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Foreword by Sheikh Dr. Ali Gomaa

The C-1 World Dialogue is an important initiative and has unique potential by virtue of its multi track approach involving business and religious leaders, academics, public figures and media leaders as well as representatives from the NGO sector. We all share a strong commitment to improving relations between the Muslim world and the West and we bring extensive practical experience of what this requires to our task. Many of us have close links to the Common Word document which has been deeply helpful by setting out a positive basis for action together based on common principles we can all share since flow from our twin obligations to love God and our neighbour.

Action is clearly vital in order bring about the improvement we seek, but it must be based on knowledge if it is to be effective and that is why the production of an Annual Dialogue Report is an important and long term part of the work which the C-1 World Dialogue will undertake. It is important to explore and establish the factors that are shaping the course of Muslim-West relations, how opinions are changing over time and why. I hope that all engaged in this field will respond so that each future edition can even better meet the needs of all those who share our aims.

Establishing and maintaining peace is one of the most urgent issues of our time for peace is the necessary prior condition for so much more. But for it to be possible requires that we better understand the issues that threaten peace, how people are responding to them and how the media is shaping awareness of them. I very much hope that the diverse array of essays and reflections on the many issues involved that are contained in this report will help to achieve this. The opinions expressed here are those of the authors but they
offer many interesting insights and contain much new information, and where they prove to be controversial I hope this will stimulate constructive debate.

I am therefore happy to join my fellow co-chair, Richard Chartres, the Bishop of London in receiving this Report and in commending it for the widest possible discussion.
I am very happy to commend this publication prepared for the C-1 World Dialogue by Innovatio Publishing.

It comprises what we hope will be the first of a series of Annual Reports that are intended to become a key source of information and analysis for all those engaged in the field of Muslim-West dialogue.

This edition comes at a time of new impetus in relations with the Muslim world, stimulated by the recent historic speech in Cairo by President Obama. Such a time calls for new action but also for good evidence upon which to ground it. It is hoped that the work now begun will continue over time and help us to establish accurately what our various communities and populations think about each other and how those views change over time and, most importantly of all, why these views change.

There can be no doubt that the more facts and data we can gather upon which to base future initiatives the more confident we can be of achieving the positive goal of a long term and stable improvement in Muslim-West relations that we need.

My experience is that dialogue between the great religious traditions, if it is conducted with courtesy, rarely fails to illuminate aspects of one’s own faith, which are often obscured by familiarity. At the same time, dialogue can serve as a reminder of the large areas of common experience, which believers in God share, and the gulf which separates them from the secular orthodoxy which has given birth to a world culture, once dubbed by Ernest Gellner as “Consumer Unbeliever International.” The opening sections of this report speak powerfully to this and to the possibilities for building a common platform for cooperative action which the Common Word document has opened up and in which His Royal Highness
Prince Ghazi of Jordan has played such an important role. I commend the Muscat Manifesto outlined by Professor David Ford for encouraging us to search deeply our own faith traditions and scriptures for a wisdom deep enough to serve our 21st century world.

T S Elliot identified the great question in one of the choruses from his play *The Rock* –

“Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge”?  
“Where is the knowledge we have lost in information”? 

I was privileged to host the inaugural meeting of the Executive Committee of the C-1 World Dialogue here in London, in March, and we were invited to participate in a special event with the Prime Ministers of both the United Kingdom and Australia in preparation for the meeting of the G-20. It was entitled “My word is my bond” and it explored the need to rebuild trust in the light of the financial crisis. Our participation reflected the need to articulate values more clearly in our contemporary world and to the role of faith in grounding them.

The word trust is one that goes to the heart of our present work in the C-1 World Dialogue. It is trust that we must establish where there is tension and I commend this report to you as part of our continuing contribution to this work.

The Rt Revd & Rt Hon Richard Chartres DD FSA
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Introduction
by Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff

I.

“Why did you do that?” is a question that many would most readily associate with their childhood when it was probably posed with dismay and urgency as a consequence of some act of youthful folly. Yet the paradox is that this is a question adults often find it very hard to answer themselves of their own actions. If this is true of individual acts, it is far more so of the great events in history and of wider social movements and phenomena.

Yet if we cannot answer the question of why people have done this or that, then how can we suppose we are in a position to influence for the better the actions people undertake in the future? And if we are not able to achieve improvement, what is the point of much that we are about? More specifically here, what is the point of dialogue if it is not to bring about positive change?

Such questions exhibit at once the range and depth of issues that relate to the fields of this report and in particular they prompt enquiry about two fundamental questions: first, what we need to know in order to be able to make Muslim-West dialogue effective, and second, what do we need to know in order to assess progress?

But before going further, it is probably appropriate to look at the specific goals set out for the C-1 World Dialogue in its charter document.

What are the Goals of the C-1 World Dialogue?
The words of the Charter are both specific and yet also significantly open in terms of implementation. The Charter states that the overall Mission and Vision of the C-1 World Dialogue

“is to support and promote, propagate and preserve, peace harmony and friendship between the Western and Islamic Worlds”
And

“to do this in accord with the two greatest Commandments given us: to love God and our fellow neighbour – as called for by the historic A Common Word open letter of October 13th 2007.”

The Charter then goes on to illustrate this in practical terms saying that:

“It is intended that the C-1 will catalyse work engaging cultures and societies at all levels and to this end it will seek:

- to be a primary knowledge base and source of strategic insight on dialogue and Muslim-West issues through an Annual Report and other publications;
- to improve the mutual understanding in and between cultures and religions;
- to bring together those engaged in dialogue who wish to share insights and ideas that can enhance practical initiatives;
- to promote partnerships and collaboration between the various sectors of society and across cultures (including governments, private sector, media, civil society, religious communities and academia);
- to catalyse new projects and to mobilize additional support for existing work with proven record of success”

Finally, in this section, the Charter explicitly adds that a key element in this work will be

1. provision of data and research which addresses key knowledge deficits and which provides the basis for
2. strategic insight and thought leadership enabling
3. solutions to the critical challenges identified.
In accord with these goals, the aim behind the present volume is to embark upon a continuing project which will seek to achieve these ends. The C-1 World Dialogue Foundation now being established will support the successive *Annual Dialogue Reports* and will thus seek to provide, through them, a cumulative body of data and resources, together with research, commentary and analysis that will provide the knowledge-base for the actions needed to achieve sustainably improved Muslim-West relations that are conducive to peace, stability and mutual flourishing.

II.

“Why did *they* do that?” is another deceptively simple question which sadly opened a key phase in the Western world’s recent engagement with the Muslim world which began with the tragedy of 9/11. It is a poignant question because it immediately disclosed through the simple use of the word “they” an implicit and dangerous lumping together of Muslims in all their diversity and the perpetrators of these attacks. This move was made all the easier when a common denominator of Islam was not merely to hand but was specifically invoked by those who claimed responsibility. The fact that the perpetrators had specifically invoked Islam in the justification of their violence made it all too inviting to commit the error of moving from the quantifier, “some”, to “all” and thus of connecting all Muslims with the violence. Too many were sadly willing to take that which was committed by a tiny few and place the blame upon all. This error has again and again been refuted, but it clearly lingers on in its effects and forging this linkage has sadly been one of the greatest successes of those committed to methods of terrorism.

But beyond this, it has generated a deeper difficulty, in that it has allowed the context of Muslim West dialogue to be framed by disaster with a consequent tendency to focus the goals of dialogue in preventative and negative terms. Rather than beginning by asking what the ideal state of Muslim-West relations should be, the tendency is to ask merely what can be done to avoid further disaster. This is much like offering a sick patient a goal of palliative but terminal care rather than the goal of full recovery and long term health. Sadly, in medicine there are times when diseases are indeed
of such a gravity as to be without hope, but it is open to doubt that the end state of Muslim West relations need follow this parallel. This is despite the fact that there are those who have offered a theoretical basis for gloom, such as Samuel Huntington whose analysis is well criticized by HRH Prince Ghazi in his essay that follows.

Nonetheless, there is a need to ground the hope that is in us, lest it is to have only the empty meaning we associate with the optimism of Voltaire’s Dr. Pangloss. We must indeed “cultivate our garden” on this point, which entails both a meaningful exploration of why conflict is *not* inevitable and what the positive end state should be that can inform and enable progress together with an articulate basis for it and the methods of building towards it.

Such a process is important, as it will have very practical implications for policy and the concrete actions needed, not only in terms of mitigating and avoiding the bad, but also, by way of promoting the good. It is thus hoped that the work of this *Annual Dialogue Report* and that which flows from it, will thus contribute to a continuing and evolving process in which the C-1 World Dialogue looks forward to engaging with an expanding range of partners.

All of which is to say that there is a need to expand upon the two questions set out at the beginning. There is a need to establish a robust conceptual basis with traction in our respective world views which can thus

- warrant a positive overall teleology or goal for Muslim-West relations
- ground initiatives that go beyond avoiding the negative to promoting the positive.

This task is addressed in the first part of the Report by H.R.H Prince Ghazi and Professors Miroslav Volf and David Ford.
Beyond this framing, however, there is next a clear need to have hard data to hand and to reflect upon how best to gather such data as will

- yield evidence of what is effective in terms of dialogue
- provide data over time about the progress of dialogue and the factors that shape it.

The extensive middle sections of the Report address these concerns starting with reflection on methods and approaches and the theory behind agenda setting together with a proposal for an Index of Religious Tolerance. The focus then moves on to the analysis of extensive data about attitudes and perceptions and the way the media have framed the salient issues and set the agenda in this arena in particular spheres of importance to the progress of Dialogue. The perception of religion, particular religious communities and religious leaders are all explored. Particular themes are explored such as the loss of trust and the impact of the Palestinian conflict and Iraq and the Ghaza crisis before an extensive analysis of the interplay between religion, academia and values and how the media covers these concerns. There is then an analysis of an area of critical importance for the future or Muslim West relations and Dialogue which is that of youth.

In the final section, the Report exhibits dialogue in action as members of the C-1 and others engaged in this field react, respond and debate some of the key issues arising. This section also includes the speech by President Obama in Cairo which has clearly been seen as a key moment of great potential for advancing the course of West-Islamic Dialogue. It fittingly therefore ends this report on a note of hope comprising a new opening to what we must trust will be a new era of improved dialogue in the doubtless challenging times that lie ahead.

Each of the sections in this Report contributes in one way or another to the objectives set out in the Charter (itself made available as an appendix to the Report in its latest edition subject to final ratification). Together they also provide something of an overview of this field, ever expanding though it is. And this brings up the important point that this survey is by no means exhaustive. The opinions expressed here are those of the authors and are not to be attributed to the C-1 as a whole or its executive Committee.
This report has itself been the result of an extensive process of consultation with an initial “White Paper Draft” being prepared for the inaugural meeting of the Executive Committee in London at the end of March. It was also distributed for consultation at the meeting of the United Nations’ Dialogue of Civilizations meeting in Istanbul in April where it was further announced and discussed at a special Press Conference during the course of the meeting. The members of the Executive were asked for their further input thereafter and invitations to participate in interviews extended in a process which ran right up to the time of final editing for publication in June.

Naturally, it is hoped to improve the report with each future edition and constructive criticism is therefore entirely welcome and the consultation process will continue. If parts of the Report are found provocative, it is hoped that this can stimulate positive, courteous and constructive debate.

III.

Some Challenges that Need to be Addressed

In this last section of the introduction it is intended to comment on some areas of particular importance for the future of Muslim-West dialogue.

The first sub section will highlight some important considerations for practical engagement.

The second sub-section will explore the place and legitimacy of the religious voice in the “Public Square” in the face of the secularist critique.

The third sub-section will reflect upon avenues for the further construction of a positive platform for cooperative relations between states in the Muslim and the Western worlds, starting with the Speech of President Obama in Cairo.
Some Reflections on Practical Action and Engagement

It was stressed earlier that among the primary goals of this report over time is to yield evidence of what is effective in terms of dialogue and secondly, to provide data over time about the progress of dialogue and the factors that shape it.

One of the primary benefits of this work will be to provide some of the tools needed to enable the better targeting of practical initiatives and the appraisal of success. This is likely to be prove of growing importance to donors as they seek some sort of avenue for measuring the effectiveness of what they give and support.

This need not always be a financial matter however. The large body of data here gathered about how the media has framed issues and thus influenced the evolution of public opinion through its agenda setting role can be very helpful in allowing the media to reflect on its own work.

It is a commonplace to say that the media have an especially important role in this field and yet it is important to respect the freedom of the media too and this means that highly prescriptive proposals about how they should cover certain types of stories etc. can be seen as very threatening and regressive by the media. Accordingly, it is surely better to provide data on what the media is doing and how it is covering key issues etc. and then to invite them to think themselves about whether they are living up to the goals and standards they have already identified as appropriate for their work.

Looking more widely, however, at practical implications for work in this field it is clear that there are several horizons to consider.

Many of the issues are both generational and societal in scale. In other words, all levels of society need ultimately to be engaged and whole generations over time as well. While in addition where the issues relate to overall economic development they again pose significant challenges in terms of scale.
However, it is commonly said that in terms of immediate reach the media is critical, while, for the long term, education must be of central concern. Accordingly, it is anticipated that the sub-groups or commissions of the Executive Committee for Media and Education respectively will be among the first to develop strategies for their respective fields on behalf of the C-1.

Looking strategically at the priorities for achieving positive goals, those of promoting mutual understanding, cooperation and harmony are the most long term while the short to medium term ones are likely to focus on the more negative goals of reducing levels of hostility and sources of potential violence. Here the critical factors are relatively easily identified but the remedies are somewhat more challenging to identify and implement, so one of the first criteria for action must be that the goals identified for practical work are achievable.

**Alienation**

Those who take up violence and engage in terrorism are by no means always badly educated or from a background of utter poverty, but a common factor is likely to be a profound sense of alienation and they tend to be action oriented even if they have a poor understanding of the real reaction they are likely to achieve through their deeds.

Identifying areas and groups who are alienated is important and then application of wider policies that aim to address the sources of grievance will be needed and this leads into the wider social context but an overall picture is always important (for example the provision of better education without addressing the need for employment can cause more rather than less alienation). Legitimate grievances wherever possible need to be identified and addressed.

**Addressing Supportive Ideology**

Tackling an ideology that is manipulated to support violence means empowering and amplifying the voices of authentic religious leaders able to challenge those who seek to misuse religious texts and other resources for the purpose of promoting violence.
Establishing who has the authority to speak truly may be very important. This work has to be seen to be done from within the relevant religious group or tradition, whatever material support may be provided, or it risks seeming inauthentic. Projects helping resource and educate moderate religious leaders while they are in training are very important, as are resources and support for those engaged on the “front line” with divided communities.

Community Support

The words of Ayman al-Zawahiri to Abu Mus’ab al Zarqawi one of the leaders of the Iraq insurgency in July 2005 are highly instructive regarding the critically important role of a supportive community for those committed to violence:

“If we look at the two short term goals, which are removing the Americans and establishing an Islamic Amirate in Iraq, or caliphate if possible, then we will see that the strongest weapon which the mujahedeen enjoy –after the help and granting of success by God –is popular support from the Muslim masses in Iraq, and the surrounding Muslim countries. So we must maintain this support as best we can, and we should strive to increase it….. In the absence of this popular support, the Islamic mujahed movement would be crushed in the shadows…. Therefore, the mujahed movement must avoid any action that the masses do not understand or approve.”

Helping communities to see how they are adversely affected by those committed to violence is a critical first step. Crisis management and intervention can be very helpful for defusing sudden issues when they first arise that may otherwise be used to whip up anger in wider communities. Public cooperation by religious and other leaders of different faiths can be extremely important. Establishing practical projects that engage people from the various communities but which address issues of immediate concern are a

---

very helpful way of breaking down barriers. Technology can be used to link communities and schools so that they can have experiences of “the other” that humanizes people from other traditions and backgrounds.

The impact of aid and development work is demonstrable though necessarily costly and long term. In December 2004, to take one example, the earthquake and terrible Tsunami which followed caused terrible devastation across a wide area of Indonesia which has an overall population of around 200 million and was one of the countries very badly affected with estimated casualties there of 130,000 dead, 100,000 injured and possibly up to 700,000 people displaced. The United States rapidly promised aid that rapidly rose from an initial offering of 35 m to a final figure of $950 million. It is highly interesting that Pew surveys of the number of people that had a favourable opinion of the United States in Indonesia show a change from 15% in 2003 to 38% in 2005. While at the same time the number of people with a favourable opinion of Osama bin Laden declined from 58% in 2003 to 35% in 2005. Overall it is very important to develop an integrated approach.2

III.2.

The Legitimacy of the Religious Voice in the Face of the Secularist Critique

The place and legitimacy of the religious voice in the “public square” of discourse about the future of any given government and society seems to face a growing challenge. Increasingly, in the West in particular, there seems to be pressure to exclude religiously based input from the processes of social debate and policy development. This needs to be explored and where appropriate challenged, not only for the good of Western societies but also in order to sustain a basis for related discussion with Muslims.

2 Louise Richardson, What Terrorists Want, New York, 2006
Islamic thought finds it impossible to close off any area of life from submission to God. Accordingly, the very concept of excluding the religious dimension from public life and social policy is likely to seem impossible to most Muslims so finding a way to address these matters is important for Dialogue.

One of the factors making this issue pressing is an increasingly aggressive and exclusivist secularism in the West. A further aspect that needs to be addressed is the frequent equation of religion with the irrational that seems to be a key move made by those who would eliminate the religious voice from the discussion of social policy and development.

One of the recurring difficulties in current times—and particularly it must be said in the secular West—is the unwillingness to take religion seriously or to understand it in its own terms. The temptation is seemingly ever manifest in certain circles to view religion as some sort of quaint personal hobby, akin perhaps to dancing or some other private amusement best practiced away from serious public life. (Although perhaps a closer if yet more misleading parallel may soon be drawn with smoking, as there is a growing band whose hostility to religion in any form makes them seek active measures to discourage participation in religion and to “protect” others from contamination).

Religion is thus often variously analyzed as really being an expression of something else, such as a quest for identity, psychological security or an oblique quest for power. But above all, there are several other often unstated thoughts at work that profoundly impede an adequate understanding, namely, that religion is somehow a relic of primitivism that we should now overcome; that it is divisive and thus best ignored or suppressed; or, most darkly of all, that it ultimately partakes of the irrational. (It often being oddly presumed that somehow when mankind leaves God out of consideration it is inherently being more rational, which is surely a leap of faith in itself if ever there was one!)

If such points seem at first somewhat abstract, it can quickly be shown that the intellectual understandings we use to frame the matters at hand will in fact be critically important to the ways in which
we succeed or fail to understand the problems and in turn the possible solutions.

Modernity, Secularism and Religion

There was at one time a “modern” view that as societies developed and industrialized religious faith and observance would decline. In support of this thesis some argued that doctrines of religion are in conflict, in one way or another, with science and that as the prestige of science rises with the reach of technology based upon it, then so, religious belief might be expected to decline. Alternatively, some argued from the perspective of sociology that, as localized community life eroded in the face of globalization then religion (understood in these terms as an expression of identity rather than of conviction) could be expected to decline. But whatever the rationales put forward, there was a clear implication that the intellectual “high ground”, so to speak, could not belong to those who are religious and that with the march of progress the assorted phenomena of religion should appropriately retreat and wither. By way of underscoring the privileged status given to this perspective, such views were often seen as the fruit of “The Enlightenment” – no matter that to make such an exclusive attribution is to slight the Classical precursors of such radicalism among some of the ancient Greeks, who would rather have asserted that “Man is the measure of all things” than ask “What is Man that thou shoulds’t regard him?”

In some degree, there seems plausibility to part of the sociological argument. As the recent work of Philip Jenkins has made clear, many of the areas in the world with the most developed economies, such as Western Europe, are ones of declining Christian observance, whereas the most rapid growth is in the third world and in Africa especially. Yet, in North America, religious observance remains strikingly high as compared with Europe.

Then again, there is also the challenge of the “post-modern”. However hard it may be to define, this movement would seem to entail an hostility to the very possibility of objective, external or transcendent truth, preferring to think of worlds where everything is about meaning or where, to put it another way, to be is to have meaning. Moreover, the act of conferring meaning can be analyzed
in terms of an exercise of power and subjugation by virtue of being an act of picking out what is meaningful from what is otherwise uncategorized. On such a view, the world as it truly is can be deemed no more than a collection of subjectivities beyond which we can have no basis to think we can reach. The availability of objective facts and the possibility of an explanation of such facts by means of a testable theory is, in this perspective, liable to condemnation as an exercise of positivism and power to the point of utter imperialism. Thus at once, do hermeneutics and politics combine to radical effect.

One point of ironic interest to note is that the post-modern critique can be as damaging to secularism as to religion. More specifically, insofar as it undercuts the possibility of access to the objective and the way things are independent of ourselves, it undermines too the force of secularism’s common attack on religion as legitimizing the holding of unwarranted beliefs, and what after all in such a perspective grounds secularism as somehow more warranted than anything else unless it is an implicit claim of privileged access to the real, albeit the ‘real absence’ so to speak of divinity.

Which brings into relief the matter of just what secularism itself is.

As a term it goes back to the world of Rome where a *Saeculum* was an epoch of about one hundred and ten years (conceived as the longest span of a human life) the end of which was usually the occasion of large-scale celebrations in the form of games and sacrifices conducted by the Roman State. In later mediaeval use, from the twelfth century onwards, there came to be a distinction made among Christian clergy between those who were “Regular” in that they were members of a religious order and followed a “Rule of life” and those who were “in the world” and thus “secular”. However in its modern sense, the term seems to have been first employed in the middle of the nineteenth century by G.J. Holyoake (d. 1906) who used it for an intellectual system which seeks to interpret and order life on principles taken exclusively from this world

---

3 Cf. on sources, G.B. Pighi, *De Ludis Saecularibus Populi Romani Quiritium*, Milan, 1941.
and without reference to belief in God and any future life after death. However, the concept was apparently only later developed in a much more systematic and explicitly atheist direction by Charles Bradlaugh (1833-91) who left the Church of England on account of his atheism and “free thinking” and was a sometime Member of Parliament and served as President of the London Secular Society from 1858-1890.

It is worth noticing that this word “secular” can be used independently of the word “godless” in English, whereas in some languages, notably Arabic, the two words tend to combine. This has the effect of immediately preventing any sense of the word “secular being somehow neutral in regard to the existence or non-existence of God and thus immediately gives a hard atheistic edge to secularism as a concept which many of its proponents in the West often seem to wish to avoid.

At some level it does seem, typically, to reflect unease about the legitimacy of religious claims and their warrant for shaping society and its laws and structures. In particular, it usually seems to be the product of a belief that, in essence, religion seeks a freedom for people to believe things on inadequate or no evidence. Thus there does seem to be a rationalist engine driving the secularist agenda. This may of itself be thought to pay insufficient attention to the self-understanding of those who are religious. For example, many religious people would not feel it adequate to their experience to understand religious belief as based upon decisions regarding the balance of probabilities according to some rationalist calculus. Moreover, how does the secularist derive a warrant for defining religion on secularist terms? By what authority does secularism warrant its normative ambitions? And what about a person’s claim to self-definition, why should a secularist be granted the privilege to decide that the self-understanding of the religious person is wrong?

Such considerations make it harder to see secularism in the guise of religious neutrality that it often seeks – as when it claims merely to be providing a “safe space” in which most religions may with equal advantage engage. It may seem on the one hand merely reasonable neutrality to suggest that it is not the place of the state or civil society to support the advocacy of any religion, or to promote empathy for religion. But if it turns out that this position is based
upon a prior judgment that, religion is an exercise in believing the intellectually unwarranted, then the “safe space” may look altogether less inviting.

If the intent is to provide protection for religion that is one thing, if the intent is to provide protection from religion that is quite another. In addition, it is hard to see why the state should grant to secularism a special right to adjudicate the nature and content of religion and yet exactly that, it would seem, may well be involved in granting the secularist case.

Faslur Rahman has well expressed how alien such a perspective is from the Muslim mind:

“The central concern of the Qur’an is the conduct of man. Just as in Kantian terms no ideal knowledge is possible without the regulative ideas of reason (like first cause), so in Qur’anic terms no real morality is possible without the regulative ideas of God and the Last Judgement. Further, their very moral function requires that they exist for religio-moral experience and cannot be mere intellectual postulates to be “believed in”. God is the transcendent and anchoring point of attributes such as life, creativity, power, mercy, and justice and of moral values to which human society must be subject if it is to survive and prosper...

....secularism destroys the sanctity and universality (transcendence) of all moral values—a phenomenon whose effects have just began to make themselves felt, most palpably in Western Societies. Secularism is necessarily atheistic..... “

There is, however, underlying much of the debate about the place of religion in the West a problem about the fact that religions (and certainly the Abrahamic ones) make claims to truth. At some point this gives rise to the challenge of how it is possible to claim to be right, or to believe what is true, and yet claim no privilege over

those consequently thought to be deeply mistaken. (Which is precisely the implicit problem identified above also with secularism.) After all, the more something is felt to be true the more it may be felt desirable that Society should recognize this truth.

The questions raised at this point are too many and too large to resolve here, but it may be suggested at least that in fact no one perspective—including that of secularism—can properly be privileged. Moreover, the nub of much difficulty must turn upon any claim to privileged access to the basis upon which particular claims are made of import for social, legal or moral policy. Here the challenge must be for any religious tradition that wishes to claim unique insights, for, if the basis for them cannot be shared, then why should they have any expectation that others, who are not believers in that particular religious tradition, should find them compelling? It may be objected that if the basis for any particular claims are however fully to be shared and set out to anyone, there will be no basis to claim that the insights are uniquely Christian or Muslim or whatever. Yet this does not have to follow. The particular religious perspective may be unique, as Faslur Rahman seeks to explain above, yet it is likely that when it comes to an explanation of why this or that injunction is proposed, then sooner or later it will be held to be in conformity with what is conducive to human flourishing. This need be no surprise, since a benevolent God might be expected to will that which is best for mankind with the result that the moral and the legal etc should ultimately all coincide with what is indeed conducive to human flourishing. This should, at least in principle, be open to reasonable discussion. In any event, insofar as religious traditions have unique proposals to make, there seems to be no legitimate basis to exclude them a priori from the debate of the “public square” upon a presumption that they somehow must be sub-rational.
III.3.

A Change of Paradigms?
Obama in Cairo and the “New Beginning” for Relations with the Muslim World

“We meet at a time of tension between the United States and Muslims around the world – tension rooted in historical forces that go beyond any current policy debate. The relationship between Islam and the West includes centuries of co-existence and co-operation, but also conflict and religious wars.

So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, and who promote conflict rather than the co-operation that can help all of our people achieve justice and prosperity. This cycle of suspicion and discord must end.

I have come here to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world; one based upon mutual interest and mutual respect; and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive, and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap, and share common principles – principles of justice and progress; tolerance and the dignity of all human beings.”

President Barack Obama, Speech in Cairo University, Thursday 4th June 2009

The speech by President Obama in Cairo was much heralded beforehand and celebrated afterwards as a landmark moment full of potential to mark the start of a fundamental change for the better in relations between, not only the United States, but the West in general, and the Muslim world. (For this reason the whole text is included later in this Annual Report.) The speech is notable for the contribution it makes to a point that has been stressed here, which is the need for a positive base upon which to build greater cooperation and harmony rather than a negative one.
It is worth noting several further points here also.

This speech, in totality, seeks to build a positive basis for cooperation based upon shared principles and values along with human rights and, at the very end, it also quotes what is sometimes called the *Golden rule*, that we should “do unto others as we would have them do unto us”.

A platform engaging beliefs common across religious traditions is *not* presented though there is nothing said which might exclude this and the frequent quotes from sacred texts lend a feeling of openness to the positive role of religion in the speech as a whole.

The speech, by implication, sees ideas as central to relations between the Muslim world and that of the West which in turn has large implications for the prior understanding employed about the workings of foreign relations. More specifically, this speech would seem to fit into what is often called a “constructivist” approach according to which (in contrast to the realist tradition) material capabilities and interests alone are not sufficient for an analysis of the course of international relations. Rather, in the words of J. Snyder, “Constructivists believe that debates about ideas are the fundamental building blocks of international life. Individuals and groups become powerful if they can convince others to adopt their ideas. People's understanding of their interests depends on the ideas they hold…” 5

Yet if this conceptual move seems a break with the past, it is worth recalling that President George Bush’s Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, declared in December 2005 that in the new international system, “the fundamental character of regimes matters more today than the international distribution of power” and added that “If the school of thought called ‘realism’ is to be truly realistic,” she suggested, “it must recognize that stability without democracy will prove to be false.”

And before this, in his *State of the Union* address in 2004, President George Bush had stated that

“America is a nation with a mission and that mission comes from our most basic beliefs. We have no desire to dominate, no ambitions of empire. Our aim is a democratic peace -- a peace founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman. America acts in this cause with friends and allies at our side, yet we understand our special calling: This great republic will lead the cause of freedom... The cause we serve is right, because it is the cause of all mankind. The momentum of freedom in our world is unmistakable -- and it is not carried forward by our power alone. We can trust in that greater power who guides the unfolding of the years. And in all that is to come, we can know that his purposes are just and true.”

This was clearly a statement that again proposed cooperation based upon common principles regarding the dignity of human beings and human rights, but then went further to invoke an overarching religious framework of Divine Providence. Such a perspective clearly goes far beyond those of the realist school.

However, there was one very important policy aspect which the purer realist bent in the earlier periods of the Bush administration my help to explain. This pertains to the difficulty for realism in handling a non-state actor such as Al Quaeda clearly was. For it is tempting so see this as a component in the move from first understanding Al Quaeda as comprising the actions of evil individuals to a later Bush Administration position where Al Quaeda was linked to hostile states such as those in the “axis of evil” namely Iraq, Iran and North Korea. Identification with a state –such as Iraq-- made Al Quaeda much easer to understand within a traditional realist analytical framework, but it also tended to bring the state involved into focus a potential point

Be that as it may, the point it is intended to highlight here is that there does seem to have been a shift (whether or not it started in the Bush administration) whereby the role of ideas in explaining the course of international politics is now much more freely acknowledged and thus for constructivism to have its “moment in the sun”. In the words of Jack Snyder: “Recent events seem to vindicate the
theory's resurgence; a theory that emphasizes the role of ideologies, identities, persuasion, and transnational networks is highly relevant to understanding the post-9/11 world.6

Karl K. Schonberg7 has pointed out that Robert Osgood8 argued as far back as 1953, that particular paradigms for understanding America's proper role in the world tend to become pre-eminent for long periods, on account of their ability to describe a coherent and believable view of the world more adequately than competing views. But these periods of conceptual stability are then punctuated by periods of re-definition which occur when consensus beliefs no longer seem effective in explaining and dealing with the international environment. Nonetheless, through all this, American interests remain relatively consistent and they are therefore either more or less properly perceived through the interpretive lense of the dominant paradigm of a given era. But the implication of the possibility of misperception is that the “definitions of the national interest may be a function of the subjective belief systems of individual decision-makers”.9 In this case, the distinction between ideals and interests thus breaks down as “the ambiguity of the unforeseeable consequences of policy, and the nature of the minds of policymakers – which don't separate these concerns carefully or neatly – mean that both factors will almost always be at play simultaneously”.10

What may be happening now is a paradigm shift towards a more constructivist approach which may better fit the realities of confronting “idealogico-religious” terrorism on the negative side, while on the other hand, allowing a better understanding of the positive possibilities and ultimate goals achievable by dialogue on the other.

9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
Elements of a Constructivist Approach

A critical factor that has emerged in the discussion of Muslim and West relations is that of the role of beliefs and ideals. From this it follows that any adequate account of how all this impinges upon international relations cannot easily be reduced to fit the realist confines of national interest, defined as power, or indeed the Neorealist emphasis on material capability and quest for security (Waltz). The alternative which has emerged to current prominence is that of constructivism, an approach which varies in the specifics of its theoretical content over quite a spectrum, but would generally include the beliefs that

- global politics is guided by intersubjectively shared ideas, norms and values held by the actors within it. (Indeed the role of shared ideas as an ideational structure, constraining and shaping behaviour is much emphasized to the point that structure is seen as a causal force separate from the material structure of neorealism).

- ideational structure is held to have a constitutive and not merely regulative effect on actors (since it causes actors to redefine their interests and identities—who they are and the roles they feel they should play-- in the process of interacting) in contrast to neorealism and neoliberalism (where interest and identities are held to be constant in order to isolate the causal roles of power and international institutions respectively).

- ideational structures and actors or ‘agents’ co-constitute and co-determine each other. Thus structures constitute actors in terms of interests and identities but structures are themselves produced and changed by the discursive practices of agents.

However, Alexander Wendt, one of the primary exponents of this approach (by virtue of upholding philosophical realism) does not hold that all aspects of human reality are shaped by social and discursive processes and thus allows that material forces do exist and may have independent causal effects on actor behaviour, and that the state is a real, self-organized actor with certain basic interests that precede its interactions with other states and which has pri-
mary needs that can be drawn analogously with those of a person (e.g. for physical survival, autonomy, economic well being etc).\textsuperscript{11} This is so even though states are constructed from within by social discursive practices that transcend the thoughts of any one individual person. (Hence it is possible to conceive of the state as capable of free-willed agency even able to employ rational deliberation in ways that are susceptible of interpretation in egoistic agent terms though this does not entai that they cannot act cooperatively.)

However, the key point here is that structure has of itself no determinative reality, rather it exists, has effects, and evolves only because of agents and their practices.

Socialized beliefs about what kinds of objectives are, or are not, worth pursuing will shape each state’s actual determination of its interests. Thus, even the basic needs referred to above (survival, autonomy etc) will manifest themselves in ways that are determined by social discursive practices. Concrete interests are not thus simply given. Socialized beliefs about the kinds of objectives that are worth pursuing will shape each state’s actual behaviour.

All of which is to say that material realities and technological artifacts are what they are, but, as Wendt puts it, “the probability that any given possibility will be realized depends on ideas and the interests they constitute”.\textsuperscript{12} In the case of a specific example: “Five hundred British nuclear weapons are less threatening to the US than five North Korean ones because of the shared understandings that underpin them.”\textsuperscript{13}

Wendt’s key assertion is that the culture in which states find themselves at any point in time depends on the discursive social practices that reproduce or transform each actor’s view of self and other.

\textsuperscript{11} See on this, “Constructing a new orthodoxy, Wendt’s Social Theory of International Politics and the constructivist challenge” in \textit{Constructivism and International Relations}, Eds., S. Guzzini and Anna Leander.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{A Social Theory of International Politics}, p.255.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
By engaging in new practices, states can come to instantiate new ideational structures that help actors transcend collective-action problems and historical mistrust. The constructivist move of regarding egoism as perpetually continuing product of the social process allows to emerge the fact that self-interest is not an eternal given driving actor behavior, but an ongoing product of the system. As Wendt asserts, “If self-interest is not sustained by practice, it will die out.”

From Enmity, Rivalry to Friendship?

This prior theoretical framework makes possible a way of interpreting the past history of international relations by means of a three fold understanding of how states have interacted.

Up until the seventeenth century states can be seen as seeing each other in the role of the enemy or “other” who is a threatening adversary that will observe no limits on the use of violence which must therefore be used as a basic tool for survival. This is characterized as one of enmity.

Since the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, however, it can be argued that there came into being in much of the Western world a culture in which a state system prevailed where states viewed each other as rivals, and as such could use violence to advance their interests but in ways which overall required them to refrain from totally eliminating each other.

Lastly in the modern world there can be seen emerging a new relationship possibility already arguably holding, at least between democracies, as they do not use force to settle disputes but rather cooperate as a team against security threats. This state of relations is one that can be characterized as one of friendship.

Such an end goal fits well with the words of President Obama’s Cairo speech:

“... human history has often been a record of nations and tribes subjugating one another to serve their own interests. Yet in this new age, such attitudes are self-defeating. Given our interdependence, any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail. So whatever we think of the past, we must not be prisoners of it. Our problems must be dealt with through partnership; progress must be shared.”

There would be many further steps required to develop a positive programme based upon the rather simplified analytical structure sketched here, for a future normative condition for interstate relations. But for the present perhaps at least expanding upon this possibility can be useful in the hope that it may yet gain further traction and offer something of a positive model for an ideal end or positive teleology for relations between states.

It may be useful to conclude by gathering together some of the principal resources emerging from the several component elements in this report, that point towards positive possibilities for characterizing the positive end states that might yet be used as a goal for West-Islamic relations.

The Common Word letter points to the potential basis for common action based on the shared affirmation of the two commandments to love God and our neighbour. A method for further expanding the quest for wisdom we can share is set in Professor Ford’s Muscat manifesto. At the level leading public figures we have the invitation to a new beginning in West-Islamic relations set out by President Obama And there is also the possibility of a model for international relations between states built upon the cooperation of friendship that has just been outlined and this itself engages a term with a rich heritage through the Greek word for neighbour love agape. Can this too offer a further resource?

Is there room for engaging on all sides with an exploration of that ancient greek word “Agape” which has been the subject of much reflection and exposition as “neighbour love” both within Christian theology and beyond. Is there something here that can be devel-
oped further and in which we might even find useful echoes as we seek to advance a states system of friendship and moreover one that can be of widely based appeal to what is needed for true human flourishing? After all, as Soren Kierkegaard pointed out, all the other forms of human love are determined by their object:

“only love to one’s neighbour is determined by love. Since one’s neighbour is every man, unconditionally every man, all distinctions are indeed removed from the object”.

(Gene Outka, Agape, An Ethical Analysis, New Haven, 1972, p. 6)
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Part A: A Common Foundation

   by H.R.H. Prince Ghazi of Jordan

2. A Common Word for a Common Future
   by Miroslav Volf

3. What is Required by a Religious Leader today?
   A Muscat Manifesto
   by David F. Ford

Interviews with Muna Abu Sulayman and Hassan Fatah

“A Common Word Between Us and You” was launched on October 13th 2007, initially as an open letter signed by 138 leading Muslim scholars and intellectuals (including such figures as the Grand Muftis of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Oman, Bosnia, Russia and Istanbul) to the leaders of the Christian Churches and denominations of the entire world, including His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI. In essence it proposed, based on verses from the Holy Qur’an and the Holy Bible, that Islam and Christianity share, at their core, the twin ‘golden’ commandments of the paramount importance of loving God and loving one’s neighbor. Based on this joint common ground, it called for peace and harmony between Christians and Muslims worldwide.

1.1. Introduction: To the “A Common Word” Initiative

In what follows, we will endeavour to outline the reasons this A Common Word initiative was so necessary at this time in history by describing the current state of Muslim-Christian relations, the causes for tension between these two religious communities, and the subsequent concerns for the future. We describe the goals and motives for launching A Common Word; explain what we did not intend by this initiative; discuss the reasons for primarily engaging religious leadership, and, finally, summarize the initial results.

1.2. Background: The Current State of Muslim-Christian Relations

In the early 1990s, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, there were various influential political theories regarding the future of the world, including Samuel Huntington’s 1993 thesis of a Clash of Civilizations, Francis Fukuyama’s The End of History and the Last Man written in 1992, as well as Robert Kaplan’s seminal article The Coming Anarchy of February 1994. In this article, Kaplan uses
the image of a luxury car driving one way on a highway and a
stream of destitute refugees walking the other way to suggest that
whilst one part of the world is moving comfortably and prosper-
ously forward, much of the rest of the world is suffering horribly,
and disintegrating due to poverty, disease, crime, conflict, tribal-
ism, overpopulation and pollution. Assessing each of these theories
can help us better understand the historical context of where we are
today.

Huntington gets a ‘B’. He was right about tension and conflict be-
tween Muslims and the West (e.g.: Bosnia 92-95; Kosovo 96-99;
2007 etc.) but dead wrong about either side unifying, never mind
Muslim countries uniting with China. Moreover, every single Mus-
lim country in the world has denounced terrorism, and the vast ma-
jority of governments of Muslim countries have sided with the
West in one way or another. Inside Syria and Iran, the two notable
exceptions, Christian-Muslim relations are excellent (witness Or-
thodox Patriarch Ignatius of Antioch’s open letter rebuffing the
Pope after his September 2006 Regensberg address).

Fukuyama, who declared the triumph of Western-style democracy,
gets a ‘C’. President George W. Bush’s plan for a new, more ‘de-
mocratic’ Middle East as outlined on November 6th, 2003 to the
National Endowment for Democracy still languishes. The most
‘democratic’ (in the Western sense) Muslim countries in the Mid-
dle East (Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine and Lebanon) are either in
civil war or close to it. And as we should know from Hitler’s 1933
election—or from the actions of the majority of Hutus in Rwanda in
1994, or of the majority of Serbs in Bosnia from 1992-1995 –
western-style democracy simply does not work where: (a) there are
no pre-existing democratic institutions that can overrule dema-
goguery; (b) there is no democratic culture that can control and
channel fear and hatred, and (c) where the majority seeks to gain
power in order to slaughter the minority, for reasons that go back
hundreds of years. Plato warns us of this in the 8th Book of The Re-
public, and Herodotus hints at it in the 3rd Book of his Histories.

Kaplan gets an ‘A-’. He was right about increased anarchy and
wealth in the world, but he failed to see the unique tensions exist-
between Muslims and the West. After all, Muslims and Chris-
tians together constitute over 55% of the world’s population, so this is a significant omission.

So where are we now? Sectarian wars, and political and religious distrust dominate the peoples of the Middle East and its relationship to the West. Chaos, conflict and disease ravage the horn of Africa and Darfur. Terrorism threatens everywhere in the world. We pray conflict does not break out in the Persian Gulf.

