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THE PRIVACY OF RELIGION IN THE SELF-MANAGING SOCIETY

bySpiro Marasović

Spiro Marasović (Roman Catholic) is a priest and theologian from Croatia, Yugoslavia. This article was originally published in Crkva u Svitetu (Split), Yugoslavia, and was translated with the permission of the publisher and the author.

"Freedom which is only for supporters of the government, only for members of one party—no matter how numerous they are—is not freedom. Freedom is only freedom for the one who thinks differently. This is not because of some fanatical "righteousness" but in its very essence, all that is instructive, good and purifying in political freedom and its essential effect, is nullified if freedom becomes a privilege." R. Luxemburg.¹

On June 25, 1986, was the Twentieth anniversary of the signing of an agreement between the Holy See and the government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. After a relatively long period of post war struggles, this document was supposed to represent a positive initiative in relationships, not only between the Holy See and Yugoslavia on the state level, but also of the Roman Catholic Church in Yugoslavia on the level of society. Now we have the opportunity to ask ourselves whether and how far this agreement fulfilled its purpose.

First we must immediately say, clearly, that it is more than obvious that this agreement has been for us a great step forward in Church life and its fruits are obvious to anyone who has eyes to see. For example, following the agreement, bishops no longer have any problems communicating with the Vatican, which at least until the Council was difficult and full of problems. The same is true of opportunities for priests and monks to travel abroad to study or work. Following the agreement also, theology students in the armed services are no longer singled out for special treatment, as was previously the case, and other similar instances. It seems, however, that such changes have been best realized on the level of Church and state institutions while points of disagreement on the level of the individual believer in society which were also obvious before, remain unsolved even after the agreement. The following facts demonstrate this:

a/ Despite all constitutional and legal rulings as to the equal rights and political equality of all peoples and citizens, regardless of their ideology or religion, which (among other things) are founded on the oft mentioned and publicly admitted fact that, along with many other members of this society and citizens, believers took part in the People's War of Liberation (World War II) and in the Socialist Revolution, even 40 years after the war these same believers do not have any real opportunities to attain any kind of significant social or government functions or positions. Nor are there any believers in any of the forums where socially significant decisions are made. There are none even in the slightly higher forums of the Union of Socialist Working People of Yugoslavia,² where they have huge numbers of members nor in the Union of Socialist Youth...
where they also have a large membership. The security services and armed forces (meaning the officer ranks) need not even be mentioned. Even some *alibi* exceptions which could be found here and there, cannot detract from this fact. Since this situation has remained the same for 40 years and even though it has no constitutional or legal foundation, and its is equally widespread throughout Yugoslavia—we may well ask ourselves: why is this the case?

b/ Since such a chronic and constant discrepancy exists between what has been stated and how that statement is put into practice, it would be reasonable to expect that at least the mass media (for whom the USWPY is publisher) would deal with it more often and in a serious manner, and would expose it and distance themselves from it. But no; instead of that in those same media we find a constant campaign against believers and the Church. Even though they are de facto shut out from political and social involvement, believers are constantly being accused of supposed transgressions of constitutional and legal rights, of *clericalism* and similar things. If this accusation came only from party agents, that could still be understandable to a certain extent, as communists by definition are atheists and as such they accept atheism as part of their program. But how is it that where religion and the Church are concerned, there is no difference between party members who are by definition atheists, and members of the USWPY which should not consist entirely of atheists. One again we ask ourselves, how can this be?

c/ On the basis of the constitutional ruling concerning the separation of Church and State, clerics in Yugoslavia are banned by law from any kind of political involvement. However, there are several cases of priests and some bishops who have received state awards. Since the work of the Church and believers is evangelism, pastoral care, catechism, theology, spirituality, charity and the like, and as we know that the state does not give out awards for such activities, the question arises: what other reasons were there for these to be awarded? If we set aside several cases where it is a case of obvious cultural or scientific achievements, it is clear in the case of these bishops, that these things were not the reasons. This is why we wonder: did they not receive rewards for political services—i.e. for services carried out precisely in the field where they should not be involved by law?

