One of the findings in the research of religious gays in Niš (Jovanović, 2008) implied the certain quality of the religiosity of the participants. In short, five interviewed gays turned out to be spiritual, and not institutionally, i.e. traditionally religious. This came as no surprise, having in mind that gays have been discriminated against by the society, and, particularly, by the traditional religions. This may have "pushed" them to look for the answers to the "questions of eternity" beyond the tenets of organized religions.

Research studies dealing with the related issues conducted in Great Britain, USA and New Zealand were taken into account (Thumma, 1991; Mahaffy, 1996; Yip, 1999; Coyle & Rafalin, 2000; Neitz, 2000; Rodriguez&Ouellette, 2000; Sherkat, 2002; Wilcox, 2002; Yip, 2002; Yip, 2003; Rosechild-Sullivan, 2005; Tan, 2005; Yip, 2005; Walton, 2006; Henrickson, 2007; Henrickson 2007a; Pitt, 2007). Although socio-cultural context in which religiosity of gays and lesbians was explored does not match that of the Serbian society, the studies have offered useful theoretical and methodological concepts that were applied in such a manner that they could be applied to the research.

According to the findings of the research of non-heterosexual Christians in the UK (Yip, 2003), the majority of lesbian and gay Christians have views which oppose those of institutionalized churches, in a sense that respondents believe that non-heterosexuality is in accordance with the Christian faith. Gay and lesbians rose above the institutional lines when it came to the shaping of their faith – they put great emphasis on personal religious experience as contrasted to the established Church practices. Specific social situation, that of being stigmatized on the basis of their sexuality, played the crucial role in shaping of their faith. Respondents showed a high level of criticism towards institutionalized churches, where the credibility of the churches and their dogma on homosexuality were brought into question. There was a "counter-rejection" of the Church, which was predicated on four bases: (1) the Church’s ignorance of sex and sexuality in general, (2) the Church’s ignorance of all sexualities as God’s creation, (3) the Church’s misinterpretation of biblical passages on homosexuality, and (4) the Church’s fallibility (Yip, 1999: 53-58). Generally, the respondents’ “beliefs in God were more pantheistic (God is around us, involving in all things) rather than theistic (God reigns over all creation, looks after us, and responds to our needs)” (Yip, 2003: 146). The respondents’ attitude towards the Bible is largely influenced by their life experience – the experience of the stigmatized minority group. Since the Bible is the primary source of the negative attitude towards homosexuality on the part of the Church, LGBT Christians questioned, through highlighting the socio-cultural-political context in which scriptural texts were written, the accuracy and stringency of dogmatic/institutional interpretations of the Holy Scriptures. Taking into account the historical and cultural context in the metaphorical (not literal) understanding of Biblical texts is justified by the process of “sifting” (Wilcox, 2002) – the use of certain parts of the Holy Scriptures that support the construction of religious identity of non-heterosexual people, and rejection of parts that cannot be used for that purpose. As one of the participants in Melissa Wilcox's study (2002: 509) says: “I believe that the Bible is God's divine word (...) However, in order to put His word in black and white, God had to use people (...) All of
these things that make up me, I’m going to read into or see into whatever work I’m doing. So it’s the same with those who wrote and then eventually translated the Bible.”

Some research findings are being cited in order to support the theory of neo-secularization, where secularization is not understood as a kind of retreat and eventual disappearance of religion, but as a reduction of influence and authority of religious institutions on the lives of people: “One crucial point is clearly reinforced by both the quantitative and qualitative data — the primacy of the self and the lack of influence of religious authority structures. The basis of their Christian faith was predicated on the employment of their own human reason in their interpretation of the Bible, within the framework of their personal experience, in the fashioning of their Christian faith and living. In this process, the working of the self eclipses the impact of religious authority structures on individual believers” (Yip, 2002: 207).

