

Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije



The Critique of Clericalisation of Serbia

Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije

Urednik: **AFANS, Antifašistička akcija Novi Sad**

Edicija anti-dogma

Prevod: Nebojša Pajić, Orfeas Skutelis

Lektura: Branka Ćurčić

Fotografija: Arhiv AFANS-a

Dizajn: AFANS

Prepress: Predrag Nikolić

Štampa: Daniel Print, Novi Sad

Samizdat

Tiraž: 500

Godina izdanja: 2007.

Font na koricama: Miroslavljeva latinica

Svako kopiranje i dalje korišćenje tekstova iz knjige je dobrodošlo (izuzev upotrebe u komercijalne svrhe i u okviru rasističkog, seksističkog, fašističkog i antisemitskog konteksta).

Publikacija "Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije" je objavljena u okviru šireg projekta osnivanja Omladinskog društvenog centra u Novom Sadu, koji će se zalagati za borbu protiv retrogradnih pojava nacionalizma, fašizma, rasizma i ksenofobije.

Projekat osnivanja Omladinskog društvenog centra u Novom Sadu su podržali "Schueler Helfen Leben", Nemačka i Pokrajinski sekretarijat za omladinu i sport AP Vojvodine (podrška objavljivanju publikacije).

Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije



Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije

Sadržaj

- 6 **Kritika klerikalizacije Novog Sada**, *Analiza društveno-političkog i estetskog diskursa novih crkvenih i pravoslavnih strategija*, **Branka Ćurčić**
- 10 **Mapa Novog Sada i okolnih naselja sa ucrtanim novoizgrađenim objektima Srpske pravoslavne crkve**
- 12 **Savremeno srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo: od tradicije do političke korektnosti**
Vladimir Mitrović
- 18 **Od psihopatologije do političkog programa: crkvena ofanziva na pragu 21. veka**
Petar Atanacković
- 24 **Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije: analiza odnosa crkve i moderne države**, *Miloš Perović*
- 27 **Dnevnik crkvenih uvreda 2000 – 2006**, *Od desekularizacije ka klerikalizaciji*
Zoran Petakov
- 39 **Spisak novih srpskih pravoslavnih crkava u Novom Sadu i u okolnim naseljima**

Kritika klerikalizacije Novog Sada

Analiza društveno-političkog i estetskog diskursa novih crkvenih i pravoslavnih strategija

Branka Ćurčić

Publikacija „Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije” predstavlja skup istraživačkih eseja i istraživačke hronološke studije posvećenih analizi ekspanzije građevina Srpske pravoslavne crkve (SPC) tokom prethodnih deset godina na teritoriji Novog Sada i njegove šire okoline, kao i specifičnog društveno-političkog ambijenta koji je omogućio ovakvo urbano planiranje zasnovano na principima dominacije isključivo jednog kôda, jezika i ideologije.

Činjenica je da je na teritoriji Novog Sada i njegove neposredne okoline tokom poslednje decenije sagrađeno (ili je započeto sa izgradnjom) više desetina pravoslavnih crkava različitih dimenzija i stilova. Ekspanzija gradnje pravoslavnih crkava se može povezati sa aktuelnim društveno-političkim zbivanjima, pri čemu se primećuje značajniji pomak ka „nezvaničnom” i „indirektnom” povezivanju i prožimanju srpske države i Srpske pravoslavne crkve. Zakon o crkvama, sistem povraćaja crkvene imovine, finansiranje rada SPC-a iz javnih fondova su samo neki od primera ove, pre svega, negativne konvergencije crkve i države u savremenom srpskom društvu. Ekspanzija srpskog pravoslavnog graditeljstva u prestonici multikulturalne Vojvodine se indirektno može povezati sa značajnim demografskim promenama koja su zadesila Novi Sad i Vojvodinu tokom i nakon bratoubilačkog rata u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini devedesetih godina prošlog veka. Pre pomenutih ratova, Novi Sad je bio grad koji je brojio oko dvesta pedeset hiljada stanovnika različite nacionalnosti i važio je za multikulturalnu prestonicu regiona. Tokom i nakon rata, grad Novi Sad je gotovo udvostručio broj stanovnika koji trenutno iznosi oko četiri stotine hiljada. Pretpostavka je da je većina srpskog stanovništva, ratnih izbeglica iz Hrvatske i Bosne našlo svoje utočište u Novom Sadu, što značajno utiče na aktuelnu strukturu stanovništva grada, političke orijentacije njegove vlade i na izgradnju i jačanje „duhovnog prstena” Srpske pravoslavne crkve. Srpskom hermetičnom i samo-referentnom politikom s jedne strane (podstaknuta i uobličena čak i prvim članom predloga novog srpskog ustava, gde je Srbija zemlja svih Srba i ostalih), i jačanjem crkvenih uticaja na politički život Srbije i na život uopšte, ide se ka stvaranju pozicije dominantne populacije u odnosu na „druge”, što neumitno vodi ka podelama, ka negaciji pluralizma, kao i ka negativnoj stratifikaciji društva.

„Normalizacija” individua

Ukoliko bismo pratili neke od teza kroz istoriju filozofske misli, moglo bi se doći do zaključka da stanje nesigurnosti, otuđenosti, samo-kontrole, samo-cenzure i samo-restrikcije čoveka nikako nije zaostavština modernog društva, pa čak ni kapitalističkog i industrijskog vremena. Tehnike „zatvaranja”, cenzure i ograničenja (samim tim i definisanja pojma slobode pojedinca) po filozofu Mišel Fukou datiraju još iz vremena srednjovekovnog hrišćanstva, kada se suptilnim mehanizmima govora, podobnog ponašanja, „vežbanja

duha”, ispovesti i praktikovanja misticizma sistemski radilo na metodama „preispitivanja savesti i usmeravanja pastorale”. Po Fukou, tri dominirajuće tehnike kontrole i ograničavanja pojedinaca su kanonsko pravo, hrišćanska pastorala i građanski zakon. Može se činiti preteranim i ishitrenim zaključkom, ali počev od Srednjeg veka, mehanizmi „zatvaranja” i regulacije ljudi mogu da se prate, s jedne strane kroz razvoj medicine, pedagogije i psihijatrije (nauka o „normalizaciji” i racionalizaciji ljudskog duha i tela), a sa druge strane kroz mehanizme državne vlasti. Fuko pojmom bio-vlasti definiše specifičnu „zapletenost” državne vlasti i samo-vlasti (vlasti pojedinca nad samim sobom). Ova povezanost između države i njene populacije kao subjekta nije „bezvremena konstanta”. Ono što se razvijalo tokom Srednjeg veka, zatim u 16. veku, uvrežilo se tokom 18. veka kao nova tehnika vlasti, ili preciznije, linija moći modernih tehnika vlasti koje postoje do današnjeg vremena. Ono što je obeležilo period pre 18. veka je karakter vlasti koja još uvek nije „vladala ljudima za njihovu dobrobit”, već pre svega za dobrobit suverenosti države. Sa 18. vekom i pojavom liberalizma, moć države ne zavisi više od samo od veličine njene teritorije, već i od uslova života njenog stanovništva. Tada mehanizmi vlasti počinju da se transformišu ka političkoj ekonomiji liberalizma, ka samo-nametnim ograničenjima vlasti za benefit slobodnog tržišta sa jedne strane i sa druge, ka populaciji koja sama podleže ovoj ekonomskoj paradigmi u svojim mislima i kroz svoje ponašanje. Po Fukou, moderna individua mora prvo da nauči kako da poseduje telo koje je zavisno od niza egzistencijalnih uslova, a onda mora da nauči da razvije odnos sa „kreativnim i produktivnim sobom”. Ako kažemo da je u doba hegemonije Crkve nad čovekovim ponašanjem, govorom i radom dolazilo do, uslovno rečeno, oduzimanja ovog „sopstva”, kroz kasnije mehanizme opresije se vidi da upravo bio-politika modernog društva stvara mogućnost samo-vladavine, ali samo kao preduslova za uspostavljanje i produkciju „normalnosti”.

I dalje, Fuko smatra da je upravo bio-vlast bila element neophodan za razvoj kapitalizma, koji se mogao obezbediti samo po cenu kontrolisanog ulaganja tela u proizvodni aparat i uz pomoć prilagođavanja svega onoga što se tiče stanovništva privrednim i ekonomskim tokovima. Ovde bi se donekle i samo u kontekstu mehanizama kontrole kapitalizam mogao dovesti u istu ravan sa Crkvom, jer i jedno i drugo su vekovima radili na povećanju korisnosti stanovništva i na njegovom jačanju ali bez otežavanja njegove poslušnosti, što su direktni činioци društvenog podvajanja i hijerarhizovanja koji dalje stvaraju odnose moći, dominacije i podčinjavanja.

Crkva = Država

Vraćajući se u sadašnjost, čini se da negativna konvergencija srpske države i crkve ima za posledicu izjednačavanje i poravnanje njihovog uticaja na društvo. U tom smislu, postepeno se vraća fikcija zajedništva, kolektivnog nacionalnog interesa i kolektivne slobode na uštrb principa individualne slobode. Ono što se demonstrira masovnom gradnjom objekata Srpske pravoslavne crkve je formiranje dominacije kolektivnog (srpskog) duha i sistematsko potiranje verskih, nacionalnih, etničkih i rasnih razlika među ljudima na ovoj konkretnoj geo-političkoj teritoriji. Pitanje gde se ta dominacija završava ima jasan odgovor – u želji za apsolutnom moći. U ovoj tački, čini se, sreću se interesi srpske države i njene crkve. Ovim

postupcima se s jedne strane nameću mehanizmi lokalnog „zatvaranja” i samo-izolacije od „drugih” proklamovanjem jedine prave istine, koji imaju jasnu vezu sa navedenim suptilnim mehanizmima „zatvaranja” i kontrolisanja stanovništva, zasnovanog na ideološkim i ekonomskim instancama. Srpsko stanovništvo i drugi su ovim o(bes)hrabreni da svojim mislima i svojim ponašanjem podležu hegemonij crkvenoj, i u maloj meri, državnoj vlasti, duboko verujući da zapravo oni sami poseduju vlast nad svojom slobodnom odlukom, koja se zalaže za dalekosežnu dobrobit tela i duha srpskoga naroda.

P. S. Iako postoji izvesna nelagoda u konceptu „generacije” pre svega kao „bio-redukcioniističkog” koncepta, ovo istraživanje jeste realizovano inicijativom „mlađe generacije”. Ovde upotrebljen termin nove ili mlađe generacije zapravo govori o potrebi za izgradnjom jedne analitičke društvene platforme koja je okrenuta ka budućoj kritici i izgradnji društva; o potrebi za za jednom novom generacijom koja će biti oslobođena dogmatske kapitalističke pozicije ili pozicije religioznosti i koja je otvoreno protiv otuđenosti, normalizacije, kanonizovanja, „psiho-patologije i usamljenosti”.





Mapa Novog Sada i okolnih naselja sa ucrtanim novoizgrađenim objektima Srpske pravoslavne crkve (pogledati stranu 39)

Savremeno srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo: Od tradicije do političke korektnosti

Vladimir Mitrović

Ovaj tekst deo je šireg istoimenog autorovog istraživanja.

(...) Postoji više, opravdanih ili ne, razloga za današnju sliku naše pravoslavne arhitekture. Do kasno-romantičarskog i nekritičkog preuzimanja tradicije stiglo se brzim ali i pogrešnim putem. Tvrd stav Srpske pravoslavne crkve (SPC) prema novim oblicima i formama usled poznatog (i priznatog) konzervativizma crkvenih krugova, posebno onih najviših, ustaljenost liturgijske prakse koja zahteva i odgovarajuću prostornu shemu, praktične i pragmatične situacije oko same izgradnje, prikupljanja sredstava i organizovanja procesa izgradnje koja su uglavnom poverena lokalnim crkvenim zajednicama, nezainteresovanost arhitekata i takozvano „fabrikovanje“ crkvenih projekata, nepostojanje određenog školskog programa iz ove oblasti, samo su neki od razloga za sliku današnje sakralne arhitekture kod nas. Povremeno se stiže utisak da ni sama crkva kao ni njihovi velikodostojnici nisu zadovoljni svojom savremenom sakralnom produkcijom.

Dugi vremenski period usredsređena na obnovu starih, istorijskih hramova i to uglavnom iz državnih a ne sopstvenih izvora, SPC nije do kraja razradila pristup prema izgradnji i projektima za nove hramove, osim stalno isticane činjenice da nova crkva treba da liči na neko staro, i to uglavnom manastirsko zdanje, što ju je ktitor - ponekad posebno živopisna priča, kao u slučaju crkve u Ubu (arh. Predrag Ristić, 1990-2001) čiji je investitor novi, kontraverzni bogataš - ili nadležni sveštenik izabrao kao neprikosnoveni uzor. Osim ovog generalnog stava, čest slučaj pri izboru projekta je i čist volontarizam investitora i nadležnog sveštenstva - čak i iz nekih ličnih pobuda, tipa porekla, podsećanja ili nešto slično. Gradnja nove crkve, u lokalnom okruženju, posmatrana je kao ispunjavanje svog zaveta koje se, skoro obavezno, mora oslanjati na neko od rešenja iz bogate istorije sakralnog graditeljstva.

U Vojvodini, autentične vojvodanske političke partije takođe oštro kritikuju nove izgradnje hramova u gradovima i naseljima Vojvodine po principima srpsko-vizantijskog stila zahtevajući „povratak“ autentičnog baroknog koncepta crkve. Ovaj, ipak politički (ili politikanski) stav, zahteva dodatna objašnjenja. Sakralna arhitektura u Vojvodini nema tako dugu tradiciju kao ona na području Srbije samom prirodom istorijskih procesa na ovim prostorima. Od 18. veka, tačnije njegovih poslednjih decenija, hramovi svih konfesija u Vojvodini građeni su programski, planovi su uvek donošeni i odobravani na najvišem državnom nivou. Njihov jedinstveni manir - jednobrodna građevina orjentisana prema stranama sveta zavisno od konfesije za koju se gradi - bio je potaknut (političkom) željom da se hramovi međusobno ne razlikuju previše da ne bi izazivali proteste na nacionalnom nivou. Pored ove zakonske regulative postoji još nekoliko veoma črstih, praktičnih razloga – jednostavni jednobrodni hram bilo je znatno lakše finansirati i izgraditi, nego crkvu sa kupolom koja se smatra najkopleksnijim delom pravoslavne crkve, sa konstruktivnog i estetskog stanovišta. Veliki

kapacitet koji pruža jednobrodna građevina takođe nije zanemarljiv. U velikim vojvodanskim naseljima bilo je potrebno podići i odgovarajuće hramove koji bi mogli da prime veći broj vernika, što je bilo adekvatno obezbeđeno izborom jednobrodne sheme crkve. Još jedan od razloga je nepostojanje stručnjaka, arhitekata i obučениh stručnih majstora, koji bi bili spremni da odgovarajući projekat prenesu u stvarnost, kada se zna da su većina ondašnjih stručnjaka, arhitekata i inženjera, bila vezana isključivo za vojsku i njene potrebe.

Ovakva graditeljska praksa, koja se može označiti kao „politički korektna“, u Austrougarskoj monarhiji trajala je i tokom prve polovine 19. veka. U vreme od sedme, osme decenije 19. veka uviđaju se velike promene na tom polju. Naime, od tada su rimokatolički hramovi podizani skoro isključivo u neogotskom, sasvim retko neoromanskom, maniru dok se sakralna pravoslavna arhitektura okreće srpsko-vizantijskom nasleđu kao osnovnoj inspiraciji. Zanimljiva je i činjenica da je ovaj novi pristup prema pravoslavnoj sakralnoj arhitekturi u suštini produkt delovanja tzv. Hanzenovih srpskih učenika. Teofil Hanzen (1813-1891) danski arhitekta i dugogodišnji profesor na bečkom Arhitektonskom fakultetu bio je poznati graditelj svoga doba koji je ostavio neizbrisiv trag na arhitekturu Beča ali i Atine, gde je jedno vreme bio gostujući arhitekta. Hanzen je naime propagirao mešavinu vizantijskih i evropskih uticaja i smatra se jednim od prvih Evropljana koji je skrenu pažnju na arhitekturu Vizantije i njene uticaje uključio u neka od svojih dela. Srpski, Hanzenovi učenici, poreklom Vojvodani, prvenstveno Svetozar Ivačković (1844-1924), Vladimir Nikolić (1857-1922) i Jovan Ilkić (1857-1917), projektovali su veći broj pravoslavnih hramova krajem 19. i početkom 20. veka na teritoriji Srbije i Vojvodine - Paraćin, Trstenik, Jagodina, Pančevu, kapele u Sremskim Karlovcima, Melencima itd - u maniru povratka na stare srpsko-vizantijske uzore. To su građevine krstoobraznog tipa u neovizantijskom modelu sa monumentalnom kupolom i (fizički) odvojenom kulom-zvonarom umesto dotadanjeg zvonika. Ovi arhitekti se, ujedno, mogu označiti i kao nosioci ideje obnove nacionalnog stila u srpskom sakralnom graditeljstvu o čemu postoje obimne studije istoričara umetnosti dr Miodraga Jovanovića i dr Aleksandra Kadijevića (1). Nažalost, tematika savremene sakralne arhitekture nastale tokom poslednje dve decenije u Srbiji, praktično, još nije ni načeta, sa teoretskog niti istorijsko-umetničkog aspekta (2).

Uloga arhitekata i urbanista

Mada crkva nerado govori o autorstvu u sakralnoj arhitekturi, smatrajući da hram predstavlja sve drugo a ne lični graditeljski pečat ili doprinos, istorija umetnosti i arhitekture uspejala je da zabeleži (i prouči) veliki broj autora kao i njihov stvaralački doprinos na polju sakralnog graditeljstva. Skoro da nema srpskog arhitekta novijeg doba koji se nije okušao u izgradnji sakralnih objekata. Čak i naglašeno modernistički arhitekti bliže prošlosti u svojim opusima su imali po neki projekat za pravoslavni hram. U poslednje vreme tom oblasti arhitekture bave se i naglašeno savremeno nastrojani autori. Jedan od glavnih crkvenih stavova u vezi sa ovim pitanjem zastupa tezu da se građenje hramova vrši na način koji ničim ne ističe pojedinca, graditelja, ali se, navodno, ističe materijal kojim se taj prostor (za „bogočoveka“) gradi. Dakle, iz ovog stava jasno proizilazi uloga koju crkva daje arhitektima. Bezličnost kao moto izgradnje novih objekata podseća na zadatke koji su pred arhitekate postavljali totalitarni režimi.

Način kako dolazi do izgradnje većine hramova, izuzimajući svetle ali retke primere konkursnih utakmica, svakako uključuje arhitekta ali i urbaniste. Postoji izreka: ako je slikar svinja, arhitekta (i urbanista) je pile. Od zaplašenog pileta, ovoga puta slobodno je tržište načinilo podanika i udvoricu spremnog na sve kompromise i izlazak u susret svim, nekada sasvim banalnim željama investitora. Nosioci vlasti u Srbiji, u vreme Miloševićevog režima devedesetih godina kao i novih, post oktobarskih, shvatili su da sa crkvom treba što tešnje saradivati kao nacionalnom institucijom od najvišeg značaja. Posle retrogradnog uvođenja religije u državni školski sistem, crkva u narednom periodu očekuje masovni povratak imovine – stanova, građevinskog i poljoprivrednog zemljišta, šuma, itd. Šta očekivati posle ovakvih odluka, do naglog bogaćenja već bogate crkve, a potom i navala na izgradnju novih objekata. Vlasti su crkvi vratili društveni ugled, između ostalog i dozvoljavajući izgradnju stotine verskih objekata, što je bilo uzrokovano prvenstveno političkim a ne verskim razlozima. Tako je „država u državi“ dobila ogroman broj nekada najatraktivnijih i najznačajnijih lokacija u srpskim i vojvođanskim gradovima i varošima. Naravno besplatno. Efekat ovog religioznog urbanizma - ako je za utehu u susednoj Hrvatskoj je takođe katastrofalna situacija na ovom polju, najbolji primer za to je tzv. „Duhovni prsten“ grada Splita gde se očekuje gradnja na desetine novih crkvenih objekata - do danas nije izazvao baš nikakve reakcije samih urbanista ili urbanističkih službi, od kojih se to, istina, nije ni moglo očekivati. Od socijalističke udvoričke prakse, naš se urbanizam veoma brzo bacio u čeljusti novih investitora, bogataša, prelazeći u svoju tzv. tranzicionu fazu, dok se paralelno s tim procesima koji razjedaju urbanu strukturu naših gradova i naselja, o ovakvim pojavama „države u državi“ skoro da ne postoji ni jedna napisana ili izgovorena rečenica.

Praktika i pragmatika

U provinciji sve stvari i pojave se lagano radikalizuju, često do banalnosti. Iz više razloga, od neobrazovanosti aktera do njihovog udvorišta prema centrali. Primer novopodignutih sakralnih objekata u Novom Sadu i okolinom području nastalih u poslednjem periodu naglašeno je provincijalizovano, i iz centra i samog grada, što rečito govori o stepenu graditeljske prakse kada su u pitanju novi sakralni objekti.

Od trinaest pravoslavnih hramova, već podignutih, onih u fazi izgradnje ili samo u najavi, u Novom Sadu i okruženju, ogromna većina (tačnije: svi) skoro da ne zaslužuju bilo kakvu ozbiljniju arhitektonsku ili umetničku analizu (3). Jedino što se može reći to je činjenica koji su tzv. istorijski hram arhitekti iskopirali ili odakle potiču često nemušte kompilacije elemenata u nekoj od eklektičkih kombinacija svega i svačega, od osnovne prostorne sheme, do preuzetih detalja ukrasnog repertoara. Ovi hramovi će ostati samo nemi, neoriginalni i na brzinu podignuti spomenici jednog konzervativnog i nekritičkog duha nesposobnog da se, uostalom kao i SPC, suoči sa realnom stvarnošću, i dalje, sa očiglednom predpredstavom nekritički tretirajući tradicionalizam u arhitekturi, često okončan karikaturnim oblicima i formama.

