

The Crisis in the Church and the Future of Christendom

Part I. Introduction

What if?

What if we are entering a time in which the simultaneous secularization of Western Christian countries, the moral failures of the clergy up to the highest level, the crisis of liberalism, and the geopolitical shift to the East together with demographic trends favoring the global South — quite contrary to expectations — actually opens up for a new but now truly universal Christendom? That is, are we moving towards the formation of a Catholic Church incorporating a large number of Christian nations, instead of, as it seems, entering a world dominated by a new tribalism fueled by relativism and mindboggling irredeemable diversity?

Let us see what a yes-answer to that question could look like — irrespective of how unlikely you think it is; or whether you believe it requires divine interventions of an apocalyptic nature. Maybe it does; but, in that case, I would like to add that the Apocalypse of John was not meant to be watched like a disaster movie, but was written as a script for heroic action.

In fact, my motive for this exercise is that I believe in the power of imagination as a basis for action. First, we need to form an understanding of how a future Christendom might look like, so that, in a second step, we can act upon such an understanding, and in this way make it come true.

With other words, understanding implies an agenda — and in order to understand what does not yet exist, we need to use our imagination, creatively pursuing alternative ways of understanding.

Moreover, this exercise is necessary, I believe, so that we do not become depressed by the abundant bad news of the 21th century Catholic Church disintegrating into warring parties, mired in dogmatic

confusion and moral decadence, and when seeing formerly Christian nations in the last stages of Neopaganism. Without denying the evident signs of decline and corruption all around us, we also need to get hold of what points towards the future “reborn” church. That is, we should not cover up evil with some good stories, as journalists often do, but acknowledge that there are parallel processes, which are intertwined in divine providence. Destruction and construction can be simultaneous.

My guiding idea is thus that the tearing down of the modern territorial Church, which is closely connected to a system of nation states, actually, enables a new but now global and universal (that is, Catholic) Christendom — without giving up the incarnational nature of concrete, lived religiosity in villages, towns and nations.

This should infuse excitement into our endeavors as we look forward to a time when all the present, seemingly invincible, enemies of goodness and truth have dissipated like mist; and what is durable and good, anchored in what is eternal and absolute perfection, emerges like the sun after the most dreadful storm.

Let us, therefore, in the midst of the crucifixion of the Church, fix our eyes on the bright vision of the bride of the Lamb:

The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it. Its gates will never be shut by day — and there will be no night there. People will bring into it the glory and the honour of the nations. But nothing unclean will enter it, nor anyone who practices abomination or falsehood, but only those who are written in the Lamb’s book of life (Rev 21.24–26).

Christendom and Christianity

As so many times before, we must begin our intellectual adventure by defining our ideas. For how are we to look for Christendom, if we do not know what this word means, or are familiar with its history?

If we, for example, look up “Christendom” in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* from 1908, we find that the Encyclopedia distinguishes between a wider quantitative sense, that is, “the part of the world which is inhabited by Christians,” and a narrow sense, “a polity as well as a religion, for a nation as well as for a people.”ⁱ

It is primarily the second sense that interests me today which points toward Christendom both as a cosmopolitan cultural community and to political (that is, concrete social) manifestations of this culture on the level of nations, and below (such as families, organizations etc.)

The Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages tells us that the meaning of Christendom was first “the community of Christians with a sense close to that of ecclesia.”ⁱⁱ Then it developed into the idea of a geographic

area based on the sense of being aware “of belonging to a single group whose common cultural source was the Christian religion.” This was, however, more an ideal than a political reality, the encyclopedia states.

With the reestablishment of the western world in the 12th century, the ideal type of Christendom came into being. The encyclopedia states that the papacy was indeed “the architect of this new self-awareness.” I would like to add that this was also the time of the gothic cathedrals, the first universities and the harmonization between Greek philosophy and Christian theology, that is, the birth of a European Christian civilization.

Christendom in this sense was broken with the tumultuous developments during the 14th century, the Avignon Babylonian captivity of the papacy (1309–1376), the Great Schism with three popes (1378–1417), nominalism in philosophy and theology, and the rise of national states leading up to the fracture of Western Europe brought about by the reformation in the 16th century. What was broken, according to the encyclopedia, was “Christendom as a whole united by a single faith.”

