

Panel 1 IFD 2004

Oldřich Černý

I am Oldřich Černý, the Director of the Forum 2000 Foundation. I'd like to welcome you here this morning on behalf of the Forum 2000 Foundation and the Vize '97 foundation: joint co-organizers of this conference. May I just remind you that the working language is English. After the introductory speeches or remarks, and initial debate on the first panel, we are going to open the floor to the public. Questions or interventions in English will be very much welcome. Now, at twelve o'clock we adjourn for a short lunch and will resume again at 13 o'clock. Now, I'd like to invite to the podium Professor Tomáš Halík and the panelists of the first panel. Thank you very much.

Tomáš Halík

Excellences, Reverendissimi, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. It's my honor and pleasure to open today's meeting. It is dedicated to the interfaith dialogue, field, whose importance has been constantly growing in recent years. Dialogue between the representatives of world religions is from its very beginning an integral part of Forum 2000 conferences, and already part of our tradition. Since the initiative of President Václav Havel, the interfaith dialogue meetings have taken place every year at Prague Castle, and have been followed by the joint interfaith meditation in the Prague's St.Vitus' Cathedral. Recently, the Forum 2000 conferences shifted towards a different, more open environment, aiming to bring the public closer to the current problems, and focusing on concrete political and cultural challenges of today. In this context, we would like to shed the light on the position of religion in today's world, questions of religious co-existence and exchange thoughts about the relationship between religions and society. For the first time, we meet at this place, in the heart of Old Prague. This jewel of Gothic architecture had been once monastery of Dominican nuns. It was converted in the eighteenth century to various secular purposes: from a printing house to a depository of stage furniture for the National Theatre some years ago. Thanks to the care and support from Vize '97 foundation of Dagmar and Václav Havel, it has been restored, renewed and reopened couple of months ago for the Prague Crossroads initiative. It hosts events and meetings like this one. The name of the initiative, Prague Crossroads, reflects the notion of Prague as a place where religious culture and national traditions have met and been exchanged for centuries. We wish for this capacity of meeting between different traditions to become a source of inspiration for us: to help us perceive the world through the eyes of the others, to overcome all prejudices and stereotypes, and cure the fears and pains of the past, and find a future path full of hope. So in this spirit, we start the meeting today. As you know, there will be three panels. And here is one quotation from St. Bernard of Clairvaux as inspiration for us. "Let us deepen that which unites us, overcome that which divides us, and preserve that what distinguishes us." So, in this approach to other traditions, we will start. Now, let's start the first panel discussion. The topic is religion and politics, and I would like to ask the participants of the first panel shortly to introduce themselves, please. Your Eminence.

Józef Zyciński

I'm Józef Zyciński, Archbishop of Lublin, Poland. Lublin is situated close to the Ukrainian border, so we now have a very special occasion to express our solidarity to our Ukrainian friends. I'm Chancellor of the Catholic University of Lublin, and I have there a chair of the dialogue between religion and science. Very often, we organize ecumenical and inter-religious meetings because, close to Lublin, the concentration camp Maidanek is situated. Together with our Jewish friends, we invite many representatives of various religions to discuss, to look for truth, to bring this unity that is so important in a global world. Thank you.

Tariq Ramadan

I'm Tariq Ramadan, Professor of Islamic Studies and Comparative Philosophy, today linked to Notre Dame University of Indiana in the States. I have been involved in interfaith dialogue and intra-community dialogue within Muslims at the grass-roots level. In academia we are trying to think about Western Muslims and the way we can remain Muslims and at the same time, be Westerners.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

My name is Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz. First of all, I want to thank you for the honor that I have been invited. I was glad to see the flag of European Community on your marketplace. I myself was born close to two borders, in Bavaria, close to the Czech border and close to the border of the so-called German Democratic Republic. I studied in Munich, and in '93 was called to the University of Dresden. So, I work in the eastern part of Germany. I am the chair of Philosophy of Religion and Comparative Religious Studies, and (I am) concentrating mainly on the edition of works of Edith Stein, of Romano Guardini, and others. I myself am Catholic, and teaching in a society of eighty percent atheists.

Mohamed Abbas

I am Mohamed Abbas, and I am from Sudan. I am in the Czech Republic from 1988. I am interested in Islamic activism. When I was a student, I, with some group of students founded the Muslim Union of Students, and after that, the Islamic Center in Prague. Now I am president of the Muslim Union and other organizations, which take interest in Czech Muslims. From the middle of the '90s I have been interested in interfaith dialogue with Christians, Jews, Buddhists and Hare Krishna.

Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich

I am Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich, Professor Emeritus at the University of Bern, Switzerland. I'm Swiss, and have been active in the Christian/Jewish dialogue for many, many years. I'm working with Catholics and Protestants. I'm sitting in a lot of commissions, for instance, the Central Committee of German Catholics, which is very active in inter-religious work.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you very much for introducing yourself. For the non-Czech participants I should introduce myself as well. My name is Tomáš Halík, I am the president of Czech Christian Academy and professor at the Charles University. Now, in the beginning, I would like to put some provocative ideas on the table concerning this topic - religion and politics.

Many of you know the best-selling book of Gilles Kepel, "The Revenge of God," where he said that religion made a global comeback to the stage in the last quarter of the twentieth century. It's now evident that the de-privatization and re-politization of religion is truly a global phenomenon and does not concern only the monotheistic religions. Religious terrorism and fundamentalism are its most obvious, but by no means sole expressions. We can find religious symbols and very active religious groups nowadays in every part of political spectrum, from the extreme right to the extreme left. (We find these symbols) from fighters for civil liberties, via human rights and social justice, to supporters of authoritarian regimes; (they are found) from ecological activists to extreme nationalists, from the United States and Latin America to the new states of Africa, from the Balkans to the Arab countries, from Israel to India or Japan.

I think that one important idea is re-politization. What does it mean? What are the forums, where religions enter the public scene of today? The second point is from our Western experience. It will be interesting to have some feedback from the non-European traditions. I think that for many years, whenever the role of the churches and religion in public life was mentioned in the West, the automatic reaction was to trot out the empty phrase of "separation of churches and state", which almost no one questioned. That principle, no doubt, has historical justification. We are all aware why and in what circumstances it came into being. (We are aware of) to what extent it was meant to protect political and civic freedom from the dangerous domination of the powerful Church, or churches, as well as the freedom of the churches and religion from the state interference.