Sistem izgradnje pravoslavnih bogomolja vezan je za uske teritorije – parohije, koje uglavnom nemaju molitvene hramove. Naravno da ova činjenica postoji kao samostalna i tačna i,

kada određena parohija nema molitveni hram, u poslednjih desetak godina sasvim lako od nadležnih gradskih urbanističkih institucija dobija najatraktivnije građevinske lokacije. Ako SPC na lokalitetu, recimo Telepa u Novom Sadu, dobije pravo i gradi hram, ona ga izgrađuje po sistemu „prst u oko“ najvećoj lokalnoj zajednici, u ovom slučaju mađarskoj, što je već pitanje morala i to ne samo religioznog već, uobičajenog, ljudskog. Ako je taj hram projektovan nakaradno, bez određene ideje, sklada i proporcija, hipertofiranih oblika, onda je to dodatni problem. Ako ga neko uopšte smatra problemom. Po ličnom mišljenju, svakako da nije ključni problem (mada donekle i jeste) broj novih pravoslavnih hramova, dakle kvantitet za koga crkva kao nadležna institucija kaže da je još uvek mali, već je problem sama arhitektura a potom i umetnička vrednost novih objekata koji niču neverovatnom brzinom i na koje se troše ogromna novčana sredstva u jednom društvu koje se, s pravom, može još uvek smatrati siromašnim. Na pitanje zašto SPC ne gradi bolnice, stacionare, sanatorijume, staračke domove, sirotišta i slične objekte koje je nekada gradila, zvaničan odgovor je da se crkva brine za duhovno zdravlje a ne fizičko. To je, po sudu crkve, zadatak države. Klasično religiozno-licemerno stanovište.

Ambiciozno i uz ogromnu pomoć države SPC gradi ogroman broj svojih hramova, a sa druge strane ne čini dovoljno na zadovoljavanju ovozemaljskih potreba svojih vernika, što je u stvari već dugi niz godina glavna odlika kompletnog crkvenog delovanja kod Srba. U prevelikoj brizi o nebeskom nema se vremena za ovozemaljsko. Ili je to još jedna od brojnih nerešenih odnosa (manipulacija) koje Srpska pravoslavna crkva projektuje prema svojim vernicima.

O propratnim efektima izgradnje hramova „na lokalnu“, oličenoj u rasprostranjenoj korupciji unutar tzv. nižeg klera – dakle, ne onog koji potiče iz manastira i koji jedini ima pravo odlučivanja unutar crkvenih krugova – degutantno je iznositi brojne primere i svoje mišljenje o tome. Podvojenost sveštenstva, u kome se oni sa stvarno teškim manastirskim iskustvom, jedino mogu smatrati višim i zvaničnim, nasuprot običnih, parohijskih sveštenika koji uglavnom brinu svoje ovozemaljske brige (kuća, kola, lagodan život i odgovarajući posao za popadiju), naravno nikada nije priznato u crkvi, mada o tome svi sve znaju. I sveštenstvo i zainteresovani vernici. Uostalom, u vrh crkve, kao zvanični zastupnici njihovih stavova, priznaju se samo oni sa manastirskim bekgraundom, nekada višedecenijskim. U crkvenim krugovima dugo je već poznat stav o odnosu ovih „klerova“.

Odlučivanje o izgledu nekog novog pravoslavnog hrama dato je uglavnom, ako to nije neki centar, baš tom nižem sveštenstvu i crkvenim odborima sastavljenim od „prosečnih“ vernika. Kada znamo šta reč „prosečan“ znači u tom domaćem kontekstu, onda je kristalno jasno ko i kako odlučuje o izgledu novih crkvenih objekata. O stepenu umetničkih vrednosti, ništa manje značajnih delova-radova u novim crkvama – živopis, ikonostas, drvorezbarski radovi, znači čitav korpus dela iz široke oblasti primenjene umetnosti - takođe, u krajnjoj liniji, glavne odluke se donose „na lokalnu“. Činjenica je da takvi poručioци ne mogu biti na visini plemenitog zadatka odabira pravih vrednosti za opremanje jednog molitvenog hrama. Naravno, bilo bi nepravedno ne pomenuti napore određenog dela sveštenstva da se čitava

priča oko projektovanja i ukrašavanja crkava podigne na jedan viši nivo. To je svakako bio i jedan od razloga osnivanja visokih školskih ustanova za ovu oblast koje se, verujemo, ipak ne bi trebalo tretirati kao redovno školovanje koje finansira država. Iz samo jednog od brojnih razloga – na takve škole mogu ići samo vernici, uz blagoslov same crkve, što građani nisu dužni niti obavezni da finansiraju iz budžeta.

Još jedno od realnih pitanja: da li je SPC-u uopšte potrebno toliko novih hramova, bar u gradskim sredinama koje ih uglavnom već imaju? Poznato je da vernici obavljaju svoje verske obrede-obaveze, ne samo na osnovu trenutnog prebivališta, nego na osnovu svojih predaka. Dakle, krštenja, venčanja i ostalo vernici bi trebalo da upražnjavaju u hramovima u kojima su to činili njihovi preci, tako da se s namerom vrši nova tradicionalizacija novih vernika, što je jedan, u krajnjoj liniji, izrazito antitradicionalni pristup. To nepoštovanje porodičnih normi između ostalog dovodi do raspada porodičnih vrednosti i tradicije u kojima je svako imao svoj „bazni“, porodični hram, posebno jer su to jedinstveni obredi u životu jednog revnosnog vernika koje bi on trebalo da poštuje. Dosadašnja praksa je pokazala da novi hramovi postaju protočna mesta svračenja novih vernika a nikako neko stablo porodičnih okupljanja, kako to crkva želi da prikaže. Verovatno će se ispostaviti, kako i mnogo puta u savremenoj, novovekovnoj istoriji, da će ova pojava veoma brzo, sa istorijskog stanovišta, doživeti bumerang-efekat, tačnije da će nove crkve, kako to i dolikuje stepenu civilizacije, ostati prazne, pretvarajući se tako u jedan simbol zastarelog, retrogradnog stava prema građanima kao osnovnim elementima svakog demokratskog društva. (...)

1. M. Jovanović, Srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo i slikarstvo novijeg doba, Beograd - Kragujevac, 1987. (1-255); A. Kadijević, Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi, sredina XIX – sredina XX veka, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, 1997. (1-344).

2. Osim jednog zbornika radova - Tradicija i savremeno srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo, ur. Z. Manević, B. Stojkov, Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam, Beograd, 1994. - i par nepotpunih pokušaja. Ne samo da ne postoje pregledi ili umetničko-arhitektonska tumačenja savremene prakse u sakralnoj arhitekturi nego ni uređeni i publikovani podaci o autorstvu pravoslavnih hramova nastalih poslednjih decenija. Sasvim je redak slučaj da se neka od crkvenih građevina predstavi i u tekućoj arhitektonskoj publicistici. Jedan od retkih tekstova koji se bavi ovom problematikom: V. Mitrović, Svetionik vere na Dunavu – Neimarski duh Predraga Ristića, DaNS br. 47, septembar 2004. (www.dans.org.yu)

3. Nove SPC crkve u Novom Sadu i okolini:

Crkva Vaznesenja Hristovog, Klisa - Novi Sad, 1994- Projektant: arh. Miloško Korać

Crkva Vozdviženja Časnog krsta, Klisa-zatvor-Novog Sada, 2002-2003. Projektant: arh. Živan Jelić

Crkva Svetog Ćirila i Metodija, Telep-Novog Sada, 2003. Projektant: arh. Baća Božić i Miloje Maraš

Crkva Rođenja Bogorodice, Šangaj-Novog Sada, 1998-2004. (po ugledu na manastir Petkovicu), Projektant: arh. Milorad Milidragović (1938 -1999)

Crkva Prenosa moštiju svetog Save, Novo Naselje-Novog Sada, Projektant: arh. Vlasta Matić

Crkva Rođenja svetog Jovana, Detelinara-Novog Sada, Projektant: arh. Sava Ristić

Crkva Svetog Simeona mirotočivog, Veternik, 1994. Projektant: arh. Miloško Korać

Crkva Svetog Đorđa, Temerin, 1994. Projektant: Mile Zec

Crkva Svetog kneza Lazara, Stepanovićevo, 1990. (prva u Vojvodini posle rata), Projektant: arh. Branko Pešić (1921-2006)

Crkva Svete Petke, Petrovaradin, Projektant: arh. Ljubica Bošnjak

Crkva Svetog Vasilija Ostroškog, Sirig (po ugledu na manastir Krušedol), Projektant: arh. Branko Kosović

Crkva Uspenja Bogorodice, Bački Jarak, 2003. Projektant: arh. Dušan Arbanjter

Crkva Sabora srpskih svetitelja, Budisava, Projektant: arh. Radoslav Prokić

Planira se podizanje SPC hramova (dodeljene parcele) na Adicama, Limanu i Grbavici.



Od psihopatologije do političkog programa: crkvena ofanziva na pragu 21. veka

Petar Atanacković

Neodvojivi deo svakog religijskog sistema, i ujedno jedan od njegovih najznačajnijih elemenata, predstavlja religijska forma oličena u ritualu, kao precizno određenom nizu verskih radnji koje se izvode na tačno određeni način. Dakle, verski ritual stoga predstavlja jednako značajan momenat i u hrišćanskoj religiji, iako se može primetiti postojanje izvesnih razlika u pogledu njegovog vrednovanja među različitim pravcima hrišćanstva. Tako je u protestantizmu religijska forma (barem nominalno) prilično zanemarena, svedena na minimum, budući da je akcent stavljen na sadržinu. Uostalom, protestantizam je i nastao kao reakcija na (između ostalog) pretvaranje religijske forme u samu suštinu religije. Ali zato, sa druge strane, kod katolicizma postoji znatno naglašavanje te formalne strane religije. Međutim, čini se da ono ni izbliza nije toliko izraženo kao u pravoslavnoj Crkvi, kod koje su verski rituali potpuno potisnuli sve ostale delove religije i postali njen osnov i suština. Na taj način jasno se potvrđuje stara poznata teza da u oblasti religije postoji sklonost ka pomeranju psihičke vrednosti, tako da beznačajni rituali postepeno postaju suština religijskih obreda i zamenjuju njihov idejni sadržaj (1).

Velika, praktično presudna vrednost religijske forme za pravoslavlje zato je primetna u svakom javnom činu pravoslavne Crkve. Primera radi treba navesti ogromnu važnost onoga što bi se moglo definisati kao „mistična atmosfera“ za pravoslavlje, zbog čega stalna reprodukcija mistike predstavlja jedan od temelja praktičnog funkcionisanja pravoslavne Crkve. A ukoliko bi se njoj oduzela ta mistika, ukoliko bi se izvršila demistifikacija njenog misticizma, i moć i uticaj crkvenih krugova (a sa time i religije u celosti) bili bi drastično umanjeni; to je uostalom razlog zbog kojeg se crkvene strukture tvrdoglavo ne odriču tog lažnog misticizma. Iz navedenog se takođe može izvesti zaključak o suštinskoj neutemeljenosti religioznih osećanja među pravoslavnim vernicima, koji su u ogromnoj većini religiozni samo formalno – upražnjavaju određene verske rituale, dok ih dalja verska (ideološka) nadgradnja ne zanima. Na taj način se opaža jasan međusobni uticaj religije (posredovan crkvenom organizacijom) i njenih sledbenika, jer u meri u kojoj vernici oblikuju svoju religiju, u istoj ili većoj meri određeni religijski sistem sa svojim specifičnostima stvara i neguje poseban tip vernika. Drugim rečima, ovaj nalaz na posredan način potvrđuje tezu po kojoj proizvodnja nipošto ne proizvodi samo predmet za subjekt već i subjekt za predmet (2). Naravno, ukoliko se uopšte prihvati pretpostavka postojanja nekakve proizvodnje u Crkvi – ali „prodaja magle“ koju vrši Crkva i nije ništa drugo nego proizvodnja, i to proizvodnja ideologije.

O praksi pravoslavne Crkve i odlučujućem mestu koje forma zauzima u njoj na najbolji način govori jezik kojim se služi kler i koji predstavlja onaj prvi i najupadljiviji momenat u javnom nastupu. Kod zvaničnika Srpske pravoslavne crkve danas je i dalje u upotrebi jedan arhaični, gotovo epski govor, koji više pristaje nekim starim vremenima, 17. ili 18. veku, nego današnjem istorijskom trenutku. Održavanje takve jezičke prakse, uporno odbijanje da se u

potpunosti prihvati vukovski govor i modernizovani srpski jezik jeste rezultat niza faktora, ali među svima treba prvo spomenuti uverenje da će modernizacijom govora crkvene strukture izgubiti nešto od svog identiteta, da će mistična atmosfera koja se sa tolikim naporom održava biti možda okrnjena, te da će na posletku moć i uticaj Crkve, ali i same religije, biti znatno umanjeni. Isti maniri su na istovetan način prisutni i u crkvenom graditeljstvu, pa se tako iz pukog posmatranja verskih objekata Srpske pravoslavne crkve (SPC) mogu izvesti određeni zaključci povezani sa ovom temom. Naime, pravoslavni verski objekti su po pravilu ili teskobno skućeni ili grandiozno veliki, ali praktično u svim slučajevima kod vernika proizvode isti osećaj sićušnosti i teskobe. Izazivanju takvih osećanja doprinosi i karakterističan mračni enterijer, a da bi prizor bio kompletan treba mu pridodati i izraženi miris tamjana, pesmu crkvenog hora (koja po pravilu dopire sa visine, što je aluzija na pesmu hora anđela) i niz, vernicima i dobrom delu klera, nerazumljivih verskih rituala (padanja ničice, klanjanja, neprekidnog mahnitog krštenja, simboličnih pokreta, uzvika, molitvi, mantri i sličnih radnji). Kao rezultat kombinovanja svih ovih elemenata nastaje specifična atmosfera koja odiše mistikom i u kojoj svaka verska radnja, ma kako prozaična bila, dobija vrednost koja bi joj u drugim okolnostima potpuno nedostajala. Ne smeju se izostaviti ni više nego specifični likovni prikazi, koji krase unutrašnjost pravoslavni verskih objekata: na njima defiluju potpuno dehumanizovani ljudski likovi, budući da su ljudska lica zamenjena likovima ispošćenih hrišćanskih martira, listom impotentnih neurotičara i frigidnih histeričarki, koji zaista više nemaju nikakve veze sa ljudskim bićima, ali koji uprkos tome predstavljaju uzore u pravoslavlju. Uostalom, to je i logično jer dehumanizacija jeste jedan od najznačajnijih rezultata razornog delovanja crkve na čoveka: propovedajući jedan karakterističan tip kao ideal kojem mora težiti svaki vernik, Crkva vrši svoju ideološku funkciju i tako ispunjava svoju ulogu u klasnom društvu. Naime, propovedajući spomenuti ideal svojim vernicima, crkva praktično usmerava svoje sledbenike u jednom pasivno-homoseksualnom porivnom pravcu, koji odlikuju mazohističko držanje i pasivnost, kao tipovi ponašanja koji sačinjavaju masovno-strukturalnu osnovu ne samo hrišćanstva, već i svake druge patrijarhalne religije. Razvojem ovih osobina kod vernika se istovremeno stvaraju i razvijaju sklonosti za nekritičko sledbeništvo i veru u autoritet (3), a na taj način religija i Crkva direktno doprinose reprodukciji dominantne ideologije vladajućeg sistema i daljem održanju klasnog društva.

Kakav uticaj na učesnika u verskom obredu može imati sve što je u prethodnim redovima pobrojano nije potrebno posebno naglašavati. U takvom okruženju kakvo je prethodno opisano, sa spomenutim uticajima, uverenje vernika da se, na primer, nakon molitve sveštenika vino zaista pretvara u Isusovu krv postaje još snažnije, a njegova ubeđenost u moć rituala (kojim je izvršena ta transformacija) više se ne može poljuljati. Nakon obavljenog crkvenog obreda pravoslavni vernik odlazi potpuno uveren u istinsku moć ritualnih radnji, u zaštitu koje mu one mogu pružiti, te ih stoga primenjuje u svakoj zgodnoj prilici. Na primer, prekrstiti se u svakoj neprijatnoj situaciji jeste jedan od najčešćih načina za upražnjavanje tih rituala.

Prema svemu što je rečeno, opaža se izuzetna sličnost između pravoslavni vernika i njihove prakse, sa jedne strane, i osoba sa dijagnozom opsesivne neuroze, sa druge

strane. Međutim, ova sličnost ne zastaje samo na pravoslavlju, već jednako važi za hrišćanstvo uopšte, ali je jednako primetna i kod svih drugih religija. Ta podudarnost između kompulzivnih radnji (kod opsesivnih/prisilnih neurotičara) i verskih rituala nije površna ili slučajna – naprotiv, ona se ogleda kako u načinu njihovog izvođenja tako i u funkciji koju obavljaju. Naime, opsesivni neurotičar obavlja prinudne radnje iz uverenja da će tako steći zaštitu od zamišljene opasnosti, a religiozna osoba učestvuje u verskom obredu iz uverenja da će se na taj način spasiti od greha i takođe steći zaštitu. Dakle, njihov pravi cilj je potpuno isti, a to je odbrana od nesvesnih iskušenja i sprečavanje kazne koja sledi za potisnute seksualne i agresivne želje (4). Dakle, sličnost između religije i verskih obreda, sa jedne, i prisilne neuroze sa njenim kompulzivnim radnjama, sa druge strane, nije samo formalna, već sadržajna i, dakle, ima suštinski karakter. Na taj način dolazi se do istog onog zaključka koji je izveo Sigmund Frojd, a to je zapažanje da se opsesivna neuroza može označiti kao individualna religioznost, a religija kao univerzalna opsesivna neuroza. Suštinsko podudaranje između njih sastojalo bi se u fundamentalnom odricanju od zadovoljavanja konstitucionalno datih nagona (5).

U uskoj vezi sa takvim karakterom pravoslavlja stoji i svojevrsna građevinska ofanziva Srpske pravoslavne crkve u proteklih dve decenije. Pomahnitala gradnja verskih objekata na gotovo svakoj slobodnoj zemljišnoj parceli zaslužuje da bude predmet posebne studije i zato ćemo ga ovde dotaći samo površno, kroz određene aspekte ove pojave. Treba spomenuti pre svega estetsku stranu ovog fenomena t.j. arhitektonska rešenja novih verskih objekata. Naime, svi pravoslavni verski objekti novijeg datuma gradnje (od 1989/1990. godine) ponavljaju stara, srednjevekovna arhitektonska rešenja, reprodukujući raško-moravski i srpsko-vizantijski stil. Ovakva pojava na samom kraju 20. i početku 21. veka smisljena je koliko i oživljavanje gotičkog stila (u kojem su podizane železničke stanice, objekti pošte itd.) krajem 19. veka u Nemačkoj – bila je to pojava nad kojom su se zgražali svi oni savremenici koji nisu verovali u jednu takvu manifestaciju moći „nemačkog duha”. Današnja prosta reprodukcija stilskih rešenja 13. i 14. veka (koja govori dosta toga o stanju „srpskog duha”) nalazi se u najdirektnijoj vezi sa već spomenutim prisilno-neurotskim karakterom religije (u ovom slučaju pravoslavnog hrišćanstva). Jer kao što svaki opsesivni neurotičar izvodi svoju prinudnu radnju na tačno određeni način, preciznim redosledom u preciznom ritmu – dakle, u jasno definisanim koordinatama – tako se i pravoslavni verski ritual odvija u određeno doba dana, u određenom ritmu i na jednako precizan način. U svemu tome veliku ulogu igra i specifično okruženje njegove izvedbe, što navodi na zaključak o tome da kod klera postoji uverenje da će ritual izgubiti na svojoj moći ukoliko se ne izvodi u objektu koji poseduje tačno definisane karakteristike, a između ostalog i određeno arhitektonsko rešenje. Kako je pravoslavni kler stekao naviku da obrede praktikuje u objektima građenim u nekom od dva srednjevekovna stila, koji se u suštini mogu svesti na jedno idejno rešenje, za Srpsku pravoslavnu crkvu postaje praktično nemoguće prihvatanje crkvene gradnje u, na primer, stilu baroka ili klasicizma (koji se pretežno sreće u Vojvodini). Zato novi trend crkvene gradnje, sa kopiranjem starih arhitektonskih rešenja, na području Vojvodine nedvosmisleno odaje želju za potiskivanjem vođovdanskih specifičnosti i za svojevrsnom crkvenom unifikacijom Srbije (na jedan poseban način). U tome svakako treba tražiti i određeni politički momenat.

Gradnja sakralnih objekata u stilu koji je dominirao tokom srednjeg veka nema veze isključivo sa opsesivno-neurotskim karakterom pravoslavlja, već sadrži i skrivenu, a opet lako prepoznatljivu ideološku komponentu. Naime, reč je tome da se u spomenutoj arhitektonskoj politici otkriva namera za podsećanjem javnosti na uticaj koji je Srpska pravoslavna crkva (a posredno i pravoslavna religija) imala u vreme nastanka tog stila, što u sebi sadrži jedva prikrivenu želju (koja je svejedno lako uočljiva) da se *urbi et orbi* izrekne zahtev za povratkom takvog stanja. Građevinska ofanziva Srpske pravoslavne crkve, koja zaista poprma obeležja urbicida, uživa i otvorenu moralnu i materijalnu podršku državnih krugova, u čemu se zapravo i ogleda postojanje jasne sprege između države i crkve. Reprodukcija srednjevekovne arhitekture na novoizgrađenim verskim objektima u tome igra značajnu ulogu, jer se kroz takve, državno-sponzorisanе objekte, koji simbolizuju bliskost države i crkve, zaokružuje i javno obznanjuje spomenuti ideološki program Crkve.

Suština političkog-ideološkog programa SPC sadržana je u tezi po kojoj snažna država u simbiozi sa snažnom pravoslavnom crkvenom organizacijom treba zajednički da predvode jedno, u svakom pogledu kompaktno – pre svega etnički, verski i politički homogeno – srpsko društvo. Dakle, reč je o društvu (ili pre zajednici) koje bi trebalo da bude određeno starim reakcionarnim načelom „pravoslavlje-samodržavlje-sabornost” i vertikalom „bog na nebu-kralj na zemlji-domaćin u kući”. Srpska pravoslavna crkva očito teži postizanju jednog staleškog poretka nadređenosti, podređenosti i apsolutne poslušnosti, u kojem bi se u potpunosti izjednačili država, crkva, društvo i (onaj već apstraktni) narod (6), poretka koji je jednom (u srednjem veku) postojao, ali koji je izgubljen i koji stoga treba oživeti. Međutim, reč je o programu koji je zasnovan na jednoj nepostojećoj, izmaštanoj tradiciji, budući da spomenuta državno-crkvena simbioza (tzv. harmonija) nikada nije egzistirala u srpskoj istoriji.

Takođe treba spomenuti i činjenicu da je u ovom programu došlo do spajanja nekih potpuno nespojivih elemenata u jednu celinu, do spajanja krajnje predmodernih, feudalnih koncepcija sa modernim (u smislu vremena nastanka) konceptima nacionalizma-šovinizma i korporativne države fašističkog tipa (u Srbiji najpoznatije kroz ljotičevski koncept staleške monarhije). Ali, bez obzira na ove i sve druge nelogičnosti – moglo bi se reći očekivane, logične nelogičnosti – svakako je reč o jednom *par excellence* antimodernom i krajnje preteče-izazivačkom političkom programu.

