

Sergeev, Mikhail. *The Project of the Enlightenment: Essays on Religion, Philosophy and Art*. Moscow: Russian Philosophical Society, 2004. Reviewed by Victor Shlenkin.

In this collection of essays, written in both Russian and English, Mikhail Sergeev elaborates on the present state of religious, philosophical, and cultural affairs in Russia, comparing its situation with the current religious and philosophical situation in the West. He makes his observations and examines various issues covering the historical period of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This reviewer is not an expert in philosophy or the arts, and accordingly, this review will focus chiefly on religion and theology, where I believe I can contribute to the subject matter. The religious theme is found in the second part of the collection, while in the first part Sergeev's reflections are of a more philosophical and cultural nature. Sergeev describes his religious convictions quite openly, presenting himself as a "liberal Orthodox" (a label which I will discuss more fully below). Therefore, I should likewise admit openly that I belong to the conservative Evangelical confession, and the framework of my own theological assumptions will be obvious in my analysis of Sergeev's work.

Sergeev's own label for himself - "liberal Orthodox" - implies both the limitations and the strengths of his position, and I would like to comment on both of these. First, his work is limited because his strong commitment to Orthodoxy leads him to misunderstand and even to ignore other Christian traditions in Russia. Many among the Orthodox, not to mention the mass media, are reluctant even to admit the existence of Evangelicals in Russia. The present Council/Committee on Religious Affairs includes only three traditional religions: Orthodox (instead of simply Christians), Muslims, and Buddhists. Although Russia is (according to the Constitution) a secular state in which religions stand on equal footing, these three religions are regarded as "the most equal." This paradoxical situation in a supposedly democratic country is an essential aspect of the religious landscape in Russia, and it must be dealt with. I believe that Sergeev's lack of attention to this point is a significant weakness in his presentation. His perspective on the religious situation in post-Soviet Russia would have been greatly enriched if he had acknowledged the fact that Russian Evangelicals are a significant religious force in the Russian Federation, and thus if he had dealt with some issues that are relevant to the Evangelicals.

When Sergeev does address issues pertinent to Evangelicals, he displays a misunderstanding of the character of Protestantism in Russia. In his article "Russian Orthodoxy: Renewal or Revival?" Sergeev makes clear that by "Protestantism" he means the liberal Protestantism that has dominated Lutheran and Reformed Europe for several centuries. However, in Russia Protestantism is primarily represented in its conservative, non-conformist strand: Baptists, Pentecostals, and Adventists. (Recently there have appeared some more "mainline" Evangelical Missions such as Presbyterian, Methodist, Nazarene, Reformed, and others, but at this point these are a very small percentage of Russia's Protestants.) Because Sergeev is concerned primarily about liberal Protestantism, the issues he deals with are not always relevant to the situation in Russia. He argues that the two great stumbling blocks to Orthodox-Protestant relations are Protestantism's lack of commitment to the authority of Scripture and its rejection of the Church's oral tradition. But both of these criticisms apply to liberal Protestantism much more than to the kind of Evangelicalism found in Russia.

In the conservative Evangelical churches of Russia, the authority of Scripture is not questioned. Evangelicals engage in considerable debate about the nature of inspiration and the question of biblical inerrancy, but the issue of *Sola Scriptura* is beyond any doubt (see p. 96). Furthermore, the relationship between the Holy Scriptures and tradition occupies an important place in Evangelical theology.³ Now I should add that Russian Evangelicals rarely raise this issue directly - Russian Evangelicals do not yet have their own representative theologians due to the difficulties of studying under the Soviet regime. However, Evangelicalism as a whole does give tradition a vital role in doing theology, and the importance of tradition is becoming apparent to Russian Evangelicals as well. One can argue that tradition has an important place among Evangelicals, even if that place is not always

³See the noteworthy article dealing with this question: Alister E. McGrath, "The Importance of Tradition for Modern Evangelicalism," in Donald Lewis, ed. *Doing Theology for the People of God: Studies in Honor of J. I. Packer*, edited by 159-173 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996) 159-73.

recognized. The difference between Evangelical Protestantism and Orthodoxy is not that the former rejects tradition outright, as Sergeev's attention to liberal Protestantism leads him mistakenly to conclude. Instead, the difference is that for Orthodox scholars, tradition has a certain mystical sense (so the Bible, Councils, Church Fathers, etc., are not so much sources of theology as they are merely witnesses of the Holy Spirit's life in the Body of Christ); but for Evangelicals, on the other hand, tradition is primarily understood as an aid for interpreting the Scriptures. As a result, in both camps tradition is present, but it functions very differently!