It is true that polite and educated company all over the world makes positive and optimistic comments about the other side, but there is not enough trickle-down to the masses and to popular culture. Moreover, as the current Pew Global survey shows, religious attitudes between Muslims, Christians and Jews are generally hardening and getting worse, not better. A cursory review of the world’s biggest bookseller, Amazon.com, shows that more Americans are buying books about Islam written by vitriolic former Muslims now touted as experts and sponsored by Christian Fundamentalist groups, than those written by serious Muslim or non-Muslim scholars. In the West there are whispers of a ‘Long War’; an idea which in the Islamic world is taken to be directed against all Muslims.

1.3. Roots: Causes for Tension in Muslim-Christian Relations

We will only briefly sketch some of the major causes of tension, as they are well known. On the Western side you have fear of terrorism; a loathing of religious coercion; suspicion of the unfamiliar and deep historical misunderstandings. On the Islamic side you first and foremost have the situation in Palestine: despite the denial of certain parties, Palestine is a grievance rooted in faith (since Muslim holy sites lie occupied). Then you have discontentment with Western foreign policy (especially the Iraq War and Occupation 2003-2009); fear and resentment of the massive missionary movements launched from the West into the Islamic World; wounded pride arising from the colonial experience, poverty and unemployment, illiteracy, ignorance of true Islam and of the Arabic language, social and political oppression, and a technology gap. On both sides you have vast centrifugal forces unleashed by fundamentalist and extremist movements, and by missionary activity.
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These far outweigh the centripetal forces set in motion by hundreds of interfaith and intercultural centers all over the world, and by world governments (e.g. the Spanish-Turkish ‘Alliance of Civilizations’; the Russian ‘Dialogue of Civilizations’; the Kazakh ‘Dialogue of Confessions’; the Amman Message; the French Atelier-Culturel; the British Radical Middle Way; the Malaysian Islam Hadari; the new Saudi Interfaith Initiative of 2008 etc. etc., and the umpteen ‘declarations’ of ‘this or that city’). The fundamentalists are better organized, more experienced, better coordinated and more motivated. They have more stratagems, more institutes, more people, more money, more power, more influence.

We are reminded of the words of W.B.Yeats in his poem *The Second Coming*:

Turning and Turning in the Widening Gyre / The falcon cannot hear the falconer; / Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold / Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, / the blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere/ the ceremony of innocence is drowned. / The best lack all conviction, while the worst / are full of passionate intensity.

In short, Muslim-Christian relations are characterized by deeply rooted, historical, cultural and racial misunderstanding, suspicion and even loathing. Thus now, according to the results of the largest international religious surveys in history (as outlined in a recently-published seminal book by Professor John Esposito and Dalia Mogahed and discussed at the Yale conference), 60% of Christians harbor prejudice against Muslims and 30% of Muslims reciprocate. Quite clearly the grounds for fear of war and religious genocides are starkly real.

1.4. Fears: The Future of Muslim-Christian Relations

With such an explosive mix, popular religious conflicts – even unto genocides – are lurking around the corner. Indeed, one such conflict took place a few hundred miles away from where the Pope sits, only 15 years ago or so ago (that is, from 1993-1995) in the heart of Europe, when 300,000 innocent Muslim civilians were slaughtered and 100,000 Bosnian women were raped as a method
of war. And our feeling is still that, God forbid, a few more terrorist attacks, a few more National Security Emergencies, a few more demagogues, and a few more national protection laws, and then internment camps (like those set up for Americans of Japanese origin during WWII) – if not concentration camps – are not inconceivable in some places, and that these would inevitably spawn global counter-reactions.

The Holocaust of 6 million Jews – then the largest religious minority in Europe – occurred 65 years ago, still within living memory. This is something that Muslims in the West, now the largest minority, should contemplate as seriously as Jews do. For, unfortunately, we are not now inherently immune to committing the crimes of the past – our nature and worst potential has not fundamentally changed. Moreover, as the Gallup survey showed, we are now actually at the stage where we (as Christians and Muslims) routinely mistrust, disrespect and dislike each other, if not popularly and actively rubbish, dehumanize, demonize, despise and attack each other. This is the stage where Hutus and Tutsis (both Christian tribes, by their own confession at least) were at in Rwanda before the popular genocide by machete of nearly a million people in 1994. How much easier would it be for Muslims and Christians – who have been fighting for over a millennia and have viewed each other with deepest suspicion since St. John of Damascus – to slaughter each other? And how much more likely will this be when we are all finally struck with the apparently looming catastrophes of global climate change, and when competition for food and natural resources becomes fiercer?

1.5. Goals and Motives behind Launching “A Common Word”

Our goal is very clear. We want to avoid a greater world-wide conflict between Muslims and the West, and we must resolve all our current crises. Then we have to find a modus vivendi to live and let live, to ‘love thy neighbor’; this idea must be expressed from within our religious scriptures, and must then be applied everywhere.

The intention in sending out the Common Word missive was simply to try to make peace and spread harmony between Muslims and Christians globally – it was and is an extended global handshake of
A.1. Concept of Dialogue

religious goodwill, friendship and fellowship and consequently of inter-religious peace. Of course, peace is primarily a matter for governments, but Huntington’s 1993 vision of global conflict between Muslims and Christians was wrong in one important sense: post September 11th 2001, the only government as such to have opposed the West in its various demands is that of Iran (but even Iran has sided with the West against terrorism); more than 50 other Islamic nations have sided with the West. That is to say then that the governments of Islamic majority countries have not banded together against the governments of Christian-majority countries (much less in alliance to China) nor vice versa. Nevertheless, Huntington was very correct in his prediction of heightened tensions between Christian and Muslim populations as such globally after the collapse of atheistic communism, albeit with religious-affiliated non-government actors taking the lead.

Thus exactly one month after His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI’s controversial and potentially incendiary Regensburg lecture on September 13th 2006, an international group of 38 Muslim Scholars and intellectuals (many in this group would later form the nucleus of those behind the “A Common Word” Initiative – and in retrospect this letter would prove to be a “trial run” for “A Common Word”) issued an Open Letter to His Holiness in what we thought was a very gentle and polite way of pointing out some factual mistakes made by His Holiness in his lecture. We did not get a satisfactory answer from the Vatican beyond a perfunctory courtesy visit to me, a month later, from some Vatican officials. So exactly a year after our first letter (and a thus a year and a month after the Regensburg lecture) we increased our number by exactly 100, to 138, (symbolically saying that we are many and that we are not going away) and issued, based on the Holy Qur’an, “A Common Word between Us and You”.

We repeat that we had honestly – as is evident from the genesis of this story, and as is evident, we believe, in the very text of A Common Word itself – only one motive: peace. We were aiming to try to spread peace and harmony between Christians and Muslims all over the world, not through governments and treaties but on the all-important popular and mass level, through the world’s most influential popular leaders precisely – that is to say, through the leaders of the two religions. We wanted to stop the drumbeat of what we
feared was a growing popular consensus (on both sides) for worldwide (and thus cataclysmic and perhaps apocalyptic) Muslim-Christian jihad / crusade. We were keenly aware, however, that peace efforts required also another element: knowledge. We thus aimed to spread proper basic knowledge of our religion in order to correct and abate the constant and unjust vilification of Islam, in the West especially.

Finally, we must say here that had we only proposed the Second Commandment for the basis of peace between Muslims and Christians – and not mentioned God at all, as many people do – we could have widened the net of *A Common Word* to all people (and could have found texts from Confucious to secular philosophy to support it) but it would not have worked between Christians and Muslims (and Jews) because believers would misquoted scriptures to say that God orders us to fight unbelievers or to dislike them. In short, we would have been ‘trumped’ by misused religious scriptures and doctrines. That is not say that we do not believe in the Second Commandment as the basis of peaceful relations between all people – we do – it is just that in the specific but critical context of Christian-Muslim tension it was of paramount importance to find our religious and theologically-correct Common Ground, in order to be blessed by God in our endeavors but also in order not to be dismissed by religious leaders and believers.

1.6. What Was NOT Intended by launching “A Common Word”

Having said what our motive was, we want to emphasize what our motives were not, in view of some of the strange suspicions and speculations we have read about on the internet:

(1) *A Common Word* was not intended – as some have misconstrued – to trick Christians or to foist Muslim Theology on them, or even to convert them to Islam. There is deliberately no mention of the ‘Christian Trinity’ in *A Common Word*, because Jesus (peace be upon him) never mentioned it in the Gospel – and certainly not when discussing the Two Greatest Commandments. Indeed, we believe the word ‘Trinity’ (or ‘Tri-une’; for that matter) itself does not occur once in the whole Bible, but comes from the Christian Creeds some time later. Of course, Muslims and Christians differ
irreconciliably on this point, but the ‘Christian part’ of *A Common Word* is based on Jesus’s (peace be upon him) own words – which Christians can obviously interpret for themselves. Besides, as we understand it, Christians also insist on the Unity of God, and so we sought, through Jesus’s own words (peace be upon him), to find what we do have in common in so far as it goes, not denying what we know that we disagree upon on beyond that.

(2) *A Common Word* was not intended to reduce both our religions to an artificial union based on the Two Commandments: indeed in Matthew 22:40 Jesus Christ the Messiah (*peace be upon him*) was quite specific (“On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets.” (Matthew 22:40): “Hang” not “are (reduced to)”

It was simply an attempt to find a theologically correct pre-existing essential common ground (albeit interpreted perhaps differently) between Islam and Christianity, rooted in our sacred texts and in their common Abrahamic origin, in order to stop our deep-rooted religious mutual suspicions from being an impediment to behaving properly towards each other. It was, and is, an effort to ensure that religions behave as part of the solution, and are not misused to become part of the problem. Indeed, the Two Commandments give us guidelines and a concrete, shared standard of behavior not only as to what to expect from the other but also to how we must ourselves *behave* and *be*. We believe we can and must hold ourselves and each other to this shared standard.

(3) *A Common Word* was not intended to deny that God loved us first, as some Christians have opined. The knowledge that God loved man before man loved God is so obvious in Islam that we did not think we had to make it explicit. It is obvious because God obviously existed before His creation of the world and man. It is also evident in the very sacred formula that starts every chapter in the Holy Qur’an but one, and that begins every single legitimate act of any Muslim’s entire life – *Bism Illah Al-Rahman Al-Rahim, In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful*. Indeed, there is a *Hadith Qudsi* (a ‘holy saying’

15 *Sunan Al-Tirmithi*, no.1907.
the word for ‘womb’ (*al-rahm*) comes from His Name, and thus implying that God created the world out of an internal overflowing of love. Indeed, creation out of *Rahmah* (‘Loving Compassion’) is also seen in the Holy Qur’an in beginning in the *Sura* of *Al-Rahman*, which says:

\[
\text{Al-Rahman / Has Taught the Quran / He has created Man / He has taught him speech. (Al-Rahman, 55:1-4)}
\]

In other words, the very Divine Name ‘*Al-Rahman*’ should be understood as containing the meaning of ‘The Creator-through-Love’, and the Divine Name *Al-Rahim* should be understood as containing the meaning of ‘The Savior through Mercy’.

(4) *A Common Word* was not intended to exclude Judaism as such or diminish its importance. We started with Christianity bilaterally simply because Islam and Christianity are the two largest religions in the world and in history, and so in that sense, Islamic-Christian dialogue is the most critical: for there are about 2 billion Christians in the world and 1.5 billion Muslims and only 15-20 million Jews. But this does not preclude our having as Muslims other conversations with those of any other faith, bilaterally or multilaterally, or even with those of no faith at all. Moreover, Muslims do not object to the idea of a Judeo-Christian tradition (even though all 3 religions share the same Abrahamic origins and traditions), and do not object to not being invited to all the Jewish-Christian dialogues, so there is no need for Jews to feel excluded by a Muslim-Christian conversation. For that matter there is no need for Christians to feel excluded by a Judeo-Islamic dialogue. We can all, however, understand Jewish fears about this dialogue, and note that there have been Jewish observers invited at the conferences in Yale and Cambridge.

(5) On the other hand, we would like to say also that “*A Common Word*” does not signal that Muslims are prepared to deviate from or concede one iota of any of their convictions in order to reach out to Christians – nor, we expect, is the reverse true. Let us be crystal-clear: *A Common Word* is about equal peace, not about capitulation.
(6) Neither does “A Common Word” mean Muslims are going to facilitate foreign ‘Evangelism opportunities’ in the Islamic World in the name of ‘freedom of religion’: this is an extremely sensitive topic with a lot of bitter history, and has the potential to create a lot of tension between Christians and Muslims – just as it is has between Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox and Eastern Orthodox Christians – so we believe “A Common Word” should focus on popular rapprochement and mutual understanding between Christians and Muslims.

(7) Some have suggested that framing our extended hand in the language of “love” is such a concession, but we assure you that this is not at all accurate, nor is it a ‘concession’: rather, it has been a particular pleasure to be able to focus in our initiative on this frequently underestimated aspect of our religion: the Grand Principle of Love. Indeed, we have over 50 near-synonyms for love in the Holy Qur’an – English does not have the same linguistic riches and connotations: as was discussed in particular during the Yale workshop and conference in July 2008. If Muslims do not usually use the same language of love as Christians in English, it is perhaps because the word ‘love’ for Muslims frequently implies different things for Muslims then it does for Christians.

Our use of the language of ‘love’ in A Common Word is simply then a recognition that human beings have the same souls everywhere – however corrupted or pure – and thus that the experience of love must have something in common everywhere, even if the objects of love are different, and even if the ultimate love of God is stronger than all other loves. God says in the Holy Qur’an:

Yet of mankind are some who take unto themselves (objects of worship which they set as) rivals to God, loving them with a love like (that which is the due) of God (only) – [but] those who believe are stauncher in their love for God…. (Al-Baqarah, 2:165)

1.7. The Recipients of “A Common Word”

A Common Word was addressed from religious leaders to religious leaders of the largest two religions in the world in the recognition
that whilst religious leaders do not generally make public policy, they are nevertheless still the ultimate touchstones for morality and thus the final safety net for public opinion and non-government actors.

We would like to emphasize here that getting secular Westernized Muslim academics together with Westerners to accomplish this cannot work, because: "Man does not live by bread alone, but from every word that issueth from the Mouth of God" (Matthew 4:4). Moreover, secular modernists command no following on the Islamic street, and on the contrary their promotion creates popular outrage which drives the moderate traditional majority of Muslims into the embrace of the fundamentalists. The 9-11 Commission report, the current Rand report and everyone who subscribes to this approach are just wrong. ‘Love thy neighbor’ is in all our scriptures in different ways: let our authentic, traditional religious authorities bring it out for us. If we do not let the orthodox voice of our religions speak for peace, our religions risk being misused and manipulated to move us towards conflict.

We would like also to say something about the Christians who answered the invitation of A Common Word, wrote responses, and attended the various resulting dialogues. These men and women have welcomed ‘strange’ people, whom they did not know, from far parts of the world that they have never been to, and from a religion that has always been considered by their own to be heretical at best. They have given much effort, time and money to do this, and since “where your treasure is, there will your heart be also” (Matthew 6:21), we know they gave from the heart, for indeed they were not obliged to do so. They met us with open hands and with even more open hearts, for they all knew that many other Christians might criticize them, yet they did so anyway out of conviction. I thus say that they have loved their neighbor as themselves as called for in the Gospel by Jesus Christ (may peace and blessings be upon him) and have even loved the stranger as thyself as called for in Leviticus (19:34). They have fulfilled the law spoken of by St. Paul in Romans (13:8), and have accepted the Common Word

between Us and You called for by the Holy Qur’an. So may God bless them as peacemakers and reward their beautiful intentions.

1.8. The Results of “A Common Word” Initiative During its First Year

Over the last year since the launch of the A Common Word initiative (see: www.acommonword.com), we do not think it an exaggeration to say it has become the world’s leading interfaith dialogue initiative between Christians and Muslims specifically, and has achieved historically unprecedented global acceptance and ‘traction’ as an inter-faith theological document:

Since its launch in October 2007, over 60 leading Christian figures have responded to it in one form or another, including H.H. Pope Benedict XVI, H.B. Orthodox Patriarch Alexi II of Russia, the Archbishop of Canterbury Dr. Rowan Williams, and the Presiding Bishop of the Lutheran World Federation, Bishop Mark Hanson (see: ‘Christian Responses’ at www.acommonword.com). On November 2007, over 300 leading U.S. Evangelical leaders also responded in an open letter in the New York Times. In the meantime, the Muslim Scholars signing the initiative increased to around 300, with over 460 Islamic organizations and associations endorsing it.

A Common Word has led to a number of spontaneous local grassroots and community level-initiatives all over the world in places as far apart as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Canada, South Africa, the USA, and Great Britain (see: ‘New Fruits’ at www.acommonword.com).

Over 600 articles – carried by thousands of press outlets – have been written about A Common Word in English alone.

Over 200,000 people have visited the Official Website of A Common Word for further details.

Over 6000 people have ‘fully endorsed’ A Common Word online alone.

A Common Word has already been the subject of M.A. and M. Phil. dissertations in Western universities in various countries (including
A Common Word has been the subject of major international conferences at Yale University, USA, and at Cambridge University (UK) and Lambeth Palace, and was studied at the World Economic Forum in Spring 2008 and the Mediterranean Dialogue of Cultures in November 2008.

A Common Word was also the basis for the First Annual Catholic-Muslim forum held at the Vatican in November 2008.

A Common Word was the central impetus behind the Wamp-Ellison Resolution in the U.S. House of Representatives which passed in 2008, and it was commended in this Resolution.

A Common Word received the U.K.’s Association of Muslim Social Scientist 2008 Building Bridges Award, and Germany’s Eugen Biser Award of 2008.

Finally, A Common Word was even cited at the traditional Post-Inauguration Service at the National Cathedral for President Obama on January 21st, 2009 during the main sermon by Reverend Dr. Sharon E. Watkins, the General Minister and President of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the US and Canada, as follows:

Recently Muslim scholars from around the world released a document, known as “A Common Word Between Us.” It proposes a common basis for building a world at peace. That common basis? Love of God and love of neighbor! What we just read in the Gospel of Matthew!

1.9. Plans for the “A Common Word” Initiative During its Second Year

There is a barrage of activity planned for 2009, including a major documentary film, three books, a joint Christian-Muslim sensitivity manual, an important political conference planned at Georgetown University, Washington DC; a large religious conference planned
in Malaysia and possibly a third in the Philippines. Also planned are two high-level meetings between Muslims and the Orthodox Churches, and between Muslims and the World Council of Churches; a multi-lingual Muslim-Christian ‘recommended reading list’ joint website with Yale, Lambeth Palace and possibly also the Vatican (to serve as a voluntary basis for school and university curricula); a Muslim Theological Press Conference in Spain; a major European-based but global and multi-stakeholder Christian-Muslim peace Institute / Foundation with *A Common Word* ensconced in its charter – this is precisely the C-1 World Dialogue –; a university campus-based *Common Word* student initiative in the USA; a joint-design *Common Word* Muslim-Christian string of Prayer-beads; a number of ‘trickledown’ projects to try to bring the Common Word to Churches and Mosques all over the world; and finally the continuation of the practical work planned at the meetings in Yale, Cambridge/Lambeth Palace and the Vatican. In short, we think we may fairly say that in its first year *A Common Word* achieved–by the Grace of God, *Al-HamduLillah*, historically unprecedented ‘global traction’, and is hoping in its second year–with the Will of God, *in sha Allah*–to achieve historically unprecedented ‘global trickledown’. God is Bounteous!

*Wal-Salaamu Alaykum, Pax Vobiscum.*
2. A Common Word for a Common Future

by Miroslav Volf

2.1. Gloomy Clouds – Sun’s Rays

Most people today see a heavy and dangerous storm of tensions between Christians and Muslims that is menacing the world. Since the Crusades, relations between our two faith communities – currently comprised of just slightly under half the human race – have rarely been at a lower point than they are today. Tensions, deep conflicts, and often murderous violence between us are leaving a trail of blood and tears as well as a mounting deposit of deeply painful and potently dangerous memories. These clashes undermine the hopes and efforts of many to live in peace, to flourish as individuals and communities. Worse still, this stunted living enveloped in hopelessness often sucks people even deeper down into a whirlpool of violence.

But many of us sense a new wind of hope beginning to blow – we feel the warm Sun’s rays penetrating the stormy gloom around us. A Common Word Between Us and You – likely one of the most important interfaith documents to appear in the past four decades – is one such ray shining through the barely parting clouds. The central message of this Muslim letter, endorsed by some of the most prominent Muslim leaders worldwide and addressed to Christian leaders across the planet, is as simple as it is profound: a belief in the Oneness of God and the commitment to love God and neighbor are resources found in both our respective faiths on which we can build more peaceful relations between Muslims and Christians. This same belief and the same commitment, of course, bind Christians and Muslims to their elder sibling Judaism, the Abrahamic

---

1 This article represents a revision and amalgamation of two presentations: (1) opening remarks at the Yale conference, “Loving God and Neighbor in Word and Deed: Implications for Muslims and Christians” (July 28–31, 2008) and jointly hosted by Professor Dr. HRH Prince Ghazi bin Muhammad bin Talal and Professor Miroslav Volf; and (2) an address at the Cambridge conference, “A Common Word and Future Muslim–Christian Engagement” (October 12–15, 2008). In a slightly different form it was originally published in Islamica (2/2009), 63-68.
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faith that originally transmitted to the world these two divine commandments.

2.2. Signs of Hope

As a reminder, *A Common Word* was issued not just in an atmosphere of stormy relations between Muslims and Christians but as a response to what many Muslims experienced as a Christian provocation. Its occasion was the famous Regensburg address of Pope Benedict XVI. delivered in September 2005. In it Pope Benedict said of the Byzantine emperor Manuel II Paleologos that he “ad-dresse[d] his interlocutor with a startling brusqueness, a brusqueness that we find unacceptable, on the central question about the relationship between religion and violence in general, saying, ‘Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached.’” Notwithstanding the Pope’s disclaimer, many devout Muslims worldwide felt insulted.

Yet despite the perceived provocation, uttered in a context of deteriorating relations between Muslims and Christians – perhaps in part because of the provocation – key Muslim leaders, gathered around *A Common Word*, did not respond in kind. Despite the present conflicts, they chose to speak of benevolence and beneficence, not to express hatred or dream of revenge. As is plain from the opening chapter by HRH Prince Ghazi bin Muhammad in this volume, it is not that they simply shrugged off multiple ways they experienced being violated by Christians and that they have forgotten the history of past violations. Instead, they turned felt provocation as well as experienced violence into an occasion to send into the wider world what seemed to many an utterly novel idea: For Muslims the commitment to love God and neighbor is central, and they share it with Christians as well as Jews. It has been said that God knows how to write straight even on crooked lines. The signatories of *A Common Word* also wrote “straight” on the crooked line of painful memories and deep tensions. The whole Christian community, indeed the whole world, should be grateful to them.

I trust it will not be taken as self-serving if I mention another smaller ray that penetrated the stormy clouds of Christian–Muslim
relations. It was the Yale Response to *A Common Word*, titled *Loving God and Neighbor Together*. We took the conciliatory hand of the authors of the *Common Word* and responded in kind and out of the heart of the Christian faith. What is significant about the Yale Response, of course, is not so much that it was written, but that it was endorsed by over five hundred Christian leaders, many of whom are leaders of large, worldwide constituencies comprised of literally hundreds of millions of believers. Why did they endorse it? Because their Holy Book says, “… as far as it depends on you, live at peace with everyone” (Romans 12:18) and because they sensed a danger of global proportions if a just peace between Muslims and Christians does not triumph over tensions and injustice. Neither the drafters nor the endorsers of the Yale Response were blind to the experience of violence and oppression from the hands of Muslims that many Christians report (e.g. the persecution of Christian minorities and converts in many majority Muslim countries as well as communal violence against Christians in places like Southern Sudan). Nor did they forget the long history of violence experienced in the past (e.g. the disappearance of Christians from the Arab peninsula or the oppression of Christians during Turkish conquests of the Balkans). Yet they felt that their faith called them to love their Muslim neighbors even in situations of enmity. Thus, with intentional obedience to the foundational principles of their faith and a deliberate decision to follow the example and teaching of Jesus Christ, these Christian leaders shook the hand extended to them.

The Yale Response, though early and widely endorsed, was not the only response to *A Common Word*. Many Christians from all corners of the world have responded favorably as well, notably and with great theological depth and ecumenical sensitivity the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams. The broad support of *A Common Word* in the Muslim community and the favorable response to it in the Christian community suggest that we may be poised for a sea change in Muslim–Christian relations. A day of transition from deep conflicts to mutually beneficial coexistence may be dawning.
2.3. Commonalities and Differences

Lest someone suppose that this assessment is a too-quick and somewhat cheap triumph of religious convergence over conflict, let me make plain what I am not saying about the significance of finding commonality between Christianity and Islam in the dual command of love. First, to have the dual command of love in common does not equate with being amalgamated into one and the same religion. Even if there is significant agreement on love of God and neighbor, many differences remain—differences that are not accidental to each faith but which have historically defined them. Some of these differences concern their basic understandings of God, love, and neighbor.

For instance, Christians believe that the One and Unique God, who is utterly exalted above all creation, is the Holy Trinity, and that God has shown unconditional love for humanity in that Jesus Christ as God’s Lamb bore the sin of the world. Muslims generally do not share these beliefs. Other differences concern the sources of revelation. Muslims revere the Prophet Muhammad as the “seal of the prophets” and the Holy Qur’an as sacred Scripture. Christians do not. Significant agreement on love of God and neighbor does not erase these undeniable, deep, and consequential differences; it enables those of deep faith to respect and protect others despite these differences, it leads them to get to know each other in their differences, and it helps them live together harmoniously notwithstanding their differences.

Second, to agree on the dual command of love is not to say that all the practical problems causing tensions between these two communities have now been resolved. Many thorny issues remain—large and small wars in which Christians and Muslims are involved, persecution and a lack of full religious freedom, problems concerning evangelism and da’wa (the Islamic practice of inviting another to embrace Islam), and many others. The common commitment to love of God and neighbor does not eliminate all conflicts. What common commitment does is this: It provides a basis on which Muslims and Christians can productively discuss and overcome these conflicts.
Thirdly, and equally significantly, agreement on the dual command of love encourages each community to hold the other accountable to its best insights and commitments. A Muslim as the target of Christian verbal attacks can now say to a Christian, “How can you claim that you love me when you only speak ill of how I understand and the way I worship God, when you malign my Prophet, and when you despise my way of life?” A Christian convert from Islam can now say to a hostile Muslim, “How can you say that you love me if you want to kill me just because I have followed my conscience and embraced the Christian faith?”

The common commitment to love of neighbor has real consequences on the ground. If practiced, it has the potential to defuse many serious conflicts of a global reach (such as that of the Danish cartoons of the Prophet Muhammad).

2.4. Transforming Love and Orienting Faith

But can one bring about a shift from what feels like a clash of civilizations to peaceful coexistence of faith traditions by promoting what some people may deem as an esoteric feeling of human devotion to God and a soft and nebulous sentiment of love? Shouldn’t we grapple with the harder realities of life instead? Shouldn’t we discuss poverty and economic development, freedom of expression, education, stewardship of the environment, pluralism and democracy, the balance of power, resistance to extremists of all stripes, or modes of countering violence with effective force? If religion has anything to do with conflicts between Christians and Muslims, the critics may continue, religious passions stemming from single-minded devotion to God as the champion of one’s cause are the source of these conflicts, not a means to overcome them. Less religion is what we need, not more. Take God out of it all, critics conclude. Let people keep religious devotion locked in the privacy of their hearts. Restrict the virtues and delights of love to friendship and family. Let instead individual and national interests, as well as the balance of power tempered by the claims of hard-nosed justice, regulate worldly affairs.

So what worldly good can come of promoting love of God and love of neighbor? Why do we see a sign of hope in A Common Word? Partly because, properly understood, love is not a soft and a
nebulous emotion but a tough, practical virtue of benevolence and beneficence, a virtue of which justice is an absolutely integral part. And religious faith is not impractical at all! For people of faith, Christians and Muslims alike, God is a motivating and sustaining power, the Holy One who gives meaning, weight, and direction to their life. In the current jargon, faith is what “makes them tick.”

2.5. Faith Matters

It’s not just love’s toughness and the orienting character of faith, however, that makes these two shared loves of Muslims and Christians – love of God and love of neighbor – socially important. Consider the undiminished vibrancy of faith in the contemporary world. To the surprise of many – notably those who believed that religion would gradually retreat before the light of reason and the wonders of technological development – the world today is becoming a more religious rather than a less religious place. The world is not progressively secularizing; to the contrary, it is desecularizing. This trend is likely to continue into the foreseeable future.

Religious faiths, notably Christianity and Islam, are reasserting themselves in two important senses. First, the number of their adherents in the world is growing in absolute and relative terms as compared to non-religious world-views. Second, religious people increasingly consider their faith not as simply a private affair but a significant shaper of their public engagements. Religion matters profoundly, and matters in the public as well as the private sphere. I hope this claim will not be heard as a statement of religious triumphalism. I am aware that religion is often employed to wrap appallingly base causes in the aura of the sacred and to legitimize, even promote, violence. My point is not to deny this obvious fact. Neither is it to suggest that disbelief will be pushed out of existence or that non-believers’ freedoms ought to be restricted. My aim is rather to remind us that religion matters and to point to a significant and unavoidable consequence of this fact.

---

What is this consequence? Negatively, if religion matters, no peace between religious people will be achieved by pretending that it is merely a veil hiding some undeniable economic, political, or other interests. Positively, if religion matters, we have to find resources for the peaceful coexistence of religious people within each faith tradition itself.

2.6. Deep Faith and Social Pluralism

It is because faith matters that the Common Word initiative is so significant. First, A Common Word points both Muslims and Christians to what is undeniably essential in each faith and common to both – love of God and love of neighbor. Second, it shows how that which is essential in each faith and common to both has the power to bind them together because it encourages – indeed, demands – that their adherents seek the good of others, not just their own good. If it is true that the dual command of love binds the faiths together, the consequences are revolutionary in the best sense of the word. We no longer have to say, “The deeper your faith is, the more at odds with others you will be!” (provided, of course, that “deep faith” means not just “emotionally strong faith” but “intelligent and informed faith”). To the contrary, we must say: “The deeper your faith is, the more in harmony with others you will live!” A deep faith no longer leads to clashes – it fosters peaceful coexistence.

What some people deride as an impractical and soft commitment to love God and neighbor – but what is actually the attachment to the Source of all reality and practice of active care – has real-life effects in defusing conflicts and fostering peace. It makes possible what would otherwise remain unattainable in a world of personally vibrant and socially assertive faiths. We can embrace deep faith while at the same time respecting the rights and promoting the well-being of those who do not share it. Deep faith expresses itself in love, and love, understood as active care, leads to respect of and struggle for others’ rights. Put differently and maybe surprisingly to some, commitment to the properly understood love of God and neighbor makes deeply religious persons, because they are deeply religious, into dedicated social pluralists. When Christians and Muslims commit themselves to practicing the dual command of
love, they are not satisfying some private religious fancy; instead, they are actively fostering peaceful coexistence in our ineradicably pluralistic world that is plagued by deep divisions. They are making possible the constructive collaboration of people of different faiths in the common public space and for the common good.

2.7. Planetary Common Good

The significance of the *Common Word* initiative goes beyond relations between Muslims and Christians. The initiative holds the potential for providing a good platform for Christians and Muslims together to engage great and troubling problems facing humanity today. If, as Muslims say, God’s mercy encompasses all, or if, as Christians might say, God’s love is universal, then so should the love of Muslims and Christians be – love for all humanity that is concerned for all aspects of every person’s life. We live in a thoroughly interconnected and interdependent world that also knows itself as such (as we have been made painfully aware by the ongoing deep financial crisis, and as the ecological crisis attests). We’re all in the same rocking boat, so to speak, and the good of one is the good of all; the ill of one is the ill of all. It is also a world caught in a whirlwind of unprecedented change. It seems that nothing is stable and that everything can – and eventually will – be overturned.

In the context of such highly dynamic societies marked by thoroughgoing interdependence, a “common word” between Muslims and Christians should not just be about mutual relations between these two faiths. It should also be, and maybe above all be, about the common good for the little boat that is our common world. In addition to sitting face-to-face and trying to make peace with one another, we need to start walking shoulder to shoulder in trying to heal the deep wounds and inspire the noble hopes of all people in our common world. Human flourishing and even human survival may depend on it.

2.8. An Encounter of Seven

What would it take for Muslims and Christians to have an effective common word with one another aimed at a better common future? How can we make fruitful the encounters of those committed to
love God and each other as neighbors? An important first step is to attend carefully to the character of their encounters.

Someone has said, somewhat surprisingly, that in an encounter between you and me, four are always involved, not just two. Two of those four are, obviously, you and me. But also present are my image of you and your image of me. If this is so, then an encounter is fruitful when my image of you has become more as you truly are, and your image of me has become more as I truly am. As a Christian, I will engage carefully with my Muslim friend long enough for my perception of him to come in line with his perception of himself – and this is so whether I eventually end up agreeing or disagreeing with his perception of himself. That’s a helpful way to think about encounters between people of different faiths. It isn’t quite complete, however.

In every encounter seven are involved – a perfect number for Christians. There are you and me, and there’s my image of you and your image of me – the obvious two and somewhat surprising four. But there’s also my image of myself (which may not be true to who I am and may be very much unlike who you think I am). And there’s your image of yourself (which may not be true to who you are and may be very much unlike who I think you are). So that’s six in one encounter. The consequence? I have to learn to see myself as I truly am, not just demand that you see me as I am (which is often a demand that you see me not as I truly am but as I think I am). Similarly, you have to learn to see yourself as you truly are, not just demand that I see you as you are (which is, again, often a demand that I see you not as you truly are but as you think you are). More concretely, as a Christian I will engage my Muslim friend long enough for his expressed perception of me to actually help me more accurately understand myself.

I spoke of seven in every encounter, however. Where does the seventh come from? In every encounter there is also another One present, the categorically unique and utterly incomparable One, the absolutely truthful and infinitely merciful One. God is present in every encounter. As the truthful One, God sees each of us truthfully rather than distorting our identities. And God’s truthful perception of us demands our truthful self-perception as well as the truthful perceiving of others. Further, as the merciful One, God de-
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sires us to be merciful in all our dealings with one another and with the world. Indeed, God desires of us to be as truthful and as merciful with ourselves, with one another, and with the world as he himself is truthful and merciful.

If God is always involved in any fruitful encounter, then it is clear that the seventh one is really the First One – not first among others, but the first one who makes all others and their encounter possible. Fruitful encounter between those who love God and neighbor is possible only because the God of love makes it possible – makes possible the encounter as well as the love of God and of neighbor around which the encounter takes place. Hence both our love of God and our love of neighbor appropriately must start with the recognition that we and our world are loved by the God of infinite love. The dual command of love is rooted in the simple and the most sublime reality of the God who “is love,” as the Epistle of John states (1 John 4:8).

2.9. A Watershed?

It is not too much to say that the Common Word initiative, with its emphasis on the dual command of love, has the potential of becoming a historic watershed defining the relations between the two numerically largest faiths in the world today for the good of all humanity. But will it? Will it remain just a document that gathers the dust of history? Or will it become a common platform made out of a web of partly overlapping convictions from which to effectively address many areas of tension between Muslims and Christians, as well as many of the burning issues in our interconnected world?

Which of these possibilities will be realized? If Muslims and Christians embrace the initiative and commit themselves to love of God and neighbor, the Common Word initiative will open up a new future for Muslims, Christians, and Jews – a future in which many swords will be turned into plowshares and countless clashes will be replaced by peaceful coexistence.
3. What is Required of a Religious Leader Today?
Lecture at the Institute of Shariah Studies, Muscat, Oman
by David F. Ford

It is an honour and a delight to be with you here today in the Institute of Shariah Studies, and to be able to lecture in the Sultan Qaboos Grand Mosque this evening. I deeply appreciate the invitation of HE Shaykh Abdullah bin Mohammed Al Salmi, Minister of Endowments and Religious Affairs, to visit Oman for the first time. I am most grateful to all those who have helped to organise the visit, in particular Michael Bos, whose work here has been so important for Christian-Muslim relations, and Dr. Abdulrahman Al Salmi, editor of the journal *Tolerance*. I also bring a message from His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams. When he was with us in Cambridge three days ago he was delighted to hear of this visit and asked me to give you his warm greetings.

Many Types of Religious Leaders
I understand that many of you who take a degree here will go on to become religious leaders, mostly in this country, but that some of you will go into a range of other careers. I see my title question, ‘What is Required of a Religious Leader Today?’ applying to both groups. Responsibility for religious leadership is of course carried by those who are called imams, or who have publicly recognised positions as teachers or religious leaders; but that responsibility is also carried by those whose callings are less officially religious. I myself am what Christians call a ‘lay person’ – I am an ordinary Anglican, a member of the Church of England (I was born into the Irish Anglican Church, called the Church of Ireland). I am not a priest or bishop, and have no official role in the church organisation, but through being a theologian and involved in the church through teaching, contributions to meetings and deliberations at various levels, and service on boards of theological colleges I could be seen as having a leadership role. Yet, just as important, I also see that role being exercised as a professor in the University of Cambridge, together with people of all faiths and none. That can be
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at least as complicated and theologically demanding as being a church leader.

Likewise, I see Christians, Muslims and other people of faith in God who take responsibility in any sphere of life – business, politics, law, civil service, non-governmental organisations, and so on – as serving God there and so in a sense exercising religious leadership. In other words, religious leadership can be exercised very visibly when focussed explicitly through the official bodies of a religious community; but it can also be exercised in less obvious ways, distributed across the whole of a society in every walk of life. Both types are important.

Offering a Gift

What can I, as a Christian, say to you who study here and prepare, as Muslims, to take on responsibilities of many sorts? There is a wealth of wisdom that you can learn here within your tradition, and you and your teachers know that far better than I. So I will not try to comment on that, but will take it for granted. My approach will be to think as a Christian about my own understanding of religious leadership today and offer it to you as a gift in order to open a conversation. My approach, of course, has also been influenced by Muslims and others – one of the privileges of being Director of the Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme is that I have had many opportunities to engage with those of other faiths. After this lecture, and perhaps also at another time during my time here in Oman, and even possibly over many years to come, we can have that conversation in order to learn from each other, discussing how our approaches relate to each other, and perhaps even having a respectful dispute. My hope is not so much that we will agree on everything but that we will bring a blessing to each other.

Leadership and Blessing

Blessing is where I want to begin. The more I have thought about leadership the more important blessing has become.
In the book of Genesis in the Bible there is the story of Abraham (at that time called Abram) being called by God:

‘Now the Lord said to Abram, “Go from your country and your father’s house to the land that I will show you. I will make of you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great, so that you will be a blessing. I will bless those who bless you, and the one who curses you I will curse; and in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed.”’ (Genesis 12:1-3)

This is an amazing promise of blessing for ‘all the families of the earth’, and it opens up the horizon of the global common good within which we are called to think and act. Abraham, like many leaders, faces a fundamental challenge to his faith: will he trust in God’s promise and leave his home for ever? For Abraham himself there is the promise that God will bless him and that he himself will be a blessing. This is what I wish to concentrate on for a little while: the leader as one who receives blessing in order to be a blessing and bless others.

How does a leader receive blessing? Utterly central to this is the relationship with God. The life of faith might be seen as a dynamic, God-centred ecology of blessing. God is the source of all blessing, and then it circulates in all directions: God blesses us and all creation, we bless God, we bless each other, creation blesses God, we bless creation.1 All this blessing is not just something general and indefinite: each blessing is particular, and each of the Abrahamic traditions is full of specific blessings for particular occasions and uses. To become a leader is to be blessed in particular ways, and each of our traditions has developed procedures through which we try to discern whether particular people are or are not blessed in ways that suit them to bear the responsibilities of leadership. (Perhaps part of our conversation might be about the different modes of

1 In the Bible this is especially clear in the book of Psalms.
discernment through which our traditions choose leaders – this has been one of the most controversial matters among Christians of different churches.)

God is the ultimate source of these blessings, but mostly they come through other people. The journey towards religious leadership usually leads through key relationships, often with parents, friends, spiritual guides and teachers. I wonder what your journeys have been like. I have been deeply impressed by the importance of successions of teachers in Islam – I remember hearing the Grand Mufti of Egypt, Dr Ali Gomaa, talking about the ‘chains’ of which he is a part (which, he emphasised, include several women scholars in earlier periods). One way of looking at a chain is as a lineage of blessings being passed on across the generations. I am sure most of you could tell of people in such chains who have been formative for you and have been a blessing to you. This is what often gives the deepest motivation for taking on religious responsibilities: gratitude for the blessings received from others, kindling the desire in your turn to be a blessing. I would go so far as to say that one requirement of being a religious leader is to be part of such a person-to-person lineage – we cannot be formed only through the internet, through books or even through being taught in classes. In my own church an essential part of every priest’s training is being apprenticed to an older priest in a parish or other setting.

(iii) Learning to Bless Wisely

But when we look at those who have been a blessing to us and to others, especially those who have most fully communicated God and God’s purposes through their lives as well as their words, we also see how costly and demanding it can be to be a leader. This evening in the Grand Mosque I will speak of the elements required for Christian theology to be wise and creative today, and all that will be said then is relevant to what is required for Christian leadership. I take it for granted that Christian leaders need to be formed in those four aspects of good theology, and I will be interested to hear how far you think that these coincide with the essential areas in which Muslim leaders should be formed.
So, first, Christian leaders should aim to be wise interpreters of scripture and tradition, understanding how to draw on the treasures of the past. Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew says:

‘Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like the master of a household who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old.’ (Matthew 13:52)

Second, therefore, they should also constantly engage in the present with God in prayer and with what is new in our changing world. The past is not to be simply repeated, and God is drawing people towards a future that is very different from the present. So every day there are fresh discernments, judgements and decisions to be made about what in the contemporary world is to be rejected, what is to be welcomed, and what is to be criticised and transformed.

