

Homophobia in Serbia and LGBT Rights

Zorica Mršević

*Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for Social Science, Belgrade
Professor of Law, Faculty of European Legal and Political Studies, Novi Sad*

Abstract

Homophobia is present in contemporary Serbian society as a rather widespread treatment of non-heterosexuality. It is manifested through various forms of public hate speech, through the forms and cases of discrimination and violence that are caused by homophobia, and through the homophobia-caused deprivation of members of the LGBT population of their various rights, particularly the right to the freedom of peaceful public assembly. Such homophobia is mostly shown by research data recently obtained by the Serbian LGBT rights groups (such as Gay Straight Alliance and Labris) and by media reporting on the recent public events (mostly on three recent attempts to organise Pride Parades in Belgrade, in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012). The research data showed that homophobia originates mostly from a lack of knowledge and a stereotyped comprehension of the people and relations among them, while its main protagonists in Serbia are nationalists, traditionalists, conformists and those who believe that hating others is the proper and even only way to defend their national and territorial integrity, as well as a reflection of their genuine patriotism. The spheres in which it is active include all social relations, from private and family, through professional, to public, media and political relations. Research data obtained in recent years by LGBT organisations provide evidence that homophobia is still very prevalent in Serbia, in some respects somewhat more so than in 2008, when the first research of that type was conducted.

Keywords

homophobia in Serbia; LGBT activists; violence; discrimination; right to public assembly; Pride Parade

Preface

The increased visibility of non-heterosexuality that has recently been manifested in Serbia in various ways, either through public events and discussions on the topic or through the demands of the LGBT population to see the respect for their rights that is warranted by the constitution and law,

seems to strengthen homophobia, and to increase the number of homophobes and the incidents caused by homophobia (M. D. M – K. Ž. – Z. M., 2011: 12).

The most recent incidents, including the expulsion of a nineteen-year-old boy from his family house after admitting to his father that he was gay (Kocić 2011: 16), the serious wounding of a girl in a Belgrade street with a knife because she was wearing a T-shirt with a gay parade inscription on it (B92-Beta 2011), the beating up of a young man of assumed gay orientation at a bus stop in Belgrade (D.D. 2011: 4), the public declaration of a secondary-school teacher that gays should be “beaten very hard, so that they can’t spread their disease to others” (Tomić 2011: 8), the attack on a gay boy in the centre of Novi Sad, who, after the attack, lay unconscious covered in blood on the pavement for more than an hour, while nobody helped him (NLO November 2011), and who was, thereupon, dismissed from work at the company where he had worked when the cause of the attack on him became known,¹ the ubiquitous hate graffiti that advocate the lynching of LGBT people (S.Ž. 2011) are only some of the most recent examples of the existence of violence and discrimination caused in Serbia by homophobia (S.B. 2011: 9).

Research data obtained in recent years by LGBT organisations provide evidence that homophobia is still very prevalent in Serbia, in some respects somewhat more so than in 2008, when the first research of that type was conducted: for example, when compared to 2008, 6% more people believe that homosexuality is very dangerous to society – making 56%. Homosexuality is an illness in the opinion of 67% of the interviewed persons (Prejudices² 2010: 8). 56% believe that homosexuality represents a danger to society. Only 52% thought that “homosexuals are people like us.” Encouraging, however, is the fact that fewer respondents disagree with this statement and now the number of those who think that homosexuals are not human has decreased to 28%, compared to 42% in the previous research conducted in 2008 (Prejudices 2010: 9). Being “human” or “not human” is to be taken not in a biological but in a civil sense of understanding: “being

¹ <<http://www.cks.org.rs/2011/11/prebijeni-gej-mladic-dobio-i-otkaz-u-firmi/>>.

² The public opinion survey for the needs of Gay Straight Alliance, aimed at discerning the attitude towards homosexuality, was conducted in March 2010. The survey was conducted on a representative sample of 1,405 respondents, in the entire territory of Serbia (without Kosovo and Metohija). Data were collected through direct interviews with respondents in their households.

a human being” means being a member of society fully equipped with all rights and freedoms, which are denied to those perceived as “not people like us.”

The Research defines homophobia by collecting responses to two sets of statements: (dis)agreeing with negative statements regarding homosexuality³ and (dis)agreeing with positive statements regarding homosexuality.⁴

Women in Serbia are less homophobic than men: among them 49% are homophobic while among men there are 60% who are homophobic. Elderly people are more homophobic than younger ones. Thus 62% of people aged 50-59 are homophobic, while 46% of those aged 20-29 are. 56% of Serbs are homophobic; members of other nations who live in Serbia are homophobic in 45% of cases. Less educated people are more homophobic than those with higher education. People with elementary school education are homophobic in 66% of cases, and people educated for manual occupations in 73% of cases, while 52% are homophobic among high school graduates. University-educated people are homophobic in 38% of cases. The most homophobic are farmers, at 76%, followed by 67% of housewives and 64% among unskilled workers, while students and pupils are homophobic in 45% of cases and experts (university degree holders in decision-making positions) in 12% of cases. People who live in Vojvodina are homophobic in 49% of cases, in Belgrade in 50% of cases, and in Central Serbia in 60% of cases (Prejudices 2010: 35-37). The Research data confirm that homophobia is widespread among Serbian citizens, among the elderly, the less educated and men, a bit more than among the younger, the better educated and women. At no education level in Serbia, from primary schools

³) “In my opinion, homosexuality is an illness; I think the Church is right in condemning homosexuality; state institutions should work on suppressing homosexuality; homosexuality is very dangerous for society; homosexuality was fabricated in the West, with the aim of destroying the family and our traditions; the problem of homosexuality is imposed by various non-governmental organisations, which make money out of that; the Pride Parade is only a provocation aimed at people of ‘normal’ sexual orientation; I have nothing against homosexuals, as long as they keep their activities private; I would never accept that a person close to me is homosexual.”

⁴) “Homosexuality has always existed: it was concealed earlier, but now it is talked about; everybody has a right to their sexual orientation as long as they do not endanger others; homosexuals are people like you and me; there should be public places where homosexuals could gather; homosexuals in Serbia are an endangered group and should be helped in fulfilling their rights; homosexuals should be granted the right to marry; Gay Pride represents a legitimate way of fighting for gay rights and should be held; it is necessary to allow homosexuals to adopt children.”

to university, do the programmes yet include any fair information about LGBT people and their rights (Martinović 2011).

The most worrying attitude is the one that states that even half of the people in Serbia would reject their loved ones in the event that they found out that they were gay, and that 90% of people consider different sexual orientations as a major obstacle to socialisation. 17% of parents would use violence if their children confessed that they were of homosexual orientation. Furthermore, 14% of respondents think that violence and beatings are legitimate ways to eliminate homosexuality (Prejudices 2010: 9-16).

Indirect justification of violence is higher than readiness for violence itself. The highest “tolerance” of violence exists when it comes to public events organised by sexual minorities (Pašić 2011: 12). One in five people thinks that it is justifiable to use threats and violence in order to stop a gay parade from taking place, if it cannot be done in any other way. However, in this case, the disagreement with this idea is significant (54%). Those who are tolerant of homosexuality categorically reject violence as a method, while intolerant ones have mixed feelings about violence and only in the totally homophobic group is there a critical mass of 30% of those who mostly or absolutely support violence.