So, here we have outlined the problem in general and also focussed our attention on the constitutional ruling which states that in Yugoslavia religion is the "private affair" of every individual, suggesting that the answer to these questions may lie in the multitude of interpretations and inadequate application of this ruling.3

I. THE THEOLOGICAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM.

Christian-Marxist dialogues in Yugoslavia more closely resemble bilateral monologues than that which we normally understand when we use the term dialogue. Like the fox and the stork in
the well known fable, who entertained one another but always in such a way that the guest could not even taste the food offered (the fox is unable to eat from a narrow jar because he does not have a beak like the stork and the stork is unable to like the offered porridge because his beak gets in the way) so in our dialogues we have not come much further as regards methodology. In these monologues in fact all that happens is a public recitation of what we already know and a public suppression of also well-known facts. Both what is publicized and what is suppressed are well-known to both sides, but we still remain quiet about it, or rather we simply pay no heed to it. The suppressed side of the monologues is actually mutual suspicion and distrust. There is no conviction as to the sincerity of the other party—or any conviction that there is no ulterior motive hidden behind what is said.

As far as the Catholic Church is concerned, its thoughts, its goals, its aspirations really hold no secrets and no hidden motives. All its teachings and desires are contained in documents of the government, and whoever proclaims freedom of religion (including Roman Catholicism) on his territory must also realize that freedom presupposes and includes the freedom of believers to accept and to identify with the Church's creed and with its aspirations. These are all included in these documents.

They state that the Church, even if it wanted to, cannot deny its internal and external form. The Catholic faith has its own anthropology, its own scale of values, its own way of looking at life and things which to a greater or lesser extent differentiate it from other groups or movements, be they secular or religious. A non-Catholic naturally, cannot accept these Catholic viewpoints and attitudes, but if someone approaches these issues from a government position, then he/she must of necessity know and respect them. For, the freedom of religion ensured by our constitution must mean the freedom of the creed which the believer actually believes and not the freedom of some religion which a non-believer imputes to a believer and then interpret what he/she has imputed. For this reason it is vital to understand how we believers see, understand and experience the constitutional statement that our faith is the private matter of every individual, and the more so because the issues surrounding this are extremely vague and confused. Our approach to this problem is subject to certain principles which are not exclusively Catholic or Christian, and as such could be described as general. We will briefly outline them below.

1. The Right to Integrate Thought and Action.

Freedom, defined as the known possibility of a new way of life, is not born and does not have its origin primarily outside or inside of a human being. No slave is free of his/her chains (unless he has never felt his/her chains to be degrading) until he/she turns his/her back on them and breaks them inside himself/herself. Only as the flood of the realization of freedom overwhelms his/her
inner being, do the external chains and defences also fall. However the one who has come to accept his/her chains as though it were a normal condition, who identifies himself/herself with them, will never be able to throw off even the chains that hold him/her externally, because freedom must be total (integrated). External freedom is always preceded by internal freedom, and at the same time assumes it. Internal freedom alone, without the external is torment, and external freedom alone without the internal, is a tragedy.

What is true of freedom is also true of the relationship between the human inner life and the external world in general. As thought always precedes action, so action makes a thought reality. A life worthy of a person is therefore only that life where to a substantial extent thought and action are integrated. All else is torment or lies. Therefore to force someone to say or do something which he/she does not believe, is to force him/her to live a lie, a life not worthy of a human being. We are not talking here about so-called “freedom of thought and conscience,” but about freedom to express one's thoughts and freedom to live according to one's own conscience. A human's thoughts have always been directed at freedom and thinking people have always through what they like and how they like. This is not the gift of any regime or of any revolution. But the freedom to express one's thoughts and the freedom to live according to one's own conscience does depend on external social factors. The level of humanity of the particular regime of society depends on the extent to which it allows its subjects to live an integrated life (i.e. where they can freely express their thoughts and freely live according to their beliefs). A person who within his/her own society is unable to act according to his/her internal convictions, but rather according to some sociological principles, would be a social and political schizophrenic, living two lives, one his/her own, the internal, and the other an alien one, the public life. A society which accepts for itself thoughts in public which are opposed to the opinions of the majority of its members would in this way force its citizens to live as hypocrites. At the very least it would be a hypocritical society. Of course we understand that the fundamental human right that a person can live and act in accordance with his/her convictions is not absolute, but is limited by the same right of others, whether the person acts as an individual or as a group.

