



FRIAS

FREIBURG INSTITUTE
FOR ADVANCED STUDIES
ALBERT-LUDWIGS-
UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG



Confessionalization vs Secularization Paradigms?

Workshop

May 25th – 26th, 2018

Organised by

Dimitris Stamatopoulos

The Confessionalization Paradigm was constructed to doubt a linear historical approach which connected directly the secularization process of the modernity with the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. But as long as we have to stand critical against an idealized version of Secularization's paradigm (as for example it took place in 1905 France) we have already to deal with the following question: the contribution of the political elites to the formation of religious identities was also pivotal for controlling and manipulating the interests of powerful religious elites? If Confessionalization was a field of continuous negotiation between political and religious elites, the secularization could be perceived as a progressive marginalization of the clergy not only to the civil society but also in the interior of the state mechanisms.

Confessionalization vs Secularization Paradigms?

Comparative perspectives in Western and Eastern/Southeastern Europe

Dimitris Stamatopoulos

In the last two decades the Confessionalization paradigm – as it was developed by Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling in the late 1970s and early 1980s - has influenced also the Eastern and Southeastern Historical Studies. The dominant role of the religion to the construction of collective or individual identities in the Balkans and Middle East started to be interpreted through Confessionalization although the experience of the Religious Wars was relatively unknown to the peoples of the Christian Orthodox East (Russian or Ottoman). This contradiction constituted the starting point for organizing the present workshop in order to compare not only the different historical experiences in Eastern/Southeastern and Western Europe but also the two paradigms, that of Secularization and Confessionalization, regarding the management of the religion-politics relations in the Western European, Russian and Ottoman cases.

Contemporary sociology of religion usually describes two historical versions of Secularization: the Church's submission to the state (usually through nationalization of the Church) or the separation of Church and State (usually by including the Church in what we call 'Civil Society'). In one sense, these two paradigms were produced through the experience of the Religious Wars, even though they did not effectively result in the abolition of the religious monopoly in the countries of Western and Central Europe. The workshop will examine the theoretical discussion on the revision of the classical position on secularization by discussing the case of the Orthodox Churches of Eastern and Southeastern Europe and attempts to categorize them both in relation to the Catholic and the Protestant model as well as in relation to the historical patterns of State control of the church, whether in the Colonial Empires of Western Europe or in the Continental Empires of the Eastern Europe.

On the other hand the Confessionalization Paradigm was constructed exactly to doubt a linear historical approach which connected directly the secularization process of the modernity with the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. But as long as we have to stand critical against an idealized version of Secularization's paradigm (as for example it took place in 1905 France) we have already to deal with the following question: the contribution of the political elites in Eastern and Southeastern Europe to the stabilization and/or demarcation of religious identities was also pivotal for controlling and manipulating the interests of powerful religious elites? And in which degree a political manipulation like this was successful and how much influential on the state-building process in the imperial as well as in the post-imperial (national) states?

In conclusion the critical comparison of two paradigms will be based exactly on these two bipolar historical axes: colonial and continental as well as imperial and national.

Keynote Lecture:
Confession and Confessionalization in Europe. The State of Art
Wolfgang Reinhard

The paradigm of confessionalization originated between 1977 and 1983 as a falsification of the traditional temporal dialectic of Reformation – Counterreformation – Modern State. Instead, social history proved the parallel development of Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Catholicism and, in addition, also of the different ecclesiastical territories. Accordingly, confessionalization was considered as the achievement of ecclesiastical and political authorities. But in contrast, recent research has demonstrated the interactive contributions of subjects and authorities resulting in a low profile religious compromise.