U tom ključu treba tumačiti i građevinsku kampanju SPC i njena karakteristična arhitektonska rešenja. Ona sa jedne strane predstavljaju manifestaciju sunovrata estetike, srozavanja i raspadanja sistema vrednosti u društvu i opšteg civilizacijskog pada – drugim rečima, manifestaciju društvene krize identiteta, trijumfa primitivizma i opšte regresije. Sa druge strane, crkvenom novogradnjom se društvu na slikovit način najavljuje mogući pravac njegovog budućeg razvitka i simbolično predstavlja jedan krajnje reakcionarni politički program, kroz čiju implementaciju treba da se ozbilji ta moguća budućnost. U suštini, reč je o programu koji ozbiljno ugrožava dalje funkcionisanje i buduću egzistenciju modernog srpskog društva. Zato se na posletku postavlja pitanje načina na koji bi se otklonila jedna pretnja

ovakvih razmera. Rešenje problema moguće je samo razrešavanjem suprotnosti koja postoji u njegovoj osnovi; kako se suprotnost razrešava tako što se onemogućava t.j. ukida, proizilazi da se razrešenje suprotnosti usko vezanih uz religiju, religijskih suprotnosti, postiže isključivo onemogućavanjem, ukidanjem religije (7). Dakle, prevazilaženje religije kroz prevazilaženje potrebe za njom predstavljalo bi ispravno rešenje za problem društvene opasnosti oličene u Srpskoj pravoslavnoj crkvi i njenim političkim planovima i aspiracijama.

Nema sumnje da će sa protekom vremena uticaj crkve na društvo slabiti i da će materijalni napredak doprineti jenjavanju religioznosti i naročito slabljenju želje za njenom javnom demonstracijom. Takav razvitak odnosa društva i religije jeste neumitan, jer ukoliko se religija definiše kao opšteljudska opsesivna neuroza koja je, poput dečije prisilne neuroze, proistekla iz Edipovog kompleksa, proizilazi da se odvajanje od religije odvija sa kobnom neumitnošću odrastanja. Ono što je društvu potrebno u takvim okolnostima jeste obustavljanje svake vrste otpora tom novom razvitku i zauzimanje pozicije u kojoj, poput dobrog vaspitača, društvo nastoji da podrži ovaj proces i ublaži nasilnost njegovog neumitnog nadiranja (8).

Međutim, na ovaj način problem se još uvek ne bi približio svom rešenju. Naime, mnogobrojni nedostaci srpskog društva – koje SPC u saradnji sa srpskom državom ne želi da prevaziđe već upravo zacementira – među kojima je i religiozna ograničenost, ne mogu se kritički analizirati, a potom i otklanjati, sa stanovišta koje bi religiju, ili bilo koji njen segment, smatralo za bazu jedne znatno šire, svetovne ograničenosti. Baš suprotno, religiozna ograničenost može se objasniti samo kroz analizu svetovne ograničenosti građana. Upravo zato se na ovom mestu i ne tvrdi da bi građani trebalo da prevaziđu religiozna ograničenja ne bi li prevazišli ona svetovna, već obrnuto, da će religiozna ograničenja biti u potpunosti prevaziđena kada budu prevaziđena ograničenja svetovnog karaktera (9). Utoliko pitanja građevinske ekspanzije SPC, arhitektonskih rešenja novih verskih objekata, načina javnog delovanja crkvenih struktura, karaktera pravoslavne religije ili specifičnog i dominantnog oblika religioznosti u društvu, prestaju da budu samo pitanja estetike, urbanističke politike, psihologije ili statistike, već postaju politička pitanja i utoliko adresa na koju se upućuju nije više SPC već srpska država. Jer, kritikujući religijsku slabost političke države, zapravo treba kritikovati političku državu uopšte, bez obzira na njene konkretne religijske slabosti (10).

1. Sigmund Frojd, „Prisilne radnje i religijski obredi“, u: S. Frojd, *Budućnost jedne iluzije i drugi eseji o religiji*, Beograd, 2002, strana 81.

2. Karl Marx, *Temelji slobode. Osnovi kritike političke ekonomije*, Zagreb, 1977, strana 17.

3. Wilhelm Reich, *Masovna psihologija fašizma*, Zagreb, 1999, strana 138.

4. Žarko Trebješanin, „Frojdova analiza religije“ u: S. Frojd, *Nav. delo*, strana 8.

5. Sigmund Frojd, „Prisilne radnje i religijski obredi“ u: S. Frojd, *Nav. delo*, strana 81-82.

6. Zašto se u crkvi šapuće, Pešćanik FM, ured. Svetlana Lukić i Svetlana Luković, Beograd, 2005, strana 49.

7. Karl Marx, *Fridrih Engels, Rani radovi*, Zagreb, 1985, strana 56.

8. Sigmund Frojd, *Budućnost jedne iluzije i drugi eseji o religiji*, strana 59.

9. Karl Marx, *Fridrih Engels, Rani radovi*, Zagreb, 1985, strana 60-61.

10. Isto, strana 61.



Kritika klerikalizacije Srbije: analiza odnosa crkve i moderne države

Miloš Perović

U novovekovnoj istoriji čovečanstva napisano je mnoštvo literature koja se bavi odnosom crkve i (moderne) države, odnosno fenomenom odvajanja crkve od države i emancipacijom čoveka – građanina od autoriteta državne religije i „zvanične” crkve. Zato se odmah nameće pitanje potrebe pisanja na ovu temu u vremenu u kojem živimo. Takvo pitanje bi bilo opravdano postaviti da se nalazimo u nekoj od zemalja tzv. zapadnog kulturno – civilizacijskog svetonazora. No, pošto naša zemlja samo delimično (pretežno geografski) pripada istom tom svetonazoru i zato što se u tom kulturno – civilizacijskom krugu ističe prevashodno svojom ekonomskom i duhovnom zaostalošću i zapuštenošću, analiza ovakve teme nameće se kao potreba. Danas smo svedoci sve agresivnijeg upliva dominantne verske zajednice (Srpske pravoslavne crkve) u sve segmente društvenoga, kao i u one probleme i ona pitanja koja se tiču samo države i njezinih mehanizama vlasti. Takođe, javnosti se nameće kao samorazumljiv stav o (Srpskoj pravoslavnoj) crkvi kao „moralnom i duhovnom obnovitelju društva”, iza čega se manje ili više skriveno pokušava isforsirati idealizovana i mitologizovana slika srednjevekovne Srbije kao nekakve države blagostanja (u kojoj je Srbija istorijski bila teritorijalno najveća, sa najvećim „međunarodnim” uticajem u svojoj istoriji, itd.) sa harmonijskim odnosom crkve i države (što predstavlja drzak istorijski falsifikat!) čemu treba danas težiti. Naravno, takvo ponašanje dominantne crkve ne predstavlja samo po sebi problem, već je temelj problema u ponašanju države prema takvim crkvenim stavovima koje ona (država) u velikoj većini slučajeva usvaja kao zvanične državne stavove i, štaviše, u svakoj od važnih situacija za sudbinu države Srbije ide se po mišljenje do vrha organizacije pravoslavne crkve. Pri tom se, bar deklarativno, zvanične vlasti države Srbije izjašnjavaju kako je osnovna težnja društva koje vode da postane demokratsko i da se u potpunosti priključi onom zapadnom kulturno – civilizacijskom krugu zemalja. Ovim tekstom ćemo pokušati pokazati da je nemoguća egzistencija demokratskog, građanskog društva ako ono nije, između ostalog, sekularizovano, tj. ako u njemu nije do kraja sprovedeno odvajanje sfere privatnog, tj. u ovom slučaju religioznosti pojedinca (građanina), od sfere opšteg, tj. države. Dakle, ovaj tekst se treba shvatiti kao kritika pre svega države Srbije, a ne kao kritika Srpske pravoslavne crkve i njenih antimodernih dogmi.

Treba naglasiti da ćemo se ovde prevashodno oslanjati na za ovu temu vazda inspirativan spis Karla Marksa „Prilog kritici jevrejskog pitanja”, pošto smatramo da je u ovom delu najkonsekventnije sprovedena analiza odnosa religije (crkve) i religioznosti građanina uopšte sa državom kroz prizmu odnosa građanskog društva i političke države.

Nameće se ovde potreba da najpre analiziramo pojam građanskog društva i pojam političke države, jer bez jasnog definisanja ovih pojmova nećemo imati osnovnu pretpostavku za analizu (u našem slučaju i kritiku) odnosa crkve i države. Začeci građanskog društva se istorijski javljaju u drugoj polovini 18. veka nakon tzv. Buržoasko revolucije u Francuskoj

(1789.), kojom je po prvi put u istoriji čovečanstva u prvi plan istaknuta subjektivnost čoveka – pojedinca na osnovu koje se on izdvaja iz unapred datog kolektiviteta (samonikle zajednice). Time pojedinac preuzima punu odgovornost za svoj život otrgnuvši se od autoriteta zajednice oličenog u Caru, kralju ili feudalcu kao nositeljima narodnog suvereniteta. Tako sada pojedinac biva sam nositeljem toga suvereniteta koji mu daje mogućnost da bira svoje predstavnike u vlasti i da i sam bude biran. U takvoj situaciji individua nužno biva udvojena na dve različite sfere koje u njoj egzistiraju – na privatnu i javnu sferu čovekove ličnosti. Da do kraja budemo jasni: s jedne strane, čovek egzistira kao član građanskog društva sa svim svojim posebnim, tj. *privatnim* interesima, dakle kao *bourgeois*, a s druge strane on se javlja i kao član političke države, političko biće, tj. javna osoba ili *citoyen*. Dakle, osnovna „ideja” političke države je da razlike koje su neminovne, nužne i prirodne među članovima građanskog društva, razlike u polu, starosti, nacionalnoj i religijskoj pripadnosti, materijalnom položaju, itd., pomiri time što upravo *apstrahujući* te razlike pruža podjednako političko pravo bez izuzetka svim članovima građanskog društva. Ovdje ćemo ostaviti po strani Marksovu kritiku Hegelove filozofije prava gde se ukazuje na suštinsku nemogućnost države da pomiri materijalne razlike među članovima društva zbog čega, po Marksu, Hegelova „ideja države” i ostaje samo na nivou ideje zato što se ne može u potpunosti ostvariti u realitetu.

No, da se mi vratimo na predmet našeg interesovanja: pretpostavka funkcionisanja građanskog društva jeste politička država koja kao neka vrsta arbitra miri različitosti koje vladaju među članovima toga društva. Da bismo pojasnili, valja navesti jedan Marksov deo: „Dovršena politička država po svojoj je suštini *rodni* život čovjeka u *suprotnosti* prema njegovu materijalnu životu. Sve pretpostavke ovog egoističnog života ostaju *izvan* državne sfere u *građanskom društvu*, ali kao svojstva građanskog društva. Gdje je politička država dostigla svoju pravu izgrađenost, tamo čovjek vodi dvostruki život – nebeski i zemaljski, ali ne samo u mislima, u svijesti, nego i u *zbiljnosti*, u životu – život u *političkoj zajednici*, u kojoj se on javlja kao *društveno biće*, i život u *građanskom društvu* u kojemu djeluje kao *privatan čovjek*, u kojemu druge ljude smatra sredstvom, samoga sebe ponižava do sredstva i postaje igračka tuđih sila. Politička država odnosi se prema građanskom društvu upravo tako spiritualistički kao nebo prema zemlji.” (1) Ovim postaje jasno da sva naša lična određenja, svi naši privatni identiteti bivaju izbrisani pred licem moderne političke države, i to upravo zato što samo tako možemo kao članovi građanskog društva živeti sa ostalim članovima tog društva upravo zadržavajući te naše posebnosti, ali tako da one ostaju u sferi naše privatnosti. Samo takvo tretiranje našeg subjektiviteta pred licem države omogućava nam da baštinimo našu subjektivnost, jer tim principom država čuva društvo od nametanja nečije pojedinačnosti za opšti princip društva. Drugim rečima: religioznost čoveka, kao jedno od njegovih posebnih određenja, postaje privatna stvar pojedinca ili određene društvene grupe i kao takvo ga politička država tretira. O tome Marks dalje kaže: „Konflikt u kojemu se čovjek nalazi, kao sljedbenik posebne religije, nalazi sa sobom kao građaninom države i s drugim ljudima kao članovima zajednice, svodi se na *svjetovni* rascjep između *političke* države i *građanskog* društva. Za čovjeka kao *bourgeois* život u državi samo je privid ili momentalni izuzetak nasuprot suštini i pravilu. Svakako *bourgeois*

kao i Jevrej samo sofistički ostaje u državnom životu, kao što *citoyen* samo sofistički ostaje Jevrej ili *bourgeois*, ali ova sofistika nije lična. Ona je sofistika same političke države... Protivrječnost u kojoj se nalazi religiozan čovjek s političkim čovjekom ista je protivrječnost u kojoj se nalazi *bourgeois sa citoyenom*, u kojoj se nalazi član građanskog društva sa svojom *političkom lavljom kožom*." (2)

Odnos u kojem se nalaze religija i politička država identičan je odnosu između građanskog društva i političke države: to je odnos između privatnog i opšteg interesa. Politička država kao opšti interes svih građana sada apstrahuje njihove privatne interese, ona ih ukida da bi građansko društvo uopšte moglo funkcionisati. „Čovjek se *politički* emancipira od religije na taj način što je iz javnog prava protjeruje u privatno pravo. Ona nije više duh *države*, gdje se čovjek – iako na ograničen način, pod posebnim oblikom i u posebnoj sferi – ponaša kao rodno biće u zajednici s drugim ljudima, ona je postala duh *građanskog društva*, sfere egoizma, *bellum omnium contra omnes*. Ona nije više suština države nego suština razlike... Razdvajanje čovjeka na *javna i privatna čovjeka, premještanje* religije iz države u građansko društvo, to nije stupanj, nego *dovršenje* političke emancipacije, koja zbiljsku religioznost čovjeka isto tako ne ukida, kao što niti teži da je ukine." (3) Dakle, država ne ukida religiju kao takvu, već ukida (svaku posebnu) religiju kao opšti princip države – religioznost može biti samo privatno pravo građana.

Imajući u vidu sve do sada rečeno koje se oslanja na praksu modernih država sveta, prosto se neverovanim čini stepen nerazumevanja moderniteta koji odlikuje vladajuće elite Srbije. Tu je na delu suštinska, epohalna – civilizacijska posvađanost sa svetskom povešću. U korenu tog stanja, koje neminovno zahteva duboku analizu, leži visok stepen civilizacijske zaostalosti političkih i duhovnih elita koje kreiraju društvenu stvarnost ove zemlje. Tako se deklarativno zalažemo za dostizanje onih vrednosti koje odlikuju modernu političku državu i građansko društvo, a u praksi favorizujemo dominantnu versku zajednicu toliko da se nekad čini da Sinod Srpske pravoslavne crkve vodi Vladu Republike Srbije (to smo odabrali među mnoštvom konkretnih primera naše civilizacijske zaostalosti zbog teme kojom se ovde bavimo). U svemu tome, kao krajnji produkt takvog stanja stvari, kreira se specifična uniformna atmosfera u kojoj je apsolutno neprihvatljivo različito mišljenje i delanje od opšteprihvaćenog, od strane države i elita koje je vode nametnutog mišljenja i delanja. Upravo takvo ponašanje države onemogućava bilo kakav zametak građanskog društva. Razlog tome jeste nametanje posebnog, privatnog interesa (u našem slučaju religioznosti članova jedne verske zajednice – Srpske pravoslavne crkve) za opšti interes čitavog društva. U takvoj konstelaciji društvenih odnosa, upravo je nemoguće afirmisati princip subjektiviteta kao verovatno najvredniji princip modernog doba.

Dnevnik crkvenih uvreda 2000 – 2006 Od desekularizacije ka klerikalizaciji

Zoran Petakov

Srpska pravoslavna crkva (SPC) je na javnu scenu u Srbiji vraćena s dolaskom Miloševića na vlast, kako bi pomogla u operacionalizaciji srpskog nacionalnog programa. Crkva je u tome zaista odigrala značajnu ulogu. S jedne strane, dala je snažan doprinos buđenju etnonacionalizma i velikodržavnog raspoloženja najširih slojeva naroda manipulišući religijskim i nacionalnim osećanjima građana u čisto političke svrhe, dok je s druge strane, pružala i neposrednu podršku samom režimu Slobodana Miloševića. Posle famoznih petooktobarskih promena 2000. godine, na trenutak se učinilo da bi ova zemlja mogla iskoračiti izvan začaranog kruga sopstvene autarhije i autoritarnosti. Promenom vlasti nominalno opredeljenje države postaje težnja priključenju Evropskoj Uniji i prihvatanju njenih standarda, ali odlaskom Miloševića i dolaskom nove vlasti, koja svoj legitimitet otvoreno i manifestno temelji u antikomunizmu, nestalo je ideoloških prepreka za legalizaciju već daleko odmaklog procesa povratka Srpske pravoslavne crkve u sferu javnog i otpočeo je ubrzan rad na institucionalnom napuštanju sekularnog principa na svim nivoima života društva i države.

Već prvi potezi „demokratske vlasti“ ukazivali su na ubrzanost retradicionalizacionih procesa kao i na jačanje uticaja najreakcionarnijih institucija u društvu, koje su paradoksalno uživale i najveće poverenje građana. Svi nosioci državne vladi od 5. oktobra 2000. godine do danas, pokazali su kontinuitet u obnašanju vlasti sa prethodnim režimom. Reprodukcijska mehanizama miloševićevog režima posebno se odnosila na sferu ideologije, samo što se etno-nacionalizam pojavljuje u obliku reakcionarnog anti modernizma i klerikalizma, a nova vlast obećavala je takvu državu i političku zajednicu, gde su u okviru laičke države zagarantovana prava svih manjina, a ne samo etničkih. Ovo su ostala samo obećanja, a u stvarnosti postojalo je i još uvek postoji mnoštvo primera shvatanja države kao plena i ignorisanja svega drugog osim klijentelizma i partijskog interesa.

Ideološka oblada pod kojom se vrši ovaj proces je klerikalizam.

Postala je sasvim realna opasnost da jedina socijalna posledica „rađanja slobode“ bude opšta klerikalizacija državnih institucija i organa. Uostalom, najautoritarnija od svih državnih institucija, vojska, je pored Srpske pravoslavne crkve - najglasniji nosilac klerikalizma.

Evidentno je nastojanje svih političkih subjekata i institucija da se u Srbiji pronađe integrativni element za društveni sistem koji se raspao i jak zajednički imenitelj za Srbe koji se nalaze unutar i van granica Srbije, ali se ovo pre svega može prepoznati i nazvati „osvajачkim pohodom SPC“. Odbrana interesa većinske verske zajednice u Srbiji izražena je praktičnim političkim potezima i izjavama političke elite. S obzirom da je SPC etničko-

1. Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, "Rani Radovi", str. 63. – 64., Naprijed, Zagreb, 1973.

2. Ibid., str. 64.

3. Ibid., str. 65 - 66.

nacionalna institucija, povlađivanje isto takvom programu slabi građanski princip u državi, koja prestaje da bude država svih svojih građana i čiji aparat postaje instrument samo jedne verske organizacije.

Proces desekularizacije i klerikalizacije je započeo još krajem osamdesetih i početkom devedesetih godina prošlog veka pod režimom Slobodana Miloševića. Kasne osamdesete i početak devedesetih godina u Srbiji bi se sociološki mogli označiti kao period desekularizacije društva, gde je desekularizacija shvaćena, pre svega, kao **društveni** proces. Taj proces svoju ekspanziju i sveobuhvatnost doživljava najpre za vreme Vlade Zorana Đinđića, a njegovim ubistvom i dolaskom na vlast Vojislava Koštunice dobija odlučujući zamajac i nesmetano se širi na čitavo društvo u Srbiji. Crkva je postala vidljiva u domenu koji se tiče javne politike i državnih poslova. S druge strane, država je mnogo kooperativnija u svom odnosu prema crkvi nego što bi to u jednom sekularnom društvu bilo normalno. U ovom tekstu podsetićemo hronološki na najvažnije aktere ovog procesa i njihovu ulogu od 2000. godine do danas.

Na početku, potrebno je pojmovno definisati proces desekularizacije i klerikalizacije. Desekularizaciju je najlakše objasniti preko pojma sekularizacije. Sekularizacija predstavlja gubitak društvenih funkcija religije i značenje koje je ona imala u prošlosti.

Proces desekularizacije počinje kada crkva, verske zajednice i religija postaju društveno značajne, postaju javne ustanove i dobijaju sve veći uticaj. Pojam klerikalizacija označava proces u kome određeni politički krugovi i određene političke strukture stavljaju crkvu na prvo mesto u političkom i kulturnom životu jedne države, odnosno sa druge strane, kada sveštenici i pretežan deo vernika određenu crkvu stavljaju na prvo mesto, pa se ona pojavljuje kao partner ili pak jača strana u odnosu na društvo. Klerikalizacija, to je vrlo važno podvući, nije samo stvar i inicijativa crkve, nego je prihvaćena šire u političkim krugovima, pa u tom procesu dolazi do sprege između struktura moći i u crkvi i u državi. Istorijski posmatrano i aktuelno postoje četiri modela regulacije odnosa države prema verskim zajednicama, odnosno crkvama. Prvi model je model državne crkve. Drugi model je model priznatih crkava, istorijskih crkava i tradicionalnih crkava. Treći model je model dosledne odvojenosti crkve od države. I četvrti model je model koji se uslovno može nazvati modelom saradničke separacije. Srbija se od modela potpune odvojenosti crkve i države (sekularne države), preko modela saradničke separacije pomerila do modela priznatih crkava istorijskih i tradicionalnih crkava i ubrzano napreduje ka poslednjem modelu državne crkve, odnosno ka klerikalizmu.

2000. godina

Direktan kontakt SPC s državnim institucijama uspostavljen je još u novembru 2000. godine, zahtevom Arhijerejskog sabora da se veronauka uvede kao redovni predmet u državne škole. Uvođenje veronauke, a krajem iste godine i odobravanje prisustva sveštenika u vojnim institucijama, predstavljali su zahteve kroz koje se prelamalo puno drugih, važnijih problema. Štaviše, još novembra 2000. godine, Informativna služba SPC je saopštila

da je „sekularizacija dovela Srbiju i njen narod do prosjačkog štapa.“ Zanimljivo je da su predstavnici Kancelarije za veronauku pri srpskoj patrijaršiji, vrlo brzo nakon oktobarskih promena, saopštili da bi „država morala da zaštiti svoju bit i naciju, i u tom cilju bi morala pravoslavlje da proglasi državnom religijom, odnosno, da naša država treba da se verifikuje kao pravoslavna država“. Bivši dekan Bogoslovskog fakulteta, Radovan Bigović, izjavio je tada da „religija nije privatno emotivno osećanje, kako se to kod nas još tumači“, a u svom zvaničnom obraćanju javnosti, SPC oštro napada stanovište po kome veroispovest treba da predstavlja privatnu stvar pojedinca i pristalice laičke države naziva „sledbenicima Satane“. Redefinisanje odnosa države i crkve vidi se, isto tako, i kroz novi odnos SPC i Vojske SCG. Još krajem decembra 2000. godine, Uprava za moral Generalštaba tadašnje Vojske Jugoslavije (VJ) organizovala je okrugli sto na kome se zalagala za „uvođenje vere u Vojsku“: „U Vojsku Jugoslavije treba uvesti vojne sveštenike pravoslavne veroispovesti“, jer „religije u našem društvu, iako su jednake pred zakonom, nisu jednake pred našom nacionalnom kulturom i istorijom, odnosno nemaju podjednak doprinos nacionalnoj kulturi i očuvanju nacionalne samobitnosti i državne samosvojnosti srpskog naroda“. Koriste se tu termini kao što su „istorijski i kulturni značaj“, „kontinuitet“, ulazi se, dakle, u neke kategorije koje više nisu samo pravne, već i vrednosne.