Third, these discernments, judgements and decisions stretch all of a leader’s capacities, and require creative and intelligent thinking, grounded in appreciation of the best available understanding.

Fourth, the leader has to be able to communicate effectively, and so far as possible to listen attentively and to speak and write well.

Those four requirements are not of a sort that can ever be fully met – a leader can always communicate better, think more wisely and creatively, engage more deeply with God and with our world, and understand scripture and tradition more adequately. So more important than having actually achieved them is the dedicated, passionate desire for them, which I name the desire for wisdom. That is the foundation for the most important thing of all: the leader being a blessing in each situation.

I think that ‘wise blessing’ is a better way to talk about Christian leadership than more secular talk of the exercise of power and authority (from the sphere of politics), or effectiveness in organising and managing (from the sphere of business), both of which are common in some Christian circles today. Indeed, I am not completely happy with the concept of leadership itself, which is proba-
bly best understood as a form of responsible and accountable service, inseparable from being a good follower. \(^2\) ‘Wise blessing’ does not deny the importance of power, authority or effectiveness, but emphasises their distinctively theological character.

(iv) Ministry of Blessing

A great many of the activities of a Christian leader involve blessing. In my own tradition this includes blessing the bread and wine in the central celebration variously called the Eucharist, Mass, Holy Communion or Lord’s Supper, and giving blessings after confession of sins and at baptisms, ordinations, weddings, funerals and other occasions. But what I have in mind is far broader than that and not only specific to Christianity. When a community is deliberating over a course of action and the leaders agree to it, this can best be seen as them giving their blessing to it. That is different from having thought it up or being a main supporter of it or being responsible for carrying it out. It is rather the crucial matter of seeking, as the community’s recognised representatives, to discern before God a wise course for the community in this matter. Likewise, the withholding of blessing rejects or delays following a particular course. The same is true when individuals seek guidance. Most Christian leaders do not have power to enforce spiritual, ethical or political advice. Their power is better seen as the power to grant or withhold their blessing. It is perhaps in the matter of whether to support particular people, groups and causes in the wider society that these blessings arouse most concern – one thinks of the great importance attached in American elections to the backing of religious leaders.

A great deal in our world, therefore, can be affected by the blessing given by those with religious responsibility. This is evident in shaping their own communities, in guiding individuals, and in their contribution to the wider society. It is also worth remembering what I called the second type of religious leader - the one who is not the public face of his or her community but whose responsibil-

\(^2\) Jesus said: ‘Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all’ (Mark 9:35).
ity is exercised in government, business, education or some other sphere of society. For all of them their vocations as leaders might be summed up as centring on questions of whether to bless, who to bless, what to bless, when to bless, how to bless and what content a blessing should have.

So whether their blessings are wise or not is of great importance. Their activity in blessing might at its best be seen as a performance combining all four of the elements of wise and creative theology: it should ring true with wise interpretation of scripture and tradition; it should spring from deep engagement with God and discerning involvement with the contemporary world; it should be informed by wise and imaginative thinking; and it should be communicated as effectively and creatively as possible. Undergirding all this is dedication to the blessing, hallowing and glorifying of God. The leading, embracing petition of the main Christian prayer taught by Jesus is ‘Hallowed be your Name’.3

Wise and Creative Inter-Faith Leadership

So, the performance of wise blessing in each situation is what is to be desired and pursued wholeheartedly. I now want to concentrate on a particular situation, the one in which we now are at this moment: Christian-Muslim encounter. When I speak about this in the Grand Mosque yesterday I will sum up the main guidelines for Christian-Muslim relations in a nine-point Muscat Manifesto that states:

---

3 The whole prayer according to Matthew’s Gospel reads: ‘Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come. Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And do not bring us to the time of trial, but rescue us from the evil one’ (Matthew 6:9-13).
Let us aim to:

**Love of God and Neighbour**

*Love God and each other, and have compassion for all God’s creation*

**A Triple Dynamic**

*Go deeper into our own faith, into each other’s, and into commitment to the common good*

**Sources of Wisdom**

*Seek wisdom through our own scripture, history and theology, through each other’s, and through engagement with the arts, sciences, philosophy, and other sources of wisdom*

**Engaging with the Modern World**

*Beware of assimilating to modernity and beware of rejecting it; seek to heal and transform it*

**Partnerships of Difference**

*Form personal relationships, groups, networks and organisations dedicated to inter-faith conversation, collaboration and education at all levels, from international to local.*

**Creative Communication**

*Encourage the best communicators, artists, writers and teachers to spread the message of love of God and neighbour, drawing on the richest sources*

**An Ecology across Generations**

*Cultivate a long-term vision of a habitable world, created and sustained by God for the good of all.*
Signs of Hope

Create signs of hope within and between our faiths, inspired by the letter A Common Word between Us and You and the responses to it.⁴

God and God’s Purposes

Do all this for the sake of God and God’s good purposes.

I want to develop further a few of those points as they relate especially to your calling as Muslim leaders. The question I will try to answer is: what are the three things I would most strongly recommend that you do in the coming years for Christian-Muslim relations? I look forward to discussing with you soon whether you think these are acceptable suggestions.

Before I name the three, let me return to an event a little later in the story of Abraham.

‘King Melchizedek of Salem brought out bread and wine; he was priest of God Most High. He blessed him and said:

“Blessed be Abram by God Most High,

Maker of heaven and earth;

And blessed be God Most High,

Who has delivered your enemies into your hand!”’

(Genesis 14:18-20)

This shows Abraham receiving hospitality and a blessing from a religious leader of another tradition who acknowledges the Creator God. At the heart of Abrahamic inter-faith relations is the giving and receiving of blessings, always in the context of blessing the God who is the source of all blessings. Three of these blessings are friendships across traditions, reading our scriptures together, and building inter-faith organisations together.

⁴ For more on this document, see note 6.
(i)  **Friendship**

I begin with the most personal matter. In studying the Christian ecumenical movement of the twentieth century (of which I will speak further this evening in the Grand Mosque) it is striking how many of the most fruitful developments had at their centre friendships that crossed traditions. I find the same is true in the best inter-faith engagements. It is possible for a faithful Muslim and a faithful Christian to have deep differences over such matters as the naming of God, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the authority of the Bible and the Qur’an, the significance of the Prophet Mohammed, the nature of salvation, and much else, and also to have very different practices regarding, for example, prayer, fasting, holy times, marriage, money, law, and education, yet to be good friends who understand, respect, trust and love each other. Such friendships are an immense blessing, and I am deeply grateful for those Muslim friends who have been given to me.

A friendship is not something that one can plan to make at will, but one can pray for it to be given and be open to it happening. *I suggest that each of you pray to be a blessing to those of other faiths and to receive blessings from them, and also that, if it is God’s will, you may find one or two friends among those with whom you have exchanged blessings.*

(ii)  **Scripture**

One of the greatest blessings we have been given is our scriptures, so it is not surprising that one of the main ways we are able to bless each other is by sharing them. In the Grand Mosque yesterday I spoke of how for the past fifteen years the practice of Scriptural Reasoning, which gathers Muslims, Christians and Jews (or sometimes just two of those traditions) to read and discuss their scriptures, has been the single most important element in my inter-faith experience and that of an increasing number of people in various spheres of life.\(^5\) It is really a matter of common sense that if we

---

\(^5\) For further information about Scriptural Reasoning, see the website of the Society for Scriptural Reasoning, http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/journals/jsrforum/). For some of the best print resources on Scriptural Reasoning, see Chapter 8 in David
want to understand each other more deeply we should study our scriptures together. This has become increasingly recognised in inter-faith engagements, and it has many advantages. Above all, it allows for long term collegiality among the participants, since conversation need never come to an end: the scriptures are endlessly abundant in meaning and there is always a sense that one is just beginning to open up their riches. I have not found anything else that serves so well to sustain ongoing, faith-centred engagement among the Abrahamic traditions.

One of the most important inspirations for joint study of scripture between Muslims and Christians is, as I will discuss this evening, the Muslim letter *A Common Word Between Us and You*. In particular the statement, signed by the Grand Mufti of Egypt and the Archbishop of Canterbury, that emerged from the October 2008 conference on *A Common Word* in Cambridge University and Lambeth Palace, acts as a blessing on the practice when it says:

‘One of the most moving elements of our encounter has been the opportunity to study together passages from our scriptures. We have felt ourselves to have been together before God and this has given us each a greater appreciation for the richness of the other’s heritage as well as an awareness of the potential value in being

---


6 The letter *A Common Word between Us and You* was sent in October 2007 by 138 Muslim scholars and leaders to all the Christian churches. I believe it to be the most important inter-faith statement in the past forty years, since the Second Vatican Council. The letter has one big wise idea, the centrality of love and compassion to both Christian and Muslim traditions, and it uses this as a starting point to engage with Christians and with the current global situation. Most striking of all, it draws on the Qur’an and the Bible together. The text of the letter, along with many of the numerous Christian responses to *A Common Word*, can be found at the official website, www.acommonword.com.
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joined by Jewish believers in a journey of mutual discovery and attentiveness to the texts we hold sacred. We wish to repeat the experience of a shared study of scriptural texts as one of the ways in which we can come, concretely, to develop our understanding of how the other understands and lives their own faith. We commend this experience to others.

I suggest that each of you resolve to engage in shared study of scriptures, as the Grand Mufti and the Archbishop recommend, if the opportunity arises, and that you also bear this in mind as something you might initiate in the future.

If you do, you may find, as I did, that it is also the way into inter-faith friendships.

(iii) Organisation

If one of the great challenges of our century is in relations between Muslims and Christians, then we can be sure that it will not be met successfully without inter-faith organisations. I direct one such organisation in the sphere of education and public understanding, the Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme\(^7\), and it is gratifying to see a blossoming of other organisations in these spheres.\(^8\) Just in the past three weeks I was present in London when a new body was

\(^7\) The Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme (www.cip.divinity.cam.ac.uk) promotes research and teaching which leads to deeper mutual understanding between the three Abrahamic traditions. It has four principal aims: 1) studying actual encounters between the three traditions, in the past and today; 2) bringing together the world’s best current and future scholars working on materials in those traditions, in a way that fosters collaboration; 3) translating the core texts of those traditions for the use of their members in study; and 4) promoting engagement, dialogue and collaboration between the three faiths, and public understanding of them. In the area of public understanding and education CIP’s major initiative is the Cambridge Abraham Project, in collaboration with the Coexist Foundation and others, aiming to build in London a major resource relating the three faiths.

\(^8\) Among these are Yale University’s Center for Faith and Culture, the Prince Alwaleed Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding at Georgetown University, Al Azhar University, the Tabah Foundation in Abu Dhabi, the Tony Blair Faith Foundation, the Coexist Foundation and Kalam Research and Media.
formed, provisionally called the C-1 World Dialogue, co-chaired by the Grand Mufti of Egypt, Dr Ali Gomaa, and the Bishop of London, Rt. Revd Richard Chartres, which it is hoped will be the main coordinator of the *Common Word* process, involving leaders from the areas of religion, the academy, business, politics, non-governmental organisations, and media. When I spoke with Dr Gomaa and Bishop Chartres about this visit to Oman they both asked that I bring you their warm greetings.

*I suggest that each of you consider how you can lend your support and leadership abilities to inter-faith organisations and networks, and if possible be willing to join in founding new ones.*

**Dangers**

Friendships, sharing scriptures and building organisations are among the good possibilities in inter-faith relations, just as blessing wisely is at the heart of good leadership. Yet ‘the corruption of the best is the worst’, and there can be misunderstanding, disappointment and even betrayal in friendships; the scriptures can be used in terrible and violent ways; and organisations can misuse power and fail in their aims. Leadership itself is one of the most dangerous and corruptible roles. It is worth considering how as religious leaders you can guard against the main threats, which I suspect are similar whether you are Muslim or Christian. Here are just three of many possible suggestions that might help in beginning to develop appropriate vigilance regarding leadership.

- Each of our scriptures and traditions has many resources helpful in showing what can go wrong in leadership. Study these, and know the history of the bad examples of leadership as well as the good. In my own Anglican tradition we especially value biographies of leaders by authors who are willing to be critical as well as appreciative.

- Face your fears. Our enemies most often win, not by defeating us, but by dominating our lives with fears. Fear can lead people into horrific attitudes and actions, and above all is hostile to compassion and love. At a recent meeting of the Brookings’ 6th U.S.-Muslim World Forum in Doha, Qatar, Dr Aref Ali Nayed represented the signatories of *A...*
Common Word in replying to the US CentCom Commander General David Petraeus who expounded the features of a “network of networks” that constituted a “Security Architecture” for the Middle East region. Dr Nayed responded with a proposal for a ‘Compassion Architecture’ aiming to be ‘constructive, mending, and healing’ and not dominated by fear and considerations of security. His basic principle is: ‘Compassion is the condition of possibility of true security.’

You will often be tempted to act more from fear than from compassion, and learning to resist that temptation will transform your leadership. Above all, trust in the blessing of God gives confidence that God will have the last word. Note in the Abraham story that God says: ‘The one who curses you I will curse’ (Genesis 12:3), not: ‘The one who curses you, you are to curse in return.’

Watch the way you hold your faith. Both the Bible and the Qur’an are full of questioning, the opening up of possibilities, and passionate desires, as well as many assertions and commands. Yet many current forms of both our faiths are...
dominated by clear, definite and certain assertions and commands that do not allow for the questioning, the range of possibilities, and the overwhelming desire for God and God’s future. One of the dangers of being a religious leader is that you come to think you know too much and therefore can have unquestioning certainty. Humility about the limits of our knowledge is built into both our faiths. Judging all our assertions, guidance and commands is the infinite wisdom of God, who has set us in a history where there is much mystery, much that is unknown, and much that is desired in trust and hope without being clear and certain.

**Most Important of All**

In conclusion, there is the most important matter of all, as has just been affirmed in the final guideline: *Do all this for the sake of God and God’s good purposes.*

I recently spent more than ten years writing a book called ‘*Christian Wisdom: Desiring God and Learning in Love*’\(^\text{10}\), and at the end of it I was, of course, much more aware of the narrow limits of my own understanding and wisdom. But studying what the scriptures and Christian thinkers have to teach about wisdom has given me some of their pearls, and I want to conclude with two of them.

The first is the relation of wisdom to cries. In the Bible wisdom cries out to us to make her our leading desire, and in the midst our world’s cries of suffering and protest, gratitude and joy, God’s wisdom calls us to a discernment of cries and to responding to them with love and compassion in God’s name.

And God’s name is the supreme pearl. We do it all for the sake of God and God’s purposes of wise love and compassion. God is the incomparable reality, whose name is to be hallowed, glorified, praised, adored and loved. As Christians and Muslims we do this

---

very differently, and the deepest and most difficult theological questions are opened up by our worship of God. But at the same time there is opened up the possibility of our deepest engagement with each other for the sake of the God of Abraham. As Melchizedek, out of his very different tradition, said to Abraham: ‘Blessed be God Most High!’ (Genesis 14:20).\footnote{And what about the rest of that verse: ‘... who has delivered your enemies into your hand’? We need to be aware also of the potentially violent, dangerous aspects of our scriptures, which need to be interpreted always in line with the love and compassion of God. The trust is that God’s main way of delivering our enemies into our hands is through making them friends, or at least through bringing about reconciliation, and that this, rather than revenge and violence, is certainly the way we are to follow.}
I am very honoured to speak in one of the finest mosques in the world, and I am inspired by His Majesty Sultan Qaboos bin Said’s leadership in creating a space where understanding between cultures and religions can be advanced. I am also deeply grateful to HE Shaykh Abdullah bin Mohammed Al Salmi, Minister of Endowments and Religious Affairs, for his invitation and hospitality. I would also like to thank all those who have helped in the organisation of my visit and of the two lectures, especially Michael Bos, whose work has done so much for Muslim-Christian relations, and Dr Abdulrahman Al Salmi, editor of the journal Tolerance. I bring warm greetings from the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, Professor Alison Richard: we greatly value Cambridge’s very close links with Oman and trust that they can become even closer in the years ahead. Three days ago His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams, was in Cambridge and was delighted to hear of this visit: he too asked me to convey his warm greetings.

Seeking the Wisdom of God: A triple dynamic

My theme in this lecture is seeking the wisdom we need for living in our time, which according to the Muslim, Christian and Jewish calendars is the fifteenth, twenty-first and fifty-eighth centuries. There are many rich traditions of wisdom in our world, among which I will focus on these three, whose members together make up around half of the world’s population.

We are siblings who share a great deal, and we are also very different. We need to be able to find shared ground. But ‘shared ground’ is a static image, and even more important is the spirit that blows over both what we share and what divides us. It is possible for us to face and discuss our differences without resolving them, while at the same time deepening our mutual respect and friendship. I want
to suggest that the spirit we most need is one that seeks wisdom above all, the wisdom of the God of wisdom, compassion and blessing.

In the Book of Proverbs in the Bible wisdom makes a passionate appeal to us:

*Wisdom cries out in the street;*
*in the squares she raises her voice . . .
Beside the gates, in front of the town,*
*at the entrance of the portals she cries out:*
*‘To you, O people, I call,*
*and my cry is to all that live . . .
Take my instruction instead of silver,*
*and knowledge rather than choice gold;*
*For wisdom is better than jewels,*
*and all that you may desire*
*cannot compare with her . . .’*
*(Proverbs 1:20; 8:3, 4, 10, 11)*

That is a manifesto! What might wisdom urge us to do today? I suggest:

first, to search as deeply as possible within our own scriptures, traditions and understanding of our world today;

second, to share with each other what we find, as we study, discuss, explore and argue together – deep differences call for wisdom in how to question and dispute;

and, third, to collaborate together for the common good of our world in ways that please God – which above all means for the sake of more wisdom, compassion and peace.

So the core vision is of this triple dynamic between the Abrahamic faiths: deeper into our own faith, deeper into understanding the two others, and deeper into engagement with the world for its good.

This is a moment of great danger in the history of our three faiths and of our world. There are tensions, crises and conflicts, and widespread misunderstandings and suspicions. But there are signs
of hope too, and we must believe that God wants us to create many more such signs.

One sign is the fact that I, a Christian theologian, have received your invitation to speak here this evening in the Grand Mosque and lectured in the Institute of Shariah Studies on its magnificent new campus earlier today. In your invitation you asked me to say what I as a Christian have learned from my own tradition that might be of value to Muslims and their relations with Christians. So in the rest of this lecture, while always assuming that the best relations between any two of the Abrahamic faiths will be formed when the third is also involved, I will largely concentrate on Muslim-Christian relations. That is a central global challenge of this century, one that has only begun to be addressed, and it deserves our urgent attention and dedication.

**Christian Resources for the Challenge**

I will first explore some of the theological resources Christianity might draw upon to meet this challenge.

For over twenty years part of my academic work has been editing a textbook, *The Modern Theologians*, now over 800 pages in its third edition, about Christian theology since 1918.\(^1\) It has been one of the most valuable parts of my education. I have had to ask questions such as: Who are the leading Christian theologians of the past hundred years? What are the most important movements? How have different theologies responded to modernity? What has been happening in Christian thinking in Asia, in Africa, in North and South America, and among Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox Christians, Evangelicals, Pentecostals, mainstream Protestants and Anglicans? What have been the main developments in the interpretation of scripture? Which philosophies have been most influential? What about theology that engages with the natural sciences, the social sciences, economics and politics? How has theology thought

about the visual arts, music and film? And what about pastoral and practical theology, and theology of prayer and spirituality?

I have come to the conclusion that the past century has in fact been one of the richest and most fruitful in the whole two thousand years of Christian theology. Why is that? There are many factors that help to explain it. In line with the explosion of education at all levels, far more people have been studying and writing theology, and there has been a huge increase around the world in seminaries, institutes, universities and courses for congregations and lay Christians. Whole new groups of people who previously were largely excluded from theology can now study it, and many of them go on to teach and write it – think of women, black Americans and Africans, lower caste Indians, lay Roman Catholics, and many others. These groups have often shown a passion for learning and for working out theologies that connect strongly with their lives and contexts.

There are other reasons too for this flourishing of Christian theology, perhaps above all the stimulus of responding to unprecedented changes and challenges. The historian Philip Jenkins has described how many signs of energetic life and thought there are in European Christianity at present, as it copes with secular forces and the growth of other faiths. He says that the church that can survive Europe can survive anything! He also raises a fascinating question: are the pressures on European Islam having similar beneficial effects, as European Muslims develop a ‘form of faith that can cope with social change without compromising basic beliefs.’

Some of my most moving conversations with Muslim friends and colleagues have arisen from sharing how each can learn from the other in responding to modern understanding, to academic disciplines, and to religious, social, political and economic pressures.

Europe is at present like a laboratory for exploring what wise, faithful and creative responses might be possible. In Cambridge my colleague in the University of Cambridge Faculty of Divinity and

the Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme, Abdal Hakim Murad (T.J. Winter) has this year begun with others a new Muslim Theological College. This, for the first time in the University’s 800-year history, adds to the rich Cambridge academic environment an independent Muslim institution that is connected to the University. In that environment we hope that the wisdom of different traditions can be studied, tested and worked out in practical ways.

**Key Elements in Wise Theology**

What about the quality of all this theology? In editing *The Modern Theologians*, I, and those many people with whom I have consulted, have faced again and again the difficult questions: Which theologies should be included? Which are the best? What is it that makes a theology wise and creative? I want to share with you my answer to that last question, about the ingredients in wise and creative theology, and then give an example of one development in Christian theology that has many lessons for Muslim-Christian relations.

---

3 The Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme (www.cip.divinity.cam.ac.uk) promotes research and teaching which leads to deeper mutual understanding between the three Abrahamic traditions. It has four principal aims: 1) studying actual encounters between the three traditions, in the past and today; 2) bringing together the world’s best current and future scholars working on materials in those traditions, in a way that fosters collaboration; 3) translating the core texts of those traditions for the use of their members in study; and 4) promoting engagement, dialogue and collaboration between the three faiths, and public understanding of them. In the area of public understanding and education CIP’s major initiative is the Cambridge Abraham Project, in collaboration with the Coexist Foundation and others, aiming to develop in London a major resource relating the three faiths.

4 ‘The Cambridge Muslim College supports the development of training and Islamic scholarship to help meet the many challenges facing Britain today. The college is dedicated to maintaining academic excellence and pushing the boundaries of Islamic learning in the West. Drawing on resources and expertise in Cambridge and beyond, the college’s mission is to help translate the many existing strengths of British Muslims into stronger, more dynamic institutions and communities’ (www.cambridgemuslimcollege.org/about.html). For further information, visit www.cambridgemuslimcollege.org.
So, what are the key elements in a wise Christian theology? I propose four.

First comes wise and creative understanding, interpretation and application of the Bible and Christian traditions. The more I continue as a theologian the more I am convinced that wise interpretation of the scriptures is the most fruitful source of theology, prayer and Christian living. The Bible is in many ways a difficult book, and it can be, and is frequently, dangerously and terribly misused. As the saying goes: ‘The corruption of the best is the worst’. So the sense of gratitude to those who intelligently and faithfully interpret the Bible is immense. Augustine said that any interpretation of scripture that goes against love is false, and the final criterion of true biblical interpretation is whether it is in line with the love of God. I am at present writing a book on the future of Christian theology, with a parallel book on the future of Muslim theology being written by my friend, the scholar Dr Aref Ali Nayed. Dr Nayed reminds me of Augustine when he says that the main criterion of true Quranic interpretation is whether it is in line with the mercy and compassion of God. His theology springs from those infinitely rich words that the Qur’an repeats so often: *Bism Illah Al-Rahman Al-Rahim*, ‘In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful’. He is working out in Muslim terms something that has deep resonances with what I see in the first element in Christian theology: wise and loving retrieval of our sources, above all our scriptures.

The second element is lively engagement in the present with both God and the world. Wise theology requires constant prayer. The God who is worshipped is the living God, who is in constant interaction with people and the whole world, and invites us to take a responsible part in fulfilling his purposes now.

Modern life is extraordinarily diverse and complex, throwing up one challenge after another. Christianity cannot thrive if it tries simply to repeat the past or reject the present. Contemporary life is

---

5 There is also a third parallel book on the future of Jewish theology being written by Professor Steven Kepnes of Colgate University. They are to be published by Blackwell of Oxford in their Manifesto series.
not all good and not all bad. It is a complex mixture, which means that we must constantly ask questions, explore possibilities, search the past with sensitivity, and listen to many other people in order to arrive at responsible discernments, judgements and decisions before God. Then we are able to avoid the two extremes of uncritical assimilation to modernity and uncritical rejection of it.

The theologians of all traditions, especially Jewish, Muslim and Christian, from whom I have learned most, have searched long and hard to discern the purposes of God in relation to the great problems and possibilities of our world. They have offered theology that is creative in the sense that it responds to new situations by seeking the wisdom of the Creator God, who desires to draw us into a good future which is very different from the past and present.

The third element is deeply involved in the first two: wise and creative thinking. I have in mind the great ideas that sum up and develop Christian understanding further. God’s knowledge and wisdom are superabundant and endless and we can only ever fathom a tiny fraction of it. But we believe God wants to draw us deeper and deeper into this wisdom. It stretches and expands us in every way – in prayer and adoration, in study and discussion, in imagination and in action. Good theologians produce generative ideas that enable us to do fuller justice to scriptures and traditions and at the same time to respond better to the world today – its sciences, its philosophies, its religions, its cultures, its ethical dilemmas, its politics and its economics. The challenge of wise and creative thinking has never been greater.

Then, fourth and finally, there is the way Christian theology is expressed and communicated in all directions to all sorts of people. There is, I believe, in most people a hunger and thirst for deep meaning and wisdom. It is sad that so much of what we are offered concerning religion, not only by the media but also by religious communities and by educational institutions, is either ‘junk food’ or good food that is indigestible. The situation is not all bad, but it is serious enough to see the immense need for the best theology to be communicated as widely as possible in appropriate ways.
I vividly remember the impact on me as a fifteen-year old schoolboy in Dublin when I happened to come upon some of the theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who was executed in 1945 for plotting against Hitler. I had never realised such writing existed – it gripped me, stretched my thinking, gave a sense of the reality of God and the power of the Gospel, and opened up some of our age’s major questions. Years later, as I edited *The Modern Theologians*, I came to realise that Bonhoeffer has all the key elements of theological wisdom and creativity: he is a perceptive interpreter of Christian scripture and tradition; he was utterly engaged with God and with the events and issues of his time in church and in society, both in his own country and internationally; he generated marvellously illuminating ideas; and he communicated powerfully not only in academic writings but also in lecturing, broadcasting, sermons, letters, conversation, poetry, and drama – and he even began a novel.

What might these four elements mean to Muslims? As a Christian, I am not the person to answer that. I simply offer them now as a gift, drawn from the Christian experience of theologians seeking wisdom today. As you unwrap it, I will be watching and listening very eagerly for your response.

**The Christian Ecumenical Movement as a Model for Inter-Faith Engagement**

Out of the riches of the past century of Christian theology I want now to concentrate on one that has many lessons for the present century’s inter-faith engagements. This is the Christian ecumenical movement of the twentieth century.6 There are, of course, many differences between attempts at bringing Christians together and attempts to bring different religions together, but there are enough parallels and comparable questions to make it very worthwhile.

The history of the ecumenical movement is remarkable. I do not think that anyone a hundred years ago could have imagined it hap-

---

pening. Never before in history had major religious communities, with hundreds of millions of members, moved from a history of much hostile and suspicious confrontation, sometimes involving conflict and even killing, to a situation in which there was conversation, collaboration and even in some cases federation or union. Yet that is what happened between many of the main Christian churches in the twentieth century. There is still a long way to go, but the change in atmosphere has been dramatic.

As an Irish Anglican member of a 3% Protestant minority in Dublin I experienced the great changes for the better in relations between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland that came largely as a result of the support given to the ecumenical movement by the Roman Catholic Church’s Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). In all the troubles that happened in Northern Ireland after 1968, better relations between the main churches were a major element making for peace and, I believe, a key factor in avoiding the large-scale bloodshed that has happened in many other places.

How did the ecumenical movement happen? It had courageous pioneers, who often formed friendships that crossed church divisions. It required enormous amounts of theological work, the best of which has all four of the elements just mentioned: reinterpretations of the Bible, traditions and historical events, above all those such as the Reformation which led to splits in the church; patient engagement in prayer, conversations, debates and joint projects; inspired thinking that allowed each side to move beyond blockages and see each other as genuinely Christian, despite their deep differences and often very painful histories; and persuasive communication, especially in educational settings, but also through the whole range of media within and beyond the churches.

The ecumenical movement has been like an ecology with many habitats. It has needed engagements at all levels: international, national, regional and local. There have been networks and groups, large and small, of ordinary Christians from different churches who have met together, prayed together, studied the Bible together, and worked for common causes together. One of the most encouraging things has been the amount of cooperation in serving the common good of society through charities, and through practical move-
ments, such as Jubilee 2000 that campaigned for international debt relief.

There has also been institutional creativity at all levels, with new organisations and centres, and transformations of older bodies. I have been especially concerned with these in the area of education. In Cambridge those of us involved in helping to bring to birth the new Muslim Theological College have had as a model the Cambridge Theological Federation, which is independent but linked to the University and has members from the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Methodist, Reformed and Orthodox traditions, as well as centres for Jewish-Christian and Jewish-Muslim relations.

I believe one of the greatest challenges of the twenty-first (or fifteenth or fifty-eighth) century is to bring about a change in consciousness among the world’s Muslims, Christians and Jews (and, of course, others too) that can be compared to that achieved by the Christian ecumenical movement. We need to move beyond our often terrible histories and misunderstandings, and shift from suspicion, confrontation and conflict towards trust, conversation and collaboration, even as we acknowledge our real differences. The vision, energy and courage needed for this is even greater than that required by the ecumenical movement, and it will also require a range of dimensions comparable to those just mentioned. There are already some hopeful signs of this beginning to happen.

**Signs of Hope**

Among the most important and best known in recent years have been two daring Muslim initiatives: the letter *A Common Word between Us and You* sent by 138 Muslim scholars and leaders to all

---

7 There have also been many other initiatives, among the most significant of which have been new organizations, such as the Three Faiths Forum (www.threefaithsforum.org.uk), and new foundations, such as the Coexist Foundation (www.coexistfoundation.net) and the Tony Blair Faith Foundation (www.tonyblairfaithfoundation.org).
the Christian churches;\(^8\) and the inter-faith gatherings initiated by King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia. These are very different and very important, and they should be seen as complementary to each other.

In the brief time available I will focus on *A Common Word*. I see it as the most important inter-faith statement in the past forty years.\(^9\) Do visit the website, www.acommonword.com, to read this remarkable letter on love of God and love of neighbour, and the fascinating replies by church bodies, individual Christians, Jews and others. It continues to be fruitful.\(^10\) Just three weeks ago in London I attended the inaugural meeting of a new body, provisionally called the C-1 World Dialogue. It is co-chaired by the the Anglican Bishop of London, Rt. Revd Richard Chartres, and by the Grand Mufti of Egypt, Dr Ali Gomaa, and when I told them of this visit to Oman they both sent their warm greetings. The C-1 World Dialogue has been largely inspired by *A Common Word*, and HRH Prince Ghazi of Jordan has been a leading figure in both. It is dedicated to sponsoring Muslim-Christian engagement and collaboration for the common good at all levels. The atmosphere at the meeting reminded me of the early days of the ecumenical movement, and I was encouraged that it saw the need for something of comparable scope and intensity. Let us pray that it flourishes.

As a theologian I am impressed by the way *A Common Word between Us and You* has all those elements of wisdom and creativity that I have been discussing. It communicates clearly. It has one big wise idea: the centrality of love and compassion to both of our traditions. It shows passionate devotion to God, and it courageously

---

\(^8\) For more information on *A Common Word*, including the text of the document in several languages, visit www.acommonword.com.

\(^9\) That is, since the Second Vatican Council’s landmark statement on the Roman Catholic Church’s understanding of other faiths in its decree *Nostra Aetate*. The text of the decree can be found in Austin Flannery (ed.), *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents* (Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1996), pp. 569-74.

\(^10\) HRH Prince Ghazi of Jordan has recently summed up the responses to the letter (cf. chapter 1).
and generously engages with Christians and with the current global situation. Most striking of all, it draws on the Qur’an and the Bible together.

Let me explain why I find this reading together of the Qur’an and the Bible especially important. For the past fifteen years I have taken part in Scriptural Reasoning. This involves Muslims, Christians and Jews studying our scriptures together, and it can also be practised between any pair of those faiths. At the heart of it are reading and conversation around the texts that are central to our faith, worship and living. Scriptural Reasoning is now practised in many countries and different settings: universities; seminaries; schools; local congregations; and regional, national and international gatherings. It allows members of different faiths to practice mutual hospitality around the texts they love most, being hosts in relations to their own scripture and guests in relation to the other two scriptures. For me as a Christian it has been a remarkable experience to be able, year after year, to engage deeply with Jews, Muslims and fellow-Christians, and to see this generate mutual understanding, arguments, friendships, educational initiatives and collaborations. I have not found a better way of actualising the triple dynamic of going deeper into one’s own faith, into the faith of others and into the contemporary world.


12 A good example of this is the on-going Christian-Muslim ‘Building Bridges Seminar’, hosted annually by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Some of the proceedings from the second meeting of the seminar, in Doha in 2003, can be found in Michael Ipgrave (ed.), Scriptures in Dialogue: Christians and Muslims Studying the Bible and the Qur’an Together (London: Church House Publishing, 2004).
So it was a special delight in October 2008 when we in the Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme joined with the Archbishop of Canterbury to host a conference on *A Common Word*.\(^{13}\) He had earlier

\(^{13}\) The participants included, on the Muslim side: H.E. Shaykh Prof. Dr. Ali Gomaa Mohamed Abdel Wahab (Grand Mufti, Egypt), Prof. Shaykh Muhammad Sa’id Ramadan Al-Buti (Dean, Department of Religion, University of Damascus, Syria), H.E. Prof Shaykh Abd Allah bin Mahfuz bin Bayyah (Professor, King Abdul Aziz University, Saudi Arabia; Vice President of the International Union of Muslim Scholars, Mauritania), Shaykh Al-Habib Umar bin Muhammad bin Salim bin Hafith (Dean, Dar Al-Mustafa, Yemen), H.E. Shaykh Dr. Mustafa Cerić (Grand Mufti, Bosnia), H.R.H. Prof. Dr. Prince Ghazi bin Muhammad bin Talal (Personal Envoy and Special Advisor of H.M. King Abdullah II, Chairman of the Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, Jordan), Prof. Dr. Ingrid Mattson (Professor of Islamic Studies, Hartford Seminary, USA; President, Islamic Society of North America), Shaykh Al-Habib Ali Zain Al-Abidin Al-Jifri (Founder and Director, Taba Institute, United Arab Emirates), Shaykh Abdal Hakim Murad Winter (Lecturer in Islamic Studies, University of Cambridge; Director of the Muslim Academic Trust, UK), Prof. Dr. Aref Ali Nayef (Former Professor, Pontifical Institute for Arabic and Islamic Studies; Senior Advisor, Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme; Libya), Dr Ibrahim Kalin (Director, SETA Foundation, Ankara, Turkey; Asst. Professor, Georgetown University), Shaykh Amr Mohamed Helmy Khaled (Islamic Missionary, Preacher and Broadcaster; Founder and Chairman, Right Start Foundation International, Egypt), Ayatollah Prof. Dr. Seyyed Mostafa Mohaghegh Ahmad Abadi Damad (Dean of Department of Islamic Studies, The Academy of Science of Iran; Professor of Law and Islamic Philosophy, Tehran University, Iran), H.E. Dr. Abdulaziz Otham Al-Twaijri (Director-General, Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Saudi Arabia), Prof. Dr. Abderrahmane Taha (President, Wisdom Circle for Thinkers and Researchers, Morocco), Dr. Muhammad Suheyl Umar (Director, Iqbal Academy, Pakistan); Mr. Sohail Nakhhooda (Editor-in-Chief, Islamica Magazine, Jordan), and Mr. Fuad Nahdi (President, Radical Middle Way; Specialist Member, Christian Muslim Forum, UK).

Participants on the Christian side included: The Most Revd and Right Hon. Dr. Rowan Williams (Archbishop of Canterbury, UK), His Beatitude Gregorios III Laham (Melkite Greek Catholic Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, of Alexandria and of Jerusalem), Metropolitan Gregorios Yohanna Ibrahim (Metropolitan, Syrian Orthodox Archdiocese of Aleppo, Syria), The Rt Revd Michael Nazir-Ali (Bishop of Rochester, Church of England; Co-President of the Anglican Communion’s Network for Inter-Faith Concerns), The Rt Revd David Hamid (Bishop in Europe, Church of England), The Rt Revd Dr Josiah Idowu-Fearon (Bishop of Kaduna, Nigeria; Co-President of the Anglican Communion’s Network for Inter-Faith Concerns), Professor Iain Torrance (President, Princeton Theological Seminary, USA), Professor Frances Young (Professor Emeritus, Formerly Pro-Vice-Chancellor, University of Birmingham, UK), Professor David Ford (Regius Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge; Director, Cambridge Inter-Faith Pro-
A.3. A Muscat Manifesto

in the summer of 2008 written the most substantial response so far, *A Common Word for the Common Good*. It was the most distinguished group of Muslim scholars and leaders ever to have gathered in Britain. Central to the conference was discussion of *A Common Word* and the study of the Qur’an and the Bible together. The communiqué issued at the end of it by the Grand Mufti of Egypt, Dr Ali Gomaa and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Rowan Williams, said:

‘One of the most moving elements of our encounter has been the opportunity to study together passages from our scriptures. We have felt ourselves to have been together before God and this has given us each a greater appreciation for the richness of the other’s heritage as well as an awareness of the potential value in being joined by Jewish believers in a journey of mutual discovery and attentiveness to the texts we hold sacred. We wish to repeat the experience of a shared study of scriptural texts as one of the ways in which we can come, concretely, to develop our understanding of how the other understands and lives their own faith. We commend this experience to others.’

If we want to act on this recommendation, as I suggest we should, it must be done in partnership – and this is, indeed, already happening.

---

programme, UK), Professor Miroslav Volf (Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale Divinity School; Director, Yale Center for Faith and Culture, USA), Prof. Oddbjørn Leirvik (Professor of Interreligious Studies, University of Oslo, Norway), Prof. Fr Emmanuel Clapis (Professor Ordinarius, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, USA; Ecumenical Patriarch), Abbot Timothy Wright OSB (Advisor on Interreligious Affairs to the Abbot Primate of the Order of St. Benedict), The Revd Prof. Christian Troll SJ (Honorary Professor, Kolleg St. Georgen, Germany), The Revd Dr. Daniel Madigan SJ (Woodstock Theological Center, Georgetown University, USA), Dr. Nicholas Adams (Academic Director, Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme, UK), Revd Dr. Mindawati Perangin-angin (Head of the Ecumenical Bureau of the Karo Batah Protestant Church of Indonesia), Pfarrin. Susanna Faust (Representative for Interreligious Dialogue, Ecumenical Center, Evangelical Church of Germany), and Revd Canon Anthony Ball (Archbishop of Canterbury’s Secretary for International and Inter-Religious Relations, UK).
One further comment on *A Common Word* needs to be added. It is important not just for relations between Muslims and Christians. It also greatly helps internal relations within each faith community. Many Muslims have seen *A Common Word* as a major achievement in Muslim unity across traditions of Islam and across global regions; likewise, a remarkably varied set of Christians have converged in responding to it. One of the most exciting religious prospects for our century is that inter-faith and intra-faith engagements might mutually reinforce each other. This has already begun to be realised by the most significant initiative within Christian ecumenism in the past decade, that of Receptive Ecumenism, led by the Centre for Catholic Studies in the University of Durham. In its last major conference in Durham in January 2009 Receptive Ecumenism engaged in dialogue with Scriptural Reasoning in order to develop a complementary practice among Christian

---

14 The preparation for the Archbishop of Canterbury’s response, *A Common Word for the Common Good*, included a great deal of consultation, culminating in a gathering in Lambeth Palace on Sunday June 1st 2008 of scholars from different churches, who next day were joined in Church House, London, by about fifty leaders of churches, including World Council of Churches, Roman Catholic, several Orthodox (including leaders from the Middle East), Methodist, Reformed, Evangelical, and others. They had a draft of Dr Williams’ response and agreed that he should send one in line with what they unanimously approved. The Yale-sponsored statement welcoming *A Common Word* and published as a full-page advertisement in the New York Times in November 2007 also had a wider range of Christian signatories, including many leading Evangelicals. The World Council of Churches held a meeting of representatives of member churches in January 2008 to discuss *A Common Word* and later issued a statement, ‘Learning to Explore Love Together. Suggestions to the Churches for Responding to ‘A Common Word’’. In each case there were close links between intra-Christian engagement and later Christian-Muslim meetings. In each case also there was strong collaboration between church leaders and academics. The internal workings of the Roman Catholic Church are not in the public domain, but it is clear that there was considerable debate before the decision to set up the Catholic-Muslim Forum between the Vatican and the signatories of A Common Word, which met for the first time in Rome in November 2008.

