), 184.

² Paul Valadier, "Quelle démocratie dans l'Église?", in *La morale sort de l'ombre* (Paris: Desclée de brouwer, 2008), 261-6.

³ Wladyslaw Blin, "Demokratie oder Diktatur", Lecture at 24th Summer academy 2010 of KMB (Catholic Men's Action) Austria in Bad Tatzmansdorf, <http://www.kmb.or.at/> (accessed August 1 2010), 2; cf. Sartori G., *Teoria demokracji*, (Warszawa: PWN, 1994), 16; cf. Josef Ratzinger, "Demokratisierung der Kirche?", in *Demokratie in der Kirche: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen*, ed. Josef Ratzinger and Hans Mayer (Limburg-Kevelaer: Lahn, 2005), 7-46, here 40; 42.

⁴ Benedikt Thomas Viviano, *Notes d'un bibliste pour une future théologie de la démocratie*. (Manuskript in personal archive), 1.

⁵ Roos Lothar, „Entstehung und Entfaltung der modernen Katholischen Soziallehre“, in: Rauscher Anton (ed.), *Handbuch der Katholischen Soziallehre*, (Berlin: Duncker&Humbolt, 2008), 104-142, here 111.

⁶ Viviano, 8.

⁷ Ratzinger, "Demokratisierung der Kirche?", 23.

⁸ Blin, 5 (after W. Piwowarski, "Dyktatura", in *Słownik katolickiej nauki społecznej*, Warszawa: IW Pax, 1993), 38.

⁹ Blin, 6, cf. Josef Ratzinger, "Znaczenie wartości religijnych i etycznych w społeczeństwie pluralistycznym", in *Naród-Wolność-Liberalizm*, Red. L. Balter, Kolekja „Communio“ no 9, (Poznań: Pallotinum, 1994), 190.

¹⁰ Blin, 6.

¹¹ Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger, "Europa - verpflichtendes Erbe für die Christen Kirche" in: *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1987) 198-210, here 206; 208-9.

¹² Paul VI, "Ecclesiam Suam" 65, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam_en.html (accessed on January 1, 2001).

¹³ Paul V., 72.

¹⁴ Paul VI, 85.

- ¹⁵ Paul VI, 88.
- ¹⁶ Paul VI, 116-119.
- ¹⁷ Hannah Arendt, *Essai sur la révolution*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1967), 45.
- ¹⁸ Karl Gabriel, "Machtausübung in der heutigen Kirche im Spiegel sozialwissenschaftlicher Machttheorien: Max Weber, Michel Foucault und Hannah Arendt." *Concilium* 3 (1988): 190-195.
- ¹⁹ Gabriel, 192.
- ²⁰ Gabriel, 193, cf. Arendt, 46.
- ²¹ Gabriel, 194.
- ²² Gabriel, 194.
- ²³ Gabriel, 195.
- ²⁴ Arendt, 47.
- ²⁵ Gabriel, 195.
- ²⁶ Roger Mager, *Le politique dans l'Eglise: Essai ecclésiologique à partir de la théorie politique de Hannah Arendt*, (Montréal: Médiaspaul, 1994).
- ²⁷ Mager, 210.
- ²⁸ Mager, 221, cf. Hannah Arendt, *La condition de l'homme moderne*, (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1961), 277.
- ²⁹ Mager, 307-8.
- ³⁰ Cf. Document of Council Vatican II, "Lumen Gentium", 12, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html (accessed January 1, 2001).
- ³¹ Cf. Jean-Pascal Perrenx, "Les sources de la théologie morale", in *Revue Kephars*, (January - Mars 2002): 37-48.
- ³² Mager, 311.
- ³³ Mager, 315.
- ³⁴ John L. McKenzie, *Authority in the Church* (Sheed and Ward Inc., 1966). Our citations are from the Slovak translation *Moc v Cirkvi* (Prešov: M. Vaško, 2003) with the help of the Polish translation *Wladza w Kosciole* (Warszawa: Pax, 1972).
- ³⁵ McKenzie, 12.
- ³⁶ McKenzie, 14.
- ³⁷ McKenzie, 14.
- ³⁸ Paul VI., Art. 53.
- ³⁹ McKenzie, 16.
- ⁴⁰ McKenzie, 17.
- ⁴¹ McKenzie, 18.
- ⁴² McKenzie, 77.
- ⁴³ McKenzie, 81.
- ⁴⁴ McKenzie, 91.
- ⁴⁵ McKenzie, 93.
- ⁴⁶ McKenzie, 106-108.
- ⁴⁷ McKenzie, 111.
- ⁴⁸ McKenzie, 112.
- ⁴⁹ McKenzie, 115.
- ⁵⁰ McKenzie, 116.
- ⁵¹ Norbert Bobbio, *The Future of Democracy: A Defense of the Rules of the Game*, (Polity, 1987).

