Summary. The study aims at an analysis of the phenomenon of festivals through the lens of a personalistic perspective. The author is of the opinion that the role of festivals as platforms for the development of civil society is best realized when the common good and personalistic approaches are accepted. Festivals, as a form of celebrating genuinely, contribute to the well-being of a society, if they accept the assumptions of the common good approach, which seems to be a promising perspective for exploring the nature of the relation between festivals and society.
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Introduction

In my paper I would like to analyze the phenomenon of festivals through the lens of a personalistic perspective. If it is true that festivals as cultural platforms derive from the unique spirit of Europe that is based on the personalistic understanding of human being, it should be interesting to look at festivals and their contribution in this way.

To begin, I would like to show how festivals implement the basic assumptions of personalistic approach – freedom, subjective character and self-awareness. In my opinion, the festival formula shows how a person as a part of society can be invited
to participate in a community and form social relations which are only real and au-
thentic if developed on the basis of free will, dignity and truth.

Next, I would like to try to analyze festivals as events taking place in the sphere of *sacrum* (which is related to the time of leisure). Here personalism gives us a lot of insights – such as understanding work and leisure as the complementary elements of human life, their interdependence, mutual contribution, which in the end leads to the full development of the human person. This goal is a necessary condition for forming the society of citizens – the civil society.

At the end I would like to look at festivals as platforms for the exchange of ide-
as and discussion about how people understand the common good. Here we can engage the division between the institutional and charismatic dimensions of so-
cial life. In my opinion this strongly corresponds with the nature of festivals, which draws from these two sources – connecting different aspects of human existence – the physical and spiritual, the formal and substantial.

**Celebrating society**

To start my reflection it is necessary to look at the terms that are central to the topic of my paper. First of them is the word “to celebrate,”¹ which draws our attention to certain sphere of social reality. The definition that we have in the footnote describes special part of social life that is unusual to normal daily routine. Although it is excep-
tional – because it means a break in the course of the week, month or a year – it does not have to be in opposition to workdays. I am highlighting this question because two perspectives can be found here. The first of them can be called – after a famous painting by Peter Bruegel – “the Fight Between Carnival and Lent.” In this perspec-
tive, society and its time are divided into *sacrum* and *profanum* and a strict boundary between them is marked. As a consequence, the sphere of work is opposed to the sphere of leisure, which includes celebration.

In the second perspective – which I would call Christian² – there is no rigid op-
position such as that encountered in the first perspective, although this does not

---

¹ “Celebrate vb 1 to rejoice in or have special festivities to mark (a happy day, event, etc.). 2 (tr) to observe (a birthday, anniversary, etc.). 3 (tr) to perform (a solemn or religious ceremony), esp. to officiate at (Mass). 4(tr) to praise publicly; proclaim. [C15: from L, from celeber numerous, renowned].” *Concise Dictionary*, Glasgow 2000, p. 236.

² Some may argue that the approach characteristic to the first perspective was present through-
out the history of Europe. That is true, although one has to remember that Christianity did not appear in a socio-cultural vacuum. That is why what we see in the culture of Europe is the mixture of elements
mean that we no longer confront the division into sacred and profane. In this perspective, we find an understanding of the connection and interrelation between these two spheres. We can say that through the fact of Incarnation the Sacred enters into the profane and transforms it. This means that from now on there is no conflict between the time of work and time of leisure which means that celebrating is the natural consequence of the hardship of labour. This means that normal day-to-day activity is no longer seen as a curse, but as a necessary – although different – part of the harmonious whole.

Celebrating appears to be universal human experience. Various authors have discussed this question and shown how fundamental and important to the well-being of a society it is. Probably one of the most recognized authors is Mircea Eliade, who stressed the meaning of celebration as the time of spiritual revitalization and deepening the understanding of individual and communal identity. “Free” days are the time when one crosses the limits of one’s professional role and is allowed to express other aspects of one’s personality and experience things that are rarely or not available during workdays. Another author who discusses this problem is the American psychologist, Rollo May. In his book *The Cry for Myth* he describes the relation between myth and celebration in the context of the existence of a person and a community. It is necessary to say that he understood myth as narration that is treated as true. He argued that all the celebrations taking place in a society are based on a myth as the source. All the rites and traditions that a community respects have a mythical origin. He also recalls Malinowski’s statement, that the myth preserves and enhances morality.