2001. godina

Godina 2001. počinje markentiškim lamentom tadašnjeg premijera Zorana Đinđića nad zlehudom sudbinom hrama svetog Save, a Đinđić je na sastanku sa crkvenim velikodostojnicima izrazio očekivanje da će hram Svetog Save biti završen u narednih godinu do dve dana, „ma koliko novca to iziskivalo“, dodajući da je „sve to malo naspram nacionalnog dobitka koji ćemo imati kada hram bude završen“. Nažalost, tu se priča ne završava jer vlada Srbije do kraja iste godine „upumpava“ oko 400 miliona dinara iz državnog budžeta u izgradnju hrama, koji do danas nije završen.

Uprkos strahu od zapadnjaštva i zapadnjačke kulture koji se kristališe kao ključni element crkvenih nastojanja na planu oblikovanja novog srpskog identiteta, u okviru SPC aktivirale su se i struje koje su uviđale potrebu poboljšanja imidža crkve, osmišljavanja novih strategija nastupa, prilagođenim onim ciljnim grupama (prvenstveno urbanoj populaciji, mladoj i mladoj srednjoj generaciji) čiji je identitet formiran pod jakim uticajima savremene popularne kulture, koja naravno, dolazi sa zapada. Ogledni primer takvih napora je projekat „Pesme iznad istoka i zapada“, muzički album koji se na kompakt-disku pojavio u aprilu 2001. godine, kao zajedničko izdanje PGP RTS i Radio-Svetigore. Osnovna namena tog projekta bila je popularizacija reči i misli Nikolaja Velimirovića (pogledaj dalje stranu 32). Projekat je okupio veliki broj poznatih pop i rok muzičara koji su komponovali i izvodili Velimirovićeve pesme i imao je značajnu medijsku podršku, i pre objavljivanja CD-a, kroz koju je predstavljan kao „simbioza rokenrola i pravoslavlja“, tzv „pravoslavni rokenrol“.

Konačno 2001. godina mora se posmatrati kao prelomna u procesu klerikalizacije društva, jer je te godine odlukom Zorana Đinđića i uredbom Vlade Republike Srbije veronauka uvedena u državne škole kao izborni predmet. Želja za povratkom veronauke u škole javila se neposredno

posle pada Miloševića, 5. oktobra 2000. godine. Namera je bila da se uvede veronauka u prvi razred osnovnih i srednjih škola početkom školske 2001/2002. godine. Posle sastanka Svetog Sinoda SPC 4. jula 2001. godine, premijer Zoran Đinđić objavio je sledećeg dana odluku da se sa veronaukom krene od 1. septembra. Veronauka je dakle uvedena u škole, na taj način što je na jednom sastanku Zoran Đinđić prosto izašao pred sveštenike i rekao „u redu, dobićete veronauku u školama“. Njegovi saradnici su kasnije to objašnjavali strahom od mešanja crkve i crkvenih velikodostojnika u proces izručenja Slobodana Miloševića Hagu i tumačili taj poguban potez Zorana Đinđića kao vizionarski, a ne makijavelistički što je on u stvari bio. Vlada je pripremila Uredbu koja je stupila na snagu 4. avgusta 2001. godine, a 25. aprila 2002. godine, republička Skupština prihvatila je izmene Zakona o osnovnom i srednjem obrazovanju. Taj predmet je uveden bez ikakve stručne rasprave, bez rasprave o odnosu tog predmeta prema drugim predmetima, bez preraspodele fonda časova i pre svega bez školovanog kadra. Kada se tražilo da se objavi koliko je uopšte učenika izabralo veronauku u odnosu na građansko vaspitanje, dobijen je odgovor iz Ministarstva prosvete da se takvi podaci ne smeju objavljivati bez dozvole Srpske pravoslavne crkve, što je u suštini potpuno besmisleno. Kad ministarstvo pita jednu nevladinu organizaciju, jedno udruženje građana (što SPC u tom trenutku jeste) da li sme da objavi neke podatke o onome šta se radi u državnim školama, taj slučaj više no i jedan drugi ukazuje na političku prevalost crkve u odnosu na državu.

Zato i nije slučajno da se odluka o uvođenju veronauke iz 2001. godine, koja je potvrđena vladinom uredbom, vrlo brzo našla pred Ustavnim sudom Srbije. Drugi problem je odnos prema laičkim državnim institucijama kao što je javna škola. Postavlja se pitanje da li su sa uvođenjem veronauke škole u Srbiji još uvek laičke institucije u tradiciji prosvetocenosti? Da li je javni školski prostor i dalje „nepovrediv“, nekonfesionalan, da li on ima neku vrstu autonomije, tako da verske zajednice ne mogu učestvovati u obrazovnom procesu? Odgovor je negativan, jer je SPC uspela da postane ravnopravan partner s državom u obrazovnom procesu. Da je vladajuća post-miloševićavska politička elita zaista usmerena na stvaranje temeljnih pretpostavki slobodnog i demokratskog poretka, onda bi se razgovor vodio o urgentnoj potrebi duboke strukturne promene naše autoritarne škole, a ne bi se ta i takva škola i obrazovni sistem u celini dodatno opterećivao autoritarnim i retrogradnim balastom veronauke.

Svakako vrlo bitno za nadiruću klerikalizaciju bilo je i formiranje paracrkvenih organizacija kao što su „Otačastveni pokret Obraz“ i udruženje studenata „Sveti Justin filozof“. „Obraz“ kao organizacija nastaje početkom 2001. godine. Formiraju ga ultradesni i ultrapravoslavni intelektualci i studenti uz podršku čitave i tada jedinstvene srpske kulturne desnice. Paralelno sa njima pojavljuje se na Univerzitetu udruženje „Sveti Justin filozof“ koje je osnovano uz podršku i materijalnu pomoć Radoša Ljušića (sadašnjeg direktora Zavoda za izdavanje udžbenika). Na početku je bilo zamišljeno da „Sveti Justin“ bude „Obrazova“ studentska organizacija, ali se od toga odustalo. Prvi put u javnosti „Obraz“ se pojavljuje u martu 2001. godine sa proglašenjem srpskim neprijateljima koji potpisuje Nebojša Krstić, a u kome se napadaju Jevreji, ustaše, poturice, šiptari,

demokrate, lažni mirotvorci tj. NVO, sektaši, narkomani i homoseksualci. Koreni ovog pokreta sežu do sredine devedesetih kada je u Beogradu izlazio časopis istoimenog naziva za koji su pisali svi od Dragoša Kalajića i Isidore Bjelice, preko Nebojše Pajkića i Dragoslava Bokana, do patrijarha Pavla i vladika Atanasija i Amfilohija. U nekoliko navrata tokom 1995. i 1996. godine, za časopis „Obraz“ pisao je i Vojislav Koštunica.

Odmah po svom osnivanju „Obraz“ je krenuo u organizovanje tribina širom Srbije sa posebnim fokusiranjem na multinacionalnu Vojvodinu. Tako su do kraja 2001. godine, tribine „Obraza“ održane u Somboru, Zrenjaninu, Kikindi, Sremskoj Mitrovici i čak tri puta u Novom Sadu. Paralelno sa tribinama osnivaju se i ogranci „Obraza“ u ovim mestima, a u svim većim gradovima u Srbiji pojavljuju se i grafiti „Obraza“.

U junu 2001. godine, članovi i aktivisti „Obraza“ su učestvovali zajedno sa ostalim desničarskim organizacijama u razbijanju gej parade. Ko se seća gej parade seća se da je hordu pomahnitih desničara u kojima su bili i obrazovci i nacisti i radovci i ravnogorci i studenti bogoslovske fakulteta, predvodio pop Žarko Gavrilović, koji je huškao te mladiće da prebiju šačicu aktivista homoseksualnog pokreta. Crkva se od ovoga nikada nije zvanično ogradila.

2002. godina

Nacionalno-politički angažman predstavlja najizraženiju aktivnost SPC u 2002. godini. Središnji problem bili su tzv. „raskoli“ – kako SPC kvalifikuje odnose sa Crnogorskom i Makedonskom pravoslavnom crkvom (MPC). U slučaju Makedonije, SPC je iznova otvorila dugi niz godina staro i delimično već rešeno pitanje autokefalnosti MPC, sa namerom da tu autokefalnost ospori, iako ne i da negira samo postojanje Makedonske crkve: „SPC nastupa s nesumnjivo političkim, preciznije, teritorijalno-političkim ciljevima“. U ostvarenju strategije stvaranja „države u državi“, SPC ima otvorenu podršku Vojske. Ubrzo nakon toga imenovan je episkop za saradnju s vojskom (Porfirije), koji je predvodio vojnu posetu Hilandar u aprilu 2002. godine.

Otvaranje „makedonskog pitanja“ u proleće 2002. godine zaoštrilo je do krajnjih granica odnose između dveju crkava. Spor je izbio povodom inicijative SPC da dve crkve pronađu sporazumno rešenje oko kanonskog statusa MPC. Rešenje koje joj je u proleće 2002. godine predložila SPC (mitropolit Amfilohije, vladika niški Irinej i vladika vranjski Pahomije), podrazumevalo je da se MPC odrekne autokefalnosti, a zauzvrat SPC bi joj priznala autonomiju. Sinod MPC, međutim, nije prihvatio ponudu SPC, nakon čega je patrijarh Pavle uputio u ime Svetog sinoda SPC javni apel za prevazilaženje „raskola“ i ponovnog uspostavljanja kanonskog jedinstva Srpske pravoslavne crkve. Tim apelom, on je indirektno stavio do znanja da je SPC spremna da primi i pojedinačne eparhije.

Poziv srpskog patrijarha prihvatio je mitropolit Velesko-povardarske eparhije Jovan, što je značilo podelu unutar MPC, odnosno prisajedinjenje jednog njenog dela Srpskoj pravoslavnoj crkvi.

Tokom 2002. godine zaoštrilo se i pitanje autonomije Vojvodine. Srpska pravoslavna crkva odredila se i prema ovom pitanju preko episkopa bačkog Irineja, jednog od najznačajnijih predstavnika tvrde nacionalističke struje u SPC, koga mnogi nazivaju „crveni vladika“, zbog njegove bliskosti sa Miloševićevim režimom. Irinej je pripadnik ekstremno-nacionalističkog pokreta „Svetozar Miletić“, čiji su članovi, između ostalih i Kosta Čavoski, Vasilije Krestić i Smilja Avramov. Kao i mitropolit Amfilohije, i episkop bački Irinej otvoreno se uključio u politički spor. U januaru 2002. godine, episkop bački Irinej saopštio je da će SPC odvojeno od predstavnika vlasti obeležiti godišnjicu žrtava fašizma u Novom Sadu („novosadska racija“), ukoliko na skupu bude govorio tadašnji predsednik skupštine Nenad Čanak što se i desilo, tako da od tada postoje dva paralelna obeležavanja ovog tužnog dana - jedno crkveno i jedno svetovno.

U „Zakonu o radiodifuziji“, koji je republička skupština usvojila 18. jula 2002. godine, verskoj problematici posvećeno je nekoliko paragrafa: u članu 77 koji uređuje javni radiodifuzni servis navodi se da će njime biti ispunjavane i verske potrebe građana. Obaveza nosioca javnog servisa je da uvažava tradicionalni duhovni, istorijski, kulturni, humanitarni i prosvetni značaj i ulogu crkava i verskih zajednica u društvu (član 78). U Radiodifuznom savetu, koji inače broji devet članova, jedan je predstavnik verskih zajednica (član 23). Aktuelni predstavnik je episkop SPC Porfirije (Perić).

Nastavlja se medijska kampanja crkve čiji se najznačajniji predstavnici bave odnosom između države i crkve. Sam patrijarh SPC prednost daje „simfoniji“ između crkve i države. „Smatramo da je najbolji odnos između države i Crkve onaj koji je već bio i pre, to je simfonija - saglasnost između države, odnosno društva i Crkve.“ (Intervju patrijarha Pavla, Danasu, 5-7. januar 2002.) Ovaj model crkveno-državnih odnosa, koji je uobličen u Vizantiji i vremenom evoluirao u sistem koji daje svetu sankciju nacionalnoj državi, u moderno doba postao je osnov na kome je nastao „crkveni nacionalizam“.

U božićnoj poslanici za 2002. godinu, patrijarh SPC je roditelje ateiste optužio da su „gurnuli sopstveni porod na puteve lažne sreće i lažne slobode...“, te da su „upropastili svojoj deci život.“ Delegitisanju ateizma pridružuju se i oba ministra vera – Republike Srbije i tadašnje Savezne Republike Jugoslavije. Za republičkog ministra Vojislava Milovanovića, ateizam je krivac za ratove i siromaštvo i „moralni sunovrat“, dok ministar u Vladi SRJ Bogoljub Šijaković, ateizam povezuje sa „stanjem uma i mentalnim nasleđem duhovno-moralno poremećenog društva u kome smo živeli 50 godina“.

2003. godina

U 2003. godini nastavlja se ofanziva crkve na sve elemente društva. Pozivanje na vladiku Nikolaja Velimirovića kao na najviši autoritet u srpskom pravoslavlju prepoznatljiva je karakteristika u komunikaciji SPC sa pastvom u poslednjih petnaest godina. Vladika Nikolaj je kulturna ličnost najkonzervativnije, danas dominantne struje u SPC, čije su temeljne odrednice antizapadnjaštvo u najširem smislu i nacionalizam s elementima fašizma. Mošti vladike Nikolaja prenete su u Srbiju u maju 1991. godine, u danima

kada je Srbija otpočinjala rat na teritoriji bivše Jugoslavije, a u skladu sa nastojanjem Miloševićevog režima da izvrši što efikasniju mobilizaciju nacionalističke euforije i proratnog raspoloženja. Nakon 5. oktobra 2000. godine, SPC još upadljivije promovise vladiku Nikolaja. Ona ga kvalifikuje „najvećim Srbinom posle Sv. Save“, stvarajući od njega mit u narodu i „zaštitni znak srpstva i pravoslavlja“. Crkva, u prisustvu samog vrha vojne hijerarhije, na dan 24. marta, na godišnjicu početka NATO intervencije u Srbiji, u manastiru Soko otkriva spomenik ovom kontroverznom vladici, koji je iskazivao otvoreno poštovanje prema Hitleru i čija je misao sadržala neuvijeni antisemitizam. Dugogodišnji trend glorifikacije pravoslavnog teologa, episkopa ohridskog i žičkog Nikolaja Velimirovića, koji je dirigovan i iz crkvenih i iz vancrkvenih krugova, dobija svoj epilog kada je Sveti arhijerejski sabor SPC 19. maja 2003. godine Nikolaja Velimirovića kanonizovao tj. proglasio ga za sveca.

Jedan od najvažnijih događaja u 2003. godinu bila je tužba za pedofiliju i protivprirodni blud podignuta protiv vladike vranjskog Pahomija. Optužnica je teretila Tomislava Gačića (svetovno ime vladike Pahomija) da je zloupotrebom položaja vladike Eparhije vranjske tokom 1999., 2000., 2001. i 2002. godine izvršio bludne radnje nad četvoricom dečaka koji su pomagali u crkvenim poslovima u toj eparhiji. Odugovlačenjem pretresa, dva krivična dela u međuvremenu su zastarela.



Vlada Republike Srbije donela je 2003. godine Uredbu o izdavanju doplatne poštanske marke „Izgradnja Spomenhrama Svetog Save“, kojom je uvedena obaveza da svako pismo ili druga pošiljka mora imati ovu doplatnu poštansku marku.

U decembru 2003. godine, tadašnji ministar odbrane Boris Tadić najavio je formiranje tima za izradu normativnih akata radi regulisanja verskih pitanja u Vojsci SCG: „Model za regulisanje verskih pitanja u Vojsci biće usaglašen sa Srpskom pravoslavnom crkvom i drugim 'tradicionalnim' verskim zajednicama“, saopštila je Uprava za odnose sa javnošću Ministarstva odbrane. Namera je bila da se vojne akademije i medicinske ustanove otvore za sveštenstvo. Očigledno se Boris Tadić i na ovaj način pripremao za predsedničku kampanju.

2004. godina

Godina 2004. značajna je po tome što na vlast u Srbiji dolazi koalicija predvođena Demokratskom Strankom Srbije (DSS), a vladu formira osvedočeni konzervativac i klerikalac Vojslav Koštunica, što je pružilo priliku crkvi da se u potpunosti razmahne i počne otvoreno da radi na ukidanju sekularne države.

Skandalozna reakcija crkvenih velikodostojnika povodom proslave Prvog srpskog ustanka, obeležila je početak ove godine. Pošto su proslavu smatrali nedostojnom, oni odlučuju da naprave paralelnu proslavu i obeležavanje ovog datuma. To ni malo nije poljuljalo „simfoniju“ crkve i države, pa u martu 2004. godine novi republički ministar vera Dr Milan Radulović najavljuje da će ukupno 2,1 miliona evra biti dato verskim zajednicama tokom te godine: Prema Radulovićevim rečima, Ministarstvo na čijem je on čelu finansiraće sveštenstvo i monaštvo na Kosovu i Metohiji, koje od ovog meseca prima platu u proseku oko 250 evra mesečno.

Takvim ponašanjem državnih organa Srbija je duboko zakoračila u jednoulje, i u državi i u crkvi, uočava se težnja da se od crkve napravi politička partija. Još jedan od stubova sekularnog društva biva srušen kada Bogoslovski fakultet postaje deo Beogradskog Univerziteta.

Bogoslovski fakultet SPC pripadao je Beogradskom Univerzitetu do 1952. godine, kad tadašnja vlast odlučuje da on prestaje da bude deo Univerziteta. Vlada Republike Srbije odlučuje da poništi ovu odluku 9. januara 2004. godine, pa tako otpočinje proces povratka pod okrilje Univerziteta. Ministar vera u Vladi Republike Srbije, Milan Radulović, izjavio je 16. jula 2004. godine „da je Bogoslovski fakultet Srpske pravoslavne crkve od danas ponovo na budžetu Ministarstva prosvete, kao i sve druge obrazovne ustanove.“

Vojska Srbije i Crne Gore je još uvek institucija na nivou višem od republičkog. U manastiru Vavedenje kod Čačka je 2004. godine organizovano i prvo kolektivno krštenje oficira i vojnika jedne vojne jedinice u Srbiji.

Politička intencija nove vlade Srbije s premijerom Vojslavom Koštunicom došla je do izražaja i putem sastavljanja „Prednacrtu Zakona o slobodi vere, crkvama, verskim zajednicama i verskim udruženjima“ (iz jula 2004.) u kome je država predvidela velike ustupke Crkvi, uključujući i instituciju imuniteta sveštenika pred zakonom. U tom dokumentu, zakonopisac određuje SPC vodeću ulogu u odnosu na druge verske zajednice, pri čemu je jasno da bi u praksi ta crkva, uz logističku pomoć države, imala puna ovlašćenja da odlučuje o tome ko sve ima pravo da slavi Boga na njenoj „vekovnoj teritoriji“. Pritom se Ministarstvo vera Srbije postavilo gotovo kao nekakav spoljni, državni „servis“ SPC. U stvari, tu se sve manje nazire jasna razlika između crkve i države. Strukture političke moći se sve više prilagođavaju religijskim strukturama, i obratno, pa se tako otvara nesmetani put ka klerikalizaciji društva. Prema tom pravnom dokumentu, država je dužna da obezbedi ili jemči crkvama niz garancija (npr. nastavu veronauke u javnim školama), a verske zajednice i njihovi službenici su gotovo nedodirljivi, oslobođeni poreza, imuni pred građanskim zakonima.

Tu vrstu autonomije i privilegije crkve u Srbiji jedva da su imale i u kraljevini. Nakon toga država i SPC čine zajedničke napore da se ubrza proces desekularizacije, ali na jednako silovit način, time što se vrše kvazi-teorijske i ideološke intervencije (čak i s ministarskih mesta) u oblasti obrazovanja, kulture i, uopšte, javnog života. U duhu *fundamentalističkog* osporavanja teorije evolucije i afirmacije kreacionizma, ministarka prosvete u vladi Vojslava Koštunice, Ljiljana Čolić, pokušala je, naime, jednim „privatnim dekretom“ da odstrani Darwinovu teoriju evolucije iz školskih programa. Indikativan je primer podrške ovakvom sumanutom ponašanju ministra za kapitalne investicije Velimira Ilića koji izjavljuje, posle odstranjivanja Darwinove teorije iz školskih programa, da je za njega „reč patrijarha zakon i pošto patrijarh kaže da čovek nije nastao od majmuna, on podržava odluku ministarke da se ta teorija izbaci iz programa“.

Istodobno, kabinet tadašnje ministarke prosvete Ljiljane Čolić je načinio veliki napor da se veronauka, na uštrb građanskog vaspitanja, nametne u školama, iako su oba predmeta do tada imala jednak status među izbornim predmetima - crkva je odjednom postala javna institucija na državnom budžetu, a ide se čak tako daleko da u jednom članu zakona piše da su organi lokalne samouprave dužni da raspišu referendum ako to traži crkva ili verska zajednica.

Pokušaj ideološkog utemeljenja klerikalizacije predstavlja „Predlog Načertanija nacionalnog programa Omladine srpske za 21. vek“ od februara 2004. godine. Reč je, naime, o dokumentu koji je najpre predložio, a onda usvojio (na Preobraženje 2004.) Sabor omladine srpske. Jedan od lidera tog Sabora, Branimir Nešić, predstavio je *Načertanije* na Sretenjskoj duhovnoj akademiji pod nazivom „Su čim ćemo pred Karađorđa...“, održanoj u Domu sindikata u Beogradu. Na tom skupu su još govorili i predstavnici SPC, mitropolit Amfilohije Radović i penzionisani episkop Atanasije Jevtić, zajedno s predstavnicima vojske i ministrom vera Republike Srpske. *Predlog Načertanija* ima 13 tačaka.

