

# THE ROMANIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH, MORALITY, AND POLITICS

Nicu Dumitrașcu\*

**Abstract:** In this paper the author shows *whether* or in *what manner* the Romanian Orthodox Church influences social relations in the contemporary world, where anti-religious activism prevails, alongside maximal liberalism and ideological intolerance. The Church proposes models that change the secular mentality of post-modern individuals and contributes to the improvement of the moral climate of society. The article examines the relationship and limits of collaboration between Church and State, religious and secular power, renewal of the Orthodox Church, its dialogue with intellectuals, and the criticism that comes from the followers of religious syncretism, often confused with ecumenism, the identity crisis of new generations and the moral relativism of civil society, and the use of technology and digital communication. The scientific and technological progress has not brought social and emotional balance to human being, but spiritual alienation. The Orthodox Church should rethink the manner of communicating with people in such a way that, without renouncing its own identity, it promotes a moralizing and brotherly spirit in modern society.

**Keywords:** Capitalism, Ideology, Identity Crisis, Orthodox Church, Church-State Politics, Secular Society.

## 1. Introduction

The contemporary world is anti-religious, dominated by a deeply secularized culture, manifested generally in the form of two radically opposed ideologies: i) the socialist (or communist, in its extreme

---

\***Nicu Dumitrașcu**, Professor of Patristics, Mission and Ecumenism at the Faculty of Orthodox Theology, Episcop Dr Vasile Coman, University of Oradea, Romania, gave lectures in Croatia, Finland, Belgium and Lebanon. His publications include *Christian Family and Contemporary Society* (2014), *The Ecumenical Legacy of the Cappadocians* (2015), and *Basil the Great: Faith, Mission and Diplomacy in the shaping of Christian Doctrine*, and several research articles in Journals. Email: nicud\_ird@yahoo.com.

form) ideology, characterized by *egalitarianism*, which plunges humanity into an anonymous and amorphous mass, and ii) the capitalist ideology that talks about freedom, which often turns into, sometimes uncontrollable, *maximal liberalism*. The former promotes a kind of dissembled dictatorship of the people and centralized economy, while the latter promotes democracy and private economy. At the same time, however, both are products of an autonomous and secularized mentality, in which reason replaces love (Popescu 12). Both ideologies have an impersonal character and place equality and freedom over humanity and society, a society oriented towards the world and earthly values in total indifference to and in contradiction of the heavenly ones (Popescu 90-91).

The Bible teaches us that equality and freedom, though important, are not the most important values for us, but rather communion or personal relationships among people based on love and mutual service. The human person discovers their true vocation and the essence of their existence in communion with and in connections of love and obedience as a mirror or projection of the communion of the Holy Trinity (Popescu 90-91). Moreover, breaking communion destroys both freedom and equality. Neither one nor the other can be achieved by itself. True freedom cannot be acquired only through the unlimited development of one's own powers and resources, because the human being is not made for individualistic autonomy or for the accumulation of treasures in this world, 'where moths and vermin destroy' (Matthew 6:20) but for communion and love. Similarly, the simple search for equality cannot also bring social justice because this is not obtained by dictatorship, terror, and depriving others from their freedom, but instead only by mutual communion, in which each person is also a recipient and a giver (Popescu 91). In this situation, the Romanian Orthodox Church, whose moral principles are in total contradiction to the secular values that govern today's human life, needs spiritual inspiration and imagination to find and propose appropriate solutions to the new and increasing challenges it faces. For this, however, it has, to a great extent, rethink its own pastoral methods and the capacities it has for internal renewal and communication with the State or public institutions and with the believers.

## 2. The Limits of Collaboration between the Church and State

Most theologians, when discussing the relationship between the Church and State and the competences of each institution, in order to try to establish the limits of collaboration between them, usually start from the dialogue between Pontius Pilate and Jesus. At the meeting of the two at the praetorium, Jesus tells Pontius Pilate that the power to crucify him is given "from above" (John 19:11), that is, from God, and that His kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36), that is not from the world of Pontius Pilate. The dialogue itself seems paradoxical, though it helps to understand the relationship between the secular and the spiritual power today. If Jesus had a kingdom similar to that of Pontius Pilate, His servants would have fought for Him not to be delivered into the hands of the Jews (John 18:36); His kingdom is different from that of the world, and He came into the world to confess the whole truth (John 18:37). In other words, Jesus did not establish a kingdom whose power lies in the constraints and obligations, like the others, but in truth and in the free manifestation of the spirit. That is why the Church also, through which Jesus continues His presence among the people, must not prove its superiority over the State by the same means as used by the State, which would distort its purpose, but rather by its own specific means, by prayer, by the power of the example of the believers (clergy and the faithful), respecting its canonical norms and moral dispositions (Stăniloae 152-153).