Therefore, on both the question of scriptural authority and the issue of tradition, Sergeev misunderstands Protestantism by paying too much attention to its liberal variant, which is NOT the variant most commonly found in Russia. Of course, it is normal for a person to lump his "opponents" into one category, rather than seeking to enumerate various strands of thought among them. But even though this is normal, it is not appropriate in scholarly dialogue. Sergeev's lack of attention to the differences among Protestants, and especially his failure to deal with the strand of Protestantism most represented in his own country, is a significant weakness of his presentation.

If Sergeev's *Orthodoxy* hinders him from seeing clearly the true state of the religious landscape in Russia, his *liberal* Orthodoxy constitutes the great strength of this book. More specifically, it enables him to discern clearly two very different strands of Orthodox thought in Russia, which he calls "renewal" and "revival" Orthodoxy. This is quite an original approach to the situation, and Sergeev's thought here calls for extended comment.

The author speaks of Eastern Orthodoxy and Protestantism as "roots and fruits of the same tree." He continues:

The recognition of the latter by the former as part of itself, and acceptance of what it has given to humanity, I would call the "renewal" of the Orthodox faith, while resistance to growing with its younger sibling, the hostility toward Protestantism in its secular or religious form, I would call the "revival" of Orthodoxy. (p. 97)

Sergeev explains renewal and revival Orthodoxy further through an historical excursion into the philosophical climate in nineteenth-century Russia, speaking of two opposite movements, Westernism and Slavophilism. It is evident from the terms themselves that these movements indicate an inclination either to the West or to the East. Therefore, in Slavophilic circles there was a great deal of contempt for the idea of any contact or cooperation with the West. Sergeev refers to the words of Khomyakov, who alluded to Protestantism as a simple "degradation" of Roman Catholicism. On the other hand, Westernists such as Pyotr Chaadaev saw Catholicism as a guardian of Christian civilization and regarded the Russian political and religious course with skepticism.

At this point the author makes clear his own attitude toward renewal and revival. He concludes that if the Russian Orthodox Church chooses renewal, this will involve openness to ecumenical dialogue with Protestants and the mutual enrichment of both sides through this fellowship. On the other hand, if the Russian Orthodox Church moves toward what he calls revival, this will involve continued hostility toward Protestantism (and especially, I may add, toward Evangelicalism). In any event, "revival" will mean the failure to accommodate a democratic society or to arrange its own ecclesiastical life within that society.

Through this discussion of renewal and revival, the notion of "liberal" Orthodoxy also comes into clearer focus. Sergeev remarks that the philosophical activity of such figures as Vladimir Solov'ev in Russia was almost unnoticed and completely forgotten during the Soviet regime; and Solov'ev's followers, Fr. Sergey Bulgakov and Nicholas Berdyaev, were sharply criticized and opposed by their fellow Russian ex-patriots in France. The followers of the "liberal" trend in Orthodoxy have a great sympathy toward Protestantism and express a desire to enter into dialogue, acknowledging in Protestants the same Christian spirit that the Orthodox have. (It is worth pointing out here that Sergeev's terminology of "liberal" and "conservative" corresponds to the distinction that Donald Fairbairn draws between mature Orthodoxy and popular Orthodoxy in his book *Eastern Orthodoxy through Western Eyes*.)

Sergeev sets out his view of what liberal Orthodoxy would look like in his article, "Liberal

Orthodoxy: From Vladimir Solov'ev to Fr. Alexander Men." Adherents of this liberal trend advocate drawing a political line with regard to the separation of Church and State. The most outstanding advocate of separation between Church and State in Russia was Alexander Men, who was murdered as a result, and then became a most popular figure not only among liberal Orthodox but also among Evangelical Christians both in Russia and in the West. Here many Evangelicals find themselves having much sympathy with so-called "liberal" Orthodoxy, and if Russian Orthodoxy were to move in such a "liberal" or "renewal" direction, this development would receive a wholehearted welcome from Evangelicals. However at present the political course of the Russian Orthodox Church is far away from the position of Bulgakov or Men. Nationalistic Orthodox unions or "*bratstva*" have grown, exhibiting a tendency toward a monarchic structure in Russian politics and a general lack of interest in building a society based on equality and the rule of law. In many ways, this trend seems to be the dominant feature of modern Russian Orthodoxy, the element that constitutes its ecclesiastical inner life. In light of this actual state of affairs in the Russian Orthodox Church, the appearance and advancement of a "liberal" Orthodoxy, such as that which Sergeev advocates, would be highly desirable.