Note that the focus is on a cultural unit made possible by the powers of the pope as the leader of the Church. This harmonizes well with Brett Edward Whalen’s definition of Christendom.

The self-declared members of Christendom nevertheless viewed themselves as a people unified through their shared faith, their use of Latin as a sacred language, their mutual observance of religious rites, and their obedience to the Roman papacy.ⁱⁱⁱ

In a sense, medieval Christendom was the Catholic Church.

In his book *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity*, which I will come back to later, Philip Jenkins contrasts the negative connotations that “Christendom” carries for modern readers with the more neutral sense he intends to give it. That is, he tries to distance himself from Christendom in the sense of Christianity being “the organizing force of society,” implying “an intimate alliance between church and state, the use of secular mechanisms to implement church policies, and the institutionalization of religious intolerance.”^{iv} This is with his words “a theocratic historical nightmare.”^v

According to Jenkins, the idea behind such forms of Christendom is “integralism,” which he defines as a submissive attitude of the Church towards political power, instead of being filled with prophetic critique.^{vi} In this way, Jenkins fears, the historical theocratic nightmare can easily turn into a futuristic one.

We can imagine a future in which cooperative churches are enlisted into the service of government under the rhetoric of creating a Christian society, complete with appropriate moral legislation.^{vii}

His own sense of Christendom, his imagining of the future of Christianity, shies away from the political and military connotations of the notion, and instead pictures it as a cultural supranational community with “a true overarching unity and a focus of loyalty transcending mere kingdoms and empires.”^{viii} His vision of Christendom is, however, not apolitical but focuses on the universal cultural dimension.

This perception had political consequences. While the laws of individual nations lasted only as long as the nations themselves, Christendom offered a higher set of standards and mores, which alone could claim to be universal. Though it rarely possessed any potential for common political action, Christendom was a primary form of cultural reference.”^{ix}

With this emphasis on Christendom as a cultural imaginary, Jenkins attempts to draw the reader away from thinking of the repression of confessional states and instead picture the coming cultural community created by the growth of Christian churches and movements in the Global South, which are connected to the Global North through increasing globalization. In a sense, his argument is foremost about the coming of Christianity as a universal global “ideology,” which transcends the borders of states and nations.

I find Jenkin’s understanding of Christendom to be a useful approach for my own imagining of a future Christendom, especially as it concerns the demographic changes. However, his approach weakens the role actually played by states, kings, presidents, village councils, and prime ministers in building and sustaining Christendom. Christendom in the meaning of a global interdenominational Christian identity easily becomes similarly weak and non-incarnational as liberal globalism. With a more robust understanding of Christendom as Church, as the universal Church that has a concrete hierarchical organization, the secular counterpart takes on a similarly important role.

That is, despite my focus on the cultural level of Christendom, I do not want to hide or empty of all substance the importance of the state. That would be to construct a non-political human being, a contradiction in terms. We should not empty out our understanding of a future Christendom of its social and political consequences, and treat states as more ephemeral than they are; thinking that the global level will dissolve that of nations. That would be like arguing for the end of cells because we have a body.

The danger is otherwise that a future global Christendom would amount to not more than the fact of large numbers of people all over the world identifying themselves as Christians, and sharing, hopefully, a vague sense of cultural affinity.

In the following, I will, therefore, first treat Christendom in the sense of cultural unity, and then within the context of church state relations, as I think both of these aspects are central for an understanding of a future Christendom. We need to keep both Church culture and politics in mind. Sometimes they are in harmony; sometimes in deep conflict.

Church Culture

A small group of Christians — let us say gathering in a private home in Rome in the first century to celebrate the Eucharist — constituted a cell in the body of the Catholic Church. They came from different polities, some from the Roman Empire, some from outside its borders. They were also of different nationalities, some Greek, others Jews, and, perhaps, one from Persia. Their supernatural goal, that is, their religion, had, in a sense, made them into a people, that is, subjects of the Church; and by their liturgical and social community, they were developing some of the qualities of a nation.

Over the centuries, this cell grew together with other similar cells, all within the hierarchical structure of the Catholic Church ruled by bishops and with the pope as the representative of Peter, until in the fourth century, the emperor, and thus the Roman empire, recognized Christianity as the established religion. The interdependence of polity and Christianity then became a reality. That is, Christendom.

