

No. 383 Church and Society

Barbara Hallensleben / Augustin Sokolowski

**Fundamentals of the social conception from the orthodox
perspective**

(translated from German by Mrs. A. Elmendorff-Pfeifer,
Düsseldorf)

This article has been published within the series "Kirche und Gesellschaft" (Church and Society), edited by the Catholic Centre of Sciences at Mönchengladbach (North-Rhine-Westphalia)

The register "Orthoxia", annually published by the East-clerical Institute at Regensburg, includes all orthodox bishops of the world with their name, title, address, date of consecration and curriculum vitae. This volume finds all times admiration which in a paradox manner seems to go along with a certain resentment of the orthodoxies. The reason of this admiration is that nobody in the orthodox world is in a position to compile all these biographical information and short structural descriptions. After its external apparition the volume is edited as "appendix" of the Roman Annuario Pontificio in which all catholic bishops are registered. The orthodox resentment has its reason in the fact that in this book all churches having their origin directly or indirectly in the antique East Christianity are registered in the file of the orthodox churches. Thus the churches which often do not have any community each other or which regard each other as schismatic or heretic feel rather unhappy in the not desired neighbourhood on the paper.

"Orthodoxia". On the social form of the phenomena

The existence of the "orthodox churches" itself is a complicated social structure which at least as a beginning must be taken in view in order to understand the place and the extent of the social conception of these churches. The term "orthodox" is originally not a term referring to the confession, but a predicate which means "of true belief" and can be linked with all Christian traditions, even with convictions of belief. In this sense the "orthodox Judaism" is a flux which is separating from Jewish reformatory movements. In this sense there exists a Lutheran orthodoxy" which after the epoch of reformation summarizes the theology of Luther in teaching systems. In this sense the Catholics pray in the first ode "for all those who take care of the orthodox catholic and apostolic belief", *pro omnibus orthoxis, atque catholicæ et apostolicæ fidei cultoribus*.

The orthodoxy in which are interested is composed by those Christians who elevate the term "orthodox" to the decisive sign of their ecclesial community. Here a distinction is again appropriate: the churches which amongst the seven ecumenical councils - from the first council in 325 until the seventh in 787 (both at Nizäa in Asia Minor) recognize only the first three (Nizäa 325, Constantinople 381, Ephesus 431) or four (with Chalcedon 451) call themselves "orthodox", have however interrupted the community with Rome and with the other centres of Christianity by a reason which can be defined by history and dogmatism. Today these churches are called "old oriental" or "prechalcedonensic" churches.

Under "orthodoxy" in a more precise sense is understood the community of churches which together with Rome recognize all seven ecumenical councils of the first millennium and form a community, but no longer a community with Rome. In this case it is not possible to indicate an uncontested dogmatically reason or a clearly defined date of separation¹. This is rather a procedure of estrangement during centuries.

As point of reference of this orthodoxy was considered since the estrangement from Rome until 1453 the patriarch of Constantinople (since 1930 officially "Istanbul"), even more the emperor of Byzantium who by divine vocation was considered as guarantor of the ecclesial unity.² As Constantinople was called "Byzantium" before the transformation in the capital of the East-Roman Empire, the term Byzantine orthodox churches is also usual. The council of Constantinople 381 has attributed to the imperial town "the priority of the honour after the bishop of Rome, for Constantinople is the new Rome". The other ecclesial centres of the Eastern Christianity - Alexandria, Antiochia and Jerusalem - have lost their importance and their influence since the Islamic conquests. Since in 1453 the Ottoman have conquered Constantinople and the East-Roman empire has declined, the orthodoxy is in search of a new shaping of the own ecclesial structure and organization.