15 See the Receptive Ecumenism website, [http://www.centreforcatholicstudies.co.uk/?cat=6](http://www.centreforcatholicstudies.co.uk/?cat=6), as well as the recent volume *Receptive Ecumenism and the Call to Catholic Learning: Exploring a Way for Contemporary Ecumenism*, ed. Paul Murray (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
churches. Wise reading of our scriptures remains the central, demanding task for Muslims, for Christians, and for both together.

**Future Christian-Muslim Relations: A Manifesto**

I will now sum up this lecture (including some things only hinted at in the lecture but dealt with elsewhere\(^\text{16}\)) in a set of basic guidelines for improving inter-faith relations and the contribution of our faiths to the rest of the world.\(^\text{17}\) This is the manifesto, in nine points.

Let us aim to:

**Love of God and Neighbour**

*Love God and each other, and have compassion for all God’s creation*

**A Triple Dynamic**

*Go deeper into our own faith, into each other’s, and into commitment to the common good*

**Sources of Wisdom**

1. *Seek wisdom through our own scripture, history and theology, through each other’s, and through engagement with the arts, sciences, philosophy, and other sources of wisdom*

---


\(^\text{17}\) These provide a broad framework. A more detailed proposal for Christian-Muslim relations is given in the final section of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s response, *A Common Word for the Common Good*. This is the most comprehensive template to have been proposed in recent years by a religious leader and it deserves thorough discussion and implementation.
Engaging with the Modern World

2. *Beware of assimilating to modernity and of rejecting it; seek to heal and transform it*

Partnerships of Difference

3. *Form personal relationships, groups, networks and organisations dedicated to inter-faith conversation, collaboration and education at all levels, from international to local*

Creative Communication

4. *Encourage the best communicators, artists, writers and teachers to spread the message of love of God and neighbour, drawing on the richest sources*

An Ecology across Generations

5. *Cultivate a long-term vision of a habitable world, created and sustained by God for the good of all*

Signs of Hope

6. *Create signs of hope within and between our faiths, inspired by A Common Word and the responses to it.*

God and God’s Purposes

7. *Do all this for the sake of God and God’s good purposes*\(^\text{18}\)

There is a Muscat Manifesto. Let us pray that God will bless our efforts and generously surprise us!

---

\(^{18}\) For a Christian understanding of the significance of ‘for God’s sake’ see Ford, *Christian Wisdom*, Chapters 3, 4, and 7.
Interview with Muna Abu Sulayman

Q: Being one of the eminent supporters of bridging the gap between the Middle East and the West: Do you feel the willingness for Dialogue has improved since 2006?

There is a lot more interest with the new Obama administration to show high level support for Dialogue, as exemplified by the President’s speech in Turkey during the Alliance of Civilization meeting, instead of sending in a high level official.

However, the rest of the world has been working on this issue for a while, take for instance the Common Word initiative that occurred in Yale. The problem was and has been that without the US’s engagement and support, not many of the initiatives could be effectively implemented.

Q: Where do you see improvements?

I think that there is tremendous improvement on the academic side in listening to the other side, to allowing a different point of view to be represented I believe that there was a huge fear felt by the universities of being attacked by organizations whose sole purpose was to smear moderates and credible academicians, and they worked for a while in the US, and to a much lesser extent Europe. Credible and thought provoking scholarship was all but eliminated from the discourse.

But, now, people are realizing that if dialogue is not used to bridge the gaps that exist, the consequences of marginalization, economic disparity, and civil wars is almost certain – even in first world countries that have significant number of minorities.

I think also moderates everywhere are shocked that extremists are being elected to governmental positions or
running on Hate agenda all over the world from Africa to Denmark.

Q: Whom do you recognize as main supporters for these improvements?

Very courageous leaders who understand that if there is not a change, the consequences of youth growing up with hatred and suspicion will make the world a much worse place to live in and will spill over in other areas, for example, even shared environmental concerns will be used as chips and needed refers will not be aired, discussed, or used.

Q: Where do you see fall backs?

Fall backs occur at many levels. There needs to be a better education system that works against the existing stereotypes in each society and helps minorities to achieve economic equality with the rest of society.

There also needs to be an assurance of freedom to worship everywhere (which is very different from proltieraziting, and that is not such a given right). I think that there are many forms of overt and covert religious discrimination practiced by many first world and 3rd world countries and it is not acceptable anymore not to be able to worship in peace.

The definition of democracy needs to be also expanded to allow for different forms of consensual governance. The US and European models are better than most, but they are not perfect. More importantly, they cannot not be implemented in countries where illiteracy or corruption run high. So new models need to be developed and accepted.

The major fall back in the Islamic world’s relationship with the West, is the Israeli and Palestinian issue. The new administration knows this and is working on it. It is the crux and symbol of the colonial past and double standards that were imposed. If a Just solution was found and carried
out, much of the tension would be cut, and any support for extremist on either side will be withdrawn.

Q: Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?

There are too many players who are involved historically and currently. The blame is not equal, however, though everyone shares in it.

If we discuss change and reform, then I place the blame on the financial sector, which has not helped support positive humanitarian and social change that comes from within cultures. It is not impossible, but very hard, to have foundations and corporations put significant continuous and sustainable support to solve these cultural and social problems that face the world.

Q: As a thought leader, what do you want to see coming in place from a civil society point of view?

I would love to see a lot more work being done on Human dignity and rights issues. There is much that is needed to be done all over the world, to help people recognize their rights, to actually help them define those rights in a way that is modern, consistent with the rest of the world, yet not disrespectful to their traditions and culture.

That is a very hard line to walk, especially with women being abused in the name of culture, but pushing for extreme reformation while making people feel that their background is not respected creates in many areas a backlash that takes years to recover from.

We have to take the time to look at a people’s history, their stories, to understand the reasons for some of the practices that we would like to see changed, and then start working from within the culture for it.

It is not as grandstanding as having huge sweeping announcements to what is and is not acceptable to a bunch of
people that make up committee created in a far flung place distant from those that need the Human rights organization’s help. But it is way more effective.

Q: Where do you see this growing easier: in the Middle East or in the West?

There are moderates in both worlds who want to see the globe becoming a better place to live in, a more just place. I think eventually those will win out the arguments, but, it will never get easier. Too many people benefit from wars, stife, and discord.

Q: Have you experienced any best practice in the field of civil society within the last 12 months? In case yes, please name your top 3 in the region and in the West.

I think the media initiatives that are being launched are some of the best way so reaching the public.

King Abdullah’s Dialogue initiative and financial support for it will help give the eastern world some needed push to be able to work on their part.

Q: What is in your expectation concerning the disposition towards the Dialogue between the religions for the next 6 months: is it going to grow or remain where it is or decrease – and why?

The willingness to Dialogue with the other will increase, but so will the expectations of implementation of cross border initiatives to help decrease hostiles and tensions.
Interview with Hassan Fattah

Q: As The National is one of the eminent supporters of bridging the gap between the Middle East and the West: Do you feel the willingness for Dialogue has improved since 2006?

Yes.

Q: Why?

There is a greater sense of a listening ear, a readiness for dialogue and a short-term optimism about dealing with the West.

Q: Where do you see improvements?

A greater willingness to argue, which means a greater willingness to engage.

Q: Where do you see fall backs?

There is a short window for action, and many will be expecting results, especially young people who felt alienated.

Q: As a business man, what do you want to see coming in place from a corporate point of view?

Greater accountability, greater engagement with the community.

Q: Where do you see this growing easier: in the Middle East or in the West?

In the Middle East, where the economic crisis does not appear to have quite the impact as elsewhere.
Q: What is in your expectation concerning the disposition towards the Dialogue between the religions for the next 6 months: is it going to grow or remain where it is or decrease – and why?

It may increase as each community becomes introspective. The past decade of crises has uncovered the wide expanses within conservatives and liberals in all religion that must be healed to move forward.
Inauguration C-1 World Dialogue, London, March 30th, 2009
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1. How Agenda-Setting Works
by Holli A. Semetko

The world outside and “the pictures in our heads” are described by prominent journalist Walter Lippmann, in his 1922 classic book *Public Opinion*, as connected by the media. Today, in many countries around the globe, 24/7 news media compete locally and globally to influence public perceptions of the world and the most important issues of the day. That said, most citizens turn to their national or regional news media for information so their ability to learn about recent events in the rest of the world largely depends on what is presented in those ‘home’ outlets.

Media Tenor has produced volumes of systematically coded content data on issues and actors reported in the news in countries around the world. Their research provides strong evidence for an agenda-setting effect of the media on public opinion. The agenda-setting hypothesis holds that the most prominent issues in the news are also the issues that become the most important in public opinion. There is a long history of research into agenda-setting effects with the vast majority of studies lending support to the hypothesis,¹ and Media Tenor’s impressive cross-national over-time data are an important and unique addition to the evidence in support of agenda-setting.

The concept of framing goes beyond agenda-setting to focus on what people think and talk about by studying how they think and talk about issues. How a problem or issue is ‘framed’ in news reporting can result in changes in public perceptions about who is responsible for the problem. Our understanding of frames and fram-

---

ing effects has been advanced considerably by research that has been conducted in various national and transnational contexts.\(^2\)

Media Tenor has gone beyond many of the aforementioned traditional studies to demonstrate a correlation between the rate at which media cover a story and the extent to which people think that this story is important, and that this occurs repeatedly over time. Media Tenor has identified the ‘awareness threshold’ as the volume of coverage necessary for an agenda-setting effect which is enhanced by the use of reliable sources and the tone of the story. An article in the *Harvard Business Review* demonstrates how the awareness threshold operates in the management of reputation.\(^3\)

Reputation is not only important for companies. Countries are also acutely aware of the challenges surrounding reputation, which have an impact on and are influenced by diplomatic and trade relations.

Media Tenor, together with its scientific advisory board, developed the Dialogue Index to compare countries’ news coverage and how it may enhance or diminish dialogue about Muslim and western political values, religions, and cultures. The Dialogue Index is applied to an analysis of news content from 24 countries, with native speakers coding the media content, including 12 Muslim-majority countries and 12 non-Muslim majority countries. The Dialogue Index gives us a unique opportunity to compare countries systematically, while also providing interesting examples of the influence of national contexts. The findings are both fascinating and controversial, as is some of the most widely read scholarship in the field.

\(^2\) Kolmer, Christian and Schatz, Roland: The Portrayal of the War in the Middle East: Media Analysis of News Coverage by ARD and ZDF, in: Liepach, Martin; Melischek, Gabriele and Seethaler, Josef (eds.): Jewish Images in the Media, Vienna 2007 [= Relation n.s. vol. 2], pp. 139-150.

2. Monitoring the Muslim-West Dialogue
   Among the People
   by David W. Moore

2.1. Measuring Religious Tolerance
A crucial element in the Muslim-West dialogue is an understanding of what the people who live in the Muslim and Western countries think about each other and how those views change over time. In the long run, we all hope for public tolerance – and even acceptance – of the diversity of religious and political views held by many different people around the world. But in the short run, we recognize the hard truth that some people of all religious affiliations are not willing to accept others if they hold divergent beliefs.

Getting an accurate assessment of the state of religious tolerance is a crucial element to understanding the scope of the problem of easing tension among the people who live in Western and Muslim countries. And monitoring the level of public religious tolerance over time will give us insights into how effective are the many efforts that are being made to improve Muslim-West relations.

The January 2008 report from the World Economic Forum Cl00 on the State of Dialogue between Islam and the West included a section devoted to measuring the people’s perceptions of relations between the two groups of countries. This was an important first step in including public opinion into an understanding of West-Muslim dialogue. Even more relevant for the future, however, is to focus on what people think of each other – how willing they are to work with each other, to trust each other, to have their children educated in the same schools, even just to live in the same country.

This chapter presents one way of undertaking a systematic effort to measure, in a truly objective way, the level of religious tolerance that exists among the Western and Muslim countries. Many of the details in the following proposal could be modified, but the overall approach is one we propose as a way to provide needed information from the people themselves.
2.2. Index of Religious Tolerance (or Religious Acceptance)

The proposal is to conduct at least an annual survey of people in the predominantly Muslim countries and in the major Western countries, in order to measure their tolerance of people whose religious orientation is different from their own. The exact proposed questionnaire is included at the end of this chapter, but here is a description of the major elements.

Nature of the Survey

It is proposed that in each of the targeted countries, a poll be conducted at least once a year (and perhaps twice a year) of a representative sample of all people in that country. Ideally, the sample size in each country would be about 1,000 people. The questionnaire would include four types of questions:

1) A set of introductory questions that gradually introduce the topic and that also measure overall how optimistic people are about the state of international relations in the world.

2) A few questions that ask people for their perceptions of Muslim-West tensions.

3) Eight core questions that directly measure people’s tolerance for others with different beliefs, questions that will be used to construct an Index of Religious Tolerance (or Index of Religious Acceptance).

4) Standard background questions that include respondents’ demographic characteristics (such as gender, age, income, education), religious affiliation, and use of the news media.

Introductory Questions

The first four questions of the proposed questionnaire are designed primarily to let respondents get familiar with the interviewer, by answering very easy and very general inquiries about their lives. The first two questions ask about how happy they are overall, and how happy they are compared with their friends and neighbors.
The next two questions measure how optimistic people are about their own lives, and then how optimistic they are about the economic and political situation in the world. By themselves, these questions help set the stage for understanding people’s reactions to possible Muslim-West tensions.

**Perceptions of Muslim-West Tensions**

While many political observers would no doubt argue that tensions between Muslim and Western countries are substantial, that doesn’t mean that all people who live in these countries share that perception. The questions in this section are designed to provide an objective assessment of what the public is thinking.

Specifically these questions measure how many people perceive Muslim-West tensions as serious, whether they think the tensions are getting worse, what they think are the root causes (religious or economic/political differences), how important those tensions are to them personally in their daily lives, and what they think would be the best way to reduce those tensions. These questions also provide some background on whether people identify more strongly with their country or their religion, and whether they prefer a theocratic or democratic type of government.

These questions are intended for background information, to help understand the conditions which contribute to people’s tolerance of different beliefs.

**Core Questions for the Index of Religious Tolerance (Index of Religious Acceptance)**

These questions measure the willingness of people to associate with other people whose religious backgrounds are different from their own. Specifically, each question asks all groups how willing they are to associate with Jews, with Christians, and with Muslims under specific circumstances.

One of the challenges in asking such questions is that many respondents are not comfortable answering a direct question about their own willingness to associate with people of another faith.
When interviewed, people are not inclined to admit that they personally would not like to live with other people whose beliefs are different from their own. Some people, of course, wouldn’t mind admitting their bias against others, but many others would. Thus, if the questions are asked directly about respondents’ feelings, the results could underestimate the actual level of tensions that exist.

One way to overcome this problem is to ask respondents whether the people they associate with (their friends and neighbors) are willing to associate with people of a different faith. Research has shown that people are much more willing to admit that their acquaintances have hostile feelings toward other people of different faiths than they are to admit that they personally have those feelings. Thus, asking respondents to describe the feelings of their friends and neighbors, rather than their own feelings, allows respondents to admit that hostile feelings exist without having to point a finger at themselves. This technique has been shown to be more reliable in measuring the kind of sentiments that we need to assess the level of tensions between Muslims and non-Muslims.

Six of the questions are designed to measure what sociologists refer to as “social distance.” The scale goes from the closest kind of interaction at one end of the spectrum (willingness to allow “others” to marry into one’s family) to the opposite end of the spectrum (willingness to allow “others” even to live in the same country). In between are four additional situations: willingness to have their children educated with the children of “others”; willingness to see a doctor who is from the “other” group; willingness to work at the same place as “others”; and willingness to live in the same neighborhood as “others.”

In addition, this section includes a question that asks whether respondents generally trust the “others”, and another question that asks whether respondents think it would be better for everyone to be converted to one faith or whether it would be better for there to be many types of religions for different people.

Taken altogether, these eight questions form the basis for constructing a numerical Index, based on the number of questions to which respondents give a “tolerant” answer compared with the number indicating lack of tolerance. This Index of Religious Toler-
ance (or Index of Religious Acceptance) can be monitored over time, to see whether people are becoming more tolerant, or accepting, of others who have a different faith.

Separately, each question that constitutes the Index can also be monitored over time to track the changes in public tolerance in each of the areas measured.

2.3. Challenges to an International Survey of Religious Attitudes

Numerous challenges are associated with this proposed project. Such challenges include problems of sampling, timing, method of interviewing, translation, and conduct of the survey. Nevertheless, many polling organizations over the years have conducted surveys in different countries, so while the challenges are substantial, they should in no way prevent the project from being done.

Sampling

It’s important that in all countries the sample be scientifically chosen to represent the adult population in that country. Some polling organizations will cut costs by using non-scientific selection methods, but the results of such surveys are not reliable. Some researchers have been known, for example, to sample people by going to crowded areas and randomly selecting people for the interviews. Other researchers have invited people to participate in surveys by going online and answering surveys on the computer. It is crucial to measuring the true state of tensions among the people in Western and Muslim countries that rigorous, scientific sampling procedures be used. Only with such samples can we have confidence in the validity of the surveys.

Mode of Interviewing

In countries where the vast majority of people have access to a telephone, interviewing respondents on the phone would be preferable from a cost point of view. And telephone interviewing in these countries can produce valid representative samples. However, in many countries, where large proportions of people do not have
telephones, conducting telephone interviews would badly skew the results in favor of those with higher incomes and education – those who can afford the telephones. Thus, in these countries, it is imperative that researchers design scientifically representative samples that provide for in-home, face-to-face interviewing.

**Timing**

In order for the results to be comparable, it is important that the surveys be undertaken in roughly the same time frame in each country. Otherwise, some major international event could affect people’s views about Muslim-West tensions, and even about their willingness to associate with others of a different religion – and if some countries are surveyed before the event and some afterward, the comparability of results could be compromised.

In 2008, the Gallup Organization surveyed 21 countries on the people’s perceptions of Muslim-West tensions, but some countries were surveyed as much as six months earlier than others. Ideally, surveys of all the countries should be conducted in the same month of each year. If the surveys are conducted semi-annually, ideally the same two months of each year should be chosen for longitudinal comparisons (such as February and August).

**Polling Organizations**

In many countries, there are highly qualified indigenous polling organizations that could conduct the surveys. Also, there are many international polling organizations that can survey respondents in many different countries. It is likely that this project will use a combination of international polling firms and indigenous polling organizations, in order for the surveys to be conducted at roughly the same time in all of the countries.

A major challenge in using different polling organizations, however, is to ensure that they all follow the same procedures for interviewing and collecting data.
Language and Translation

The challenge to translation is no different from other tasks involving people speaking different languages. In the case of cross-national surveys, however, question wording can have a major effect on answers, so ensuring that the questionnaires all transmit the same meaning in the different languages is especially important.

Also, the questions in the survey, especially the core questions for the Index, have been designed to minimize complicated scales. Research has shown that for cross-national comparisons, it’s important to keep the scales as simple as possible. Thus, the core questions are dichotomous, with respondents indicating that their friends and neighbors are “willing” or “not willing” to associate with people of other religions, with a middle position accepted if volunteered.

Governmental Restrictions on Surveying

For most countries, surveying the general public is not a problem. But in some countries, local laws and restrictions can impede such efforts. It will be important in such cases to work with authorities in order to allow unfettered access to the general public for purposes of the survey. Otherwise, the reliability of the results will be suspect.

2.4. Conclusions

One of the most crucial elements of Muslim-West tensions is the willingness of people around the world to at least tolerate, and even accept, the diversity of religious views that exist. This project would directly measure such sentiments. It would provide for an annual, or semi-annual, scientific update on the state of public religious tolerance around the world. And it would help assess the success of efforts to improve relations among Muslim and Western countries over time, while providing insights into why people react the way they do.

While there are many challenges to surveying numerous countries within the same time frame, using the same questionnaire, they are by no means insurmountable if sufficient resources are committed
to the project. Given the importance of knowing how people feel about others with different beliefs, such a commitment of resources would seem to be an important element in the efforts to improve Muslim-West tensions.
Appendix: Proposed Questionnaire for Monitoring Views of the People about Jews, Christians, and Muslims

Introduction (to be adapted to each country)

Section 1 – Introductory Questions

A1. Overall, do you feel very happy, a little happy, or not happy?

1 Very happy
2 A little happy
3 Not happy
4 No response

A2. Compared with the people you usually associate with – such as your friends and neighbors – do you think you are more happy than they are, less happy, or about the same?

1 More happy
2 Less happy
3 About the same
4 No response

A3. Do you feel mostly optimistic about your future, mostly pessimistic, or somewhere in-between?

1 Mostly optimistic
2 Mostly pessimistic
3 Somewhere in-between
4 No response

A4. Thinking now about the situation in the world as a whole – do you feel mostly optimistic about the future, mostly pessimistic, or somewhere in-between?

1 Mostly optimistic
2 Mostly pessimistic
3 Somewhere in-between
4 No response
Section 2 – Perceptions of Muslim-West Tensions

Now I’d like to ask you some questions about differences between mostly Muslim countries and countries from the West.

B1. Do you think there are serious tensions between the Muslim countries and Western countries, or are the tensions not serious?

1  Serious
2  Not serious
3  (Unsure)
4  (No response)

B2. In the past year, do you think the tensions between Muslim and Western countries have increased, or decreased, or remained about the same?

1  Increased
2  Decreased
3  Remained about the same
4  (Unsure)
5  (No response)

B3. Do you think the differences between Muslim countries and the Western countries are mostly because of religious differences, mostly economic differences or mostly political differences?

1  Mostly religious
2  Mostly economic
3  Mostly political
4  (Unsure)
5  (No response)

B4. How much do the tensions between Muslim countries and Western countries affect you personally in your daily life?

1  A lot
2  A little
3  Not at all
4  (No response)
B5. Do you think that tensions between Muslim countries and Western countries are caused mostly by political leaders who don’t understand each other, or mostly by real differences in beliefs among the people?

1. Mostly because politicians don’t understand each other
2. Mostly because real differences in beliefs among the people
3. Both (volunteered)
4. (No response)

B6. Which do you personally identify with more strongly – your religion or your country? Or do you think of them as being equal?

1. Religion
2. Country
3. Both
4. (No opinion)

B7. What kind of political system do you think is better for the world:

1. Where people vote for their top political leaders,
2. Where the top political leaders are also the top religious leaders
3. Or is neither system better?
4. (Other – No response)
Section 3 – Core Questions for the Index of Religious Tolerance

Now I’m going to ask you a few questions about how people you associate with—such as your friends and neighbors—feel about most Jews, most Christians, and most Muslims. First—

C1 – Living in Neighborhood

C1a. Are the people you usually associate with generally willing—or generally not willing—to have JEWS live in their neighborhood?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Not willing (Most are not willing)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C1b. What about having CHRISTIANS live in their neighborhood?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Unwilling (Most are unwilling)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C1c. And what about having MUSLIMS live in their neighborhood?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Unwilling (Most are unwilling)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)
C2 – Working at Same Place

C2a. Are the people you usually associate with generally willing – or generally not willing – for JEWS to work at the same place where they or other members of their family work?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C2b. What about CHRISTIANS working with members of their family?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C2c. What about MUSLIMS working with members of their family?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C3 – Marrying into Family

C3a. Are the people you usually associate with generally willing – or generally not willing – for JEWS to marry into their family?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)
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C3b. What about CHRISTIANS marrying into their family?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C3c. What about MUSLIMS marrying into their family?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C4 – Going to a Doctor

C4a. Are the people you usually associate with generally willing – or generally not willing – to go to a doctor who is a JEW?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C4b. What about going to a doctor who is a CHRISTIAN?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)
C4c. What about going to a doctor who is a MUSLIM?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Not willing (Most are not willing)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C5 – Living in the Same Country

C5a. Are the people you usually associate with generally willing – or generally not willing – to have JEWS live in the same country they do?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Not willing (Most are not willing)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C5b. What about having CHRISTIANS live in the same country they do?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Not willing (Most are not willing)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C5c. What about having MUSLIMS live in the same country they do?

1 Willing (Most are willing)
2 Not willing (Most are not willing)
3 Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4 (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)
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C6 – Children Educated in Same Classrooms

C6a. Are the people you usually associate with generally willing – or generally not willing – to have JEWISH children be educated in the same classroom as their own children?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C6b. What about CHRISTIAN children being educated in the same classroom as their own children?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C6c. What about MUSLIM children being educated in the same classroom as their own children?

1. Willing (Most are willing)
2. Not willing (Most are not willing)
3. Some are willing, some unwilling (VOLUNTEERED)
4. (No opinion) (VOLUNTEERED)

C7 – Need for Everyone to Convert

What do you personally think would be better –

1. That all people be converted to the same religion
2. That there be many types of religion for different people
3. Or doesn’t it matter to you one way or the other?
4. (No opinion)
C8 – How Much Trust in Others

In general, how much do you trust each of the following – do you trust them a lot, a little, or not at all? First –

C8a. Do you trust most JEWS:

1 A lot
   A little, or
3 Not at all?
4 (No opinion)

C8b. Do you trust most CHRISTIANS:

1 A lot
2 A little, or
3 Not at all?
4 (No opinion)

C8c. And do you trust most MUSLIMS:

1 A lot
2 A little, or
3 Not at all?
4 (No opinion)

Section 4 – Demographic Questions

D1. Do you identify with a particular religion, or not?

1 yes
2 no [SKIP TO D3]
3 (No response) [SKIP TO D3]
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D2. (If yes) Which religion do you most closely identify with?

1 Muslim
2 Christian
3 Jewish
4 Hindu
5 Other
6 (No response)

D2a. (If Muslim) Which do you most closely identify with:

1 Shi’a
2 Sunni
3 Sufi, Ahmadiyya, or
4 Other?
5 (No response)
6 (No response)

D2b. (If Christian) Which do you most closely identify with:

1 Protestant
2 Roman Catholic
3 Eastern Orthodox, or
4 Other Christian?
5 (No response)

D2c. (If Jewish) Do you consider yourself a Secular Jew, a Traditional Jew, or an Orthodox Jew?

1 Secular
2 Traditional
3 Orthodox
4 (No response)

D3. Apart from weddings, funerals, and christenings, do you ever attend religious services, or not?

1 Yes
2 No
3 (No response)
D3a. (If yes) How often
1. Few times a year
2. About once a month
3. Several times a month
4. About once a week
5. More often than once a week
6. (No response)

D4. How often, if ever, do you pray:
1. At least once a day
2. Less than once a day, or
3. Never?
4. (No response)

D4a. (If at least once a day) On average, how many times a day do you pray?
1. One time
2. Two times
3. Three times
4. Four times
5. Five times
6. Six or more times
7. (No response)

D5. Which comes closest to your view of God:
1. You believe there is a personal God
2. You believe there is some sort of spirit or life force
3. You think there is NO God or spirit or life force, or
4. You don’t know?
5. (No response)
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D6. How old are you?

___ ___ Actual age mentioned
99 Refused to answer

D6a. (Estimated age, if person refuses to answer)

___ ___ Estimated age
99 Can’t estimate age

D7. How many years of school do you have?

___ ___ (actual number of years
99 No response

D8. How much money do you and members of your family living with you earn each month?

NEED TO DEVELOP A SCALE FOR EACH COUNTRY

D9. Do you and members of your family living with you live in a house or an apartment?

1 House
2 Apartment
3 (Other)
4 (No response)

D10. How many bedrooms are in the place where you and your family live?

___ ___ Actual number of bedrooms
99 No response

D11. Including yourself, how many members of your family live with you?

___ ___ Actual number of family members (including respondent)
99 No response
D12. How many children under the age of 17, if any, live with you?

___ ___ Actual number of children under 17
99 No response

D13. USE OF NEWS MEDIA – NEED TO DEVELOP A SCALE FOR EACH COUNTRY

D14. Gender of Respondent

1 Male
2 Female

D15. Gender of Interviewer

1 Male
2 Female

D16. Religion of Interviewer

1 Muslim
2 Christian
3 Jewish
4 Other
3. The Need for Theory and its Role in Understanding International Public Opinion about People belonging to other Religions by Michael Elesmar

A theory in the context of this chapter is a statement or statements, derived from empirical work, whose function it is to explain and predict interrelationships among specific variables. The variable at the center of focus here (i.e., the dependent variable) is “opinion about people belonging to other religions”, within an international context.

Within this context, a valuable theory would explain why international public opinion about people belong to other religions varies across individuals. A theory would also predict the conditions that will make it vary one way or another in the future. This type of theory, if found, would be crucial to highlight and detail. If such a theory does not currently exist, then it is worth developing it. The importance of theory has long been stressed for assisting in the solution of problems similar to the one at hand. Singer (1960) states “[one] of the most promising developments in the intellectual growth of a discipline is the appearance of theory on the part of its students and practitioners. It might even be argued that, in the absence of such a concern, we have no discipline at all but merely a crudely delimited area of inquiry” (p. 431). Fogelmann (quoted by McClelland, 1960) contends that theoretical frameworks play a key role in explaining the variation inherent in public opinion data:

- they give coherence and significance to the data and findings;
- they facilitate a true accumulation of knowledge;
- they indicate areas for further research;
- they help alert the researcher to all relevant aspects of his work;
- they may aid in prediction (McClelland, 1960, pp. 303-304).

Kelman (1971) stresses that without a theoretical framework the researcher is unable to fully understand the implications of the data trends that he/she is observing and thus cannot make meaningful inferences from such trends:
To make such inferences, the student of public opinion needs a theoretical framework which accounts for the adoption and expression of particular opinions on the part of individuals and groups. Such a framework can serve as a guide in the collection of data; it can provide a systematic basis for deciding what information is relevant and what questions should be asked in order to permit the drawing of inferences. Similarly, it can serve as a guide for interpreting the data and deriving implications from them (p. 401).

After reviewing numerous articles, books, and manuscripts, I came to a conclusion similar to the one identified by Inis (1960) in the context of international relations:

...[T]hat progress toward the scholarly understanding and practical solution of this problem [...] requires the development of a respectable body of theory; that a considerable quantity of theoretical bits and snatches and hopeful assortments of theoretical beginnings are already in existence; and that the time is ripe for careful assessment of those theoretical fragments and the effort to construct - from them and from such new materials as may be required – a more systematic and elaborate body of theory (p. 263).

Thus, the aim of this chapter is to begin reviewing the various “theoretical beginnings that are already in existence” (Inis, 1960, p. 263) in order for a future instalment of this chapter to integrate current knowledge pertinent to the topic at hand and propose a theoretical model that explains the variation in international public opinion about peopling belonging to other religions.

What is the general paradigm in which a theoretical model about international public opinion about people belonging to other religions can exist? An individual’s internal states, overtly expressed in the context of public opinion, consist of this individual’s thoughts and feelings. Thoughts and feelings reflect an individual’s perceptions of certain aspects of his/her existence and surroundings.

Thus, a natural framework for an international public opinion theoretical model is the social-psychological paradigm originally known as social perception (see Krech & Cruchfield, 1971) and currently identified as social cognition (Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Srull & Wyer, 1988; Wyer & Srull, 1994; Sedikides, Schopler & Insko, 1998). It is certainly not within the scope of this chapter to fully detail the social cognition paradigm with all of its branches and specialties. Rather, it is presented here in its most simple form and,
in an overview fashion, as a backdrop for contextualizing this chapter’s approach to the study of international public opinion about people belonging to other religions.

**Social Cognition as a Framework for the Study of International Public Opinion about People Belonging to other Religions**

A human being interfaces with the social world that surrounds him/her through his/her senses. This interfacing process generates sensory information that enables the human being to perceive the social world (Goss, 1989). Given that international public opinion about people belonging to other religions consists of overt expressions reflecting human perceptions of other humans and their traditions, rituals and other aspects pertaining to religions other than one’s own, the discussion of perception will be solely confined to the notion of social perception.

It is worth noting that, until the mid-1970s, the literature concerning the notion of social perception spanned several fields of inquiry including international public opinion. Beginning in the 1970s, a new field was created for specifically and solely studying social perception under the label of social cognition. The reader should keep this historical progression in mind when following the organization of the sections below. Many important studies within the field of “social perception” were conducted prior to the mid-1970s and focused specifically on international public opinion (e.g., Scott, 1965). Thus, the discussion below first incorporates the findings of studies conducted prior to the mid-1970s, before exclusively relying on the more contemporary body of literature on social cognition. The reader should also keep in mind that terms used in the studies conducted pre- and post-1970s might appear different when, in reality, they refer to quasi-identical concepts. For example, the term “social perception” was popular in studies conducted prior to the mid-1970s, while the term “social cognition” is used in more contemporary investigations. Also, “image” was a popular term in studies conducted prior to the mid-1970s while “schema” is used in more modern articles. These terms and others, and the interrelationships among them, will be further described below.
Krech and Cruchfield (1971) distinguish between two areas of social perception: structural and functional. “By structural factors are meant those factors deriving solely from the nature of the physical stimuli and the neural effects they evoke in the nervous system of the individual” (p. 235). Structural perception, therefore, involves the physiological translation of sensory pickup into mental cognitions. “The functional factors of perceptual organization are those which derive primarily from the needs, moods, past experience and memory of the individual” (Krech & Cruchfield, 1971, pp. 236-237). Functional perception, therefore, focuses on the selection of sensory pickup from among the enormous amounts of sensory cues available to the human being at any given moment during which he/she is awake and the organization of such sensory cues. This sensory selection and organization process is influenced by a combination of factors, including independent direct observation made in the past, and/or such internal thought processes as induction, deduction, or analogy (see Beike & Sherman, 1994).

Functional perception is also affected by preexisting information in an individual’s memory as communicated by the various agents of socialization present in a given culture: “What is selected out for perception not only is a function of our perceiving apparatus as physiologically defined but is partly a function of our perceiving apparatus as colored and shaped by our culture” (Krech & Cruchfield, 1971, p. 248). Using Krech and Cruchfield’s terminology, the focus in this chapter is on the functional aspects of social perception and how these aspects can help us understand the factors that result in the expression of such perceptions in the form of an opinion about people belonging to other religions.

**Perception, Beliefs, Attitudes, Images, and Schemas**

Regardless of what drives the selection of sensory stimuli, once a new social stimulus is selected, the incoming sensory information is related by an individual’s perception apparatus to preexisting information held by that individual (Krech & Cruchfield, 1971; Wyer & Carlston, 1994) Preexisting information is that which was acquired through previous instances of social perception (see Isaacs, 1958; Wyer & Carlston, 1994). As a result of new instances of social perception, the preexisting information held by the individual
might become reinforced, expanded, or sometimes even changed (Deutsch & Merritt, 1965). Zaller (1992) contends that these preexisting conditions or predispositions “are critical in understanding the variation in individual opinion” (pp. 22-23).

Researchers have used the terms “beliefs” and “attitudes” to label two distinct yet related types of social information: preexisting and new (see Scott, 1965; Fiske & Taylor, 1984). For the purposes of this chapter, beliefs represent subjective information held by an individual as they pertain to a specific aspect of his/her social existence (e.g., the islands of the Bahamas have many sandy beaches). Attitudes are an individual’s affect toward that aspect of his/her social existence (e.g., I like the islands of the Bahamas). Attitudes can be thought of as feelings held by human beings toward aspects of the social world that surround them. Although there is a plethora of definitions for the term “attitude” (see DeFleur & Westie, 1963; Oskamp, 1977; Albarracin, Johnson, Zanna, & Kumkale, 2005), this chapter conforms with those that “refer to affective or emotional components” (Klineberg, 1964, p. 48; see also Fishbein & Ajzen, 1972; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Beliefs and attitudes toward a particular aspect of the social world that surrounds a human being are often interrelated (Scott, 1965). There could be a plethora of beliefs and attitudes associated with a particular aspect of the social world. Researchers have traditionally used the term “image” (Isaacs, 1958; Deutsch & Merritt, 1965; Scott, 1965, LeVine, 1965; Kelman, 1965) to label the entire set of beliefs and attitudes associated with a particular aspect of the social world as perceived by the cognitive system of a human being.

Therefore, beliefs and attitudes are components of images. Kelman (1965) defines an image as “the organized representation of an object in an individual’s cognitive system” (p. 24). According to Isaacs (1958):

*Images carried about by some people for a whole lifetime may have been fixed by a single exposure dating, perhaps, from an experience deep in the past. Or else they may emerge from a whole collection of pictures that a man takes with his mind over the years and which come out looking much the same because his mind’s setting is fixed, like a fixed-focus box camera* (p. 390).
Figure 3.1 depicts a very preliminary and simplistic process of social perception.

**Figure 3.1:** *Image as an Output of Social Perception*

![Diagram](image)

In Figure X1, and all subsequent depictions of process models in this chapter, we adopt the following conventions: the process of influence begins in time on the left side of the page and ends on the right; the building blocks of a process model are concepts each of which is visually housed in a rectangle; the arrows connecting the rectangles indicate presumed directional causality among the concepts.

Scott (1965) relates image to beliefs and attitudes within the context of perceiving other countries:

> ...*An image of a nation (or any other object) constitutes the totality of attributes that a person recognizes (or imagines) when he contemplates that nation. In abstract terms, one may describe an image as consisting of three analytically distinct aspects: First and primary is the set of cognitive attributes by which the person understands the object in an intellectual way. This is his view of its inherent characteristics, which he regards as independent of his own response to them. Second, the image may contain an affective component, representing a liking or disliking for the focal object. This is usually associated with perceived attributes that the person either approves of disapproves of. Finally, the image may carry an action component, consisting of a set of responses to the object that the person deems appropriate in light of its perceived attributes (p. 72).*

When exposed to a multitude of complex social stimuli, human beings tend to readily select those that can be easily related to preexisting systems of beliefs and attitudes. This tendency to relate incoming information to preexisting information was expressed in the 1960s by Klineberg (1964):
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1. “We perceive according to our training, our previous experience” (p. 90).
2. “We perceive according to our mental set, our expectations” (p. 91).
3. “We perceive what we want to” (p. 91).

These previously acquired images “may be thought of as the set of lenses through which information concerning the physical and social environment is received” (Holsti, 1962, p. 245). Therefore, images are not only the outcomes of perception but they are also filters for subsequent related sensory cues thus affecting what a human being will subsequently perceive. “Images serve as screens for the selective reception of new messages, and they often control the perception and interpretation of those messages that are not, completely ignored, rejected or repressed” (Deutsch and Merritt, 1965, p. 134).

Why is this the case? Putting it simply: efficiency. The field of social cognition provides a much more detailed and eloquent explanation of this process. Born in the 1970s, social cognition, as a subfield of social psychology, extends and refines much of the work on perceptual images done up until that time. It “is the study of the interaction between internal knowledge structures – our mental representations of social objects and events – and new information” about these social objects and events” (Brewer, 1988, p. 1). Social cognition specifically addresses how efficiency is a goal of cognitive processing. The “cognitive miser” model of social cognition embodies “[t]he idea… that people are limited in their capacity to process information, so they take shortcuts whenever they can” (Fiske and Taylor, 1984, p. 12). Similarly, Hurwitz and Peffley (1987) assert that “under conditions of uncertainty, people are assumed to behave as cognitive misers by using old, generic knowledge to interpret new, specific knowledge” (p. 81). When faced with a plethora of complicated stimuli or a complex problem, individuals will do their best to simplify the incoming information:

...They often attend to [these social stimuli] selectively, focusing on some features while disregarding others. They interpret these features in terms of previously acquired concepts and knowledge. Moreover, they often infer characteristics of the stimulus that were not actually mentioned in the information, and construe relations among these characteristics that were not specified (Wyer and Carlston, 1994, p. 42).
Social cognition researchers have given a label to the preexisting knowledge that is consulted when humans attempt to simplify incoming sensory information: the label is “schema.” “A schema may be defined as a cognitive structure that represents one’s general knowledge about a given concept or stimulus domain” (Fiske and Taylor, 1984, p. 13). According to Fiske and Taylor (1984), a schema not only includes the attributes relevant for a given concept but also contains the interrelationships among these attributes.

Schemas “guide perception, memory and inference in social settings” (Fiske and Taylor, 1984, p. 13). The reader should note that other authors have often used the terms “schema” and “image” interchangeably. In order to avoid the confusion that stems from using multiple labels for a similar concept, the more contemporary term “schema” is exclusively used for the remainder of this chapter. If schema serves as both filters and outcomes of the process of social cognition, then an “opinion” concerning a specific topic is a function of the schema related to this topic. An opinion about a particular topic can also be thought of as reflecting one or more aspects of a human being’s inference about this topic. What does the field of social cognition tell us about the relationship between schema and inference?

According to Fiske and Taylor (1984), in social cognition, inference is “a process and a product. As a process, it involves deciding what information to gather [in order] to address a given issue or question, collecting that information, and combining it into some form. As a product, it is the outcome of the reasoning process” (p. 246). “The process of deciding what information is relevant and how one is to interpret the evidence is heavily influenced by preexisting … schema” (p. 248). Figure 3.2 graphically depicts a simplistic process of social cognition and highlights opinion as an outcome.
Figure 2.2 illustrates the notion that an overt opinion about social concept A is a function of an individual’s inference about social concept A which, in turn, is a function of an individual’s schema related to social concept A. Note that the parallelogram representing an individual’s schema related to social concept A contains several interrelated cognitive components that, altogether, embody that schema. These cognitive components most likely consist of previously acquired beliefs and attitudes. When an individual’s sensory pickup results in information pertaining to social concept A, this information will be processed through that individual’s schema related to social concept A. This processing results in an inference about social concept A which influences both subsequent sensory pickup about social concept A and an individual’s opinion about social concept A. Due to the important role schema plays in social cognition, and in order for a researcher to understand an individual’s expressed opinion about a social concept, it is necessary for him/her to identify the key cognitive components of an individual’s schema pertaining to that concept and understand the interrelationships among these components. A schema pertaining to a particular social concept can potentially contain an infinite number of cognitive components. How can a researcher identify those that are most likely to be key cognitive components? The heuristics perspective, explained below, offers some useful suggestions.
Schemas and Heuristics: Efficiency in Social Cognition

When processing information, individuals tend to take “shortcuts that reduce complex problem solving to more simple judgmental operations” (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 268). People will look for “rapid adequate solutions, rather than slow accurate solutions” (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 12). These shortcuts are labelled “heuristics” by social cognition researchers. According to Fiske and Taylor (1984), the following are two common heuristics used by individuals:

Representativeness: Based on the characteristics of the situation that I am observing, how likely is this situation to be similar to other situations that I already understand?