Closely tied to the "non-liberal" strand of Orthodoxy in Russia is religious nationalism, which Sergeev discusses in his short essay, "Russia and the Jews: Reflections about Metaphysical Images of Jerusalem" (pp. 40-44). Religious nationalism in Russia is most evident with regard to the Jews. Sergeev argues that Russians and Jews are both martyr-nations ("*narodni-stradaltsi*"), though their sufferings are of different natures. Whereas Jews suffered in the face of external enemies, Russians suffered at the hands of their cruel rulers. Thus, we can assume, Russians are jealous because Jews as a nation constitute a competing factor, a threat to Russia's identity as a suffering messianic people, and should consequently be removed. Sergeev points out that the idea of religious nationalism is prominent in the writings of some of the Church hierarchs. Then the author uses some biblical texts demonstrating the role of the Jews in fulfilling biblical prophecies as a way of emphasizing that Russian messianic expectations are vain. His conclusion is that Russians who step onto the new democratic stage must recognize this problem and show some sort of respect for the Jewish people, to whom Christians owe their origin. This appeal for kinder treatment of Jews by the Orthodox in Russia should also be welcomed by Evangelicals, who also encounter nationalistic opposition from the Russian Orthodox Church.

Sergeev's laudable appeal for tolerance of Jews is especially poignant in light of some recent events in Russia. Anti-Jewish spirit, always present in Russia, was shockingly expressed in the recently-issued "Document of 500": 500 people, including 20 deputies from the Duma (the Senate) signed a document demanding a ban on all Jewish organizations in Russia. Similar acts are quite common in Russia, and now they come close to defining a political policy among some religious Orthodox fundamentalists (extremists?). What is more, religious nationalism in Russia is evident in view of the newly organized "*bratstva*" which stand for the restoration of the monarchy. With events such as these in mind, it is rather unlikely that the "new democratic Russia" for which the author longs could easily change Russia's mentality or her attitude not only toward Jews, but also toward Evangelicals and others, who are considered foreigners in their own country.

In the end, Sergeev concludes that Russia (or perhaps the Russian Orthodox Church?) nowadays faces two options: the path of revival or the path of renewal. The first option, Sergeev believes, would set Russia on the path of hostility toward the West and would produce messianic forms of nationalism (or, to use a term that was coined by the Ecumenical patriarch, "philetism"). The second option would "witness the spirit of ecumenicity and interreligious dialogue, the establishment of democratic institutions, and an aspiration for universalism and the global integration of humankind" (p. 101). The author believes that the second option must prevail. However, I suggest that in view of all the current evidence from Russian society, it seems that Russia is already on the path of "revival," making its way toward religious exclusivism. It also seems that Russia is constructing a hybrid-state that combines religious ideology and some democratic elements. Some observers claim that Russia reflects a new *clerical ideology* that replaces the former Soviet one. Sergeev's optimism seems misplaced; Russia is not headed toward the "liberal Orthodoxy" he advocates.

I believe that Sergeev's book, in spite of its incompleteness and the weaknesses I have

mentioned, is of paramount importance for the study of the religious situation in Russia. The book's two major merits, I suggest, are the author's sincere desire to admit the existing diversity in Christianity today, and his acknowledgment of the need for Orthodoxy to engage in cooperation and dialogue with Protestant groups. Unfortunately, few Orthodox in Russia itself share Sergeev's desire, since the Church in Russia appears to have already chosen the path of "revivalistic" Orthodoxy. It is also unfortunate that few among the Evangelicals in Russia acknowledge the need for any cooperation and dialogue with the Orthodox. Persecution of Protestants by "revivalistic" Orthodoxy has so embittered Evangelicals that they can muster no trust of the Orthodox or even desire to take them seriously. Sergeev is right that this situation needs to change, but it is unlikely to do so unless revivalistic Orthodoxy gives way to renewal Orthodoxy on Russian soil.