2. The Precedence of Conscience over Truth.

This awareness is in fact fairly recent even in the Catholic Church so that the late Pope John Paul I once publicly admitted how in its time the Council's declaration on freedom of religion "Dignitatis humanae," produced a theological crisis in him. Even today Archbishop M. Lefebvre and his not so unknown followers and sympathizers bear witness to the fact that he is not the only one. For the principle by which they had been brought up, which is quite correct in itself, that truth and error cannot have the same right to co-exist, had at times and in some places been
interpreted and practised in such a way that there was no room for legitimate pluralism and for the integrity of one's own conscience. Therefore there was at times a pressure exerted in the name of truth on a person's conscience to an almost incomprehensible extent.

The Second Vatican Council sought once and for all to put an end to all this. In so doing, the Roman Catholic Church did not deny its deep awareness that it is the only true Apostolic Church in which there is the fulness of revelation, and upon that Revelation the truth is founded which it is responsible to bring to the whole world. It did not deny its lasting doctrine that each one is responsible to seek the truth and to order his/her life according to that truth. This still stands as before. But in spite of all this, that is in spite of this awareness, the Church publicly teaches that truth, even if it is its own, may not be forced on anyone, nor even hinder anyone to live according to his/her own conscience which may not be in accord with our "truth." For the right to live according to the truth of one's own conscience does not arise from the truth itself, but from the nature of each human being.

"This Vatican Council", it says in the document "Dignitatis humanae," "proclaims that every human being has the right to religious freedom. This freedom means that all peoples must be free from pressure from individuals or social groups or any kind of human authorities, and that in matters of faith no one should be compelled to do anything against his own conscience, whether in public or in private, alone or together with others, within the limits of duty. It also proclaims that the right to religious freedom is founded in the very dignity of every human being, as we learn from God's revealed Word and from our own reason."5

Having thus interpreted the right to freedom of conscience as part of the dignity of every human being and not on any supernatural grounds, the Roman Catholic Church by logic admitted that same right for all who are included in the term "humans." Of course that means everyone—the Church did not preserve the right for itself alone. But it does seek it for itself! This is not because it alone is the only true way, but because this freedom is part of the dignity of every human being and whoever ignores this, sins against human dignity. Therefore the Church is not seeking anything that it does not allow to others, so that every speech about how the Church is seeking some kind of monopoly or privilege, if it is not pure deception, is a sign of ignorance of the subject in question.

3. The Legitimacy of Democratic Authority Comes from the People.

The Catholic Church, since it is "catholic," which means universal, lives and works in many societies which differ from one another and in social systems which may but do not necessarily conform to Christian principles in their public life. Thus the question arises: what kind
of relationship should there be between the believer's right to integrity of thought and action and the logic on which the particular society is based, meaning a way of thought which is obligatory for everyone. Is it a necessary principle of the Roman Catholic Church that its conscience and principles should become public—i.e. political consciousness and the conscience of every individual in society?

No, in no way do the principles of the Roman Catholic Church demand this. A society if the majority are Catholics, may accept Catholic thinking even in the public arena (after all it must have some kind of philosophy!) but as most contemporary societies are pluralistic and as the Church seeks freedom for itself and for other religions and world views, it is understandable that it cannot seek to be the only and exclusive way. What the Church is seeking is that the public (i.e. socio-political thought and logic) should not oppose what it is trying to do and what members of that society want, at least—if it would not work any other way—what the majority wants. It is not the same thing to accept someone's ideas (which all public authorities must do) and to adopt them (which authorities do not have to do). No state needs to adopt Catholic thought in its political life, but if that state is in fact a democratic system, by the force of the logic of democratic life, it will have to respect that way of thinking, in the sense that it should not be allowed to make any decision opposed to that thinking and that it will not demand that believers perform any tasks which are in conflict with their faith. This in fact arises out of the very term "democracy"—the power of the people. It is unthinkable that a nation, or rather the majority of a nation, should rule itself like a schizophrenic, in a manner completely opposed to what it really thinks and desires. Believers constitute the Church, but they also are part of the demos which is in power. Even if believers are in the minority in some society, or rather when in some area adherents of any faith or world view form a definite minority, even then it is necessary for the public authorities, as far as possible, to take into consideration the consciousness of that segment of the nation. It cannot be any other way if politicians in a democracy are only delegates of the people and not holding power endowed by some mysterious higher authority. Otherwise believers (or members of minority faiths) in that kind of society would be mere second class citizens, a common work force, and no more.