Availability: What is the quickest association that comes to mind in relation to the situation that I am observing?

Individuals, then, utilize heuristics to reach inferences based on topic-relevant schemas. The heuristics perspective can help a researcher focus on the most likely key cognitive components of an individual’s schema pertaining to a specific social concept.

Schema and International Public Opinion About People Belonging to Other Religions

In order to understand how a human being processes and infers a particular sensory cue (e.g. seeing someone who belongs to another religion), one needs to understand this human being’s schema relating to that sensory cue. Earlier we noted that schema is “a cognitive structure that represents one’s general knowledge about a given concept or stimulus domain” (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 13). Schema includes the attributes relating to that concept and the interrelationships among these attributes. In the case of opinions about people belonging to other religions, such attributes include beliefs and attitudes associated with other religions and the people who belong to them. Thus, in order to understand why “opinion about people who belong to other religions” varies among individuals, we first need to identify the beliefs and attitudes that are part of the schema associated with this concept and detail the interrelationships among them. While there could be a plethora of po-
tential beliefs and attitudes, the heuristics notion within social cognition leads us to expect that individuals will retrieve those beliefs and attitudes that are most readily available and closely associated with the notion of “people who belong to a specific religion other than one’s own”.

Ideally, we also need to understand the antecedents of these beliefs and attitudes such as the sources of information and other pertinent factors resulting in these beliefs and attitudes. Similarly, the inter-relationships among these antecedents and schema components (i.e., pertinent beliefs and attitudes) also need to be detailed and understood. Figure 3.3 presents a simplistic graphical representation of the relationships between antecedents, schema and opinion.

Figure 3.3.: Antecedents, Schema and Opinions

Figure 2.3 illustrates the notion that an opinion about social concept A is a function of an individual’s schema pertaining to social concept A which, in turn, is a function of specific antecedents that have influenced the individual cognitive components that embody this schema.

Antecedents and Schema Components of International Public Opinion about People Belonging to Other Religions: Some Preliminary Thoughts

The previous paragraphs established that social cognition is the theoretical framework through which we ought to study public opinion about people belonging to other religions. Accordingly, in order to understand why individuals’ opinions about people belonging to other religions vary, we need to identify the components of their schemas pertaining to other religions and the people who belong to them and then understand the structure of these schemas. For example, if an individual living in the West feels negative about Muslims, in order for us to understand what prompted this feeling we first need to identify his/her various beliefs and attitudes related to Islam and Muslims. These beliefs and attitudes would
consist of his/her schema components. The way these beliefs and attitudes about Islam and Muslims are interrelated and the strength of their interrelations provide us with the structure of his/her schema toward Islam and Muslims. In addition, we would also need to identify antecedents of individuals’ opinions of people belonging to other religions. Using the same example as before, this would mean that, in the case of the individual living in the West, we would need to identify the sources of information and pre-existing conditions that influenced the formation of his/her beliefs and attitudes toward Islam and Muslims. In other words, answer the question: Where could this individual’s beliefs and attitudes about Islam and Muslims have come from?

There is a plethora of potential schema antecedents and a potential overabundance of beliefs and attitudes toward other religions. How would we know which ones are most likely to be related to an individual’s opinions about people belonging to other religions? The heuristics perspective within social cognition informs us that out of a potentially infinite number of beliefs and attitudes pertaining to a particular topic, those that are most easily and readily available to an individual’s memory are those that will be activated when processing information about this topic. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that these types of beliefs and attitudes are a function of the agents of socialization that have shaped the development of an individual. The most common agents of socialization for an individual are: The individual’s family, the school that this individual has attended, the media content to which this individual is exposed, the political and/or religious leaders that this individual admires, and the group of peers with whom this individual interacts. So, interpersonal and mediated sources of information are most likely to be antecedents for an individual’s schema pertaining to people belonging to other religions and the relative influence of these antecedents is highly likely to vary across individuals.

A future instalment of this chapter will include a thorough literature review to extract from prior studies those beliefs and attitudes that seem easily and readily available when thinking about people belonging to other religions. Identifying these beliefs and attitudes would allow this researcher to propose a process model of opinion about people belonging to other religions. This model would illustrate the schema components that are activated when an individual
is thinking about people belonging to other religions and the sources of information that have influenced the formation of these beliefs and attitudes. After proposing such a model, the next step would be to quantitatively measure each of its components. After measuring these components, the next step would be to apply structural equation analytic techniques to determine whether the data collected supports the structure of the proposed theoretical model. The ultimate objective would be to arrive at a simple and clear explanation of why certain people hold negative opinions of people belonging to other religions while others hold neutral or even positive such opinions. Understanding this process would allow us to recommend specific steps that will foster a better understanding and a better opinion of people belonging to other religions and thus better interfaith relations.
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4. Methodology of Quantitative and Qualitative Content Analysis

Media Tenor International is a global content analysis organization based in Zurich, Switzerland that monitors print, broadcast and online news in more than 15 languages and 35 countries. Its research focuses on the portrayal of countries, individuals and institutions in leading media outlets.

Media Tenor’s content analysis which has been developed from the year 2007 for the Annual Dialogue Report included a three-and-a-half month long content analysis of three TV news shows, three print publications and one business publication from 24 countries. The ongoing analysis of TV coverage in 2008 was based on 19 TV news programs from nine countries. The analysis was conducted by 43 Media Tenor researchers who coded content in their native languages. The Analysis was conducted on a statement level. A statement is identified by a combination of an actor and a topic presented together in the media. The words “coverage” and “statements” are used interchangeably in this report.

Variables in the coding system

In addition to coding an article’s formal aspects (date, style, length and media outlet) every message in the media was assigned a numeric code by a human analyst in their native language. Coding was performed on a “statement” level, meaning that every combination of a protagonist and a topic was coded as a single statement. Depending on its complexity, a single sentence could produce multiple statements. The following sample of our coding fields demonstrates how a statement would be coded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Statement 1</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protagonist</strong></td>
<td>816473</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective</strong></td>
<td>601</td>
<td>Abbas, Mahmoud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive, takes part in dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>609</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>208669</td>
<td>Relations, negotiations between Israel and Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating (explicit)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No explicit rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating (implicit)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No implicit rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Opinion</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anonymous sources, &quot;informed circles&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td>609</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Statement 2</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protagonist</strong></td>
<td>816098</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective</strong></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>Olmert, Ehud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Positive, takes part in dialogue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>208669</td>
<td>Relations, negotiations between Israel and Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating (explicit)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No explicit rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating (implicit)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No implicit rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Opinion</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anonymous sources, &quot;informed circles&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td>609</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Area and Rating variables relate to the protagonist.
A Coding Example

The following example displays how a quote would be coded:


Statement 1: Bush gives and address on Middle East peace
Protagonist: Bush
Explicit rating: Neutral
Implicit rating: Neutral

_Bush’s activity – giving an address – is not explicitly qualified, nor is it generally considered to be positive or negative activity in and of itself._

Statement 2: The Islamic group Hamas seized control of the Gaza Strip in a bloody sweep.
Protagonist: Hamas
Explicit rating: Negative
Implicit rating: Negative

_“Bloody” is both a negative adjective and an indication of a negative circumstance._

Statement 3: Mr. Bush pledged to restart the moribund peace process...
Protagonist: Bush
Explicit rating: Neutral
Implicit rating: Neutral

_Both the explicit and implicit ratings are ambivalent – a restart of the peace process is generally considered to be positive, but the fact that the peace process is “moribund” is negative. Ambivalent statements are coded as neutral._
Statement 4: by pouring aid and diplomatic attention…
Protagonist: Bush
Explicit rating: Neutral
Implicit rating: Neutral

Bush’s action is not explicitly qualified. Providing aid and attention to could be perceived as implicitly positive or negative for the US government.

Statement 5: on the new government established by Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas
Protagonist: the government established by Abbas
Explicit rating: Neutral
Implicit rating: Positive

While aid and attention are not identified with any positive adjectives, they are generally considered to be a good thing for a country. Abbas receiving aid is implicitly positive.
Interview with Mark Fuller

Q: Being one of the eminent supporters of bridging the gap between the Middle East and the West: Do you feel the willingness for Dialogue has improved since 2006?

Absolutely. The dialogue has improved.

Q: Why?

Changes in leadership and in mind-set, stemming from many different factors, in particular, recognition in the West that confrontation frequently produces negative results, paralleled by a growing understanding in the Middle East of the costs – economic, social and national security – inherent in the absence of dialogue.

Q: Where do you see improvements?

The interest in, and willingness to engage in dialogue has improved in many countries. In particular, there is increasing recognition of the need in the USA. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia presents another noteworthy, and under-appreciated example.

Q: Whom do you recognize as main supporters for these improvements?

Political and social leaders have directly contributed with business leaders often supplying indirect, if significant support. Notable examples include the election of President Obama in the USA, the election of the new Orthodox Patriarch in Russia and positive developments in Turkey and elsewhere, not least the recent victory of the Congress Party in India. These supplement the long-standing, valuable efforts of the Aga Khan, Shayka Mosa in Qatar etc.
Q: Where do you see fall backs? Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?

The apparent re-election of President Ahmadinejad in Iran constitutes a set-back. We must also remain concerned about the growth of intolerant, even extremist, views in various European countries.

Q: Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?

Again, it is frequently a question of leadership and mindset. In some cases, it stems from the activities of opportunistic politicians exploiting public fears; in more cases, from the absence of responsible leaders taking a stand.

Q: As businessman what do you want to see coming in place from a corporate point of view?

(i) More and more real engagement by the business sector.
(ii) Better support to build organizational capacity in relevant social sectors actors.
(iii) Most importantly, a fundamental shift in the attitude and practice of the crucial media sector which has, with some notable exceptions, dealt with the issues in an unsophisticated and inflammatory manner.

Q: Where do you see this growing easier: in the Middle East or in the West?

Both are making progress. Given history, and relative clout, particular responsibility lies with the West to take the initiative.

Q: Have you experienced any best practice in the field of journalism within the last 12 months?

No.
Q: What is in your expectation concerning the disposition towards the Dialogue between the religions for the next 6 months: is it going to grow or remain where it is or decrease – and why?

*I believe and hope that it will increase, due, in part to an enhanced recognition of the need, in conjunction with a rate-able improvement in the number, the density and the diversity of connections.*
C-1 invited by the G20 Pre-Conference, London, April 2nd, 2009
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Interviews with M. Shafik Gabr and Fred Kempe
1. Media Image and Peoples Perception of Religion
   by Katharina Nötzold

1.1. Trends and Opportunities for Dialogue

The differences between the Muslim and the Western world are often referred to in terms of religious terminology. This even finds expression in comparing a religious entity (the Muslim world) with a geographic unit (the West). It is clear that these designations refer to wider connotations, mainly political ones. The purpose of this chapter is to scrutinize how the media frame the coverage of religions in general as well as to find out if and how perceptions of ‘the other’ (religions) have changed in opinion polls between 2007 to 2009. Such a twofold approach provides useful insights in spotting trends about the willingness and readiness of the public to support dialogue. Moreover, it may help to identify possible obstacles that impede possible dialogue activities but it also highlights the opportunities for increased dialogue between religions in general and the Muslim and Western world in particular.

The need for dialogue is often urged from official quarters only after events such as the Mohammed cartoon crisis or the Pope’s Regensburg speech and thus at times of moral outrage, anger and violent demonstrations in the Muslim world. Yet anger and outrage also reigned in the West after the Madrid train bombings and people were frustrated and puzzled by the hatred of the ‘homegrown’ Muslim perpetrators after the London bomb attacks in 2005. All these events make it extremely difficult to call for dialogue, especially as they are emotionally charged. Under these circumstances dialogue and engaging with (representatives from) ‘the other’ side seem to be the least appealing option. Therefore it takes the vision of some courageous groups and individuals who are willing to engage despite or because of these tensions and misperceptions of ‘the other’. Yet, dialogue is a delicate matter that cannot be achieved on an ad hoc basis. To become successful it requires

---

knowledge, trust, listening, communication and understanding from all participants. It needs nurturing over a long period of time. For the initial stages of dialogue it is better that they take place outside the media spotlight so as to establish trust and find common ground about contentious issues without letting those interfere who prefer to cling to a powerful ‘monologue’ about their own superiority. Dialogue does not mean mere talking in order to exchange pleasantries but rather has to challenge sometimes long-held, favoured and favourable believes about oneself or one’s own group. It can become painful at times to hear ‘the other side’ and face their experiences and grievances as well as truths and long-held beliefs which can be deeply opposed to those of one’s ‘own group’. Dialogue does not necessarily mean to agree under all circumstances in all instances, but it is a necessary and most often a helpful exercise to see the point of view of ‘the other’. It can be helpful ‘to imagine walking in their shoes’ for a while and most importantly to find points of agreement from which to proceed together. This can be the basis for building upon commonalities and shared values and to bridge divides that have been submerged by the more visible differences in the first place. It is at this point that dialogue needs exposure to the public to introduce and familiarize them with these commonalities that eventually become an antidote to the often inflammatory reporting about differences. Yet despite declarations of intent by some media representatives during dialogue conferences to report in a balanced manner about ‘the other’, news reporting too often follows a different approach. News items are often chosen in accord with an understanding of “newsworthiness” which focuses too much on negative events, the extraordinary, and the scandalous.

Opinion polls and content analyses of media reports give invaluable insights for analysing various aspects of dialogue. Nevertheless some caution needs to be applied when drawing conclusions from those results. They can often reflect only a momentary mood: thus, longitudinal studies can be excellent additions to highlight trends in attitudes among people. Additionally, it is important to formulate questions in such a manner that most respondents have a similar understanding of their meaning. It is therefore essential to define some terms beforehand. In the case of religion for example, media practitioners and pollsters often operate with a rather simplified or at least ambiguous terminology such as ‘fundamentalist’ or
'modernist' without much further deliberation about the meaning. However, some respondents may believe that so-called ‘fundamentalists’ in fact contribute to a much needed change (and political, social and economic modernization) of their societies.

A case in point is Turkey, where the AKP party is seen as ‘fundamentalist’ by some because of its Islamist roots and appealing to those who want to change Turkey’s secular system established by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, whereas other parties such as CHP, MHP and DSP are considered ‘modernist’ because of their more secular outlook. The secularists claim that the AKP-led government is trying to introduce religion into the system by using EU calls for more religious freedom. For their part, AKP officials accuse the secularists of hindering Turkey’s democratization and aspiration to EU accession, which would strip them of a lot of their power and privileges. Moreover, it is the AKP which wants legislation to change the penal code, which so far calls for up to three years in jail for insulting the country. The law is one of the main obstacles in Turkey-EU relations, inspiring hundreds of cases against prominent intellectuals accused of a ‘lack of patriotism’, and is defended by the ultra-nationalist, yet ‘secular’ MHP.

1.2. Religious Coverage and Opinion about Religion 2007-2009

Since 2007, the coverage of religious issues has not significantly increased despite the global economic downturn, which leaves many people exposed to financial losses, unemployment and the loss of certainties in their lives such that several columnists have predicted already a return to traditional values, and religion. Even though several conflicts are explained partly in religious terms by the media, it is surprising that religion does not receive more attention. In fact, coverage of everyday religion, religious practice, background information and of religious rituals etc. is rare in mainstream media and leaves mainly a void. There are certainly occasions when news with reference to religion makes the headlines, but then the focus is not on the ordinary but on the unusual and the scandalous. The Primate of the Anglican Communion, Archbishop Rowan Williams, made headlines when he was (mis)quoted as advocating the introduction of Sharia law in the UK in February
2008. During the US presidential campaign in 2008 Barack Obama was at times accused of being in fact a Muslim fundamentalist because of his middle name, Hussein, and his upbringing in Indonesia. Sarah Palin, meanwhile, was hailed as a candidate of the ‘values’ of the Christian Right. The same year also brought a slow turnaround in Iraq, which had become a bloody sectarian battleground between supporters of different religious and political factions since 2005. In some countries, coverage of religion in the beginning of 2009 concentrated on the Pope’s decision to revoke the excommunication of the Holocaust-denying Bishop Richard Williamson. All these examples illustrate that religion is less likely to be reported for everyday practice than for the extraordinary or scandalous.

At the same time, opinion polls by Pew Research (2008) show unfavorable views of Jews and Muslims to be on the increase in most of Europe.

**Chart 1.1. Opinions of Jews, Spring 2008**


Majority Muslim countries view Jews almost unanimously negatively, which gives credence to the assumption that the often used term ‘the Jewish state’ in lieu of Israel in most Arab media con-
tributes to the intertwining of religion with a political conflict (Israel-Arab conflict).

Jews were increasingly viewed negatively especially in Spain, Poland or Russia, whereas in the UK and the US this number remains constantly lower. And those who see Jews in a negative light also tend to view Muslims negatively.

**Chart 1.2. Opinions of Muslims, Spring 2008**

Spain and Poland come high on the list of dislike of Muslims together with Germany and to a lesser extent France. Spain shows an especially high increase of unfavourable views towards Muslims during the past four years – a figure that almost doubled from over 30% to 60%. Without further qualitative results from opinion polls, however, it is difficult to explain the rise of unfavourable views on Muslims solely with Spain’s experience with the Madrid train bombings. Figures from the UK, a country that also experienced bomb attacks (London 7/7/2005 and failed attempts), indicate that there is no automatic correlation between attacks and people’s general attitudes toward Islam.
Pew figures also show that Japan, Brazil, South Korea, China, India and Mexico among other countries give Muslims highly unfavourable ratings. Even before the Mumbai attacks Muslims have been viewed increasingly unfavourably in India despite a large native Muslim population. The Kashmir conflict, the Hindu nationalism of the BJP and violent incidents such as the terror attack on the Indian parliament in 2001 or the Mumbai attack in November 2008 by Muslim fundamentalists (from Pakistan) may well have exacerbated the attitudes towards Muslims in India. The Indian numbers might be influenced highly by the volatile relationship with India’s neighbour Pakistan, not only in regards to the Kashmir conflict but the involvement of Pakistani nationals who claim to commit their vile actions in India in the name of Islam or at least on behalf of Islamist parties.
Chart 1.4. Attitudes towards Muslims in India 2005-2009
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Source: Pew Global Attitudes Project, Report 17.09.2008, Q10g, p. 53

Some countries such as Poland, Japan or South Korea do not even have large Muslim or Jewish populations; and Muslim countries no longer have sizeable Jewish communities in their midst. These observations suggest that media coverage of religion and politics certainly plays an important role in defining the image of ‘the other’, especially in light of the absence of ‘the other’ in the every day experiences of many people. Moreover, specific events such as the brutal killings of South Korean and Japanese civilian hostages at the hands of violent Jihadists in Iraq may influence the attitudes of how an entire religion is viewed by those who did not have previous encounters with Islam.
These negative trends regarding the perception of Jews and Muslims in Europe and the Muslim world hardly come as a surprise when considering how religion is covered by the media, mainly as a non-item when it comes to covering rituals, and shrouding political conflicts in religious terminology. Although in Europe Christians are not perceived as negatively as Jews and Muslims, anti-Christian sentiments have risen in recent years as well, especially in Spain and France. Moreover, negative attitudes towards Christians are highest in Turkey, Pakistan and China but Indonesia and Egypt still show high rates of disapproval of Christians. In fact, disapproval of Christians has risen sharply in Turkey in recent years and approving rates dropped considerably. Again, without further qualitative data reasons for this tendency remain rather speculative. However, it can be assumed that discussions about Turkey’s bid to join the European Union and especially Germany’s and France’s refusal to support Turkey’s bid on the grounds that the European Union is based on principles of Western Judeo-Christian traditions that excludes Islam, may play a major role in recent increasing disapproval rates. The evangelical rhetoric of the Bush administration may also serve as a partial explanation of the
high figures in a country that no longer has large numbers of Christians among its midst. In addition, the militant nationalistic rhetoric of MHP and other nationalistic Turkish parties that do not embrace diversity within Turkish society but view only Turkish Sunni Muslims as ‘true and authentic Turks’ most certainly have an influence in Christianity being seen in a negative light.

Chart 1.6. Attitudes towards Christians in Turkey, 2004-2009

![Chart showing attitudes towards Christians in Turkey, 2004-2009]


However, these poll results need further research in the future as to whether Christianity has received coverage purely as a religion or whether Christianity has been framed in the context of Western policies deemed unfair towards the Muslim world.

Again, in some countries people do not have many opportunities for everyday exchange with believers from other faiths as they live in either predominantly Muslim or Christian or secular contexts. Thus the role of the media needs to be taken into critical account for its role in forming images that influence also the willingness to support exchange and dialogue.
5.1.3. Visibility of Religion over time 2007-2009

The aggregated data shows that overall Islam gets more media coverage than Christianity (Chart 1.4.) or any other religion. Judaism and other religions play only a minor role in media coverage. Moreover, Muslim countries are mentioned far more than the West. Having said before that the West and Muslim world are terms that are occasionally intertwined with religious meaning, Islam as religion and the Muslim countries as political/geographical units dominate the news agenda in reference to religions. Yet these results need to be more closely scrutinized to establish whether or not the large number of reports about Islam and Christianity actually inform about these religions, in ways which lead to better understanding of ‘the other’ and eventually support serious dialogue efforts between religions.
Chart 1.8. Visibility of religions over time, 04/2007-05/2009

Basis: 238,324 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

Most people rely on the mass media for information about those parts of the world that they have not experienced, with the result that attitudes about foreign countries or other religions are largely formed by newsmakers’ opinions and the media’s news and commentaries. The mass media interpret, edit, report, and function as gatekeepers and with all these functions they can strongly shape the image of places that the audience has not been to and people and their cultures which they have not experienced themselves. Additionally, many people are more interested in national than in international issues and therefore it is even more difficult for foreign affairs to grab the attention of their audience and to sustain depth. It is in this context that the media tend to establish a relationship with their audiences by using imagery that people are familiar with and can relate to, or by resorting to explicit pictures and
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language to capture the audiences by presenting something unheard or unseen before. It is in this general context that the coverage of religion and of ‘the other’ takes place.

Even those media people who are highly sympathetic towards religious coverage, in particular of Islam, acknowledge the difficulty in finding ways to describe Muslims beyond the 1:30 minutes of televised newscasts in their daily living conditions without losing the interest of the audience.\(^3\) In the context of Islam, an amalgam of historic clichés about Muslims as threatening, lustful, superstitious, violent and sly mixed with present day stereotypes of Muslims as fanatical, intolerant, irrational, violent and sometimes decadently rich is often combined with indifference to the realities of the Muslim world and present developments and conflicts. This may partly be a result of the fact that some Europeans and Americans think they know Islam, coupled with a general notion of being “fed up” with hearing about conflicts such as that of Israel-Palestine where no solution is in sight. It is in this “Bermuda triangle” of perceived knowing that media people have to operate, even though it is made up to some extent of past and present stereotypes, uninterest in a region that seems geographically close to the West (Europe) yet distant in its values, and of resignation among Westerners that there will be no peace any time soon in the Middle East.

Similar observations can be made about how the West and Christianity are perceived in the Muslim world, thus influencing results of opinion polls. It is rarely based on first-hand knowledge or encounters with Christianity, even in countries with sizeable native Christian populations. Many Muslims think they know about the West, Christianity and Western culture after consuming Hollywood films or evoking the history of the Crusades, or referring to the colonial experiences of their countries coupled with present day perceived injust treatment of the Muslim world by the West.

At the same time, journalists, editors, cameramen, advertisers and writers are equally part of the thought systems in which they happen to have been brought up – some more and others less inclined

\(^3\) Interview with Jörg Armbruster, June 11, 2006.
to explain religion beyond the existing stereotypes. Apart from their own convictions and professional ideals and standards, they also belong to the systems of thought of their media organizations and have to adhere to editorial guidelines and also to growing economic pressure.

1.4. Coverage of Religion: Dominance of Catholic Church and Islam

Media very often frame events, personalities, and organisations in a one-dimensional and simplified manner. This oversimplification is due to several factors including those of time or space constraints. Such a tendency is also evident in reporting about different religions, when Christianity, Islam, Judaism or other religions are mainly presented either as monolithic blocs or when differences

**Chart 1.9. Coverage of Christianity, 04/2007-02/2009**

![Chart showing coverage of Christianity](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis: 80,074 statements about Christianity in 17 international TV news shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

within these religions are portrayed mainly in the framework of conflict without referring to shared roots and commonalities in ritual practice.
Media data show that Christianity is most often reported in the form of the Roman Catholic Church and its leaders, especially the Pope and even some prominent local bishops (cf. Chart 2.2. Religious Leaders). This concentration of reporting about Catholicism is partly due to the strong hierarchy within the Catholic Church. Thus the Pope acts not only as a religious leader but also, despite the official separation of church and state in most of Western Europe, he is still seen as somebody who comments also on world affairs and internal political issues (such as the right to die in Italy, the internal political conflict in Lebanon or on abortion policies in Germany).

Despite continuing trends towards secularization in Western Europe, many people in Western Europe and North America belong to various and vigorous strands of Protestantism, yet media data shows that these very large groups get less attention than the Catholic Church. Protestantism has less colourful rituals; an aspect that should not be underestimated in the audio-visual sphere where there is a need for exciting pictures. It also lacks strong clerical hierarchies, something which makes it more difficult for journalists to be sure who is speaking as a representative of all Protestants or who is speaking mainly for a small group. Depending on a country’s history with Protestantism and its role there, knowledge about Protestantism may vary widely among journalists and Protestantism is seen even as aberration in some predominantly Catholic countries. Moreover, during the presidency of George W. Bush, Protestantism was often portrayed only in its evangelical form practiced especially in the United States.

Whereas Catholicism is most often taken as representative of Christianity, the coverage of Islam shows a different image. There it seems that Islam is most often represented as a monolithic bloc without different strands. Such a monolithic representation of Islam may well be in the interest of some Muslims who appeal to the unity of an ‘imagined Islamic umma’ (nation) and who perceive the portrayal of the division of Muslims according to their different strands as a Western attempt to weaken Islam. However, such a monolithic representation can also lead to an uncritical mixing up of mainstream Islam with the most rigid interpretation as practiced by the Taliban, which can have negative consequences on the view even of moderate Islam. Although the majority of Muslims follow
the Sunni tradition of Islam, they only receive a tiny portion of coverage in comparison to Shiites.

**Chart 1.10. Coverage of Islam, 04/2007-02/2009**

This phenomenon can be explained by reference to several factors. With the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979, militant Islam was first associated with Shiism. The Shiite ritual of Ashura contributes to a visual picture of violence. It is the commemoration when Shiites mourn the death of Ali’s son Hussein, who is perceived by Shiites as the rightful descendant of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). Often they beat violently their chests and foreheads until blood is drawn. Moreover, with the fall of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, who violently suppressed Iraq’s Shiite majority, Shiism came to the political fore and even with a power-sharing agreement Iraq is seen in the meantime as country with a Shiite majority. Despite political sensitivities in Lebanon, it has become clear that Shiites form the largest single sectarian group in a multi-sectarian country with Hezbollah as Shiite Lebanon’s most powerful political party, even though it lost the elections in June 2009. Also some Gulf countries have sizeable Shiite communities in their midst (e.g. Bahrain, Saudi Arabia) who demand more political participation. These developments led Jordan’s King Abdullah and Egypt’s President Mubarak to deplore the dangers of the creation of a Shi-
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ite crescent in the Arab world on several occasions. Thus, Shiism as a political force but by extension as a religion itself is seen as being on the rise and therefore more talked about than Sunni Islam.

There exists a fundamental difference when the topic structure of the different major religions is analysed: Whereas Christianity (Chart 1.10) and Judaism (Chart 1.11.) are primarily talked about in a religious context, Islam (Chart 1.12.) by contrast is mostly associated with foreign affairs/conflicts and terrorism and security-related aspects and only after that is it also portrayed as a religion.


Basis: 80,074 statements about Christianity in 17 international TV news shows

Such a different perspective will definitely have implications for dialogue. Moreover, it also highlights another phenomenon. Everyday practices of religion are not widely covered in the media, especially when it comes to the portrayal of Islam. The latter is shown first and foremost in relation to its violent and extreme forms. Yet for dialogue to be successful it is important that people get to know the religious teachings and practices of the mainstream.

Basis: 3,048 statements about Judaism in 17 international TV news shows

It is a recurring issue that Islam is usually represented in such a way that it is associated with politics, i.e. Islam thus emerges not simply as a religion but as a political religion. Since the Iranian Revolution, the media has depicted mostly aspects of political Islam and given the impression of a growing and dangerous re-Islamization of the Middle East and other parts of the Muslim world that stands in direct opposition to the ‘free West’. The perceived unity of politics and religion in Islam without a clear-cut differentiation explaining Islam as a religion and a way of life is an additional factor while a spectre of re-Islamization, and the phenomenon of fundamentalism or violent currents within Muslim societies in many reports further support a politicized image of Islam. With such background understanding, the showing of pictures of pilgrims in Mecca or ceremonies of ritual flagellations for the Ashura commemorations no longer carry purely religious meanings but become symbols of political expressions of Islam.
When the religious sphere is given a political interpretation it follows that the political sphere may receive a religious interpretation and these spheres can overlap if not merge. Political Islamic thinking is very often associated with the radical fundamentalism of Ayatollah Khomeini or al-Qaeda; thus political Islam is understood as opposition to modernity and everything it encompasses, like democracy, human rights, equal rights and progress. Some progressive ideas within the Islamic discourse have only been marginally treated by the media— if at all.

1.5. Reasons for One-Dimensional Reporting
The news-making process is influenced by many factors, such as the personal dispositions of journalists, how news organizations work, and which outside actors, like governments, play a role, but the audience and the news-making process also exist in a certain political culture. If these factors are ignored then the conclusions of a text-centered media analysis are speculative at best. Reporting
about religions in other part of the world is mostly part of foreign news reporting, which is influenced by different factors:4

National/domestic policies and internal discourses dominate foreign news reporting. This means that some areas and topics receive greater coverage than others, depending on a country’s strategic interests, historic dependencies and perhaps cultural proximity.

A journalist is – even though he/she tries to be objective – not free of individual dispositions. Journalists bring in their own experiences, stereotypes and political orientations to their work. This may result in concentrating on topics that are dear to the journalist or ignoring other stories because they do not fit his/her ideological frame. Interviews with US journalists have shown that up to the 1990s, the majority of them did not attend church at all or were part of mainline churches.5 This resulted in their either not covering religion at all or portraying all those deviant of the mainstream in obnoxious terms.

The professional socialization of journalists influences foreign news reporting as well. Does a journalist understand his/her profession as a “neutral reporter” or is there the willingness on the part of the journalist to be a “co-creator” of the news?

There are constraints and demands from media organizations themselves, which affect coverage of religion. (a) The production of mass communication is usually profit-oriented. News about the unusual or spectacular may sell more than regular religious events. (b) Just as the personal political and religious orientation of a journalist can influence reporting, it can also be influenced very much by the political and by extension religious orientation of media organizations. (c) Organizational influences may also be a constraint

in reporting when, for example, some correspondents lack the cultural and religious competence.

Foreign news reporting is expensive and many media therefore rely in the meantime mainly on material from news agencies. There are in addition only a few big players (AP, AFP, Reuters), which leads to a market domination by their news items. In effect, they can set the agenda (for reports, for pictures) even if they work with many stringers in a region.


Basis: 148,024 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 13 international TV news shows

Crisis and conflict reporting dominate foreign news coverage most of the time and reports about everyday life are underrepresented. To put the focus back on Islam, it is not the case that coverage of
Islam is always presented in a negative manner but it is hardly represented in a positive way (cf. Chart 1.14).  

**Chart 1.15. Evaluation of religions in Arabic TV, 04/2007-02/2009**

![Chart showing evaluation of religions in Arabic TV](chart)

Basis: 49,572 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 4 Arabic TV news shows

Again, there are several reasons for the dominant way of reporting about religion and ‘the other’: Time slots about foreign affairs and particular religion are limited in the news bulletins and other programs. The news is mainly confined to political issues. Daily events have to be reported and therefore crises reporting will receive coverage, whereas there is no space in the news for a positive event. There is no space left for explanations and to put stories into their wider social, political or religious contexts. In the case of Islam, Middle-Eastern topics often have to compete with each other (e.g. war in Lebanon, Iraq or the conflict in Palestine) and this leads not only to competition over the most horrifying story but
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also makes omissions necessary. Since reporting mainly reacts to crises, war and terror, the audience starts to assume that terror and violence reign in these regions and over time, these images of terror and violence stick in the minds of the audience and define the frame in which future reports will take place. All these points are not intentionally in place to distort the image of religion and particular Islam on purpose or as a result of any sort of conspiracy, but are mainly structural problems of news making.

**1.6. Reporting and Evaluation about ‘self’ and ‘the other’**

Charts 1.10 and 1.11 give evidence that religion and ideologies in general both in non-Muslim countries and on Arab TV are reported more in a negative than a positive tone, even though most reporting seems to be neutral. This can be partly related to journalists’ dispositions towards religion. In addition, Arab TV’s perhaps unexpected negative reporting of Islam and Muslim countries may be partly explained by the fact that secular authoritarian regimes fear an increase in religious activity of potential political contenders (e.g. Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt) and the sectarian infighting in Iraq and Lebanon has also contributed to a negative evaluation of Islam.

Against the background of possibilities for religious dialogue, the coverage of ‘self’ and ‘other’, in this case exemplified one’s own and other religion, are important markers. Thus, for non-Muslim Western countries Christianity is assumed as one’s ‘own’ religion and it shows that it receives the least negative of all religious reporting in non-Muslim countries, whereas Islam has the highest negative reporting of any religions, followed by Judaism. On Arab TV, on the other hand, Christianity still receives less negative reporting than Islam and gets even the highest amount of positive reporting of all religions. Thus for Arab TV at least, no equation can be made that their ‘own’ religion is automatically better represented in their ‘own’ media outlets than the religion of ‘the other’. This can be viewed as an encouraging sign for inter-religious dialogue that the equations ‘self’=good and ‘other’=not as good as ‘self’ have been proved wrong in the case of Arab television at least in relation to the coverage of religions.
For inter-religious dialogue to become truly meaning- and successful in the long run, it is essential to include young people both as participants in dialogue activities as well as to evaluate their opinions and aspirations as they are going to shape the future as decision-makers in about two or three decades.

**Chart 1.16. Hope for Global Change, Shell Citizen 2050 Report**

- **Chart 1.16** reveals that for young people religious changes feature as one of the lowest priorities on the agenda of proposed issues for change. Instead the improvement of living conditions, environmental issues as well as society changes and world peace top the list of desired changes. These high figures can be explained by the extensive media coverage of those issues. Yet, the fact that young people do not prioritize the need for religious change may not necessarily pose an obstacle to dialogue efforts. Instead, some of the top priority issues of the young people such as world peace or care for the environment are not contravening religious beliefs but are central features of several religions. Thus, these findings may actu-
ally suggest the inclusion of some seemingly secular issues in inter-religious dialogue forums, especially in regard to attracting more young people to participate in dialogue activities.

1.7. The Challenge – Asking the Right Questions

Other results of the Shell Citizen 2050 Report regarding young people’s attitude toward religious changes are rather vague and cannot be used for significant and meaningful conclusions that could withstand closer critical scrutiny. Several charts/questions are ambiguous because they already predetermine answers. This becomes obvious when the attitudes of Christian and Muslim youths are examined regarding their feelings as to whether ‘their’ religion should spread all over the world and ultimately replace all others. The comment ‘Hope for Islam spread all over the world / Islam as the only religion’ is very precise in its meaning. However, the question most likely to be intended to mean something similar to Christians is framed as ‘Acceptance of Jesus/Acceptance of God’ and is far more ambiguous and very vague in its wording. The ambiguity becomes evident when the results of this question are more detailed. It shows that among other countries Saudi Arabia and the US rank at the same (low) level of agreement to this statement. However, Saudi Arabia is a Muslim country with strict interpretations of Islam whereas the USA has a large number of people who consider themselves as evangelical Christians who have accepted Jesus. At this point it becomes clear that the respondents in the two countries interpret the question differently. No Muslim has problems with accepting Jesus per se as Muslims recognize him as one of the prophets (along with Moses). Moreover, Muslims could also agree to the neutral statement of accepting God. Thus, Muslims could agree to ‘Acceptance of Jesus/Acceptance of God’ if it is just understood as a general acknowledgement of accepting Jesus and/or God. However, if the question would be correctly specified as ‘Acceptance of Jesus as Son of God/Acceptance of the Holy Trinity’, statements which exemplify Christianity in a nutshell, then the approval rates among Muslim respondents would most likely drop significantly.

In order to compare the attitudes of young Muslims and young Christians about their own religion replacing others, questions need
to be asked in a similar manner, perhaps along the line, “Do you want to see Islam as the only religion spread all over the world?” and “Do you want to see Christianity as the only religion spread all over the world?”

Another example of vagueness is the category ‘Hope for Religious Change’, which does not reveal what kind of change the young respondents desire. Does this hope for change include religious revivalism or change towards less religion? Such general statements need further specification in order to become meaningful for analysis and conclusions.

Questionnaires also often provide the category ‘other’ as happens in the Shell Study under the heading ‘other religious change’. However, if respondents cannot specify what they subsume under ‘other religious change’, the findings of such a generalized category cannot contribute any significant results.

Although the examples for ambiguous questions were drawn from the Shell Citizen 2050 Report, the earlier mentioned use of the simplified terms ‘modernist’ and ‘fundamentalist’ in regards to religion by Pew makes it clear that questionnaires and findings from other polling institutes equally need to pay more attention to asking the right questions. Thus, designing questionnaires requires not only methodological skills but also in-depth knowledge of the subject area to avoid confusion and guessing among respondents. After all, the gathered data should facilitate the comparison of results to come up eventually with meaningful conclusions.

1.8. Conclusion

Dialogue necessitates as a precondition knowledge about oneself and about ‘the other’ and in the case of inter-religious dialogue, an increased reporting about religious affairs would be desirable. Yet despite several inter-religious dialogue initiatives at national and international level and repeated calls to the media to inform more about religions in a positive manner, religious coverage has not increased on the news agenda in general, except in some circumstances when religious leaders were presented mainly in a scandalized form. The results of the opinion polls have highlighted that people obviously draw their own conclusions from the often
stereotyped media reporting that mainly focuses on scandals or the extreme interpretations of religion but also from current events happening in the religious realm. These results suggest that religion is evaluated more often in a negative way and that the adherents of other faiths are viewed more often with mistrust than in a positive manner. Moreover, suspicions about ‘the other’ religions have increased in recent years, even in places where these faiths have almost no followers. These negative trends of how especially religions of ‘the others’ are perceived, not only influence the openness of the public for dialogue attempts but also reiterate the need to be more careful in media coverage of religions.

One-dimensional reporting about religion which often uses stereotypes is not conducive to any dialogue efforts. Moreover, the intertwining of religion with political symbolism and vice versa, in the case of Islam, also proves unhelpful for inter-religious dialogue as political issues so easily get in the way of true understanding. Instead, increased coverage of every day religious practice and of rituals both in non-Muslim and in Muslim majority countries, together with an increased focus on shared values among believers from different faiths, would highlight several common aspects that have been rather left out of media coverage so far. In addition, the often used terms ‘modernists’ or ‘fundamentalists’ in the media to describe certain religious and political groups are over-simplifying their message, this can be unhelpful for true and meaningful inter-religious and political dialogue. Afterall, dialogue can only begin successfully with the establishment of a certain level of trust and understanding, something which can be achieved by increased positive and less negative media coverage of religion and their shared values.
2. How Religious Leaders are Framed in International Media
by Christian Kolmer

2.1. Personalisation in the Media
A personal relationship with God is an elementary feature of religion for many believers. The dialogue between religions can therefore develop best from a dialogue between individuals. This personal quality of dialogue is an aspect which fits neatly with the demands of the media society of the 21st century. Over the last 20 years media coverage of politics and business has changed in a marked way, as the focus has shifted increasingly from institutions to personages. The ascendancy of personality over substance in the media has expanded from the realm of politics to other sectors of society like business or the non-governmental organisations. Actors or rock stars are increasingly involved with the publicity of organisations like UNHCR or public concerns ranging from global warming to animal protection. In the headline media for instance the visibility of executives as a share of the overall coverage of companies has risen by about 70% between 200 and 2007.

This trend has been sometimes traced back to a growing professionalization of public relations, which makes ever more use of orchestration and dramatisation. Outside the USA this change has been perceived as an increasing “Americanisation” of the public sphere. The growing personalisation of reporting has in turn had a marked influence on the strategies of the protagonists which tailor their communication activities to the demands of mass media, a process that has been explained as growing “mediatisation” of other spheres of society. Mediatisation in this context is defined as “the meta process by which everyday practices and social relations are increasingly shaped by mediating technologies and media organisations.”

---

2.2. Visibility of Religious Leaders 2007-2009

Against the background of this trend towards personalisation, it is evident how important religious leaders have become for the public perception of their faith – and for the dialogue between religious communities. The visibility of religious leaders in international TV news shows a striking gap between different religious traditions concerning the role of religious leaders in the reports of the media. While international TV news devotes a significant share of their reports to representatives of Christian churches, Islamic religious leaders do not play a comparable role in the media sphere.