But I think, and it's my conviction, that there are many reasons, why we can no longer accept this principle as a paradigm for understanding the relationship between religion and public life. This relationship is acquiring a new dynamic and operating at completely different levels. The churches have ceased to be the exclusive representatives of religions, the monopoly over religion, in the same way that the state has ceased to exercise monopoly in the political sphere. In this process of globalization, the role of the nation states and traditional structures are diminished. I think there is a new position; there's a new dynamics in politics, (there are) new dynamics in religion. Perhaps we should ask if there is a new paradigm to see the relationship between religion and politics. Here are some ideas, perhaps for provocation, perhaps for inspiration. Now, I would like to ask the participants for their statements at the beginning.

Józef Zyciński

I agree with Professor Halík that the traditional expression, "separation of religion from politics" is an empty term. The Communist authorities interpreted it in their own way according to their preferences, sometimes in a Machiavellian way, sometimes totalitarian. So, instead of "separation" we prefer today the expressions "autonomy" and "cooperation." "Autonomy" means for the church that there will be no new Franz Joseph or new Communist regime that would discuss liturgical issues. Symmetrically, there would be no particular support for one political party in democratic society given by the church, because this would not be in the spirit of "autonomy." But, when we look on the domain of "cooperation," this is the domain of important changes. And in the document of John Paul II on the church in Europe, there is an important set of values that constitute the domain of "cooperation" between political and ecclesiastical authorities. The Holy See mentions there, we have to recognize altogether the value of human person. The value of human dignity: the sacredness of human life, the centrality of the family, the importance of education, freedom of thought, speech and religion, legal protection of individuals and groups, promotion of solidarity and the common good, and the recognition of the dignity of labor. Thus, there is a large set of values that should define the domain of concern of the church and of the state. The problem is that the practical approach very often results in quite different policy.

To conclude, I will refer to two meetings of young people of Europe with John Paul II. One, first, was in Paris, the next one in Rome. In Rome, in spite of the separation between the state and the church, police

arrived to the airport and to the station, to help the young students coming to Rome to organize their trip - to help them in whatever matter. In France, when the accommodations were already made in public schools, an officer responsible for laïcité discovered that placing Catholics in public school would violate the separation between the church and the state. So the students who were already accommodated there had to leave public schools. (They had) to go outside of Paris seventy, eighty kilometers, and twice a day. (They had to) go there and return in the spirit of laïcité. In my opinion, if we value any form of principle more than human dignity, than our service to the people, then there is more of an ideology and not a humanity. So, in my opinion, it is our duty for both the state and church authorities to defend human dignity, to help the people in building common good in our global world.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you.

Tariq Ramadan

I really think that if we want to address the very important issue of religion and politics there are two main fields within which we have to study the realities of these connections. A mutual relationship, in a sense: you have autonomy and at the same time collaboration.

First, we know what secularism means: the distinction between church and state. This process is a process known in the West and first started in Western history. Many Muslims are saying: we are not concerned by that because we don't have the church. But, the question is not about church and state. The question is about the realm of dogma and the realm of rationality; the realm of the authority coming from above and the authority coming from the grass roots - coming from the people. This is a process which is common to all, but we have different models in different places. The model of separation, for example, in the States, has nothing to do with the model in France where we speak about laïcité or with the situation here in your country. Every country has its own model of separation of the state and church and we have to study in which way they are connected and not connected.

This is a very important point. Why? Because when we come to models it's easy to say that in Islam there's no difference between religion and politics. But, when we study deeply the Islamic tradition we'll find that there was, and still is, a distinction between the realm of dogma and the realm of rationality. It's important to understand that when you study what we call the [phonetically "ai-be-de," Arabic], which means worship; the way we deal with God is different than the way we deal with people. The way we deal with people means that everything is permitted except what is prohibited. The way you deal with God is exactly the opposite. You have to rely on texts. Thus there is a distinction. The way this distinction works depends on the way the people understand it in a specific cultural region or in a specific country. I think that we have to challenge, from the Islamic viewpoint, the idea that we are mixing both. We will find that in every country we have a model, a specific model according to the memory, according to the culture, according to the collective psychology articulating the references to religion and references to politics.

Thus I think that saying that a total divorce of both is needed... I don't think that it works currently in any country; but, a necessary distinction is needed. We have to say that the realm of dogma should not have precedence to the field of collective rationality when it comes to politics. If we are not following this we are going to be destroyed because the authority should not come from above, it should come from the people - and this is what we call democracy.

Hence, I think that we don't have to promote one specific model; we have to promote principles. The first principle, if we speak about autonomy and collaboration, is the distinction and autonomy of the sphere of dogma. When you believe you are dealing with truth it is your personal choice, which has nothing to do with the way - how we are organizing ourselves. Here we have the collective rationality, but its model, its articulation will come and should come from specific history, memory, and the collective psychology of the people. You cannot impose a model of collaboration. And this is why you have so many models in the West. I really think that we have to promote common principles and at the same time to understand that we have specific models. This is really important in the way we deal with the situation.

To conclude, I think that we should understand that the divorce is not the right way to do it; because, what we can take from religions is ethics, values. We may come to the field where these ethics and these values are nurturing the way we deal with politics - where having more morality in politics is necessary. But, it does not mean to use or to instrumentalize religion in order to say "God bless our country". I think that God blesses, and should bless, all the countries, and all the ways. What is just, is just everywhere; it's not just because it's in our country. I think the perception that God is with us, and not with you, is wrong. God is with justice and is with what is right. When you are wrong- even if you are a Muslim, even when you are a Christian, a Jew, or a Buddhist- if you are wrong, you are wrong. God is with the just.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

Our discussion today is stemming from an experience of the twentieth century. In the twentieth century, we won this experience, the experience of an atheistic regime in two variations. The total separation of politics and religion was promoted especially in two ideologies, which condemned religion as a pre-modern and something old-fashioned. These were the two great ideologies, the red one, and the brown one. Astonishingly, both ideologies then led to sanctification of the state, totalitarian temptation to make the state the last address of everything what concerned human being. This totalitarian experience, especially in Germany, and I speak as a German here, means that the consequent model now is democracy. Democracy, especially its division of power, is now the new cradle internationally, and also in my country. This democracy is all right, but it - in a different way from France - tries to leave or to reach only the level of common welfare, civilization, etc. The shyness to move towards a more religious understanding of democracy, I think, stems from this dirty and ugly experience of this sanctification of the state. In this sense, our democracy is now tending to an emptiness of the post-modern being. I think we will speak more about post-modernity in this sense during the day. Nowadays, we have "nomadic" ethics: we take ethics from wherever we get it, and we drop it in the following moment. We still suffer from some kind of nihilism. I don't want to make accusations, but I want to say this is all a consequence of our bad experience of those sanctification ideologies.