At first glance, the dialogue between Pontius Pilate and Jesus seems to establish a clear separation between the Church and the State, but we must bear in mind that the kingdom of heaven Jesus talks about is won by the continuous struggle with sin that human beings carry throughout their life in this world, the world of Pontius Pilate and ourselves. Moreover, this inter-relationship between the two worlds represents the basis or foundation of the mission and pastoral care of the Orthodox Church. Although the mentality of a complete separation of the two institutions exists in some of the radical circles of the Orthodox world, the Church cannot isolate itself from the needs of its believers, it cannot look from a distance at how the State, instead of protecting its citizens and securing for them the conditions by which they come to perfection, oppresses and exploits them (Seliște 15). At the same time, while it does not have to become a constant critic or become an opponent of all the legislative

measures, it does have an obligation to ask the State not to deviate from its purpose in the world, namely, to be in the service of God and all people, not just a person or groups of people with common interests (Târziu 3). If the State fulfils its purpose, then the Church should bless and support it. Therefore, between the Church, identified with the personification of the kingdom of grace, and the State, identified with the kingdom of law, there should be a good collaboration, each appreciating the activity of the other, without confusing their duties or substituting responsibilities.

The Church should not disturb the activities of the State, to ensure order and compliance with the law in the society, and the State should not intervene in the internal organization of the Church, nor the socio-pastoral mission of the Church. In this way, both the freedom of the Church and the State is ensured, fulfilling the will of God by two different but complementary services. But if we were to make a distinction between the two institutions, and also an observation on the priority of one over the other, it would be in the sense in which Nikolai Berdiaev spoke, namely that the Church should not isolate itself in the world, but rather manifest its presence and transform the world, making it better, conquering it spiritually, not allowing the Church to be conquered by the world (53). Of course, the Church may not succeed in transforming the contemporary society into an earthly paradise because that would be a utopia, but it is her duty to propose a model of an ethical society in which social relations are based on Christian fundamental values, such as love, forgiveness, truth, kindness, mutual help and support.

### **3. Politics and the Concept of 'Symphony'**

The mission of the Church is to preach the Gospel and to call not only individual persons to faith, but also families, groups of people, and organized communities, and by extrapolation the entire people. The Orthodox Church created the concept of *symphony* between the State and the Church (Ducellier 38), providing the boundaries of correct collaboration, based on mutual respect (Eslin 100). The Church has a prophetic mission, that of evangelizing the people or nation (Bria 84). It is not its role to judge and condemn the human, personal, and social values, proposed and supported by other centres of moral or religious authority, because it - by its very essence - is a place of reconciliation and meeting of the believers. At

the same time, it has an obligation to form the community consciousness is, to evaluate its social and political options, to analyze the system of values existing in society according to its own moral principles and norms (Bria 83).

The Church must pay attention to the exercise of political power within the State and publicly make clear its position when it discovers the failures of the State that endanger the spiritual and material health of the people that God has entrusted to it to shepherd. The Church's right to intervene in political life can be criticized because the dividing line between what is allowed and what should be forbidden is very narrow, but it cannot remain silent when human rights are affected (Bria 84-85). It is important to remember that politicians, magistrates, businessmen, civil servants, and bankers are among the ranks of Christian believers. Therefore, the involvement of the Church in the life of the society is a topic of interest, especially now that the society is going through a major moral crisis. There is no longer a scale of values. Competence has been replaced by the nepotism, moral integrity by the obedience, and professionalism by the dilettantism.