Under the aspect of phenomenology the actual orthodoxy is a confederation. The most important centres of this community are local (orthodox churches in Poland, Czech Republic, in the USA amongst others), national (orthodox churches of Serbia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Georgia amongst others), or transnational (the patriarchy of Moscow, the patriarchy of Constantinople). These churches understand themselves as an unique orthodox church. They stand together in the unity of the belief and in Eucharistic community. But they do not agree on the form of this unity: The patriarchy of Constantinople considers itself as orthodox pendant of the bishop of Rome and has transformed his "priority after the bishop of Rome" in a honour primacy within the orthodoxy; the Russian orthodox church which after the decline of Constantinople has grown into a transnational responsibility as "third Rome" does not see any reason for this role of the Greek archbishop in Istanbul. Today the orthodoxy is living in this tension, from this perspective we must understand and interpret the efforts of the Orthodox Church and churches on the way to official ecclesial declarations in the dogmatic and socio-ethical area. One expression of the uncleared social form of

the orthodox world is the fact that an external occidental view prefers the plural "orthodox churches", whilst the internal orthodox discussion rather uses the singular and refers to orthodoxy or the "orthodox church" as such.

The place of social teaching in the life and in the teaching of the Orthodox Church

The credo of the councils of Nizäa 325 and of Constantinople 381 is almost common to all the Christians. Here the church is confirmed to "one, holy, catholic and apostolic" (church). If the Catholic church chooses itself a self-designation it prefers to call itself world church. One of the most important attributes in the self-comprehension of orthodoxy is called today "the church of the fathers". This predicate was chosen in order to delimit vis-à-vis the presumed rationalism and the scholastic structure of the orthodox theology. The further characteristics of orthodox Christianity, as it can be read in the theological literature and in the official documents of the Orthodox Church are conciliar, liturgical and ascetic. Each of these attributes refers to a special sphere in the life of orthodoxy. Thus the term "church of the fathers" means the main criterion for the dogmatic dimension of the belief; the ascetic church refers to the area of moral teaching; the liturgical church designates the prevailing form of acting by the church in its self-realization and at the same the essential form of communication of faith teaching.

All that what concerns teaching of faith and morality must correspond for orthodox Christians to the criteria of the patristic theology. However, the area of patristic theologian - and this is the main difference in understanding the term "fathers of the church" in West and East - does not only include the theologian of the first Christian millennium but also those authors who find themselves in recognized agreement with these authors of the Christian past. Thus the time of the fathers of the church never ends. As additional criterion of belonging to the wisdom of the fathers is considered the attribute ascetic. Under asceticism is understood above all the monastic discipline which already in the second half of the first millennium became a compulsory standard of the oriental Christianity. Asceticism means also a tendency to distinguish between the spiritual and the corporal, between the life here and the life to come, between celibacy and the married life. The first is considered as a model, the other as dispense. The daily life of the orthodoxy is deeply marked by ascetic exercises and imaginations strongly perceived during

the rigid Lent practice which takes almost half the year. This accentuation of the orthodox perspective is reflected by the historical self-perception of orthodoxy insofar as certain periods of the past were considered as glorious models of ascetic piety of the people and the state. The effects on the political and social perspective cannot be ignored.

Occidental readers will approach contributions on social teaching from the orthodox perspective with their pre-understanding; (catholic) social teaching is the complex of those documents by which the popes, recurring to all the traditions since the outgoing 19th century reacted on the consequences of the industrial revolution and further social, political and economic developments; social ethics is the theological work which under the terminological aspect operates on this proclamation and accompanies and inspires critically the social movements in the people of God. Who with such pre-understanding turns to the orthodox perspective will not only find formal differences in formulations, in accents, in interpretations, but also different premises which as such must be perceived. Social teaching is an example of the phenomenological "incompatibility" of both our traditions. Occidental Christians to whom a Christian contribution to social ethics seems self-evident will, when discovering the orthodoxy, have the feeling to start a travel in the time. The will to enter the orthodox world like another epoch - with all advantages and inconveniences of the situation- is a condition of all further fruitful discoveries. Up to now occidental social ethics met social teaching in the orthodox perspective in most cases under the standard of "compatibility with liberal-democratic and liberal-constitutional order ideas" of the West³ and ends by the mark "pre-modern" which makes superfluous any further discussion. Here it should be verified if a more differentiated judgement cannot lead to a real encounter of mutual benefit.