Now, the third and the last point is that we are just at the very level, especially in Western Europe, where this separation of both powers is not meaningful any longer. The level, where the answer to the sanctified understanding of an atheistic state now needs to be developed further. The real functioning of a state is also the functioning of a common understanding: of a common culture, and of a more meaningful interpretation of human being, more than a biochemical, and an economical and a function-oriented individual. We cannot get over this individualism without formulating some common ethic bottom, or bottom convictions. I think this is the duty of religion. On the other hand, we have a lot of interpretations of religion today, and I think the problem what we will have to discuss, is not so much the pluralism of choice, or the pluralism of realms existing close to each other, but the spiritual enterprise – we need to get into the question of truth within religion. I don't speak for Huntington, that's not my field. But, the specific aims of religions are different. There are religions which stress more the individual rights and others more the rights of community. I think if Europe gets a soul, or gets its soul back, then we can't evade the discussion of the truth of different religions - on which common ground they can be referred to and where are the standing differentiations. Not the divisions, but the differentiations in the sense of Bernard of Clairvaux.

I think that Europe has a great future at the moment - when it understands that democracy is the pre-last, and very important, but pre-last item: what we found after the century of idealization. The main task is still open: to find the common interpretation of what is worthwhile to live and to die for: in that sense, what is the value of my life - what do I tend to, where is the orientation of my life. In this sense, I see the European development still undecided. To the contrary, paralyzed by its own terrible history.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you.

Mohamed Abbas

Since many of my ideas have been said, it is not wise to repeat them. I will try to address this problem from the practical point of view, as a Muslim living in Europe. Like Mr. Ramadan said earlier, in Islam, there is no division, or not a very strong division between religion and politics. Till the fall of Ottoman Empire, Muslims were used to having one ruler. This ended in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Strangely, this led to the phenomenon of Islamism, political Islamism. The beginning of the movement of Muslim brothers in Egypt also was due to the fall of Ottoman Empire. This group was the beginning of, and the inspiration for, most of the political involvement of Islam.

But in Islam, in its history, there is also the concept, which has been mentioned by our Christian brother: that has been autonomy. If we see the Jews, the Christians, and other religions, they did have autonomy. Muslim rulers should not interfere in liturgy, in schooling, religious schools, in religious courts, and in the marriage law. This is the reason, why so many Muslims in Europe feel that they expected something like this, which does not exist until now. We see it in France, for example, in this story of the way of how women should wear headscarf.

I guess that one of the biggest problems, which we have now is the division between the fear from religion stemming from what was happening in the last four, five years. In an era of weapons of mass destruction to feel that the political will, which will govern over those arsenals is unethical, that is very fearful. The image that someone can use all those weapons of mass destruction without restrictions, just following ideas of those who produce them is something very fearful for me as well. Thus we need ethics and the possibility to control the people, who are using politics in the name of religion, because when somebody wants to use weapons on behalf of a religion - you can't do it. We need a model, which shows the people the way, how to practice their faith, and gives them the possibility to participate in the process of decision-making.

Muslims in Europe lived in two model situations: one model in Spain, a long time ago, and one model in the Balkans. There has been tolerance there as recorded in the past. So, we have the possibility and we have

to learn something from the history and try to create a model, which enables us to conserve and to keep our faith and still have the possibility of participating in the political arena. This is, I guess, the challenge for us in the near future.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. Prof. Ehrlich.

Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich

In order for religion to be truthful to its task, it must actively and responsibly struggle against inhuman situations of man; this way political powers will not deprive the individual of his freedom or of his capacity for self-determination given to him by God as his creator. Hence, most trends in political theology point out that in the modern era, religion must be concerned with all aspects of life. The province of religion is not merely Heaven, but also perhaps primarily the Earth; it does not merely save souls, but also, or perhaps primarily, it has responsibility in shaping the way of life of man, of society, and state. This rather paradox represents a particular trend in current Christian thought and has reached a position which, despite the far-reaching differences between the Halachic conception and what you and Baptists called Christian practical critical hermeneutics, is reminiscent of one of the Jewish post-Biblical traditions.

Accordingly, whilst the Torah has been given from Heaven, it's not itself in Heaven, but rather on the Earth, and amid society. It is destined to be applied to the ever-changing realities of life, of history, of creation. Our shared concern is the Earth or this world, which has been given to man by his Creator to be guarded, cultivated, and cherished. Our shared concern is for life and for the upholding of the covenant with the entire realm of Being that is between me and you and every living creature for all generations. Our shared concern for peace in the realm of religion is simple sense of depart from evil. We share concern for simple conditions of dignified human existence. As Marmonides thought, a man will not search for the truth nor seek to do what is good when he's going off into exile or is hungry or is fleeing from his enemies. All these shared concerns for God's concrete earthly creation could greatly benefit from a true dialogue.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you very much. So, now is time for comments, questions, corrections.

Mohamed Abbas

One idea we must not forget is that religion is a tempting element for mobilizing people. There are so many factors, which can mobilize people: nationalism, patriotism, religion, and also political and economical arena. Sometimes we fear that religion, when joined with politics, leads to problems and disasters. I think the experience of the last decades shows that even if religion in itself is not involved, it will not stop some people from politics to use its elements, because they need a mobilizer. Thus it is unfair to discredit religion and faith only because somebody, some people, some group misuse religion as a motivator for mobilizing people to wars or similar.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. Prof. Zyciński.

Józef Zyciński

I'm grateful for comments of my colleagues and I'm asking, what more we can do to bridge and to unite our efforts so that in a pluralistic society our voice can be better heard. I would suggest that there are at least two domains. One, what shouldn't be done, a negative appraisal of current practices. On the basis of experience from my country, Poland, I would argue that a practice shouldn't be tolerated, in which one party represents religious group or the Church. Always it results in politicians appreciating more pragmatics than moral principles, and later, the people who supported this one Christian party are disillusioned and disappointed. So, let us develop politics without introducing God into our strategy, but honoring this separation between politics and religion. This is pragmatic and a negative statement.