However, the Roman empire was not a nation state, but an empire with a center ruling over a vast territory inhabited by many different ethnic identities. This corresponded nicely with the cosmopolitan nature of the Christian religion, which did not differentiate between a Greek and a Jew.

Our small cell of Christians in first century Rome developed a Christian culture while living within a pagan state. Foremost for that religious culture was to give God his due, that is, worship in the form of the Eucharistic sacrifice, from which a new culture was born. As Robert Louis Wilken points out in his 2004 article “The Church as Culture” things such as a distinct Christian material culture, liturgy, calendar, and language made it clear that the Church was, “a culture in its own right. Christ does not simply infiltrate a culture; Christ creates culture by forming another city, another sovereignty with its own social and political life.”^x

This is an important point for my argument about a truly Catholic, that is, universal Christianity. The Church as an organized, hierarchical society with a rich culture flowing from its religious nature, constitutes persons across different nations and languages into one people over which the Church has jurisdiction.

And this has, of course, political consequences; that is why, for example, the Chinese communist party insisted that the Catholic Church in China broke with Rome; as Henry VIII in 16th century England or the Swedish king Gustav Vasa of the same century did.

A too close connection between Church and polity, with other words, easily leads to the breakdown of catholicity, that is, universality. When the political leader, the emperor, king, or president decides to go to war, then the local church does the same with sometimes disastrous results for the unity of Christendom.^{xi}

To imagine a future Christendom we thus must also look at the Catholic understanding of the relation between state and church; not only at the cultural ideal of Christendom.

State and Church

According to traditional Catholic teaching both the state and the Church are perfect societies, with the state sovereign in matters of temporal order while the Church is sovereign in supernatural matters.^{xii} As the latter stands above the former, the state should recognize and support the Church.

In the words of Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei* released in 1885:

The Almighty, therefore, has given the charge of the human race to two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over divine, and the other over human, things. Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of each, so that there is, we may say, an orbit traced out within which the action of each is brought into play by its own native right.^{xiii}

However, this does not mean two separate spheres, as the Church and the state have as their subjects the same persons, considered from the perspective of different goals, those of this earth and those of heaven.

Therefore, Leo XIII also writes:

To exclude the Church, founded by God Himself, from life, from laws, from the education of youth, from domestic society is a grave and fatal error. A State from which religion is banished can never be well regulated.

The state thus has an obligation to recognize the Christian religion and the Catholic Church.

Nevertheless, the declaration on religious freedom *Dignitatis Humanae* of the Second Vatican Council seems at first sight to contradict this teaching. That, from now on, the state has no authority to recognize a particular religion or church, and give it a privileged place, instead the decision of what religion an individual is to practice seems to be up to him or her alone. That is, the classical liberal position in which religion becomes a matter of personal decisions, not of the political community. *Dignitatis Humanae* states:

This freedom means that all men are to be immune from coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups and of any human power, in such wise that no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits.^{xiv}

It seems, then, as if the Catholic Church has given up on the idea of Christendom in the political sense and resigned itself to have, at least, freedom within a multi-religious state, which remains benignly neutral. Left is then Christendom merely as a cultural ideal.

However, Thomas Pink argues that the declaration was carefully drafted in order to be in harmony with traditional Catholic teaching recognizing two coercive powers, the Church and the state. In this view, the Church has coercive force in religious matters, which requires that the state recognizes that religion is a higher good than civil life. By baptism, both of individuals and of the state (in the sense that it has recognized Christianity as the true religion) the state has the responsibility to coerce in religious matters on the behalf of the Church. But, “Once it is detached from the Church, the state entirely lacks competent authority to coerce us in matters of religion; and so our human dignity gives us a right not to be coerced religiously by the state – exactly as *Dignitatis Humanae* says.”^{xv}

According to Pink, then, the declaration should be interpreted as it was presented to the council fathers, that is, as addressing only civil order and as being silent on the question of the coercive power of the Church, which is based on revelation and not natural law.