As the GSA reports, the majority of LGBT people in Serbia in fact do not need research to find out how high the level of homophobia around them is – they face its consequences on a daily basis in their homes, schools, and workplaces, on the street, among friends [...] everywhere (Step by step 2011: 5). They suffer from high ambient pressure and often they continue to try in vain to adapt to the majority’s heterosexual discourse, which is reflected in the poorer quality of their lives. They often lose their jobs or are harassed by colleagues and superiors if their sexual orientation is disclosed or suspected, they get thrown out of their living spaces, they are abused by parents and family members in an attempt to “re-educate” them, they are exposed to threats, hate speech and discrimination at all levels, and they are often victims of violence, perpetrated both by individuals and by organised extremist groups. They often decide not to report cases of violence and discrimination to the relevant authorities because of the chronic lack of trust, fear of further victimisation and stigma in the region. When they decide to do so, legal proceedings are dragged through the justice system for years, and perpetrators are either set free or just symbolically punished. They are constantly reminded of how unwelcome they are by graffiti threats, conveying insults and hatred, which they pass by daily in Belgrade and other Serbian cities.

There are certain shifts in terms of the social acceptability of sexual diversity in Serbia,⁵ which is primarily the result of general modernisation and the opening of society and the state, but on the level of the political system and institutionalised guaranteeing of human rights, the LGBT population thinks that Serbia is still far away from the necessary standards, as expressed in the aforementioned research (Prejudices 2010: 40).

Gay rights, Pride Parades and public visibility of homosexuality

The Pride Parade is a topic that caused bitter disagreements in Serbian society.⁶ It divided Serbian society more dramatically than some other, apparently “more important” social, economic or political issues at various moments. Some of these moments are the adoption of the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination (March 2009) or attempts to organise the Pride Parade in Belgrade (September 2009, October 2010 and October 2011). These events treated the topic of people with “different” sexual orientations and the acceptance of their assembly as a particular agenda of public debate, therefore confronting the public with the need to discuss it (Step by step 2011: 7).

Regarding public opinion on the Pride Parades, 45% of the interviewed persons see these events as a kind of provocation, while as many as 58% gave a positive answer to the claim that they have nothing against homosexuals, but they disagree with any public visibility of homosexual individuals and groups connected to homosexuals.

Regarding their attitude towards the Pride Parade, most people, one half of them, would walk past such an event without showing any interest – they would simply ignore such an event like any other kind of event they are not interested in. The other half is again divided into two groups – those who have a positive and those who have a negative attitude towards this event. Those with a negative attitude (about one fifth of them) would avoid such an event in all cases, verbally “attack” the participants, or use violence.

⁵ Based on comparison of the two research projects on homophobia in Serbia, one conducted in 2008, mentioned above, and the second conducted in 2010.

⁶ Even a long time before the date of the announced Parade for October 2011 a few attacks with Molotov cocktails were made on a youth club that was well known as a site of gathering supporters of the LGBT population in Novi Sad (Labris Annual report 2010: 29).

The other group (nearly one fifth, i.e. 18%) would stop to see what such an event looks like out of curiosity, or they would join it (Prejudices 2010: 18).

The organisation of the Pride Parade in 2010 brought the greatest visibility ever to LGBT persons in Serbia, with all the good and bad consequences that this entails. The Parade was, to a great deal of people, a very important, strengthening or reviving act in a symbolic, political and personal sense of the word. Specific political and social phenomena that deny basic human rights and liberties, even for a short while, were identified as a huge problem of the entire society (Tolerancija 2011).

The Pride Parade attempt in 2009

As early as 2009, when the Parade was publicly conveyed, individual assaults on organisers of the Parade occurred on a daily basis. Both female and male activists were threatened by rape, beating up and murder on Facebook or on the telephone, and those threats, which took the form of verbal attacks or assaults in the street, continued to be made almost each day. In that respect, the increased risk to personal safety became the price of visibility (Ljudska prava 2009).

The feeling of being physically threatened was felt more in the period prior to the holding of the Pride Parade, when a discussion on the rights of the LGBT population became more pronounced in public discourse, and when the media became more available to the advocates of homophobic views and/or the protagonists who called for violence against the LGBT population.

In 2009, the lack of unity within the LGBT movement (there were different views regarding organisational methods, the Parade location and programme, a lot of misunderstandings occurred regarding the security of participants and the security of the LGBT population outside Belgrade, and moreover some groups and individuals within the movement were not for the Parade at all) was often used as an excuse to explain, and by many to justify, the failure to organise the Pride Parade, although the true reasons then were certainly not related to the (lack of) unity within the movement, but to the lack of true political will and readiness of institutions to organise the Parade (Step by step 2011: 37). The 2009 Parade was cancelled by the Serbian Government because of security reasons, after the refusal of the organisers to give the Parade up or to replace it in the city park far from the downtown area primarily planned as the Parade route (Ljudska prava 2010).

The first Pride Parade, held in October 2010

The first Pride Parade, which was held in Belgrade on 10 October 2010, did not leave a generally good impression, bearing in mind the dimensions of violence and huge damage to the city, but all its organisers are, nevertheless, proud because it, after all, took place. The violence and vandalism that occurred outside the event area were assessed as something that could have been and, yet, was not prevented, despite all the operational data that the security services had had since 2009, or even since 2001 (still nobody has been held accountable for the 2001 violence, which occurred during the attempt at organising the Parade). A day before the Pride Parade, which should have been the civic manifestation of tolerance and the warning that “others and the different” must be accorded all their rights, the atmosphere got heated, thanks, among other things, to the statements (“The stench of this Sodom and Gomorrah is the shame of the Serbian capital”) made by a high-ranking bishop of the Serbian Orthodox Church. The calls to violence of the right-wing groups, who sporadically threatened participants in the Parade during those days, were encouraged, because, as Professor Zarko Trebjesanin, a psychologist, said for the *Blic* daily, the metropolitan “encouraged them to crush the sinning, and by the repeated mentioning of Sodom and Gomorrah, he practically called them to violence.” On 10 October 2010, the “gays” did not defeat members of the right-wing and hooligans, but the values of civilisation finally overpowered. The state took the side of participants in the Parade and of the rule of human rights. The conduct of the police was of key importance and it is worth praising.

The organised Parade means the shift of the *status quo*. The shift, as well as active and loud dealing with unpopular topics, brings a certain risk.

While the 2010 Pride Parade was held under heavy police security, which included the closure of a large number of streets around the Parade route and strict security rules, the significance of this event lies in the fact that the Parade, after several failed attempts in previous years, was finally held for the first time in Serbia.

Thus, when the first Pride Parade in Belgrade was held on 10 October 2010, over 1,000 participants attended, including a significant number of representatives of state institutions, the diplomatic corps, international organisations, NGOs and MPs. The state, unlike the case in 2009, demonstrated an unequivocal commitment to the protection of the Parade’s participants, and on that day the police played a key role in the fight against the many hooligans and extremists who tried to prevent the Parade and

attack its participants (Step by step 2011: 10). The police force did not change its attitude; it was always against the Pride Parade. But in 2010 the political top leadership, meaning the Serbian president himself, decided to support the Parade, probably bearing in mind the fact that these events are peaceful in many European countries, hoping that the same might be the case in Serbia too, and also hoping to gain an improvement of Serbia's image in terms of its respect for the human rights of the LGBT people.

In the presence of a heavy police force, the Parade participants safely walked the planned route to the Student Cultural Centre (SKC), where a short party was held, after which the participants, as had been planned earlier, were transported by police cars to safer locations in the city or police stations. Most of the Pride Parade participants were not fully aware of what was really happening outside the area dedicated for this event, or how aggressive the well-organised extremists were in trying to get to the Pride Parade participants. More than one hundred injured police officers, at least 200 arrested demonstrators, demolished shop windows and head offices of political parties, two burnt-out police cars, overturned garbage containers, broken traffic signs, tear gas that, because of the wind, reached almost all parts of the city – these were the results of several hours of confrontation between the police and demonstrators who protested on Sunday because of the organisation of the Pride Parade (Step by step 2011: 41).