Prema ovom dokumentu, koji podržava i SPC, budućnost srpske države bi trebalo da se zasniva na „svetosavlju, kosovskom zavetu, preispitivanju dosadašnje srpske kulture, prosvete i istorije, odnosa sa drugima, stvaranju elite, očuvanju srpskog jezika i ćirilice, obnovi srpskog sela, domaćinske porodice, parohijske zajednice, crkvenonarodnih sabora, demokratije i monarhije” - duhovne vertikale srpske istorije po modelu Bog-Kralj-Domaćin koji ima metafizičko-političke konotacije. Crkvi je suvišan i parlament, i političke partije. Ona ovim dokumentom ne priznaje jedan objektivni proces koji se davno obavio, da se evropsko društvo pre više od dva veka sekularizovalo i da je to ireverzibilan proces.

Razlike između količine poverenja u Vladu i Crkvu postale su očigledne neposredno pred parlamentarne izbore 2004. godine na Kosovu kada se, uoči samih izbora, Crkva javno suprotstavila pozivu predsednika Srbije, Borisa Tadića, koji je kosovskim Srbima savetovao da učestvuju na izborima. Lider SPC-a, patrijarh Pavle, je pozvao kosovske Srbe da ostanu u svojim kućama na dan izbora. „Skoro potpuni bojkot Srba koji je usledio je još jednom pokazao da SPC na Kosovu ima veći uticaj nego predsednik Srbije, čak i kada se radi o političkim pitanjima poput učešća na izborima”, pisao je tada beogradski nedeljnik NIN.

Godina ekspanzije klerikalizma završava se operacijom postavljanja skaradnog gvozdenog „kaveza” koji se ni uz pomoć najbujnije mašte ne može nazvati crkvom, ali se uz pomoć vojnih helikoptera može postaviti na Rumiju. Operacijom je komandovao mitropolit cnogorsko-primorski Amfilohije.

2005. godina

I 2005. godina počinje skandalom koji je šokirao javnost u Srbiji kada je crkva nametnula moralno pitanje da li je po veri i hrišćanski praviti manifestaciju kao što je „Kobasicijada” u vreme uskršnjeg posta. Zbog održavanja „Kobasicijade” u vreme Velikog posta, episkop bački Irinej Bulović kaznio je meštane Turije dvodnevnom oglašavanjem zvona za mrtve, dok je lokalnom svešteniku zabranjeno da ulazi godinu dana u kuće organizatora „Kobasicijade”.

Arhiepiskop Jovan Vraniškovski je 27. jula 2005. godine sproveden na odsluženje zatvorske kazne u trajanju od dve i po godine zbog podsticanja nacionalne i verske mržnje, razdora i netrpeljivosti. Ovo je izazvalo reakciju političke elite u Srbiji. Povodom osude arhiepiskopa Jovana, Velja Ilić je samovoljno uveo avio-sankcije Makedoniji, a da se Vlada o tome uopšte nije izjašnjavala. Lider PSS Bogoljub Karić je čak pretio da će prvog septembra 2005. godine, ukoliko arhiepiskop ne bude pušten iz zatvora, blokirati granicu sa Makedonijom i tako uzurpirati državne prerogative. To se naravno nije desilo, ali je to bio još jedan primer svojevrstne smbioze države i crkve. „Ovo je vreme da pokažemo zube”, izjavio je tada Velimir Ilić, ministar za kapitalne investicije u srpskoj vladi kada su ga upitali da prokomentariše zatvorsku kaznu dosuđenu Vraniškovskom. „Ovo što se događa sa vladikom Jovanom u Makedoniji postaje nepodnošljivo i ne može da se toleriše... Crkvu u koju verujem niko ne može da omalovažava, a posebno ne njene velikodostojnike”, dodao je ministar.

Ovaj primer je najindikativniji za patološko stanje u kojem se naše društvo danas nalazi. Srpska vlast je takođe našla za shodno da tokom prvih zvaničnih pregovora o budućem statusu Kosova uključi i gotovo čitav Sinod SPC, i javno prizna njihovo mišljenje kao legitimno. Posebno je zastrašujuće što je jedan od učesnika i Tomislav Gačić, među dečacima poznatiji kao Pahomije, kome se u tom trenutku još uvek sudilo za pedofiliju.

Veliku buru negodovanja izazvalo je kanonizovanje koljača iz drugog svetskog rata, koji su kao pripadnici četničkih grupacija u Crnoj Gori počinili nezamisliva zverstva u ime i za račun ravnogorske ideologije, koja je opet od strane srpskih vlasti u potpunosti rehabilitovana, te je i na taj način pružena podrška Amfilohiju Radoviću koji je kanonizaciju i predložio.

Vlada nastavlja da se ponaša kao ispostava Srpske pravoslavne crkve, a od procesa klerikalizacije nije izuzeta ni funkcija predsednika Republike. Naime, predsednik Boris Tadić odlazi u Moskvu sa patrijarhom, kako je javljeno, u crkveno-državnu posetu. Na taj način iskazuje se sav besmisao političke situacije u Srbalja, jer predsednik republike ide u crkveno-državnu posetu, iz države koja je Ustavom definisana kao sekularna.

2006. godina

U 2006. godini zakonski se operacionalizuje iskazana težnja ka klerikalizaciji i ona postaje institucionalizovana, donošenjem dva ključna zakona: „Zakonom o verskim zajednicama” i „Zakonom o povraćaju imovine crkvama”. Time klerikalna klika dobija zakonski okvir delovanja i njihov je posao olakšan i zakonom zaštićen. Zakon o verskim zajednicama predviđa da „crkve i verske zajednice mogu obavljati obrede i u školama, državnim ustanovama, bolnicama, vojsci, policiji, ustanovama socijalne i dečije zaštite, zavodima za izvršenje krivičnih sankcija, javnim i privatnim preduzećima, stanovima građana i drugim odgovarajućim mestima.“ „Ministarstvo vera je prema zakonu dužno da iz ukupnih godišnjih dotacija Crkvama i verskim zajednicama najmanje 20% nameni za njihove kulturne i izdavačke programe.“ (član 39).

Evidentno je da se Ministarstvo vera zakonom između pravoslavnih kanona i evropskih konvencija opredelilo za kanone. Ukoliko Ministarstvo vera identifikuje svoje stavove sa unutrašnjim pravnim uređenjem jedne od verskih zajednica, onda se više ne može govoriti o postojanju sekularnog načela odvojenosti države i crkve, a to praktično poništava i sekularni karakter države. Posebno zanimljiv je član zakona prema kome „Sveštenici, odnosno verski službenici, ne mogu biti pozvani na odgovornost pred državnim organima za svoje postupanje pri obavljanju bogoslužne delatnosti.“ Dakle, njima se praktično garantuje imunitet za sve što urade ili izjave. Ovaj imunitet crkveni velikodostojnici obilato koriste tokom 2006. godine.

Ubrzo posle donošenja ovog zakona Okružni sud u Nišu potvrdio je oslobađajuću presudu vladici vranjskom Pahomiju, kome je pred Opštinskim sudom u Nišu suđeno zbog bludnih radnji nad dečacima, budućim bogoslovima. Tročlano veće, na čelu sa predsednikom suda Dr Danilom Nikolićem, odlučilo je 29. juna da odbije žalbu Opštinskog javnog tužilaštva da se oslobađajuća presuda ukine i vrati na ponovno razmatranje. Drugostepeno veće,

međutim, nije javnosti obznanilo razloge kojima se rukovodilo prilikom donošenja odluke da odbije žalbu Opštinskog tužilaštva, koju je bezrezervno podržalo i Okružno javno tužilaštvo u Nišu.

Na scenu zatim ponovo stupa vladika bački Irinej koji uz pomoć policije prekida uličnu predstavu italijanske trupe „Teatro dei Venti“, saopštivši pritom da je policija pozvana da prekine uličnu predstavu italijanske trupe ispred Vladičanskog dvora da bi se sprečilo divljanje pred crkvom i njegovim prozorima. Vladika je naveo i da predstava „Teatra dei Venti“ nije igrokaz već „arogantna i primitivna satanistička seansa“. Takođe je navedeno da su se „poklonici satane“ pojavili u vreme kada se vrši bogoslužjenje u kapeli Vladičanskog dvora, i da je on tražio zaštitu policije. Mada je dvosatni program na Trgu slobode i Zmaj Jovinoj ulici organizator Studentski kulturni centar prijavio novosadskom SUP-u, predstava je prekinuta desetak minuta pre završetka. Nakon što je episkop bački Irinej predstavu „Teatra dei Venti“ nazvao satanističkom, a policija na njegov poziv grubo prekinula ulični performans u Novom Sadu, pojedini građani Rume, sedam dana kasnije u prisustvu sveštenika, vredali su glumce. Reditelj Stefano Te je nakon toga odlučio da prekine program.

Ohrabren oslobođajućom presudom za pedofiliju, Vladika vranjski Pahomije podneo je novosadskom Opštinskom sudu tužbu protiv umetnika Živka Grozdanića i „Art klinike“ iz Novog Sada zbog uvrede ugleda i časti „istaknutog velikodostojnika“ Srpske pravoslavne crkve, jer ga je Grozdanić u svom umetničkom performansu prikazao kao pedofila.

Ovaj hronološki prikaz samo je mali deo crkveno državnih aktivnosti na procesu ukidanja sekularne države i pretvaranja društva u Srbiji u reakcionarno i klerikalno. Sasvim je očito da Srbija u „istorijskoj pometnji“ nije razumela šta joj se dešava kada crkva ukida umetničke slobode i anatemiše umetnike, širi strah od progresa, blagosilja oružje, preti paklom onima koji u vreme posta jedu kobasice, itd.

U uslovima gotovo potpunog izostajanja kritike SPC i njenih strategija i praksi širenja uticaja koja bi došla iz bilo kojeg segmenta društva, u kojima se političke partije, državne institucije, mediji, univerziteti, kulturna javnost praktično utrkuju u dodvoravanju crkvi i uglavnom oklevaju da bilo koji potez njen ili njenih zvaničnika izlože kritici, teško je očekivati da će se iz unutrašnjih redova SPC stvoriti snaga za njeno „reformisanje“ ili bar drugačije viđenja sopstvene uloge u društvu. Očigledno je da je Srpska pravoslavna crkva danas uverena da će uspeti da stekne istorijsko, ustvari mitološko mesto. Važno je napomenuti da to mesto ona nikad nije imala u istoriji. U takvom sistemu, ona teži da se preplete u „simfoniji sa državom“ i sa društvom, da stvori staleški, hijerarhijski poredak nadređenosti, podređenosti i apsolutne poslušnosti i da se u tom smislu izjednače država, crkva, društvo i nacija. Da li će u tome uspeti zavisi od onih snaga koje uviđaju pogubnu politiku i crkve i države po samo društvo i od stepena rešenosti tih progresivnih snaga da se ovom procesu sveopšte klerikalizacije suprotstave. Sledeći načelo velikog filozofa koje kaže da je kritika religije pretpostavka svake kritike, naša je dužnost da retrogradni proces klerikalizacije na svaki način zaustavimo.

Spisak novih srpskih pravoslavnih crkava u Novom Sadu i u okolnim naseljima

1. Crkva Svetog kneza Lazara kosovskog, Stepanovićevo, 1990.
Projektant: arh. Branko Pešić (1921-2006)
2. Crkva Svete Trojice, Ledinci, 1992-1995.
Projektant: arh. Peđa Ristić
3. Crkva Svetog Simeona mirotočivog, Veternik, 1994.
Projektant: arh. Milojko Korać
4. Crkva Svetog Đorđa, Temerin, 1994.
Projektant: Mile Zec
5. Crkva Vaznesenja Hristovog, Klisa - Novi Sad, 1994 -
Projektant: arh. Milojko Korać
6. Crkva Prenosa moštiju svetog Save, Novo Naselje - Novi Sad, 1996 -
Projektant: arh. Vlasta Matić
7. Crkva Rođenja Bogorodice, Šangaj - Novi Sad, 1998 - 2004.
Projektant: arh. Milorad Milidragović (1938 -1999)
8. Svetosavski dom, Kać, 1999-2000.
9. Crkva Vozdviženja Časnog krsta, Klisa (zatvor) - Novi Sad, 2002 - 2003.
Projektant: arh. Živan Jelić
10. Crkva Svetog Ćirila i Metodija, Telep - Novi Sad, 2003.
Projektant: arh. Bata Božić i Miloje Maraš
11. Crkva Uspenja Bogorodice, Bački Jarak, 2003.
Projektant: arh. Dušan Arbajter
12. Crkva Svetog Vasilija Ostroškog, Sirig, 2004.
Projektant: arh. Branko Kosović
13. Crkva Sabora srpskih svetitelja, Budisava, 2004.
Projektant: arh. Radoslav Prokić
14. Crkva Svete velikomučenice Marije (Ognjena Marija), Paragovo
15. Crkva Svete Petke, Petrovaradin, 2004 -
Projektant: arh. Ljubica Bošnjak
16. Crkva Rođenja svetog Jovana, Detelinara - Novi Sad, 2004 -
Projektant: arh. Sava Ristić
17. Crkva na Adicama – Novi Sad, 2005 -
18. Crkva Svetog Georgija, privatni Gerontološki centar “Sv. Georgije”, Petrovaradin

U planu je podizanje SPC hramova na Limanu i Grbavici u Novom Sadu.

The List of New Serbian Orthodox Churches in Novi Sad and its Surroundings

1. The Church of "Sveti knez Lazar kosovski", Stepanovićevo, 1990.
Projektant: arh. Branko Pešić (1921-2006)
2. The Church of "Svete Trojice", Ledinci, 1992-1995.
Projektant: arh. Peđa Ristić
3. The Church of "Sveti Simeon mirotočivi", Veternik, 1994.
Projektant: arh. Miloško Korać
4. The Church of "Sveti Đorđe", Temerin, 1994.
Projektant: Mile Zec
5. The Church of "Vaznesenje Hristovo", Klisa - Novi Sad, 1994 -
Projektant: arh. Miloško Korać
6. The Church of "Prenos moštiju svetog Save", Novo Naselje - Novi Sad, 1996 -
Projektant: arh. Vlasta Matić
7. The Church of "Rođenje Bogorodice", Šangaj - Novi Sad, 1998 - 2004.
Projektant: arh. Milorad Milidragović (1938 -1999)
8. Svetosavski dom, Kać, 1999-2000.
9. The Church of "Vozdviženja Časnog krsta", Klisa (zatvor) - Novi Sad, 2002 - 2003.
Projektant: arh. Živan Jelić
10. The Church of "Sveti Ćiril i Metodije", Telep - Novi Sad, 2003.
Projektant: arh. Bata Božić i Miloje Maraš
11. The Church of "Uspenje Bogorodice", Bački Jarak, 2003.
Projektant: arh. Dušan Arbajter
12. The Church of "Sveti Vasilije Ostroški", Sirig, 2004.
Projektant: arh. Branko Kosović
13. The Church of "Sabor srpskih svetitelja", Budisava, 2004.
Projektant: arh. Radoslav Prokić
14. The Church of "Sveta velikomučenica Marija (Ognjena Marija)", Paragovo
15. The Church of "Sveta Petka", Petrovaradin, 2004 -
Projektant: arh. Ljubica Bošnjak
16. The Church of "Rođenje svetog Jovana", Detelinara - Novi Sad, 2004 -
Projektant: arh. Sava Ristić
17. The Church at Adice – Novi Sad, 2005 -
18. The Church of "Sveti Georgije", private Gerontology Center "Sv. Georgije", Petrovaradin

Building of new Serbian Orthodox Churches is planned in parts of Novi Sad City called Liman and Grbavica.



4



6



5



7









The Critique of Clericalisation of Serbia

Editor: **AFANS, Anti-fascists Action Novi Sad**

Edition anti-dogma

Translation: Nebojša Pajić, Orfeas Skutelis

Proof reading: Branka Ćurčić

Photographies: AFANS archive

Design: AFANS

Prepress: Predrag Nikolić

Printed by: Daniel Print, Novi Sad

Samizdat

Print run: 500

Year: 2007

All copying and further utilisation of texts from this publication is welcome (except in cases of commercial use and of their utilisation within rasists, sexists, fascists and anti-Semit context).

The publication "The Critique of Clericalisation of Serbia" is published within wider project of establishing the Youth Social Center in Novi Sad, which will be dedicated to fighting retrograde phenomenon such are nationalism, fascism, rascism and xenophobia.

The project of establishing of the Youth Social Center in Novi Sad has received support from "Schueler Helfen Leben", Germany and province Ministry of Youth and Sports of Vojvodina.

The Critique of Clericalisation of Serbia



The Critique of Clericalisation of Serbia

Content

- 40 The List of New Serbian Orthodox Churches in Novi Sad and its Surroundings**
- 54 The Critique of Clericalisation of Novi Sad, Analysis of Socio-Political and Aesthetic Discourse of New Orthodox and Church Strategies, *Branka Ćurčić***
- 58 The Map of Novi Sad City and its Surroundings with Marked New-built Objects of Serbian Orthodox Church**
- 60 Contemporary Serbian Church Buildings: From Tradition to Political Correctness *Vladimir Mitrović***
- 66 From Psychopathology to Political Programmes: Clerical Offensive on the Threshold of the 21st Century, *Petar Atanacković***
- 72 Criticising of the Clericalisation of Serbia: Analysis of the Church/Modern State Relationship *Miloš Perović***
- 77 The Diary of Church Insults 2000 – 2006, From Desecularization to Clericalization *Zoran Petakov***

The Critique of Clericalization of Novi Sad

Analysis of Socio-Political and Aesthetic Discourse of New Orthodox and Church Strategies

Branka Ćurčić

Publication "The Critique of Clericalization of Serbia" represents a set of research essays and a chronological study, dedicated to the analysis of expansion of Serbian Orthodox Church buildings during the past ten years on the territory of Novi Sad and its vicinity, as well as analysis of specific socio-political climate that enabled this urban planning based on the principles of exclusive domination of one code, language and ideology.

The fact is that over a dozen new orthodox churches of different sizes and styles were built (or their construction had started) during the last decade on the territory of Novi Sad and its surrounding area. Orthodox Church building expansion can be related to current socio-political events, where one can see a significant shift towards "unofficial" and "indirect" binding and permeation of the Serbian State and Serbian Orthodox Church. Law on churches, process of denationalization, financing Serbian Orthodox Church from public funds are only few examples of this, above all, negative convergence between the church and the state in contemporary Serbian society. Expansion of Serbian Orthodox masonry in the capital of multicultural Vojvodina can be indirectly connected to significant demographic changes that struck Novi Sad and Province of Vojvodina during and after the civil war in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990ties. Before the mentioned wars, Novi Sad was the city of 250.000 people of different nationalities and was the multicultural capital of the region. During and after the war, Novi Sad almost doubled the in the number of people living in it, and at the moment it has around 400.000 inhabitants. Presumption is that largely Serbian population, war refugees from Croatia and Bosnia, found their asylum in Novi Sad, and that fact had significant impact on current population structure of the city, political orientation of its government, building and strengthening of the "spiritual ring" of Serbian Orthodox Church. Serbian hermetic and self-referent politics on one side (stirred and shaped even in the first article of the new Serbian constitution, where it is stated that Serbia is the land of all Serbs and its other citizens), and strengthening the church influence to political life of Serbia and life in general, on the other side, led to creating position of dominant population in relation to "others", which inevitably led to divides, negation of pluralism and negative stratification of the society.

"Normalization" of individuals

If one follows some thesis through the history of philosophical thought, it would be possible to reach the conclusion that the state of insecurity, alienation, self-control, self-censorship and self-restriction of human being is not the heritage of modern society, not even of capitalist and industrial era. Techniques of "closure", censorship and restriction (thus defining the term of individual freedom), according to philosopher Michel Foucault, date

from the time of middle age Christianity, when through the subtle mechanisms of speech, fit behavior, "spirit exercise", confession and practicing mysticism was systematically worked on the methods of "consciousness revision and directing the herd". According to Foucault, three dominant techniques of control and restriction of individuals are canonic right, Christian pastoral and the civil law. It might seem hasty and overstated conclusion, but starting with middle ages, mechanisms of "closure" and regulation of the population can be followed, on one side through the development of medicine, pedagogy and psychiatry (science about "normalization" and rationalization of human body and spirit), and on the other side, through the mechanisms of state government. With the term bio-government, Foucault defines specific "entanglement" of the state government and self-government (government of the individual over him/herself). This connection between the state and its population as a subject is not a "timeless constant". What evolved during the Middle ages and then in the 16th century, became enrooted during the 18th century as a new technique of government, or to be more precise, power line of modern government techniques that exist to the present time. What marked period before the 18th century, is the distinctive feature of the government that still didn't "rule the people for the benefit of the people", but above all for the benefit of the sovereignty of the state. With the appearance of liberalism in the 18th century, power of the state didn't depend only on the size of its territory, but on the life conditions of its population as well. It was then that the mechanisms of government had begun to transform towards political economy of liberalism, towards self-imposed government restrictions for the benefit of the free market, on one side, and towards population that succumbs to this economic paradigm in their own thoughts and through their own behavior, on the other. According to Foucault, modern individual first must learn how to possess the body that is dependent on the series of existential conditions, and then must learn to develop the relationship with "creative and productive self". If one says that deprivation of this "property", conditionally speaking, was happening in the age of church hegemony over human behavior, discourse and work, through later mechanisms of oppression could be seen that it is bio-politics of modern society that created possibilities for self-governance, but only as a prerequisite for the establishment and production of "normality".

Further on, Foucault thinks that bio-government was necessary element for the development of capitalism, and that it could be provided only at the cost of controlled body investment in the production machine, adapting all things that concern population to the economic flows. At this point we could, but only to the certain extent, and only in the context of control mechanisms, put in the same level capitalism and the church, because over the centuries both had been working on the increase of population usability and on its strengthening but without negative influence on its obedience, which are direct factors of social separation and hierarchy that further on create domination, submission and power relations.

Church = the State

Returning to the present time, it seems that the negative convergence of the Serbian state and the church has as a consequence an equalization and leveling of their impact

on society. In that sense, the allegory of the community is being reintroduced, collective national interest and collective freedom at the cost of principle of individual freedom. What is being demonstrated through mass building of sacral objects of Serbian Orthodox Church is creation of domination of collective (Serbian) spirit and systematic canceling of religious, national, ethnic and racial differences between the people on this geopolitical territory in particular. The question where this domination ends has a clear answer – in the wish for the absolute power. It seems that at this point interests of the Serbian state meet the interests of the Church. These actions are imposing mechanisms of local “closure” and self-isolation from the “others” proclaiming the only real truth, that have clear connection to the listed subtle mechanisms of “closure” on one side, and control of the population, based on ideological and economic instances, on the other. By this means Serbian population and others are (dis)couraged to succumb in their thoughts and behavior to hegemonic church, and a bit to the state government, deeply believing that it is themselves that actually have governance over their own free decision, and again all for the benefit of body and soul of Serbian people.