Victor Shlenkin

Popescu, Alexandru, *Petre Țuțea: Between Sacrifice and Suicide*. (Aldershot, England, and Burlington, VT, USA: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2004) 353 pp. paperback. Reviewed by Michael S. Jones.

In many countries of the Soviet bloc, imprisonment of intellectuals who were not sympathetic to Socialist ideology was widespread and even systematic. There are many great intellectual and spiritual figures who are lost to the world because of the political prisons of Soviet-block countries. Great or promising intellectuals entered these "gulags" and disappeared, died, or were broken. The stories of these lost heroes deserve to be heard. However, Petre Țuțea's is not one of them. Petre Țuțea (1902-1991) rose to greatness *because of* his gulag experience.

Țuțea was born in 1902 in a rural Romanian village. He studied law in Transylvania, earning master's and doctoral degrees, and also studied in Germany. Țuțea read widely, both within and outside of his areas of specialization. He worked as a government administrator, eventually rising to the position of Director of the Office of Economic Publications and Propaganda. During WWII he served as a Director in the Ministry of War Economy.

Țuțea began publishing articles, many of which were on political subjects, in the mid-1920's. His political views seem to have passed through several stages, and at different points in his life he seems to have sympathized with democratic ideals, Marxist thought, and right-wing nationalism. His interests prior to the installation of communism in Romania in 1948 were primarily in the fields of economics and public policy. It is perhaps his outspokenness in these areas and his positions in the governments that preceded communism that made Țuțea a target for "re-education."

Țuțea was imprisoned in facilities specially designated for the "re-education" (brainwashing) of political prisoners, including the prisons at Ocnele Mari and Aiud. His time in prison encompassed 1948 through 1953 and again from 1956 through 1964. Prison life entailed living with very little food, scarce access to other necessities, and sometimes forced labor. Re-education involved enduring severe physical and psychological abuse in addition to ideological indoctrination. The goal of re-education was conversion of the prisoners to the secular communist world-view. Converts were promoted from torture victim to torturer.

A man of education and culture, Țuțea enjoyed a certain amount of prestige and prosperity through his administrative career. The loss of these, the potentially devastating change in his personal circumstances, and the disappointment in the direction taken by his country could have crushed his spirit. Add to this the systematic brutality of a prison system designed intentionally to break the human spirit, and it would be easy to understand if Țuțea had lost his sanity or abandoned his beliefs. His response was just the opposite: loss and imprisonment drove Țuțea to profound, sustaining spirituality, and a philosophy based thereon.

Țuțea's philosophy is a synthesis of science, culture, theology, and philosophy. It is remarkably religious considering the fact that his background is in economics and government. His philosophy could perhaps be described as a Romanian Orthodox philosophical anthropology. He succeeds in using basically secular terminology and a wide array of intellectual sources to express

Christian convictions. In reaction to, or in distinction from, the philosophy of his communist/socialist oppressors, which devalued humans and humanity and exalted the state, Țuțea believed that Christ's love gives value to all people. Christ views each person as an end in his or her self, not merely as means to be exploited for the benefit of the collective.

According to Țuțea, human enterprises such as art, science, technology, and philosophy are merely means to greater humanitarian and doxological ends. However, this does not result in Țuțea's philosophy having a pessimistic tone: on the contrary, his philosophy is very optimistic. This is a result of the theology implicit in Țuțea's philosophy: Țuțea believes both that it is possible for a person to successfully follow God, and that God is actively involved in human history. This optimism was virtually a necessity in Țuțea's life: without it he would not have survived his imprisonment experiences. This fact testifies to the potency of his philosophy: it has been tried by fire and has withstood the test.

Christ's life and message provide the paradigm for successful human life. Imitation of Christ is the way to maximize one's earthly life; love for God and love for others is the result of this imitation, which benefit both self and others. The anxiety that each human experiences can best be resolved by a humble seeking after God, which directs human energies into paths that result in ultimate, lasting joy. However, Țuțea is clear that unaided human seeking and human creativity cannot reach God; only through God's grace can humans succeed in fulfilling their religious and non-religious potential.

This raises the question of the proper place of reason according to Țuțea's philosophy. According to Țuțea, true religion is revealed religion. More precisely, true revealed religion is Christ. All other religion, including much or all (I'm not sure which of these is more correct) of Christianity, is mere human activity. Truth cannot be reached via pure analytic reason. The mind must be brought into parity with the heart and the body. This does not mean that reason must be abased, but rather that its analytic faculty must cease to be "judgmental" of the input of heart and body. Intellectual activity is valued, but so are emotional, aesthetic, ethical, and religious intuitions. Pure rationalism is sterile; philosophically, an alternative such as Romanticism would be preferable, while theologically, an alternative like mysticism is preferred.