Wolfgang Reinhard is professor emeritus of modern history of Freiburg University. Born in 1937 he received his Dr. phil. in history at Freiburg in 1963. He enjoyed research fellowships at Rome from 1966 to 1973. After the habilitation at Freiburg in 1973 he became professor of early modern history at Augsburg University in 1977. In 1990 he moved to Freiburg where he retired in 2002. In 2001 he received the German History Award (Preis des Historischen Kollegs) and in 2012 an honorary Dr. phil. of Konstanz University. Besides the British Academy he is member of the Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Is there an Orthodox Confession? Considerations on Confession and Confessionalisation in the Eastern European Christianity

Mihai-Dumitr Grigore

In my contribution, I present the results of the international conference held 2014 at the Leibniz Institute of European History in Mainz, which asked, if processes and paradigms of Western confession building and confessionalisation can be possibly applied on the Eastern Orthodox traditions. This question is not new, there are some punctual inquiries in this direction related to the Russian and Ukrainian area, but in this complexity and systematic the topic was discussed for the first time in Mainz. A broad area from Russia to Asia Minor is covered and the chronological spectrum stretches from the late Byzantine time (1204) until the beginning of the 20th c., in the era of the so-called 'second confessionalisation'. Interesting was to see how confessional delimitation appeared in the Eastern Christianity between Latin and Orthodox Christians even before the 16th c. - a 'confessionalisation' avant la letter as shown among other things by numerous formulae fidei -, as well as how confessional boundaries fundamentally determined State building processes, national modernist revivals, cultural and economic life, leading to such complexes designated in the late Western research-terminology with the integrative term 'Konfessionskultur' (T. Kaufmann, G. Wassilowsky).

Mihai-Dumitr Grigore, was Born in 1975; 1999: graduated at the University of Bucharest in the Department of Historical Theology and Byzantine History with a thesis on the Second Bulgarian Empire between the 12th and 13th centuries. 2007: PhD in church history from the Friedrich Alexander University of Erlangen and Nuremberg with a dissertation in historical anthropology on the topic of the sense of honour in medieval society based on a case study of the Pax Dei in the 10th and 11th centuries. 2007-2012: postdoctoral researcher at the Max Weber Center for Advanced Cultural and Social Studies and in the platform "World Regions and Interactions: Area Studies, Transregionally" in Erfurt with a project on the prince of the Wallachia Neagoe Basarab (1512-1521). January-May 2012: Stanley S. Seeger Research Fellow at the Center for Hellenic Studies of Princeton University. Since November 2012: member of the academic staff of the Leibniz Institute of European History in Mainz.

Coming to terms with multiconfessionalism: Europe at the beginning of the 17th century?

Ronald G. Asch

In 1629 a book was published in the Netherlands in The Hague to be precise which was entitled, *Europæ speculum. Or, A view or survey of the state of religion in the Western parts of the world wherein the Romane religion, and the pregnant policies of the Church of Rome to support the same, are notably displayed* This was the second edition of a treatise first published in 1605 under the title *A relation of the state of religion in Europe apparently without the author's Consent*. The original treatise on which both editions were based had been written by the Englishman Edwin Sandys. Sandys was the son of an Archbishop of York and had been born in 1561. His father had been a staunch Calvinist and Edwin Sandys's own views can be seen a reaction to the brutal and intolerant Calvinism of his father. Having been taught at Oxford by Richard Hooker one of the most influential English theologians of his time he had travelled widely in Europe. One of the cities he had visited was Venice where he met Paolo Sarpi the violently anti-papal priest and servite monk who played an important part in the conflict between Venice and the papacy in 1606-07. As a result of his travels Sandys wrote the treatise which was originally called *Europæ Speculum*. For Sandys there was a real chance to overcome the religious divisions of his time by way of a genuine compromise - he insisted that the Roman Catholic church was far less homogenous than was widely assumed, various factions fought against each other and by no means all Catholics in particular in France or Venice had a great deal of respect for the Pope. However if the divisions between Protestants and Catholics were to be overcome both sides had to make concessions.

Sandys can be seen as an outsider within Protestantism, his writings certainly provoked an outrage among the more militant Calvinists in England and abroad and one may rightly see in him a precursor of those laymen and theologians who wanted to position the English church midway between Rome and Geneva later in the century, the so called conformists or ceremonialists. Nevertheless there were a number of such figures around at the turn of the 17th century, Sandys was no complete exception. We find rulers such as James I of England who tried to achieve some sort of alliance of all princes against the theocratic pretensions of catholic and Presbyterian hardliners alike, catholic intellectuals such as the Venetian Paolo Sarpi who saw the power of the Papacy as the real threat to liberty and peace in Europe, or men who moved between the hostile camps as mediators or even as converts, such as Justus Lipsius for example and who seemed to favour rather a *religio politica* based on reason of state than the pure doctrine of the theologians.