The Belgrade mayor Đilas said that this was a sad day for Belgrade, which was demolished and ruined, and said that the police had reacted to the extent to which they could have, because the groups that were demolishing the city were very well organised. But at the same time he said that the Pride Parade would not bring anything good to those who organised it. He voiced concern over everything that had happened and demanded that the LGBT population refrain from organising similar events in the future (Step by step 2011: 44).

Right after the Pride Parade, the Minister of Internal Affairs demanded that the LGBT population organise the next (if any) parade outside of the city centre. He used that opportunity to support the standpoint of the majority of the population and to blame the organisers of the Pride Parade for everything that had occurred.

It is up to state institutions and the LGBT movement to contribute, with their actions, to the following Parade being safer than the previous one, and to gradually reducing the number of police officers that is necessary to protect the participants. The Pride Parade 2010 is very significant for the fact that the state has for the first time expressed its willingness to fully empower

and protect the right to freedom of assembly for LGBT people and their supporters. The answer to the question of why this was so in 2010 but not before is probably that enough convenient political elements coincided in 2010 but never before and never afterwards: the political will of the authorities combined with the good methods of the Parade organisers. This event greatly contributed to an increase in visibility for LGBT people and the visibility of problems that this population faces every day and that are primarily related to a high degree of homophobia and discrimination as well as high exposure to violence. These problems cannot be resolved only by a Pride Parade but through a systematic approach and specific measures (Step by step 2011: 8).

The experience of all parades is that attempts of sexual minorities to articulate their rights has shown that, without organised support from different social and political figures, their efforts can remain only at the level of attempts (Prejudices 2010: 21). The phenomenon of a different sexual orientation is becoming very much present in public life: it stimulates people to think about it, to become acquainted with elements of that phenomenon, which, to a certain degree, leads to a change in climate and acceptance of the phenomenon and people with such characteristics to a greater extent than before (Prajd u 4 zida 2011). However, it has also been concluded (B92-Beta 2011) that the stronger the presence of sexual orientation minority topics and struggle for the rights of LGBT people are, at the same time, the stronger reactions 'on the other side' are: in other words, those on the side of opponents and adversaries of the rights of such persons (Prejudices 2010: 39).

Is the Serbian Orthodox Church to be blamed for violence and discrimination against LGBT people?

The role of the Serbian Orthodox Church

Representatives of the Serbian Orthodox Church are identified as implicitly or explicitly defending violence and discrimination against LGBT people, which happens particularly in times of social conflicts (LGBT populacija 2011: 25).

The first clear public expression of homophobia by the Serbian Orthodox Church happened in spring 2009 as a public intervention against the Draft Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination, when the Serbian Orthodox

Church was against legal protection of the LGBT population against discrimination and it organised all six other so-called traditional churches and religious communities to issue a mutual explanation: “The traditional religious communities are not in accord with the legislative provisions that prohibited discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The proposed Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination is a direct violation of the freedom of religion and conscience of the faithful citizens, as well as a violation of the free functioning of the churches and religious communities, guaranteed by the laws and the Constitution” – thus runs the letter from the Synod of the Serbian Orthodox Church to the president of the Parliament, Ms Slavica Đukić-Dejanović, the Government, and the Ministry for Human and Minority Rights. In that way the Serbian Orthodox Church put itself in the leading position among other churches’ religious communities in spreading homophobia. The Church critiques the implementations of categories of gender identity (transsexuality) and sexual orientation (homosexuality) as specific grounds for discrimination. The Church requested the adjustment of Section 18 of this law to make reference to religious beliefs, as well as the removal of Section 21, which prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation. The Church states that “it is crucial to keep in mind esteemed scientific authorities who maintain that the expression of gender identity through transsexuality is a form of mental disturbance, as well as those who have determined that there is no scientific proof that homosexuality is an inherent trait.” One day before the voting on this law should have taken place, the Government of the Republic of Serbia withdrew it from the parliamentary procedure, following this intervention from the Serbian Orthodox Church. Twenty-two days were needed for the Law to be reinstated in the parliamentary procedure and voted upon, due to the loud and univocal public civic protests of human rights and LGBT activists, women’s organisations, university professors, and so on, conducted in the media, which played a key role in applying pressure on Government representatives to adopt the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination. The media offensive regarding the withdrawal of the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination from the parliamentary procedure lasted even longer, for a month and a half, and over 200 different texts of various lengths were published on this topic in the Serbian daily press. Most of the texts regarding the withdrawal of the Law from the parliamentary procedure had a neutral context as general protection of human rights, with the representatives of the non-governmental sector as one of their sources (Godišnji izveštaj 2010: 10-14).

After the Serbian Orthodox Church positioned itself regarding LGBT rights, the next action from it came a day after the Pride Parade held in October 2010. Namely, one of the highest-ranked figures of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Radović, used very strong hate speech against LGBT people, stating that homosexuality was “sodomite stench” and blaming the LGBT community for all the violence that had taken place. The Serbian Orthodox Church condemned the violence in general terms. At the same time, the leader of the LDP, Čedomir Jovanović, stressed that Serbian Patriarch Irinej should make a statement about the hooligans attacking the police from backyards of churches and said that it was a devastating truth that the Serbian Orthodox Church must publicly deny some statements of their leaders, who support bullies (Step by step 2011: 37).

Keeping the track of the role of the Church, it should be explained that religious leaders are protected by law and cannot be legally sanctioned for discrimination, which puts them in the position of being above all legal provisions banning discrimination. The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination envisages the following. In Article 18, Para 2: The acts of priests or religious officials, which are in compliance with the religious doctrine, convictions and the goals of the church and religious communities that are recorded in the religious community register, are not considered as discriminatory. In accordance with a separate law by which the freedom of religious affiliation and the status of churches and religious communities are governed, in a complaint lodged with the commissioner, Labris, an organisation for lesbian human rights based in Belgrade, claimed that Metropolitan Radović did not represent the stand of the Serbian Orthodox Church in his statement, because the Serbian Orthodox Church, on several prior occasions, very explicitly called on the public to refrain from violence, and also publicly condemned the violence committed against participants in the Pride Parade.

Before the 2011 Pride Parade organisation attempt the Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church publicly said, “This ‘pride’ should by all means be ignored, and I invite people not to be on the streets during the event and in that way, through disregard, to react to this stupidity” (Papović and Petrović 2011: 2). While the patriarch did not call for counter-activities, the leaflet was delivered in all Belgrade’s churches, calling for an Orthodox rally against what was called “a shame parade.” The organisers were the Orthodox associations functioning within the Serbian Orthodox Church. They called on the believers to gather in protest rallies a day before the Pride Parade in

front the Cathedral and the day of the Parade in front of the St. Marko church.

Since the territory of the nation is seen as a part of the 'extended family,' the assumption of the Step by step research on prejudices was that there would be a high correlation between negative attitudes towards homosexuality and nationalism. The research proved this: 76% of nationalists are homophobic, while only 20% of non-nationalists are homophobic. Nationalism was tested through responses to the following claims: "I am ready to sacrifice myself for the interests of my people; one must be careful towards other nations, even when they approach us as friends; because of the mixing of various cultures, we are in danger of losing our identity" (Prejudices 2010: 26).