#### **4. The Need for an Internal Renewal for the Orthodox Church**

The Orthodox Church is a constant, and constantly challenged, presence in the Romanian society. There are those who accuse the Church from outside that it is a hermetic institution, with a special status and problems of spiritual and fiscal 'corruption', or of privileges that are inappropriate, given its purpose and that it receives more from the believers than it offers them. Others accuse it from within that it has departed from its spiritual mission and has become a kind of 'administrator' of salvation, much more concerned with economic activities and maintaining a very rigid leadership regime, almost military, in which freedom of opinion has become a luxury. The main mission of the Church is to sanctify the believers and the whole society through its specific means, the Holy Liturgy and the other church services. It cannot substitute for the State and the public authorities in what concerns the civil society. For the social and educational projects, it needs financial resources and, therefore, a competent hierarchical leadership that has the capacity to develop also economic activities, which, however should not be in contradiction with its primary spiritual purpose (Târziu 113-115).

Unfortunately, there are internal conflicts between the upper and lower clergy, in the sense that the former *commands* and the latter *execute*, but also between the clergy and the faithful, disfiguring the true image of the Church and its reason for existence (Metallinos 20-22). This functional imbalance makes the Church perceived in society as a retrograde institution, incapable of progress, renewal, and also having a lack of fidelity to its own moral norms instituted by Jesus Christ Himself. Jesus told his disciples: "If anyone wants to be great among you he will be your servant, and if anyone wants to be first among you he will be the slave of all" (Mark 10:43-44)." Therefore, the relationship between people in the Christian world should be that one in which *the greatest* serves *the least*, not imitating the power relationships within the political world. The subtext of this answer is that the Church does not have to change according to the patterns of the society, but the society needs to take the example of Christian ministry as a model of coexistence among people. Unfortunately, the Orthodox Church seems to draw more inspiration from public life than vice versa (94). A higher position in the hierarchy and the church administration should bring greater responsibility and care for the poor. In reality, however, there is a gap between *the great* and *the small* inside the Church, and in many cases, a 'pseudo-spiritual dictatorship' has been established. Authority should come from faith, not from obligation; from respect, not from coercion. In the Church there should be no privileges and relationships of force, but of much merciful and long-suffering love.

This situation is largely due to the transfer of authority from the monastic world, to which the hierarchs belong, to the civil world, to which the priests and the faithful belong. In other words, Orthodox bishops impose on priests and believers a moral, social, canonical legislation that, in many cases, collides with the civil one and therefore produces uproar and discomfort. It is as if someone wanted to apply the teachings of Paterikon in daily life (Bădiliță 27). The mystical path and holiness have nothing to do with etiquette, social rules, or civic sense, because its purpose is precisely *to get out of the world* (Bădiliță 28). It is necessary to rethink and reform the relations within the Orthodox Church so that love becomes again the fundamental principle of living.

The Church, by its very nature, must promote truth, freedom of speech, respect for the law, and harmonious coexistence in society.

But for this it needs well-trained people, with a moral and civic conscience, able to respond anytime and anywhere in front of any challenge (Baconschi 35 and Bănică 39). Yet, we see often that young people without many qualities, relying mostly on their enthusiasm, but with submission to the limit of servility, are preferred to important offices of representation. Such blind service destroys any trace of dignity and trust (Preda 132-133). Unable to oppose any inappropriate initiative, they end up being just simple performers without credibility and positive influence in the society, especially among the intellectuals and the young people who generally have higher expectations from the Church.

### **5. The Culture of 'Totalitarian' Morality**

The Orthodox Church is not limited only to the sacramental hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons, but also to the lay people, although, unfortunately, the voice of the latter is increasingly difficult to hear. Even if there are some exceptions, there is a certain 'coldness' or reserve in the communication and co-operation between the clergy and the intellectuals. This communicational and functional disharmony is visible and causes many failures, on both sides, and the fault also seems to be with both sides (Codrescu 70). The intellectuals are well-educated and have professional careers, who before giving something to others, think about what they might receive in return. This is also the case in their relationship with the Church. They consider religion a personal choice (Cîrlan 64-66) and act as secular activists and ruthless judges of any moral crime coming from within the Church, sometimes even of the views of some of the clergy.