The second domain is - what we could do positively to bring our voice to the global world. I don't mean the case of statements that everything is relative, that various religious groups are separated and inconsistent in their message. In my opinion, we could find set of basic values that should be recognized by Jews and by Catholics, by Muslims and by Hindus. In my opinion, we have to look for such basic values during international meetings. Many times I suggested that human dignity should be recognized as such central value. My critics argue on two levels. First they say that I'm reaching to the level of secular humanism, because for a secular humanist, human dignity is so important. I respond that if we leave human dignity only to secular humanists, it would be a disaster. When we repeat in Christian creed, for us, He descended from Heaven, the drama of incarnation refers to human person. When John Paul II in his first encyclical letter Redemptor hominis emphasizes the central position of human person in the God's plan of Salvation, it is recognition of human dignity. In my opinion, the threat of secular humanism is no threat. Other criticism of my opinion that we should recognize human dignity as a common ground for discussion, says that

pragmatically taken, the present society does not understand what dignity means. My critics argue, when you go to the United States, dignity is the term denoting the group of lesbians and gays; they have their structures called Dignity. In a Scandinavian country, a branch of Pampers for elderly people is poetically called Dignity. In such a context, many critics argue, let us leave aside dignity, let us look for more basic values.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. Yes, please.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

I would like to stress another idea, just as a consequence of yours. I think that we should discuss the problems in Europe, not in the U.S. or other parts of the world. Europe 's state of mind is, excuse me the simplification, a complicated one. I still want to stress that we come from the Enlightenment, which led to the atheism of great part of today's European population. I live in a society, which is actually atheistic, and I think in the Czech Republic it is not much different. Even in the religious streams, or mainstreams of Europe, I think there is a level or latent or subconscious atheism. What does it mean? Atheism now means that we first believe in rationality and secondly we believe in God. I'm working against it with all my power; but, I think that's the point. I mean that in the Biblical text, God Himself is, of course, the Logos. However, in the European mind, the first principle of rationality is strongly expressed. In this sense, all religions including Catholicism, Buddhism, and so on have the touch of something pre-modern. That means that they still have some relics, which in modern times cannot be exactly combined with what we call rational behavior.

To the second point, the role of the modern state is to guarantee, for instance, the liberty of the individual, and the law; that means it is a neutral, or more or less neutral duty to guarantee civic right. However, religions attempt or stress something different from that. I think common duty, or common experiment, is to combine the modern type of religion to that which the Enlightenment produced, to make people understand that this schism between faith and reason is also a pre-modern one, and that we have to go to a next generation beyond this last of all schisms. We have to go beyond the year of 1791 when the goddess of reason was installed in the Cathedral of Notre-Dame in Paris.

This is the last great European schism. But this schism is now overcome, and we come to a kind of re-evaluation of this problem. But in this process - we will discuss it in the third panel - the movement of Islam appears in a way that again made the impression of something pre-modern. But I think we all have the same problem. The European understanding of efficiency, of rationality and the lack of sense in life, in religious terms, will not be solved easily- neither by the traditional religions, nor by the newly imported religions. Religions have to manage to close the gap between these principles stemming from Enlightenment, especially individuality, freedom, relation between man and woman, which is a very hard duty. If this gap cannot be concluded, then I think that religion will just fall behind and will not reach the mainstream of what this atheistic, half-atheistic or non-atheistic population of Europe is used to think. I think it is a great human, European task. The U.S.A. is solving it a different way, that does not trouble me; but Europe, in a way, is the loser of the last century. If it understands what it has lost, maybe it will be the winner for coming discussion. I put here some postulates that I have no solutions for, but one had to formulate them.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. Yes, prof. Ehrlich.

Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich

We have spoken about religion as a value. We have also spoken about religion against atheism and so on. But, there is a danger with religion today, with all the religions, Judaism included – people forget that religion exists only within development of society. It must not assimilate in modern ideology but must develop with the society. It must develop so that people can grasp it from one side and the other side as well; religion must not be dangerous for others. We are living today in a world where all three monotheistic religions are in very big danger of doing the contrary of what religion should stand for. Religion is against other people, there is no dialogue possible, it is really in a sense too political. The feeling is that real religion, belief, faith in God goes together with political aspirations and political activity. We are today further than the times when atheism was modern; we now have religion, but this religion goes sometimes too far - which is the contrary of a real religion. It's to the contrary of ethics. Replacing ethics, in all the three religions there is a very heavy ideology which has nothing to do with a real religion. We have to try. I think that that's the task of those who are sitting on this table: to educate the people that religion is not leaving the path of ethics. We have to stress more the ethics in our means - be it the Bible, the Old and New Testament - be it the Koran, which is full of ethics. We have to try to give this back to this world. As the Torah was given from Heaven, it should be lived here in this world.

Tomáš Halík

Perhaps I could raise this as the main point for politics and religion. It was said by many here we must distinguish between politics in terms of management of power, and politics, in broader sense, as responsibility for public life. Then, perhaps, we should distinguish between power and authority. As said by Hannah Arendt, the political philosopher, the distinction between *auctoritas* and *potestas*, which was already in the Roman times, is very typical for the European identity. *Auctoritas*, authority, belongs to *Senatus*, the Senate – it put forward the visions or formulated main principles, stress ethical principles, and so on. The management of power; however, belonged to *populus Romanus* : the people of Rome, or to the Caesar. Hannah Arendt wrote that the Catholic Church continued in this distinction in the 5th century, Pope Gelasius wrote the Church is here for this *auctoritas* and the Caesar, and the political power are there for practical management of power.

And the third point, there is also the tradition in these three monotheistic and prophetic religions, of prophetic critics of power. The prophets are always the people and they criticize the power. They are in opposition to temptations of power, to beatification of power. They oppose the power of this temptation to be a type of religion in itself. When the gap between religion and power is too big and when religion is absent from public sphere, there is a temptation that the politics may become some sort of religion, or pseudo-religion. Such religion could be also intolerant. It's the topic of the second panel; but, I think I put down some impulses for the second part of our discussion. Now, prof. Zyciński.