The "privacy of religion" therefore, according to these principles, can only mean that a certain belief is not official or normative in public matters, that it has no privileges and that its tenets are not in any way binding to any other member of the same political group. But it cannot mean that privacy is actually a synonym for "non-existence"—that is that the authorities can behave towards believers as though they are not believers, that it is able to ignore the existence of religion and the Church. Moreover it has no right in the name of some other tenet, to oppose that
religion and Church, or rather go against religious groups which exist on its territory. No political power has anyone from whom to receive a mandate for something of that nature. "The privacy of religion" means that the people for justifiable reasons have taken their religious life and religious issues out of the jurisdiction of the civil authorities so that each one is permitted to and able to believe whatever he or she likes and to practice the religion he or she chooses without any kind of repercussions in public, socio-political life. But the "privacy of religion" does not mean being written off publicly, the disqualification of one or more religions for the advancement of some new, public and all-encompassing negation of all of them both collectively and individually.

II. SELF-MANAGEMENT—POLITICS OR SECULARIZATION?

What at first sight characterizes self-managing socialism as a unique socio-political system amongst all known systems, and what is important here, is that this system seeks to be socialism with the greatest degree of democracy, democracy with the greatest degree of socialism, secularization with no kind of belief, and belief that Marxism is the same as secularization. This combination of democracy and socialism, belief and secularization, all within the bounds of the dictates of the proletariat, cannot fail to have consequences for the life of faith and the Church. For it is significant that according to Marxist philosophy, the period of government by the proletariat is relatively short but intensive, a time of subjective alignment of social forces towards a communist society, in which, as is well-known, there will no longer be any religion or church. Therefore in this context, let us look at what the phrase 'religion is the private matter of the individual" could mean in socialist jargon. First of all we must see how far a secularized society of a socialist type allows religion and secondly how far the socio-political dictates of the proletariat allow the privacy of thought and conviction.

1. The Subjective and the Objective in the Politics of Socialism.

Yugoslav socialism has the basic genetic characteristics of Leninism, that is, that version of Marxism which became so fatally confused at the time of the Third International. The chief characteristic of Lenin's Marxism, or as it is usually called "Marxist-Leninism" to differentiate it from original Marxism, is according to Lenin, because of a lack of the most basic conditions for a socialist revolution in Russia (the working class, for example, hardly existed), a lack of objective causes had to be made up by a surplus of subjective causes. Marx himself had ascribed to this subjective factor an almost messianic role and importance by declaring it to be the sole possessor of a special, uniquely correct class awareness. But even that subjective factor is still not able to achieve what it seeks. Rather, in practice it functions as mature socio-economic objective
conditions and circumstances. The communist party, as an organized objective factor, according to Marx, alone correctly interprets historical events and therefore its function is to further direct those events. But, according to Marx, the party does not create objective circumstances! They are the fruit of historical laws which cannot be altered or imposed.

Lenin and Leninism means one step further in the development of the self-awareness of that subjective factor in society. Since Lenin and the Russian revolutionaries had no time nor will to wait until objective circumstances came around and matured, they added revolutionary voluntarism to the already existing messianic consciousness of the subjective factor. Thus, from a party which interprets and directs legitimate social development, came a party, which, according to its own will, imposes laws onto that development. In no way was Lenin an exception in this regard amongst the Russian revolutionaries. This brand of voluntarism was also characteristic of the Russian Nationalists and Anarchists as well as of the Bolsheviks. As the Bolsheviks did not have the people's mandate—being a party exclusively of one class, and that not even the class which made up the majority of the people, (for at that time that class was not qualitively sufficiently developed)—for this reason it was not necessary for them to be accountable to the people, but only to history.

This kind of messianic-voluntaristic self-consciousness, a typically Russian variety of Marxism, spread later to all members of the Third International, so that in the way they interpreted it, "democracy" was understood and practised as power for the people and not the power of the people. Since the people were divided into classes, they could not govern for every government is from one particular class, and as the working classes, who should have taken power, had not yet attained the status of a "class in its own right," they were not able to govern. Power then fell exclusively to the Party, as one segment in society which was a class in its own right and to whom history had given the mandate to rule the people in the name of the working classes.