This is seen as a result of certain psychological needs for self-confirmation of one's own identity and fear that this identity is jeopardised. There is a strong need to have something else, something different in society (which is at certain times and in certain circumstances perceived as hostile). That 'something else,' 'other' and 'different' is no longer marked as a dominant category by a national epithet, but by a sexual and a gender one (Step by step 2011: 7).

The effects of the Balkan wars in re-affirmation of the hegemonic masculinity

The Serbian women's movement frequently expresses its concern regarding the influence of war veterans on contemporary issues. "Those who were the murderers of Srebrenica's people are those who are among us, and who continuously hate all who are different and other," said Stasa Zajovic, the leader of the Women in Black (Pride forum, 2011). The WIB particularly worry that citizens' security is handed over to the mercy of fascist organisations, with which the Government flirts all the time, thereby creating a lynching atmosphere for everything that is different, and transforming nationalist chauvinism and clerico-fascism into the ruling ideology once again (Women in Black 2011, September).

The social inheritance of the Balkan wars is usually described as an increased level of nationalism and overstressed patriotism in Serbia. This explains why the Pride Parade was considered as ushering in the "most difficult period in life of all Serbian patriots" in the statement made by the extreme nationalist organisation "Naši" (Naši and Kurir 2011: 6). The

hooligans who present themselves as patriots and who are the most violent against the LGBT population are permanently protected and even defended by so-called patriotic intellectuals who argue that the hooligans are “our children,” “young people with hearts for their nation” and moreover “fighters who defend our territorial integrity and endangered family values” (Pančić 2011: 1078).

Homophobia in Serbia is mostly linked, through cause and consequence, to the value-based orientations towards nationalism, traditionalism, conformism and authoritarianism, created and maintained in the post-war situation and disintegration of Yugoslavia. Nationalism was tested as explained above. Traditionalists are those who claim the following: “men should hold the leading positions in the business world; the most important virtue of any woman is to be a good wife and mother; one should strictly follow national customs and tradition; it is necessary to adhere to ethical norms preached by my religious community.” Claims used in the testing of authoritarianism were as follows: “children should be raised with strict discipline; teachers and professors should be strict with their students; this country needs a strong and fearless leader who will be followed by the people; respecting authority is the greatest virtue that children should learn today.” The following claims were used to define conformism: “I always behave in the manner that society expects me to; I don’t like to argue with someone about something if we have differing opinions; I try not to stand out too much from the people in my surroundings; I don’t like to express my opinion if I know that it will differ from that of others” (Prejudices 2010: 24-26). In accordance with expectations, most traditionalists are homophobic – 66% – while 14% of modernists are homophobic. 71% of authoritarians are homophobic, 22% of non-authoritarians are homophobic, 74% of conformists are homophobic, and 34% of nonconformists are homophobic.

Within the sample of the Prejudices research, Cluster A, which makes up almost *one third* of the population, includes all those who have negative value-based orientations taken to the extreme. These are people who are traditionalists, conformists, authoritarians, nationalists and homophobic. On the other hand, cluster B comprises all “bright spots” of value-based orientations, and it includes people who are modernists and nonconformists, and are not authoritarians, nationalists or homophobic. This cluster makes up *less than one fifth* of the population (Prejudices 2010, 28).

Different attitudes towards the wars in the 1990s determine the level of homophobia today, which is judged in accordance with current political

preferences. The body of voters for the Serbian Radical Party (whose leader Vojislav Šešelj has been indicted as a war criminal by the Hague Tribunal) who are homophobic even increased from the previous 80% to 86% today. At the opposite side of the sample are voters for the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) who are the most liberal, today as well as before. The number of those among them who are liberal towards homosexuality is far above the average. Those who voted for the list “For a European Serbia” in 2008 had a negative attitude towards homosexuals in 40% of cases, and had a positive attitude in 32% of cases. Trust in leaders also determines the level of homophobia: those whose preference is Vojislav Šešelj are homophobic in 90% of cases. Among those whose preference is Ivica Dačić (the leader of the Socialist Party) are 75% homophobic, supporters of Tomislav Nikolić are 74% homophobic, supporters of Vojislav Koštunica are 62% homophobic, supporters of Aleksandar Vučić are 55% homophobic, supporters of Boris Tadić are 41% homophobic, and supporters of Čedomir Jovanović are 30% homophobic (Prejudices 2010: 36–38). There still are strong homophobic political centres, parties and leaders influenced by the Balkan wars during the 1990s, which makes their current followers homophobic too.

Process of EU integration and homophobia cannot get along

The role of Europeanisation

According to the LDP leader, Čedomir Jovanović, the destruction of Belgrade during the Pride Parade held in 2010 was organised by those who are opposed to Serbia's European integration. The fact is that political division is clear: 71% of the opponents of the EU are homophobic, while only 42% of supporters of the EU (those who believe that Serbia should join the EU and those who see the EU as a system that will lead us to normalcy) are homophobic (Prejudices 2010: 29–36).

The most important political process that is currently taking place in Serbia is certainly European integration. This process should be viewed primarily as a great opportunity to realise all the necessary changes and improvements that Serbia has failed to implement for many years now. The Commission's recommendations to reduce violence and discrimination are very clear and unambiguous, and European standards in terms of balancing the rights of people with different sexual orientations include a

wide range of areas such as employment, access to goods and services, and the right to freedom of assembly.

In spite of this, at the time of announcement and cancellation of the 2011 Pride Parade, the question of whether the European Union had any documents obligatory for candidate countries on the LGBT population at all was frequently posed in a public discourse. The assumed reply was negative, since it was considered that the general public did not know much about the issue and that it was easy to market the idea that the LGBT population put too much emphasis on the alleged and existent “commitment” of Serbia to enable the organisation of Pride Parades on its path to the EU. At the same time, they forgot to mention even one very basic document, the “Charter on the European Union’s Basic Rights,” the first international instrument of human rights, which, in its Article 31 (Par. 1), explicitly bans discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation: “Any discrimination committed on the grounds of gender, race, skin colour, ethnic or social background, inherited characteristics, language, religion and faith, political or other affiliation, the belonging to national minorities, property, disability, age or sexual orientation shall be banned.”

There is a clear lack of information on the connection between the exercising of LGBT rights and the right of assembly for everyone, even for those that make up the unpopular minority, as a set of Europe’s messages that have not been heard so far (Logar 2011: 7). The Serbian media never informed the public that the European Parliament, on 18 January 2006, adopted the Resolution on Homophobia in Europe, with an overwhelming majority of 468 votes for, 149 votes against and 41 abstaining votes, although the document expresses a strong condemnation of homophobia. The said resolution strongly condemns not only homophobia but also discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation in the EU member states, and it calls on all European institutions and EU member states, as well as candidate states for EU membership, to promptly halt the current discrimination proceedings on the grounds of sexual orientation and to promote and protect everyone’s human rights in terms of their sexual orientation (Čongradin 2011: 3). The European Parliament harshly condemns any discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and calls on all member states to guarantee protection from homophobic hate speech and violence towards lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons. On 27 April 2010, the Council of Europe’s Parliamentary Assembly adopted Resolution 1728 (2010) on Discrimination on the Grounds of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity,

according to which discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity is considered as a prohibited basis for discrimination.

On 24 March 2011, Serbia, along with 85 countries of the world, at the meeting of the United Nations Council for Human Rights in Geneva, signed the Resolution on the Struggle against Discrimination and Violence against LGBT Persons. Regarding the said resolution, the overwhelming majority of 85 countries issued special and rather pronounced statements (some of the countries did this in order to warn those who were ready to commit violence against persons with different sexual orientations), thereby classifying their countries among those that respect the human rights of all individuals and minority communities. In Serbia, however, due to the small or negligible publicity that was given to the said act, the human rights of LGBT part of the population remained concealed.