The competition between rival confessional churches could have effects which were often contradictory. The feeling to live in a besieged fortress could re-enforce existing loyalties and strengthen the tendency to demonise the enemy one was fighting against, but the lost unity of Christianity could also stimulate a quest for some kind of common ground beyond the narrow

confines of one's own confessional camp, be it that one tried to take refuge in some kind of trans-confessional piety as Edwin Sandys apparently did for a time, or that one sought to construct a system of secular principles and rules which could withstand the onslaught of religious conflict, to that it was acceptable for both sides. However this quest for a more secular system of public or international law for example could in itself have its roots in a specific confessional perception and interpretation of the world, for a example a Calvinist or a Lutheran one. As there were different varieties of religious allegiance even within one and the same denomination or church, so there were different varieties of incipient secularism in the early 17th century. The insistence of a French Gallican on the independence of royal authority with regard to the Papacy, was different from the anticlerical attitude one might find in Protestant countries.

At the end of the day it is far from easy to distinguish between politicians and scholars who were prepared to seek some kind of compromise to contain and settle conflicts and more hawkish advocates of a warlike policy at the turn of the 17th century; one could be a religious hardliner and still believe that it might be better to let heretics in other countries go to hell in their own way as many Spanish councillors in influential positions increasingly came to believe in the 1590s or one could be comparatively tolerant in religious matters and still believe that a lasting peace would never be achieved without winning a complete victory against those who were themselves intolerant or seemed to be so.

But the dominant problem at the turn of the 17th century was the prevailing climate of distrust. The Protestant assumption that Catholics did not consider treaties with heretics as binding and the Catholic suspicion that Protestant wanted to undermine existing political structures such as the constitution of the Holy Roman Empire were an important factor in creating such lack of trust. But there were other reasons as well. Of course dissimulation and lies had always been an important part of politics but in the late 16th century dissimulation developed into a fine art, taught by a wealth of political treatises, inspired to some extent by Machiavelli but also by a particular reading of Tacitus. But "to constitute dissimulation as an object of knowledge – to put it into discourse – meant to alter its status irrevocably" as Jon Snyder has put it, in his study on the culture of secrecy in early modern Europe. Courtiers, politicians and theologians became obsessed with the idea of dissimulation and insincerity for the very reason that it was now seen as a central element of all political prudence and could seemingly be learned out of books. This heightened awareness of subterfuge, casuistry and secrecy as political weapons, reinforced the tendency to distrust one's religious opponents.

In Protestant countries such as England for example suspicion of treason regarding Catholics verged on paranoia. Less ardent protestants were seen as secret papists who only waited for the right moment to betray their country or to murder their countrymen but the atmosphere at catholic courts was not necessarily more conducive to stability and calm.

The fact that any kind of peace settlement, both at the domestic and the European level, had to be based on a certain amount of dissimulation given the enormous gulf between the real religious convictions and political objectives on both sides, remained problematic. And this dissimulation both widespread and perceived to be all pervasive in itself proved to be a source of mistrust and

therefore of future conflicts. Or as Alexandra Walsham has put it with regard to the domestic peace in England after 1558 and this insight can be transferred to some extent to inter.state relations. "By creating conditions in which dissimulation and clandestinity could flourish, it stimulated anxieties which culminated in the conviction that radical constitutional measures and military action had to be taken to prevent English Protestantism from being undermined from within." But was true for the English church settlement which was so much based on fudged compromises was even more true for all attempts to find common ground between the rival political and confessional powers in Europe before 1618.

Ronald G. Asch, has held the chair of Early Modern History in Freiburg since 2003. He obtained his Ph. D. in Tübingen in 1982 and his "venia legendi" (Dr. phil. habil.) in Münster in early 1992, having been employed for three years by the German Historical Institute in London in 1985-88 as a research fellow and having taught subsequently at the University of Münster. Before moving to Freiburg he taught for 6 years in Osnabrück. – He has published widely on British and Irish history in the 16th and 17th centuries, but also, in a comparative perspective on the history of kingship, the court and noble elites in the early modern Europe. He is a member of the Heidelberg Academy of Arts and Sciences and of the Academia Europaea.