However, it should be pointed out that belonging to traditional Churches in the context of neosecularization is not absent, but it does not include conformity and acceptance of dogmatic views on the issues of homosexuality of the official religious institutions: “Traditions and the self do co-exist” (Yip, 2002: 210), with the self in a constant creative dialogue with the tradition. In a recent interview (Mathewes, 2006: 155), Peter Berger comments on the relatively common statement of the people who say that they are not religious, but are spiritual: “When people say — and you get this in Europe as much as in the U.S. — ‘I’m not religious, but I’m spiritual,’ what do they mean? I think they mean two quite different things. One is New Age-ist type stuff: ‘I want to be in harmony with the cosmos. I want to discover my inner child.’ But sometimes it’s much simpler; it means, ‘yes, I’m interested in the questions of religion, but I don’t feel at home in any church, in any organized religion,’ and that doesn’t have to have a New Age flavor.”

The strategies for integration of gay and Christian identity which were analyzed by Gerald Walton (2006) are: 1) the critical interpretation of Biblical text, in contrast to the literalist interpretation, 2) the perception of inconsistencies between idealized views of life and actual lived experience (the difference between God and Church is often mentioned, and, in that way, the condemnation of the religious institution is being relativized, where the perception of dissonance in the identity paradoxically plays the role of a catalyst of the self realization of the person as a gay-Christian, as one of the respondents in the research states: “I realized that it’s not God that I should be mad at. It’s the church that I should be mad at” (Walton, 2006: 10) and 3) the acceptance of the attitude that homosexuality is not a choice (religious institutions treat homosexuality as a chosen lifestyle), but a “product of God’s will”. Walton notes that “the very existence of these blended identities represents an act of resistance against particular moral or political regimes” (Walton, 2006: 15). This assertion can be seen as an example of the effect of agency against structure, as Giddens states: “The self is not a passive entity, determined by external influences; in forging their self-identities, no matter how local their specific contexts of action, individuals contribute to and directly promote social influences that are global in their consequences and implications” (1991: 2).

The findings of Darren Sherkat, who used data from the General Social Survey in the United States from 1991 to 2000, show that the participation of gays and male bisexuals in the life of the Church is on the same level as those of heterosexual men, while the level of participation of lesbians and bisexual women is fairly lower. But, at the same time, there is a greater probability that people from all groups of non-heterosexual persons, compared to heterosexuals, are to become apostates (Sherkat, 2002: 318-319).
The research conducted in Niš included five participants, 4 of whom identified as Orthodox Christian and one as a follower of Judaism. They were asked the following questions, which served as a kind of check-points in the conversation (for more details on methodology used see: Jovanović, 2008: 337-339):

How would you describe yourself?
Do you consider yourself a religious person? In what sense?
Were your parents religious and were you raised in the religious spirit or have you been exposed to religious tradition?
How would you define religion, spirituality and faith?
Do you consider yourself a Christian/Judaist?
What is the attitude of Serbian Orthodox Church towards homosexuality/homosexuals?
Do you know in which parts of the Bible is homosexuality mentioned?
What do you think about those parts?
In your opinion, what is the basis for the Church’s condemnation of homosexuality?
Do you feel the pressure to accept a set of beliefs or dogmatic rules?
Do your beliefs affect the relationships with other people?

When answering the question “How would you define yourself?”, participants primarily reflect on their psychical and physical traits, features of character, social roles, and only after these (if at all) do they give answers pertaining to their sexuality. Although all of the interviewees were part of the stigmatized minority group, none of them mentioned the stigmatized part of the identity as crucial. This could mean that the participants are to a great extent accustomed to their homosexuality, that they take it for granted, as an integral part of their identity and do not have any particular need to accentuate it. So, it seems that they are refusing to submit to a heteronormative order and bring their sexuality to the forefront – “[i]n our culture it has been easy to think it is people of color who have race, it is women who carry gender, and it is gays and lesbians who have sexual orientations or sexual preferences. White, middle class, heterosexual men are ‘just people’. They define themselves as the norm. Their race, gender, class, and sexuality usually goes without comment” (Neitz, 2000: 388). This refusal to be defined by the heteronormative institutional order has similarities with the refusal to define one’s religiosity in accordance with the dogma, i.e. with the dictate of the religious institution.