An interesting aspect of May’s approach is the notion of “anti-person” which connects us to the personalistic concept we will also discuss. He recalls the Biblical story of the most severe punishment that God could mete out. It was the eradication of one’s name from the *Book of Life*. May continues by describing the practice of communist regimes which fabricated facts and history so that the existence of

---

some persons was eliminated (apart from the physical extermination which was also carried out at the same time, in many cases). The fact of a person's life with all its exceptionality was removed from public awareness and memory. This meant the theft of one's identity and the destruction of myth, which is a necessary background for celebrating.⁷

In the Western tradition a significant example of traditional celebration is the social role of Sunday, which is not only limited to the religious dimension.⁸ As Aniela Dylus writes, besides the aspect that was just mentioned, the celebration of Sunday has an important humanistic and social dimension. When it comes to the humanistic dimension, Dylus identifies two aspects of celebration: as a symbolic space of individual freedom and as a means for integrating a community.⁹ When we look at the social dimension, we find that celebrating is a part of society from the very beginning. No matter what character it has – religious (as a form of cult) or other, e.g. political – it always integrates members of a community.

**Festival as the form of celebration**

After discussing the meaning of celebrating I want to briefly analyze the way the word “festival” is understood and the character of the relation between festivals and the idea of celebration. When we look at the meaning of the word “festival,”¹⁰ which is central to the topic of the conference, we find a few, slightly different explanations. The most interesting definition for us would be the one that refers to “an organized series of special events and performances.” Although our reflection will concentrate on this meaning, it is difficult to completely resign from other statements present in the dictionary definition, because a festival demands a given time to take place and is accompanied by revelry, and as the form of celebration it is public in nature.

---

⁷ Ibidem, p. 43.
⁸ “It is right, therefore, to claim, in the words of a fourth century homily, that ‘the Lord's Day’ is ‘the lord of days.' Those who have received the grace of faith in the Risen Lord cannot fail to grasp the significance of this day of the week with the same deep emotion which led Saint Jerome to say: ‘Sunday is the day of the Resurrection, it is the day of Christians, it is our day.' For Christians, Sunday is ‘the fundamental feastday,' established not only to mark the succession of time but to reveal time's deeper meaning.” John Paul II, *Dies Domini*, 2.
¹⁰ “Festival – n 1 a day or period set aside for celebration or feasting, esp. one of religious significance. 2 any occasion for celebration. 3 an organized series of special events and performances: a festival of drama. 4 Arch. A time of revelry. 5 (modifier) relating to or characteristic of a festival. [C14: from Church L fēstivālis of a feast, from L festivus FESTIVE].” *Concise Dictionary*, p. 523.
Festivals are naturally seen as an element of the sphere of leisure. Holidays as the days of rest in the European tradition have strong religious roots, because their original meaning comes from the “holy days.” That is why it is obvious to say that the time of holiday is the time reserved for celebration. I have already discussed its role in society. To analyze festivals as form of celebration one has to understand that the temporal sphere they naturally appear in is originally religious in character. That is why – although this may be surprising – I think it is justified to say that festivals can also be seen as religious events. This may be better understood if we consider the sociological meaning of the term “religion”11: we can see that in this wider context than that of limiting religion to a relation to a personal God, festivals can be described as religious in character. Certainly it is connected with the nature of art, in which some kind of transcendence is always inscribed.12

This assumption concerning the religious character of festivals can also be confirmed by everyday observation. When we look at social expectations I think it can be said that people expect that something extraordinary will happen, that they will experience something different from their daily routine; that they will have the chance to leave their profanum for a while and enter some kind of sacrum. Although some festivals initiatives seem to cross the boundary between sacrum and profanum or appear to disrespect the values or norms that are traditionally sacred to a given community, in fact the idea of festival in my opinion belongs to the sphere of sacrum. I simply do not believe that one can find a festival that does not aspire to be an occasion to experience something unique and extraordinary.

This may be surprising to see but in fact festivals are allies of e.g. Christian churches in the defense of Sunday holiday not only as the day of worship but in general, but also as an important social and cultural value. It is obvious that festivals need free space in material and temporal terms as well. If the space for celebration within a community shrinks, the environment for festivals also deteriorates.