The document of the Russian Orthodox Church (2000) - Point of crystallization of most recent developments and debates

The church "need not establish a political system, not a social teaching, nor an own socio-ethical or ethical system"-, thus the words of the renowned Greek orthodox theologian Georgios Mantzadiris (born 1933) representing many orthodox thinkers.⁴ After its sense this statement is justified as follows: All what is necessary for the faithful Christians, for the humanity and for this world, has been told by the fathers of the church and proclaimed by the councils, it is celebrated in the liturgy and

realized in the life of the church. Therefore it is in no way self-evident that one of the orthodox churches - accentuated is "one", is in this context important and is a dilemma - presents an explicit document: In the year 2000 the Episcopal council of the Moscow patriarchy adopted the "fundamentals of the social conception of the Russian orthodox church".⁵ At right it has been remarked that it is a novelty in the history of the orthodox churches.⁶

The nearness to the catholic social proclamation in form and substance should not mislead that also the Russian position follows the specifically orthodox hermeneutic. In the following chapters we choose the document of Moscow as point of reference of the analysis of social teaching from the orthodox perspective. Moreover it is referred to the document by which the Moscow patriarchy in July 2008 has completed the social conception of the year 2000 by "Fundamentals of the teaching of the Russian Orthodox church on dignity freedom and rights of the human being".⁷

Why here and now?

Why was it just the Russian Orthodox Church which as sole church amongst the fifteen autocephaly orthodox churches has officially commented the social questions? Even the patriarchy of Constantinople which claims for itself a leading role of world orthodoxy has up to now not given any official comment in this area – excepted comments on ecology which have attributed to the present patriarch Bartholomaios the designation "green patriarch".

The Russian Orthodox Church itself indicates in its official comments one essential reason: The quickly changing society need new answers to new questions; the challenge is big and the church must be able to present its position publicly. It is to presume that not pronounced backgrounds have to do with the historic development of orthodoxy; for a long time the clear separation of church and state remained strange to the oriental churches. Thus in the course of history a social teaching could not be expressively formulated, because the social area was attributed to the jurisdiction of the state.

This original unity was broken by the Bolshevist Revolution of 1917. The Russian church was directly faced by the dilemma: How shall be evaluated the state which for the first time in the history of orthodox Christianity faced the church not only separately but in principle with hostility and with destructive mind? The Muslim empires on the ground

of which the oriental Christianity existed after the creation of Islam could not serve as models because they were not areligious states.

The preparatory work of the Moscow council which today is interpreted as the "II Vatikanum" of the Russian Orthodox Church was not efficient due to the Russian revolution. Thus the answer of the church to this dilemma remained dilemmatic: 1927 the then representative of the vacant patriarchal seat, metropolitan Sergij Stragorodskij, declared the new soviet state as being legitimate and underlined the unconditional loyalty of the church to this state. As an answer to this declaration of peace broke up a terrible wave of pursuit by the state, with millions martyrs who were sanctified at the same Episcopal council having ratified the "social conception". Under these experiences of the not expected separation and the suffered martyrdom the Russian church has grown in a new maturity and emancipation. The formulation of the fundamentals of social teaching can well be seen as a mark for this. Already 1969 had taken place in the then Leningrad, due to the initiative of metropolitan Nikodim a first meeting of the catholic church and the church of the Moscow patriarchy dealing with questions of social teaching.

Title and addressee

In the year 2001 the Foundation Conrad Adenauer presented a German translation of the Moscow document on social teaching. The cover title is worded in a poster like manner "social doctrine Russian-orthodox", the larger inner title is worded "The fundamentals of the Russian orthodox church". It is known and unavoidable that every translation is at the same time an interpretation. In the present example the wanton deviation from the clear wording must have an importance: the term "doctrine" which in German has a negative meaning shall presumably avoid the use of the current occidental terminology "Soziallehre", signalizes however in connection with the national predicate a rather distant perception of the text.

A dilemma is also shown in the self-presentation of the document. The Russian Orthodox Church is speaking here, but in the conviction that the questions dealt with "are for the whole fullness of the church at the end of the 20th century in the same measure actual like in the nearest future".⁸ A reception of this document in the orthodox world corresponding to this option is up to now missed. The document is addressed to the "episcopate, the clergymen and the laymen", whilst the catholic social

teaching, since the encyclical "*Pacem in terris*" of Pope John XXIII, is *expressis verbis* addressed "to all human beings of good will".