Chart 2.1. Relative visibility of religious leaders, 04/2007-02/2009

In the realm of religion, personalisation of media coverage is obviously not yet as far evolved as in other segments of society. This can probably be explained by the reluctance of many religious leaders to engage “modern” media. On the other hand, a small group of religious leaders enjoys a quite considerable media presence. There are several factors that drive media coverage of these
progatonists, ranging from their political role – like The Dalai Lama – to their established status – as in the case of The Pope – and conflict, or in the case of Tom Cruise, whose role as a leading representative of Scientology has been discussed in some depth in connection with the “Valkyrie” movie in Germany.

Chart 2.2. Volume of coverage of religious leaders, 04/2007-02/2009
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Basis: 13,425 statements about religions leaders in 17 international TV news shows

Compared to other types of protagonists, the tone of coverage of religious leaders is rather friendly. Moreover, reporting is on balance less negative than the tone towards their religions more generally. A great part of the reporting originates from direct quotes, which do not carry a direct positive or negative evaluation of the source. But there remains a significant potential for negative reporting. As liberal media are rather negatively disposed towards the teachings of the more conservatively oriented religions like the Roman Catholic Church, conflicts about the moral implications of modern society possess a strong communication risk. Apart from these basic faultlines between the religious arena and the world of the media, religious organisations and their leaders have to cope
with “normal” communication risks as well, for instance scandals originating from within the organisation.

Chart 2.3. Tone of coverage of religious leaders, 04/2007-02/2009

Basis: 13,425 statements about religions leaders in 17 international TV news shows

2.3. The Media Image of the Pope

The media coverage of the Pope shows the potential for media support and media criticism. Despite the long-standing criticism of the Catholic Church in the media, which focuses especially on its teachings on sexuality and its allegedly rigid structures, Pope Benedict XVI. enjoyed a long spell of positive media coverage and not only in Germany. This ended abruptly in January 2009, when the media charged the Pope with embracing a notorious Holocaust denier, when he ended the excommunication of Bishop Richard Williamson, a member of the conservative Society of Pius X.
This example shows how one false step can mobilize the latent reservations of journalists and other protagonists quoted by journalists. As in the case of general reporting about religion, the inter-religious dialogue does not play a major role in the media image of religious leaders – unless the dialogue fails in a spectacular way. As the news selection of opinion-leading media in general and TV news in particular is controlled by news values like conflict, negativity, status on one hand and news routines that focus on short-term events, a long-term process like dialogue between religions is not judged to be especially newsworthy by the mainstream news outlets.
C.2. How Religious Leaders are Framed in International Media

Chart 2.5. Volume and Tone of Coverage of Pope Benedict XVI, 04/2007-02/2009

Basis: 7,970 statements about the Pope in 17 international TV news shows

It is noteworthy that the Pope was covered in a positive way when the inter-religious dialogue was addressed, even while his overall relationship to other faith traditions gave rise to critical reporting.

2.5. Buddhism and the Role of the Dalai Lama

While the Pope has been a leading protagonist on the political and the media stage for centuries, the role of the Dalai Lama is currently even more impressive. Although living in exile, travelling through the world, the Dalai Lama is not only high up in comparison with religious leaders generally but what is even more: he is the most important representative of Buddhism, which otherwise would most probably be devoid of any significant media coverage.
A 2007 poll by TNS for the German magazine Spiegel shows the high level of support the Dalai Lama enjoyed in Germany at a time when the Pope rode high in public opinion too, profiting from the nationwide feeling of “being Pope”. The Dalai Lama had to cope with growing hostility on the part of the Chinese Government in the wake of the anti-Chinese demonstrations and riots in Tibet during the run-up to the Beijing Olympic Games. The high esteem the Dalai Lama enjoys worldwide outside China is a fruit of his long-standing openness to dialogue in general and the media in particular. This reflects a media strategy that combines high-level events like receptions by leading politicians with directness and authenticity in language and communication style.

The Dalai Lama therefore manages to achieve a continuous media presence that is not dependent on the flow of events, even if the conflict with the Chinese Government has evolved as the prime frame of reference in their reports about the Dalai Lama.
While the attacks from the side of the Chinese government, charging the Dalai Lama with being a “splittist”, left their mark in TV news, the balance turned positive again in May 2008, when the peaceful principles of the Dalai Lama were re-affirmed.

Negative coverage of the Dalai Lama does not result at all from overwhelming criticism, but relates as well to his exile on account of Chinese occupation and his failure to reach an agreement with the Chinese government.

Over the past 22 months, media coverage of the Dalai Lama has been driven by the events in Tibet, but did not peter out in the second half of 2008, because of the approaching fiftieth anniversary of the uprising in Tibet which led to the expulsion of the Dalai Lama in 1959. Although the Chinese Government launched a world-wide media attack on the Dalai Lama, political issues played the leading role in the TV coverage in the years 2007 to 2009.
The importance of the Dalai Lama’s high visibility in opinion-leading media and the resulting world-wide reputation of the Tibetan leader for political decision-makers were underscored again in March 2009, when the refusal of the South African Government to grant a visum to the Dalai Lama led to the cancellation of the South African Peace Conference. This important event would have united a host of Nobel Peace Price Laureates in South Africa in connection with the 2010 Soccer World Cup in a discussion about the role played by sport in bridging gaps between cultures and generating peace in the face of racism and xenophobia. Behind this development lies the positive public opinion on the Dalai Lama, which remains a lasting threat to the Chinese assimilation of Tibet. As the Chinese government has been driven into a ever more acid propaganda war against the Dalai Lama in the context of the 50th anniversary of the uprising in Tibet and the exile of the Dalai Lama, Chinese pressure on the South African Governement thus squashed an important discussion about dialogue and peaceful cooperation, exposing the level of hypocrisy in the political sphere.
Moreover, the high-level support of the Dalai Lama and the ensuing cancellation of the event highlighted the outstanding role of the Dalai Lama as a leading exponent of dialogue between religions and cultures.

But reporting was not restricted to the political role of the Dalai Lama. His religious teachings and frequent allusions to universal rights were taken up by the media as well. Most importantly, the Dalai Lama also strikes a chord with the public and the journalists. This is evident from the very positive overall evaluation of his personality. The Dalai Lama therefore appears as the model of a religious leader for the 21st century, who is equally at home in a TV study as in his temple.

2.6. Personalisation and its Implications for the Dialogue

Against the background of the strained relationship between the Western World and Islam even a conciliatory stance can meet with strong media criticism and do so even in the media of non-Muslim-majority countries. A case in point were the imprecise remarks of the Archbishop of Canterbury on a potential recourse to Sharia Law in the United Kingdom as one way to solve conflicts between Muslims. The resulting uproar in the media was fuelled by critical comments from politicians and led to intensive international media coverage as well. Moreover, on balance the media image of Archbishop Rowan Williams turned significantly negative for the overall period from April 2007 to February 2009.

Media prominence entails not only risks but also. The representatives of small religious groups can help to place them on the international agenda – as one precondition for a global dialogue between religions and cultures. How many people in the Western world would, for instance, know about the Muslim branch known as the Ismailis, if not for the publicity surrounding the Aga Khan, who accounts for nearly 1/5 of the international media coverage of his community (cf. chart 2.1.)? Thus, even when international TV news focuses on the horse racing success of the Aga Khan, a reference to his religious role will always accompany his media presence.
Support for inter-religious dialogue in general and a real dialogue between the Western and the Muslim worlds can, on the basis of the foregoing analysis, expect to benefit from a stronger media-compatible role for religious leaders in dialogue. Moreover dialogue originally relates to a conversation between individuals and that is something that individual religious leaders can seek to embody and build upon in their dealings with the media.
3. The Trust Meltdown – 2008 was a Year When Everyone Everywhere Seemed to Lose Trust in Almost Everybody by Roland Schatz

The year 2008 will be remembered not only for the global economic downturn caused by the U.S. financial crisis, but also for launching a new era of doubt and mistrust in which almost all common values came to be questioned. Even countries enjoying steady and uninterrupted growth rates over the past decade faced slowdowns. The rise in food prices caused demonstrations and protest as early as the first half of 2008, and the price of oil was on a rollercoaster that led to unparalleled questioning of economic planning in wealthy nations. Citibank ended 2008 as a penny stock, albeit better than Lehman Brothers which ended in bankruptcy. When the first Annual Dialogue Report of the C-100 was presented at the World Economic Forum in early 2008, no one would have predicted the dramatic financial losses later that year.

Aside from the economic crisis and the subsequent loss of trust in the different financial systems and those who led them, 2008 was another year in which many impoverished children and parents around the globe had to face the harsh reality that even reaching the most basic living standards remained uncertain. The war in Georgia at the beginning of the Olympic Games forced Europeans to realise that even in their seemingly secure neighbourhood it doesn’t take much to fall back to old patterns of hatred and war. The outbreak of the war in Gaza during Hanukkah, after Christmas and before Hijri New Year reminded the whole world of the unsolved situation in Israel and Palestine. Even putting aside these major conflicts the numbers of refugees losing their homes and being taken care of by the UNHCR continued to rise in 2008. Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe managed to demonstrate hand in hand with the Sudanese, North Korea and the Iranian president, that neither the UN nor other international organizations like the African Union can effectively prevent the abuse of power.

2008 will remain in the minds of people around the world for another reason: it was the year in which China, as the leader of the
BRIC states, had its chance to be recognised as one of the truly global players - face to face with the G8. China’s economic growth rates promised to be strong yet again, and a modern state was supposed to be presented to a global public as supporting and serving the people both within and outside of China. Being the host of the Olympic Games was a unique opportunity to demonstrate the achievements and potential of this huge nation. But in fact the country had to continue dealing with old conflicts within its regions: cultures like Tibet and Uiguria put China’s difficulties in managing diversity into the global limelight. The same is true with respect to the similarly poor way in which China was dealing with the arms business in Africa or the food product scandal. All this was happening at the very time when the TV-Cameras of the world were focusing on China because of the Olympics. The country had been given a unique chance to raise awareness around the world and yet the global public became more aware not only of the positive developments inside of China but also of all the question marks. Attention also focused on the realities behind the one-party regime: the high death-toll and severe suppression of a growing number of people who no longer want to live according to the rules of the party hierarchy in a remote Peking.

As if these events had not put enough pressure on building trust in global leaders, systems and values and those of ‘the other’, terrorists in Pakistan and India reminded the world that too many extremists exist who are abusing religion and values for their private ideological, military and economic goals. The battlegrounds in Iraq and Afghanistan remained constantly in the evening news and kept the global public alert to the fact that democracy is not a one-way road. Elections which worked well and smoothly like the ones in Ghana or even the second one in Iraq were of less interest for the global media. The headline news continued to present the world in a rough and unpleasant state with hardly any progress with regards to the common ground of values such as a basic understanding of human rights and good neighbourship. Even Kenya didn’t do itself and the continent a favour by taking so long to finally accept the voters result...

But amidst all of these pessimistic experiences came the respected polling institute PEW with a sign of hope: people in certain areas
have changed their opinion. They sent strong signals of hope for less violence and more dialogue:

**Chart 3.1. Fewer Muslims View Suicide Bombing as Justified, Pew Global Attitudes Project 2002-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2002-2008 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of polled, who view suicide bombings as often / sometimes justified**


Since 9/11 people were asked the same question year after year and PEW was able to come to the following conclusion in 2008: “The decline in support for terrorism observed in Pew Global Attitudes surveys over the last few years continues this year among Muslims in Nigeria, Turkey and Pakistan. Elsewhere, there has been virtually no change, or in the case of Egypt, a slight increase in support for ‘Lebanese Muslim terrorism’.

Since 2002, the percentage saying that suicide bombing and other forms of violence against civilians is justified in order to defend Islam from its enemies has declined in most predominantly Muslim countries surveyed. For instance, in 2002 roughly three-in-four opinions about Osama bin Laden have followed a similar trend. For instance, only three years ago, about six-in-ten (61%) Jordal-
nian Muslims voiced at least some confidence in the al Qaeda leader; today, just 19% express a positive view. In 2003, 20% of Lebanese Muslims and 15% of Turkish Muslims had positive views of bin Laden. Today, seven years after the September 11 attacks, bin Laden’s ratings have plummeted to the low single digits in both countries (Turkey 3%, Lebanon 2%). Still, substantial numbers of Muslims continue to express confidence in bin Laden in Nigeria (58%), Indonesia (37%) and Pakistan (34%)."1

These results offer a clear indicator, that change is happening on a day by day basis – and yet this is often not recognised neither within the communities where the question was asked nor outside of them.

3.1. Influence of Philosophy on Perception of Religion and Values

Once one takes a step back and tries to understand why effective dialogue between two of the world’s largest religious communities seems to have become more and more difficult one finds the first hints in an area which seems to be ignored and to defy common sense: philosophy.

It can be argued that the reason as to why Muslims and Christians have had so many difficulties understanding each other and why the tension has risen so much over the last one hundred years can be found by looking beyond their purely religious differences and looking instead at their fundamentally different mindset around the ‘common ground of values’ and thinking.

Stefan Weidner2 pointed out that the real problem between “The West” and “The Muslim World” was created once philosophers like Friedrich Nietzsche and later Foucoult, Derrida and Levis-Strauss became accepted in Europe and America with their questioning of everything. Dr. Ceric will refer to this argument in his

As long as both religions had their focus on Allah/God and the Quran or the Bible one could discuss the different concepts and consequences. But together with the Jews one was – a comparison Lessing became famous for in the play “Nathan der Weise” – admiring and following the same ring, just that “it had gone lost”. But “the ring” itself was not questioned.

With the turn to the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century Europe’s intellectuals were intrigued by the thoughts of the “Alles-Zermalmer” (the destroyer of everything) from Nietzsche and Schopenhauer. Nietzsche was – by following Hegels ‘Phänomenologie’ in which he already elaborated the idea of Existenz defined by negativity\textsuperscript{3} – literally enjoying the act of provokation in his works like ‘Der Antichrist’, in which he declared his fight with Christianity “on every wall even on those which would be readable by the blind”\textsuperscript{4}. He ends by proposing the “change of all values – Die Umwertung aller Werte”\textsuperscript{5}. By being quoted everywhere he was one of the early ‘Agenda Setters’. Wolfgang Beutin describes this trend in ‘European History on Mentality’ with the clear tendency no longer only by intellectuals but later even by large parts of the public who “turned their back in the second half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century to religious beliefs. The working class was guided by Karl Marx ‘Religion is opium for the people’”\textsuperscript{6}. Almost a century later the communist Minister of the Chinese Military changed this Marx quote into “Religion is poison for the people” while he entered Tibet for the first time.

To illustrate how common this mindset was, Beutin later quotes the protestant leader Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who described the opinion-leading mindset in 1944 out of prison “God as moral, political and

\begin{enumerate}
\item Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: Phänomenologie, Page 20; Leipzig 1949.
\item Friedrich Nietzsche: Der Antichrist, Page 253; Munich 1988.
\item Ibid.
\item Wolfgang Beutin in Peter Dinzelbacher (Editor): Europäische Mentalitätsgeschichte, Page 149; Stuttgart 1993.
\end{enumerate}
scientific hypothesis is deleted”. With this he proved the argument that by following Hegel, Feuerbach, Nietzsche and Marx—questioning everything even for the sake of questioning was not an insult, but another way of approaching truth. Bochenski framed it in 1947 as “our time is suffering under the bad consequences of thinking without a metaphysic frame” This was an idea which found a foothold in the European discussion and later spread to the US. Sir Karl Popper later was able to build his own school on this – his autobiography has the title “Unended Quest”.

This has led to fundamental consequences in all areas of society from science to daily life, as people realised that those truths which they had trusted for centuries were intellectually destroyed either completely or partially. Not everyone was able to rebuild a new and more solid base using the ‘left over stones’. This experience was taught in Europe and the US but hardly anybody before Stefan Weidner pointed out that these developments in Europe would have an impact on the scientists and people in the Middle East, Asia and Africa and their relationship to “the West”. Other regions did not have the chance of growing into the thinking of Karl Popper in the same ways as Europe moved through trials and tribulations of Scholasticism, Enlightenment, Idealism and Nationalism. Even the US took their time.

In the Middle East, Asia and Africa this development of thinking had no time to go step by step, phase by phase, as Rilke described it in a constructive way in his poem ‘Stufen’. They had to face, understand and adapt to 500 years of revolutionary thinking in the essence of the meaning of this world within less than 20 years. This had to create a situation of misunderstanding, fear and existential threat. While Europe was able to take its time, the rest of the world had to take the crash course as TV and the Internet gave access to the whole universe of thought everywhere at any time.

7 Beutin, loc.cit.
Once one opens oneself to this perspective the understanding of the global challenge might become ‘easier’ to deal with: it seems to be less a question of ‘right or wrong’ in regards to values or even religion. It is more a question of trust in one’s own fundamentals and the fundamentals of “the other”.

Everybody around the world is liable to respond with panic once he or she has to realise that the base assumptions that have ordered their thought and rendered their world stable and intelligible are moving or even vanishing. This situation becomes even more critical when it is realised that those authorities who had always been understood as the ones who would give a hand in a crisis, either no longer exist, or are identified as powerless.

The experience which describes the typical situation of a teenager moving towards leading an adult life is no longer reserved for this relatively small section of society (although one can get scared that in particular those countries with little experience of how enlightenment can create positive forces as well, have the largest percentage of teenagers…). In 2008 it has become the one common experience around the globe: people losing their homes due the subprime catastrophe, losing their jobs, realising that their credit-cards are no longer functioning, that the pension fund savings went down the drain and that the cost for one packet rice has doubled within weeks. This experience, which seemed to have been ‘reserved’ for those living in hurricane regions, for people calling areas home where earthquakes, firestorms or floodings seem to come more often than once a century seemed to be part of the family of 2008, effecting those people whom once only got to know of such circumstances due to the evening news after such catastrophies. No longer is it just far away strangers who are impacted. Almost everybody knows somebody who faced in 2008 a fundamental downward experience. Not only in Bangladesh, Iraq or Somalia but in Connecticut, London, Frankfurt, Beijing or Tokyo.

3.2. Financial Meltdown as Common Experience
The global perception of the unique devaluation of values happening in 2008 is at least described in the global media as something not seen since World War II or even the times of the Great Depression. The World Bank announced in early March 2009 that the
economic situation around the world was the worst it had been in 80 years. Whether or not this is true for all regions – Canada, South Africa, Poland and China are just a small selection of countries with growth and stable banks - it is true that several blue chips and even more importantly the small and medium size companies, that are the main employers in Europe and elsewhere announced profits for 2008 and stated they are not scared by the year ahead even with perhaps sometimes even significantly less growth than in 2008 or the record breaking years 2006 and 2007. But data supporting the ‘glass is half full’ perception of economic statistics was not the data which made it to the front page. The headlines in 2008 and even more so in the first quarter 2009 were instead supporting the idea that all economies on the globe are bankrupt:

Buzzwords for the axis of horror: inflation, recession, depression…


Basis: Overall 283,698 stories in 26 TV media
3.2.1. The US Example: How Media Influence People’s Opinions

In regards to the perception of values 2008 will definitely be understood as the year in which the people lost trust in their own economy – whether this is based on real facts or whether it was merely the result of a self-fulfilling prophecy is a very interesting question because they were ‘told’ by the opinion-leading media that they were in a crisis long before the evidence seemed to warrant this conclusion. Americans were told by the evening news from ABC, CBS and NBC that the country was falling apart financially – see Graph 1 - even in those months in 2007 and 2008 in which the US-economy was in fact still growing as in Q1 or Q2 of 2008, while the network news presented their own version of the situation with an overall negative sentiment of minus 80.

It is important to be clear here that the data in the graph describe every single report on the air in the prime time news from ABC, CBS and NBC every day since Jan 2007 until March 2009. This data could be a report on a specific company, it could be an interview with the FED, it could be quoting quarterly results – in other words: every single piece in regards to their own US economy or any other aspect which would give the audience an understanding of what was happening in the business world was analysed by human experts, who sit in front of taped TV-News and scrutinise every single bit of every news report day by day.
Once one aggregates this data to a monthly trend one can see how these TV-networks had selected out of the universe of daily reports on Apple, Citigroup or Ford what they thought best represented the US economy. The bottom line is that in 2007 the US journalists had already come to the conclusion that in not one single month was the economy in a positive situation and that this got even worse in 2008, the election year. As described above, this view was neither backed by the US or international authorities measuring the US economic development nor did this give an accurate picture how the US companies or their competitors around the globe were faring. The success of Apple, GE, HP or Wal Mart hardly show up in the data selected. Then again, no one sitting in front of ABC, CBS or NBC would likely be able to understand the situation in Canada, or why Canadians were not talking about bail-but plans, why the Canadian finance sector was doing fine or why other blue chips listed on Wall Street (such as the insurance giants Allianz, Axa or Munich Re) were producing profits even in 2008 while AIG declared they would need a taxpayer injection of $180 billion in this same period of time wherein others had managed their assets in a more sustainable way. The journalists of ABC, CBS and NBC were focussing their news selection regarding business de-
velopment on Lehmann, Bear Stearns, General Motors and other companies. Their management had created enough stories to be covered, but the question remains: why so little news about other industries? And if one comes to the conclusion that the financial sector is of special relevance: why so few reports on the banking industry in Canada? Why so little interest in those companies within the US and outside it who represent a different management philosophy and style such as Banco Santander, which announced a 2008 profit of 8 billion euros.

As ABC, CBS and NBC had decided to focus on the losers one can easily follow with the eye on the dotted line that ‘Joe Average’, sitting in front of his prime time news believed these journalists: consumer confidence was falling and falling since 2007, as the blue line in Graph 1 illustrates. It reached an historical record long before the US economy finally stopped growing. It is worthwhile to keep the newspapers from October 2008 and keep the TVnews of these days: in midst of the final election rally, the announcement was made that the growth results for the US economy in Q3 had not dropped into negatives as all the ‘experts’ had been forecasting previously for Q1, Q2 and now certainly for Q3. No, even in Q3 the US economy didn’t fall into severe negatives, after having been growing despite the negative sentiment in the first half year. This news was not welcomed: it was quoted in a short and neutral way and directly afterwards the journalists continued searching for interview-partners who could instead give them quotes that 2008 was nothing other than the Great Depression of 1929.

Who would expect in such an overall framework any US citizen to buy a new car, spend money for a nice holiday or invite friends out for a decent meal? If one wants to find another example for the concept of the Self-Fulfilling Theory: the way that US TV-networks selected from the pool of information on business development and how the US people responded to this seems to be another showcase.
3.2.2 In Europe Similar Patterns of How Media Shape Consumer Confidence are Visible

The patterns of media impact on consumer confidence in Germany, France, UK one finds that they are almost identical to the US experience: as the charts 4-6 illustrate.

**Chart 3.4. Impact of Media Coverage on Consumer Confidence, Germany 2007-2009**
Everywhere people responded to the same news-selection. The consumer confidence index is at an all time low almost everywhere. Even in those countries like Canada, Poland, South Africa or Switzerland who that haven’t been hit by subprime and the other aspects of the financial meltdown like the US or UK have been.
Employment figures in Germany reached an all time high in 2008… but the overall sentiment was as if almost everybody already lost his job or is expecting to lose it next week.

As a consequence one is not risking too much by saying that people around the world were not only facing the largest meltdown of financial values, but that they lost trust in their financial industry including leading people on both sides: the banking and insurance industry as well as the governments. The most extreme case to follow was probably that of Iceland. But even regions like the GCC were facing irritations not only among the business elite but also among the people. The New York Times ran a story on its front-page on February 12th how expats in Dubai left the Emirates in panic after losing their jobs and facing an insecure legal situation where they could be sentenced to jail if they could not manage to pay their monthly credits on cars and or flats.

3.3. Loss of Trust in Leaders

As 2008 progressed people on all continents were united in their experience of losing money or assets: the poor had to pay more money for rice and the rich saw their houses and/or pension funds vanish. This had consequences. The trust in leaders melted simultaneously. The media, who had been rather calm with questions regarding the real value of nicely presented annual reports, responded in their typical way: heroes were turned into criminals within days. Chapter 5.2. has already pointed to the phenomenon of personalisation in the media with tabloid media framing those working in the finance sector as “banksters”: 
When management was described in the opinion leading media bottom line after one year of newsflow showed that only a few of the leading managers were not framed in the same way, as the following rating of the banking industry demonstrates:
Even countries like Switzerland which had been regarded as different and therefore rock solid, turned out just the same or even worse. The trust crisis started to become one generating systematic disbelief: if UBS top-managers didn’t act in accordance with proper business ethics and Credit Suisse changed their announced results within seven working days, there was hardly anyone left within the industry in whom the people felt they could trust. People responded by transferring money to those banks which had not been mentioned in the media in a negative way (so far) or even by closing their accounts completely and bringing it back home.
C.3. The Trust Meltdown

At the same time the polls reflected this unique experience with an all time low in regards to manager reputation: no other profession had seen a sharper fall in credibility among the public than the business elite.

Chart 3.9.  Loss of trust in business

Who do you trust more to solve the United States’ economic problems – the U.S. government or U.S. businesses?

- U.S. government
- U.S. businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Americans</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
<th>Independents</th>
<th>Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. government</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. businesses</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gallup Poll, March 5-8, 2009
Based on 500 national adults in Form B

This was followed by a fundamental fall in people’s trust within the whole economic system. In the US as well as in Europe large numbers questioned the ‘capitalist’ system and were open to change towards ‘socialism’, or, at least, a stronger state directed economy – ignoring the fact that those banks which had been at the forefront of all the turmoil had been state run finance organisations such as Freddie Mac or Fannie Mae in the US or in Germany IKB, Sachsen LB and NORD LB state owned and governed banks that instead of lending money to SME’s pushed taxpayers money into subprime markets in the US. The latest Gallup poll released March 2009 demonstrates that the overall majority in the US no longer trusts US businesses to fix the economic problems.
3.4. War Remains in the Headlines and in the Heads

While one tries to get a grip on the range of value-meltdown happening in 2008 one should not only focus on the materialistic side in regards to the financial meltdown around the globe.

Perception and trust in those who run a country is essential to the fundamental question of the ability to secure peace. In Europe the decision was taken in the Middle Ages to hand over the individual power to something described as the ‘state’ – as Thomas Hobbes pointed out in his Leviathan, it was no longer worthwhile following the power of the mace but to let a ‘higher’ institution take care of the individuals right to not get killed while travelling from A to B. This fundamental change, which is seldom understood by today’s heads of state and their ‘authorities’ (i.e. the justice, tax-authorities, immigration etc.) was existential: one no longer had the option of going to one’s ‘own’ count or head farmer, who was taking big percentages for guaranteeing personal survival as it was the tradition until 300 years ago, one had to write papers to faceless authorities and with whom one has no personal relationship.

I would be surprised if the current practices at US Immigration or South African or UAE borders continue, as it is a daily bad experience for legions of innocent travellers. If their own heads of state faced similar experiences of physical lack of fundamental rights e.g. elderly people – after sitting 10 hours in an airplane - get sent home by SA immigrant civil servants who have no understanding what the term ‘serving’ means both to their own country as well towards those who visit. The contrast is clear at the Peking International Airport, where in front of each civil servant one can find a little machine with five buttons to press: 5=one is absolutely dissatisfied with the treatment by this civil servant and 1=one is delighted about the friendliness.

Another example will be explored in Chapter C.4. on the perception of Heads of State in regards to religious matters, but this deserves a mention now: US backpackers had already started late in the Bill Clinton era to change the flag on their rucksack from US to Canada. It turned out to be less unpleasant and economically most disastrous to be spotted in SA, Australia, New-Zealand and, later on, also in Europe as US citizen. Aside from the US government in
general and State Department particularly: who should be blamed for this unnecessary ‘downgrading’ of their citizens? That the media all over the world loved to select only one part of news coming from the US is not reason enough to not make change happen. No CEO of any company would survive if employees or clients were treated in a similar way, only because the media loves to frame an institution in an unbalanced way. The Swiss food giant Nestlé was running ads in the Middle East pointing out that they were not Danish after protesters in Palestine and Egypt started to burn the Swiss flag ignoring the fact that the Swiss flag was not the Danish one in the heat of the caricature protests.

The human right of being able to move and exist without fear for one’s own life and pure acceptance did not improve in 2008. On purpose I started this section without turning directly to the wars and militant conflicts in 2008. As the willingness for dialogue among people from different religious and value backgrounds is not only based on the question of life or death. How do ex-pats in Dubai feel by having to hand over their passports to the UAE authorities – only for the sake of working on behalf of Dubai companies?

But to move on to the typical examples: 2008 saw the Chinese government preferring to kill Tibetans as soon as March – live on air in front of global TV news. This was no help with regard to improving trust in the quality of political leadership only few months ahead of the world’s largest peace party: the Olympic Games. Already in early 2008 one of the BRIC states presented itself as no alternative to the world.
A few months later the second did the same: Russia lost the option of presenting itself as alternative world power in the way they ran the Georgia conflict. The following graphs demonstrate how Russia was portrayed in the media.

**Chart 3.10. Coverage of the Georgia Conflict in British TV News, August 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Georgians</th>
<th>Russians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis: 687 news stories in 3 British TV news shows

**Chart 3.11. Coverage of the Georgia Conflict in South African TV News, August 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Georgians</th>
<th>Russians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis: 1,023 news stories in 7 South African TV news shows
These two examples from UK and SA illustrate how Russia was presented to the people in England and South Africa as the key actor. Consequently the public in the UK or SA perceived Russia as a government which had not changed since the cold war. Other news coming out of Moscow didn’t make it better: the ongoing murder of journalists and the way the Russian government was treating the gas conflict with Ukraine and the EU did not present another BRIC state to the watching world public as an alternative to the US in regards to building trust and listening to others than the own nationalistic motives. The ongoing news in regards to the treatment of Chordokowski is just another ongoing info flow, at least outside of Russia, and that the fundamental individual rights described five centuries ago by Thomas Hobbes seem to be of marginal interest to those in power in the Kremlin.

It is as if Putin wanted to make this point clear to everybody on all continents: his attendance at the World Economic Forum in Davos 2009 made clear to his own attending Russian CEO’s, as well as the complete international business and political elite that his interest in dialogue is close to zero. Putin didn’t attend private sessions he personally had arranged and his way of answering the offered help by Michael Dell in front of the world media stressed his message: the political elite of Russia is open for monologue but not for dialogue. This was not a good sign coming from one of key powers in the world.

Before 2008 came to an end, India made it into the limelight with the terrorattack and its difficulties dealing with Pakistan. From the BRIC States only one emerged from 2008 without a frightening story: Brazil.

The African continent continued to not communicate that it is more than Kenya, Zimbabwe or Sudan. The impressive improvements in Ghana, Tansania, Namibia, etc. were hardly recogised in Asia, America or Europe as the headlines again belonged to the conflict regions in Kenya, Sudan and Zimbabwe. Without Kofi Annan’s moderating skills the killings after the Kenyan elections would have not come to an end by March 2008. But the pictures in the heads of the public in and outside of Africa were already framed by the scenes of horror in Kenya after the elections. The same was true for Sudan and Zimbabwe. With this overall framing, it be-
comes more and more difficult to expect trust in Europe, Asia or the Americas as long as the evening news is dominated by these dictators. Impressive activities by Bill Gates, Tony Blair, Mo Ibrahim, Kofi Annan and uncountable others make it clear they need to understand that doing good is no longer enough: one has to make sure that the others, that is almost the complete rest of the world, are aware of these concrete projects which are supporting dialogue on the ground and everywhere else where people are getting to know about it.

3.5. The Palestine Conflict – Again Visible in 2008

Last but not least, by going over the books in regards to improving or decreasing perceptions of values one has to recall the outbreak of the Gaza conflict directly after the Western part of the globe calmed down to celebrate Christmas and the most important reminder of peace on earth. As the media had almost ignored the end of the ceasefire on December 19, almost everybody in Africa, Asia, the Americas and Europe was shocked on the second day of Christmas by seeing weapons killing again instead of dialogue to finally find a peaceful agreement in the Region.

Without wanting to be cynical: Jorge in Lissabon as well as Sarah in Dover or Stefano in Venice – not to mention ‘Joe Sixpack’ in Minnesota, Li in Shanghai, Joe in Brisbane or Mpho in Pretoria – nobody will ever come to Gaza, Tel Aviv or Beirut. Their perception of the region and its century old conflict is purely based on what they see in the evening news. And that is not helping to create even a taste for dialogue:
C.3. The Trust Meltdown


The TV news in US, Europe and Africa were presenting mainly Israel as guilty while Hamas seemed almost invisible. This might be a success from a PR point of view, but the people in the US and Europe had received enough news about Hamas and the problems to trust these pictures. On January 16 at a debate about these results participants in an audience in Dubai said: “We have a fatigue seeing these pictures – not because we don’t feel sorry for the victims. But how can they expect actions from our side when they continue to tease the beast? If you pull the tail of a lion how can you be surprised about his reaction?” This response explains the response of the world public: on one hand Israel is losing ground almost everywhere but at the same time the people in Palestine are winning nothing. In the end all parties in the region are losing existential values as well as the last pieces of reputation as the data show:
Chart 3.13. Evaluation of Israeli / Palestinian protagonists
During the Gaza Conflict 2008/2009

And it is not over interpreting if one comes to the conclusion that the ‘new’ pictures of an old conflict would be of zero impact to the people outside the region. It demonstrates the World’s inability to fix a problem which is touching people around the globe. To see this happen again at the end of a year which was not developing too much hope this could have been the final drop in the bucket of people feeling no longer des-illusioned but depressed. And the overall mood of depression is definitely not the frame on which dialogue can grow and get strong.

3.6. Democracy Seen and Experienced as Source of Hope
One would miss out on a fundamental experience by talking on values without mentioning the spectacular elections happening in 2008. Even with the described problems in Kenya or even Zimbabwe the people in Africa are realising more and more that shared power can become a sustainable experience. The elections in Ghana ran without any conflict although unfortunately also without any headlines in the world news… But these facts are reflected in the peoples perception: the latest polling results published at the Africa Barometer http://afrobarometer.org/round3.html demon-
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strate the power of this progress. The following selected five re-
results speak for themselves:

**Chart 3.15. Perception of Democracy in 18 African Countries 2005-2006**

Who would have expected these strong results 5 years ago – not to
talk about 10 or 20 years ago? Mid 2009 the updated results will
show, which impact the experience of 2008 elections made on the
peoples perception of this “best of the worse options” to improve
the circumstances within a country.

Chart 3.16.  Patience with Democracy in 18 Countries, 2005-2006


Chart 3.17.  Support for Multiparty Competition in 18 Countries, 2005-2006


3.6. Iraq is Developing Stronger and Stronger
Despite of all the negative news and prejudices the people in Iraq proved with their second elections to be able to judge based on facts and less on PR. The slide shows how the situation in Iraq was portrayed by US, European and SA TV news – and the dots demonstrate how the people in Iraq themselves feel. One couldn’t see a stronger split:

Chart 3.20. US TV Coverage of the Situation in Iraq and Opinion Poll on the Situation of Iraqis

The European journalists had been so determined in their opinion that President Bush and Tony Blair were fundamentally wrong in their decision to remove Saddam Hussein from power that they had obvious difficulties in reporting about the real situation going on in Iraq once Hussein and his government was replaced by the elected President Maleki and the new government. News out of Iraq was ok if they could include at least a bomb attack or protest against the US or British government. The newly built schools, opened companies and restored infrastructure only rarely make it into the evening news in Germany or elsewhere. With this lack of information the public especially in Germany was missing out the
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Chart 3.21. British TV Coverage of the Situation in Iraq and Opinion Poll on the Situation of Iraqis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No Clear Rating</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/02-02/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04-02/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06-02/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07-02/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Iraqis who feel unconfident in their personal environment

Basis: 3,704 reports in 2 British TV news shows / Poll: ARD Tagesthemen

Chart 3.22. South African TV Coverage of the Situation in Iraq and Opinion Poll on the Situation of Iraqis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No Clear Rating</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/02-02/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04-02/05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06-02/07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07-02/08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Iraqis who feel unconfident in their personal environment

Basis: 3,336 reports in 5 South African TV news shows / Poll: ARD Tagesthemen
growth in the northern part of Iraq and entrepreneurs had difficulties getting support from their own government in Berlin to become part of the revitalised business options in an richer and richer Iraque with all its oil sources. This became almost grotesque when Secretary of State Frank Steinmeier finally visited Bagdad early 2009 – still in a bulletproof vest – to keep the public at home in line with their (wrong) perception of the situation in Iraq, while, trying to support German CEOs finally getting their part of the billions of investment due to be decided by the Bagdad authorities.


While 12 months ahead of election day in November 2008 the US media as well as the international journalists declared the race for the White House as a battle between Hillary Clinton and Rudy Giuliani the world turned more and more exited once the ‘experts’ were proven wrong by Barack Obama and John McCain. Both representing a similar but different approach of energy, surprise and compassion showed that there is always a chance to come back.

At the same time religion was relevant: Obama was framed by his later secretary of state and her husband as having strange connections towards both Islam and an extreme Christian pastor, while Mike Huckabee and even more so Mitt Rommney had to answer tough question regarding their ability to build their own opinion outside of their religious backgrounds. And McCain later had the problem of being not connected enough with the church:


Basis: 34,845 statements on or by candidates on ABC, CBS and NBC evening news programs
Religion remained an issue later on for Barack Obama as he had difficulties presenting his position not only to US media. The data show how much more they focussed on Obama’s position in regards to religion than compared to Hillary Clinton or John McCain:

Chart 3.24. Volume and Tone of Candidate Coverage on Religious Issues, 02-08/2008

Basis: 753 statements in TV network news, Time and Newsweek

The Obama campaign team had severe problems finding the right answer to the attacks already before the final stage of the campaign in September. The polls saw him 10 points behind John McCain after he had announced Sarah Palin, who managed to close the gap for the Republican candidate with the conservative religious voters.

But with the collapse of Lehman, neither the issue of African-origin, nor religious issues mattered: “It’s the economy” was played again, even stronger than its invention by Bill Clinton during the race in 1992. Usually one issue can dominate the public agenda once the opinion-leading media give it more air space than 1.5% of all reports in the evening news. In September 2008 the focus on topics related to economy reached a historic peak of 35%. McCain was all of a sudden presented as part of the system and lost immediately his pole position in the polls. Obama managed to be seen as outsider and walked into White House under the unseen applause by a majority of the US citizens and with undefinable hope from the rest of the world. Not only in late night shows jokes made the round comparing him to Jesus Christ Superstar, including
expectations that he can not only walk on water but fix all the problems of the word, such as climate change, the recession and war in Gaza within the first 100 days. As no human being has this ability one has to be careful that the excitement does not turn quickly into frustration. The falling job approval rates announced by PEW early March 2009 down to 59% indicate that this process is already on its way. But aside of this challenge for the new US president to manage expectations, one result of the 2008 elections won’t be taken away: Hope was re-instilled and not only in the US. The opportunity for the world to witness to this incarnation of the so-called ‘American dream’ had to impress everybody. All around the world even the strongest anti-Americans realised that in their own country it would not be very likely that somebody looking like a foreigner could even dream of becoming a candidate.

Democracy became a new understanding: the feeling of ‘representation’ seemed to be more important than any other value implemented in the idea of sharing power. Obama represented more than the black people and more than democrats: he seemed to give people within the US and outside the impression of empowerment and participation.

3.8. Conclusion
Writing about values in regards to the openness for dialogue 2008 was more than just ambivalent: the financial crisis reminded the people that materialistic goals alone seem to be less stable than they had thought. On the other hand in Africa, Asia but mainly with the elections in the US, everybody realised that the tyranny of the status quo is not eternal.

One additional result became obvious: no country government was in the position to declare their situation and their core politics as perfect. On all continents the people in line with their heads of state realised one can’t continue walking the same path. So change will no longer be seen as a sign of weakness, as everybody has to give up traditions without losing his or her face in the public.

The best starting point to take the risk of dialogue in a more sustainable way as benchmarking and learning from others will be understood as being clever.
4. Politics in the Perception of the People and the Media
by Michael Gawthorne

“Which scriptures should guide our public policy? Should we go with Leviticus, which suggests that slavery is ok and that eating shellfish is an abomination? ... Or should we just stick to the Sermon on the Mount, a passage that is so radical that it is doubtful that our own defense department would survive its application.”

- Barack Obama 2008

“I feel God’s words coming to me, ‘Go get the Palestinians their state and get the Israelis their security, and get peace in the Middle East’. And, by God, I’m gonna do it.”

- George W. Bush 2005

4.1. The shift in values: where are we at the end of 2008?
A monumental shift in values occurred in the United States in 2008: the election of Barack Obama, an African-American candidate sharing the name of the Prophet, and, a candidate whose charismatic approach made him “the biggest celebrity in the world”

In order to take stock of where we stand at 2009, we begin by realising that leaders in both West and East are facing a set of value contradictions which will be decisive in deciding the direction of the dialogue. The US is at a crossroads: Obama has created a powerful set of symbols for the perception of the US in the rest of the world, and as his recent efforts in engaging Iran have showed,

1 “Obama Mocking God and the Bible Speech on Religion” URL: http://video.google.com/videosearch?q=obama+and+god&rls=com.microsoft:de:IE-SearchBox&oe=UTF-8&sourceid=ie7&um=1&ie=UTF-8&ei=2JG-SYOtNdCMsAbVyJDQBg&sa=X&oi=video_result_group&resnum=4&ct=title#.