12 “Art gives easy and complete possibility of uncovering the truth of our emotions, the direction of our thoughts, of guiding the development of our values. [...] Art has always aimed at unifying individual emotions in an integrated feeling of collective identity, through an experience of self-truth through beauty. This transcendence is not always possible.” Celebrating Europe: International Festivals Strengthening the Civil Society (background briefing paper), Celebrating Europe Conference, Poznań 22-25 April 2010, http://festivals.amu.edu.pl/about.html [23.02.2011].
The public sphere and the common good

Here I want to discuss the strategy that a society chooses to organize and regulate its public life. I will use the distinction characteristic of management theory as I find it useful and present in the practice of public governance.

Before I do that, it is necessary to offer a short introduction. Every social action is based upon some premises. I think it is justified to say – after Alford and Naughton, the authors of *Managing as if Faith Mattered* – that what we do is motivated by a desire to accomplish something good.\(^{13}\) Traditionally in Europe and the rest of the Western world the understanding of “good” was based on Aristotle’s meaning of “good” as “something that perfects or fulfills a living being.”\(^{14}\) With this assumption comes the necessity of a hierarchy of goods because it is impossible to realize all goods at the same time. We can distinguish two types of “goods” that people try to accomplish through their activities. Firstly, the “foundational goods” (such as profits, capital, technology) and secondly, “excellent goods” (e.g. human development). It is important to say that these two kinds of goods are not in opposition, but what we can call “a good life” requires both types of goods.\(^{15}\)

Now we will go back to the problem of the strategy used for public policy. Generally speaking, we can distinguish three approaches that one can choose from to regulate the social reality. The first of them is the *shareholder* model, which concentrates on the maximization of the value of the individual or a group of people that own the enterprise. It may seem inappropriate to analyze this model when we discuss public policy. But if we think of it for a while we will see that those who govern the state, organization or a community may act the way that is most convenient for them to hold power and control the situation – which in fact means that they treat the public sphere as their property. This “particular” and not “universal” pursuit of goods has to be seen as the weakness of the *shareholder* theory. In this model there is a danger that “foundational goods” will be prioritized, while “excellent goods” will be left behind.

A second proposal that aspires to improve the governance of a community is the *stakeholder* approach. It is expected that this model will fix what the *shareholder* model cannot. The *stakeholder* theory became popular recently as it promises to broaden perspectives and raise awareness of the complexity of reality. Significantly,


\(^{14}\) Ibidem, p. 39.

\(^{15}\) Ibidem, p. 40.
the stakeholder approach tries to take into consideration the opinions and expectations of different individuals, groups and institutions in the surroundings of an organization. Although in comparison to the shareholder theory the stakeholder approach is progressive, it still misses the essential "common idea." This is the weakness of the stakeholder model, which only recognizes the individual good of different individuals (or groups), and is not helpful for recognizing the common good of a community.

The third approach that I want to analyze is the common good model. It is necessary to explain what I understand by the "common good" because this expression is often used in everyday communication and it may appear clear enough for everybody.

The common good, as Michael P. Hornsby-Smith writes, is an approach that "recognizes interdependence of human beings and rejects the individualistic presuppositions of that form of liberal thought rooted in the Enlightenment notion of human autonomy." The common good model strives to protect and perfect the coexistence of the individual person and society. The complex context of human life is the fact that the common good model accepts and respects. Interestingly, this issue is addressed by the authors of Gaudium et Spes – The Second Vatican Council’s Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. In this document we read that the common good refers to "the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfillment more fully and more easily." This statement can be completed by the definition given by Alford and Naughton which states that the "common good is considered to be a human perfection or fulfillment achievable by a community, such that the community’s members all share it, both as a community, and singly, in their persons." One of the important advantages of the "common good approach" is the shape of the relationship between “particular” and “common” goods. While the first group consists of those goods which are owned by one person or a small group, the second


17 The Second Vatican Council, Gaudium et Spes, 26.

18 H.J. Alford, M.J. Naughton, Managing..., p. 41. Robert G. Kennedy makes an important remark on the terminology we use: “It can be a mistake to speak of the common good, as if there were one good (or collection of goods) that composed the common good. (We do, of course, speak of the common good as a sort of shorthand for the common good of a civil community. This is a legitimate usage, but it should not obscure for us the fact that there are many other important common goods.” R.G. Kennedy, The Good That Business Does, “Christian Social Thought Series” no. 9, 2006, p. 52. This author also offers an interesting explanation of the kinds of common goods. See ibidem, pp. 41-66.
group is available to everyone (e.g. peace\textsuperscript{19}). Another interesting thing is that in the “common good perspective” we find the encouragement to organize the particular goods in such a way that they can be shared and held in common. This is accompanied by the idea of the universal destination of goods.