When asked about their religiosity, the participants talk about confessional belonging and declare as Orthodox. They state that they are born in Serbia, and were baptized into Orthodox Christianity as kids; therefore we could call them “geographically Orthodox”. They do not value their confessional belonging very much as, they emphasize, they didn’t chose time and place in which they were born. The exception is the Participant 4, who declared himself as believer of Judaism. Confessional belonging is “a very important thing” to him, since he had a possibility of choice, which he exercised (with his father being Serbian, Orthodox, and mother of Jewish origin). Therefore, confession is more valued when it is a product of personal choice, and not a socio-culturally given.

Similarly to the results from the other researches, the participants emphasize their spirituality as opposed to traditional religiosity. Aware of the social context, which is characterized by the wave of retraditionalization, that is, “a return to the good old values”, they notice, in the religious sphere, the phenomenon of belonging-without-believing – conformist behavior in accordance with the new dominant ideology. The behavior, whose authenticity, in a sense of being based on the inner religious feeling, can be questioned. This religious revival in the East differs from the
desecularization in the post-modern west, and is marked by retotalization and recollectivization – the form very similar to the communist social system (see: Blagojević, 2005: 137-8).

Participant 1: There are people who are really..., as that is concerned, a lot into it – faith, God, blah-blah, they get drunk every weekend, go out, they are not moderate with foods and drinks, they brake all (...) those people are not religious, and they don't have the idea of theory, if they have only once read the Bible, although there's nothing special inside it, that is, it is not plainly written so they could instantly understand how to behave, and I don't even know if they know ten commandments (...) I think of spirituality as some kind of inner harmony (...) For me, spirituality is more personal, people who believe may exist, but they might not be spiritual, not fulfilled.

Participant 2: Spirituality, religion, and faith.. Hm.. first and foremost, I think that, you know, Church doesn’t practice this religion the right way, I think it's only a way to get the money and nothing else, and I think that priests no longer have their, how should I say this... They don't behave according to the norm, in accordance with the dogma, so you can say priests (...) Spirituality... I think that... every man experiences it differently, you know, I think, and I can't tell exactly, now with words, about spirituality, I think the closest, moment of consciousness, the moment of feeling, it's hard to say (...) Faith and religion... yes... I believe, believe in the Serbian Orthodox Church, I am Orthodox, but that doesn't mean that I respect and approve everything that they do. I still think that faith must be practiced on a higher level than it is done here (...) To tell you honestly, I think, let me tell you my first impression, like, it is possible that I think of this things as equal, but I don’t connect them to Church, nor with any other institution, that means it's something mine, my experience, my everything... like Serbian Orthodox Church, and any other Church, they can practice their religion and they can express their faith, but that’s not that. I think everybody has his own experience and his own story.

Participant 4: When we, for example, talk about an institution, for example, a synagogue and a church, it would be something entirely different, because I do not mix religion and the institution, I have to be clear on that. Every institution is the same, just to say that, I just do not have a lot of good, positive feedback about these institutions. (...) Spirituality, I think, is for me, something most important in my life, now if you ask me to compare it, I don't make a difference, maybe I'm not, I may not have a sufficient knowledge, but for me religion, faith and spirituality essentially are the same, so I do not know, spirituality as a state of consciousness, type of, you know, you believe, and again it is connected to religion and spirituality, therefore I do not know. (...) Perhaps when you say religion, you think of a general term, like you have a lot of religions. First, I think of Islam, Judaism, Christianity, Catholicism, firstly this, Orthodox Church, and then the division of Lutheran, Evangelists or Evangelical, Reformer, Anglican, blah-blah-blah. So for me when you say religion, I first think of lots of different religions, you know, when you mention spirituality, it is something entirely mine, I feel that I'm talking about myself, and belief, again, is associated with religion, as if being religious and being faithful is the same for me.