The programmatic triad: Church - nation - state

The document is subdivided in 16 chapters which deal with the classical subjects which are also known in the occidental social teaching:

1. Theological fundamental positions, 2. Church and nation, 3. Church and state, 4. Christian ethics and secular law, Church and politics, 6. Labour and its fruits, 7. Property, 8. War and peace, 9. Crimes, reconciliation, reparation, 10. Questions of the personal, familiar and social morality, 11. The health of the person and of people 12. Questions of bioethics, 13. The church and questions of ecology, 14. Secular science, culture and education, 15. The church and the secular mass media, 16. International relations, problems of globalization and of secularism. Paradigmatic for the method and the contents of this draft of an orthodox social teaching are the first three chapters which can be titled by the key-words church - nation - state. We concentrate the analysis of the text on these paragraphs.

Church: "Church ..." is under the programmatic aspect the first word of the document. Here the church does not primarily appear as *Mater et Magister*, as teacher of the social order, but as space of that social form of life which has been opened to the human beings in Jesus Christ. The force of this declaration reposes in the perception that Christian social teaching is not an abstract system of standards but has its place in the lived social form of the community of the church. Therefore orthodox social ethics never follows the occidental tendency to become a rational social ethics without relation to the belief. The chapter rises questions insofar as the importance and the objective of the Christian service in and to the world do not become judicious: Certainly "a manichaeic detestation of the life of the us surrounding world is not allowed"(I,3), but an original vocation of this world is not perceivable - excepted its quality as material for transforming in the form of life determined by orthodoxy.

Nation: The necessity of such a chapter is more urgent for oriental churches than for the catholic social teaching: the Orthodox Church as federation of local churches is faced with the task to develop criteria of distinction between nationalistic functionalization of religion and a genuine inculturation. The biblical reflection on the chosen people of Israel and God's people of the New Alliance incite to stress the universal

supranational vocation of the church and to warn of aggressive nationalism, hate of strangers and hostility of ethnic groups. Simultaneously the right of Christians to "national originality and national self-realization" is accentuated, for "the church links in itself the universal with the national principle" (II, 2).

This in principle balanced description underestimates the own dynamic of modern nationalism which with the coming about of the national states of the modern time has to a certain degree replaced the religion. The national state proceeding from the unity of birth, tongue and culture (and religion?) has been established as principle of identification and competition in the political and in the ecclesial world and which within its undividable claim of sovereignty does in principle not recognize any universality beyond its own. The difficulty of the orthodoxy to reach inner orthodox decisions, not alone with regard to the convocation of a pan orthodox council, is reflecting this fundamental problem. The discussions on the form of orthodoxy in the Diaspora, e.g. outside the territory described as being national, show parallels with the actual crisis of the national state which as concerns migration and globalization must verify its identity principles or become intolerant. Which importance has "Christian patriotism" for a Christian who belongs to the third generation of a Russian family of migrants in France or in Great Britain and does not speak one word of Russian? It must be conceded to the Russian Orthodox Church that it defends in a specifically marked way the supranational character of the church. Its endeavour to conserve after the decline of the Soviet Union the ecclesial unity beyond the new national frontiers can be valued as a genuine contribution to the relative nature of nationalism.

State: At a first view the convergence between the catholic social teaching and the document of the Russian Orthodox Church is especially important under the aspect of the relation between the state and the church. In its vocation and mission the church is not bound to a determined form of state. The secular character of the state (III, 3) is recognized if it moves along with a mutual non-intervention. "The religious ideological neutrality of the state does not contradict the Christian conception of the vocation of the church in the society" (III, 6). The obligation of obedience to the state authority is accentuated in Rom 13, 1 - 7, but there exists the right and the obligation to "civil resistance without violence", "if the state authority compels the orthodox Christians to withdraw from Christ and His church and to commit sinful

acts damaging the soul" (III, 5). A historic excursion honours the different forms of the relation between the state and the church with a clear option for the "ideal of the symphony" according to the byzantine form of the "Epanagoge" (9th century): "The secular power and the clergy behave each other like body and soul and are for the order of the state at the same degree indispensable like body and soul in the living human being. In the relationship and in the convergence between them is founded the welfare of the state" (cit. 111, 4).