Armed with this kind of consciousness of its own messianic mission, the consciousness that they could change the world in any way they felt fit, the Bolsheviks did not think it necessary to wait patiently for the maturation of social conditions in which religion would die out, as Marx had predicted it would. Rather they, as the subjective factor in history, decided to hasten that death even if social conditions were not ready for it. As they could not speed up history, they hastened the predicted historical outcome, as if they wanted to see the communist eschaton in their lifetime. "The privacy of religion," in a campaign conceived and executed in that way, could only have one meaning given by this subjective factor, and that is the most restrictive sense. For at that time there was no question to the separation of State and Church. The only question was: How? Everything that was done was tactical, aimed at a strategic goal. So any discussion which took
place about this was merely a question of methods—should they approach the Church harshly and by force, or should they apply some kind of euthanistic skill. Lenin was against proclaiming religion as a private matter. He was only in favor of religious groups being declared "private societies" in the strictly restricted sense, that is not in the sense of a democratic admission of their autonomy, but in the sense that they as such lost all support from public funds and all influence in schools. However, due to its abstract self-awareness and sectarian relationship with the real world, the bolshevik socialists, regardless of the fact that they had declared religion a private matter, did not solve the problem of the Church in their jurisdiction, rather they only made it more complex.

Srdjan Vrcan speaks of the "deeply contradictory and even slightly paradoxical nature" of the real position which religion had reached in those societies "when they had gone beyond the bounds of classical Stalinism."

On the one hand religion as a peculiar cultural and symbolic system of socially alien nature and as the basic of preoccupations and activities which are also alien to the system, has been treated by the system more or less like a "foreign body" among the members of the socialist society. Therefore naturally it is squeezed exclusively into the purely private sphere and excluded from all public involvement. Moreover the system undertakes to prevent any possibility that religion could become socially or politically significant. Thus, depending on circumstances, they subject it to severe or mild, partial or complete institutional limitations, suppression and pressure. At the same time, religion has emerged as the only cultural and symbolic system of an alien nature which has been legally accepted as an institution and is given a certain area of activity and organization which the social system controls only externally. That is, on the one hand religion is treated by the system as the private matter of the individual, while institutionally they try to strip it of all social relevancy and push it not only out of the political arena, but also out of the entire public realm, transforming it into something without public significance. On the other hand, the cultural exclusivism inherent in the system tends towards a continual politicization of religion. In a certain way the very "alien-ness" of religion in a political and cultural sense almost of necessity leads to the politicization of religion.

Entirely in accord with this kind of assessment of the state of religion in socialist societies, we believe that no great importance should be attached to the fact that the first constitution of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, drawn up in 1946, does not mention religion as the private affair of every individual, whilst the subsequent constitutions of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia do, including the constitution which is in force today. Whether the first post-war constitution had omitted it because of the stronger influence of Lenin's opinions in that so-called first phase of "revolutionary statism" or for some other reason, we do not know. It is not necessarily significant under whose political influence Yugoslavia was in regard to the approach to this problem of mentioning or not mentioning religion as a private matter. But as Yugoslavia passed from the phase of revolutionary statism to the development of self-management, the fact that this is expressly mentioned must be significant, for self-management endeavors to affirm once again the demos and democracy, which were neglected by the Bolsheviks. Once things have turned towards the demos and have opened the doors to democracy,
e. the stronger affirmation of objective realities, religion as the private affair of the individual can no longer be the exclusive object of interpretation and politics of the so-called subjective factors—rather of the citizens whose private affair it is.