In general, they are adept practitioners of a moral relativism, which has become common sense, of adapting the practices and ordinances of the Church to the current needs of society, even of radical changes (Târziu 141-142), notwithstanding their religious specificity and the synodal way of making such decisions in accordance with the moral, liturgical, and canonical norms valid at the level of the whole Orthodox Church. They are extremely vocal when they defend their beliefs, even if they have no solid arguments, endlessly repeating the often illogical theories that almost border on the absurd, but which may well echo in the hearts of those who respect their position in society and their exceptional professional

training. Although they claim the respect for the democratic system and freedom of expression and, consequently the vote of the majority, they try to impose, by using the most modern communication technologies, a kind of 'dictatorship of the moralizing minority'. Under the pretext of defending tolerance, freedom of expression, respect for modern values and culture, they propagate anarchic ideas that merely distort the meaning of the moral or social ethics specific to a democratic regime, and establish the reign of a radical, anti-Christian and anti-religious ideology (Târziu 195-196).

Although they are at odds with the Christian values and the practice and traditions of the Orthodox Church, they become public opinion makers. Not only they do not help in any way the Orthodox Church's efforts to improve the moral climate of the relationships between people and, as a consequence, of the society as a whole, they also cause damage to its image and distort its message (Codrescu 70). To respond to the criticism of the intellectuals, even if it is only a certain group of them, the Church needs a pastoral strategy. The Church must choose and promote its most valuable representatives with strong convictions, who excel by the power of dialogue and argumentation, with a sincere, undisguised, simple, and dignified faith, capable of transmitting old and unchangeable truths through a language appropriate to the present times, open to new spiritual experiences, being critical of certain aspects of the activity of their own institution, but willing to contribute to its improvement. In other words, the selection and promotion of the people in the Church must be made according to theological and moral performance criteria, and not according to bookish criteria that ignore the former (Codrescu 76-77).

Today's intellectuals need interlocutors capable of intellectual dialogue who can support their point of view through impeccable moral attitudes (Codrescu 72-73). Winning intellectuals would transform the Church into a powerful moral and moralizing force in society because, although most of the believers who participate in the Holy Liturgy on Sunday, who uphold, respect, and maintain the Christian traditions are simple people, without theological training, it is the intellectuals of a nation who transmit in writing and in the public consciousness for centuries this rich spiritual heritage (Codrescu 71). They are also the ones who either out of religious

belief or the desire for a so-called 'spiritual emancipation', support efforts for a relaxation of the Romanian Orthodox Church in its ecumenical relations with other Christian denominations. And within the Church there are different views on the ecumenical dialogue. Some believe that collaboration between the Orthodox church and other denominations is necessary, but others, especially some of the monks, consider this to be blasphemy. It is true that no one can live in isolation because the contemporary world is very mobile and very mixed, which implies an inevitable interaction among people with different religious traditions (Guran 91).

### **6. Ecumenical Flexibility versus Secularization**

Today there exist almost no large single-faith Christian communities. Even in countries with a majority Christian population, the diversity of beliefs is very high. Therefore, it appears that in addition to the natural feeling of self-preservation there is an obligation to collaborate in a way that does not affect participants' faith identity negatively. At the same time, however, despite the differences of opinion, everyone has to face the danger of the permanent secularization of the society. With the integration of countries through globalisation, media, and economic interdependence, pressures have also emerged for the imposition and acceptance of the policies of secularization. Thus, in parallel with the degree of social emancipation assumed by the new generations, a strong sense of alienation has developed over time from the Christian values, traditions, morals and education received in the families. The breakdown of the traditional Christian models favours the emergence of the modern human being who has no past or roots, does not understand the present very well and much less the future. It is known that those who control the history, education, and faith of a people can easily manipulate it and destroy its identity. Therefore, the role of the Churches in maintaining the spiritual balance of a society becomes crucial. Overcoming the confessional barriers is thus a necessary imperative and should not be viewed with fear because, beyond the doctrinal or liturgical differences, there is a *common moral platform* on which inter-human relations in society should be built, and therefore a social ethic adopted by everyone.

The dialogue between confessions outside the religious dimension has an ethical component because it brings into the

foreground the achievement of the common good of all members, to the detriment of the self-interest of groups or individuals. The modern human being, devoid of a traditional spiritual horizon, needs to know and adopt a set of classical and religious values to apply in their concrete life, such as: wisdom, justice, moderation, courage, honesty, faith, love or dignity. All of this can be found in one way or another within the Christian morality, regardless of confession, and those who exacerbate the differences and turn them into reasons for conflict, simply remove themselves from the essence of Christianity which is love, the unconditional love for God and love for one's neighbour, or for those on the highest stage of living the Gospel, even love for their enemies. In a society crushed by hatred, falsehood, wickedness, and selfishness, in a continuous state of conflict between the various social factions or generations, the promotion of the values of inter-Christian, or where appropriate inter-religious, dialogue, represents the model that the modern human being needs and should follow not only through declaration, but also practically.