Józef Zyciński

Just a footnote to what was said by Professor Ehrlich. I do agree that sometimes the divisions among theoretically the same religious groups are more profound than the divisions between various religions. In my case, in many situations it was for me much easier to develop Jewish/Catholic dialogue than to try to reconcile Christian traditionalists with Christian liberals. And why? Aggression, self-satisfaction, narcissism, and the absolute conviction that only our interpretation of truth is right create these irreconcilable differences. This eliminates what belongs to the essence of religion: openness to God to transcend the reality of truth to His grace, to His help, to compassion. But please, let us notice that when, at least in Europe, when we refer with esteem and we appreciate certain symbols of inter-religious contacts we appreciate, for instance, the Theses. I never met a person who would have said something critical of the Theses. Why? Prayer, recognition of the dignity of the people, dialogue, the conviction that God is one God for all of us. When this basic Theses attitude is replaced by adoration of one charismatic politician within religious group or by politics in the narrowest sense, as indicated by Tomáš Halík, then we find the religion in ideological diversion. This ideologization of religion is just something that belongs to pathology and not to religion.

Tomáš Halík

Yes, please?

Tariq Ramadan

I just wanted to say a few things about the last two comments. If we are speaking from within our religious traditions, I really think that we have to be explicit and clear regarding the fact that it's wrong to say that religion has nothing to do with power. It's wrong to say that religion has nothing to do with violence. It's wrong to say that religion has nothing to do with alienation. It's totally wrong. Religion is dealing with human beings. In every field, you have to deal with power, alienation, domination, exploitation, and sometimes it's done in the name of God. The real contribution of religious people is not to speak about religion in a way, which idealizes religions, it is to speak about religion the way it is - which means, we can be dangerous people. If you speak in the name of God, and if you speak in the name of truth, you reach exactly the situation you have within the religious traditions sometimes: it becomes impossible to lead the dialogue with people, because they say, I am the right Muslim and you are the wrong one.

As you are dealing with this, I think that we have to get rid of this naive discourse about religion. It will not help the people when we deal with politics. Why? Because the very important point is that within our religious traditions - even with Jesus and the prophet Mohammed, it is the same thing, and with Moses, exactly the same - when you are criticizing power you are in a relationship of power. It means that when I am criticizing the political power I put myself in a situation where power is speaking to power. The power of God is speaking to the power of you; if you are too arrogant, it means that I have to liberate myself from your power.

The religious tradition means to liberate yourself from any kind of human power in order to be free; this is the message. But, when this is alienated, it becomes a power against a power, and it could be an absolute power against a relative power. We are mixing in that field authority and power. I really think that we have to come with a deep discourse into our hearts but never forget about our minds. (Never forget) to share this when we speak about religion, to have a rational way and critical way to speak about our own traditions. For me, it means that Islam is great, but that not all the Muslims are great.

This self-criticism is really important if we want to contribute to work from within our traditions against every

kind of alienation: to find a way we can contribute to this. What does it mean, alienation? When does rationality become the objective? When rationality is rationality per se, without ethics? Therefore, I totally agree with what you said, that our contribution is sometimes to come with a rational discourse about religions, and ethical rationality when we deal with religion. The ethics of rationality is needed in our world today. It is the way we are yielding our own rationality and trying to work against absoluteness: absoluteness of rationality or absoluteness of religion.

When the religions are instrumentalized in order to say - the power, or the truth, is with us - I really think we have to get rid of this naive discourse about religions. We are dealing with violence. We are dealing with real struggle for power. This is the reality of our world. What I think we can do is to come up with what I call ethics of rationality, ethics of citizenship, ethics of dealing with interfaith issues. We should come up with this common ground, common values. I don't think that we have to ask ourselves to integrate the other values; the question now is to find the intersections of our common, universal values. We have common values, and we need to contribute them in the field of politics, make it real, stress them when we speak about civil rights, put it as: this is our contribution. For example, when you speak about human dignity, put it in motion. Thus we need self-criticism, ethical contribution, and sometimes to be very critical towards our own tradition. Education and self-criticism is the way the people understand it. However I'm sometimes scared of all this naive discourse about religions, because I think that we are misleading our own fellow brothers and sisters.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

I totally agree, but I wanted to stress something. All what you said is a European concept of rationality, you know?

Tariq Ramadan

No. It is Ibn-Rush.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

Okay, I know Averroes. I agree with you. But, I want to say that self-criticism is exactly the cultural product of something what we call European development. The problem of our modern world is its own concept of self-criticism, of critics of rationalism, of division of imagination, of division of power between different levels. It is hard and sour product of a long and cruel history we had in our poor Europe. The other question is, if we take it globally, how many cultures will join this concept? How many cultures will join this concept of critical approach to religion, of division of power, of repeated re-assessment. Would they also analyze: are we on sure ground, are we not? I agree with you, but the question is open. How will you export this concept to cultures, which are not able, don't want to, or have difficulties accepting it?

Mohamed Abbas

I'm just thinking the same way. I have a lot of discussions with some friends, most of them Europeans. When I speak about Islam, they understand me within the history context they came from. Secularity in France comes from the experience of Europe. It was a solution for a problem, which was a European problem. I think that it is something as if you came to Prague and gave the medicine for malaria to cure a problem that is not here. In other cultures, people think that this particular problem is not their problem. Secularity is a solution for a problem, which happened here. We have now the problem that in the secular state the secularity is gradually becoming holy too. Now, we hear some people speaking about fundamentalism of Taliban; but, in France, we have fundamentalist secularism. Secularism that has the power to say, to dictate you what you should believe and what is the model of behavior. There is now this problem in other parts of world that some European secularist organizations, parliaments or political groups or pressure groups, are trying to dictate to the world. We consider some ideas holy- they don't. In fact, they are holy as they came from endless knowledge and endless wisdom.