So, as officially presented, the declaration provides no challenge whatsoever to traditional teaching on the Church as coercive *potestas* within the religious order.^{xvi}

In the minds of most people reading the document, however, it provided legitimacy to religious freedom according to the liberal state’s notion of it as a private affair, while the state is supposed to be secular, that is, “neutral.” The important point for our exercise today is that Pink insists on that the right of the Church, “to treat the state as her agent, at least under certain conditions,”^{xvii} is preserved; and in a new situation of a renewal of Catholic Christianity and its recognition by the state, this can be re-actualized.

The Bad News of Today

However, presently, we see signs every day of the erosion of what once was Catholic countries both as regards church state relations, but more ominously also in the realm of culture. Take, for example, Italy where one can be fooled by the material remains of Catholic civilization, by the tombs of a multitude of saints, to think that this is a genuinely Catholic country, but even the will to reproduce is gone.

It seems we are evolving back to the little cells of the Christians of first century Rome. Christendom, in the sense of nations recognizing and embracing Christianity and the Church, seems to suffer setback after setback. A modernist materialist and hedonist culture is overflowing in all media both popular and elite.

If we then add dogmatic relativism and the abandonment of the principles of Christian morality within the Church, leading to the moral bankruptcy of much of Catholic clergy, shown with horrific detail in the recent affair of Cardinal McCarrick and the Pennsylvania report, the very structure of the Church seems to be in jeopardy. And with every new week something more comes up.

So, if we look forward, what hope is there, actually, for a new Christendom? Am I desperately trying to see good news in a train wreck?

Part II. Signs of Our Times

I think a number of features in the world of today point toward a possible future Christendom. Not automatically, but by destroying old structures they enable new ones. My point is that these new structures make possible more perfect realizations of traditional Catholic doctrine; that is, they do not force a quantum leap into something completely new.

With other words, I am not advocating a revolution, but the possibility of a true Catholic Christendom in the 21st century. In one sense, we are living in a time when catholicity in the sense of universality is for the first time achievable. This was not possible until all the peoples of the earth became interconnected.

I will shortly mention five such destructive-constructive processes, before outlining some features of a future Christendom.

Globalization

The first process is globalization.

I would like to emphasize that the global level is not simply an international level, but is a development that makes the question of universality impossible to escape.

As I see it, all ideologies and religions are under pressure to capture this emerging global level, but not many religions, ideologies have the capability to do so.

If we look at a global map from the viewpoint of religion and civilization, as this map of the distribution of religions in the world,^{xviii} then it is obvious that the shape has been produced by imperial religions and colonialism.

First, we see a divided Christian world encircling a Muslim area corresponding to the reach of the Muslim empires of old with the exception of Indonesia. To the East we also find a Hindu India, and a Buddhist Sinitic area.

This map is based on religious majorities and hides significant minorities, and also changing realities. For example, all of these religious civilizational units are in crisis.

The Western Christian world is culturally undermined by a dominant secular, hedonist culture with only this-worldly goals.

The Muslim world is in severe crisis along its western eastern axis with collapsed states, warfare and brutal attempts to establish hardline forms of Islam, destroying fragile nation states, which were created after the break down of the Muslim empires and the end of western colonialism.

The Sinic Buddhist civilization has suffered cruelly at the hand of Marxist ideology and is surviving only by opening up to the consumerist logic of the modern market economy, which offers little food for the soul.

In India, Hindu nationalism (Hindutva) is presently the ideology of the ruling party and of this vast country, which is more an empire than a nation state. Hindutva ideology is, because of memories and experiences of colonialism, decisively antichristian. However, the inherent problem with making Hinduism into the state religion is its lack of unity.

If globalization through exposing different cultures and religions to the sum of human variety can create a reaction of relativism advocating mutual tolerance within a liberal framework, it also puts pressure on offering universal solutions. For the Vatican to be Italian becomes problematic as Italian does not function as a global language. And a religion that is only valid in one country, or only for some people, loose probability.

Universal "religions"

Therefore, I think that instead of looking at world religions, we should look at religions and ideologies with a universal nature and thrust. It is these that battle for dominance on the global civilizational level. It is a fight about the framework of global society.

That is why globalization points forward to Christendom.

The Rise of the Global South

In his book, *Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity*, published in 2002, but since then appearing in several new editions, Philip Jenkins argues that the loss of European Christian culture, and the post-Christian state of much of the West, is simultaneous with Christianity increasing in the Global South.