Participant 5: For me, Church was always a bore, like “today I have to go to Church”, that day you wake up, you wear your best clothes and we go to Church. I mean why – I am asleep, I don't want to go to church today, and simply, when I found something somewhere for me, that wasn’t a problem anymore and I love to drop by the Church and I look at all that in a different way. But, I'm not a believer who is there for the service and who knows all the rules, who bows in front of the icon, who knows what to wear, and then leaves the
church and hates everyone who is not a part of it, I mean, what is the point of all my respect if I, at the first step out of the Church, hate someone for spitting, where is then that spirituality? Then, I simply found myself in faith, to me the most important thing is simply my relationship with God, my spirituality, my relationship to the prayer – I pray from a taxi, I pray at the party, I pray in the middle of the night, before going to bed, in the morning, in the evening, when I feel the need and wherever and I think that generally going to Church every day or on Sunday is not a priority. That's again that politics, and I think that faith... Well, someone who never went to Church, and who can in a hard moment for him stand and look at the sky and say “Oh I beg of You Lord” and not out loud for someone to hear, I think that is a real believer and a true one, and if he is somewhere not afraid of God, but simply tries simply to be god-pleasing in life, than, I think, he is a believer, and I am for that kind, I experience myself as that kind of believer. I’m not that kind of person – I go, but I’m not believer, I’m not into rules, rituals, and against some I rebel, some of them I don’t understand, some are obsolete, some things, why do I have to light a candle when you enter a Church? Sometimes I want to come in just for three minutes, sometimes I want to sit inside the church for five days, inside a monastery... 

In connection with such an understanding of spirituality, which emphasizes action of the self, and not that of religious institution, is the phenomenon that Danièle Hervieu-Léger calls *bricolage* (“bricoler” – cobble; do odd jobs; potter about; tinker), and Robert Wuthnow *patchwork religion* (“patchwork” - a collection of miscellaneous or incongruous parts; a jumble) – religion “thrown together” from the beliefs and practices which were at hand (as an object made out of Lego bricks). People are shaping their faith out of elements which are borrowed from traditional and publicly recognized religions, the new (mostly New Age) religious movements, from the folk superstition, profane ideologies and popularized scientific concepts, primarily psychological and especially psychoanalytic ones. Law writes of spirituality (1997: 345) as “the ability to make connections”. 

The term *cafeteria religions* came to denote the setting “where people choose their religious beliefs and practices according to what inspires and nourishes them” (Savastano, 2007: 12). This kind of religious hybridity presupposes the process of negotiating between different parts of religious identity, as to make them into a compatible whole. This process seems to be the hallmark of the modern world, where “[e]xcept for the hermit or the isolated sect, identity negotiation appears to be unavoidable” (Thumma, 1991: 345).

Post-socialist societies seem to be taking makeup exam in religious instruction – institutionally determined religious practices and beliefs are gaining absolute primacy in the religious lives of the people. This may be a necessary step in a tardy process of modernization, it may be a reaction to the long-term imposed atheization on the part of the socialist state, and it may also be one kind of cultural resistance to the “godless” and consumerist West and it’s *Eurosecularity* (Berger, 2005: 438). Whatever the case may be, the form of religiosity found in the participants in the research can be qualified as the vanguard for its social environment, since this form of religiosity is characteristic for the western, highly developed capitalistic, post-modern/industrial societies, where the ruling credo became *anything goes*:

*Participant 3*: I know, God is in essence pure energy, some fourth level of our mind, if you are, like, have beta state, alpha state, and like, last state of mind, like it’s merely working, and in that state we are all connected, that is that collective unconscious, I don’t know, now, different schools of psychology call it differently, different faiths mark it differently, but that energy exists, because,
by meditation, I don't know, by hypnosis you can go there, and now, if you are conscious enough to maintain conscious state when you go there – okay, you'll feel everything that people feel, what they feel through prayer, through meditation. And that is God for me, collective unconscious, from where we get the good and the bad.