"It is a fundamental truth of self-management strategy," says Vrcan, "that at least on the theoretical level it rejects the possibility of building socialism under the decisive and comprehensive influence of the state, and furthermore by means of a distinct minority in power, which constantly reproduces itself as a minority and which as a result can only exercise its power in accord with a rigid one-party political system." This kind of strategy presupposes a pluralism of interests, including cultural pluralism, in which the culture of so-called subjective factors may only be one of many, but not the only one which is valued. In the Leninist-Stalinist sense "private" was a restricted concept which created, interpreted, and brought into being subjective factors in accord with their own political persuasion, for their own purposes, at the same time not consulting interested parties. But under self-management, which once again affirms the democratic, this is no longer possible. In a democracy the field of the private can and must be understood in an affirmative sense, and the right to interpret it belongs to the people whose affair it in fact is. However, the issue is far from being clarified, as we might have expected it would be. That is, it remains unclear in the area of religion, which and what kind of powers the subjective factor may retain for itself, as an area where it may carry out its own plans, in accord with its political ideals, but without in so doing, crossing the boundaries of democracy and democratic freedom. Since this problem remains unsolved in our country up to the present we may see the theoretical background to the contemporary attacks on the Church and believers, or rather the theoretical background to their actual position in socio-political life.

2. The Subjective and the Objective in the Process of Secularization

Secularization as a socio-cultural process is not a recent phenomenon but its interpretation, its extent, and its final goal even today are still not fully understood or generally accepted. On the one hand, as we see the positive side, secularization signifies in fact a justifiable laicization, that is just emancipation of all lay or worldly life from the direct influence of the clergy, which by strength of belief, dogma, and logic, in fact, do not fall under their direct control or leadership. The fact that these aspects of life were once controlled by the clergy—and to a greater or lesser extent in some places still are today—was not because they were especially empowered for these tasks by God, but solely because they were the only ones at that time and in that place, or one of the rare social groups who were able to fulfil that social role by strength of their above average education and organization, which made them competent to perform various duties. Of
course, it goes without saying, that at a time of general illiteracy, no society could ignore the services of practically the only educated work force, based on a shared faith. It is also understandable that, lulled by centuries of tradition and practice, many members of the clergy, had not developed and refined in themselves a feeling for the boundaries between their duties as priests and those which arose out of their higher level of education and their social status which was founded upon it. Even the feeling for the time when they should give up these secular offices to lay workers was not always sensed in all places. So it happens that what was at one time normal and went without saying, became, in the new age, abnormal and incomprehensible. This is how what we call "clericalism" arose. This is when in totally new circumstances the clergy tried to retain for itself authority in areas of life which were no longer their responsibility.

The Second Vatican Council distanced itself clearly from this kind of clericalism. It underlined as a sign of social maturity the rightness and legitimacy of the emancipation of secular life from the direct involvement of the clergy in every matter for which they were not fitted because of their call to the Church. This teaching runs through all the Council's documents especially the pastoral constitution "Gaudium et spes", in which it clearly set out as part of the "autonomy of temporal things". Therefore the Church has declared from the highest authority, loud and clear, that it does not consider itself obliged as a Church, under its mandate given by God, to be involved in any one particular brand of politics as typically its own, any one culture as typically its own, any form of science as typically its own, and so on. Every believer is free to experiment in these areas and to act in ways appropriate to these areas of human interest. The Church, as the Church will only become involved in these things when they touch on issues of faith or morality.

There is however another much more broadly spread view of secularization, which sees it not only as a process of the right emancipation of the secular life, but more simply the distancing of people from the Church and religion in general. This kind of secularization is in fact the Church and religion in general. This kind of secularization is in fact a synonym for atheism. Such interpretation of secularization we believers do not see as positive and we do not consider efforts made to spread it to be positive. Regardless of how we think and feel, this kind of secularization even in the Western world is not a new phenomenon. Throughout its history, this kind of secularization has ebbed and flowed. Today, according to contemporary research and observations, it is once again at a stand still, and, according to some, even retreat.

Secularization and democracy, at least in the forms they have emerged and developed in Europe, go together. However because of its emphasis on distancing itself from religion and the Church, it comes to be taken over by certain elements which, in fact, have no logical right to it.
So, for example, Marxist-Leninism is anti-religion and anti-church, but that does not mean that societies built on it are necessarily at the same time secular societies. Secularization is a process whose results include aversion towards any kind of mediator between anyone or anything. In its extreme state, secularization does not only mean the turning of the world into itself, but also the turning of each individual into himself/herself. This is the attempt to interpret the world by itself alone and at the same time to motivate each human being by himself/herself alone. This is why secularization is distanced from religion and the Church not primarily because secularized people see themselves as more intelligent than those attached to some religion or the Church, but because they see the church as a mediator and its belief and morals as the mediated belief and mediated morals. They cannot square these with their ideal of autonomy. For them this is heteronomy.