One driving force is fertility levels that point toward the increasing influence of Africa for both Christianity and Islam. Africa has both high fertility and religiosity. But favors a hot supernatural, conservative religiosity.

The two growing religions are then Christianity and Islam. And with this shift comes also a more positive view on church state unions.

The future Christendom has then a marked African nature, or?

Fragile states

We need to combine this future religious development with a crisis motor, which affects the West by building up pressure that is hard to escape. It is like in meteorology, an area with low pressure is rushed upon by forces from high pressure areas.

This adds political and social dynamism to demography.

First, I will show you a map of fragile states with a scale from sustainable to alert (failed states), which closely matches levels of wealth and poverty, and areas of armed conflict.

Crisis of liberalism

This needs to be put into the context of a crisis for liberalism in the west.

The pressure from the south with mass immigration emphasizes the importance of culture for politics. More and more, people and societies realize the need for a stronger value community to simply survive as a unit, as a nation, and as a culture. You cannot allow anything in culture and in society, but which are the borders for which a nation should decide?

It points to the necessity of religion, for an anchor beyond the world.

Liberalism was born together with the separation of religion and state; in which the state allowed religious freedom as a private activity, but did not take a stance in religious questions.

Presently instead of promoting freedom, its proponents are moving in an illiberal direction putting forward laws and regulations that restrict free speech and freedom of religion. In essence, the reliance of liberal societies on the remnants of a lingering foundation of Christian values is exposed when radical pluralism includes also non-tolerant ideologies such as fascism and militant Islamism. In Europe, this development has gained speed through large immigration from Muslim majority countries.

In Sweden, for example, in the run up for this election the Social democrats proposed a complete ban on religious schools.

I find this illiberal turn of liberalism logical, as it tries to take the place normally held by religion. But with large minorities, especially from Muslim majority countries, this becomes a dubious strategy, as it will have to exclude larger and larger number of people. In a sense, it will have to abandon democratic principles at some point, when the majority decline to choose according to liberal principles.

Another response is to develop a stronger national identity, that is, nationalism, and the recognition of religion as an important factor in this. But this is sometimes an instrumental use and understanding of Christianity, a cultural Christianity functioning as a social glue keeping the nation together and giving the state a needed religious foundation.

Still, I consider it a sign of a human universal expressed in the Catholic understanding of the complementary functions of the Church and the state. A recent *First Things* article symptomatically had the heading “Of course Christians are Theocrats.”^{xix}

Theologically this leads to a reflection on the kingdom of God, and Christ the king. But what does that mean in a globalized world?

Part III. Important principles of a future Christendom

After clarifying the notion of Christendom, at least in a preliminary way, and then discussing the idea of Church as culture and the Catholic understanding of Church state relations, and the present signs of our times, we are, I hope, ready to begin to sketch some principles for a future Christendom.

I will first look into what the notion of Christ as king means for a future Christendom, especially how it touches upon an eschatological understanding of world history. Then I will explore the development from a territorial Church to a personal Church, the future more perfect realization of the fundamental catholicity and unity of the Church, and finally its renewed missionary spirit.

Christ the king and his Kingdom

The basic idea of Christ the King is to relativize earthly rulers, as we are all subjects of a universal king. This notion corresponds to the fulfillment of salvation history with the return of the Son of Man in his glory to judge the living and the dead. Then he will establish his kingdom not only in the souls of Christians but also over material creation, human society and culture.

The understanding of Christ as King has a clear eschatological dimension in the sense of a fulfillment of history, in contrast to a secular understanding of history as either increasing enlightenment (utopia) or human self-destruction (dystopia).

It is also Catholic in the sense of universal.

It does not include separation between Christians nor nations; but, on the other hand, not their obliteration. Remember the passage from the Revelation of John, “all the nations will...” The Church will be one. A global Christian civilization. A new universal Christendom.

It also abolishes a secular religious division within society. Everything is ultimately put under the kingship of Christ. The ideal is that of a restoration (or renewal) of all things in Christ (*instaurare omnia in Christo*).

Furthermore, the heart of future Christendom is a vibrant Eucharistic culture. Where human and divine meet.

Moreover, I believe the developments we are living through point to a detachment from the notion of territory and instead promotes an understanding of the Church as personal. Personal in the sense of belonging to, for example, a parish not based on living within a certain territory, but according to a choice, to active faith. For example, Opus Dei is a personal prelature.