It has already been stated that Țuțea's philosophy opposes communist/socialist philosophy. Țuțea believed that pride was the original sin, and that humanism is the prevalent contemporary version of this sin. Humanism, however, wears other guises in addition to communism. In addition to opposing Marxist communism, Țuțea also opposed materialist capitalism and the philosophies of eliminative materialism and Darwinian (non-theistic) evolution. He criticizes secular existentialism, which was popular among some of his Romanian philosophical contemporaries (eg. Cioran), as lacking space for holiness and heroism. Similarly, he offers an alternative to the bifurcation of Neo-Kantian philosophy, another influential movement among some of Țuțea's Romanian contemporaries (eg. Błaga), and argues for a "*correspondence* between sensory taste, spiritual discernment, intellectual joy, ontic mystery, vocational activity, scientific curiosity, and social identity." (261). He provides critiques of a wide range of philosophical movements, including both determinism and indeterminism, chaos theory, aporetic philosophy, and eleatic philosophy. The alternative he suggests to these is a philosophy of "nuance" that sees in the logic of nature a universal rational order that mirrors divine reason and harmony, yet without providing access thereto. The resulting philosophy heightens the unpredictability of existence for humans but also provides a basis for human emotional comfort and assurance.

Despite Țuțea's philosophical interests and vocabulary, at its heart his philosophy is a wide-ranging application of the Orthodox interpretation of Christianity. Popescu writes, "Țuțea presents a deeply traditional Orthodoxy in an often disconcertingly secular, interdisciplinary guise." (261). This Orthodoxy of Țuțea's philosophy is clearly seen in the almost mystical aspects of his philosophy of religion, in his insistence on the necessity of revelation, in the sacramentalism of his soteriology, and in his emphasis on the importance of community. Țuțea taught that since Christian truth is love, this truth can only be experienced in community. This led him to stay engaged with his fellow prisoners and also with those who imprisoned them. His Orthodoxy is also reflected in the proclamatory rather than analytic style of his philosophy, and in his ability to show forgiveness towards his torturers. Țuțea's

philosophy, bound up in his Christian faith, enabled him to minister both to his fellow inmates and to those who were charged with keeping and re-educating them.

In summation, perhaps it could be said that two basic features distinguish Țuțea's philosophy. The first of these is his unique utilization of philosophy and broad cultural learning to compose a wide-ranging Orthodox Christian philosophy. The second is his consistent practice of this philosophy even under the most difficult circumstances.

The author of this book, Alexandru Popescu, is a Bucharest psychologist and an Oxford theologian. He came to know Țuțea when he was a first-year medical student assigned to the floor of the Bucharest hospital on which Țuțea was being treated in 1980. Popescu was drawn to Țuțea's philosophical preaching, and although it was risky, he continued his relationship with Țuțea for twelve years, eventually finding his own Christian faith under Țuțea's tutelage.

Systematically describing Țuțea's philosophy is a difficult task. This is because Țuțea's disavowed systemization, partly as a reaction against the over-systemization of communist ideology, and partly because of Țuțea's philosophical position that reality transcends the limits of human rationality and therefore is not susceptible to human systemization. Popescu's presentation of Țuțea's philosophy is stylistically analytical but at the same time strangely vague on this account. Popescu does not argue for, nor present Țuțea's arguments for, Țuțea's philosophy. Țuțea himself refrained from arguing for his beliefs, presenting them exhortingly rather than argumentatively. Popescu's description of Țuțea's prison experiences is also vague, purportedly because Țuțea preferred not to talk about them.

The book itself is nicely laid out, with a map of Romania in the front, a seven-page chronological table comparing Țuțea's life with other important events in Romanian history, the usual forwards and prefaces, et al., a series of plates located in the center of the book, brief appendices on Romanian history and the Hesychast movement in Romania, a detailed bibliography, and an index. Although the book is paperback, the binding seems very durable. The back cover of the book contains glowing endorsements from such notable figures as Rowan Williams, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Michael Bourdeaux, founder of the Keston Institute at Oxford. The style is that of an intellectual biography, although it proceeds somewhat slowly because of the esoteric nature of Țuțea's philosophy and experience. That Popescu has thoroughly researched his subject is clearly reflected in the numerous footnotes.