Marxism, however, offers exactly the thing secularization rejects—a mediator. What sets Marxists apart from all other politically active people is their self-awareness that their consciousness is, in fact, scientifically a universal consciousness, which they are responsible to mediate first of all to the working classes and then to all people, until it becomes the truly universal human consciousness. On this is based their right to be the only subjective factor. As Leninism is Marxism tailored to fit everyday politics, the previous function of the clergy in a clericized society now passes to members of that subjective factor. They approach religion and the Church from a secularized position rather than from the position of a positive alternative to the Church. This is why, in contrast to a secularized society where interested citizens, religious workers, and communities but not politicians, are involved in religion as the private affair of every citizen, in a Marxist-Leninist society politicians are concerned with religion, but believing citizens are not involved in politics although they should have every right to be so involved. In a nonsecularized society, even if religion has been declared the private affair of every individual, in fact, it never is. And if it is not, society is divided exactly at the limits set for religion.

Sociological research bears witness to the fact that this is the case in Yugoslavia. Although S. Vrcan used the term "secularized" even for socialist societies, especially for self-management, to mean the distancing of people from religion and the Church, he still had to admit that this was a secularization which was developing "under the considerable influence of politics," and which in a deepening social crisis displayed its "totally specious and superficial nature."

"The false and flimsy nature of that kind of secularization shows itself in almost all situations where the gap or split between so-called legal society and the so-called real society shows itself and widens. That is, that gap usually appears as a gap between the so-called legal society, which sees itself as almost entirely secularized and in which religion exists as a definitely minority phenomenon and a more or less "folk lore" element of social life, which it is barely worth bothering about, and the so-called real society where religion exists as a massive and unavoidable fact of social life with a high motivation
potential, able in certain circumstances to activate and mobilize huge numbers of people.\textsuperscript{11}

Or as the same writer says in another place:

"We should expect of course, that secularization in the sense of a lessening in the social importance of religion and its greater privatization, would naturally lead to a gradual but continuous fall in the need to discuss the Church and religion first of all in political terms, and that various political bodies would need to debate the issues less and less, and also the need take specific political action concerning religion and the Church would diminish. The very fact that in recent years this is not happening rather the very opposite is happening, is a sign that secularization in that particular sense is not going exactly the way one might expect. This is at least a small confirmation of the fact that religion and the Church are no longer losing their social significance, regardless how this may please or displease anyone and regardless of any kind of proclamation."\textsuperscript{12}

Conclusion

If a society is divided into the so-called legal, which is completely secularized, and the so-called real, which is widely religious, and if vertical movement between those two societies is difficult or impossible in a political sense, in that society religion is not "a private" matter but public, that is political. This is the case today in the self-managing society of Yugoslavia. The Church, for its part, offers no kind of support for this kind of politicization for a) it would necessarily lead to clericalism, which it has rejected and distanced itself from it at the last general council and b) the constitutional position of the Church in this society does not give it any kind of opportunity for action. Therefore we consider that the improvement in the promised relationship between the Church and the State, initiated by the singing of the Protocol twenty years ago and which is already fairly well developed on an institutional level, should be continued also in the area where the problems have not yet been solved.

Translated from Croatian by

Janet Kerry

Zagreb, Yugoslavia

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Rosa Luxembourg "Izabrani Spisi" (Selected writings) Naprijed, Zagreb, 1974, page 293.
\item \textsuperscript{2} USWPY hereafter
\item \textsuperscript{3} Article 174 of the Constitution of SPRY.
\item \textsuperscript{4} \textit{ct.} "Dignitatis humanae," 1.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Idem., 2.
\item \textsuperscript{6} Marx was not much more tolerant in this in his "Critique of the Gotha Programme" he speaks specifically against the "freedom of the religions conscience." And Lenin even maintained that the SDRPP was created amongst other things the fight against any kind of religions in doctrine. In this connection read S. Marasovic, "Samosvijest Crkve u Samoupravnom društvu." [The Self-Consciousness of the Church in the Self-Managed Society.]
\end{itemize}
9Ibid.
10Cf “Gaudium at Spes”, 36, 41, 56, 76 and similar.
11S. Vrcan, op. cit., p. 74.
12Ibid., p. 158.