Participant 2: Here, an actual example, for every exam I have a specific ritual, like, even in the elementary school and the secondary school for every grade I had a specific ritual, that is, like, the evening before I have some test and the evening before an exam, you know, you turn to the east, because they say “turn to the east and let the first light of the dawn shine on you and pray to God and ask him to do something for you”... I do that to the very day and I still believe in it, now maybe I am superstitious, but whenever I didn't do that I flunked and never did anything in my life. Now, that's something I practice and what I really believe. Or, for example, I believe, like, that's my written path by which I go to my faculty, like, I go down this path and I pass the exam, but if I turn from the path, no way. Yes, specific rituals have to exist, like in situations like that I call God, and (...) in some especially difficult situations, purely... In those situations, it's usually a torrent of thoughts, musings, you know, all sorts of leavings, and then you say like “God help me”, you know, in that, when you say it's like a dramatic pause, some small brake, and with that if you are a bit superstitious, like, it gives you some energy... like you're not alone, like you nevertheless know, he is going to help you or something like that.

Participant 5: [Do you have problems with people who are not believers or with people who are “real” believers, in a sense that they are trying to convince you this or that?] I have both problems, and that is very strange, because they tell me that I am some third kind of faith, which I find very funny.

Regarding the questions of the attitude of Christianity, i.e. Judaism, towards homosexuality, the participants give answers that are very similar to those given by the respondents in USA and Great Britain – critical interpretation of dogma through socio-cultural relativization of the meaning of the Holy Scriptures, emphasizing the fallibility of the Church as well as lack of informed, educated and goodwill clergy. But there is a difference in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures between the participants from Serbia and those abroad, which is probably a consequence of anti-religious socialization in the socialist regime (see: Barker, 1998: 128).

Participant 1: Uh, I know, ouch, like some character, like his wife is not there, and he went somewhere, I don't remember, and to be worse, I underlined (...) I read it only once, Old Testament is more interesting than the New. To me it is more like a fairytale, while I read it, I imagined a cartoon... New Testament is somehow, like, I don't know... [What do you think what was Jesus' attitude?] Hmm, well, he surrounded himself with 12 men (...) I think that every faith, every nation, translated the Bible as it wanted to.

Participant 2: Well, you know what, they think that, like, for every illness there is a pill that we, like, swallow and tomorrow everything is going to be OK (...) you have seen the Bible in our office, which we read, and like there is nothing in there explicitly against homosexual liaison, against homosexuals, so, like, their story is not water-proof! And, by the way, I don't care what they say and I don't think about that, and them people should educate more, like, to be more open-minded. [Do you know in which parts of the Bible is homosexuality mentioned?] Uh... I read that so long ago. And, like, we have it copied, we have marked pages, so you can just turn the page, you don't have to... No, sincerely, I've tried to read the Bible, it was somehow... Dull. I have a problem with a text
where there's no picture. [Have you read the whole of it?] No, I tried, but I can't, I have a problem, it is hard for me to read it, it was written in some, somehow... [Archaic?] Yes, so... If it only had pictures, it would be good. [What is your attitude towards those parts in which there is a mention of homosexuality?] Almost all of us here in the office read it, and we had lecture on the subject of, I think, “Homosexuality through history”, like through the centuries, I like some kind of their understanding, some story of theirs, which was far from... It was funny at some moments. Like the Greeks could have boys, and that was generally approved, and like it was super, you know, we all watched “Alexander”, and now, like, thousands of years of modernization, and I don't know what else, and, you know, we're on some higher level of development of a mind as well as technology, now it is a taboo, and it is “sick” according to them, I mean, like, c'mon people...

Participant 3: You have it in the Old and in the New Testament. In the Old Testament in the... The relationship between, uh, I can't really remember the names now [David and Jonathan?] Yes! That's it! And you have it in two places, in the Bible when you look at the Old and the New Testament you don't really have strong attitude against homosexuality [sic], actually you have one place which says “Don't sleep with a man, it is an abomination”, just that. And there is one more, it's in some of the gospels... I can't remember. I've read it so long ago. [What's your attitude toward those parts where homosexuality is mentioned?] You mean, if they turn me on? [No. I mean your feelings about alleged condemnation] Bible was written by a man. It's just a work of man, like the “Zarathustra”, like, I don't know... [So, you're not too worried about it?] No, and when I read the Bible I don't have, like, too much, I don't get much spirituality from the Bible itself, and why would I? [Have you read the whole of it?] Yes, yes, yes. The New Testament just recently, some three or four years ago, and the Old Testament long time ago, I think, the Old Testament is nevertheless better than the New.