P. S. Although there is a certain discomfort in the concept of “generation” in the first place as a “bio-reductionistic” concept, this research is realized on the initiative of “younger generation” of people in Serbia. Term of new or younger generation, used here, in fact shows the need to build one analytical social platform that is turned towards future critique and building of the society; about one new generation that will be freed of dogmatic capitalistic or church position and which is openly against alienation, normalization, canonization, “psycho-pathology and loneliness”.





The map of Novi Sad city and its surroundings with marked new-built objects of Serbian Orthodox Church (see page 40)

Contemporary Serbian Church Buildings: From Tradition to Political Correctness

Vladimir Mitrović

This paper is a part of a more elaborate author's research work of the same name.

(...) There are many reasons, justified or not, for the picture of what our Orthodox architecture looks like today. The church architecture is in the state of the late-romantic and uncritical acceptance of tradition, following a fast but wrong lane. The rigid attitude of the Serbian Orthodox Church (SOC) regarding all of the new forms due to their well-known conservative views (which is not denied) of the clergy circles, especially the high-ranked ones, the unchanged ways of the liturgy that require a suitable space, practical and pragmatic situations regarding the construction work, money raising and organising the processes of building that are mainly assigned to the local church communities, disinterested architects. The so-called "mass-production" of the churches, lack of the educational curriculum from this field, are but a few of the reasons for the situation of the present sacral architecture around us. From time to time, one has an impression that not even the Church and its dignitaries are satisfied with its contemporary sacral production.

Having been concentrated on renovating the old, historical, temples mainly from the state funds, not from their own, the SOC has not completely developed the approach regarding the building and designs of their new temples, apart from the fact that they keep pointing out – that the new churches should resemble old, monastery-like constructions, thought up as an ideal by the benefactor together with the local priest, just as is the case with the church in Ub (architect Predrag Ristić 1990-2001), the investor of which is a controversial *nouveau riche*. Apart from this general attitude, it is quite often that the project is chosen for various reasons, like pure volunteerism of the investors and the assigned priests, even personal reasons, like a person's origins, remembrance and similar. Building a new church in a local environment is seen as a fulfilment of one's oath that, almost as a rule, has to lean on some of the solutions from the rich history of sacral building.

In Vojvodina, authentic Vojvodian political parties also strongly criticise the constructions of new temples in the cities and villages of Vojvodina that follow the Serbian-Byzantine style, demanding the "return" of the authentic baroque concept of building churches. This, after all, political (or daily-political) attitude, requires additional explanation. The sacral architecture in Vojvodina does not have such a long tradition as the one in Serbia proper, due to the historical processes in this area. From the 18th century, or, to be more precise, its latter decades, the temples of all the confessions in Vojvodina were built following a unique scheme, because the plans were made and approved on the highest state level. Their unique manner – single-nave constructions oriented towards the sides of the world according to the confessions they were built for – was inspired by a (political) wish for the temples not to differ too much in so that they would be a cause for protests on a national level. Apart from this legislature there were a

few more quite solid, practical reasons for such a way of building – a simple single-nave temple was much easier to finance and build than a church with a dome, which is considered to be the most complex part of an Orthodox church, both from the points of view of construction and aestheticism. The large capacity that a single-nave construction offers is not to be disregarded easily. Some Vojvodian settlements required the raising of suitable temples that could take in a large number of people, which was secured by choosing a single-nave type of a church. One of the other reasons was that there were no professionals, architects and experienced builders who would be ready to realise a certain project, when it is known that most of the professionals of that time, architects and engineers, were working exclusively for the army and its needs.

Such practice of construction, which can be said to be "politically correct", in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was usual during the first half of the 19th century. During the seventh, eighth decades of the 19th century, one can notice great changes in that field. Namely, since then, Roman Catholic temples have been built almost exclusively in a neo-gothic, very rarely in a neo-Romanesque fashion, while the sacral Orthodox architecture has turned towards the Serbian-Byzantine heritage as its basic inspiration. It is also interesting that this new approach towards the Orthodox sacral architecture is basically the product of the so-called Hansen's Serbian pupils. Teofil Hansen (1813-1891) a Danish architect and a long-term professor at the Academy in Vienna was a famous builder of its time and left his mark on the architecture of Vienna and Athens, where he was a guest-architect at one time. Hansen was promoting a mixture of Byzantine and European influences and is considered to be one of the first Europeans who pointed out to the architecture of Byzantium and its influences and who included some of its influences in his works. Hansen's Serbian students, originally from Vojvodina, and we shall mention Svetozar Ivačković (1844-1924), Vladimir Nikolić (1857-1922) and Jovan Ilkić (1857-1917), designed a large number of Orthodox temples by the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries in Serbia and Vojvodina – Paraćin, Trstenik, Jagodina, Pančevo, chapels in Sremski Karlovci, Melenci etc., their manner reflecting the return to the old Serbian-Byzantine ideals. Those were the buildings with a cross in its basis, following a neo-Byzantine model with a monumental cupola and a (physically) separate bell-tower, instead of the one that was adjoined to the church. These architects can be seen as the bearers of the idea of the restoration of the national style in the Serbian sacral building, as it has been meticulously studied by Miodrag Jovanović, PhD, and Aleksandar Kadjević (1), PhD, both art historians. Unfortunately, the topic of the contemporary sacral architecture that arose during the past two decades in Serbia, has practically not yet been touched, neither from theoretical nor from the historical and artistic aspects (2).

The Role of Architects and City-planners

Although the Church speaks reluctantly of the authorship in the sacral architecture because they think that a temple represents anything but a personal designer's seal or contribution, the history of art and architecture has managed to note down (and study) a large number of authors as well as their creative contributions in the field of sacral construction. Almost every Serbian architect has had the experience of building sacral objects. Even the very modernist architects from not so distant past had an Orthodox church design or two in their portfolios. Recently, very contemporary-oriented authors have started to work in this field of architecture.

One of the main attitudes that Church has regarding this is that the construction of the temples is done in such a manner that it does not point out to the individual, to the builder, but to what materials are used to build the space (for the God-human). So, it is clear from this attitude, what role the Church gives the architects. Absence of personality, as a motto of building new objects resembles the tasks given to the architects in totalitarian regimes.

The ways of coming to building most temples, with the exceptions of bright yet rare examples of public competitions, include architects by all means, but they also involve city planners. There is a saying: if a painter is a pig, an architect (and a city planner) is a chicken. The market has created a servant and a yes-man from the frightened chicken. And he is ready to compromise about everything and to fulfil all, sometimes completely banal wishes of the investors. Those with power in Serbia, during the Milošević's regime of the nineties, as well as these, post-October ones, have realised that the church should be cooperated with really closely and should be seen as a national institution of highest importance. After the retrograde introduction of religion into the state education system, the church is expecting a massive reimbursement of their assets in the forthcoming period – flats, building lots, arable land, forests etc. What is to be expected after such decisions? Is it the sudden richness of an already rich Church and then a stampede to build new objects. The authorities have already given back the social status to the Church, among other things, by letting it build hundreds of sacral objects, which was a result primarily of political, not religious reasons. And so the “state within the state” has been given an impressive number of most attractive and important locations in Serbian and Vojvodian towns and cities. Free of charge, of course. The effect of this religious town planning – if it is any consolation, in neighbouring Croatia, the situation is also catastrophic; the best example for this is the so-called “Spiritual Ring” of the city of Split, where the construction of ten new churches is expected. So far it has not caused any reactions of the city-planners or their services. Yet, to be true, they were not expected to react. From the socialist yes-man practice, our town planning has thrown itself into the jaws of new investors, rich people, crossing over to its so-called transitional phase, while, parallel with the processes that are eating the urban structure of our towns and settlements, not a single word or a sentence have been written and said about these phenomena of “the state within the state”.

Practice and Pragmatics

In the province, all issues and phenomena are slowly radicalised, almost to the point of banality. For more and more reasons, from the insufficient education levels of the assigned people to their being obsequious to the central instances. The example of the recently built sacral objects in Novi Sad and its outskirts is obviously lead to the provincial level, both from the centre and from the city, which obviously speaks of the degree of the builders' practice when speaking of sacral objects.

Out of 13 Orthodox temples, that have already been built, those that are being built and those that are planned in Novi Sad and around, a vast majority (to be precise – all of them) almost do not deserve any serious architectural or artistic analysis (3). The only thing that can be said about them is to name the facts regarding which of the so-called historical temples they have copied or regarding the origins of the mumbo-jumbo compilations of elements in some of the

eclectic combinations of this and that, from the basic spatial scheme to the copied details from the ornamental repertoire. These temples will remain as silent, unoriginal and hastily erected monuments of a conservative and uncritical spirit incapable of facing the reality, just as the SOC is, and further on, with the obvious preconceived ideas, uncritically treating traditionalism in architecture, often with caricature-like loose ends.

The need to build Orthodox churches arises from the fact that certain narrow territories – parishes, mainly do not have places of worship. Of course, this fact stands for itself and is true and, when a certain parish does not have a place of worship, it has quite easily in the past ten years, managed to obtain the most attractive construction locations from the town-planning institutions. If the SOC is given the right to build a temple in Telep, then this building of a church is a “finger in the eye” regarding the local majority in this part of town, namely Hungarians. This is a matter of morality and not only a religious one, but common one, human morality. If this temple has been designed horribly, without a main idea, harmony and proportions, its shape being hypertrophied, then it represents the additional problem - if someone sees it as a problem at all. In my opinion, the number of new Orthodox temples certainly is not the key problem (although it is up to a point), i.e. the quantity which is still inadequate by the Church's standards as the authorised institution. The problem is the very architecture, and then the artistic value of the new objects that pop up with incredible speed and the amounts of money spent on them in a society that can still be considered to be poor. The official answer to the question why the SOC is not building hospitals, hospices, sanatoriums, old people's homes, orphanages and similar objects that it used to before, is that the Church is there to care of the spiritual health, not physical. It is, as the Church sees it, the task of the state. This is a classical example of religious-hypocritical point of view.

Ambitiously and with the immense support from the state, the SOC is building a great number of its temples, yet on the other side it does not do enough to satisfy the earthly needs of its subjects, which has been for a long time the major feature of the complete Church activities amongst Serbs. In the out-of-proportion care about the heavenly there is no time for the earthly. Or, is it one of numerous unsolved relations (manipulations) that the Serbian Orthodox Church is projecting towards its believers?

It is a matter of taste not to mention the many examples of the side-effects of building the temples “in the local”, embodied in the ever-present corruption within the so-called lower clergy circle – i.e. the clergy that does not come from monasteries and they (the ones from the monasteries) are the only ones with the right to bring decisions within the clerical circles. The duality of the clergy, where those with the really difficult experience of living in a monastery can be the only ones that can be considered higher and more official, as opposed to the ordinary, parochial priests who mainly care about their earthly problems (house, car, easy life and a suitable job for the wife) has, of course, never been publicly recognised by the Church, although everybody knows everything about it - both the clergy and the interested believers. Besides, the top of the Church, as the official representatives of their attitudes, only recognises those with the monastery background, sometimes decades long. The Church circles have for long known about the relationships among the two types of “clergy”.

Deciding upon how a certain Orthodox temple is going to look is assigned, mainly, unless it is in a bigger town, to the lower clergy and Church boards made up of “average” believers. When we know what “average” means in the local context, it is crystal clear who and how decides about the look of the new sacral objects. Regarding the degree of artistic values, and no less important bits – work on the interior of the new churches – lives of saints, iconostasis, wood carving, the entire corpus of work from the wide spectrum of applied art – the main decisions are also brought “on the local level”. The fact is that such people cannot be up to their noble task – choosing the right values for the work on the interior of a praying temple. Of course it would be unjust not to mention the efforts of a certain segment of the clergy that the entire story about the designing and decoration of churches is to be raised to a higher level. That was, of course, one of the reasons for initialising organisation of high educational institutions for this field, which should, still, not be treated as regular education, financed by the state for only one of numerous reasons – only believers could attend those schools, with the blessing of the Church, and ordinary citizens are not obliged to finance such projects from the state budget.

Another realistic question is – Does the SOC need as many new temples at all? At least in the urban environments, where there are churches already? It is a fact that believers deal with their religious rituals not only on the basis of where they currently reside, but on the basis of where their predecessors used to be. Christenings, weddings and the rest should be dealt with in the temples of their predecessors, so this is an intentional attempt to traditionalise new believers, which is a very anti-traditionalistic approach. This disrespect of family norms, among other things, leads to the decadence of family values and traditions where everybody had their “basic” family temple, especially because those are unique rituals in a life of a fervent believer that he should obey. The practice so far has shown that new temples become places where new believers come and go through, not a place of family gathering, as the Church is trying to present it. Probably, as many times in the contemporary history this will, historically speaking, have a boomerang effect; i.e. the new churches will, as the civilization has proven it, remain empty, and become a symbol of an old-fashioned, retrograde attitude toward citizens as basic elements of each democratic society. (...)

1. M. Jovanović, *Srpsko crkveno graditeljstvo i slikarstvo novijeg doba* (Serbian Sacral Building and Painting of Recent Times), Belgrade-Kragujevac, 1987 (1-255), A. Kadijević, *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi, sredina XIX – sredina XX veka*, (A Century of Finding a National Style in Serbian Architecture, Mid 19th to Mid 20th Centuries, Published by Građevinska knjiga, Belgrade, 1997. (1-344)

2. Except for collected papers – *Tradition and Contemporary Serbian Sacral Building*, editor, Z. Manević, B Stojkov, Institute for Architecture and City Planning, Belgrade, 1994 – and a couple of unsuccessful attempts to do so. No only are there no reviews or artistic-architectural interpretations of the contemporary practice in sacral architecture, but there are no published data about the authorship of the Orthodox temples during the past decades. It is very rarely that one of the churches has its presentation in the current architectural magazines. One of rare papers that deals with this problem is V. Mitrović, *Svetionik vere na Dunavu – Neimarski duh Predraga Ristića*. DaNS No. 47, September 2004. (www.dans.org.yu)

3. New SOP churches in Novi Sad and its outskirts: The Church of Christ's Ascension, Klisa - Novi Sad, 1994- Design: Architect Miloško Korać; The Church of the Raising the Honorable Cross, Klisa - prison - Novi Sad, 2002-2003. Design: Architect Živan Jelić; The Church of St. Cyrill and Methodius, Telep - Novi Sad, 2003. Design: Architects Bata Božić i Miloje Maraš; The Church of the Birth of Mother of God, Šangaj - Novi Sad, 1998-2004. (after the Petkovića Monastery), Design: Architect Milorad Milidragović (1938 -1999); The Church of the Transfer of the Remnants of St. Sava, Novo Naselje - Novi Sad, Design: Architect Vlasta Matić; The Church of the Birth of St. John, Detelinara - Novi Sad, Design: Architect Sava Ristić; The Church of St. Simon, Veternik, 1994. Design: Architect Miloško Korać; The Church of St. George, Temerin, 1994. Design: Mile Zec; The Church of St. King Lazar, Stepanovićevo, 1990 (the first one in Vojvodina after the WWII), Design: Architect Branko Pešić (1921-2006); The Church of St. Petka, Petrovaradin, Design: Architect Ljubica Bošnjak; The Church of St. Vasilije Ostroški, Sirig (after the Krušedol Monastery), Design: Architect Branko Kosović; The Church of Ascension of Mother of God, Bački Jarak, 2003. Design: Architect Dušan Arbajter; The Church of the Gathering of Serbian Saints, Budisava, Design: Architect Radoslav Prokić; Building of SOC temples is expected (the lots have been allotted) in Adice, Liman and Grbavica.



From Psychopathology to Political Programmes: Clerical Offensive on the Threshold of the 21st Century

Petar Atanacković

A ritual as a religious form is an inseparable part of every religious system and one of its most important elements. The ritual is seen as a precisely predetermined stream of religious acts that are performed in a precisely determined way. Religious rituals are equally important moments in Christianity, too, although one can notice that there are differences regarding their evaluation within the different Christianity groups. In this way the Protestantism neglects the religious form (at least nominally), it reduces it to the minimum, because the stress is placed on the contents. Protestantism emerged as a reaction to (among other things) the fact that the religious forms were becoming the very essence of religion. But, on the other hand, the Catholicism enunciates to a great degree the formal side of religion. However, I think that it is not nearly as pronounced as it is in the Orthodox Church, where the religious practice has gradually become the essential thing and pushed aside the all of the other segments of religion. This confirms an old thesis that there is a tendency to shift mental values, so that petty ceremonials become the essential thing and banish the underlying thoughts (1).

A great value of the religious form for the Orthodox Church, if not the key one is therefore noticeable in each of the public acts of the Orthodox Church. For example, one should mention a vast importance of what could be defined as “mystical atmosphere” for the Orthodox religion, due to which the constant reproduction of the mystical is one of the foundations of practical functioning of the Orthodox Church. Yet, if we extract the mystical element, if the mysticism were demystified, both the power and the influence of the clerical circles (and the religion as a whole) would be drastically reduced; that is the reason why the clerical structures stick stubbornly to the false mysticism. From the above mentioned, one can also come to the conclusion regarding the essential lack of foundation of religious feelings among the Orthodox believers, who are for the most part just formally religious – they follow certain rituals, while further religious (ideological) superstructure is of no interest to them. In this way, one can notice a clear mutual influence of the religion (mediated through the Church organisation) and its followers, because the measure to which believers form their religion matches the measure, more or less, of the way a certain religious system with its particularities creates and tends a special type of believers. In other words, this finding indirectly confirms the thesis which says that production by no means produces an item for a subject but it also produces the subject for the item (2). Of course, if one accepts the supposition that any sort of production takes place in the church – but “pulling the wool over somebody’s eyes” by the church is nothing else but production, and production of ideology at that.

The practice of the Orthodox Church and the critical place that the form takes in it is best presented by the language the clergy uses, and which presents the first and most

outstanding moment in their public appearance. The officials of the Serbian Orthodox Church still use an archaic, almost epic speech, which is more appropriate for olden days of the 17th or 18th centuries than today. Keeping such a linguistic practice, decidedly refusing to completely accept Vuk Karadžić’s speech and modernised Serbian language is a result of many factors, but among all of them one should mention the belief that through modernisation of the way they speak, the clerical structures would lose some of their identity, that the mystical atmosphere that is created with so much effort would be slightly defect, and that in the end the power and the influence of the Church, but also of the very religion would be considerably diminished. The same manners are present in the same way in the sacral architecture, so by just observing the sacral objects of the Serbian Orthodox Church (SOC) one can come to certain conclusions connected to this topic. Namely, religious objects are either crammed to the point where they cause anxiousness or they are grandiosely big, but, practically in all cases they create a feeling of diminutiveness and anxiousness among the believers. Those feelings are caused by the typical interior, but, in order to complete the picture, one should add the overwhelming smell of frankincense, the singing of the church choir (that comes from above as a rule, which resembles the singing of angels) and many religious rituals that the believers and a good part of clergy do not understand (bending over, constant uncontrollable making signs of cross, symbolic movements, yawps, prayers, mantras and similar). As a result of combining all of these elements one can see a specific atmosphere that radiates mysticism and where each religious practice, regardless of how prosaic it is, gains in value which it would not in other circumstances. One must not leave out artistic presentations that are more than specific and that decorate the interiors of the Orthodox sacral buildings: they represent a line of completely dehumanised humans, because human faces have been replaced with the faces of fasted Christian martyrs, all of whom are impotent neurotics and frigid hysterical women who, indeed, have nothing in common with humans, but who are, in spite of this, seen as ideals in the Orthodox religion. After all it is only logical, because the dehumanisation is one of the most important results of the degenerative influence church has on humans: by preaching a characteristic type as an ideal each believer should aim for, the Church plays its ideological role and thus realises its function in a class society. Namely, by preaching the mentioned ideals to its believers, the Church practically directs its followers towards one passive-homosexual direction characterised by masochistic attitude and passivity, as the types of behaviour that make up the mass-structural basis not only of Christianity but of any other patriarchal religion. Through the development of such features that believers have, one simultaneously creates and develops inclinations towards non-critical following and faith in the authority (3) and religion and the Church thus directly contributing to the reproduction of the dominant ideology of the ruling system and the further survival of the class society.

It is not necessary to outline the influence of all the above mentioned on a participant in a religious ritual. In such an environment, as already described, with the mentioned influences, the belief of a believer that, for example, after the priest’s prayer the wine does turn to Jesus’ blood gains in strength even more, and his conviction in the power of the rituals

(by means of which this transformation has taken place) cannot be shaken any longer. After the religious ritual, the Orthodox believer goes home completely convinced in the true power of ritual actions, in the protection that they can give him, so he applies them on every convenient occasion. For example, to make a sign of cross in each unpleasant situation is one of the most common ways to apply the rituals.

Based on everything that has been said, one can observe exceptional similarity between the Orthodox believers and their practice on the one hand and persons with a diagnosis of obsessive neurosis on the other. However, this similarity does not stop at the Orthodox religion only, it is as valid for Christianity in general, but is equally noticeable with all other religions. This coincidence between the compulsive activities (among the obsessive neurotics) and religious rituals is not superficial or accidental, on the contrary! It is reflected in their performance and the function they deal with. Namely, an obsessive neurotic involves himself in obsessive actions because he believes that he will be protected from the imagined danger, and the religious person participates in a religious ritual because of the belief that he will be saved from sin and gain protection. So, their true aim is exactly the same, and that is the protection from the unconscious temptation and prevention of punishment that ensues because of the suppressed sexual and aggressive desires (4). Therefore, the similarity between religion and religious rituals on the one side and obsessive neurosis with its compulsive actions on the other is not only formal but has the same context, it has the essential character. This way one comes to the same conclusion that Sigmund Freud did, and that is the observation that obsessive neurosis can be marked as individual religiousness and religion as universal obsessive neurosis. The essential matching of the two would consist of progressive renunciation of constitutional instincts (5).

Closely connected to such a character of the Orthodox religion we have a sort of constructional offensive of the Serbian Orthodox Church during the past two decades. A madness of building sacral objects on almost every free building lot deserves to be a subject of a special study and that is why we shall touch it only lightly here, analysing certain aspect of this phenomenon. Above all one should mention the aesthetic side of this phenomenon i.e. architectural solutions of the new sacral objects. Namely, all of the Orthodox religious objects from recent times (since 1989/1990) quote old, medieval architectural solutions and reproduce Raška/Morava and Serbian-Byzantine styles. This phenomenon at the very end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century has as much point as the revival of the gothic style at the end of the 19th century in Germany (the same style of railway stations and post office buildings were built). It was a phenomenon frowned upon the contemporaries who did not believe in such a promotion of the power of the "German spirit". The present day simple reproduction of the solutions from the 13th and 14th centuries (that says a lot about the state of the "Serbian spirit") is in the most direct connection with the above mentioned obsessive-neurotic character of religion (in this case the Orthodox Christianity). Because, as each obsessive neurotic performs his obsessive action in an exact manner, by following the precise order in the precise rhythm in clearly defined coordinates so does the Orthodox religious ritual take place at a certain part of

day, in a certain rhythm and in the equally precise manner. The specific environment that surrounds the ritual plays an important part here, which leads us to the conclusion that the clergy believe that the ritual will lose its power if it does not take place in a building with clearly defined features, and among other things, in a defined architectural solution. As the Orthodox clergy have developed the habit to practice the rituals in premises built in one of the two medieval styles, that can be lead to one ideal solution, it is practically impossible for the Serbian Orthodox Church to accept building churches in styles like baroque or classicism (which is mostly seen in Vojvodina). That is why the new trend of building churches, by copying old architectural solutions in Vojvodina no doubt reveals a desire to subdue Vojvodian particularities and a desire for a sort of clerical unification of Serbia (in a very special way). One should look for signs of politics here.

