

CIVIC

Panta rei

By: Daliborka Uljarević

And this is why the thought as such is so inconsequential here: it has to be in the service of daily needs or worthless, it has to be a personal attack or it lacks the necessary stage flair, it has to be an attack on others because the phenomenological approach is too demanding for the worked-up adrenaline which can't be brought down and directed to some sensible goals and thus becomes oppressive, useless and suicidal.

The greatest obstacle to the development of Montenegro is the existence of two opinions: mine and everybody else's. This flawed arithmetic of the authentic Montenegrin experience of democracy dangerously limits the space for what we need the most: a reasoned dialogue on strategic issues and systemic, not only personal, changes.

A few years ago, driving outside of town, I caught on the radio part of an old interview with **Ivo Andrić**, conducted just after he received the Nobel Prize for this book "The bridge on Drina" (I can't help pointing out here too that "Chronicles of Travnik" deserved it more!). Towards the end of the conversation, the journalist asked him if he had any regrets, or rather what, as an already world-famous writer, he would do differently in his life. After a short pause, Andrić said that he felt under a lot of pressure writing under his own name, and that he would have much more to say had it not been for this limitation.

I have been for a long time both chased and inspired for thinking with that answer of his. If the man of such an indisputable great format was tied with the part of his identity within his own artistic and political expression, how are those made of less quality material facing this challenge. Believe it or not, extraordinary easy, without any responsibility...

And this is why the thought as such is so inconsequential here: it has to be in the service of daily needs or worthless, it has to be a personal attack or it lacks the necessary stage flair, it has to be an attack on others because the phenomenological approach is too demanding for the worked-up adrenaline which can't be brought down and directed to some sensible goals and thus becomes oppressive, useless and suicidal.

On the other hand, it is always a question whether something is a result of pure coincidence or of a well thought-out plan to create and maintain the atmosphere of a general lack of ideas, opposition parties and other alternatives of low quality and well controlled people. I don't believe in coincidences and the experience has proven me right, at least in this country.

In the endgame, we all know who can afford to pay for electricity and who will foot the bill, whose docks will stay protected this summer and whose will go, via manipulated tenders, into the hands of those who need a way to quickly launder the money, whose bars are avoided by the inspectorates while they persistently pester others, and many other similar examples that each of us can think of and which defy the theory of coincidences and equality before law in our part of the microcosm. We have all seen through the game in which one day you will have a drink with somebody and tomorrow attack each other in the media to demonstrate your commitment to the principles and morals and your attachment to the popular masses, as well as those who intentionally shut their eyes before the well known facts.

These tactically attractive, but essentially irrelevant attacks are the main line of defence of the status quo: they do no harm to those they are aimed at, while (un)consciously preventing the rise and development of a genuine, credible and sustainable alternative.

Hyper-production of issues and affairs which remind of Spanish soap-operas serve to continuously rape the minds of the public, already indifferent to that crime without punishment. The greatest obstacle to the development of Montenegro is the existence of two opinions: mine and everybody

else's. This flawed arithmetic of the authentic Montenegrin experience of democracy dangerously limits the space for what we need the most: a reasoned dialogue on strategic issues and systemic, not only personal, changes.

Going back to the burden Andrić had spoken about in these yet uncovered content, the author of this article, without any pretension to a link with Andrić himself, admits to her own inability to write about what she sees and what she lives with any more precision. There will be place and time for that. Right now, it is more important to work on getting rid of this small-town atmosphere, of the rules of the game which identifies the winners and the losers at the very start, thus forsaking the spirit of the game; on (re)constructing the future where a citizen never bows before greater force, fully aware of his rights and powers.

The author is executive director of the Centre for Civic Education (CCE).