The civil society of persons

It is important to say that each of the approaches we have discussed is connected with a certain vision of the human being. If we analyze this fact through the lens of the personalistic perspective we will see that the common good model offers the best environment for a person and a society of persons to develop. In this section I will try to show how the personalistic approach, common good and civil society are interlinked. In order to do that I want to start from explaining what it means to be “a person.” In personalism we find such fundamental assumptions about the nature of the human person as freedom, dignity (subjective character), truth (self-awareness), and prioritizing a person over society. This last assumption is well explained in the following passage:

\textit{[\ldots] to Personalism, personality is the supreme value. Society then should be so organized as to present every person the best possible opportunity for self-development, physically, mentally, and spiritually since the person is the supreme essence of democracy and hostile to totalitarianisms of every sort.\textsuperscript{20}}

It may seem that personalism is a kind of individualism. In fact it is not, as it from the very beginning is interested in the conditions for creating a balance between a person and society. The concept of a person is also directly oriented towards an analysis not of an abstract human being but real person in his or her unprecedented life. That is why it is justified to say that

\textit{[\ldots] personalism and life are linked. Personalism is realized between idealism and materialism, between individualism and collectivism and between abortion and eu-}

\textsuperscript{19} The following passage from John Paul II may be helpful in understanding the nature of the common good: “Also to be mentioned here, as a sign of respect for life – despite all the temptations to destroy it by abortion and euthanasia – is a concomitant concern for peace, together with an awareness that peace is indivisible. It is either for all or for none. It demands an ever greater degree of rigorous respect for justice and consequently a fair distribution of the results of true development.” John Paul II, \textit{Sollicitudo rei socialis}, 26.

thanasi. An unborn human being is a person. Somebody will try to clone a human organism but it is impossible to clone a human person. To be a person means to be in relationship. A bridge signifies this relationship.²¹

To understand a human being as a person means then to accept him or her as independent in existence, a substantial whole that has a physico-spiritual nature and is the subject of thoughtful and free action.²² This integral and complex character of a person leads us consequently towards the common good approach because it is in this model that all the goods – “foundational” as well as “excellent” – are taken into consideration. Also the personalistic orientation to look for balance between the individual and social perspective is the motivation to continuous effort to connect and harmonize what is particular or private so it can serve the well-being and multiplication of the common good of all the community.

I think this describes the European and Western tradition well. I agree with an authors who said that

[...] the Latin civilization is the personalistic civilization, which means that it understands human being as subject and the purpose of social actions at the same time, and the good of a man is the measure and criterion of these actions. Versatile development of human person is the purpose, and it means that also freedom is the purpose, because without freedom there is no personal development. We stress, that the Western civilization is the only civilization that uses the notion of the dignity of human person and human rights. At the same time personalism emphasizes individual responsibility of a man, while in non-personalistic civilizations collectivity is preferred. The example of the affirmation of human freedom by the Latin civilization is the fact, that nobody besides the concrete man can not bear the responsibility for realization and accomplishing of the purpose of human life.²³

This means that it is justified to say that the foundations of Europe are personalistic.

Now I will try to show the link between the personalistic approach and civil society. An interesting argument for this can be found in Jacques Delors’ paper, where he discusses the relation between Europe and personalism, and employs the category of civil society. He shows that the personalistic approach that finds the link between the individual and social perspectives resembles the balance that is

---

necessary in society. He writes that “civil rights alone drift towards the inequalities of the market, and social rights give rise to state bureaucracy.” He also illustrates the influence of the personalistic perspective on the transformations that lead to formation of civil society. He describes it using the example of the Polish transformation: “it was in the 1970s that personalist thinking made an encounter with the human rights tradition in Poland – as well as with the notion of civil society as an association of individuals which is independent from the state and allows the authentic expression of individual and community needs. Personalism introduced a moral perspective to this public civil sphere, by emphasizing human dignity, personal rights and the duty of solidarity.”