Petre Țuțea: Between Sacrifice and Suicide is not a book for the casual reader. It is, however, a well-written book. At times it gets a little bogged down in detail and analysis; at other times it leaves one asking for more specifics. All in all, though, it is a good treatment of someone who appears to be a difficult but interesting philosopher. This book will be of particular interest to those who are interested in Christian resistance to the communist oppression of religion in Eastern Europe, and also to those who are interested in religious perseverance in general. Although it is not a systematic philosophy, it will certainly be of interest to those who are interested in the development of an Eastern Orthodox philosophy. It is also of great interest to those who, like myself, have an interest in Romania.

Michael S. Jones, editor, Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies

Klaus Buchenau. *Orthodoxie und Katholicismus in Jugoslawien 1945-1991: Ein serbisch-kroatischer Vergleich..* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004. 484pp. Bibliography, Abbreviations, Index of persons. Euros 98.00, hardbound. *Reviewed by Paul Mojzes.*

Usually comparisons between the Serbian Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church among Croats tend to be rather biased affairs, very much at the expense of one of those churches. More often than not the Serbs and their church fare worse. Klaus Buchenau's book, fortunately does not belong in this category. Despite the fact that the author deliberately undertook a comparative study of the two churches and their roots in their respective societies he succeeded in maintaining a praiseworthy scholarly objectivity, shedding light rather than additional heat on a generally conflictual relationship

that boiled over in the 1990s. I consider this book as the most comprehensive, most erudite, and most balanced study of the two churches focusing primarily on the period under socialist rule but actually providing a reliable introductory history that gives the reader a dependable insight into the workings of these two churches which are located half-way between Constantinople and Rome to which they ardently gravitated.

German scholarship is proverbially thorough, based on sound linguistic abilities and attention to details and Klaus Buchenau is the product of this proud tradition. The book is based on the author's doctoral dissertation and hence it begins with a review of previous literature in the field, followed by a consideration of methodological issues and the already mentioned survey of the histories of the Orthodox Church among the Serbs and the Catholic Church among Croats. It will not surprise most readers that these two churches followed entirely different paths of development which would be seen as self-evident if it were not for the remarkable, and now entirely unpopular and frequently denied similarity between the Serbs and Croats.

The pattern of presentation in the book is that the author deals with numerous aspects of church life in separate chapters or sub-topics following a pattern of first presenting the issues within the Serbian Orthodox Church followed by Roman Catholic developments. This provides for a clear comparison as well as the possibility to isolate issues if the reader is unable to read the entire book but wishes to explore a particular aspect, such as their activities during World War II, their response to Communist control, theological education, assistance from abroad, or charitable activities. In addition to the previously available primary and secondary sources the author made use of state archives (available perhaps for the first time), especially minutes and reports of the federal and republican committees on church affairs. Regretfully neither of the two church's archives were available to the author but he compensated by the copious use of church publications and the writings of a few Serb or Croat authors who provided thorough historical analyses. If and when church archives become available to researchers we may obtain additional, perhaps corrective information but until then I expect that Buchenau's investigation will remain authoritative in the way in which Stella Alexander's *Church and State in Yugoslavia* was for a previous generation.

The major conclusion of the book is that historically and during the communist period both churches deliberately saw themselves as promoters of the national interest of their people which they closely associated with their religious missions. Therefore it is accurate to view them as contributing to the 1990s war between Serbs and Croats, which, while not a part of this book, nevertheless is clearly in the mind of both the author and the reader. Thus the author concludes that the churches definitely contributed to the rise of nationalism that ended so tragically in the recent wars. However, the author also declares that they were not the main manipulators of nationalism; other factors contributed more decisively to the tragedy of the 1990s.

However, the author also declares that they were not the main manipulators of nationalism; other factors contributed more decisively to the tragedy of the 1990s. Buchenau is also helpful in pointing out that certain developments are not simply explainable by conventional answers. For instance, the greater Catholic resistance to Communism than displayed by the Orthodox is frequently described due to traditional caesaro-papism, i.e. subservience of the church to the state than was the case in Catholic lands. True enough, but not enough to explain things well. Buchenau points out that the Catholic Church had significant foreign sources of financial support as well as a greater tradition of community support by church attendance of a celibate clergy with fewer financial needs, while the Orthodox clergy was married and impoverished and living in poorer parts of the country thus the Orthodox hierarchs had to depend more on the state's willingness to provide a unsteady measure of support which, naturally, subjected the church to greater state pressures for accommodation.