The limits of Catholic and Orthodox confessionnalisation in the 18th Century

Bernard Heyberger

It is during the 18th Century that normativity has been systematically introduced into the Eastern Catholic Churches, under the pressing of Rome, and through Pontifical documents or through local synods which set the rules in various issues, like the relations between patriarch and bishops, the regulation of the monastic life, the sacraments, or the fasts and abstinences. This tendency to increase homogeneity within a denomination and to clearly establish the borders between one Christian flock and other Christian denominations or Muslims is not an exclusivity of Catholics. The Orthodox Church, in reaction and with similar instruments, aimed to work in the same direction of homogenization of the practice and control of the faithful, although with a weaker organization and a less efficient agency. That development has to do with confessionnalisation, as far as it raised borders among the people, signs of identification and differentiation among them, whereas previously ambiguity and confusion often prevailed. However, the ecclesiastical authorities never could completely achieve their scope, because a mix of denominations and practices prevailed among the Christians, and even improved during the 18th century, through migrations and mixed settlements, because the Ecclesiastical institutions remained weak and dependent from the secular, and because it was impossible to rely on the political power in order to enforce the pontifical, the patriarchal or the synodic decisions. Moreover, there is also a question of cognition: the idea that homogenization would be achieved through a scholarly work on sources, in order to turn back to the genuine traditions considered corrupted by the manuscript copies, became an unattainable scope because as far as knowledge progressed, the unity and the homogeneity of the traditional rules were contested by scholarship.

Bernard Heyberger graduated in History and Arabic in Strasbourg. He prepared his Ph.D. (U. of Nancy II, 1993) as a fellow of the École Française de Rome. He was a Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Tours. He is currently Professor (“Directeur d’Études») at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) with a chair dedicated to « Historical Anthropology of Christians under Islam”; and at “Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes » (Chair : History of Eastern Christians, 16th-21th C.) in Paris. From 2010 to 2014 he managed the Institut d’études de l’Islam et des sociétés du monde musulman (IISMM) at the EHESS. As an historian and an arabist, he devotes his researches to the study of Eastern Christians under Islam, especially in the Ottoman Syria. He focuses on interaction between the Christian minority and the Muslim society, as well as on the dynamics of contact, opposition and mimicry between Eastern Christians and the West. He gives a special attention to the role of Western scholarship in the building up of sectarian, ethnic and national identities since the 17th C.

Main publications :

- Les chrétiens du Proche-Orient au temps de la Réforme catholique, Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1994 (second edit. 2014, Arabic transl. in preparation).
- Hindiyya (1720 – 1798), mystique et criminelle, Aubier, 2001 (Arabic : Dar Al-Nahar, 2010 ; English : James Clarke, 2013).
- Les chrétiens au Proche-Orient. De la compassion à la compréhension, Payot, 2013.
 - Hanna Dyâb, D'Alep à Paris. Les pérégrinations d'un jeune Syrien au temps de Louis XIV, (trad. et édit. avec J. Lentin et P. Fahmé-Thiéry), Actes Sud, 2015 (German translation : Die Andere Bibliothek, 2016).
 - Les chrétiens d'Orient, Paris, PUF (Que-sais-je?), 2017.

May we speak of religious wars in the Russian Tsardom in the second Half of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century?

Jan Kusber

In the mid of the 17th century a serious split occurred within the Russian Orthodox Church. In the wider context of the Church Reforms of Patriarch Nikon, the old believers, the so called "raskolniki" left the church and attacked the reformers to neglect the genuine Russian tradition of Orthodoxy. What came up, was not a sectarian movement, but a split with Orthodoxy of theological as of political importance till the End of the Tsarist Empire and beyond. In my talk, I will discuss 1. If the confessionalization paradigm fits to this split within the church and 2. weather we may speak of religious wars in the consequence. The Solovki-uprising, the rebellions of the famous Stenka Razin and the less famous Kondratij Bulavin, the extensive burning of "raskolniki" by Peter the great will serve as examples to discuss the topic.