The European Court of Human Rights decided in October 2010 against Russia because of its banning of the Pride Parades in Moscow on three occasions: in 2006, 2007 and 2008. The petition was submitted by gay activist Nicola Alekseyev. The Russian authorities violated articles 11 (right to freedom of assembly) and 13 (right to legal remedy) of European Convention of Human Rights. Moreover, the bans were based on the sexual orientation of the participants of the Pride Parade, which violated article 14 (banning discrimination).⁷ Serbia has been a member of the Council of Europe since 2003, and so the Court is mandated for citizens' claims against Serbia too. Therefore the Court's decision may be taken as guidelines of what is and what is not a violation of human rights.

In compliance with already established practice, the Serbian public was never informed, either, that the European Commission's report on Serbia would include everything that would be happening before the Pride Parade and during the event itself, or that the Government's conduct would be watched. That is an important test that may be interpreted as an obstruction of the freedom of assembly. Jelko Kacin, the European Parliament's Rapporteur for Serbia (Kacin 2011), stated that the decision to ban the Pride Parade might not have an influence on the text of the European Commission's recommendation for Serbia's candidacy for the European Union (EU) membership, but it would surely have an effect on the decision of the EU members whether to accept the recommendation or

⁷) Alekseyev v. Russia (application nos 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09).

not. “What surprised me the most was the news that the National Security Council had had a session. As the Rapporteur for Serbia, I can’t imagine any other country in Europe that would convene such a body on the occasion of such a Pride Parade,” Mr. Kacin said.

Due to the irresponsible conduct of representatives of the executive authorities (an inter-institutional body, like the one in 2010, was not set up, and the minister responsible for human rights failed to come to the Parade, which the previous minister for human and minority rights had announced months in advance), and on the occasion of recognition of basic human rights, it was announced that the OSCE’s monitoring group would come to Belgrade one week before the holding of the Pride Parade, for the purpose of carefully monitoring all the developments. The OSCE’s presence at the Parade was actually pressure and an attempt to prevent any effort to ban the Pride Parade. The consequences that Serbia might suffer for placing a ban on this gathering are political ones, and they might have an effect on Serbia’s expectations regarding the EU integrations (B92-Beta 2011).

The European Commission has assessed the Belgrade Pride Parade held in 2010 as a “confirmation of freedom of expression” and the rejection of any discrimination.

A day after the 2010 Pride Parade in Belgrade, European officials welcomed the Serbian Government’s determination to protect this meeting. “The EU is a community of values that guarantee the freedom of association, freedom of expression and the rejection of all discrimination, including those related to sexual preference,” said the spokeswoman of the Commission, Maja Kocijančič. In her opinion, the spokeswoman of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy of the EU, Catherine Ashton, said, “Serbian authorities supported the event and took measures to ensure safety.” In this, she responded to the reporter’s question on whether it was a simple truth that on the previous day a parade of homosexual activists that took place in Belgrade, causing severe conflict, was a breakthrough for the realisation of human rights in Serbia, taking into account the fact that the European Commission gave too much importance to it and that the head of the EC delegation in Belgrade was among the participants of the Parade. Maja Kocijančič stressed that the gay parade in Belgrade “was essentially an expression of such (European) values.” Serbian authorities were determined to protect the rights of participants of the Pride Parade to demonstrate, and they acted professionally and with restraint, in order to enable this event to take place, she added (Step by step 2011: 44-46).

Ups and downs in development of Serbian gay and lesbian movement

The role of the history of the gay and lesbian movement

In 1991 Arcadia, the first LGBT group in Serbia, was founded; both women and men were founders and members. When in 2010 the first Pride Parade was held in Belgrade, this was considered in some ways the culmination of over two decades of activism in Serbia: from Arcadia the movement had finally come to what was the first concrete step in winning a more tangible freedom (Step by step: 48).

During the 1990s women stepped out from Arcadia and founded Labris, an organisation for lesbian rights. The founders of Labris were active in the feminist movement of the time, mostly dealing with violence against women and operating in various forms of political protests and resistance against the Milosevic regime. Their LGBT-oriented activities mostly targeted raising the awareness of the lesbian community as to their rights, and raising the level of their self-consciousness and the issues of coming out in a situation of social conflicts, economic crisis and isolation imposed by the international community.

However, the LGBT movement in Serbia was not at all involved in the decriminalisation of male homosexual acts, which happened in 1994. It happened mostly due to the wish of the isolated Serbian regime of the time to represent itself as democratic and human rights-oriented in a way that did not cost much. To be more specific, homosexuality was already decriminalised in the region, while in Serbia this crime was used mostly as a way for the police to blackmail gay people but not really to prosecute them and to send them to prison.

At the beginning of the 2000s, the movement was enthusiastically and unrealistically convinced that the new democratic era had finally come, because the Milosevic regime was finally overturned after losing the elections in 2000, and therefore tried to organise the first Pride Parade in 2001, which ended in a disastrous burst of violence. A few later attempts finished far before realisation, mostly due to the lack of social and political allies and support. These attempts absorbed lot of the movement's energy and time, resulting in a wide range of internal conflicts and divisions, disappointments and frustrations, and even feelings of helplessness.

All these Pride attempts were followed by the condemnation of the public, which eventually become louder in opposing the event (Čongradin 2011: 5). One of the arguments was that the LGBT communities wished by

means of organising the Parade to gain legally recognised family status for their communities and adoption of children. Although these claims have genuinely never been seen by the LGBT movement as the aim of the Parade, the topics inevitably became publicly perceived as real, current claim of the LGBT community. The topic was thus imposed through a misunderstanding of the LGBT movement, which could not deny that the recognition of same-sex families was the final goal of their activities (Martinović 2011).

After the banning of the Pride Parade 2009, Labris initiated the creation of the LGBT Platform – a document that will define the minimum of understanding among LGBT groups. This initiative was a result of numerous disagreements between LGBTIQ⁸ organisations and activists during the Pride Parade organising process. Due to the inability to achieve the minimum of understanding with all LGBT organisations, Labris signed the document entitled “Principles of mutual cooperation and coordinated activities of LGBTIQ human rights organisations” together with Gayten LGBT, the Rainbow Association from Šabac, and Safe Pulse of Youth. The signing of this document represents an important step for LGBT activism in Serbia. After the signing of the Principles, these four organisations applied to the Ministry for Human and Minority Rights with a proposal for a project entitled “Dialogue and cooperation with institutional representatives regarding the position of the LGBTIQ population in Serbia” (Godišnji izveštaj 2010: 17). The project is significant due to its showing that there is the necessary critical mass of organisational will to cooperate in the mutual fight against homophobia.

Legal framework for combating violence and discrimination against LGBT people in Serbia and political will for its implementation

The role of legislation

Serbia has an adequate legal framework for combating violence and discrimination against LGBT people. Its Constitution from 2006 prohibits discrimination⁹ but omits any mention of sexual orientation as a protected

⁸) The added “I” stands for inter-sexual people and “Q” for queer ones.