On the other hand, the traditionally more extensive theological education of Catholic priests and the steadier adherence to church authority by lay Catholics as well as the ability of the hierarchy to resist pressures by explaining it as a matter of ecclesial loyalty to the pope as well as Yugoslavia's need to court Western countries gave the Catholic church both more moral and financial support in its resistance to Communist authorities while the Orthodox Church had no such ally abroad; Orthodox sister churches were frequently in even greater trouble than they.

The book is also a great source for the examination of several other sub-themes. Among them are the role of the Orthodox Bishop Nikolaj Velimirovic (who lived after World War II in exile) and the theologian Justin Popovic (who lived in house arrest in a Serbian monastery) who fueled an anti-Western near-fundamentalist Orthodoxy that influenced an entire group of contemporary Serbian Orthodox bishops. Another is the Macedonian Orthodox Church schism and the American diocesan schism under bishop Dionisije, and finally the role of the Serbian Orthodox church in prodding the Serbs to an awareness of the fate of the Kosovo Serbs that eventually fueled Serbian nationalism to a frenzied state by the use of Kosovo mythology.

On the Catholic side the author deals with the Alojzije Cardinal Stepinac controversy and its role in solidifying Croat nationalist feeling behind the Catholic Church and the very skillful navigation by the Catholic hierarchy of anniversary celebrations of Marian and Eucharistic congresses that brought a mass influx of people back to the Church as an expression of their ethno-religiosity. Buchenau also examines briefly the support by the Catholic Church leaders of the rising movement of Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica (Croatian Democratic Union) under the leadership of Franjo Tudjman. Buchenau raised the question of Serbian Orthodox victims to *ustasha* genocides during World War II and the Catholic hierarchy's unwillingness to express apologies or regrets which Orthodox hierarchs frequently requested of them. Only Bishop Alfred Pichler, bishop of Banja Luka in Bosnia-Herzegovina, issued a statement of regret. I am somewhat surprised that Buchenau did not press this issue but did engage in a short discussion whether the number of claimed victims during World War II by the Serb side is exaggerated and concludes that the much smaller numbers proposed by some Croats is more accurate. That may well be so, though more work is necessary to establish the extent of the World War II genocides. But the question is, what made the Catholic bishops so unwilling to condemn the genocides, their Catholicism or their Croatianism? There are a whole slew of other topics to be found in this extensive treatment: the role of the association of priests, the use of punitive taxation by the state to control non-cooperative priests, the role of the Concordat between the Vatican and the Yugoslav state, and so forth.

In my opinion no serious scholar of religion of the former Yugoslavia will be able to by-pass this book without seriously impairing her/his ability to understand this complex issue. It would be highly desirable to have an English translation of this book in order to make it available to a wider circle of readers. The question only is its marketability as its readers would be primarily graduate students and scholars in the field. It would fit well the mission of a university press.

Paul Mojzes, Rosemont College

Ivan Cvitković, *Konfesija u ratu* (Religious Confessions in Wartime) Sarajevo: Svjetlo riječi, 2004. Softcover 191 pp. Summary in English. Bibliography. Index. Reviewed by Jim Satterwhite.

Written by a sociologist of religion who teaches at the University of Sarajevo, in the School of Political [Social] Sciences, this work grows out of the author's attempt to come to grips with the role played by the various religions in the Bosnian war of 1992-1995, but it also attempts to examine the larger issue of the interrelationship of religion and war.

As a sociologist Cvitković begins with an observation about religion in Bosnia and Herzegovina that sets the stage for the entire analysis to follow. Among the various factors that differentiate people in Bosnia and in other parts of Europe – traits such as religion, culture, traditions – in most of Europe language is the most important factor in defining national differences. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the other hand, where linguistic differences are not significant, religion plays the largest role in social differentiation. Furthermore, “it is on this basis that the consciousness of the fundamental identity between religious affiliation and ethnic group is formed,” even though in other parts of the former Yugoslavia the connection is not as close (9; all translations by reviewer).