Jan Kusber studied East European History at the universities of Kiel and Poznan. Since 2003 he is Full Professor and Chair for East European History at Johannes Gutenberg-University in Mainz. His interest of Research is the premodern Russian Empire, especially in the Age of Catherine the Great.

Among his publications are:

With Ilya Gerasimov, Alexander Semyonov (Ed.): Empire Speaks out? Languages of Rationalization and Self-Description in the Russian Empire. Leiden 2009.

Kleine Geschichte St. Petersburgs. Regensburg 2009.

Eliten- und Volksbildung im Zarenreich während des 18. und in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Studien zu Diskurs, Gesetzgebung und Umsetzung. Stuttgart 2004 (extended Version also in Russian 2018).

Nationalization as Confessionalization and Secularization?

Modern Developments within the Eastern Orthodox World

Vasilios N. Makrides

Given the increased interest during the last years to apply the Western confessionalization paradigm to the Eastern Orthodox world, it is necessary to reflect on the appropriate ways to undertake this challenging endeavor. This becomes especially evident by taking into consideration the particular contours and ramifications of the overall Eastern Orthodox historical evolution, which are in many respects different from the respective Western Latin ones. No doubt, it is possible to apply the confessionalization paradigm in various ways to Eastern Orthodoxy, either by locating existing parallels and analogies to the Latin West or by underlining any obvious divergences from it. The present paper will attempt to show that one way to do this is by looking at the pervasive nationalization process, which has radically transformed the Eastern Orthodox world from the 19th c. onwards. This led to a “national pluralization” of the Orthodox world, which may be compared with the “confessional pluralization” that has taken place much earlier in the West in the wake of the Reformation. Contrary to various theories postulating the opposition between the confessionalization and the secularization paradigms in the West (e.g., regarding the “Zweites konfessionelles Zeitalter” during the 19th c.), it will be argued that nationalization in the Orthodox East was closely connected with modernization processes that had a clear secularizing agenda. Thus, the latter issue also invites us to reflect in this context on the specific ways secularity and secularization should be conceptualized with particular reference to the Orthodox world, a point on which East and West again differ.

Prof. Vasilios N. Makrides is Professor of Religious Studies (specializing in Orthodox Christianity) at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Erfurt.

***The struggle for ecclesiastical autocephaly of the Macedonian orthodox church:
nation as confession?***

Nenad Živković

The Macedonian ecclesiastical schism turned 50 last year, while the Republic of Macedonia, internationally recognized as the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, has been independent for the last 27 years. Gaining of political independence did not automatically lead to the ecclesiastical recognition, arguably because the name-issue (Macedonia) stands at the core of this schism. Despite a quite promising attempt to solve the schism in the Republic of Macedonia in 2002, the Macedonian Orthodox Church chose rather to remain in schism, then to potentially harm national interests. Hence, the question arises, can belonging to the Macedonian Orthodox Church, defined on national grounds (because one is of Macedonian nationality he/she can or even must belong to the MOC), be in a certain way understood as confession? Considering the fact that the MOC is ecclesiastically unrecognized i.e. uncanonical church and that there is, at the same time, a canonical church in Macedonia, which in turn is publicly perceived as anti-Macedonian, one could very well come to such a conclusion. Drawing on various statements of several church figures of the MOC on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the autocephaly declaration I would like to examine the previous question.

Nenad Živković studied orthodox theology in Serbia and completed a master studies program in the field of Religious Studies at the University of Erfurt (Germany). He is currently finishing his PhD thesis on the link between nation-building strategies and the struggle for ecclesiastical autocephaly in the Republics of Macedonia and Montenegro in comparative perspective. Some of his interests include national-ecclesiological issues within Orthodoxy, the nation-church link in the southeast European Orthodox tradition, Orthodox churches in West Europe etc.