In the ideal of the symphony the hermeneutic ambivalence of the declarations becomes clear. It is astonishing that the foundation of the state is considered in the Moscow document as consequence of the sin (III, 2): The church administers the heal, the state, to the contrary, administers the sin. The conception of the symphony implicates on the contrary a higher evaluation as regards the history of heal: The state realizes by the divine healing programme that what the church represents in the sacramental sign. Not the existence of the state as such but its actual salutary situation is conditioned by the sin. Therefore the state needs the church, because it cannot guaranty the success of its vocation itself. On the other hand, the church too cannot be interpreted without the political community; here it sees the target of the creator and of its own vocation: the successful living together of human beings and the whole creation, so that in the vision of the new owner of Jerusalem there is no need for a temple (s. Revelation 21, 22).

The in the West dominant idea of the separation of church and state renounces in most cases to grouping the state in theological categories so that the contribution of ecclesial social teaching itself must take secular features in order to become understandable. A common recourse to the monumental basic work "De Civitate Dei" of Augustinus, which is a classic model of the patristic overwhelming of these problems and was not accepted by the orthodox church of the fathers up to now, could help to discover an enrichment in the resistance of the respective other position.⁹

The dispute around the modern trend

The comments of the Russian Orthodox Church on dignity, freedom and rights of the human beings (2008) produced a public debate, beyond the hesitating scientific Perception, on the European level. To a broader perception of the Russian orthodox position has not at least contributed the German translation of contributions of the patriarch Kyrill during his

office as metropolitan and decisive initiator, of the "social conception"¹⁰. Therefore some part polemic discussions can be put down to the already analysed hermeneutic differences. They show a form of encounter which ends in a not-encounter: "The community of the evangelic churches in Europe (GEKE) considers the position of the Russian orthodox church a misunderstanding of the human rights" is the lapidary wording of the presentation of the evangelic comment. The evangelic churches present themselves, to the contrary, as solicitors of the human dignity in the context of the occidental modern trend. Criticized are the without any doubt existing ambivalences of the Russian position. To the contrary the contextuality of the own position is not taken in view.

Without being in a position to analyse here the details of the controversy, a working hypotheses may be presented: Social teaching in the orthodox perspective develops - not at least by reason of the own experiences of suppression by totalitarian states declaring themselves to be progressive and human - a remarkable sensibility for the ambivalences of the modern trend without having at their disposal appropriate terminological instruments to present their critics in a logical form and to propose a consistent alternative. The critic by the Orthodox Church concerns less the occidental social teaching but the uncritical identification of occidental Christians with the actual occidental form of society as a world of consumption and media. Remarkable parallels relate this orthodox critic to the far-seeing self-critic within the occidental civilization. This can be shown specifically clearly by the disputes on human rights: Persons who criticize social teaching in orthodox perspective turn their regard to "the worldwide political catastrophes of the 20th century and the fact that 'millions of human beings having lost such (human) rights were emerging and who because of the new global situation were not in a position to get back these rights'".¹¹ Violations of human rights require more respect of the human rights. Under the same perception the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben, together with Hannah Arendt, concludes the contrary: The actual extent of violations of human rights points to the ending of the idea of human rights: "The term based on the assumption of the existence of the human being as such plunged as soon as those who believed in the human rights met for the first time human beings who really had lost every other quality and relationship - excepted the pure fact of being a human being"¹², shortly: when millions of refugees emerged in camps as this was a mass phenomena existing since the end of the first world war. West and East do not meet as advocates and

opponents of the human dignity and of human rights as well as of concrete social principles, as advocates who in the present world must overwhelm the collective overcharge to proclaim not only but to concretely guarantee these social principles in a space of instability and fear, of financial and economic crises, of fragile sovereignty.