⁵² Cf. Milan Znoj, "Cesta od normativní teorie demokracie k teorii procedurální a zpět", in Ian Shapiro, Jürgen Habermas, *Teorie demokracie dnes*, (Praha: Filosofia, 2002), 7-22, here 20-22.

⁵³ cf. Josef Kardinal Ratzinger, "Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?", in *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1987) 183-197, here 195.

⁵⁴ Ratzinger, "Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?", 189-192.

⁵⁵ Ratzinger, "Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?", 193-4.

⁵⁶ Jürgen Habermas, "Tři normativní modely demokracie", in Ian Shapiro- Jürgen Habermas, *Teorie demokracie dnes*, (Praha: Filosofia, 2002), 85. We maintain this position despite the grim vision of the unfinished work in a secret study of the German army speaking about the exhaustion of economic resources causing the downfall of democracy. See Jana Horáčková, *Press report TASR* <http://aktualne.centrum.sk/ekonomika/svet-a-ekonomika/clanek.phtml?id=1216101>, taken from www.investweb.cz (accessed September 15 2010).

⁵⁷ Ian Shapiro, "Teorie demokracie: současný stav", in Ian Shapiro, Jürgen Habermas, *Teorie demokracie dnes*, (Praha: Filosofia, 2002), 29.

⁵⁸ Viviano, 1.

⁵⁹ Viviano, 8.

⁶⁰ Viviano, 12.

⁶¹ Ratzinger, "Demokratisierung der Kirche?", 38.

⁶² Ratzinger, "Demokratisierung der Kirche?", 45.

⁶³ Cf. Josef Ratzinger, "Demokratisierung der Kirche- Dreissig Jahre danach", in Ratzinger, "Demokratie in der Kirche: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", 79.

⁶⁴ Ratzinger, "Demokratisierung der Kirche- Dreissig Jahre danach", 81-2.

⁶⁵ Ratzinger, "Europa - verpflichtendes Erbe für die Christen Kirche", 208.

⁶⁶ Cf. Paul Valadier, "Maritain, philosophe de la démocratie", in Valadier, "La morale sort de l'ombre" 349-363, here 357.

⁶⁷ Valadier, "Maritain, philosophe de la démocratie", 362

⁶⁸ Valadier, "Maritain, philosophe de la démocratie", 362 (cf. Bergson, *Deux sources de la morale et de la religion*, donné en OC, VII, 740).

⁶⁹ Valadier, "Quelle démocratie dans l'Église ?", 266.

⁷⁰ Valadier, "Quelle démocratie dans l'Église ?", 268-9.

⁷¹ Valadier, "Quelle démocratie dans l'Église ?", 269.

⁷² Ratzinger, "Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?", 193.

⁷³ Ratzinger, "Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?", 197.

⁷⁴ Ratzinger, "Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?", 196, and also now 2010 in England cf. Benedikt XVI., „Korrigierende Rolle der religion gegenüber der Vernunft“, www.kath.net/detail.php?id=28169 (accessed September 17, 2010).

⁷⁵ Ratzinger, "Europa - verpflichtendes Erbe für die Christen Kirche", 209.

References:

Arendt, Hannah. *Éssai sur la revolution*. Paris : Gallimard, 1967.

Arendt, Hannah. *La condition de l'homme moderne*. Paris : Calmann-Lévy, 1961.

Benedikt XVI.. „Korriegierende Rolle der religion gegenüber der Vernunft“.

www.kath.net/detail.php?id=28169 (accessed September 17, 2010).