Tariq Ramadan

I think that we will speak about this in the second panel. But to your question: it is a very important point. I speak often like this, having studied the Western philosophy and the Islamic philosophy and teaching comparative philosophy. Very often, when we speak about self-criticism we only speak about rationality. When we speak about the fact that you can be de-centered from your own tradition, it's perceived as something coming from the West, from the Western history, which is not true. It's not true to say that this concept is only Western, that is Judeo-Christian tradition. Why? Because it's wrong to think of Europe as of Judeo-Christian tradition; it represents both Judeo-Christian and Islamic tradition. When you come to the intrinsic, the roots of the Islamic tradition, you will find something, which is not new. It is not coming from us, because we are now European Muslims. These are not just European Muslims who are dealing with this concept of ethics of rationality. It is not only Ibn-Rush (Averroes), it's also Al-Ghazali, it's also El-Farabi, or El-Kindi. All came up with something, which is now part of this rational understanding of the religious teachings, without saying that rationality was against faith and worship. It can be understood this way: deep

faith doesn't mean superficial reason. Both are intertwined. I'm speaking from within Islamic tradition, but I really think that you will find other examples. For example, discuss the future of Tibetan struggle and speak with the Dalai Lama. He had to use rational sense when speaking with some Tibetans; he had to think about political attitudes towards Chinese oppression. He uses intrinsic rationality from his tradition to try to tackle the issue. My point is not to say, we have rationality coming from one tradition; but, we have to look for specific and intrinsic dynamics stemming from self-criticism, rationality, and ethics (in different cultures). From each tradition we have to come to the universal common ground and this is possible. I don't think that it's monopoly of one tradition or one civilization; every civilization has its own way to reach this concept. This is what we have to look for.

Tomáš Halík

I think it's a very interesting question. I will second those who spoke about the Aristotelian tradition in the Islamic thoughts, and...

Tariq Ramadan

First, in the Middle Ages, what we knew about Aristotle was not Aristotle. It was Aristotle known by Averroes. I really think that there are many Western inputs in the Islamic tradition and there are many Islamic inputs in the Western tradition. So, we are connected for a long time, and it's good.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

Of course, one should not apply the monopoly of rationality the way you described; but, I think we should remain in the field of philosophy. Of course, thank God, there's influence on both sides. There's also a specific phenomenon: the cruel history of Europe that has just finished. We are in the city of at least three confessions, of at least three religions from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century. To handle that is a different problem stemming from a more or less monolithic tradition. I know that Islam is not monolithic; we will discuss it in the third panel.

I want to say that I would like to have this specific critical self-reflection of European thoughts exported. However, I think that it always meets the same reaction from other cultures, even the U.S.A., that the medicine for our problems is our medicine. It cannot be applied to China. The Dalai Lama was also partially brought up in Oxford. If we discuss it, then we have to stress common history, but also the different parts of history and different experiences we learned. The export of self-criticism is, of course, also a dangerous thing. Self-criticism is not the best contribution what we have achieved. However, if you apply it elsewhere, then you are applying partially European history as well. I would like you to be right. But how can you bring it back to your country, to your culture - how to invest it without being only a philosopher or speaking for one percent of the population? I want to interfere a bit with this harmonization of rationality and the we-all-believe-in-the-same-thing idea. I don't believe that. If we go to the roots, there will be strong differences, and I want to say that Al-Ghazali and all these discussions ended between the twelfth to the fourteenth century and then there was a great gap in between.

Tariq Ramadan

So, it means coming back to our tradition, not exporting other.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

Yeah.

Tariq Ramadan

That's great.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

It would be very good, yeah.

Tomáš Halík

Yes. Professor Ehrlich.

Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich

I think, Dr. Ramadan, you are right saying that there was a lot of rationality in Islam as well. But the question is: how developed this rationality was, and do you find it today as well? In Judaism and Christianity you have - in Judaism since Spinoza and later - you have a constant trend of rationality, even its development. The question I have for you is: how was the rationality, which was in Islam developed until today, and how deeply rooted is this rationality within intellectuals, or people who are thinking about their religion. That's my question, not a polemic, just a question.

Tariq Ramadan

I think it's a really important question. As you have said right now, there was a relationship between faith and rationality in the Islamic tradition which was very dynamic and vivid. Intrinsicly, there is nothing in the Islamic tradition against rationality. In one point you are right though, there was a gap in Islamic history for various reasons after the fourteenth century. In fact, (the gap ranged from) the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries until the end of the eighteenth century, in use of dynamic rationality in dealing with the texts. The reasons were historical domination or perceived domination from the West and other. This was known in the Islamic tradition as *EL Džamúd* (imitation in Arabic), when people were just imitating the rules. I think that for the last one hundred fifty years, what we experience now is a comeback of needed rationality. It is not against teachings of the faith, but rather effort in finding a way to deal with new challenges. This will be the topic of the third panel, but my point is that the Western Muslims, because they are facing new challenges, because they are in secular societies, because they are at the forefront of new contemporary challenges, are bringing this new rationality to find new ways of responding, new answers. It means coming back. It's what we call critical effort to deal with the texts, and the silence of the texts. I believe that we are not exporting something alien to the Islamic tradition. We are just trying to come back to the roots of this creative mind the Muslims had and need today.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. It's time for questions from the public. Yes, please. Wait for the microphone, please.

Joyce Davis

I wanted to add to the discussion something that I expected to hear, but did not in the conversation: a clearer distinction between that danger, we're really talking about, which is the abuse or misuse of religion, and actual religious principles. It seems as if we're all in agreement: have a role in politics, and have a role in society. However, one of the key questions I have here is: is enough being done in organized religions to try to deal with the issue of misuse or of extremism? Can anything be done? It's one of the key issues that I think the world is facing today, not just in Islam. We can see it across the board. What efforts from the authorities are being made to try to control the real danger? Which is the extremism and the abuse of religion?

Tomáš Halík

Yes, please.

Józef Zyciński

I had an experience in Belfast when we had an ecumenical meeting. Our Irish colleagues told us that in their community, a prayer was a very important factor in changing social mentality. After a terrorist attack when a person was killed, whether a Catholic or a Protestant was killed, both groups took part in the funeral, and in the homily. It was emphasized that Christianity could never be expressed in fanaticism, in hatred, in bringing death. Recently, a chaplain in Belfast told us that the most aggressive terrorists recruit from groups that have identity crisis. They don't know who they are and, to demonstrate that they are powerful, they try to use bombs and arrogance. In creating this form of unity - in which no version of hatred, of aggression, could be tolerated, and in practicing of group solidarity, we introduce more basic concept of human solidarity, and of religious solidarity. Maybe it would be very important step in changing mentality in the same way as it was already done in Belfast.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. Yes, please?