⁹) Prohibition of discrimination (Article 21): All are equal before the Constitution and law. Everyone shall have the right to equal legal protection, without discrimination. All direct or indirect discrimination based on any grounds, particularly on race, sex, national origin,

category, probably based on the assumption that the general term “any grounds” is good enough to cover all other possibly discriminated groups and any incitement of racial, ethnic, religious and all other inequality and hatred.¹⁰ Moreover, human dignity is inviolable¹¹ and freedom of assembly is warranted.¹²

In addition to the Serbian Constitution and the Criminal Code, there are in force several more laws that sanction discrimination based on sexual orientation, above all the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination, the Labour Law, and the Law on Higher Education, the Law on Broadcasting and the Law on Public Information. Unfortunately, legislation in Serbia still does not recognise the category of “hate crimes” that in many developed countries is treated as an aggravating circumstance in judicial proceedings (Step by step 2011: 8).

The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination (adopted on March 26 2009) in Article 16, paragraph 1, prohibits discrimination in the area of labour, i.e. violation of equal opportunities to establish employment or enjoyment on an equal footing of all rights in the field of labour, such as the right to work, free choice of employment, advancement of one’s career, vocational advancement and professional rehabilitation, and the right to equal compensation for work of equal value, to just and favourable work conditions, to vacations, to education and to joining unions, as well as protection against unemployment. Article 18 of the Labour Law prohibits direct and indirect discrimination against persons seeking employment or employees, with regard to gender, language, race, colour, age, pregnancy, medical condition or disability, national origin, religion, marital status,

social origin, birth, religion, political or other opinion, property status, culture, language, age, or mental or physical disability shall be prohibited. Special measures that the Republic of Serbia may introduce to achieve full equality of individuals or group of individuals in a substantially unequal position compared to other citizens shall not be deemed discrimination.

¹⁰ Article 49: Any incitement of racial, ethnic, religious or other inequality or hatred shall be prohibited and punishable.

¹¹ Article 23: Human dignity is inviolable and everyone shall be obliged to respect and protect it. Everyone shall have the right to free development of his personality if this does not violate the rights of others guaranteed by the Constitution.

¹² Article 54: Citizens may assemble freely. Assemblies held indoors shall not be subjected to permission or registering. Gathering, demonstrations and other forms of assembly held outdoors shall be reported to the state body, in accordance with the law. Freedom of assembly may be restricted by the law only if necessary to protect public health, morals, the rights of others or the security of the Republic of Serbia.

family responsibilities, sexual orientation, political or other opinion, social origin, property, membership of political organisations, unions or any other personal characteristic. It explicitly prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, while Article 21 reads as follows: “Sexual orientation is a private matter and no one can be asked to explain oneself in connection with one’s sexual orientation. Everyone is entitled to explain oneself with regard to one’s sexual orientation, and discriminatory treatment due to such an explanation of oneself is prohibited.” At the same time, the said Law prohibited uniting for the purpose of practising discrimination, hate speech, harassment and degrading treatment, discrimination in the proceedings conducted in bodies of the public authorities and in the sphere of labour. Serious forms of discrimination from that Law include the instigating and inducing of non-equality, hatred and intolerance on the grounds of gender identity, sexual orientation and disability.

One should not forget the context that marked the adoption of the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination: the draft Law was firstly removed from the agenda for the National Assembly’s session (on the initiative of the Serbian Orthodox Church), and it was, thereupon, voted by a small majority. The main reason for obstructing the adoption of the said Law was the “controversial” Article 21, which is of the greatest importance to the LGBT population.

Poor enforcement of existing legislation in the protection against discrimination at work quite often causes various problems to many people who are different from the majority, based on any personal trait (Step by step 2011: 49).

The Serbian LGBT population still cannot be satisfied with the lack of systematic implementation of the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination.

The first steps in the implementation of this law – the nomination of the Commissioner for Equality – remained more in the shadow of divisions in the NGO (which happened because of different views on suitable candidates for the post), sector than it contributed to public promotion of the significant role of the Commissioner and tolerance towards minority groups. Various problems once again bring into question the seriousness of the state’s intention to establish an independent regulatory body. The lack of adequate implementation of the prohibition of discrimination in the Employment and Labour Law also slowly crystallises as a problem that can lead to very negative consequences for LGBT people in the near future, primarily in terms of the great potential for discrimination and bullying in the workplace (Step by step: 11).

The Law on Prohibiting the Events of Neo-Nazi and Fascist Organisations and Associations and on Prohibiting the Use of Neo-Nazi and Fascist Symbols and Insignia was adopted on May 29 2009. Although it was not directly induced by a wish to ensure the protection of the rights of LGBT persons, it is, nevertheless, one of the instruments for protecting the said population too, since the attacks on members of the LGBT population are carried out by such organisations. The Law on Associations was adopted on 8 July 2009. It provides the necessary legal grounds and the range of activities and organisations that protect the rights of LGBT persons.

At the end of 2011, with the intention of showing evidence of shortages in the implementation of existing legal anti-discrimination provisions, Labris conducted a survey examining the opinions of members of the LGBT community, both women and men, according to whom a systematic discrimination against LGBT persons was obvious. (About two hundred persons voted on the Labris site, and out of them 80% confirmed systematic discrimination against the LGBT population in Serbia today.) In the Labris public release (Saopštenje Labris, 2011) the following is concluded:

1. The LGBT population is a minority in Serbia that is not allowed to freely gather together and demonstrate the rights warranted by the law and the highest legal document, the Constitution.
2. LGBT persons are threatened by death if they wish to enjoy that right.
3. The LGBT population is systematically discriminated against when the point at issue involves the rights stemming from partnership relations, either conjugal or non-conjugal, which are governed by the law and which are available only to heterosexual persons.
4. Due to a systematic non-recognition of same-sex partnerships, a series of laws are discriminatory towards the LGBT population, including the Law on Family, the Law on Inheritance and the Law on Healthcare.
5. A systematic discrimination against LGBT persons is also obvious when the existing laws are implemented. Those laws ban discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity, yet LGBT persons are regularly and mostly discriminated against in various ways at work, in educational institutions, in their families, and in governmental institutions, such as the police, the prosecutor's office and the courts.

The greatest shortcoming of legal regulations on the position of persons with a non-heterosexual orientation in Serbia is a lack of definition of the category of "hate crime," which would, according to the experiences of

other countries and the stands taken by LGBT organisations, contribute to a more efficient prosecution of those accused of violence and other criminal offences committed against the LGBT population. The Criminal Code should include the category of “hate crime,” which would enable a faster and more efficient identification and prosecution of homophobic and transphobic crimes. Serbia should improve its legislative scope by adopting changes in the criminal code, by introducing “hate crime” as a specific criminal offence, or by increasing the penalties for violent criminal offences committed on the grounds of race, religion, ethnic affiliation, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, mental or physical disability, and so on.

A more accurate wording should be introduced in the laws governing the operation of the Army of Serbia and the police of the Republic of Serbia, which would explicitly exclude discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation. This implies that it should be stated in the Law on the Army of Serbia that the insulting of a subordinate’s dignity on the basis of his/her sexual orientation might be the grounds for instigating a disciplinary procedure against members of the Army of Serbia. It should also be stated precisely in the Law on the Police that an authorised official should act without discriminating on the grounds of sexual orientation.

The official system of monitoring and providing information to the public about the reported and processed cases of attacks on and discrimination against members of the heterosexual minority should be established (LGBT populacija 2011).

This is necessary for providing accurate data, with the aim of adopting information-based political decisions in the fight against violent hate crimes and for the purpose of assessing the prosecution of hate crimes. Such systems should record incidents and attacks, as well as cases of persecution, and they should also be accessible to a larger number of persons. Serbia should simultaneously introduce the procedures for evaluating the success of the police and the prosecutor’s office with investigating and prosecuting hate crimes.