Blin, Wladyslaw. “Demokratie oder Diktatur”. Lecture at 24th Summer academy 2010 of KMB (Catholic Men's Action) Austria in Bad Tatzmansdorf. <http://www.kmb.or.at/> (accessed August 1 2010), 8 p.

Bobbio, Norbert. *The Future of Democracy: A Defence of the Rules of the Game*. Polity, 1987.

Document of Council Vatican II, “Lumen Gentium”, 12,
http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html (accessed January 1, 2001).

Gabriel, Karl. “Machtausübung in der heutigen Kirche im Spiegel sozialwissenschaftlicher Machttheorien: Max Weber, Michel Foucault und Hannah Arendt.” *Concilium*. 3 (1988): 190-195.

Habermas, Jürgen. “Tři normativní modely demokracie”. In *Teorie demokracie dnes*. Ian Shapiro, Jürgen Habermas, 79-95. Praha: Filosofia, 2002.

Horáčková, Jana. *Press report TASR*.
<http://aktualne.centrum.sk/ekonomika/svet-a-ekonomika/clanek.phtml?id=1216101>, taken from www.investweb.cz (accessed September 15 2010).

John Paul II. *Centesimus annus*.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus_en.html (accessed January 1, 2001)

John Paul II. *Evangelium vitae*.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25031995_evangelium-vitae_en.html (accessed January 1, 2001)

John Paul II. *Sollicitudo rei socialis*.

http://www.vatican.va/edocs/ENG0223/_INDEX.HTM (accessed January 1, 2001)

Mager, Roger. *Le politique dans l'Eglise: Essai ecclésiologique à partir de la théorie politique de Hannah Arendt*, Montréal: Médiaspaul, 1994.

McKenzie, John L. *Authority in the Church* (Sheed and Ward Inc., 1966), our citations are from Slovak translation *Moc v Cirkvi* (Prešov: M. Vaško, 2003) with a help of polish translation *Wladza v Kosciele* (Warszawa: Pax, 1972).

Paul VI., "Ecclesiam Suam" Art. 67,
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_06081964_ecclesiam_en.html (accessed January 1, 2001)

Perrenx, Jean-Pascal. "Les sources de la théologie morale". In *Revue Kephars*. (January - Mars 2002): 37-48.

Petráčková, Vlasta. *Slovník cudzích slov* (Dictionary of Foreign Words). Bratislava: SPN, 1997

Roos, Lothar. *Entstehung und Entfaltung der modernen Katholischen Soziallehre*. In Rauscher Anton (ed.). *Handbuch der Katholischen Soziallehre*. Berlin: Duncker&Humbolt, 2008, 104-142.

Ratzinger, Joseph Kardinal. "Europa - verpflichtendes Erbe für die Christen Kirche". In *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*. Joseph Ratzinger. 198-210. Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1987.

Ratzinger, Joseph Kardinal. „Christliche Orientierung in der pluralistischen Demokratie?“. In *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*. Joseph Ratzinger. 183-197. Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag 1987.

Ratzinger, Joseph. "Demokratisierung der Kirche?", in *Demokratie in der Kirche: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen*. Josef Ratzinger and Hans Mayer. 7-46. Limburg-Kevelaer: Lahn, 2005.

Shapiro, Ian. „Teorie demokracie: současný stav“. In *Teorie demokracie dnes*. Ian Shapiro, Jürgen Habermas. 23-78. Praha: Filosofia, 2002.

Valadier, Paul. "Quelle démocratie dans l'Église ?". In *La morale sort de l'ombre*. by Paul Valadier. 261-6. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 2008.

Valadier, Paul. "Maritain, philosophe de la démocratie". In *La morale sort de l'ombre*. by Paul Valadier. 349-363. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 2008.

Viviano, Benedict Thomas OP. „Notes d'un bibliste pour une future théologie de la démocratie.” Manuskript in personal Archive of author, 13 s.

Znoj, Milan. “Cesta od normativní teorie demokracie k teorii procedurální a zpět”. In *Teorie demokracie dnes*. Ian Shapiro, Jürgen Habermas. 7-22. Praha: Filosofia, 2002.