Social teaching from the orthodox perspective warns of the ambivalence of freedom without binding to morality and responsibility for the common welfare; it warns of the dialectic of the enlightened without binding to a bearable form of life; it warns of the ambivalence of democracy and of the modern national state not rooted in values which protect of a turning over in manipulated masses and totalitarianism. The orthodox world uses for its critics a - may be - premodern language, however in order to encourage a postmodern form of life which makes possible the survival of the human beings in peace and justice. Not being prepared to see this confirms an occidental self-satisfaction which since long does no more correspond to the real crises and the growing manipulation and disillusion. The well known declaration of Samuel Huntington: Europe ends there where the orthodoxy is beginning,¹³ is mostly cited as justification, in order not to put in question the occidental identity, whilst the American political scientist truly criticises the belief of the West in its on universality as being violent and producing violence.

Attentive observers of the inner-Christian dialogue state that in the last years a transition from the classical dogmatic-theological subjects concerning the form of life in the (post)modern trend takes place. The central role of the ecclesial understanding therewith does not become superfluous, but gets another importance: The catholic reformatory dialogue of the occidental churches has almost completely concentrated on the debate church-church and has, from a theological point of view on the relation ecclesial-secular order taken leave and has thus encouraged, without wishing it, the granting of authority of the discussions as a reaction on the occidental ecclesial scission.¹⁴ With the East-West dialogue the theological view on the public order appears again on the agenda, also and just if the order is secular. Secular is not longer synonymous with: prohibition to think for theology. Shortly: Social teaching becomes theology.

The orthodox world - Encouragement for a common path of discovery

This contribution cannot have the sense to draw a final balance sheet or even to judge a procedure in which we are ourselves involved and for the outcome of which we are also responsible. The orthodox social conception in its expressive form is beginning to grow and cannot be summarized in a "compendium". The cooperation of East and West in this central and for our present time so actual area will require a rethinking of all parties involved. It will be a long path on which must be overcome the estrangements and the misunderstandings of centuries so that the respective richness of the other person can after all be perceived. One thing is sure: a fixation of orthodoxy on separation would not only accelerate the confessionalization of the orthodox churches, but also delay the procedure of a better self-evaluation and inner reform of the occidental churches.

On this path there are many companions and protagonists and social-ethical impulses are being shown at place not expected: With the fathers of the oriental church, as for example with St. Basilus, we meet an ascetic paradigm which has its centres in the monasteries but goes along with a power of civilization and is in a position to reform the church and the society. We discover that the famous Trinity icon of Andrej Rubljov has a social importance insofar as St. Sergij von Radonezh has chosen the icon as model of the monk community founded by him. We are faced with the historic-philosophical analyses of Wladimir Solowjew which flow into considerations of the social application of the trinitarian principle. We become conscious that the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas, very important for social ethics, received important impulses from Russian literature (Fjedor Dostojewski, Wessilij Grossman). With occidental and oriental thinkers we are finding a new estimation of the liturgy as "political acting" of the divine people (Erik Peterson, Giorgio Agamben, Alexander Schmemmann).

Not accidentally it is a thinker from the exile who has presented a synthesis which becomes a bearable starting point of a new understanding of a theological social conception: Sergij Bulgakov (1871 - 1944) began his career as political economist, convinced Marxist and friend of Lenin. After having again returned to the belief of the church he used his scientific economic knowledge to the benefit of theology. In the year of revolution 1917/18 he was consecrated priest. After his expulsion from Russia he arrived via Constantinople and Prague in Paris

where he became dean of the newly founded orthodox theological Institute St. Serge and where he wrote numerous theological works. Critically with regard to the individualist welfare perspective which he perceives in the orthodoxy of his epoch he faces the challenges of the modern world.