The legislation necessary for identifying and respecting the rights of transsexual and transgender persons should be adopted. The information necessary for providing adequate support to transsexual and transgender persons should be distributed to all relevant establishments and institutions.

The legislation is not yet fully understood by state officials, and nor has it been fully implemented in practice (Živanović 2011).

The effects of the Western gay and lesbian movement

While on the one hand the LGBTIQ population is receiving more support than ever before from numerous public persons and leading domestic and foreign organisations, on the other hand the institutional representatives show a complete lack of readiness and willingness to work on the promotion and advancement of LGBTIQ human rights in Serbia. Their support remains only declarative, while the honest support comes only through the work of certain sensitised individuals (Godišnji izveštaj 2010: 17).

When people were asked explicitly about their attitudes towards the activities of NGOs that advocate the rights of sexual minorities, opinions were divided – although more than a third of respondents (35%) think that activities of such organisations should be prohibited, 31% think that they should do their work just like all other organisations, and 4% are for the application of “positive discrimination” to such organisations, while as many as 30% do not have any opinion about them (Prejudices 2010: 23).

At the present time, the international community is seen as a very important partner in the attempts to change the position of the LGBT population, primarily their representatives who act in the country and who have the real understanding and instruments to help both this population and the state to make improvements (Prejudices 2010: 40-41).

The lists of the international partners of some currently implemented activities show numerous sources of Western support for the Serbian LGBT movement.¹³ They are necessary sources of funds, but also necessary allies. They provide support, advice and communication with foreign LGBT organisations, transfer experiences and good practices, and make the efforts of the Serbian LGBT movement visible and recognised outside of Serbia.

¹³ Amnesty International, Athens Pride, CARE International, the European Commission, Front Line Defenders, the European Parliament Inter group on LGBT Rights, Friedrich Neumann Foundation for Freedom, Heinrich Boll Stiftung, Human Rights Watch, Gloucestershire Pride, IGLHRC, ILGA Europe, Justice in the Balkans: Equality for Sexual Minorities, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Labriz Lesbian Association, Lesbian group Kontra, Ljubljana Pride, MiGay, Development Department of the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe – OSCE, Pride Solidarity, Queer Parade Brno, Rainbow Rose, Council of Transgender Europe and many other national LGBT organisations in Europe.

Conclusion

We can say that the level of homophobia in Serbia, its forms and its strength are very similar to those in all other neighbouring countries. What is dissimilar is the willingness of the state to consistently oppose homophobia, to put its own laws into effect and to protect the rights of all its citizens without discrimination. Instead of this, the Serbian state permits the activities of homophobic organisations and individuals (Žene u crnom 2011), as if the points at issue were legitimate stands, legitimate confrontation of opinion, scholarly and expert discussions and conflicts of political ideas and viewpoints (Lambros 2011).¹⁴

Homophobia gains in strength and in the “legitimacy” of its existence and operation when the Government, or those who are in power, manifest self-interest in letting such stands legitimately exist in public, thereby establishing alliances of mutual interests with homophobic individuals and organisations (Pančić 2011). It is important to stress that public discourse in Serbia is like a powder keg, still full of hate speech regarding the LGBT population, which might easily be set off in practice in the form of hate-motivated crimes (Sekulić 2011: 4).

One important step forward in Serbia is certainly the 22 December 2011 decision of the Constitutional Court (Saopštenje Ustavni sud 2011), which adopted a constitutional appeal of the organisers of the 2009 Pride Parade. The Constitutional Court established that by banning the Parade, the governmental bodies violated the right of free assembly of those who had submitted the constitutional appeal, and it also established that they were entitled to effective court protection. The Constitutional Court’s decision is an important step towards protecting the freedom of speech and assembly of all citizens of the Republic of Serbia, particularly those belonging to the threatened minorities.

Unfortunately the step backward was the 2012 banning of the Pride Parade, followed by very strong homophobic public discourse. Responding to homophobia and violent attacks against the vulnerable LGBT community by banning them from peacefully gathering and expressing themselves further violates their fundamental human rights, and provides further strength to homophobia in Serbian society. The simple truth that the state should confront prejudice, not submit to it, has unfortunately not yet been

¹⁴ <<http://www.begrad.rs/cms/view.php?id=2575>>.

adopted in Serbia. It is yet to be seen how great the price is that has been paid, and will be paid, because of widespread homophobia, discrimination and prejudice against LGBT people. It is still not yet understood that nobody has the right to treat one group of people as less worthy or less respected. For example, instead of taking a strong public position against violations of the human rights of LGBT persons and promoting respect on issues related to sexual orientation and gender identity, the Serbian Ombudsman did not issue any official statement regarding the 2012 banning of the Pride Parade. However, in some media comments he rather cynically wished “better luck to all in the next year’s organisation of the Parade” (as if the Parade were the matter of a lottery) (M.D. 2012: 1), and his comment on the attack on the web site of the Queeria centre, one of Belgrade’s LGBT rights groups, was his condemnation of “all sorts of extremisms” (N-J. 2012: 4).

Bibliography

- B92-Beta, Posledica otkazivanja Parade, B92, 2011, 16. oktobar <http://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2011&mm=10&dd=16&nav_category=12&nav_id=549902>. Accessed: 9 December 2011.
- Constitution of The Republic of Serbia <http://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text.jsp?file_id=191258>. Accessed: 22 September 2011.
- Cveković Lj., *Prajd u 4 zida, Konferencija za novinare*, Organizacionog odbora beogradske Parade ponosa, 2. 20. 2011, MS Press centar. <http://www.slobodnaevropa.org/content/prajd_u_cetiri_zida/24346360.html>.
- Čongradin S., *Srpska kandidatura zavisi i od Parade ponosa*, Danas 12. Septembar, 2011: 3 <http://www.danas.rs/danasrs/politika/srpska_kandidatura_zavisi_i_od_parade_ponosa.56.html?news_id=223352>. Accessed: 13 September 2011.
- Čongradin S., *Predizborni okršaji DS i SPS oko Parade ponosa*, Danas 27. Septembar 2011: 5 <http://www.danas.rs/danasrs/drustvo/predizborni_okrsaji_ds_i_sps_oko_parade_ponosa.55.html?news_id=224512>. Accessed: 30 September 2011.
- D. D., *Homofobni napad u centru Beograda*, Danas, 28. Novembar 2011: 4 <http://www.danas.rs/danasrs/drustvo/homofobni_napad_u_centru_beograda.55.html?news_id=228966>. Accessed: 1 December 2011.
- Dopis za medije povodom početka kampanje “Tolerancija, pre svega!”*: 08. Septembar 2011. <<http://www.labris.org.rs/umrezavanje/dopis-za-medije-povodom-pocetka-kampanje-tolerancija-pre-svega.html>>. Accessed: 10 September 2011.
- Godišnji izveštaj i položaju LGBT populacije u Srbiji 2010*. 2011. (Beograd: Labris – organizacija za lezbejska ljudska prava). <http://www.labris.org.rs/images/npublikacije/2011/izvestaj_2010_SR2.pdf>. Accessed: 3 January 2012.
- Vučković D. i M. Savić, *Godišnji izveštaj o položaju LGBTIQ populacije u Srbiji 2009. 2010* (Beograd). <<http://www.labris.org.rs/images/npublikacije/izvestajSR.pdf>>. Accessed: 3 January 2012.