Confessionalization and Secularization in Bosnia under Habsburg rule

Heiner Grunert

The paper analyzes the interdependence of confessionalization and secularization in Bosnia under Habsburg imperial rule. From the 1880s until the 1910s several religious hierarchies redefined religious knowledge and implemented religious norms. This process ran parallel with the fundamental restructuring of religious organization and its religious experts by the Habsburg state. Before the 1880s religious knowledge and religious practice was to a far greater degree characterized by unwritten, customary and regional traditions especially among the non-Muslim population. These traditions often resembled practices and convictions of other religious groups. Top-down and state backed religious reforms thus sharpened on the one hand the distinction between private and public religion; on the other hand it deepened the practical and discursive boundaries towards other denominational groups.

Imperial confessionalization in the nineteenth century included intended and unintended secularization. One intended form of secularization was the hierarchical separation of religion and politics, state and religious organizations. Whereas political participation for the Bosnian (male) population was mostly forbidden, Bosnians demanded participation in the religious (by definition non-political) field. After years of quarrels Habsburg sanctioned religious autonomy for Serbian-Orthodox and Muslim communities in 1905 and 1909. These religious statutes defined religion as a broad social field. On the other hand the statutes distinguished between secular and religious duties of religious organizations and opened possibilities of largely autonomous lay (male) participation in religious administration and education. Lay people within religious organizations could now make decisions about schools, pious endowments and cultural organizations - often with quite profane national motivations.

Because of the 'short' Habsburg rule and Bosnia's three main religious groups, the country is a laboratory for studying confessionalization and secularization processes. Bosnia shows on the one hand that 'Verkirchlichung' of religious life can go parallel to developments of more secular social distinctions and that secularization on the other hand does not necessarily mean that religion loses social importance.

Heiner Grunert studied Eastern and Southeast European history and Slavic studies in Leipzig and Sarajevo. He completed his PhD on religious life of Serbian Orthodox believers in Habsburg-ruled Herzegovina at Ludwig-Maximilians Universität Munich (LMU) in 2015. Since 2014 he is research assistant at the chair of Eastern and Southeast European history at LMU Munich.

The paradox secularization process in interwar Greece: Anglicans and Orthodox, confessionalization and State building.

Dora Dimanopoulou

After the defeat of the Greek Great idea (Megali Idea) in Asia Minor, the interest in modernizing the Greek Church became very significant, as the Greek State during the 1920s hoped to use the cultic mediation of the Church to the process of the State building after a long period of wars. The reform of the Church accommodated the plans of liberals and the liberal governments themselves integrated into their agendas the modernization of the Church, in order that the State use not only the cult influence of the Church for the moralization of society, but also its help in order to integrate the populations created and/or developed by the war. The Greek *Great Idea* (Μεγάλη Ιδέα), which has nationalized the statist character of the autocephalous Church of Greece and has Hellenized the ecumenism of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, looked for a new politico-theological model in the framework of the new Nation-State. For the Greek liberals the Anglican model of Church-State establishment provided an interesting paradigm of Church-State relations and accorded well with their aims. In this perspective in 1922, Meletios Metaxakis famous liberal clergyman welcomed the idea of union between the Anglican and Greek Orthodox churches as *one of the most important events of the century*. What impact did the above mentioned unification between the Anglican and Greek Orthodox Churches have in the process of secularisation in interwar Greece? In my paper I will discuss, by means of the archival resources, the question of whether the reconciliation attempts between the Anglican and the Greek Orthodox Church during the interwar period played an active role in the process of secularization in Greece. Is there an Anglo-Saxon paradigm of confessionalization that influenced the Greek Orthodox reality? Can we show a perspective for any usefulness of the confessionalization concept as a research tool for the study of Greek orthodox political religious and cultural history? If so, my paper will try to demonstrate which elements of this paradigm were adapted, transformed or ignored to the Greek reality.

After my doctoral thesis, at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, I continued my postdoctoral research at the Institut of political Studies in Paris, at the University of Postdam and at the Free University of Berlin. Drawing on tools and insights from different branches of the social and political sciences, I seek to match the complexity of the history of International relations by providing forms of analysis that connect its human, socio-political, economic and religious dimensions. My current research focuses on the agency of Churches as social non –state actors which participated in economic, political and cultural transnational networks. I have also taught in postgraduate and postgraduate courses and seminars in France and Greece. I have published a book entitled *“Rendez à César ce qui est à César et à Dieu ce qui est à Dieu? Le rapprochement entre les Églises anglicane et orthodoxe grecque, 1903-1930”* and numerous

academic articles on European and Greek political, diplomatic and social history in journals and books.