And in his introduction into the orthodoxy for occidental Christians he describes in the chapter "Orthodoxy and State" in an agreeing manner the social mission of the church as service to freedom: "The church which has accepted the juridical separation from the province of the emperor, from the state as its liberation, does in no way renounce to the task to exercise an influence on the whole life of the state and to penetrate in all its pores. The ideal of the Christian transformation of the characteristic of state by the characteristic of church, with all its power and without any restriction also in the epoch of the separation of the church and the state which has become a constitutional state, is maintained not because this separation remains external only and not internal. The ways of the influence of the church are changing here; influence does not come from the outward, from the above, but is comes from the inner, from below, from the people and through the people. But here remains a fundamental advantage: The influence on the souls is realized on the path to freedom which singularly corresponds to Christian dignity and cannot be reached by constraint from above, by sometimes quicker results which however is punished by history, such as recent history in East and West proves sufficiently,"¹⁵

Annotations:

¹Recent research shows that the year 1954 cannot be considered as date of a definite schism between Rome and the oriental churches: see Ernst Christoph Suttner, *Das wechselvolle Verhältnis zwischen den Kirchen des Ostens und des Westens im Lauf der Kirchengeschichte*, (The relation full of change between the churches of East and West in the course of ecclesial history), Fribourg 2002, 34-36.

² S. Nikolaus Wyrwoll, *Politischer oder petrinischer Primat? Zwei Zeugnisse zur Primatsauffassung im 9. Jahrhundert*, (political or petrinical primacy? Two proofs on the conception of primacy - in the 9th century), Fribourg/Switzerland 2010.

³ Rudolf Uertz/Josef Thesing (Hg.), Die Grundlagen der Sozialdoktrin der Russisch-Orthodoxen Kirche, (The fundamentals of social teaching of the Russian Orthodox Church) Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation: St. Augustin 2001, 145.

⁴ Georgios Mantzaridis, Grundlinien der christlichen Ethik, (Fundamentals of the Christian ethics) St. Ottilien 1998, 55.

⁵ Besides of the text of the Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation was also published a German translation in „Stimme der Orthodoxie“ (Voice of orthodoxy): 4/2000, 14–16; 1/2001, 13 – 24; 2/2001, 23–39; 3/2001, 13 – 24.

⁶ „Die Sozialdoktrin ist die erste kirchenamtliche Stellungnahme der Orthodoxie überhaupt zu grundsätzlichen und aktuellen politischen, gesellschaftlichen, kulturellen und technisch-wissenschaftlichen Fragen“ ("The social teaching is the first official comment of the church of the orthodoxy to principal and actual political, social-cultural and technical-scientific questions"): Uertz/Thesing, cited elsewhere

⁷ Kyrill, Patriarch von Moskau und der ganzen Rus', Freiheit und Verantwortung im Einklang. Zeugnisse für den Aufbruch zu einer neuen Weltgemeinschaft, (Kyrill, patriarch of Moscow and the whole Rus', freedom and responsibility in harmony. Proofs for the start to a new world community) Fribourg 2009, 220–239.

⁸ Uertz/Thesing, cit. elsewhere, 11

⁹ Vgl. die widersprüchliche Deutung des Augustinus: von der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche kritisiert, während der Kommentar die russische Position als augustinish beschreibt (S. the contradictory interpretation of Augustinus: critized by the Russian Orthodox Church, whilst the comment describes the Russian position as being augustinic): Uertz/Thesing, cit. elsewhere, 150,156.

¹⁰ Ökumenische Rundschau (Ecumenical review) 59 (2010) Heft 3 Themenheft Menschenrechte und Menschenwürde in der Sicht der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche (human rights and human dignity in the view of the Russian Orthodox Church).

¹¹ Hannah Arendt, Es gibt nur ein einziges Menschenrecht; (There exists only one sole human right) cited according to G2W 10/2009, 22.

¹² Hannah Arendt, cited according to Giorgio Agamben, Mittel ohne Zweck. Noten zur Politik, (Means without purpose. Marks on politics) Zürich – Berlin ²2006, 25.

¹³ Samuel P. Huntington, Kampf der Kulturen. Die Neugestaltung der Weltpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert, (Fight of the cultures. The new shaping of world politics in the 21st century), Munich-Vienna 1996, 252.

¹⁴ S. Reinhart Koselleck, Kritik und Krise. Eine Studie zur Pathogenese der bürgerlichen Welt (Critic and crise. A study on the pathogenese of the civil world), Frankfurt²1976.

¹⁵ Sergij Bulgakov, Die Orthodoxie, (Orthodoxy) Treves 2004 245 sq.