3 “Is he ready to lead“, Republican advertising Campaign 2008.
there is a will to engage in dialogue between East and West. However, he has inherited a long-standing problem of US presidents – ambiguity. By balancing the perceptual needs of the American voter with the perceptual needs of his policies he has already created uncertain and disparate messages especially regarding religion. Our introductory quote highlights both the change in direction but also Obama’s contradiction – during the election campaign Obama explicitly devalued the role of religion in governance and political decision making, while at the same time cultivated his own religiosity. The lack of coherence, while strategically necessary in the context of a difficult election campaign, raises some key questions: How will the mix of religious values and personal conviction, which was a trademark of President Bush’s style, function in Obama’s vision of pluralistic democratic government? Will the US be able to produce a coherent set of messages and hence take a solid role in dialogue? What effect will the change of leadership have on perceptions of Americans around the world?

On the other side of the dialogue, the Middle East is currently both symbolically and literally an area in which conflicts over nationhood are driven by religion. For the Middle East, we need to ask ourselves if nationalization of Islam, which binds the Middle East into “the Muslim World”, is belied by the concept of nationhood? As the Bahraini Foreign minister, Shaikh Khalid bin Ahmed bin Mohamed Al Khalifa put it:

“The rise of nationalism, itself a foreign import to the [Middle Eastern] region, produced new perceptions. Arabs could lay the blame for their troubles on the Turks, who had ruled them for many centuries. Turks could lay the blame for the stagnation of their civilization on the dead weight of the Arab past, in which the creative energies of the Turkish people were caught and immobilized. And the Persians could lay the blame for the loss of their ancient glories on Arabs,
If the West is in danger of slipping into ambiguity, the Middle East begins 2009 with the problem that its militant elements have usurped the position of political protagonists in the perception of the region’s values. The necessity of dividing politics into nations has weakened the ability of political leaders to challenge those who have taken over the image of a broader and more symbolically powerful “Muslim World”.

The final aspect of this chapter, and the link between the role politics is having on the perceptions of the “other” is the current nature of Western and Middle Eastern media. Technologies and consumption patterns have led to 24 hour news services, condensed information delivery through the internet and an attempt by traditional media to adapt and meet the challenge of change from traditional media. Political leaders and nations now have an increased responsibility towards the media. As representatives of their nations in a high speed, competitive message environment, the values which leaders package together in their own media coverage are an essential ingredient in the perception of their cultures and nations.

4.2. The Middle East

2008 saw an election battle being played out in the US, but elsewhere, religion and religious values became even more entrenched in their role as dividing lines between ideologies and nations: it was another bitter year in the Palestine-Israel saga; the future of Iraq and Afghanistan are still open issues; the Mumbai terrorist attacks were not publically seen by the Indian government as a Pakistani sponsored act of war; Tibetan monks rose against the Han-Chinese population in the largest uprising in Tibet since 1959, and the geo-political location of Islamic Iran is still being played out around the issue of its nuclear capabilities.

---

The fact that nations lend themselves so readily to packaging clusters of complex ideals and stories into simplistic, understandable units for the modern sound bite school of journalism, means that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict’s complex intertwinement of history, religion and armed conflict provides a wide range of easily understandable interpretations of the motivations of the conflict parties. These can be easily packaged into bite size concepts “Ultra-orthodox” or “radical-militant”; a process which brings religious values into the same compressed and simplified information stream as those acts of violence which drive the coverage.


![Chart showing the volume and tone of coverage for various countries](image)

Basis: 210,224 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

Casting our gaze over the coverage of religious protagonists in the international television news (Chart 7.1.) we can see that the coverage of religion is inextricably linked to war and conflict. The three conflicts dominating the Middle East on a global level - Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine – are all laden with protagonists whose Islamic association has been made crystal clear to the Western public – The Taliban, Al-Qaida and Hamas. The fact that op-
ponents in these conflicts are so easily characterized by their perceived religious backgrounds means that media around the world are much more easily able to simplify the ideologies which are driving these conflicts. It also leads to exclusions of those leaders whose moderation no longer makes them as newsworthy.

It is possibly fair to suggest that the West’s preoccupation with armed conflict is a challenge for non-militant Middle East leaders to control the images of their countries. The Bahraini foreign minister Shaikh Khalid bin Ahmed bin Mohamed Al Khalifa is the prime example of this problem. His suggestion of the establishment of a pan-Arab-Israeli forum at the UN received moderate attention in the Middle Eastern press but was largely ignored in the West. For the Middle East the problem is not one of creating will amongst its leaders but of communicating this will across the perceptual divide and into Western media.

There is some evidence that suggests that the propagation of religious images through armed conflict in the Middle East is having an effect on the perception of the religions themselves and those Jews and Muslims who are not involved in the conflicts themselves. According to the PEW Global Attitudes project, negative attitudes towards these religions have increased over the past three years in Europe.5 This corresponds with at least two years of negative reporting on Israel in Western European Media (Chart. 7.2.) a highlight of which was the clear judgment by the media that Israel was primarily responsible for the December 2008 war in Gaza.6

---

What makes the situation in the Middle East significant for the progress of dialogue is that the hostility shown towards Muslim protagonists on a global level is not reciprocated by coverage of Western religious leaders in the Middle Eastern media. In fact, the Middle Eastern public is receiving a significantly positive view of the West’s religious leaders. Whereas Western media is focusing on the lines on conflict in the Middle East, the Middle Eastern coverage of religion includes a large component of religious practice and the role of secularism in Western government. Finally, the Middle Eastern perception of “Western” religion from its own media is positive and focused more on those elements which support understanding of other religions e.g. festivals, practices, customs.
There are at least two possibilities to explain this: firstly, the formulation of opinions towards the US in the Middle East is not only heavily dependent on the tone of media consumed form Middle Eastern sources, but also upon the tone of coverage and level of access to US television. Secondly, Western leaders tend to be perceived as political-secular leaders, whereas Middle Eastern leaders tend to be perceived as political-religious leaders. Hence, Bush’s invasion of Iraq is an act of a secular leader, whereas Hezbollah attacks on Israel are more likely to be perceived as an Islamic militant attack.

In light of this finding, we suggest that the influence of the media is a one way street. The “Muslim world” is exposed, and indeed, receptive to the stream of US information coming into the region, whereas the West’s view of “the other” is filtered through its own media without the perspective of the Middle Eastern voice.
To take the argument further, the absence of a controlled Middle Eastern share of voice means that perceived Islamic values in the West are only being transmitted by images of armed conflict and terrorism. This scenario puts an extra burden of responsibility upon Middle Eastern leaders to position themselves as being in opposition to the militant Islam picture, and to actively communicate this message.

Walter Russell Mead has called the Middle East Peace process, “the worst kind of necessary evil for a U.S administration: at once very necessary and very evil”. With such a perception - what are the chances that the US will willingly engage itself in the creation of dialogue and peace and which among its own goals would it be willing to sacrifice in order to accommodate the differences it has with the Arab world, and the Islamic perspective?

The position of the US at the start of 2009 is, at best, unpredictable. On the one hand there is powerful symbolic information stemming

---

7 Mead, Walter Russell, “Change they can believe in: To make Israel safe, give the Palestinians their Due“ Foreign Affairs Jan-Feb 2009.
from the spirit of change and the symbolism that has been packaged into the election of Obama, the new openness and abandonment of Unilateralism in his foreign policy. On the other hand, there is a second powerful set of symbols: financial crisis, an untested regime, two long and painful occupations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the perceived threat of Islam-militant terrorism which has not yet been resolved.

4.3 The US: The vision of pluralism meets “one nation under God”, Newsweek December 2000

However, in looking at recent change in the US and where we stand at the beginning of 2009, it is worth realizing that negativity against the US is not necessarily a product of the Bush administration, even though the situation has been exacerbated by the consequences of 9/11. The United States’ history of suffering a critical perception both of itself and the “other,” dates back at least to the height of the Cold War. As the Newsweek cartoon from 2000 so vividly illustrates, what good were the messages of bilateralism and dialogue sent out by the Clinton administration when the President himself, was behaving in ways unacceptable in many moral codes?
The US is faced then with a history of pluralism which manifests itself in contradictory messages to the rest of the world. Obama, unfortunately, seems to have added to this problem by positioning himself as personally religious, but not willing to take religion into account when governing. Looking into the new era of change, the question is whether Obama will be able practically to place those values which he, himself, so personally embodies – multi-racialism, tolerance, change, optimism – into a coherent set of messages which promote openness and dialogue.

Chart 4.5.: Volume of reporting on Religious topics on American television

Basis: 3.245 reports in CBS, FOX, NBC and ABC TV news

Obama has also put the US in a difficult position in relation to religious values. During the election campaign, Obama was forced by relatively extreme comments made by his former pastor to dissociate himself from his religious foundations in the Black Church movement. This important step suggested that, although Obama was willing to ask Americans to face their relationship with “the other” in terms of race – the confrontation on the level of religion, the insertion of a divisive social connection stemming from doctrine, was something that he was not willing, or able, to chance. In essence, the President has created a situation where religious values are of the utmost importance to his credibility as a suitable President, while at the same time denying religion’s significance in ruling the country. Further, Obama has explicitly expressed the
“dangers of sectarianism”. A problem which for him lies in his view that values resting on specific belief systems are not acceptable in governing large pluralistic democracies. For his governmental approach “democracy demands that the religiously motivated translate their concerns into universal rather than religion-specific values.” This attempt to move to a Utilitarian/Rawlsian model of governance was useful in defining policy stances on religiously charged issues such as abortion, and creationist/evolutionist teaching in schools – yet it has weakened the president’s ability to represent “religion” in a dialogue between cultures.

**Chart 4.6. Hope For No Religious Feeling / Religions Being Banned, Shell Citizen 2050 Report**

![Chart showing share of respondents in various countries hoping for no religious feeling or religions being banned by 2050.]

Basis: TNS poll among 8,264 young people below 25 in 27 countries, 2007
Question 7: “Thinking now a long time into the future - through the 43 years to 2050 - If there could be one big change by 2050 to the world we live in, what would you hope it would be?”

Survey data would suggest that Obama’s move away from religion is not something which meets with broader community support. As the TNS survey above shows, only a handful of countries show *any* desire to disregard religion. And of those countries, the proportion

---

8 Mead, Walter Russell, “Change they can believe in: To make Israel safe, give the Pales-tinians their Due“ Foreign Affairs Jan-Feb 2009.
of respondents is very small. Clearly religion is something which people are not willing to disregard.

If, as Obama said, “America, whatever it once was, is no longer a Christian nation, at least not just. It is a Jewish nation, a Muslim nation, a Buddhist nation and a nation of non-believers”\(^9\) will it be able to take an unambiguous place in religious dialogue? Further, what place can the US have as the representative of “the West” in such a dialogue? In the shift away from religion Obama has effectively abdicated the role of the political-Christian leader which Bush had occupied. The question of who might be capable of stepping into this role should be prefaced with the question as to whether Bush was indeed correct in placing Christian values and the US presidency in such close quarters in the first place.

4.4. Conclusion

The concept of the nation is convenient for packaging information in the media. Yet, because of the limited space and crisis driven nature of current media reporting, the public receives rather too little information on the intricacies of the social and moral issues which make up the complex reality that comprises any one nation. Nations are portrayed in generic ways, with the focus on rather standardized events within them. Elections, meetings of leaders, wars, sports contests and natural catastrophes are the standard stock of foreign news reporting. Nations not only allow message makers to homogenize complex social structures within nations, but they also allow complex ideological structures to be grouped into regions of regional groups and geographical packages. The results are concepts such as “the West”, and “The Muslim World”. Homogenization of Islam and US values are fixed on an apparent geographical location. These two “nations” allows the media efficiently to communicate information but at the price of hugely simplifying the conflicts and issues involved.

The result of this process is a set of values in the West and a separate set of values in the East which are driven primarily by conflict

\(^9\) “Obama Mocking God and the Bible Speech on Religion” see above.
driven perception. The leaders of these two images are not necessarily in control of their messages, nor are they projecting ambiguous sets of messages. If the state of religious dialogue is to be improved, there is a burden of responsibility on both sides to communicate with clarity and conviction, to circumvent the negativity generated by those militant leaders whose presence has been undermining perceptions of the East, and to avoid the wholesale contradictions in ideology when creating awareness of the West’s position.
5. How the Media Presents Academia within its Reporting on Religion
by Christian Kolmer

5.1. Media and Academia – Two Different Arenas
Modern mass media can support the dialogue between religions in general and between the Western World and the World of Islam in particular in various ways. In the most basic way, every story about meetings between the religions, about common projects, about exchange and about what is common to both parties to the dialogue is a counterweight to the narrative of war, terrorism and violence that dominates international reporting about the “clash of cultures”. But even more important is the potential of mass media to inform the public about the “other”. As the ongoing routine coverage of the relationship between religions is shaped by the actions of political protagonists – ranging from the governments of the West to the armed groups in the Muslim World – a more detached view of the “other side” is necessary, to render background information of the theological and social principles of other religions, about its history and about its options in the future. Such a point of view – which has to be in a way more objective than the statements of the protagonists, which see themselves as engaged in great conflict between incompatible views of the World – can probably be furnished best by contributions from the academic sector.

But the easy flow of information from academia to the mass media is not a foregone conclusion. Much to the contrary, as the rules of attention, that direct the selection and presentation of information, are different between the arenas of science and of the mass media, valuable information offered by academics may not be perceived as newsworthy by journalists.

While academics are trained to paint a differentiated picture, evaluating the arguments on both sides of a debate, journalists value an easy narrative, focusing on one line of argument, which is easy to comprehend. The news values that dictate news selection apply to news from the realm of academia in the same way, as they direct the selection of news about political or business developments. Scientific arguments that stress controversy, focus on nega-
tive events and developments, relate to prominent scholars and feature an element of drama are therefore much more likely to be picked up by the media, than news that offer new insights without catering to these news values. The rules of news selection thus even favour academic sources that are not in tune with the scientific consensus in their specific field: Dissidents get much more attention in the media than the leading representatives of a field – who can for instance be identified by their track record in the leading academic journals. The role of academia in the media coverage of the relationship between religions thus merits a closer look.

5.2. Academic Perspectives

Opinion-leading media did not address the role of religion very often in an academic perspective: Only the role of “The West” was


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion/Ideology</th>
<th>Share of all statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The West</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Countries</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular Ideologies</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religions</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis: 210,224 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

---

discussed in some depth. While more than 8% of all statements about protagonists that represent the West, take an academic perspective, Islam, Christianity or other religions are viewed from a scientific perspective in less than 1% of their coverage. In other words: Academics play virtually no role in reporting as representatives of religion. Visibility is of academia is slightly higher, when they it is referred to as a source of opinion on other protagonists in the field of religion (cf. chapter 5.5.).

Reporting from an academic perspective is significantly less critical than coverage in general, although in an academic context negative statements outnumber positive statements in a ratio of two to one. Moreover, positive references are even less frequent than in other perspectives. Nonetheless, academic contributions offer opportunities for a more balanced view of the “other side” than general coverage.

**Chart 5.2. Evaluation of Religions and Ideologies in Academic and other perspectives, 04/2007-02/2009**

![Chart showing evaluation of religions and ideologies](chart.png)

Basis: 3,499 / 207,456 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows
But this observation has to be qualified: While academic protagonists figure prominently only in statements about the West, these references are most salient in US and UK news. In other words: academic perspectives relate primarily to media coverage of the “own side”. The media refers to academic contributions primarily as a way to make sense of the developments in the Western World in its conflict with Islam.

**Chart 5.3. Salience of a Academic Perspective: Comparison of Countries of Origin, 04/2007-02/2009**

Basis: 210,224 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

Academic contributions are thus used to a certain extent to explain the characteristics of Western society that foster conflict and to explore ways how to deal with the negative impact of the conflict. Information of the other side, namely the World of Islam on the other hand is rather infrequent in comparison with the visibility of “Islamist” armed groups, Muslim terrorist and the political representatives from Muslim countries.
Moreover, the academic perspective of reports on Muslim countries and on Islam in general is much more negative than the respective statements on Christianity or the West. In other words: When it comes to the role of science, reporting about Islam paints a rather bleak picture – much in line with the general line of reporting. Positive aspects thus do not enjoy notable media support as a way to change perception of the “other side”.


- Muslim Countries
- Secular Ideologies
- Islam
- Judaism
- The West
- Other Religions
- Christianity

Basis: 3,499 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

5.3. National Perspectives
A comparison of the different countries, whose media coverage of religions has been analyzed for the period from April 2007 to February 2009, reveals remarkable differences. Reporting in German and US TV news has been significantly more negative than in other countries. While German media focused on Islamic dogma as taught on universities in the Islamic world and on the restricted scope for scientific debate about Islam in Muslim countries, US
network news addressed issues of international politics and terrorism in the first place. One case in evidence was the detention of the US scholar Hallah Esfandiari in Iran on the charge of plotting the overthrow the Islamic government of that country.

**Chart 5.5. Evaluation of Religions and Values in an Academic Perspective, 04/2007-02/2009**

Basis: 3,499 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

In Arab TV on the other hand, reporting focused on Islamic law scholars as the most important branch of academic life, but these were as well addressed most often in the context of international conflicts and terrorism.

The comparison thus shows a varying propensity to take an academic point of view, but references to academia relate unvaryingly to the grand themes of the debate about Western-Muslim relations. There are only few instances of independent points of view that were fed into the debate by academics. Quite to the contrary, references to academia are framed in the context of the general line of argument and thus to a certain degree instrumentalized by the media to support their general line of reporting.
5.4. Issues in the Debate

The restricted role of academia in the media coverage of religion becomes even more evident from the thematic structure of reporting: Foreign affairs – and thus primarily international conflicts – and terrorism account for more than 2/3 of the statements that address an academic point of view. This share is even higher than in general coverage. Religious issues on the other hand are even less salient than in overall reporting. The media thus does not rely on academic expertise to a significant extent to make sense of the religious foundations of the dialogue between the Western World and Islam. Many dimensions are virtually absent from the debate; economic issues for instance account for less than 2% of the statements.


Basis: 3,499 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

The scope for positive reporting is even more restricted: Positive references to academia do not relate to basic issues at all, but are of a rather peripherous nature, for instance addressing the lifestyle of
individual scholars, that navigate the cultural borders successfully. At least the – infrequent – references to inter-religious dialogue are widely positive. This aspect was addressed most often in Arabic TV, but altogether accounted for only 0.9% of all statements taking an academic perspective on religions and secular ideologies, which is significantly higher than in general coverage, where the issue of inter-religious dialogue accounts for only 0.3% of the coverage. Nevertheless, inter-religious dialogue remained a non-starter for academia as well.

**Chart 5.7. Evaluation of Religions and Values in an Academic Perspective, 04/2007-02/2009**

| Basis: 3,499 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows |

5.5. Academic Sources in the Coverage of Religion

The findings of the preceding chapters are confirmed by the analysis of sourcing. Visibility of academia is somewhat higher as a source of information in comparison with its role as a protagonist in the context of the relationship between religions. While the aca-
academic perspective accounts for about 1.7% of all statements about religions and secular ideologies, academic source make up 2.6% of all sources of information, which compares unfavourably with the 55.1 share of journalists and the 4.6% share of governments.

Chart 5.8. Coverage of Religions and Values by Academic Sources:
The Issues, 04/2007-02/2009

Basis: 5,423 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

Academics are fielded as sources to roughly the same issues as those, that are addressed, when the reports focus on academics as protagonists: about 55% of the statements focuses on the issues of international politics, terrorism and domestic security.

Quotes from academics are significantly less critical than general coverage and even more so, when compared with statements from journalists: While statements by the journalistic authors of the newscast expose a critical tone in 30% of all cases, voicing either an explicitly negative opinion or referring to unfavourable aspects of the described events and developments – quotes from academics
show a negative tone in only 17.3%. But positive statements on the other hand account for only 2.6% of the information.

### Chart 5.9. Evaluation of Religions and Values by Academic Sources, 04/2007-02/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>No Clear Rating</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of the III. Reich</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media system</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime/Domestic security</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other topics</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic cycle/Public policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society/Social policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party politics</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business: companies</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political values</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business life</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis: 5,423 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

Especially negative are academic contributions relating to the role of the Church in the history of German III. Reich and the freedom of media in the Arabic World, but in Western contexts as well – for instance in the case of the Muhammed caricatures. Another contended issue is the relationship between religion and science. Especially the argument about creation and evolution and more specifically the theory of “Intelligent Design” draw critical comment from quoted academics.

And again, positive information does not address the real areas of concern: Quotes on religious issues is squarely negative, while positive statements refer to such an insignificant area as human interest. Summing up: Academia encountered strong obstacles, when projecting its contributions on the dialogue between religions into the mass media and via this channel to the wider public. Reporting
focused on the political implications of the conflict, emphasizing the negative aspects that had been exposed by academic research. Findings that have been supportive of the dialogue on the other hand play a minor role. Moreover, background information about other religions in general and Islam in particular were not used intensively by the journalists. In order to gain momentum for the dialogue, academics would need to engage other protagonists as well as journalist much more intensively, both in contributed background stories and opinion pieces as well as by taking part in the dialogue with representatives of other religions more intensively.


Basis: 83 reports about universities in 17 international TV news shows

Only a small number of universities left their mark in the international TV coverage of religion, but the examples of Emory, Oxford or Münster show, that this is not a hopeless challenge.
6. Do All Media Cover Religion in the same Way? 
by Wadim Schreiner

As the report is based in significant degree on how the media in different regions had been covering religion and values, this chapter will focus on what they have in common and what the regional differences are. It will elaborate on practical results to support the editorial teams around the world to improve divers reporting by using, for instance more sources.

Chart 6.1. Visibility of Religions – Comparison of Media Types, 06-09/2007

Basis: 298,206 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 124 international TV and print media

The long term analysis depicts two key observations, when comparing print versus television news. Firstly, television news has a considerably higher share of politicised religions coverage (83%) than print media (72%). Secondly, television depicts twice as much militant and fundamentalist religions aspects than print media.
6.1 Television media

On a first glance, and in terms of visibility of religions, most Western television news broadcasters have a diversity of religions in focus. Italy’s Rai Uno has, compared to the other surveyed television news programmes, an exceptionally high focus on Christianity (60%), but this has been largely due to the religions proximity to the Vatican. The Swiss’ DRS Tagesschau showed a higher than average political depiction of the Islam (40%) with the actual religion playing only a minor role (7%). The Spanish Telediario devoted equal coverage (40%) to both Islam and Christianity, and similarly to the United States (CNN, CBS, ABC, NBC).


Basis: 209,708 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows

German broadcasters ARD, ZDF and RTL had all three an about equal share of coverage on both Christianity and Western countries (40%) as well as Islam and Muslim countries (50%). The balance depicted either other religions, Judaism or secular ideologies. In Britain BBC and ITV similarly ‘agreed’ on a focus, with slightly less coverage on Christianity than Germany (35%) compared to Is-
Islam (60%). Other religions were almost invisible with a combined 5% coverage. Italy’s Rai Uno has, compared to the other surveyed television news programmes, an exceptionally high focus on Christianity (60%), but this has been largely due to the religions proximity to the Vatican. The Swiss’ DRS Tagesschau showed a higher than average political depiction of the Islam (40%) with the actual religion playing only a minor role (7%). The Spanish Telediario devoted equal coverage (40%) to both Islam and Christianity, and similarly to the United States (CNN, CBS, ABC, NBC).

In contrast, Arab news networks Al Arabiya and Al Jazeera featured in 90% of reports the Islam and Muslim countries, and highlighted Western religions in less than 8% of all reports. While the average ratio of coverage on Islam on television news in Arab countries was 90%, Western countries had an average share of 45%.

When evaluating the contextual coverage of the West (as the political ‘arm’ of Christian religion) in general, most television news broadcasters displayed a considerably more negative than positive picture. On average, 20% of the coverage across the news broadcasters has been negative and less than 5% positive. While one might have expected Arab media to be particularly negative against the West, this has not been the case. Instead, RTL, BBC World News and TVE Telediario displayed higher than average negative reporting on the West (40%). The actual religion of Christianity received considerably less criticism than the political/organised side, with less than 15% negative and – particularly on German TV news – more than 10% positive coverage. Clearly, the criticism across all broadcasters has been against the institutionalised part of religion, as expressed in either country representatives or political figures rather than the religion itself.

The same distinctive characteristic however cannot be seen in the assessment of news broadcaster’s coverage on Muslim countries (as the political ‘arm’ of the Islam religion) and the Islam itself. The evaluation of Muslim countries shows an average of 40% negative coverage across the Western broadcast media (with Germany’s RTL and the U.S.’ CBS even higher at 60% negative coverage) and 8% positive coverage. The criticism of the Islam as a religion remains almost as critical as its political protagonists: RTL
and CBS again exceptionally high with 62%, but most other Western broadcasters with negative coverage of between 30% and 40%. Positive coverage on the religion is less than 5%. However, it must be stated that both Arab channels Al Arabiya and Al Jazeera showed 20% negative coverage towards the religion Islam as well as the political protagonists. Clearly, while news broadcasters make a distinction between religion and organisation when it comes to Christianity, this is not the case for Islam.

Interestingly, the assessment of Judaism, although generally negatively portrayed (on average 20% negative coverage; exception: DRS Tagesschau from Switzerland with less than 10%), positive coverage has been particularly high in Germany (both ARD and ZDF close to 20% positive coverage) and on NBC. Perhaps contrary to common perception, 8% of coverage on Judaism on Al Jazeera has been positive (Al Arabiya: none).

**Chart 6.3. Coverage of Religions – Perspectives in Media Comparison, 04/2007-02/2009**

Basis: 209,708 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 17 international TV news shows
Television news broadcasters in the West had a more or less similar perspective when reporting on religion: political protagonists featured in approximately 10% of all coverage and either individuals or groups within the society in approximately 20%. Differences could clearly be seen in the coverage of religious leaders: Rai Uno for instance had a share of close to 20% (mostly on the Pope), with Frances TF 1, BBC World News as well as CNN World News above average 10%. For Italy, the proximity to the Vatican is a clear explanation for this, while both BBC and CNN’s World Channels had a higher share of coverage than their regional counterparts perhaps due to a greater audience outside of their own countries. Particularly distinctive are references to either fundamentalists or militants. While most channels had a similar share of coverage on what was considered ‘militants’ rather than fundamentalists, British television has been exceptional, when compared to the other channels in high numbers of references to fundamentalists. On both BBC, ITV the share of coverage has been around 15%. Only German media had a more than average percentage of reporting on fundamentalists (8%). In both cases, the involvement of British and German troops in Afghanistan, and references to the Taliban as ‘fundamentals’ are an explanation for the regional differences. Although the U.S. also has an involvement in Afghanistan, local broadcasters there tend to focus exceptionally high on Iraq rather than Afghanistan.

Both Arab channels have been more or less agreeing in their respective coverage: 30-35% focus on political protagonists (including a focus on Palestinian and Israeli leadership), a similar focus on social protagonists as well as militants. Coverage on what constituted fundamentalists has been largely absent.

### 6.2 Print media

Compared to television news, print media don’t have the same time restrictions. One would expect greater balance, more diverse voices as space is less limited and – unless it is a reaction to breaking news – more time available to compile the relevant information. This is generally reflected in the results: more proportional positive and negative coverage with a general reduction of the ‘neutral’ or ‘indifferent’ rating. Generally, however, print media are more po-
larised in their depiction of religion and religious leaders than their broadcasting counterparts.

**Chart 6.4. Coverage of religions: Media Coverage on Islam versus Percentage of Muslim Population, 06-09/2007**

Basis: 289,279 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 124 international TV and print media

The depiction of negative and positive coverage in terms of both religion as well as representatives has in most Muslim countries been alongside the religions of the individual country, while many Western countries depicted a less polarised picture.

In Africa, due to South Africa’s history, media are still sensitive towards discrimination, particularly for minorities. Although only
with a 2% Muslim population\textsuperscript{1}, the difference between the depiction of the West and the Muslim world has not been to different (-31\% and -20\% respectively). Namibia, with a Muslim population of 5\%, Islam received a 55\% negative coverage, with Christianity only 11.5\% negative. In Morocco (99\% Muslim), coverage in print media on Christianity has been 100\% negative. In Egypt, the analysis of Al-Akhbar Al Yawn as well as Al Agram showed an equal picture of 27\% negative coverage towards both the Muslim countries and the West.

A similar picture emerged in Asia. In Pakistan (97\% Muslim), coverage on Christianity has been 45\% negative, while in Malaysia (52\% Muslim) Christianity was only 5\% negative, while Islam showed 14\% negative coverage. In the Arab world, a bit of a different picture emerged. In the United Arab Emirates, the analysed dailies Gulf News and Emirates daily depicted a proportionally much less negative coverage on Christianity (-4\%) than any of the other Middle East countries. It can be argued that although the United Arab Emirates actual citizens are 96\% Muslim, the large percentage of expatriates from other countries might have had an impact on print editorial decisions in the Emirates. In Saudi Arabia for instance, 100\% of coverage on Christianity has been negative. In Iran, a similar picture emerged: 78\% of coverage on Christianity and the West being negative and Islam being 17\% positive (only two countries depicted an overall positive coverage on Islam and Muslim countries, being Iran and Indonesian print media). In the region most affected by the Israel-Palestine conflict, criticism of Islam and Christianity were similar. The 73\% negative sentiment in Palestinian print media towards Islam and Muslim countries has largely been due to negative portrayal of the political representatives of the countries than a general assessment of the religion. The negative perception of Christianity and the West equally can be attributed to Western representatives (negative 43\%). In Lebanon, with a 70\% Muslim population, coverage has been similar: 41\% negative towards Islam and 44\% towards Christianity. In Jordan (Al Ra’I and Al Ghad) 42\% of Christian religions reports had been negative, compared to 33\% Muslim. In Israel, perhaps not supris-

\textsuperscript{1} http://www.factbook.net/muslim_pop.php
ingly, there has been almost no criticism of the West, but the two
analysed papers (Jerusalem Post and Ha’aretz, as well as the
agency Faxx) were relatively uncritical of the Muslim countries (-15%). EU aspirant Turkey, despite its almost 100% Muslim popu-
lation, was only in 11% of all reports on the West critical, and
similarly towards the Muslim countries (19%).

Chart 6.5. Coverage of Religions: Balance of coverage on
Muslim countries and Islam versus
Western Countries and Religion,
06-09/2007

Basis: 289,279 statements about religions and secular ideologies in 124 interna-
tional TV and print media
In the Americas, the United States were more critical towards the Muslim countries (27%) than to the West (-9%), whereby Time, when compared to for instance Newsweek, has been particularly critical of Islam (50% negative versus 25%). In Brazil, O Globo was negative of Islam as a religion (55%) rather than Muslim countries (negative 21%), a trend generally shared by the other Brazilian print media.

In Europe, Russia emerged particularly negative (e.g. Kommersant displaying 50% negative coverage towards Islam). While in Spain, Italy, the UK and France criticism of both areas remained similar between 15% negative for Islam, and 10% for Christianity. In Denmark, the depiction of Muslim countries and religion has been similar (-31%) as it was in Germany (-32%).

It must be noted that the aspect of fundamentalism has received in general little coverage in print media (on average between 3 and 6 percent), which militants considerably more often featured (20-30%).

Generally, analysis of print media depicts a much less fundamentalist/militant focus on religion, but at the same time a higher political angle to the issue. Sadly, the religion itself plays a minor role in print media. This is particularly disappointing since print media, contrary to television news would have the time and space to place current – and highly political events – into a more historic and religious perspective. It seems however, that print media – equally to television news, are failing in providing more contextual information to breaking events.

6.3. Religion in the Media. A Country Analysis

The differences between print and television news have been briefly been elaborated upon in the above subchapters. If we were to assume that the analysed print and television news are similarly accessible for all people in the relevant countries, joining the results will reveal the overall attitudes of media in the respective countries.

In terms of visibility, most countries depict a greater share of coverage on Islam than Christianity – even in countries were Christi-
anity is the dominant religion. With the exception of the US, Italy and South Africa, Islam has at least 50% of the focus. Muslim countries have an overwhelming focus on Islam: Morocco, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, UAE, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Iran, Egypt – all have an above 60% focus on Islam. However, the focus on Islam is also high (>40%) in countries were the Muslim population is <10%.

Generally, and in terms of coverage on Christianity and Western Countries, coverage is particularly high in Western countries and those with a high share of Christian population, but Muslim countries have a marginal coverage on Christianity.

6.4. Conclusion

Overall, it seems clear that media, both print and television are struggling with the issue of dialogue. Western countries attempt to give ‘the other side’ considerably more coverage than Arab media, yet the coverage is both negatively associated and focuses more on the political dimensions than religious. Arab media on the other hand have virtually no coverage of ‘the other side’, which in turn enables little discussion points about other religions, both from a political-governmental position as well as a religious. It must also be noted that religious issues in all analysed countries have been primarily focused on the polarisation of Islam and Christianity, almost entirely ignoring other religions. Granted, the actual number of people of a non-Christian and non-Muslim faith in the analysed countries has been minimal, but a more contextual approach towards non-topical religions could be a good way to anticipate future challenges with ‘the other side’. According to an article published in the Christian Science Monitor in 1998, Christianity and Islam make up approximately 60% of the world’s religion. However, large religions such as Hinduism (781 million followers), Buddhism (324 million followers) and Chinese traditional religions (400 million followers) receive an unnoticeable coverage in all assessed countries. Since news coverage is largely event driven, and Middle East-Western conflicts having dominated the past years of

---

news coverage, this might not be surprising, but current developments in India and Pakistan (following the Mumbai Bombings of 2008 as well as the attacks on the Sri Lankan Cricket team in Lahore in 2009) are clear indicators that religious and ethnic clashes are also beyond the traditional Islam-Christian confrontations – and news media, through their one-sided reporting on ‘the others’ have perhaps failed to place the conflicts of other religions in the appropriate context. This makes a religious dialogue increasingly difficult.
7. The global generation: A cross-cultural study of Arab and Western youth
by Sunil John

7.1 Introduction: Divergent demographics

Today’s generation of young people, born as the Cold War was winding to a close and coming of age in a geopolitical landscape defined by the events of September 11th and its aftermath, are the first to be raised in a truly globalised environment. The rise of new technology, in particular, has broken down old barriers and fostered the flattening of cultures across the world.

Just over two decades ago, Harvard professor Theodore Levitt published an important essay, “The Globalisation of Markets,” insisting that communications technology had radically shrunk the world and homogenised our tastes. “Almost everyone everywhere now wants all the things they have heard about, seen or experienced via the new technologies,” Levitt wrote at the time.

Some 15 years after another Harvard professor, Samuel Huntington, first published his own landmark essay on “The Clash of Civilisations,” arguing very much the opposite, the tastes of Western and Middle East youth are now frequently remarkably aligned. Today, young people in the West and Middle East indulge in many similar activities, adopt similar technologies and engage in similar lifestyle habits. Both have mobile phones as their main technology and ceaselessly text their family and friends. Young people in both regions view many brands – such as Nokia, Sony, Toyota and Toshiba – with similar levels of warmth.

Both groups, like adolescents since time immemorial, constantly worry about their appearance, and spend the majority of their disposable incomes on looking good and going out with friends. Both wonder when and if they will find true love.

The superficial similarities between Arab and Western youth are indeed myriad. Yet despite these commonalities, the hopes, fears and aspirations of Western and Middle East youth frequently diverge – sometimes strikingly so. There are a range of drivers of
this divergence, including culture, religion and historical identity. But demographics may be the single most important factor of them all.

Quite simply, the West is getting older, while the Middle East is growing younger by the day. Never before in history has the Arab world faced such a significant youth population bulge: today, one in five people in the Middle East is between the ages of 15-24. In contrast, by 2040, one in five Americans will be aged 65 or older – compared to barely one in eight in 2000.

Today, the average German is more than 43 years old; the average Jordanian is just 23. In Saudi Arabia – where an astonishing 38% of the population is under the age of 14 – the average citizen is just 21 years old. In the United Kingdom, in contrast, barely 16% of the population is under the age of 14, and the average citizen is 40.

Such divergent demographics unquestionably colour the perspectives of youth in both the Middle East and West. Especially before the global financial crisis and even now, the sustained economic growth of the Middle East, and the Gulf oil states in particular, continues to act as a counter balance to the significant economic insecurity created by such a large and growing youth segment, which is endemically under-employed in many Arab states. In the West, meanwhile, rapidly aging populations will create unprecedented economic stress points, especially to entitlement programmes such as Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security in the United States. In the future, the West’s shrinking working-age population will be hard pressed to provide for an older generation that is living longer than ever before.

7.2 Methodology

To gain a unique understanding of the attitudes of youth in the Middle East and compare them with those of their peers in the Western world, ASDA’A Burson-Marsteller, the leading public relations consultancy in the Middle East commissioned a proprietary research survey of young people between the ages of 18-24. The results of the First ASDA’A Burson-Marsteller Arab Youth Survey were announced at a special forum in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, on November 10, 2008.
Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, Inc. (PSB) and The Nielsen Company conducted some 1,800 interviews with respondents between the ages of 18-24 during September, 2008 in six Middle East states (Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates) and three Western countries (Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States). The results, which have been weighted to have a 50:50 balance between the two regions, have a margin of error of +/5.66% in the Middle East and +/9.8% in Western nations.

7.3 Bursting bubbles: An uncertain future

There is no question that the current challenges to the stability of the financial order are enormous in scale and global in shape. Worldwide, the bursting of the credit bubble has led to widespread pessimism. For that reason and a range of others, including perceived political lethargy, young people in the West are strikingly pessimistic about the future. Just 34% of Western youth feel that things in their country are heading the right direction. In the Middle East, despite ongoing conflicts in Iraq and the Levant, youth are considerably more optimistic, with 52% arguing that their country is heading the right direction.

Saudi Arabian youth were the most positive in the Middle East, with 65% of respondents saying things were going in the right direction. In Jordan, 60% of respondents gave the same answer. Positive responses accounted for 57% and 52% of respondents in the UAE and Qatar respectively.

Interestingly, respondents in Egypt do not share the optimism of their Gulf peers; 70% of youth there believe things are heading in the wrong direction. Kuwait was the only Gulf country with a majority of respondents agreeing with their Egyptian counterparts, 54%.
C.7. The Global Generation

Chart 7.1. General attitudes: Right or wrong direction?

Question: Do you think things in your country of residence are going in the right direction or are they going in the wrong direction?

More generally, however, young people in the Middle East and the West share similar concerns – about the economy, inflation, their ability to live in a good area and stay in touch with their family. The economic outlook and rising cost of living is the overriding concern for both groups, including 43% of Western youth and 30% of their peers in the Arab world.

Even though people in the Middle East are much more likely to be victims of terrorism than those in the West, a higher proportion of Western youth, 90%, described “living without fear of terrorism” as “very important” or “somewhat important” compared with 78% of Arab youth in the survey. Of most importance to Arab youth surveyed were “having economy security,” “having good infrastructure like Internet access and electricity” and “living in a safe neighbourhood.”

The importance of “living in a democracy” drew a mixed response from Middle East youth. Only 58% of UAE respondents and 68% of youth in Qatar described it as “very important” or “somewhat important,” arguably a reflection of the large expatriate populations
in these countries, compared with 93% and 95% in Egypt and Jordan respectively.

**Chart 7.2. General attitudes: Biggest challenge**

| Question: What is the biggest challenge facing the world today? |

Arab youth attitudes divide along national lines on issues such as education, healthcare and personal fulfillment, representing the significant income and lifestyle disparities across the Middle East. “Having the same opportunities to succeed as everyone else” was rated “very important” or “somewhat important” by 100% of respondents in Egypt and Jordan, but only by 47% in the UAE. Having access to reliable healthcare and the best universities was also prioritised by Egyptian and Jordanian youth, but appear to be taken for granted by their more privileged Gulf neighbours.

Strikingly, though, just 4% of Western youth and 8% of Arab youth feel that conflict in the Middle East is the biggest challenge currently facing the world. How to interpret this finding? Why are Western and, in particular, Arab youth seemingly so unconcerned with current and seeming intractable conflicts in the Middle East – including their impact on stability and security worldwide?

While this may be partly due to the fact that fewer and fewer young people the world over read daily newspapers or closely fol-
low geopolitical events, it is equally possible that such findings point to one of the most significant responses to globalisation: the increasing localisation of perspectives and concomitant hardening of national identities in response to this same trend.

In that regard, it is worth noting that while Western youth rely on TV, the Internet is the most important source of news information for young people in the Middle East. On average, 67% of youth in the six Middle East countries surveyed claim to get their news online, while TV is the second most important source. Newspapers rank third, with 46% of respondents identifying them as their main source of news. With just 15% of the votes, magazines are of least importance to Arab youth.

The Internet appears to be most influential in Egypt and Jordan, with 89% and 82% of youth respectively saying they get their news online. TV is also strong in Jordan and the UAE. As one might expect in the Middle East, which trails the West in press freedom, the grapevine remains a dependable source of news.

This trend is particularly notable in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, countries associated with strict media censorship: 57% of youth in Jordan and 51% in Saudi Arabia get their news from “friends and family.”

In the West, 81% of youth get their news from TV, and like their Arab peers they rate the Internet, newspapers, and friends and family highly as news sources. But only 1% claim to have no interest in news, compared to a fifth of Arab youth. In the UAE, 43% describe themselves as “not interested in news.” Kuwait and Qatar also demonstrate high rates of apathy when it comes to news information. In contrast, Egyptian and Jordanian youth have large appetites for news, with only 4% claiming to have no interest.