Festivals, the common good, participation

Here I want to concentrate on the role that festivals play in the promotion and development of the common good through participation, which is an important aspect of civil society. It is in the common good approach that the environment for engaging of the members of society has the greatest opportunities to develop. This means that “the fullness of the common good does not reside in things but in the quality of relationships established between the people themselves and between each person, in communion with others, and God.” As a consequence, “the community must be structured in a way that the individual can participate in and contribute to the common good.”

When it comes to the personalist perspective, it provides support for the necessity of involving each individual person in the life of a larger community, and this complements the contribution of the common good approach.

As a result, we arrive at the fundamental idea of participation. This has to be distinguished from the notion of “allocation,” which is somehow similar, yet specific to economic activities. This difference is well described by Alford and Naughton when they write that “by allocation we share a pizza, a bench at the museum, profits from a product or service; by participation we share a conversation over pizza, the view

---

27 Ibidem, p. 11.
from the museum bench of van Gogh’s *Sunflowers*, the fairness of the distribution of the profits. Allocation is the sharing of a whole by dividing it into, and distributing, its parts; participation is the sharing of a whole by its distribution as a whole.\(^{28}\) This means that with the growth of the number of people participating, the amount of common good does not diminish. This fundamental aspect of participation in contrast to allocation seems to be often forgotten.

This division into participation and allocation can be very useful in analyzing different events and trying to discern whether they are festivals or not. This problem was raised by Dragan Klaic, when he observed that not every undertaking that has the word “festival” in the title in fact is a festival. He writes, that

\[\text{[...]}\] that there is an increasing number of festivals that occur intentionally only once, without any ambition for reoccurrence and longevity, indicates that the “F” word has become a fundraising and marketing shortcut for any arbitrarily composed cluster of events, offered under a common title.\(^{29}\)

It can be seen that when a festival is oriented towards accomplishing certain particular interests it starts to lose its charisma as a space of contribution to the common good. In such a perspective, a festival formula is used instrumentally and – using the language of management – more in the perspective of the *shareholder* or *stakeholder* value production (creation) than the common good development. It can be summarized by saying that – as I suppose – people do not participate in festival events to admire the ability of the organizer to maximize profits because they encounter this approach too often in their everyday work. This does not mean that a festival is not expected to prove that it is managed well in the perspective of the formal and material aspects of this kind of activity.\(^{30}\)

Coming back to festivals, it is justified to say that participation can be seen as the basic goal of every festival. It does not mean that this has to be measured quantitatively because one has to be aware that different festivals may be directed to different groups or communities. Although the size of the public matters, it can


\(^{30}\) “[...], voluntary organizations strengthen political participation, thus consolidating civil society. Such social organizations are important not only by virtue of their meritorious aims, but also because they are usually guided by personalist values. It is open to question whether purely disinterested initiatives are viable in the contemporary world. Market forces are compelling social organizations to recognize economic exigencies, while political parties and governmental agencies are seeking to exert an influence through the more prestigious voluntary bodies.” J. Delors, *European Personalist...*, p. 94.
be said that what really matters is the effect that the participation in a festival has on the individual person. It means that the “festival experience” in fact is always personal – what remains when the festival is over is what a given person has experienced – and this experience is what he or she will convey to society, and only the given person can transform this experience into real element of the common good (e.g. in the form of “social capital”). This means that it is by such a transformation of individual experience that a person displays responsibility for the community. As a result, the citizenship develops and through this civil society grows.

The institutional and charismatic dimensions of festivals

The nature of festivals reflects the dynamics between the institution and the charisma that is a fundamental feature of social life. It is connected with the existence of festivals, which is often hard to predict. This aspect is described by Klaic who writes that, festivals

[…] depend on a complex logistic, much cross-marketing, well-orchestrated fundraising and a synergy of public subsidy, sponsorship and own income. Appearing once a year or biennially, they suffer from a structural discontinuity in staff competence, visibility, audience loyalty, funding and media attention.31

This relative instability may be seen as both an advantage and disadvantage at the same time. Festivals that are built from institutional and charismatic “bricks” are associations and communities at the same time.32 Of course, different festivals have different structures – the degree of institutionalization may vary, and it is also related to the “size” of the charismatic element. I think it can be said that what most often festivals “create” by engaging the public can be called a “short-term community.” A festival then can be described as an association that is oriented towards supporting community creation and development. Of course this so-called “short-term community” appears within a larger community and contributes to its common good.