The layout of the book follows from this initial observation. Cvitković begins by looking at different religions/confessions before the war, and then examines the role of religion in situations of social conflict. Several chapters are devoted to methodological questions before he once again

examines the issue of religious identification and “confessional homogenization” in wartime. After a brief look at kinds of participation in religious practice, Cvitković gets at the heart of his topic by devoting several chapters to moral questions: “What was the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina like?” “Is killing as a part of military actions moral?” “Is retaliation for killing justified?” He concludes his study by again examining some more general sociological concerns, such as the impact of war on forms of religious expression, the question as to whether during the war there was any sense of fighting for some “true faith,” and inter-religious relations during the war.

Even when he is dealing with theoretical issues, such as that of “sociological models of religion regarding war,” Cvitković does not neglect the moral dimension. He notes that “even the Bosnian-Herzegovian war provided an extreme example of how a religious community can lose the feel for its function, its mission. It is difficult to be simultaneously on the side of God and guns, the Bible, Qur’an, and shooting, symbols of faith and gun barrels...In this way religion and faith are transformed into a means for conducting war” (40; see also 140 ff., 187). He continues in this vein in his discussion of the war itself, stating that in the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina ethnic conflict took on the characteristics of religious conflict inasmuch as the “enemy” belonged to some other denomination, or even another religion altogether. Consequently, “even if religions and denominations were not [in themselves] the cause of the outbreak of war in Bosnia/Herzegovina, they provided the pretext and context for the war” (64). This discussion in turn raises another issue: if crimes were committed as part of the war, and these crimes were sometimes perpetrated using religious symbols, then to what extent are religions themselves culpable? Cvitković states that these “crimes were the result of extremist, destructive national consciousness,” and we have already seen that in this context religious and ethnic identities were closely intertwined (114).

Here the issue of “collective responsibility” is raised. Cvitković writes that the basis of the idea of collective responsibility can be found in religious consciousness. Collective responsibility is not necessarily the same thing as collective guilt – in a situation such as that which pertained in the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, though, crimes committed in the name of an ethnic group point the way to an understanding of collective responsibility [116/117].¹

This subject is related to the section where Cvitković looks at inter-religious relations during the war. If religious identity is closely tied to ethnic identity, then a corollary is that “in wartime a sense of belonging to a particular confession is constructed in relation to other confessional groups, and not on the basis of adhering to the same set of beliefs,” and the emphasis on confessional groups becomes the primary locus of identity (135; see also 107). Here Cvitković enters into an overview of Muslim-Christian relations in Bosnia/Herzegovina, and the way each of these religious communities perceived the other, before going on to examine the interrelationships and perceptions among and within the other major religious communities as well (Chapter 13, 135-182).

At the heart of the conflict was a crisis of identity stemming from the post-socialist society in the former Yugoslavia. “The war showed that in a multi-confessional society, inter-confessional relations have an impact on the way people think about interpersonal relations, about the processes of social communication and (dis)integration.” The “others” (those belonging to different groups) were characterized negatively, and the premise became one of incompatibility and the impossibility of life together (184). Cvitković goes on to ask rhetorically whether the war did not demolish the myth of a Bosnia and Herzegovina as a model of a multicultural, multi-religious, and multiethnic society whose people get along well together (184). This type of society cannot come into being without the growth of important elements of political culture. “The construction of a system of common values in a multi-confessional, multiethnic environment such as Bosnia and Herzegovina is a precondition for an open society” (185). The essence of such a society has to be pluralism, which cannot rest on the negation of others. It would be tragic if this system of pluralism was to be regarded as the enemy, but it is also the

¹ for a similar discussion, see this reviewer’s discussion of Jan Tomasz Gross. *Sąsiedzi: historia zagłady żydowskiego miasteczka*. Sejny: Pogranicze, 2000, 2nd ed. Hardcover, 163 pp. [Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland. Princeton Univ Pr., 2001. Hardcover - 216 pp., \$19.95] Review in *The Slavic and East-European Journal* (Spring, 2002).

case (as demonstrated by the war) that religious pluralism by itself does not automatically carry with it an openness to religious difference (185). All of this brings to the fore again the nature of the relationship between religion and politics, and the question as to the true mission of religion (187ff; see 40, 140ff).

The book is well written, and has a wealth of survey data to illustrate and support the arguments Cvitković makes. It is informative and thought-provoking, and deserves a wide audience.

James Satterwhite, Bluffton University, Bluffton, OH