### **7. The Moral and Identity Crisis of the Youth**

The modern youth shows indifference to the past and a rapid adaptation to the profound political, social, and economic changes of society and the chase to acquire an immediate and illusory happiness. This leads to a moral crisis they face and the danger of their being accommodated to a culture of acquiring an artificial paradise, without a spiritual horizon (Caragiu 49-50). However, the young people have always been and will remain the strongest, but also the most fragile social class. On the one hand, they are capable of changing mindsets and producing important changes in the way society thinks, in the scientific and technological research activity, with incredible contributions to the development of the society. On the other hand, they are very easy to manipulate because of their enthusiasm for everything that is new and for their spirit of adventure. They live in the present and they feel they have no debt to anyone and to nothing. They have strong beliefs for a short time and are capable of sudden changes depending on the currents that appear and the benefits they could bring. Therefore, their involvement in the development of an ethical society is often minor, because they are particularly interested in a material and less

spiritual comfort. However, when they commit to a cause they are willing to take risks without thinking about the consequences.

This is also the case when, in the name of so-called *modern moral principles*, the youth act against evidence and logic, convinced that the truth is on their side and they represent the progress and the future of the society. Some of them are the followers of the current political correctness, even if they are affiliated with political parties or groups of different orientations, including postmodernists, neoliberals, atheists, or Christian democrats, who generally follow a secular politics, in which Christian morality is replaced by an uncertain social ethic. Others are supporters of the communist policies, neo-nationalism, or the Marxist idealist philosophy - all characterized by a critical attitude towards Western cultural values. While others, far fewer, declare themselves conservatives, defenders of the national values, for whom the Christian faith, love for country, and respect for traditions are a duty of honour and an inheritance from generation to generation. They are considered fundamentalists and radical nationalists, retrograde, and are often viewed with some caution or reserve by most of their fellow citizens, although their attitude springs from a sincere belief in the values of the Christian morality and its role in society (Târziu 58-59). We can, thus, observe the diversity of the political-cultural currents that cause a crisis for today's youth rather than a discovery and strengthening of their own identity in a society which is in the midst of a flood of social inequities, injustices and discrimination of all sorts. However, as the young people from other generations did, when they had faced similar problems, although in different forms, so today's young people must be aware of their purpose and to do everything possible to fulfil it (Bria 32-35).

Each generation is characterized by its own spirit, it embodies the aspirations of the people to whom it belongs, by solidarity, love, and even sacrifice, but for this they need an inner force that aims not only for survival, but also for development and continuity. This force does not come from out of nowhere but from the observance of some Christian moral principles, in which truth, freedom, love, and compassion towards one's neighbour are fundamental. If this morality is replaced by an uncertain work ethic, by an arbitrary judgment of any personal or community action, without any human empathy, if the spirit of the moral law disappears and only its letter

is promoted, then society itself suffers and becomes sick with indifference, selfishness, and carelessness. In other words, the society loses its community character and becomes an amorphous collectivity in which the morality disappears, being replaced by legality. Alternatively, a true Christian society is one that operates according to the evangelical principles, an ethical society in which the moral elements will be integrated into the legal system, so that there is no longer separation between the moral and the legal norms (Hotca online). Of course, this can happen in an ideal society, but if the moral element is marginalized to extinction, as is the case in contemporary, desacralized society, then the future generations will never know their identity.

### **8. Power of the Media and Lack of Communication in the Church**

One of the big problems still facing the Orthodox Church, especially due to its internal organization and its functional conservatism, is the lack of effective communication in society, in a society, which by its very nature is at odds with the Church. The accusations that are frequently brought against the Church from outside or inside are, for the most part, the result of its poor communication with the society, both in terms of managing the funds resulting from the cultural and economic activities, as well as the relationships existing within its hierarchy or between the clergy and the faithful. Poor communication leads to suspicion, an accumulation of frustration and tension that threatens to cause irremediable disorders and disruptions (Târziu 114). The inability of the Orthodox Church to communicate directly and in time with its believers, especially with the young people and the intellectuals whose expectations are higher, is at the root of its loss of some very important media 'battles', such as that concerning the possible collaboration of the clerics with the communist police, the so-called *Securitate*, during the communist regime; the mutual support between politicians and hierarchs for obtaining public recognition; the problem of preserving the traditional family; the place of religion and icons in the schools of the State, the lack of a social doctrine; etc. (Târziu 192-194). Facing these accusations, most of them unfounded, the Orthodox Church should rethink its manner of public communication in such a manner that everyone who disputes it in one way or another can have access to all the information necessary to make an objective