Secularisation and Confessionalisation in the Making of Modern Romania

Lucian Leustean

All post-1989 opinion polls in Romania have placed the predominant religious confession, the Orthodox Church, as one of the top trusted institutions in the country with annual figures usually ranging around 70-80 per cent. For the first time, in October 2017, the results of an opinion poll gave the Church less than 50 per cent in the population's trust as a public institution. Is this significant drop an example of secularisation gaining pace in Romania or a major shift in religious values in society? This talk examines the interplay between secularisation and confessionalisation by focusing on the ways in which Romanians have engaged with religious confessions by exploring the institutionalisation of the sacred in the making of modern Romania from the nineteenth century until today.

Dr Lucian Leustean is a Reader in Politics and International Relations at Aston University, Birmingham, United Kingdom. His publications include, as author, *Orthodoxy and the Cold War. Religion and Political Power in Romania, 1947-65* (Palgrave, 2008) and, as editor, *Eastern Christianity and Politics in the Twenty-First Century* (Routledge, 2014).

Politics and Religion under AKP Rule: The Sacralization of Politics or the Politicization of Religion?

Nikos Christofis

Religion, politics and nationalism in Turkey – and not only in Turkey – are bound together in a very distinct relationship that forms an integral part of the framework of the ideology of the state, ever since the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923. More recently, and in particular, since 2002 when the Justice and Development Party (AKP) came to power, scholars tend to refer to the socio-political process undergoing in Turkey, dependent upon the emphasis one perceives on religion, in terms of ‘Islamization’ or ‘de-Islamization’ of Turkey. This choice of emphasis, the present paper contents, is not only clear-cut, but also perplexes rather than exemplifies the Turkish socio-political scene. The aim of the present paper, and the core issue that it will deal with, is to consider the ‘nationalization/’politicization’ of religion along with the path of the interaction between religion, nationalism and territory, during the AKP rule (2002-2018).

Nikos Christofis is adjunct lecturer at the Department of Balkan, Slavic and Oriental Studies at the University of Macedonia in Greece and postdoctoral researcher at the same university. He is also adjunct lecturer at the Hellenic Open University. He previously was postdoctoral researcher at the Research Centre for the Humanities (RCH) in Athens, Greece. He completed his PhD at the Leiden University Institute for Area Studies (LIAS), Leiden, The Netherlands. His revised and expanded thesis, *From Socialism via Anti-Imperialism to Nationalism. EDA – TİP: Socialist Contest over Cyprus*, will be published soon. His work focuses on comparative historical analysis in the Eastern Mediterranean, and in particular, Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus, and the Middle East. He is the chief editor of the academic website, *Ottoman and Turkish Studies* at Dissertation Reviews and member of the editorial board of the journal *New Middle Eastern Studies*. He published extensively in Greek, Turkish, English and Spanish in edited volumes and academic journals. He recently edited a book on *War and Resistance in Thessaly Greece during the 1940s* (in Greek). He can be reached at n.christofis@gmail.com; n.christofis@uom.edu.gr.

1. List of Participants

Ronald G. Asch	ronald.g.asch@geschichte.uni-freiburg.de
Nikos Christofis	n.christofis@gmail.com
Dora Dimanopoulou	
Mihai-D. Grigore	grigore@ieg-mainz.de
Heiner Grunert	h.grunert@lmu.de
Bernard Heyberger	bernard.heyberger@ehess.fr
Jan Kusber	kusber@uni-mainz.de
Lucian Leustean	L.LEUSTEAN@aston.ac.uk
Vasilios N. Makrides	vasilios.makrides@uni-erfurt.de
Wolfgang Reinhard	wolfgang.k.w.reinhard@web.de
Dimitris Stamatopoulos	dimitris.stamatopoulos@frias.uni-freiburg.de
Nenad Živković	nenad.zivkovic@uni-erfurt.de