- Kacin J., *EP rapporteur: Citizens deprived of legal rights*. <http://www.b92.net/eng/news/politics-article.php?yyyy=2011&mm=10&dd=01&nav_id=76655>. Accessed: 21 October 2011.
- Kocić D., *Kad je saznao da sam gej, otac me je isterao iz kuće*, 16. December 2011, Press <http://www.pressonline.rs/sr/vesti/vesti_dana/story/192881/Kad+je+saznao+da+sam+gej,+otac+me+je+isterao+iz+ku%C4%87e.html>. Accessed: 20 December 2011.
- LGBT populacija i reforma sektora bezbednosti u Republici Srbiji, Organizacija za evropsku bezbednost i saradnju*. 2011 (Beograd: Misija OEBS u Srbiji). <<http://publicpolicy.rs/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/LGBT-populacija-i-reforma-sektora-bezbednosti.pdf>>. Accessed: 29 December 2011.
- Lambros A., *Vi ste problem* <<http://www.beograd.rs/cms/view.php?id=2575>>. Accessed: 9 December 2011.
- The Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination* <http://www.ravnopravnost.gov.rs/files/Zakon_o_zabrani_diskriminacije_i_prevodi.pdf>. Accessed: 3 January 2012.
- Logar G., *Skriveni potpis Srbije*, Danas 28. mart 2011: 7. <http://www.danas.rs/danasrs/kolumnisti/skriveni_potpis_srbije.883.html?news_id=212387>. Accessed: 19 September 2011.
- Ljudska prava u Srbiji 2009, pravo, praksa, i međunarodni standardi ljudskih prava*, Beogradski centar za ljudska prava. <www.bgcentar.org.rs>. Accessed: 30 December 2012.
- Ljudska prava u Srbiji 2010, pravo, praksa, i međunarodni standardi ljudskih prava*, Beogradski centar za ljudska prava. <www.bgcentar.org.rs>. Accessed: 30 December 2012.
- Martinović I., *Homofobija i nacionalizam mladih u Srbiji*, Radio Slobodna Evropa 9.11.2011. <http://www.slobodnaevropa.org/content/pride_bez_jasne_podrske_drzave/24340665.html>. Accessed: 10 November 2011.
- M. D. *Verske vođe koriste boga da bi pretile manjinskim grupama*, Danas, 6.10.2012: 1. <<http://web.arhiv.rs/develop/stanjepress.nsf/ea935cf1fd51137c125784d0067fe6c/c12578d9004890d1c1257a8e0067f4a7?OpenDocument>>. Accessed: 10 October 2012.
- M. D. M – K. Ž. – Z. M., *Država nema na homofobiju*, Danas 21. Decembar 2011: 12 <http://www.danas.rs/danasrs/drustvo/terazije/drzava_nema_na_homofobiju.14.html?news_id=230536>. Accessed: 22 December 2011.
- “Naši” ismevaju policiju pred gej paradu*, Kurir 29. Septembar 2011: 6 <<http://www.kurir-info.rs/vesti/drustvo/nasi-ismevaju-policiju-pred-gej-paradu-130396.php>>. Accessed: 30 September 2011.
- N.J., *Homofobe proglasite za pijanice i rasiste*, Informer, 6. October, 2012: 4 <<http://web.arhiv.rs/develop/stanjepress.nsf/ea935cf1fd51137c125784d0067fe6c/c12578d9004890d1c1257a8e0067a086?OpenDocument>>.
- Novosadska Lezbejska Organizacija – NLO i grupa za podršku gej muškarcima “Izađi,” Saopštenje za javnost povodom napada na gej muškarca, Da li nasilje treba da se dogodi vama da biste reagovali? (Novi Sad), 01.11.2011. <<http://kuda.org/saop-tenje-za-javnost-povodom-napada-na-gej-mu-karca>>. Accessed: 02 November 2011.
- Pančić T., Kapuljače i pokrovitelji, Vreme, Br 1078(1). Septembar 2011. <<http://www.vreme.com/cms/view.php?id=1008682>>. Accessed: 15 September 2011.
- Pašić D., *Nogama u glavu zato što je gej*, by Centar za kvir studije. 12 December 2011: 57. <<http://www.cks.org.rs/2011/12/nogama-u-glavu-zato-sto-je-gej/>>. Accessed: 13 December 2011.
- Papović V., Petrović-M., Dakić I., *Patrijarh srpski Irinej za Alo “Gej parada je glupost, ignorišite je!”* Alo, 26 Septembar 2011: 2. <http://www.alo.rs/vesti/42000/Gej_parada_je_glupost_ignorisite_je>. Accessed: 27 September 2011.

- Prejudices exposed, Homophobia in Serbia 2010, Research and analysis public opinion views of GLBT population, discrimination in the workplace.* 2010. (Bograd: GSA). <<http://www.gsa.org.rs/izvestaji/Research-Prejudices-Exposed-2010-GSA.pdf>>. Accessed: 15 October 2011.
- Prebijen gej mladić dobio otkaz.* <<http://www.cks.org.rs/2011/11/prebijeni-gej-mladic-dobio-i-otkaz-u-firmi/>>. Accessed: 10 November 2011.
- Presuda Evropskog suda za ljudska prava protiv Rusije i zabrane održavanja parade ponosa. Alekseyev v. Russia* (Application nos 4916/07, 25924/08 and 14599/09). <http://www.ilgaeurope.org/home/news/for_media/media_releases/european_court_of_human_rights_russia_violates_the_european_convention_on_human_rights_by_banning_moscow_prides>. Accessed: 22 September 2011.
- Saopštenje Labris o postojanju sistemske diskriminacije.* (Beograd), 28/12/2011. <<http://www.labris.org.rs/poll-results/da-li-misli-da-u-srbiji-postoji-sistemska-diskriminacija-lgbt-osoba.html>>. Accessed: 22 September 2011.
- Saopštenje: Ustavni sud je odlučio da su zabranom Povorka ponosa 2009. Vlasti prekršile Ustav Republike Srbije. 27. decembar 2011 (Beograd: Beogradski centar za ljudska prava). <http://www.queerbeograd.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=585:saopstenje-ustavni-sud-&catid=1:latest&Itemid=54>. Accessed: 30 December 2011.
- S.B., *Homoseksualci su bolesni ljudi*, Kurir 22. September 2011: 9. <<http://www.kurir-info.rs/vesti/drustvo/profesorka-homoseksualci-su-bolesni-ljudi-127792.php>> Accessed: 23 September 2011.
- Sekulić N., *Govor mržnje znak primitivizma*, Press 1. mart 2011: 4. <http://www.pressonline.rs/sr/vesti/vesti_dana/story/152751/Govor+mr%C5%BEenje+znak+primitivizma.html>. Accessed: 10 September 2011.
- Step by step report on human rights status of LGBT persons in Serbia 2010* (Report produced by Gay Straight Alliance) 17 May 2011.
- S. Ž., *Trolejbus GSP oblepljen nalepnicama "Pedere u blendere,"* Blic, 22 October 2011. <<http://www.gsa.org.rs/izvestaji/GSA-report-2010.pdf>>. Accessed: 20 September 2011.
- Tomić Z., *Gejeve treba odvaliti od batina*, Kurir, 21 September 2011: 8.
- Živanović, K, *Ustavni sud Srbije usvojio žalbu organizatora Povorka ponosa 2009. Zabrana Parade neustavna* Danas, 29. December, 2011. <http://www.danas.rs/danasrs/drustvo/zabрана_parade_neustavna_55.html?news_id=231204>. Accessed: 22 September 2011.
- Žene u crnom*, 30 September 2011 (Institucije države predale Beograd i Srbiju fašistima). <<http://www.nspm.rs/hronika/zene-u-crnom-institucije-drzave-predale-beograd-i-srbiju-fasistima.html?alphabet=l>>. Accessed: 30 September 2011.