judgment. It is true that we should not summarize the life and activity of the Church as only a question of image, because this is not its mission in the world, but the problem of communication is very topical and important.

Moreover, we are in a paradoxical situation, because although we live in a world flooded by numerous means of transmitting information, yet the communicative power of the Church in society is very poor, and the impact of its message is minor. This is especially the case since the Church itself has its own press outlets and radio and television stations; there are sites or discussion forums on religious topics, many clergy are organized into groups on WhatsApp and frequently communicate on Facebook Messenger or Instagram. Though in the political world, the use of these means of communication has become an indispensable tool for promoting ideas or concepts, as well as for organizing large meetings, conferences or events, with a major impact on society, either positive or negative, most of the time, the press is hostile to the Church (Târziu 40). It is only interested in the negative aspects, operating with generalizations, choosing to caricature reality, promoting a clear moral Phariseism, and misleading public opinion by false or manipulative news (Baconschi 34-36). The mass media is not only limited to transmitting the religious message, but has actually begun to produce it, substituting itself for the Church as a moral authority. Instead of upholding and multiplying the moral authority of the Church in the society, it merely distorts its status and mission.

The technological revolution of the Internet and the other forms of digital communication favours the spread of all the ideologies of our time and brings about a change of mentalities and religious behaviour much faster than in the past. The Church though benefits from its own press trust, it faces major communication problems. First of all, both the written press and the radio-TV output of the Orthodox Church is generally addressed to an audience who are already won, made up of people who attend the church or are interested in Christian teaching, in services and church events, but who, unfortunately, are fewer and fewer and mostly elderly people. Secondly, the Orthodox Church does not have the necessary funds nor professional teams (with small exceptions) to compete with the national private media institutions, but only for a niche television, and for the same type of radio. Thirdly, the topics covered by the

religious press or church radio and television programs are confined by some rules of professional conduct and specific hierarchical control that largely limit both the editorial policy and the manner of presentation and the coverage of the topics of immediate interest.

The Orthodox Church, through its cultural and communication department, should think of a partnership with the national private television channels through which the latter will also put into their schedule of programs those of religious education and culture, either through the acquisition of news and documentaries from the church media, or through cooperation to develop common programs. Thus, the Orthodox Church could at least theoretically be able to make its voice heard at national level. However, in order to have a direct effect on society, it needs journalists, radio and television people who must meet at least two essential conditions: firstly to have a sufficient professional training, able to convey old and eternal truths in a new way, using modern means, in a language accessible to the practicing Christians and to the non-practicing and indifferent people of the present generation, and secondly to believe in the power and capacity of the gospel of Christ to change the world. Therefore, the Orthodox clergy, in order to be able to use the new media technologies with discernment should take special online and offline communication courses in order to be able to separate 'the wheat from the chaff' and to offer the interested public spiritual nourishment and the hope of discovering their own identity (Cîrlan 66-67). Of course, the extension of the new media technologies does not cancel the responsibility of the priest's direct communication with his believers, but it could transmit it faster and more efficiently to the young people who are more familiar with the modern means of communication, but especially among those who do not have a religious background or indifferent to any religious information.

## **9. Conclusion**

The process of continuous secularization of the modern world is characterized by radical anthropocentrism, which moves the centre of gravity of the Church from God to humanity (Popescu 88-89). The immediate consequence is that persons close themselves off within their own immanence, opposed to the transcendence to which they were oriented by God. They recognize themselves as the only subject and agent of history and refuse any appeal to transcendence, to the