Modern communications make it possible to keep together such personal structures much more efficiently than before.

Finally, to capture the global universal civilization level: the Western, Sinitic, Indian, Middle Eastern; African, the church will need to become a missionary church and understand that what is at stake is not this and that nation, but the new emergent level of the whole of humanity.

Part IV. Final Words

At the same time as I do not deny that the Church as we know it seems to falter and run the risk of fissure into small fragments, thereby losing its unitary catholic nature, I have argued that the future Church and Christendom are being born. The destruction is, then, creative, in the sense that it liberates a truly universal Christendom from social structures previously suitable, but now inadequate.

We need to use our imagination illuminated by faith, by grace, in order to see this future Christendom. We become then equipped with a spiritualized imagination that can see through the present crisis, and have hope that inspires concrete actions.

The choice is thus not between mere human power or a decisive divine intervention, but I advocate the grace filled human attempt to build forms of life of meaning and purpose; of goodness, virtue, and honor, even in the middle of the most severe crisis.

I cannot think of a better example of this symbiosis of human and divine in cultural form than the gothic cathedral. When I come to a village and in its midst a church stretches towards the sky with rising towers, buttresses and rosette windows, to me that is a human celebration of divine intervention, of God becoming man, and living with us in the form of the Eucharist.

At the same time as the cathedral rose toward the sky, the university was born. Think of what a new Christendom, now catholic in a new and more powerful way as it encloses the whole of humanity, would give rise to. What cathedral or university will rise in the midst of such a city? Use your imagination.

I see the Church becoming truly universal, but strong in her own culture, which acts as leaven for all the cultures of various nations and regions.

The church is then a universal, perfect society, transcending and at the same time incorporating all nations.

In order for the Church to live up to this reality, I believe it must become a truly Catholic, personal church founded on an intense Eucharistic culture.

Let us, therefore, like abbot Suger, when he rebuilt and adorned St Denis in the 12th century around divine worship and thereby created the gothic style, build a culture rising toward heaven, giving God what is his due, that is to love him with all our heart, soul, strength and mind.

Then, destruction, no matter how devastating, far reaching and deep, will only prepare the way — make the mountains low, fill in the valleys, and make crooked and rough ways smooth — for the universal king: Christ.

ⁱ Urquhart, *Francis*. "Christendom." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 3. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908. 8 Aug. 2018 <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03699b.htm>>

ⁱⁱ *Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*, 2002, edited by André Vauchez (James Clarke & Co), Published online: 2005 Current Online Version: 2005.

ⁱⁱⁱ Brett Edward Whalen, 2009, *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), 2.

^{iv} Philip Jenkins, 2002, *Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (Oxford University Press), 13.

^v Jenkins, *Next Christendom*, 13.

^{vi} Jenkins, *Next Christendom*, 188.

^{vii} Jenkins, *Next Christendom*, 188.

^{viii} Jenkins, *Next Christendom*, 14

^{ix} Jenkins, *Next Christendom*, 14.

^x Robert Louis Wilken, 2004, "The Church as Culture," *First Things*, www.firstthings.com/article/2004/04/the-church-as-culture.

^{xi} Cf. Jenkins, *Next Christendom*.

^{xii} A perfect society has a human purpose that is not subordinate to any other in its own order; it also has control of all the means it needs to reach that goal. This means that the Church and the State are perfect societies within the fields constituted by their respective goals, that is, the common natural good and the common supernatural good of the community. <https://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/dictionary/index.cfm?id=35522>.

^{xiii} http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei.pdf

^{xiv} http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html#

^{xv} Thomas, Pink, “Dignitatis Humanae: continuity after Leo XIII,” 12.

^{xvi} Pink, “Dignitatis Humanae,” 18.

^{xvii} Pink, “Dignitatis Humanae,” 21.

^{xviii} By World religions map ru.svg: Tetromino et al.derivative work: — Obsuser (talk) - File:World religions map ru.svg; BlankMap-World6,_compact.svg; inspired by w:ru:Файл:Weltreligionen.png and w:de:Datei:Weltreligionen.png., CC BY 3.0, <https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=59517723>.

^{xix} <https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2018/08/of-course-christians-are-theocrats>.