Mohamed Abbas

I guess this question has more to do with Islam. I have this feeling that it is also important to bear in mind psychology of human beings. Like in the Newton law, for every action there is a reaction. Thus, also in human beings, in human psychology, for every action, there is a reaction. It is very unwise to go on the street and slap people and think that nothing would happen. I believe that majority of what is happening with some groups in the Islamic world is a reaction to injustice. Much violence is done in the name of law and international law, in the name of democracy, in the name of civil rights, or in the name of good ideas; but, actually, when you look at it you see F-16 airplanes bombing civil houses, you see people who are dying of depleted uranium, you see people who are dying in thousands as if they were flies, not human beings. I believe that if in Prague, or elsewhere in Europe, one hundred thousands animals die, some groups for rights of dogs will organize demonstrations. It's very important to realize that human life is everywhere the same and this reaction is natural. This is the core of the problem, and if we don't solve this it is useless to speak about anything else. It is like if we have a disease in kidney, for example, and have a headache, the solution will not be Aspirin. Aspirin will solve the headache, but the other problem will stay. The problem in the Middle East and in some countries is this problem. After we solve it, we can speak about problem between religion and extremists; otherwise, I don't see any relation. I believe that the people

will react this way to aggression either if they are Muslims, Christian, Jewish, or atheists, because it is a reaction to defend themselves. Similarly in the West two or three buildings fall after bombs, three thousands people died, and we see a reaction. So, we must anticipate that also other people would have such a reaction.

Tomáš Halík

One short comment, please.

Tariq Ramadan

I really think that it is, and I want it to be, a global question not only targeted towards Muslims, although we have to take a stand. There are two very important points. The first one is that, there is an accepted diversity; people are following different trends within each tradition. But, this accepted diversity should draw a line by saying: this is accepted, and this is not. For example, when a Muslim says, or anyone says- that it's possible or legitimate in Islam to kill a Jew, a Christian, or an American, only because he or she is Jew, Christian, and American, Muslims should say, no. It's not. So, to be vocal and to speak out is really important. I believe it's not happening only due to social problems. It could be sometimes explained out of social and political problems, this is right. This could be a reaction. But it's not only the case. Sometimes you have very sophisticated minds speaking in that way as well; mine is the truth and this is possible in Islam, this is possible in Christianity. I think that we have to say first: no, it's not legitimate.

Secondly, we have to distinguish between situations, and say: it is humanly explainable, but it's religiously unjustifiable. There is a difference. Sometimes you are asked to explain: why are you reacting that way, if I am beating you? Your reaction is human, but is it justifiable? This is the difference. There is moral gap that we have to deal with. As religious people, or as belonging to specific tradition, we have to be clear about the fact that, although I can explain my actions, I'm not going to justify them. I want to explain them in order to change the situation and provoke justice. The point about the Middle East is to say: oppression explains the actions, but now the international community should change its mind and help to change the situation in order to go from non-justifiable to non-explainable. That was one point, and now the last: we have to be self-critical. Muslims with Muslims and others; however, at the same time, I think it's not the right message to people to say: when we are launching a war against a country, we are doing it in the name of God. The perception that there are crusades now, and this is being done in the name of God against the Iraqi people, is not going to help. It's rather going to promote more fractures. I think this is what we have to do from within our respective traditions: to accept the diversity. But, some stands are simply not acceptable.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

I think that the anonymous psychological process, what you described, is only one of the processes. I would like to stress that research of conflicts shows that attacks or aggression are mainly not between individuals; but, ethnical, racial, confessional and religious differences. These are group conflicts. These group conflicts need a long history of learning, especially in monolithic societies that have fewer minorities and the history of tolerance is a long one to be learned. I think, that in societies where there are majorities or they are monolithic groups, these attacks against different ethnical groups are more or less a rule. Now I come to the views. The views can be stopped only if the authorities of the majority are without any excuse condemning the attacks against minorities. To come back to Ireland, whoever throws a bomb is automatically excommunicated. IRA is not working in a Catholic name. The bombers are automatically excluded from the community of the Church and this is stressed each Sunday. It is necessary. I'll come back to our Christian tradition that the religious leaders of monolithic societies, or more or less monolithic ones, automatically exclude terrorists from the community. That would be the way to control it.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. We must go to another question. Is there any? Yes, please.

Question from audience

The question is primarily for Archbishop Zyciński, but, I'll welcome comments from other members of the panel. How do you justify or rationalize living in a secular state that has a secular constitution when you're beholding to the Bible? How do you reconcile that difference?

Józef Zyciński

The question of reconciliation is not only between the constitution and the Bible. Often we are living in a plural society in different frames of reference but without psychological schizophrenia or dichotomy. For instance, when a physicist - after many hours spent in his lab comes home he must reconcile between the laboratory research and his children and wife. It was Edington who admonished his colleagues that if they regard their wives only as a set of electrons they would risk a short divorce. I don't think that treating wives also as a set of protons is the best solution. A physicist must remember that the physical structure of the

world functions also in his family. But, there are levels that are more important: the emotional life. It is the same in a secular society: where what is secular must be regulated by secular regulations for the society, in which there are not only Christians, but also agnostics, militant atheists and so on. We must be united on the same level of order and values that are important for our republic.

On the other hand, as a Christian, I must go beyond that. In a democratic society, there shouldn't be a conflict between general levels for the entire society and the possibility of reference to purely Christian principles. Sometimes they happen- for instance in France where children are told to wear a special head covers. It seems to be an exception. Living in a free democratic society I have moral dilemmas whether it is better to express my solidarity with the presence of foreign troops in Iraq or to stay aside and say: oh, it doesn't matter, we are so nice, we don't intervene. Similar ethical problems could be inspired by Christian expression of solidarity or of compassion; but, I don't find any domain of conflict that would be the conflict based on the essence of the democratic society. If someone could find such a conflict I would be grateful to know about it. Certainly, there could be a negative reaction. For instance, the United Nations two weeks ago reacted that in Poland the abortion law should be more liberal. Our reaction was: the bureaucrats are there not to control our consciousness, our ethical sensitivity. If the United Nations takes care of the people in the developing countries that really need our cooperation we appreciate it; however, teaching moral principles that are accepted only by a part of society is something going beyond the competence of the United Nations. The reaction of the Polish Christians was strongly critical.

Tomáš Halík

I think it will be the topic of the second panel: how to create modern society or contemporary society as a place for freedom for people with different viewpoints. Focusing on how to avoid religious fundamentalism but also secularist fundamentalism. It's time for the last question from the public. No one? If there is no question from public, we can start with the last word of the panelists. Archbishop Zyciński, please?