When we look at the personalistic and common good approach, it is evident that the common good of a community cannot be accomplished unless both the

31 D. Klaic, Festival.
institutional and charismatic dimensions are involved. This corresponds with the
nature of festivals, which draws from these two sources – connecting different as-
pects of human existence – the physical, intellectual and spiritual, and the formal
and substantial.

Another thing that can be said is that festivals can be defined as platforms of so-
cial communication where people exchange ideas and discuss how they understand
the common good. When we look at the problem of the lack of participation that
may be present in democratic systems, we can turn to festivals as chances for social
debate. Of course none of us expects and wishes that festivals will become strictly
political events. Nevertheless, to some extent every festival has a political dimen-
sion, if we understand politics as looking for ways to organize human groups and
solve common and particular social problems. This aspect may be seen as difficult
to avoid, but I do not think it is necessary or possible to eliminate it. Certainly this
becomes important when we encounter the situation that political engagement is
understood by the majority of society as voting once every four years. Such a pas-
sive political attitude may be the result of the dominance of the individualistic at-
titude across society. In such circumstances festivals become precious laboratories
of democratic and civic personality – the elements crucial for the existence of civil
society. This role that festivals can play seems to be very important nowadays, also
from the perspective of the development of the consumerist mentality throughout
society, which suffers more often from the lack of involvement. It leads to rethinking
the origins of civic engagement and agreeing that “citizenship is no longer confined
to voting in elections. It grows out of citizen’s daily participation in civic life, in the
improvement of the neighborhood, school, hospital, library, museum, or wherever
there is work to be done for the common good.”33 When it comes to the role of fes-
tivals, in the same paper we read that “in their immense diversity, the spontaneous
initiatives of NGOs, business foundations, philanthropic associations, service clubs,
volunteer centres, informal support networks and self-help groups, respond to little
perceived needs, confer visibility on problems encountered by vulnerable groups
in the population, and test – even if only on a small scale – innovative solutions.
This exercise of participatory citizenship is significantly contributing to expand the
energies, capabilities and resources invested in social development”34.

---

33 M. Darcy de Oliveira, Citizen Participation and Social Capital Formation: Resource Mobilisation for
Social Development: the Experience of Comunidade Solidária in Brazil, in Social Capital and Poverty Reduc-
DA536E0D2D0800/filename/soc_cap_symp.pdf, p. 16 [22.02.2011].

34 Ibidem.
Conclusion

In my paper I have shown how certain assumptions about understanding of human beings and their relation to society are essential. My reflection can be summarized by saying that the role of festivals as platforms for the development of civil society is best realized when the common good and personalistic approaches are accepted. Festivals, as a form of celebrating genuinely, contribute to the well-being of a society, if they accept the assumptions of the common good approach, which seems to be a promising perspective for exploring the nature of the relation between festivals and society.

If we understand that to realize civil society we need physical and non-physical elements of a certain character, we should accept the vision of the human being that resembles this fact. This can be found in the personalistic approach, which understands the human being not as someone of a double nature, but as someone of one – although complex – nature. This complexity means that human being is spiritual, mental and physical at the same time. In this perspective, a person participates in everything that he or she experiences as a whole. It can be better understood if we say that for a person everything has a personal dimension.

This corresponds well with the question of the institutional and charismatic dimension of civil society. It may be explained as the continuing process of transforming reality through institutions inspired by the charisma of civil virtues.

What is more, the principles of personalistic perspective – such as dignity, freedom and truth – can be used as the criteria for measuring the condition of festivals.

Another argument in favour of personalism and the common good perspective is the fact that a festival – which can be defined as a European phenomenon – can be seen as the cultural consequence of the unique European identity that is founded on the understanding of the human being as a human person and the common good approach that is most characteristic for the culture of Europe.
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