Building sacral objects in the style that dominated during the middle ages is not exclusively connected to the obsessive-neurotic character of Orthodoxy, but hides an easily recognisable ideological component. Namely the mentioned architectural policies show the intention to remind the public of the glory days of the Serbian Orthodox Church (and with it the Orthodox religion) in the days of that style, which contains within a hardly hidden desire (which is easily recognisable anyway) to utter the request for the return of such a state *urbi et orbi*. The constructional offensive of the Serbian Orthodox Church which is really beginning to acquire the features of *urbicide*, enjoys the open moralistic and materialistic support of state circles, where we see the reflection of the clear connection between the state and the Church. Reproducing the medieval architecture in newly-built object plays an important role there, because the mentioned ideological program of the Church is made public through such projects that symbolise closeness between the state and the Church, which are sponsored by the state.

The essence of the political and ideological program of SOC is contained in the thesis according to which a strong state in symbiosis with the strong Orthodox clerical organisation should lead one, in every way compact Serbian society, above all ethnically, religiously and politically homogenous. We are, therefore, speaking about the society (or rather the community) which should be determined by the old reactionary idea of "Orthodoxy-state-congregation" and the vertical "God in heavens – king on earth – host in the house". The Serbian Orthodox Church obviously aims to achieve a class order of superimposition and absolute obedience, with the equality of the state, church and the society and (the abstract) (6) people, the order that existed (in medieval times), but which is lost and which should be revived. However, this is about a program that has been based on a non-existing, imagined tradition, since the mentioned state-church symbiosis (so-called harmony) has never existed in the Serbian history.

One should also mention the fact that in this program there was a merge of some elements that cannot be merged into one whole, the merge of utterly feudal concepts with modern ones (modern in the sense of when they were conceived) of national-chauvinism and corporative state of a fascist type (in Serbia best known through Ljotić's concept of class

monarchy). But regardless of these and other illogicalities – one can say unexpected ones, logical illogicalities – we are, by all means, speaking of one *par excellence* anti-modern and utterly threatening and teasing political program.

This is the key to how to interpret the building campaign of SOC and its typical architectural solutions. They, on the one side represent a manifestation of the decline of aesthetics, fall and decadence of the system of values in the society and overall civilisation fall – in other words, the manifestation of the social identity crisis, triumph of primitivism and overall regression. On the other hand, the new clerical buildings announce possible directions of its future development and a symbolic presentation of an utterly reactionary political program the implementation of which should realise the possible future. Basically, it is about a program that seriously undermines further functioning and future existence of the modern Serbian society. That is why, in the end, one asks a question of the ways to remove a threat of such dimensions. The solution to the problem is possible only through sorting out the opposition that lays in its basis; since the opposition is resolved by disabling it i.e. abolishing it it, it turns out that the solution to the opposition closely connected to religion, religious oppositions, is achieved exclusively by thwarting or abolishing the religion (7). So, resolving religion though resolving the need for it would represent a right solution for the problem of the social danger represented by the Serb Orthodox Church and its political plans and aspirations.

There is no doubt that, with time, the influence of the Church on the society will become weaker and that the improved material situation will contribute to the weakening of religiousness, especially weakening of the will to publicly demonstrate it. Such a development of relations of the society and the religion is imminent, because, if we define religion as the overall obsessive neurosis, which has arisen, like children's obsessive neuroses, from the Oedipus' complex, one can conclude that the separation from the religion is taking place with the imminence of growing up. What the society needs in such circumstances is to prevent any sort of resistance to the new development and assuming the position in which, like a good teacher, the society tries to support this process and soften the aggression of its imminent advance (8).

However, in this manner the problem would not come close to its solution. Namely, many disadvantages of the Serbian society – the ones which SOC together with the Serbian state does not want to overcome but cement – among which is the religious narrowness, cannot be critically analysed, and then removed, from the point where religion or any of its segments would be seen as a basis for a wider, secular restrictions. Quite contrary, religious limitation can be explained only through the analysis of the secular limitation of a citizen. That is why here we do not assert that the citizens should overcome religious limitations in order to overcome the secular ones, but the opposite. We say that the religious limitations will be completely overcome once the secular limitations have been (9). If the issues of the building expansion of SOC, architectural solutions of the new religious objects, ways of public acting of the Church structures, the character of the Orthodox religion or the

specific and dominant shape of religiousness in the society, stop being just aesthetic issues, issues of town-planning policies, psychology or statistics, but become political issues, and inasmuch the address they are writing to is not the address of SOC but of the Serbian state. Because, by criticising religious weakness of the political state, we should actually criticise the political state in general, regardless of its concrete religious weaknesses (10).

1. Sigmund Freud, Prislne radnje i religijski obredi u: S. Frojd, *Budućnost jedne iluzije i drugi eseji o religiji* (Obsessive Actions and Religious Practices, in S. Freud, *Future of an Illusion and other Essays on Religion*), Belgrade, 2002, page 81.
2. Karl Marx, *Temelji slobode. Osnovi kritike političke ekonomije* (Fundamentals of Freedom, Bases of the Criticism of the Political Economy), Zagreb, 1977, page 17.
3. Wilhelm Reich, *Masovna psihologija fašizma* (The Mass Psychology of Fascism), Zagreb, 1999, page 138.
4. Žarko Trebješanin, "Frojdova analiza religije" (Freud's Analysis of Religion) page 8.
5. Sigmund Freud, Prislne radnje i religijski obredi u: S. Frojd, *Budućnost jedne iluzije i drugi eseji o religiji* (Obsessive Actions and Religious Practices, in S. Freud, *Future of an Illusion and other Essays on Religion*), Belgrade, pages 81 - 82.
6. *Zašto se u crkvi šapuće?* (Why do we whisper in churches?), Peščanik FM, Edited by Svetlana Lukić and Svetlana Luković, Belgrade 2005, page 49.
7. Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Early Works*, Zagreb, 1985, page 56.
8. Sigmund Frojd, *Budućnost jedne iluzije i drugi eseji o religiji*, (Future of an illusion and other essays about religion) page 59.
9. Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Rani radovi*, (Early Works) Zagreb, 1985, pages 60-61.
10. *Ibid.*, page 61.

Criticising of the Clericalisation of Serbia: Analysis of the Church/Modern State Relationship

Miloš Perović

During the history of modern times much has been written about the relationship between the church and the (modern) state, i.e. the phenomenon of separating the church from the state and emancipation of a man/citizen from the authority of the state religion and “official” church. That is why one can question writing about this topic in the time we live in. This questioning would be justified if we were in one of the countries of the so-called Western culture and civilisation and had similar views of the world. But, the analysis of such a topic has become a necessity because our country is only partly (mostly geographically) within that part of the world, and because its extraordinariness within this cultural and civilisation circle is primarily a result of its economical and spiritual backwardness. Today, we are witnessing the aggressive influence of the dominant religious community (Serbian Orthodox Church) over all of the segments of the society, as well as over the problems and issues that are only a matter of the state and its mechanisms of power. Also, the public is offered the dogmatic position that the (Serbian Orthodox) Church is a “moralistic and spiritual restorer of the society”, thus trying to forcefully introduce an idealised and mythical picture of the medieval Serbia as a country of well-being (where Serbia was the biggest territorially, with the greatest influence within this region in its history and so on) and a country where the church and the state had been in a harmonious relationship (which is a historical fallacy!), simply said – it is a state one should aim for. Of course, such behaviour of the dominant church is not a problem by itself. The basis of the problem is the behaviour of the state regarding such clerical positions that it (the state) adopts as official state positions for the most part. What is more, when deciding upon any major situation important for the destiny of the state of Serbia one seeks the opinion of the top of the Orthodox Church. Yet, at the same time, at least nominally, official authorities of Serbia keep stating that their basic goal for the society that they are leading is to become a democratic one and to fully adopt the values that the Western cultural and civilisation circle of countries has adopted. In this paper, we shall try to show that the existence of a democratic, civil society is impossible unless it is secularised, i.e. if the private (here seen as religious feelings of an individual/citizen) is not separated from the general (here seen as the state). This paper should be seen as a criticism primarily of Serbia as a state, not of the Serbian Orthodox Church and its anti-modern dogmas.

It should be pointed out that we shall primarily lean on the, for this topic, always inspirational paper by Karl Marx’s “On the Jewish Question”, since we think that it analysed the relationship between religion (the church) and religiousness of a citizen in general on the one hand with the state on the other, through the prism of the relationship between the civil society and the political state.

Yet, first we have to define the terms “civil society” and “political state”, because without clearly defining these terms we shall not have the basis for the analysis (and criticism, in our case) of the relationship between the church and the state. The civil society dates back to the second half of the 18th century, after the so-called Bourgeois revolution in France (1789), where the subjectivity of a man was thrust forward for the first time in the history of mankind – the subjectivity of an individual, on the basis of which he is separated from the given collective (a self-grown community). With this, the individual takes full responsibility for his life and separates oneself from the authority of the community seen in the likes of an emperor, a king or a feudalist as the bearers of the national sovereignty. And so the individual becomes the bearer of the sovereignty that gives him the opportunity to choose his own representatives in the government and to be elected himself. In such a situation, an individual becomes necessarily doubled into two different spheres that exist in one – to the private and public sphere of a man’s personality. Let us be clear to the end: on the one side, a man exists as a member of the civil society with all of his special i.e. *private* interests, as a *bourgeois*, and on the other side he is seen as a member of the political state, as a political being i.e. a public person or a *citoyen*. So, the basic “idea” of the political state is that the differences that are inevitable, necessary and natural among the members of the civil society, differences in sex, age, national and religious belonging, material status etc., are reconciled by *abstracting* those differences, they offer an equal political right without exception to all of the members of the civil society. Here we shall put aside Marx’s criticism of Hegel’s philosophy of right where one points out to the essential incapacity of the state to reconcile the material differences among the members of the society, which is why, according to Marx, Hegel’s “idea of the state” remains just an idea, because it cannot be fully realised in life-like situations.

But, let us go back to the issue we are interested in: the premise of functioning of the civil society is a political state that reconciles, as a sort of a judge, the differences among the members of such and such society. To make things clear, we should quote one Marx’s statement: “The perfect political state is, by its nature, man’s *species-life*, as *opposed* to his material life. All the preconditions of this egoistic life continue to exist in *civil society outside* the sphere of the state, but as qualities of *civil society*. Where the political state has attained its true development, man – not only in thought, in consciousness, but in *reality*, in life – leads a twofold life, a heavenly and an earthly life: life in the *political community*, in which he considers himself a *communal being*, and life in *civil society*, in which he acts as a *private individual*, regards other men as a means, degrades himself into a means, and becomes the plaything of alien powers. The relation of the political state to civil society is just as spiritual as the relations of heaven to earth.” This makes it clear that all of our personal inclinations, all of our private identities become erased before the modern political state, and precisely because of this we can, as members of a civil society live with other members of the society by keeping our particularities, but so that they remain within the sphere of our private lives. It is only such way of treating our subjectivities before the state that enables us to nurture our subjectivity, because with this principle, the state protects the society from imposing somebody’s particularities as the general principles of a society.

In other words: the religiousness of a man, as one of his special determinations, becomes his private issue or the issue of a special group and the political state treats him or them as such." (1) Marx goes further on and says that "Man, as the adherent of a *particular* religion, finds himself in conflict with his citizenship and with other men as members of the community. This conflict reduces itself to the *secular* division between the *political* state and *civil society*. For man as a *bourgeois* life in the state is only a semblance or a temporary exception to the essential and the rule. Of course, the *bourgeois*, like the Jew, remains only sophisticatedly in the sphere of political life, just as the *citoyen* ('citizen' in French, *i.e.*, the participant in *political* life) only sophisticatedly remains a Jew or a *bourgeois*. But, this sophistry is not personal. It is the *sophistry of the political state* itself... The contradiction in which the religious man finds himself with the political man is the same contradiction in which the bourgeois finds himself with the *citoyen*, and the member of civil society with his *political lion's skin*." (2)

The relationship between religion and a political state is identical to the relationship between a civil society and a political state: this is a relationship between private and general interests. The political state now abstracts people's private interests as one general interest of all the citizens, it banishes them so that the civil society can function at all. "Man emancipates himself *politically* from religion by banishing it from the sphere of public law to that of private law. Religion is no longer the *spirit of the state*, in which man behaves – although in a limited way, in a particular form, and in a particular sphere – as a species-being, in community with other men. Religion has become the spirit of *civil society*, of the sphere of egoism, of *bellum omnium contra omnes*. It is no longer the essence of *community*, but the essence of *difference*. ... The division of the human being into a *public man* and a *private man*, the *displacement* of religion from the state into civil society, this is not a stage of political emancipation but its *completion*; this emancipation, therefore, neither abolished the *real* religiousness of man, nor strives to do so." (3) Therefore, the state does not abolish religion as such, but it abolishes (each individual) religion as a principle of the state – religiousness can be only a private right of a citizen.

Having all this in mind, the issues that lean on the practice of modern states in the world, the lack of understanding the modernity by the ruling elites in Serbia seems purely unbelievable. We can see the essential, epochal – civilisation clash with the world history. At the root of such a state, that definitely demands a deep analysis, lies a high step of civilisation backwardness of political and spiritual elites that create a social reality of this country. And so, we declaratively stand for reaching the values that characterise a modern political state and civil society, but in practice we favour a dominant religious community so much that it sometimes seems that the Serbian Orthodox Church Synod runs the Government of the Republic of Serbia (we have selected this among many concrete examples of our backwardness because of the topic we are dealing with here). In all this, as a final product of such a state of affairs, a specific, uniform atmosphere is being created where it is absolutely unacceptable to have a different opinion or mode of acting from the generally accepted one, form the condition of the state and the elites that lead it. It is exactly that

behaviour of the state that makes it impossible to conceive a civil society. The reason for this is imposing a special, private interest (in our case it is religiousness of the members of one religious community – Serbian Orthodox Church) as the overall interest of the entire society. In such a constellation of social relations it is impossible to introduce the principle of subjectivity as probably the most valuable principle of the modern times.

1. Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, "Early Works", (Rani Radovi), pages 63-64, Naprijed, Zagreb, 1973.
2. Ibid. page 63.
3. Ibid., pages 65-66.



The Diary of Church Insults 2000 – 2006 From Desecularization to Clericalization

Zoran Petakov

Serbian Orthodox Church entered public life in Serbia when Milošević's came to power in order to help the operationalization of Serbian national program. Indeed, the church played very important role in that process. On one side, it gave strong contribution to the awakening of ethnonationalism and hegemonic disposition of the widest population, manipulating religious and national feelings of the citizens and using them in purely political purposes, while, on the other side, it gave direct support to the regime of Slobodan Milošević. After renowned political changes on the October 5th, 2000, it seemed for a moment that this country could step out of the vicious circle of its own autarchy and authoritarianism. Changing the old government, main decision of the state was to strive towards the EU membership and accept its standards, but with Milošević's departure and with the arrival of the new government that openly and manifestly based its legitimacy in anticommunism, ideological obstacles to legalize process of returning the Serbian Orthodox Church into the public sphere were gone and hasty work on the institutional abandonment of the principles of secularity on all levels of social life and the state had begun.

Even the very first moves of the "democratic government" showed the accelerated progression of re-traditionalistic processes and strengthening influence of most reactionary institutions in the society, which paradoxically had the biggest trust of the citizens. From October 5th, 2000 until today, all bearers of power in Serbia showed continuity in behavior that resembled to the government of previous regime. Reproduction of Milošević's regime mechanisms particularly had impact on the sphere of ideology, with the difference that ethnonationalism took the form of reactionary anti-modernism and clericalism, and the new government promised a kind of state and political platform, where the rights of all minorities, not only ethnic minorities, are guaranteed within the framework of a laical state. These promises were just promises, and in reality there were and still are numerous examples of understanding the state as a loot and ignoring everything else except clientelism and political party interests.

Ideological wafer under which this process is taking place is clericalism.

There was extremely realistic danger that the only social consequence after the "birth of freedom" would be general clericalization of public institutions and organs. After all, the most authoritarian of all state institutions, the army, is besides the Serbian Orthodox Church the most prominent bearer of clericalism.

Endeavor of all political subjects and institutions to find integrative element in Serbia for the social system that had collapsed and a strong common denominator for the Serbs that are outside and inside Serbian borders, was evident, but this could also be seen as

the “crusade of Serbian Orthodox Church“. Protection of the religious majority interests in Serbia is articulated through practical political moves and statements of the political elite. Considering that Serbian Orthodox Church is ethnonational institution, the approval of that same program weakens civic principles in the state, which then ceases to be the state of all its citizens and its apparatus becomes an instrument of only one religious organization.

Process of desecularization and clericalization started in the end of 1980ties and the beginning of 1990ties under the regime of Slobodan Milošević. It would be possible to sociologically mark the late 1980ties and the beginning of 1990ties in Serbia as a period of desecularization of society where desecularization was understood, in the first place, as a social process. That process experienced its expansion and universality, for the first time under the government of Zoran Đinđić and then, after his assassination under the leadership of Vojislav Koštunica, it receives the decisive impetus and spreads into the Serbian society. Church became visible in the domain that concerned public politics and state affairs. On the other side, the state became more cooperative in its relations to the Church than it would normally be in one secular society. This text will be a chronological reminder of the most important actors in this process and their role since 2000 onwards.

In the beginning it is necessary to define process of desecularization and clericalization. Desecularization can be easily explained through the notion of secularization. Secularization is the loss of social functions and importance that religion had in the past.

Process of desecularization begins when the Church, religious communities, and religion started to be socially important, and became public institutions with growing influence. The notion clericalization denotes the process where certain political circles and political structures impose the Church in political and cultural life of the state, i.e. when priests and most of believers impose certain Church and then it appears as a partner or even the stronger factor, in comparison to the society. It is important to emphasize that clericalization is not only matter and initiative of the Church, but it is widely accepted in the political circles, and this process creates a conjugation between the power structures, both, in the church and in the state. Historically looking, there are four models of regulating the relation of the state to the religious communities, i.e. churches. The first model is the model of state church. The second is the model of acknowledged churches, historical churches and traditional churches. Third is a model of consistent separation of the church from the state. And the fourth model is the model that could conditionally be called cooperative separation. Serbia has shifted from the model of complete separation between the Church and the state (secular state) through the model of cooperative separation to model of acknowledged, historical churches and traditional churches and is now progressing very fast towards the last model of state church, in other words – clericalism.

Year 2000

Direct contact with the state institutions Serbian Orthodox Church established in November of 2000, on the demand of the Holy Assembly of Bishops to introduce Religious Education

as a regular subject in state schools. Introduction of Religious Education and allowing presence of priests in the Army institutions by the end of the year, were the demands that actually represented a prism diffracting many other more important issues. Moreover, in November of 2000, Information service of Serbian Orthodox Church made an announcement that “secularization brought Serbia and its people into the poverty“. It is interesting that very soon after the October changes, representatives of Religious Education office of the Serbian Patriarchy, declared that “the state should protect its essence and the nation and in that sense it should declare orthodoxy as a state religion, i.e. our state should be verified as a orthodox state“. Former Dean of the Faculty for Religious Studies, Radovan Bigović, declared that “religion is not a private emotional feeling, as we still interpret it“. In its public statements Serbian Orthodox Church strongly attacked the standpoint according to which the religion should be private matter of an individual, and referred to the supporters of laical state as “Satan’s followers“.

Redefining relationship between the state and the Church could also be seen through newly established relationship of Serbian Orthodox Church and the Army of Serbia and Montenegro. Even back in December of 2000, Department for Morale of the General Staff of Yugoslav Army, organized a round table where it supported “introduction of religion to the Army“: “Military priests of the orthodox religion should be present in the Yugoslav Army“, because “religions in our society, even if they are equal before the law, are not equal before our national culture and history, and they don’t have equal contribution to the national culture and to the preservation of the national originality and state independence of Serbian people“. Terms such as “historical and culture importance“, “continuity“ were also used, thus taking the matter to some categories that are not only juridical, but also evaluative.

Year 2001

Year 2001 begun with the marketing lament of the prime minister Zoran Đinđić over the miserable destiny of Saint Sava temple in Belgrade. On the meeting with respectable dignitaries of the Church, Đinđić expressed his expectations that the temple of Saint Sava will be finished in the next year or two, “no matter how much money it may take“, also saying that “it is small amount of money compared to the benefit nation will have when the temple is finished“. Unfortunately the story doesn’t end there. By the end of the same year, Serbian government “injects” around 400 million dinars (approx 5.1 million Euros) of the state budget into the reconstruction of the temple that is still not finished.

In spite the fear of westernization and western culture that is being pinpointed as the key element of all church’s endeavor to form new Serbian identity, Serbian Orthodox Church activated new currents that recognized the need to work on improving the image of the Church. Creating new strategy groups, the Church started to adjust itself to those target groups (urban population in the first place, youth and younger generations) whose identity has been formed under the strong influence of contemporary popular culture, that comes, of course, from the west. Obvious example of those efforts is the project “Songs above East and West“, music album that was released on a CD in April 2001, as a joint release of PGP

RTS (state label) and Radio-Svetigore. The main purpose of that project was to spread the words and thoughts of Nikolaj Velimirović (see page 83). Project gathered great number of renowned pop and rock musicians that wrote and performed music on Velimirović's lyrics. The project had significant media support, even before the CD was released, that presented it as a "symbiosis of rock and roll and orthodoxy", so called "orthodox rock and roll".