Józef Zyciński

Just to be sure that there is no difference between Ramadan and Zyciński. You introduced the distinction between what is explainable in human terms and what could be justified on the basis of religion. It is very important for me to refer to religious fundamentals as the ground for the ethic of religious people. I have a problem, whether you paid any attention to the so-called humanly explainable activity. For me, the reference- what could be explained in human terms, is a relative reference. In human terms, at least one person tried to explain Auschwitz. All totalitarian systems and violations of human rights are conceived by a private person or a group with a totalitarian form of logic. To say that their actions can be explained on the basis of their own version of private or party rationality would be a drama. Personally, in my epistemology, I never refer to any category of humanly explainable activity. What do you think?

Tariq Ramadan

I think that we disagree. We disagree strongly. I really think that if we want to contribute towards a better world we will be lost if we (become) removed from the fact that we deal primarily with people, with humanly explainable actions. For example, when people are telling you - I have no house, I'm not respected, I'm facing racists everyday and this is why I'm reacting like this, I'm shouting to this society because this society is not listening to me, and you say to them: okay, it's explainable, but I'm not going to listen to you. I will go beyond that... but - what does it mean "beyond" in this case? I really think that if we want to change people and if we want to change society, we have to deal with the humanly-explainable. Not to accept it, but to struggle with what is explainable, to go beyond that. Peace is not the starting point for our people. Even with myself, my own self, I'm not at peace. I'm struggling with the darkest aspects of my own personality: violence, greed, ego. This struggle with my own self means going towards peace. To reach this peace, I have to be just with my own self. To be just with my own self is to master the bad aspects of my personality. This is a humanly explainable condition. There is no peace without justice in my own heart, no peace without justice in society. If the people are telling you, I'm facing injustices, I say - okay, it's humanly explainable; but, I'm not going to rely on it. I really think that we have a naive way of speaking to people. I really think that we have to tackle what is explainable; once again, it's the state of mind. I was speaking about what is explainable to rely on and about saying okay if it's explainable, is it also justifiable – no. We have to say: I think that your behavior is explainable, but not justifiable. We have to find ways to solve the problem in order to go from the explainable towards justice and peace. I really think that if religious people are not bringing up this kind of discourse, they are not going to help the people to change and reach peace. This is my perception. I think that we disagree on that.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you. Professor Ehrlich?

Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich

To the question of Mrs. Davis. There are not many things in this world, which are so misused as religion.

Religion is misused for many purposes, political and others. I think our task is, today, to make clear for ourselves and for the world we are speaking to that religion has more to do with God. He asked us to follow the Law, the Commandment of love, so speaks God. Therefore, we spoke about secularism and humanism; the depth in God manifests religion. Anything without the depth is not religion.

On the other side, it is dangerous that religion could be, and is, politically manipulated. Speaking about religion, it is more than just the words, just philosophy, just ideology, because it concerns men. It concerns myself, and the question is: how could I live as a religious human being in this modern, dangerous world, which is practically living in war? This is our question: how could I live as a religious human being in a world of war? We are living practically all over Europe and outside Europe in war. It is a real question - this question of misuse of religion for other purposes, especially for political purposes. We have to avoid it, and this is the task for all of us. How could we try to avoid this misuse of religion, which is happening all over the world - happening to Jews, Christians, and Muslims?

Tomáš Halík

Thank you.

Mohamed Abbas

I want to say another idea, which came to me. We spoke a lot about misusing religion from the inside. But sometimes we have misused the religion from the outside. For me, as a Muslim, we know that in Islam - in the wartime, in the time of prophet Mohammed, they ordered the armies not to kill a civilian, not to kill a woman, a child, a priest in his temple, people working in agriculture. Sometimes, when wars happen in Islamic countries now, we notice that some Muslims are becoming so extreme that they cross those boundaries. I think that it is not problem in Islam, because this is very clearly defined in Islam. Even in a war, you should not do it. It's not justifiable to do it. We are asked as Muslims to clarify the stance of Islam in this matter. The problem is that you can't control all people, you can't control all Muslims, you can't program them not to do it. Religion is not a tool for programming people, it is a relation between a human being and his Creator. I don't think that the real problem is in Islam. I just wanted to say that we can't control everybody.

Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz

Two ideas at the very end - One can violate human being in the name of humanism. We have this history, as I stressed at the beginning, in the totalitarian experience. Now, we live in a democracy. If we look closely we can say that also in democracies the temptation (exists) for directing people in the name of humanism even where they don't want to go. We are now in the process of a European common law, where, for instance, abortion will be prescribed, or even be forced on different nations. This is only one example; there will be different ones. I think every democracy is still better than nothing, but now the constitution of politics is just non-Christian, or anti- or a-humanistic. Thus, even in the name of human beings, one can destroy a human being. We are clear about that. It is a common task of religions to observe this movement.

Secondly, one can violate human being in the name of God. I refer to the question of Mrs. Davis. I would say that every religion is inclined to do that, if it is in the position of the majority. Again, we could use European history. Christianity as a dominant religion was the same - we are not far from the church, where Hus was venerated. The majority always tends to oppress the minorities. Possibly, it's best to avoid the abuse of the name of God by avoiding religion being in the position of the majority. We don't want it, but maybe it's better for a religion if it is a minority. Christianity in the catacombs was something what we don't desire; but the purity or the innocence, or avoiding the seduction or abuse of religion can be achieved better when one is not in this role of dominance and majority.

I want to close with a sentence I remember. There is a sentence of a rabbi, who said, we always have to be a bit sad. Everybody, who exists, has to be a bit sad, not dominant, not ruling other people. Maybe the abuse of the name of God will be avoided if religions keep to, or are brought to, the minority and are not in the temptation of the glorious emphatic authoritarian behavior. What I see is that Christianity against its role will be brought onto this side. That maybe helps from a side, which we don't exactly want; but, we could regain innocence after such a long history of dominance. I don't know whether you agree with me; however, it is better to be a bit sad than to be too triumphant.

Tomáš Halík

Thank you very much. As you have heard, we are very disciplined with time. I would like to thank all the participants in the panel for their patience. It was a very warm discussion in this very cold hall. We have opened many questions and we'll continue to discuss them in the next two panels. I invite you to have now something to eat. I hope there is also something hot to drink. In one hour, at one o'clock, we continue. Thank you very much.