extent that they desacralise themselves and the world (Popescu n. 2, 87). The Orthodox Church, faithful to its bi-millennial Christian tradition, offers to the secularized State and society the power and the example of merciful love and sacrificial service as an antidote to the 'dictatorship' of the rationalist ideologies. The Orthodox Church opposes both the individualism, which selfishly closes each person into oneself, separating one from other fellows, and the collectivism, which destroys human identity and uniqueness by immersing each person in the anonymous and amorphous mass of nature, and highlights the inter-rationality between people, collaboration and mutual support. Its pastoral strategy involves a renewal of its own methods of learning, explaining and implementing the moral principles of the Gospel of Christ in society, so that it ought to be felt a real moral and inter-relational renewal. For this, however, the Orthodox Church itself needs a moral and institutional reform which involves, among other things: a return to the correct practice of the message of the Evangelical ministry instituted by Christ among his apostles, the rethinking of the theological education process, and promoting the most competent candidates, who are capable of communicating effectively its message through modern means of communication available today, to important positions of the church administration. This does not mean modifying, changing or altering in any way the doctrine, liturgical, moral or canonical norms, but only finding new methods of promoting its moralizing and saving spirit in today's society. This is because the Church does not change according to the image of the passing world, the secularized world, but is rather the expression of the descent of eternity within time (Popescu 62-63), just as the role of humanity is not to secularize and desecrate nature, but to purify and transfigure it (Popescu 110-112).

## References

- Baconschi, Teodor. "Portrete și ...fapte (Portraits and .... facts)." in *Preotul Ortodox*, ed., Marius Vasileanu. Bucharest: Lumea Credinței Press, 2019, 33-36.
- Bănică, Mirel. "Parohia Ortodoxă Română, astăzi: Câteva elemente pentru studiul ei (Romanian Orthodox Church, Today: Some Elements for her Study." *Călăuza Ortodoxă*, 11 December, 2015: 322-323.
- Bănică, Mirel. "Preotul. Mai ales Preotul! (The Priest: Especially the priest!)." in *Preotul Ortodox*, 37-42.

- Berdiaev, Nikolay. "The Truth of Orthodoxy" Alvia Smirensky, trans. *The Wheel* 8, Winter (2017): 47-53.
- Bria, Ion. *Ortodoxia în Europa (Orthodoxy in Europe)*. Iași: Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei Press, 1995.
- Caragiu, Florin. "Preotul, călăuză spre libertatea Duhului (The priest, the guide to the freedom of the Spirit)." in *Preotul Ortodox*, 49-52.
- Cîrlan, Lucian. "Preoția cea de toate zilele. Un profil sociologic (The Everyday Priesthood: A Sociological Profile)." *Preotul Ortodox*, 63-67.
- Codrescu, "Preotul și sfințenia vieții (The Priest and the holiness of life)." *Preotul Ortodox*, 69-74.
- Ducellier, Alain. *Les Byzantins: Histoire et Culture*. Paris: Seuil, 1988.
- Dumitrescu, Marina. "Preotul printre noi (The priest among us)." *Preotul Ortodox*, 75-77.
- Eslin, Jean-Claude. *Dieu et le pouvoir: Théologie et politique en Occident*. Paris: Seuil, 1999.
- Guran, Petre. "Biserica și Clerul (The Church and the Clergy)" *Preotul Ortodox*, 87-95.
- Hotca, Mihai Adrian. "*Morala și Legalitatea*" <<https://htcp.eu/morala-si-legalitatea/>> (12 February, 2020).
- Metallinos, Gheorghios. *Parohia: Hristos în mijlocul nostru (Parish: Christ in our Midst)*. Sibiu: Deisis, 2004.
- Popescu, Dumitru. *Hristos, Biserică, Societate (Christ, Church, Society)*. Bucharest: Institutul Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române Publishing House 1998.
- Preda, Radu. "Inteligența slujirii (The Intelligence of Worship)." *Preotul Ortodox*, 131-134.
- Seliște, Marcel Răduț. "Gândirea socială a Bisericii – reinventarea unei realități (The Social Thinking of the Church - the Reinvention of a Reality)." *Rost* 50 (2007): 13-15.
- Stăniloae, Dumitru. *Ortodoxie și Româanism (Orthodoxy and Romanianism)*. Bucharest: Albastros Publishing House, 1998.
- Târziu, Claudiu. "Politica Bisericii (Church Policy)." *Rost* 50 (2007): 3-4.
- Târziu, Claudiu. *Rostul Generației Noastre (The Purpose of our Generation)*. Bucharest: Rost Publishing House, 2019.