Participant 4: Look I, uhm, don't have enough knowledge to be able to tell you something about it, although that might be the most important thing in this interview. I don't have enough knowledge about the official stand of Judaism towards it (...) [Do you know in which parts of the Bible is homosexuality mentioned?] I sort of, know, this, like man who has long hair is associated with homosexuality. Ouch, I don't know if it is some of the evangelist, nor do I know, erm, like 'sorry', I didn’t prepare myself. If I knew, I would go over the Bible and tell you exactly... [But you know that there is something in the Bible?] Yes, yes, something like man behaving like a woman... [What is your attitude towards that?] What's my attitude? Well, look, first, I must start with... Look, before everything else, I see that as an opinion of some specific people who were biblical characters, not as a word of God, I make a big difference there. I'm not one of those people who will swallow the “it is a word of God” thing and it was said by some evangelist whose name was Matthew, Luke, Mark, John, I'm not like that. And thank God, I went a little bit further, like, if you understand what I am trying to say, I don't absorb every word, and, erm, it is a single man's opinion and, it's been so much understood, that what the priests and others glorify, exaggerate in the sense of “The word of God”, I don't accept that and I don't believe in it, so, my attitude is that that is not true, and that, what the Church is saying like that, and again like... I think, you know what, it is not nice to say that, but to me Christianity is a funny religion, I apologize if I am offending someone, but simply I, so many things that I read, they seem funny to me that I really can't accept it as a word of God, but simply as a way the Church used it to, erm, control people. Let's not talk of the rejected Gospels, which are still hidden. Who knows what is written in them and who knows what is true there, and only those Gospels were accepted and put in that New Testament that suit the Church, if you know what I'm trying to say. For example, in Jewish religion
there's Torah and Thalmud, and nothing is hidden, there are expansions, expanded, it's really a dogma of the Jewish religion, of the Jewish people, and at the same time a history, religion and everything else, but that's not something hidden, like "we're not going to put this in Torah, this we're no going to put in Thalmud" like with the Bible.

Participant 5: I don't know. [Have you ever read the Bible?] Yes, I have read it in an early age and I know some parts by heart, and I'm preparing to, like, read it again, but now I'm like more mature person, sometimes I said 'I'm gonna read it when I'll be spiritually ready to read it, so I wouldn't have to read it again like... [You have read the Old and the New Testament?] No, no, I've read only the New Testament. [And do you know, not by heart, what is the "attitude" of the Bible toward homosexuality?] No. I didn't pay much interest, but...

Participant 5 mentions the existence of “too many rules” which the Church, as he sees it, implements selectively – by judging the flock, but not the shepherds, who are protected even in some cases when the charges against them are raised by the secular (juridical) authority.

The relation of religion and homosexuality cannot satisfactorily be considered if the global context is not taken into account. Modernization has destroyed the homogeneity that characterized traditional society, and brought racial, ethnic and religious pluralism. In order to survive in this new situation, religious institutions must develop their capacities so they can operate as a voluntaristic association. In this manner, they can engage, more efficiently, with pluralism. However, this would not be an easy task bearing in mind that “the concept of pluralism can be a problem for the country, ignorant even of those suspect kinds of democracies which can be found in the west” (Barker, 1998: 128). This means that the Church, in order to survive, has to “behave” in the way denominations do – as religious institutions that have almost all the features of the church, but which individuals join on the basis of their (free) choice, which is a characteristic of the sect. Other possibilities, in addition to engaging and inner transformation, would be: 1) resistance to pluralism and 2) withdrawal from the “religious market”. These two neotraditionalist, or, in other words, fundamentalist options have a smaller chance of “success”, given that they are not compatible with liberal democracy, which goes hand in hand with pluralism, as is itself a product of the process of modernization. Only in the conditions of a despotic state (Russia?) can this mode of religious community be expected to survive.
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