Finally, 2001 must be seen as crucial year in the process of clericalization of the society because in that year, by the decision of Zoran Đinđić and by the decree issued by the government of Republic of Serbia, religious education was introduced to the public schools as an optional subject. The wish to reintroduce the religious education to the schools emerged just after the fall of Milošević on the October 5th, 2000. The intention was to start with religious education in the first year of grammar and high schools in the beginning of school year of 2001/2002. After the meeting with the Holy Synod of Serbian Orthodox Church on July 4th, 2001, Prime Minister Zoran Đinđić announced that religious education will start on September 1st. Religious education was reintroduced to schools when Zoran Đinđić simply stood up before the priests and said: "Alright, you will have religious education in schools". His associates later explained that move by the fear of possible interference of church and its dignitaries in the process of extradition of Slobodan Milošević to the Hague tribunal for war crimes and interpreted that catastrophic move of Zoran Đinđić as visionary, not Machiavellistic which it actually was. Government prepared the decree that was in effect on August 4th, 2001 and on April 25th, 2002 Republic Parliament accepted the changes of the Law on Elementary and High School Education. This subject was introduced without any expert debate, without debate about the relation of that subject to other subjects, without distribution of class hour funds and above all, without educated cadre. When it was asked to publish the information on the number of students that chose religious education to those that chose civic education, the answer from the Ministry of Education was that this kind of information can't be published without the permission of Serbian Orthodox Church, which makes no sense. Imagine Ministry asking NGO if it is allowed to publish some information about what is happening in state schools – this fact, more than anything else, illustrates the political supremacy of the Church over the state.

That is why it was not an accident that the decision on introducing Religious Education in 2001 validated by the government decree, was very soon presented to the Constitutional Court of Serbia. The next problem is the relation to the institutions of laical state, such as public school. Did schools remain laical institutions with the tradition to educate, after Religious Education was introduced to Serbian schools? Is public school still "inviolable", non-confessional space? Does it have some kind of autonomy, so that religious groups cannot participate in the educational process? The answer is no, because Serbian Orthodox Church managed to become equal partner with the state in the process of education. If the post-Milošević political elite had really been focused on creation of basic preconditions of free and democratic order, then the discussion would be about urgent need for the deep structural change of our authoritarian school system, and there wouldn't be any additional burdening of that school system with authoritarian and retrograde Religious Education.

Very important for the invading clericalization was creation of para-church organizations like "Otačastveni pokret Obraz" and student's society "Saint Justin Philosopher". As an organization "Obraz" was formed in the beginning of 2001. It was formed by extreme right wing and extreme orthodox intellectuals and students with the support of whole (at that time) united Serbian cultural right. Parallel to them, at the University, emerges society "Saint Justin Philosopher" that was established with the ideological and financial support of Radoš Ljušić (present director of Institute for Textbooks and Teaching Aids). In the beginning it was conceived that "Saint Justin" represents student branch organization of "Obraz", but it was rejected as a plan. First public appearance "Obraz" had in March 2001 with the announcement to the Serbian enemies, signed by Nebojša Krstić, in which they attacked Jews, Ustashas, Muslims, Albanians, democrats, fake peacemakers i.e. NGO, sects, drug addicts and homosexuals. The roots of this movement go back to the mid 1990ties when a magazine "Obraz" was distributed in Belgrade, and everyone was contributing texts, from Dragoš Kalajić and Isidora Bjelica, on to Nebojša Pajkić and Dragoslav Bokan to Patriarch Pavle and Bishops Atanasije and Amfilohije. On several occasions, during 1995 and 1996, Vojislav Koštunica wrote texts for this magazine as well.

Right after establishing "Obraz", series of public discussions all over Serbia were organized with special focus to multinational Vojvodina. So, by the end of 2001 these public discussions were held in Sombor, Zrenjanin, Kikinda, Sremska Mitrovica and even three times in Novi Sad. Discussions were followed by establishing local "Obraz" branches in those cities and "Obraz" graffiti.

In June 2001, members and activists of "Obraz", together with other right-winged organizations were involved in disbandment of gay parade in Belgrade. Anyone who remembers this gay parade, also remembers that the bunch of manic rightists consisting of "Obraz" members, Nazis, "Rad" football club supporters, "Ravna Gora" Chetnik movement supporters and students of Faculty for Religious Studies were led by priest Žarko Gavrilović, that incited those young men to beat the handful of gay movement activists. Church never disassociated itself from this incident.

Year 2002

National-political engagement is the most prominent activity of the Serbian Orthodox Church in 2002. The center issues were so called "schisms" – as Serbian Orthodox Church qualifies relations with Montenegrin and Macedonian Orthodox Church. In case of Macedonia, Serbian Orthodox Church again mooted old and partially solved question of autocephaly of Macedonian Orthodox Church, with the intention to deny its autocephaly, but not to negate the very existence of Macedonian Orthodox Church: "Serbian Orthodox Church acts with undoubtedly political, more precisely, territorial-political goals". In the accomplishment of strategy of creating a "state within a state", Serbian Orthodox Church had an open support from the Army. Soon after that, the Church elected the Bishop for cooperation with the Army (Porfirije), who led the army visit to monastery Hilandar on Mount Athos in April 2002.

Mooting “Macedonian question” in the spring of 2002 stirred relations between two churches. Dispute broke out because of the initiative of Serbian Orthodox Church to find an arrangement between two churches about canonical status of Macedonian Orthodox Church. The solution that was suggested by Serbian Orthodox Church in the spring of 2002 (Metropolitan Amfilohije, Niš’s Bishop Irinej and Vranje’s Bishop Pahomije), and it meant that Macedonian Orthodox Church should waive autocephaly, and in return Serbian Orthodox Church would acknowledge its autonomy. Synod of Macedonian Orthodox Church, however, didn’t accept the solution that Serbian Orthodox Church suggested, after which Patriarch Pavle in the name of the Holy Synod of Serbian Orthodox Church petitioned a public appeal to overcome the “schism” and to reestablish canonical unity of Serbian Orthodox Church. This appeal indirectly signified that the Serbian Orthodox Church is willing to accept even single Dioceses.

Invitation of Serbian Patriarch was accepted by Metropolitan of Veles and Povardarje Diocese, Jovan, which meant the schism within Macedonian Orthodox Church, that is, mediatization of one its part to the Serbian Orthodox Church.

During 2002 the question of Vojvodina’s autonomy arose. Serbian Orthodox Church had an opinion on this question as well, through Bačka Bishop Irinej, one of most important representatives of hard nationalist stream in Serbian Orthodox Church, who is also called “The Red Bishop”, because of his close relations to Milošević regime. Irinej is a member of extreme nationalist movement “Svetozar Miletić”, whose members are, among others, Kosta Čavoski, Vasilije Krestić, Smilja Avramov (nationalist writers and journalists). Same as Metropolitan Amfilohije, Bishop Irinej openly engaged in the political dispute. In January 2002 he declared that Serbian Orthodox Church will denote the anniversary of Fascism victims (“Novi Sad Raid”) separately from the city government if the assembly is going to be addressed by Nenad Čanak, president of Vojvodina Parliament at the time, which has happened. From then on, we have two parallel anniversaries of this sad date – one is of the Church and the other is secular.

In the Broadcasting Law that was ratified by the Republic Parliament on July 18th, 2002, religious thematic was addressed in several paragraphs: in the article 77 that is regulating public radio and TV broadcasting is stated that it will also serve to the religious needs of the citizens. Obligation of the public service broadcaster is to acknowledge traditional, spiritual, historical, culture, humanitarian and educational importance and role of the Church and religious communities in society (article 78). Broadcasting Commission consists of nine members and one of them is representative of religious communities (article 23). Current representative is Serbian Orthodox Church Bishop Porfirije (Perić).

Media campaign of the Church continues and its most important representatives are concerned with the relation between the state and the Church. Patriarch of Serbian Orthodox Church himself supports the “symphony” between the state and the Church. “We consider that the best relationship between the state and the Church is the kind we had before,

it is symphony – consent between the state, i.e. Society and the Church.” (Interview by Patriarch Pavle, Danas, January 5-7th, 2002). This model of church-state relations, that was shaped in Byzantine Empire and evolved through time into in the system that gives the Holy Sanction to the national state, in modern times became the foundation of “church clericalism”.

In Christmas mass in 2002, Patriarch of Serbian Orthodox Church accused parents who are atheists that they have “pushed their offspring to the roads of false happiness and false freedom...”, and continues that they “ruined life of their children.” Both Ministers of Religious Affairs (Republic of Serbia and Federative Republic of Yugoslavia) joined in this delegitimization of atheism. According to Republic Minister Vojislav Milovanović, atheism is to blame for wars, poverty and “moral downfall”, while the Minister in the government of FRY, Bogoljub Šijaković connects atheism to “the state of mind and mental heritage of spiritually and morally deranged society in which we have lived for the past 50 years”.

Year 2003

In 2003, offensive of the church on all elements of the society is continued. Referring to Bishop Nikolaj Velimirović as the highest authority in Serbian Orthodoxy was very recognizable characteristic in communication between Serbian Orthodox Church and its herd in the last ten years. Bishop Nikolaj is the cult person of the most controversial, today dominant, stream of Serbian Orthodox Church, whose basic characteristics are anti-westernism in the broadest sense and nationalism with fascist elements. The remains of Bishop Nikolaj were transferred to Serbia in May 1991, in the days when Serbia was starting the war on the territory of former Yugoslavia, in concordance with endeavor of Milošević’s regime to efficiently conduct mobilization of nationalist euphoria and pro-war atmosphere in Serbia. After the October 5th, 2000, Serbian Orthodox Church even more noticeably promoted Bishop Nikolaj. It characterizes him as “the biggest Serb after Saint Sava”, creating a myth for the people and a “trademark of Serbianity and Orthodoxy”. In the presence of the army’s high command, on March 24th, the anniversary of the beginning of NATO intervention in Serbia, in the monastery Soko, the Church unveils the monument dedicated to this controversial bishop, who showed unhidden respect to Hitler and whose ideas contained unveiled Antisemitism. Long lasting trend of glorification of this orthodox theologian, Bishop of Ohrid and Žiča, Nikolaj Velimirović, conducted by the Church and other circles, reached an epilogue when the Holy Assembly of Serbian Orthodox Church canonized Nikolaj Velimirović, i.e. declared him a saint on May 19th, 2003.

One of the most important events in 2003 were the accusations for pedophilia and criminal sexual conduct against Pahomije, Bishop of Vranje. The accused, Tomislav Gačić (Bishop Pahomije), was charged that he abused his position of Vranje Diocese Bishop and during 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 sexually harassed four boys that were helping in church matters in that Diocese. Prolonging the court hearings, two out of four charges expired in the meantime.

In 2003, Serbian government verified a decree that regulated issuing additional postage stamp “Building a memorial temple Saint Sava”. It was obligatory, and every piece of mail had to have this additional post stamp.

In December 2003, Boris Tadić, defense minister at that time, announced formation of a team that will create normative acts regulating religious issues in Serbia and Montenegro Army: “Model for regulation of religious issues in the Army will be in concordance with Serbian Orthodox Church and other ‘traditional’ religious communities“, proclaimed the Public relations service of Ministry of Defense. The intention was to open military academies and medical institutions to priests. This gesture of Boris Tadić obviously was preparation for his presidential campaign.

Year 2004

The year 2004 is important because the coalition led by Democratic Party of Serbia came into power, and the government was formed by well-known conservative and clericalist Vojislav Koštunica, who gave even more power to the Church that openly started working on abolition of secular state.

Scandalous reactions of church dignitaries regarding the celebration of “The First Serbian Uprising” marked the beginning of that year. Since they considered the celebration to be inappropriate they decided to have parallel one. That didn't shake the “symphony” between the state and the church, so in March 2004 new Republic Minister of Religious Affairs, Dr. Milan Radulović, announced that 2,1 million Euro will be given to religious communities during that year: “According to Radulović, ministry he is presiding, will finance priests and monks in Kosovo and Metohija, and they would receive monthly payment of approximately 250 Euro”.

Behaving in such manner state organs led Serbia to deep into ideological unitarism, and both the state and the church showed efforts to turn Church into a political party. One of the pillars of secular state was destroyed when Faculty for Religious Studies became part of Belgrade's University.

The Faculty for Religious Studies of Serbian Orthodox Church belonged to Belgrade's University until 1952 when the former government decided the opposite. Serbian government annulled this decision on January 9th, 2004, thus starting the process of returning this faculty to the University. Minister of Religious Affairs in Serbian government, Milan Radulović, on July 16th, 2004, declared “that Faculty for Religious Studies of Serbian Orthodox Church is starting of today again financed from the budget of Ministry of Education, like all other educational institutions.”

Army of Serbia and Montenegro was still an institution on the higher level than the Republic. The first collective baptism of officers and soldiers of a Serbian military unit was organized in monastery Vavedenje in 2004, near Čačak.

Political intention of new Serbian government with Prime Minister Vojislav Koštunica, was clear and obvious through making “Proposal for the Law on freedom of religion, churches, religious communities and religious organizations” (July 2004) in which the state have made major concessions to the Church, including the institution of immunity before the law for the priests. That document gave the leading role to Serbian Orthodox Church, in contrast to other religious communities, and on the practical level it was clear that the Church, with the logistic help of the state, had full authority to decide who has the right to praise the Lord on its “ancient territory”. At the same time Ministry of Religious Affairs of Serbia positioned itself almost like some kind of “external, state service” of Serbian Orthodox Church. In fact, the clear separation between the state and the church more and more blurred. Structures of political power are more and more to religious structures and vice versa, thus opening clear path to clericalization of society. According to that legal act, the state is obligated to provide or guaranties to the churches a whole set of things (for example, classes of religious education in public schools), and religious communities and their clerks are almost untouchable, exempted from paying taxes and immune to civil laws.

That kind of autonomy and privileges, church in Serbia hardly experienced in the past, when Serbia was part of the Kingdom. After that the state and Serbian Orthodox Church make mutual, equally vigorous, efforts to speed up the process of desecularization because “theoretical” and ideological interventions (even from the positions in the ministry) are



being conducted in the domain of education, culture and public life in general. In the spirit of fundamentalist dispute of evolution theory and affirmation of Creationism, Minister of Education in the government of Vojislav Koštunica, Ljiljana Čolić, tried to remove Darwin's theory from education programs with a "private decree". What is very striking is the support to this crazy behavior by Minister for Capital investments, Velimir Ilić, who after the removal of Darwin's theory from educational programs stated that to him „the word of Patriarch is the law and since Patriarch said that humans didn't evolve from the ape, he supports the decision of the minister to remove the theory from the program“.

At the same time, the Ministry of Education made a huge effort to impose religious education over civic education in schools, and although both subjects up to that moment had equal status among optional subjects, the church suddenly became a public institution on the state budget, and even one article of the law says that the organs of the local self management are obligated to schedule referendum if it is asked by the church or religious community.

The attempt to ideologically embed clericalization is "Draft proposal of Serbian youth national program for the 21st century" in February 2004. That is a document that was first proposed and then accepted on Preobraženje (Transformation - religious holiday) in 2004. by the Council of Serbian Youth. One of the leaders of this Council, Branimir Nešić, presented the Draft at Sretenje (Serbian Statehood Day) spiritual assembly entitled "Su čim ćemo pred Karađorđa..."(What are we going to tell Karađorđe...), held at Dom sindikata in Belgrade. Keynote speakers at this assembly were representatives of Serbian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Amfilohije Radović and retired Bishop Atanasije Jevtić, together with the representatives of the Army and Minister of religious affairs of Republika Srpska. The Draft has 13 articles.

According to this document that was supported by the Serbian Orthodox Church, the future of Serbian state should be based on "Saint Sava's preaching, Kosovo oaths, questioning of contemporary Serbian culture, education and history, its relations with others, creating elite, preserving Serbian language and Cyrillic alphabet, restoration of Serbian villages, household, parish community, church-people assemblies, democracy and monarchy, spiritual vertical of Serbian history" following the model God-King-Householder, which has metaphysical-political connotation. Church does not need parliament and political parties. With this document church renounced an objective process that was accomplished long time ago – European society had been secularized more than two centuries ago and it is irreversible process.

The difference between the amount of trust that people have in the government and the Church became obvious before the parliamentary elections in 2004 in Kosovo, when just before the elections the Church openly and publicly opposed to the appeal of Serbian president, Boris Tadić, who advised Kosovo Serbs to take part in the elections. The leader of Serbian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Pavle, appealed to Kosovo Serbs to stay at their

homes on the election day. "Almost complete Serbian boycott that followed, once again showed that Serbian Orthodox Church has more influence on Kosovo than Serbian president, even when it comes to political issues like taking part in the elections", as it was written in political magazine NIN.

Expansion of clericalism in 2004 is ending with the operation of placing a hideous iron cage that couldn't be called a church, not even with the help of most vivid imagination. But, it is possible to put it on mountain Rumija in Montenegro with the help of military helicopter. Operation commander was Metropolitan of Montenegro and the Littoral Diocese, Amfilohije.

Year 2005

Year 2005 started with a scandal that shocked Serbian public. Church posed moral question if it is in concordance with religion and in the Christian spirit to organize manifestation like "Sausage fest" during the Great lent. Because of organizing "Sausage fest" during the Great lent, bishop of Bačka, Irinej Bulović, punished the people of Turija with the two-day dead-bell ringing, while the local priest was forbidden to enter the house of manifestation organizers for a year.

Archbishop Jovan Vraniškovski was "convicted and sent to serve two and a half years in prison on July 27th, 2005 because of stimulating national and religious hatred, discord and intolerance." This provoked the reaction of political elite in Serbia. On the occasion of sentencing Archbishop Jovan, Velja Ilić obstinately imposed air traffic sanctions to Macedonia, and the government didn't comment on that. The leader of political party Movement Strength of Serbia, Bogoljub Karić, even threatened that he will block the border with Macedonia on September 1st, 2005 unless Archbishop is released from prison, and in that way he appropriated state prerogatives. Of course, that didn't happen but that was another example of a special symbiosis of the state and the church. "This is the time to show our strength", stated Velimir Ilić, Minister for Capital Investments in the Serbian government, when he was asked to comment on prison sentence to Vraniškovski. "What has happened to Archbishop Jovan in Macedonia became unbearable and cannot be tolerated... Church that I believe in, and especially its dignitaries, cannot be looked at with disdain", minister added.

This example is most indicative of the pathological state that our society is in today. Serbian government also thought that it is necessary to include almost entire Synod of Serbian Orthodox Church in the first official negotiations on the future status of Kosovo, and acknowledge their opinion as legitimate. It was particularly frightening that one of the participants was Tomislav Gačić, also known amongst boys as Pahomije, who was still on trials for pedophilia at the time.

The eruption of protests was provoked by canonization of WWII butchers, members of Chetnik groups, that committed unthinkable atrocities in the name of Ravna Gora ideology

in Montenegro, that was on the other side completely restored by the Serbian government, which in that way supported Amfilohije Radović who proposed the canonizing.

Government continues to behave as a branch office of Serbian Orthodox Church, and the process of clericalization didn't even exclude the president of republic. Namely, president Boris Tadić traveled to Moscow together with Patriarch, as it has been reported, to the official church-state visit. The entire meaningfulness of political situation in Serbia was expressed in that way, because the president of the republic is on a church-state visit, from the state that is according to the Constitution defined as secular.

Year 2006

In 2006, by the means of the law the expressed effort towards clericalization is being operationalized, and it becomes institutionalized by passing two key laws: Law on religious communities and law about restitution. By these two legal acts clerical clique received a legal framework of action and their job is under cover of the law made easy. The law on religious communities says that "Churches and religious communities can perform religious rituals in schools, state institutions, hospitals, army, police, institutions of social and child care, prisons, public and private firms, citizen's apartments and other appropriate places". "According to the law, Ministry of Religious Affairs is obligated to educe at least 20% out of overall annual donations to the churches and religious communities and use that money for their culture and publishing programs" (Article 39).

It is evident that through this law, Ministry of Religious Affairs choosing between orthodox canons and European conventions chose canons. If Ministry of Religious Affairs identifies its standpoints with the inner law organization of one religious community, then can no longer be discussion about the existence secular principle of separated church and state, and this practically annuls secular character of the state. Particularly interesting is the article of the law according to which "Priests, i.e. religious clerks, cannot be called to responsibility before the state organs for their actions while performing their duty". Practically this means that they are guaranteed immunity for everything they do or say. This immunity is being widely used by the church dignitaries over the 2006.

Soon after this law was passed, County Court in Niš confirmed an acquitting verdict to Bishop of Vranje, Pahomije, prosecuted in the Municipal Court in Niš because of charges for pedophilia and criminal sexual conduct with boys, future priests. Three-member council, headed by the president of this court, Dr Danilo Nikolić, on June 29th decided to dismiss appeal from the Municipal Public Prosecution to annul the acquitting verdict and to take it in consideration again. Council of the second degree, however, didn't reveal the reasons for waiving the appeal of the Municipal prosecution, and that was without hesitation supported by Public County Prosecution in Niš.

Then steps in bishop of Bačka, Irinej who, with the help of police, interrupted Italian theater troupe "Teatro dei Venti" street performance, saying that the police was invited to

stop the Italian street performance in front of Vladičanski dvor (Bishop's Palace) in Novi Sad in order to stop barbaric act in front of the church and his windows. Bishop stated that the performance of "Teatro dei Venti" is not a play but "arrogant and primitive satanic session". It was also stated that "Satan worshipers" showed in time for the sermon that was being held in chapel of Vladičanski dvor, and that he asked for police protection. Even though the two-hour program at the Square of Liberty and Zmaj Jovina street in Novi Sad was announced and reported to the police by the organizers, Students Cultural Center, the show was stopped ten minutes before it ended. After Bishop of Bačka, Irinej called the performance of "Teatro dei Venti" satanic, and the police upon his call violently stopped the street performance in Novi Sad, few citizens of Ruma, seven days later in the presence of priest insulted the actors. After this, director Stefano Te decided to stop the program.

Encouraged by the acquitting verdict for pedophilia charges, bishop of Vranje, Pahomije submitted to Novi Sad County Court lawsuit against artist Živko Grozdanić and "Art klinika", because of the insult to the reputation and honor of "prominent dignitary" of Serbian Orthodox Church. Namely, in his artistic performance Grozdanić depicted him as a pedophile.

This chronological overview is just a small part of church-state activities in the process of abolition of secular state and turning Serbian society in reactionary and clerical one. It is obvious that Serbia in this "historical confusion" didn't understand what was happening, when the church is capable to cancel artistic freedom and put anathema on the artists, spread the fear of progress, bless arms, threatens to those who eat sausage at the time of fasting, etc.

In the state of complete absence of critique towards Serbian Orthodox Church and its strategies and ways of spreading the influence, that should come from any segment of the society, in which political parties, state institutions, media, universities, culture public are practically running to ingratiate themselves with the church and hesitate to criticize its actions or actions of its officials, it is hard to expect that Serbian Orthodox Church will have enough strength to reform itself or at least rethink its position in the society. It is obvious that Serbian Orthodox Church today is convinced that it will gain historical, actually mythological position, but it is important to note that it never had that position in the history. In that kind of system it endeavors to interweave in the "symphony with the state", and with the society, to create one class, hierarchical order of dominance, subordination and absolute submission and in that sense to equalize the state, church, society and nation. Are they going to succeed depends on those forces that see the devastating consequences that this policy of the state and the church have in the society and on the degree of volition of these progressive forces to confront this process of clericalization. It is our duty to disrupt and stop the retrograde process of clericalization in every way following the principle of the great philosopher that says that the critique of religion is assumption of every critique.