7.4 Equal opportunities: Reality and perception

In both the West and Middle East, young men are slightly more optimistic than their female counterparts about the future – though the gender divide is statistically insignificant in each case. This is a very positive finding, which suggests increasing gender equality in both the West and the Middle East. However, when asked if they
believed that men and women currently have equal opportunities in the workplace, a majority in both regions said no.

In the West, strikingly, 54% of male youth agreed with this vision of workplace equality, while just 31% of female youth shared this sentiment. Among male and female Middle East youth, in contrast, 44% and 42%, respectively, agreed that there is now equality in the workplace.

Perhaps more importantly, Western and Arab male youth diverge significantly when asked if they believe that men and women should have equal opportunities in the workplace: 79% of Western male youth concurred with this statement, while just 58% of their male counterparts in the Middle East agreed. In striking contrast to the attitudes of their male peers, 73% of female Arab youth feel that they should have equal opportunities for professional advancement.

Does this point to a growing gender divide in the Arab world? Possibly. More likely, however, is that this data points to the powerful forces of conservatism that pervade in the Middle East, partly as a result of historical identity and partly in response to the forces of globalisation. For reform-minded policymakers in the Middle East, such findings suggest the importance of framing the debate on gender equality on economic terms, rather than cultural ones.

7.5 Where East meets West: The role of faith

Nowhere is the contrast between Arab and Western youth more pronounced than when examining the importance of religious belief. Some 68% of Middle East youth say that religion defines them as a person, compared to just 16% in the West. Asked to name an influence on them and their outlook on life, 59% of Western youth cited music, compared to just 32% of Arab youth. In contrast, 62% of Middle East youth listed religion as a key influencer, compared to just 38% of their Western peers.

Of course, the degree of religious belief varies not just between these two regions but also within them. Surprisingly, youth in Jordan appear to attach more importance to religion than their counterparts in Saudi Arabia; 71% of Jordanian youth view religion as
“very influential” compared with 56% in Saudi Arabia. Youth in Egypt may feel the most strongly about their faith, but they are also the most passionate about their record collections; 23% of youth polled there say music has a “very influential” impact on their outlook on life.

Chart 7.3. Values and beliefs: What makes a person?

Question: Which of the following would you say defines who you are as a person?

Especially when contrasted with the generally strict divide between church and state in post-Enlightenment Europe, where such barriers are frequently constitutionally codified, religious ritual is commonplace in the Arab world at nearly all levels of society, including within the political space. Of note, the same statement is largely valid in the United States, where political discourse frequently invokes religious belief and voting patterns often mirror those of faith.

In this regard it is also noteworthy that 9% of Arab youth say that the loss of traditional values and culture is the greatest challenge facing the world today, a sentiment a statistically insignificant percentage of their Western peers agree with. Likewise, Arab youth generally very strongly agree that their national identity is very important to them, while Western youth view the same as only moderately important.
Correspondingly, roughly 11% of Arab youth say success means being enlightened spiritually and 34% say it is making the world a better place – compared to 5% and 12%, respectively, in the West. In line with these findings, Arab youth have considerably more positive impressions of those who make a contribution to the public good, across the political, religious and economic spheres.

Asked whom they look up to, 30% of Arab youth cited government leaders, compared to just 9% of their Western peers. Likewise, while just 5% of Western youth said they looked up to religious leaders, 31% Middle East youth claimed admiration for the same group. In the economic space, 29% of Arab youth look up to business leaders, a sentiment shared by only 5% of youth in the West.

**Chart 7.4. Values and Beliefs: Role Models**

![Chart showing role models and percentages for both West and MENA regions](image)

**Question:** Which of the following go you look up to?

Middle East youth are therefore not just more conservative than their Western peers; they are also far more idealistic in their vision and optimistic about their future. Western youth, by comparison, come across as cynical beyond their years.

This overarching dichotomy between the West and Middle East cannot be fully appreciated without taking into consideration the larger forces shaping the views of the youth of both regions. His-
Western societies have celebrated individual achievement while generally underplaying actions that benefit the culture as a whole. Indeed, the West’s founding myth, and especially that of the United States, is based on the ideal of equal opportunity for all – with comparatively scant regard for the social responsibilities of those selfsame individuals.

In the Middle East, by comparison, and especially in the Gulf states, the identity of the individual has historically been defined by their place within a larger social network. Deference to one’s elders or superiors therefore comes more naturally in this region, as does a certain humility about the limits of individual achievement. Arab youth may therefore be less cynical and pessimistic than their Western peers partly because their ambitions are less grandiose and their personal expectations less exalted. Driven by religious and cultural norms, contributing to the social good thus assumes far greater primacy for Middle East youth than it does for their Western peers.

Where East meets West: Family values

If Western and Middle East sharply diverge on some of the most fundamental issues shaping their outlook and vision for the future, especially the role of religion, they nevertheless are in complete agreement on at least one key determinant: both groups see their family and friends as among the most influential forces in their lives, with both ranking them as the people they most look up to.

Precisely 64% of Arab and Western youth say that their family defines who they are as a person, with both groups citing family as one of the most important factors in this area. The two also agree that friends are among the key determinants in defining their identity, with concurrence from 57% of Western youth and 61% of their Arab peers.

Despite volumes of rhetoric about a so-called clash of civilisations, youth from the Middle East and West ultimately mirror one another as they cope with the eternal challenges of adolescence and struggle towards self-definition and adulthood. Both groups recognise that nothing matters more to them than their mothers and fa-
thers, sisters and brothers, and extended networks of family mem-
bers and friends.

This insight is of potentially great value to policymakers, marketers
and anyone else involved in communicating with the youth of these
two regions. Even more important, this bedrock commonality can
also serve as a platform from which to build stronger ties between
the West and Middle East moving forward.

7.7 Conclusion: Coming of age in the post-crisis world
While less than 12 months have passed since ASDA’A Burson-
Marsteller carried out its first Arab Youth Survey, the world has
changed dramatically in the interim. The financial crisis that began
in the United States has had a profound impact on economies
across the globe, and on the hopes, fears and aspirations of just
about everyone, including members of the millennial generation.

In both the West and Middle East, the prevailing mood is now one
of pessimism. More than any generation before them, today’s
youth are hyper-aware of the challenges that face them in this pe-
riod of global uncertainty. As a result, their faith in figures of au-
thority and prevailing social and economic systems is being put to
the test. They are skeptical that modernity’s fundamental promise
of progress – that their lives will be better than those of their par-
ents – will be met.

This global crisis of confidence will inevitably alter the habits,
opinions, tastes and values of young people in the Middle East and
the West. Yet just how that change will be realised remains to be
seen.

Historically, of course, great crises have led to a long-term reshap-
ing of the political, financial and social order. They have changed
the landscapes of cities and countries, altered demographic patterns
and fostered the rise of new technologies. This crisis will be no dif-
ferent.

Consider that the generation of Americans who came of age in the
Great Depression tended to be more frugal, self-sacrificing and
conservative than their immediate predecessors. But the conserva-
tism of their worldview was tempered by political liberalism: as a consequence of witnessing extreme poverty, they believed much more strongly in the role of government. Likewise, that generation placed greater emphasis on the value of education, and on the traditional values of family.

Looking ahead to the second Arab Youth Survey, we will ask how the millennials feel about the great challenge of their lifetime – and how their values have changed in the past 12 months. The results, of course, are likely to be very different from those outlined in this paper.
8. Hopes, Fears & Expectations: The Next Generation on 2050 by Björn Edlund

We are living through a period of great uncertainty, which calls for strong and courageous decisions. The decisions we make, or do not make, over the coming years will define what kind of world we leave to the younger generation. But what do they expect from us?

In order to answer this question, Shell commissioned a survey of young adults in 27 different countries about their hopes and fears for life in 2050 (Citizen 2050). The exercise let us start a dialogue with the leaders of tomorrow on subjects that will dominate their future. The results are a differentiated look at regional and cultural facets in the ongoing environmental debate.

It turns out that young people have high hopes for the future, balanced by fears for global security and a rapidly changing environment. They are aware of the dangers of rising sea levels but remain reluctant to make personal sacrifices that could help address the problem.

8.1. Optimism and traditional values

Despite constant media portrayals of young people as celebrity-obsessed airheads, they are in fact a thoughtful, responsible and fairly centred group. Their hopes for the future are largely down-to-earth and surprisingly traditional.

The vast majority of youth across the globe hope to have at least two children, with young people from Nigeria and Saudi Arabia expecting to have four. Chinese youth, on the other hand, would prefer to have a small family or no children at all, reflecting their fears about overpopulation.

The other chief aspiration for young people across the world is to achieve job satisfaction. This is much more important to them than becoming famous. Only 15% of young people express any desire for the bright lights.
Young people have not, however, turned their back on “consumerist” aspirations. Materialistic goals still preoccupy an overwhelming majority of young citizens. Over 80% say they want “to be wealthy”, “to have a big house” and “to see many countries of the world”.

With the vibrant optimism of youth, they wholly expect to achieve these goals. Most 18-24 year olds expect to be better off than their parents by 2050. It is thought that rapidly industrialising countries may help lift the developed world out of the downturn, and certainly their young people expect as much. More than 80% of youth in China and India envisage a more comfortable lifestyle than their parents ever had. Young people from Holland, Japan and Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, expect to earn less than their parents.

8.2. Religion and values

In an increasingly secular world, religion remains relevant. Almost half of young people consider spirituality very important. More than three-quarters of China’s young people and a staggering 85% of Nigerians believe that focusing on spirituality is very important in the coming years.

But young people are less focused on the state of religion across the world. Religious changes in the broader environment are one of the lowest priorities on their agenda for change. Instead, when asked what big change they would hope to see in the world by 2050, half of the young people focused on global changes, from world peace to environmental issues.

Young people from around the world also express their desire for key lifestyle and societal changes. Priorities varied from less crime, better governance, and greater harmony, to increased employment, improved standards of living, and cures to major diseases.

In a clear extension of this theme, young people today have strong altruistic instincts. More than half of global youth hope to help people less fortunate than themselves between now and 2050. There are stark regional differences in this respect. Only 20% of Russians consider charity very important, compared with 76% of young people in the United Arab Emirates.
Politicians often gripe about the youth of today disengaging from the political system. Again, they may be surprised. Just over half of young people said they saw voting as one means by which individuals can make the most difference. This suggests that today’s youth intend to be actively engaged in the political process. There are significant and fascinating country variations, but overall the future seems to be in the hands of people willing to be personally accountable for shaping the world in which they will live.

One young American voices the hopes of many with this rousing statement of intent: “By 2050...No violence, no discrimination, no terrorism, all the world could be at peace and people could choose to live how they want and where they want with the expectation of being safe.”

8.3. Fears, knowledge and nonchalance

Balanced against these hopes for the future, young people share some pronounced fears. The leaders of tomorrow are growing up against a background of, at best, pessimism about the future. Three quarters of young adults cite war and terrorism, followed by climate change, as the biggest threats to their happiness or way of life in 2050. Other major concerns are economic recession, drought or hunger, overpopulation, and military coups d’état.

Prevailing media coverage, particularly in Europe and North America, has painted the efforts of China and India to provide energy for their expanding economies as one of the chief contributors to climate chaos. The assumption is that they simply do not care about the damage they may cause. In fact, their young people are acutely aware of the dangers of rapid growth. India and China were among only five countries where young people identify climate change as a greater threat than war and terrorism.

One would expect education about climate change to lead to greater concern about the future of the planet. Counter-intuitively, it seems the more a young person knows about the perils of environmental damage and climate change, the less they worry about it. The results defy easy explanation, but may reflect degrees of confidence in the mitigating and regulatory measures on climate change taken by national governments. They certainly suggest that
a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach to educating the citizens of tomorrow on environmental issues is unlikely to succeed.

Young people are agreed on the role humans have played in causing climate change. They are also certain it will affect them personally. One fifth of Russian respondents even say life on earth will be extinct by 2050. At the other extreme, one third of Nigerians do not expect any real change to the environment.

**8.4. Action and expectation**

Does this level of concern translate into action? Young people are alternately characterised as apathetic or reactionary on climate change. The young man playing computer games is contrasted with the dread-locked protestors camping outside London’s Bank of England during April’s protests.

It appears that in reality, the young have not given up on the world. Well over two thirds of young people say it is not too late to act on climate change. There are significant exceptions to this rule. Turkish youth are particularly pessimistic about the future, with 77% believing that we are beyond the tipping point where it comes to environmental damage.

In some respects, it appears the future is in the hands of people willing to be personally accountable for shaping the world in which they live. Nearly 80% of young adults believe that their actions can help change the world or make a difference.

But, and it is a big but, they are reluctant to make any real sacrifices that could have the largest impact on climate change. Two-thirds are ready to make small changes in their lives to help the environment, such as composting or recycling, but only one fifth of respondents are prepared to take fewer long-distance holiday trips, and just a third will change their diet to eat only locally grown food.

Young people also recognise the importance of working together in order to tackle climate change. More than three quarters are willing to accept decisions from international organisations on energy use and availability, and ways to protect the environment. This can
only be interpreted as a clear mandate from the voters of tomorrow for international organisations to take the lead in determining energy policy decisions.

Technology plays such a major role in daily life in the developed world, one would expect young people to place their hopes for the future of the planet in technological advances. But not everyone thinks technology will be the silver bullet. When asked about one big change that could make a difference in 2050, only 9% offered technological change as a solution. If nothing else, there is clearly a need for greater education about the role of technology in addressing the impact of climate change.

8.5. Energy: national solutions in a global scramble
Growing wealth in rapidly developing economies, coupled with a rise in the world’s population from around 6.5 billion today to 9 billion by 2050, will force global demand for energy ever higher. The need for power - generated by oil, coal, natural gas, nuclear, as well as renewable sources like wind and solar - is set to rise by 65% over the next two decades. Young people are aware of this fact, and 90% of them believe the availability of energy resources will impact their quality of life at some point in the future.

Their solution is for a mix of renewable energy sources to power the future, with 80% believing that solar power will be in common use by 2020. Some 77% and 68% believe the same for hydroelectric and wind power, respectively. This is balanced by the realisation that these sources will not account for all our energy supply.

Beyond energy, much of the world has now accepted that there needs to be some fundamental changes in transport if we are to deal with the threat of climate change. The industry is at the stage where innovators are exploring every possible avenue and there is still little clarity on which direction it will eventually take.

In the eyes of young people, it depends very much where you live. Brazilians believe their country’s 2 million-strong fleet of biofuel-powered cars will grow further, while Canadians say electric vehicles will be more widespread. For the Chinese it will be magnetic monorails and solar-powered cars. Americans expect to see more
hybrid vehicles on the road, but Nigeria’s young adults see little change and expect gasoline-fuelled cars will remain the most common mode of personal transport. Meanwhile the Dutch forecast more hydrogen-powered cars, and more bicycles even though bicycles already outnumber people in The Netherlands. One in five of the young adults believe that personal flying machines will be in common use by 2050, notably youth from Brunei, Saudi Arabia, China and India.

8.6. Conclusions

Overall, the young people surveyed are positive about the future of the planet, with 94% confident that “something” will be done to avoid the dangers of climate change. It remains to be seen whether that represents a healthy dose of optimism or a worrying refusal to take responsibility for the future of the planet.

After all, they will be tomorrow’s leaders and their behaviour is key to how the energy system develops. It is absolutely clear that there is considerable alarm about the future of our planet and global youth do understand that there is a challenge to be met. They fully understand that alternatives to existing hydrocarbon-based energy sources need to be found and there appears to be a greater tolerance for nuclear power than might have been expected.

The link between lifestyle desires and environmental concerns is only partially understood, and there seems to be little appetite amongst most of the respondents to make the hard sacrifices necessary to secure the long-term viability of the planet. Again, there is a significant need for education to bring a greater level of reality to the debate.

Overall, the survey helps to frame the energy challenge in a manner that is both consistent with Shell’s overall position on the issue, and helpful in terms of articulating that position.

The Citizen 2050 survey can be seen as a companion to Shell’s energy scenarios, which describe two contrasting ways the energy future may develop in the decades ahead.
In the first scenario, which we call Scramble, countries rush to secure more energy for themselves. Political responses to the energy squeeze and to climate change are often knee-jerk and severe, leading to price spikes, periods of economic slowdown and increasing turbulence. By 2050 greenhouse gas emissions are heading towards concentration levels in the atmosphere far above the levels that scientists say are safe.

In Blueprints, our alternative scenario, a global policy framework emerges—and with it a global cost for emitting greenhouse gases—that spurs innovation, increases energy efficiency and helps maintain steady economic growth. By 2050 greenhouse gas levels in Blueprints are on track to stabilise at levels far lower than in Scramble. In the long run, Blueprints would offer a better world, to live and do business in.

The Citizen 2050 survey report captures the passionate voices of the citizens of tomorrow and brings the Shell Scenarios to life. It articulates the difficult energy challenge from the point of view of those that will be most affected by the decisions we make today.

It uncovers a global youth that is at once optimistic and concerned; educated and naïve. They are willing to take responsibility and yet look to others to make decisions for them. In short, they are like the young people we once were and, like us, will become the decision makers of tomorrow.
Interview with M. Shafik Gabr

Q: Being one of the eminent supporters of bridging the gap between the Middle East and the West: Do you feel the willingness for Dialogue has improved since 2006?

*I believe the willingness to have a dialogue have improved however the challenges remain complex and multi dimensional.*

Q: In case Yes: Why? In Case No: Why?

*The improvement comes from many reasons. The work of many groups to bridge the gap. The fact that has dawned on everyone that an increasing gap does not serve any parties interest. The election of President Obama and his policy of reaching out to all for dialogue and engagement.*

Q: Where do you see improvements?

*President Obama’s speech in Cairo addressing the islamic world was visionary, well thought out and comprehensive. ME and Islamic leaders must now step up to the plate and work with the Obama administration to maintain the momentum and implement on the ground change.*

Q: Whom do you recognize as main supporters for these improvements?

*Whilst there are leaders in politics, religion, business, community activists and academics trying to bridge the gap as of date they have gained very little traction and have not reached a tipping point.*

Q: Where do you see fall backs? Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?
Till now extreme minorities impact the agenda and derail the moderate voices and silent majority.

Q: Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?

The short concentration span of the media and the medias lack of reporting good news on page one plus the lack of just and sustainable resolutions to a number of conflicts.

Q: As businessman what do you want to see coming in place from a corporate point of view?

Business leaders should continue to work on the gap and speak out on the issues both in the ME and the west. Alongwith academics, think tanks and religious leaders the short term win win common ground needs to be identified and implemented.

Q: Where do you see this growing easier: in the Middle East or in the West?

Companies who have no profiling, no biased selection process and that promote total even handedness on all levels are growing on both sides of the Atlantic.

Q: What is in your expectation concerning the disposition towards the Dialogue between the religions for the next 6 months: is it going to grow or remain where it is or decrease – and why?

A huge need for charismatic, well spoken, knowledgeable leaders on both sides of the Atlantic to engage on promoting the common ground and healing the differences.
Interview with Fred Kempe

Q: Being one of the eminent supporters of bridging the gap between the Middle East and the West: Do you feel the willingness for Dialogue has improved since 2006?

Absolutely.

Q: Why?

Obama and the Iranian potential threat to Arab Gulf.

Q: Where do you see improvements?

So far it is more in terms of mood, and particular with U.S. president speaking as he did about Israeli settlements. Now it is time to see how that can be transformed into concrete gains.

Q: Whom do you recognize as main supporters for these improvements?

It really has to do with Obama’s early emphasis in the administration, his naming of Mitchell, and his identification of Mideast peace as crucial issue that will define his administration. His own personal story does have an impact in the region.

Q: Where do you see fall backs?

I do think that the election in Iran is crucial. If Iran is not willing to engage with the U.S., then within Obama’s first term he will have to decide whether to countenance an Iranian nuclear capability or consider military or other action to disrupt it. This will have impact across the Muslim world.
Q: Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?

*Iran.*

Q: As a business man, what do you want to see coming in place from a corporate/government point of view?

A *two state solution with arab world’ recognizing israel’s right to exist in a firm and clear manner, and NATO troops providing peacekeeping and reassurance between two states.*

Q: Where do you see this growing easier: in the Middle East or in the West?

*It is always easier to change thinking in the West than in the Mideast.*

Q: What is in your expectation concerning the disposition towards the Dialogue between the religions for the next 6 months: is it going to grow or remain where it is or decrease – and why?

*I think this depends on evolution much more within Islam than in the West. I am hoping for an Islam-generated initiative to increase dialogue between religions, which would be more effective than any initiative started by the West. If it doesn’t come from the Islamic world, then I believe the Obama effect will be short-lived. So I am undecided, but I fear that we could turn out worse than better over time if the Islamic world doesn’t see the opportunity of Obama.*
Debating the ADR White Paper Draft, Istanbul April 6th, 2009
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1. **The News Media and Religious Affairs**
   **Failures and Success**
   by Mustafa Cerić, Grand Mufti of Bosnia

[What I ask of the free thinker is that he should confront religion in the same mental state as the believer … [He] who does not bring to the study of religion a sort of religious sentiment cannot speak about it! He is like a blind man trying to talk about color.

There cannot be a rational interpretation of religion which is fundamentally irreligious; an irreligious interpretation of religion would be an interpretation which denied the phenomenon it was trying to explain.¹

This is exactly what the modern media is missing – “the same mental state as the believer”. The Godless movement, particularly in Europe, is responsible for the lack of “religious sentiment” the result of which is today’s lack of interfaith understanding. Although trained to live as if God does not exist, many people are confronted now with the fact that God does exist after all and that “religions are founded on and express “the real”, as Emile Durkheim insists.² The indifference toward the issue of God and religions cannot hold on any more. People are faced with “the real” of religions, but they are equipped neither with religious experience nor religious knowledge how to deal with “the real of religions”. The ignorance brings about fears. And fear is the most powerful enemy of reason which often leads to intolerance and violence.

The role of media is essential in producing or removing the fear which leads to intolerance and violence. Generally, the media in the West has had an indifferent or ignorant approach towards relig-

---


ion as such whereas the media in the Muslim World has a promotional and defensive coverage of it. Obviously, the faith of Islam has been the main focus of the Muslim media. Due to recent events such as the 11th of September, the Afghan and Iraq war, Islam has become the main focus in the western media as well. This fact has increased the defensive trend in the media of the Muslim world whereas the media in the West has displayed the double ignorance about the nature of the faith of Islam and the nature of the complexity of Muslim societies. The examples are the Denmark caricature of the Prophet Muhammad, and Pope Benedict XVI’s Regensburg University Lecture on September 13th 2006. The case of Denmark has not achieved its objective in the sense that it did not increase freedom of the media in the West, but it did reduce the trust between the West and the Muslim World to the lowest level in recent history.

On the other hand, the Pope Benedict XVI’s Regensburg University Lecture did provide the challenge for a creative reassessment of the Muslim-Christian relationship as well as Muslim-Western interaction in which the media, particularly in the West, has played a positive role. The initiative came on October 13th 2006 from 38 international and interdenominational leading Muslim Scholars in the manner of an Open Letter to the Pope as a response to his Regensburg Lecture. Then, on October 13th 2007 – on the One-Year Anniversary of the Open Letter to the Pope, the 38 scholars are joined by another 100 scholars (138 in total) and together have issued the document A Common Word between Us and You to the Pope and all the leaders of the major Christian churches, worldwide. Following the Muslim initiative, the leadership of the Christian world issued around 50 different responses and reactions to A Common Word, these include Pope Benedict XVI; the Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams; Lutheran Presiding Bishop Hanson; World Baptist Alliance President Coffey; World Council of Churches General Secretary Kobia; Cardinal Scola; Cardinal Pell; Leaders of the Mennonite and Quaker Churches; Unitarian Congregation President Sinkford; British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and Former Prime Minister Tony Blair, and a number of Orthodox Christian leaders. The document is also welcomed by a few Jewish leaders, including the Chief Rabbis of Israel.
Indeed, the crisis may lead us to a creative thinking and positive attitudes towards each other especially in terms of the West-Muslim interaction which can be seen in the light of the first interaction in Baghdad where the Muslims had taken the lead in the 8\textsuperscript{th} century by translating Greek philosophy in the House of Wisdom. Then, the second interaction in Cordoba, Spain, where the Muslims continued to play the role of promoting Geek rational philosophy through the work of Ibn Rushd (Averroes) in 12\textsuperscript{th} century, the result of which had been the movement of European humanism and renaissance. But the third interaction had occurred in Europe where the Europeans had begun in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century to learn about the faith and culture of Islam.

Furthermore, the West-Muslim theological dialogue is a continuous process which cannot be reduced to a particular historical significance except, perhaps, in the Middle Ages when all three Abrahamic religions had a common goal in elaborating the Cosmological Argument as the main proof for the Existence of God. But this argument was challenged by modern western philosophy and it seems as it has lost the theological focus and put the theology in a different perspective.

However, the West-Muslim cultural dialogue has been the most productive interaction during the last two or three centuries. The initiative for this interaction came from the West whereby major western universities open the departments for oriental studies, i.e., the study of Arabic language and Islamic culture in the broadest sense of the word. It is due to these oriental studies in the West that we have today valuable references on Islamic culture which are relevant not only for the West, but also for Islam. The works such as Islamic Encyclopedia, the Index of Hadith and the edition and translation of the fundamental Islamic theological and philosophical works which are available to the academic community in the West are the undisputable proof of the western contribution to the development of the West-Muslim cultural interaction.

Finally, the West – Muslim political dialogue remains the greatest of all challenges in the West-Muslim interaction. We may start with Israeli-Palestinian conflict or we may end with it, but we cannot escape it wherever we go and whatever we do.
Here is the role of religious leaders to play in the sense of raising the positive examples not only of religious significance, but also of a cultural engagement and political fairness which can increase mutual trust necessary for a global peace and security.

The challenge for the C-1 World Dialogue is in the fact that humanity lives at the most interesting crossroad of interchange of religious and secular as well as rational and spiritual life. We are now certain more than ever before that religion without reason cannot fulfill its mission, but also we know that reason without faith cannot deliver. In the same way as the minds of secular thought have been disturbed by the incompetence of rationality of religious men, the minds of religions thought today are irritated by the corruption of morality of secular men. Historically, the minds of rationality were able to reshape the religious life for the last few centuries. It remains to be seen whether the minds of religion are capable to bring into the secular life its lost spirituality.

Ours is not the time of separation of the essential elements of social life. Ours is the time of unity in diversity. Hence, the faith is too important to be left to the theologians alone, and the politics is too serious to be left to the politicians alone. But also media, both in the West and in the Muslim World, is too influential on human common destiny to be left to the journalists alone.

There is no one-reason solution for our today’s problems and there is no one-faith domination for our today’s needs. We have no choice but to share the space with many reasons and many faiths. The three Abrahamic faiths – Judaism, Christianity and Islam must accept the fact that they share the same idea of cosmogony and eschatology; that they share the same space of the link between the Heaven and Earth – Jerusalem; that they share the same God’s Commandments of Sinai: you shall worship One God, you shall be good to your parents, you shall love your neighbor, you shall not kill, you shall not steal.
I am delighted and honoured to be playing a part in the executive committee of the C-1 World Dialogue. Delighted because I believe there are few more important tasks today than locating a proper place for religion in the affairs of the world, drawing on its wisdom to help solve the world’s problems, and increasing understanding both of and between the different faiths.

Because faith is still of massive importance in the modern world. It has confounded the many thinkers and commentators who, for the last two hundred years and more, have predicted that religion would wither way and die. On the contrary, faith is still flourishing.

However much some people may dislike it or seek to dismiss it, faith still matters to billions of people around the world. Even in the West, which in some places now has a more sceptical attitude towards its religious traditions, millions of people still believe. In most other parts of the world, religions are growing. Faith provides a structure for peoples’ lives, values to guide their behaviour, and aspirations and ideals which endow their existence with meaning. It is a force which in countless different ways motivates people to do good, though sometimes, it is true, it motivates them also to do great harm. Either way, it is hugely influential.

So we shall not fully understand what drives countless individuals and their communities if we do not understand religion in its various manifestations.

And this matters. It matters all the more in the world today, a world driven increasingly by the forces of globalisation. Under the momentum of globalization, countries and cultures are coming closer together at astonishing speed and the world is becoming ever more interdependent.

For me this has a number of important implications.
First, it is vitally important that we all have a better and deeper understanding of the different religions, their values and their mindsets. Any politician, major business leader, community leader, opinion former needs to understand such an important influence for so many millions of people. Without that understanding, we shall make decisions which are at best misguided or at worst damagingly wrong. And if different communities fail to comprehend one another better, then misunderstanding, suspicion, and distrust all grow.

Secondly, given faith’s power to move people and to motivate them, it can either play a positive or a negative role in this increasingly interdependent world. With globalisation pushing people closer together and making interdependence inevitable, peaceful coexistence becomes essential. And not just coexistence but active cooperation. If faith becomes a countervailing force pulling people and communities apart, it becomes destructive and dangerous.

But if it becomes a means of peaceful co-existence, teaching people to live with a diverse religious ecology, to respect ‘the other’, to search for common values while respecting differences, then faith becomes an important power for making the 21st century work more humanely and the one shared creation a better place for all its inhabitants.

Thirdly, religious faith potentially has a crucial part to play in shaping the values which can help guide the modern world. It can and should be seen as a force for progress and betterment. But there is a risk that it either falls prey to extremist and exclusionary tendencies which are latent within each religion, or that faith is seen mainly as an interesting relic, part of the past but with little to say to the present and the future. But in fact faiths can transform and humanize the impersonal forces of globalisation, help shape the values of the changing set of economic and power relationships of the 21st century, and underpin the responses of individuals and communities to the challenges and opportunities which globalization creates.

So these are the reasons why, and because as a person of faith I believe in faith’s power in individual lives, I set up the Tony Blair Faith Foundation. The Foundation works with the three Abrahamic
faiths and Buddhism, Hinduism and Sikhism to encourage more inter faith action on the great humanitarian challenges of today, to help deepen respect between the religions and to increase understanding of the relationship between the forces of globalization and of the great faiths. And for the same sorts of reasons I am delighted to ally myself and my Foundation with the work of the C-1 World Dialogue.

I am pleased that the C-1 will help to build on A Common Word, that ground-breaking letter addressed to the Christian churches. A rich conversation is now under way, as a direct result of the letter, between the two great faiths.

I believe the challenge for C-1 is now to help build on A Common World and its resulting dialogue, to find productive ways of contributing to it, and to devise ways of translating it into action. We need to build on the good will and networks of the C-1 participants to develop concrete forms of action which will make a real difference. The dialogue needs to continue at the high levels at which it is often conducted but also to be taken down into practical and meaningful forms for the street. It needs to diversify from the universal into the local. One idea which has been proposed is that each faith contributes texts towards an anthology, each text being one which the faith tradition which owns it would actively want others to be aware of and read. The texts would in effect present the best of each faith. This would be an invaluable aid for those, like my Faith Foundation, who are working to improve the quality of religious education and to create opportunities for both adults and children to learn more about the strands of thought within each tradition which teach tolerance and the need, indeed the duty, to build for peaceful co-existence.

The more the dialogue can be translated into constructive action, the more religions will be seen in a positive light. We should therefore devise a programme which draws in as many people as possible in as many different fora and at as many levels as possible. I look forward to playing a part in that work.

In this globalised world we cannot afford to ignore faith. In a shrinking world we must be global citizens as well as citizens of our own countries. And this means that we must know more about
the dynamics of the world’s great faiths, must be prepared to learn from their stores of wisdom, must be willing to trust those of other faiths and to work so that they will trust us. We are all close neighbours now, which makes the task all the more urgent. If people of different faiths can co-exist in mutual respect, then so much the better for our world. I know that the C-1 World Dialogue can and will play an invaluable part in this vital endeavour.
3. Tibet on World Media Stage
   by Tseten Samdup Chhoekyapa

In 2008 Tibet was the focus of international attention. A new generation of Tibetans – Buddhist monks, nuns, students, laypeople, and students studying in Chinese universities protested against Chinese repression and discrimination in Tibet.

Over 145 peaceful protests took place across in Tibet. Over 200 Tibetans were killed, more than 6500 Tibetans arbitrarily detained or arrested. These protests were the biggest challenge to Chinese rule in Tibet in almost two decades.

Tanks and armored vehicles were deployed on the streets of Lhasa, similar to 1968 Czech uprising when Soviet tanks entered the streets of Prague. Elite units of the People’s Liberation Army were involved in the crackdown on Tibetans. An undeclared martial law was imposed in Tibet and there was complete information blackout.

The Crisis
The crisis in Tibet is a manifestation of five decades of Chinese repression - human rights violation, cultural and political discrimination of the Tibetan people. The Chinese government’s political reliance on Han Chinese chauvinism has exacerbated tensions between the Tibetans and the Chinese in Tibet.

Every day thousands of Chinese travel to Tibet on the high speed train from Beijing to Lhasa. The influx of Chinese population into Tibet is aimed to make the Tibetans a minority in our own land - China’s final solution to the Tibetan issue.

New Media
The crackdown on peaceful protesters in Tibet sparked strong media attention. At the time of the unrest, there were foreign journal-
ists in Lhasa. Their coverage of the events in March 2008 provided independent reports of the unrest on roof of the world.

What is amazing is the use of new media by Tibetans in communicating the developments in Tibet. Pictures and videos taken by mobile phones, and the use of the internet to communicate with fellow Tibetans and the media were an important source of information. Tibetans in Tibet called relatives in exile by phone, giving live commentary about the demonstrations and the crackdowns that followed. The contacts with relatives were an important source of first-hand information from Tibet.

In the past, what happened in Lhasa wasn’t known in the next town. However, today this has changed thanks to mobile phone and internet.

Alone Tibetan women in Beijing wrote daily reports about developments in Tibet and compilation of news coverage from Chinese media on her blog. Her blog was so popular and it terrified the Chinese. Her blog was hacked five times.

Further, in desperation, China hastily organized about two dozen journalists to tour Lhasa in the late March 2008 in an effort to present that all is calm in Tibet. While on an official tour of Jokhang Temple, Tibet’s holiest temple, about 30 monks shouted pro-Tibetan slogans.

One monk shouted “Tibet is not free, Tibet is not free” before he started to cry. Another monk said demonstration in Tibet "had nothing to do with the Dalai Lama". They first spoke in Tibetan and then in Chinese.

This was repeated in Amdo, in Eastern Tibet. Again, the Tibetan monks hijacked the Chinese guided tour and openly spoke to the journalist in defiance of Chinese rule in Tibet.

**Dalai Lama’s Influence**

Even after 50 years in exile, the Dalai Lama continues to inspire loyalty among his people. Tibetans in Tibet express their devotion and allegiance through songs, poems, and careful subtle acts of dis-
sent. Tibetan protesters shouted – “Long Live the Dalai Lama. We want the Dalai Lama back. Free Tibet.” The bond between the institute of the Dalai Lama and the Tibetans people spreads over 300 years. In recently years, the number of Chinese from mainland China attending the Dalai Lama’s teachings has been growing.

In response, China launched a stinging personal attack on the Dalai Lama, calling the revered leader a "wolf in monk’s robes." China is terrified of the Dalai Lama’s influence. The language used by China is similar to the Cultural Revolution language.

Instead of creating a climate of calm, China has intensified the “patriotic education campaign” across Tibet. Buddhist monks, nuns, civil servants, school students and lay people are forced to attend special classes in the virtues of Communist Chinese rule and denounce the Dalai Lama as a “political reactionary” and “betrayer of the motherland.”

Monks and nuns who refuse to speak against the Dalai Lama are usually expelled from the monastery or arrested.

**Buddhism**

China fails to understand that Buddhism is deeply enrooted in Tibetan culture and the institute of the His Holiness the Dalai Lama (over 300 years) has served and continues to guide the Tibetan people in this darkest period in our history. Therefore, to destroy Buddhism and the role of the His Holiness the Dalai Lama won’t success.

The Dalai Lama’s message of compassion, tolerance, mutual respect, non-violence and the need of have a sense of Universal Responsibility in a world becoming increasing interdependent won him respect of people of all faiths and walk of life the world over. He followed the same principles in seeking a solution to the problem of Tibet.

The Dalai Lama’s has tried to find a mutually beneficial and acceptable solution on the basis of his Middle Path policy of not seeking independence but a genuine regional autonomy for the Ti-
betans in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Chinese constitution.

An elderly Tibetan man in his 80s, who spent over 34 years in Chinese prison, said that only once during the imprisonment that he almost lost his temper at the prison guards. He explained that Tibetan Buddhism had taught him compassion, forgiveness and tolerance. His was not against the Chinese people but the Communist Chinese government policies that discriminate and denies basic human rights to Tibetans.

A Tibetan doctor who spent many years in a Chinese labour camp practiced Tibetan meditation in secret to survive the harsh treatment at the camp.

Despite the brutal crackdown on Tibetan protestors over the years, the Tibetan resistance against Chinese rule in Tibet has been non-violent. It is the Buddhist principles of non-violence that Tibetan practice even in the most severe crackdown by the Chinese, the peaceful resistance has drawn international sympathy and support. His Holiness the Dalai Lama has said that if the struggle turns violence, then he would no longer lead the Tibetan people.

In Exile

Like tens of thousands of Tibetans, I haven’t seen Tibet. My parents followed the Dalai Lama into exile after failed the 10 March 1959 Tibetan Uprising against Communist China’s rule in Tibet. I was born in a refugee camp in Nepal. I am now a second generation Tibetan living in exile. I long for the day when I can return to Tibet with our head held high.

In show of solidarity, the Tibetan communities across the world stages demonstrations. Tibetans in exile have a responsibility to represent fellow Tibetans and we are the voice for the voiceless Tibetans living under Chinese rule where dissent is not tolerated. You are imprisoned for wearing a Tibetan national flag pin or even saying “Long Live the Dalai Lama.”
The Olympic Torch

The Dalai Lama from the beginning supported China’s right to host the Olympic. China has planned to make Beijing Olympic the biggest celebration in 2008. It was in everyone’s lips.

However, what we saw during the torch rallies in London, Paris, San Francisco and Canberra was unbelievable. Tens of thousands of people not mislead by China about the gross violation of human rights, joined in the protest to show they sympathy for Tibet.

The Tibetan communities and support groups organized protest across the world to highlight the plight of Tibetans under Chinese rule. The Tibetan national flag banned in Tibet was carried by every supporter of Tibet during these protests. The massive show of support and media interest robbed China its moment of glory. China’s PR plan to create an image that all is well behind the bamboo couldn’t win over the support of the world. Tibet took the prime spot on international TV news channels and front page of major international newspapers.

The Tibetan activist began their non-violent protest on 10 March 2008 at the Olympic village in Greece, lighting of their own freedom torch. Protest was even staged at the base camp of Mount Everest. The base camp was later closed fear of further protest when the Chinese climbers scaled Mount Everest with the Olympic torch. These protest and the publicity helped to build the momentum for public awareness and media attention on Tibet.

As act of defiance, during the Olympic Games in Beijing, individuals and small groups of people protested against Chinese rule in Tibet in Beijing.

The dedication and sacrifice of Tibetans to self-guard Tibetan issue must never be forgotten. Their resilience and steadfastness has give the Tibetans strengthen, courage and belief in the non-violence struggle.
Challenge Ahead

March 2009 marked the 50th anniversary of the failed Tibetan national uprising against Chinese rule. China’s propaganda campaign on Tibet has saturated its domestic media. It has gone to the extreme as buying a 12 page newspaper ad in The Daily Times of Malawi.

China is a super power but it doesn’t have moral legitimacy in Tibet. It must be earned by responding positively to the Dalai Lama’s call for genuine autonomy for the Tibetan people.

Tibetans both inside and Tibet felt that they have been able to rise to the challenge of keeping the issue of Tibet alive in international politics. Tibet issue is an international issue. The Tibetans and their supporters sent the strongest message to Tibetans in Tibet, the importance of media and more important, the world has not forgotten them and their suffering.
4. The Ethics of Foreign Policy – A Generational Project
Mediap and The New Age of American Diplomacy
by Haris Hromic

In this paper I will attempt to demonstrate a critical link between media reporting and its effect on influencing policy choices and do so in the context of past and present challenges facing the West – Muslim world. I chose to focus on media and public policy simply because that is precisely what C-1 World Dialogue Annual Report is looking to highlight.

Roy Gutman, now a Newsday foreign editor, in 1992 was a reporter who risked his life to cover stories revealing the horrors of aggression in the former Yugoslavia. Most importantly, his reporting, for which he received the 1993 Pulitzer Prize, managed to free many thousands of men from Serb-run concentration camps in northern Bosnia. He was the first to expose the existence of death camps fifty years after the Holocaust. His Newsday reporting on crimes against humanity set the lead for the national coverage that eventually broke the siege of indifference. His achievements are truly remarkable and his contribution to human dignity immeasurable. The title of his book *A Witness to Genocide* explains best the critical role media can play in recognizing and highlighting the challenges in foreign affairs and influencing foreign policy choices.

Such ability of the media to document crimes, provide irrefutable evidence of their commission, and clearly assign individual responsibility intensifies the meaning of these facts and brings closer to the ordinary citizens a realization that war crimes, acts of violence and injustice will not be unpunished. More pressingly, it forces the society to question its conscience against everyday reality. President Barak Hussein Obama himself voiced this concern before the Muslim world in his historic Cairo address referencing tragedies of Bosnia and Darfur.¹ From the perspective of the C-1

¹ Remarks of the President Barak Obama on the New Beginning, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt June 4, 2009
http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-Cairo-University-6-04-09/
World Dialogue, Bosnia and Darfur have at least one critical common denominator; they both rest on the intersections of Islam and Christianity.

Media and its front line journalists often have a larger role than we are willing to admit in such global endeavors. Not often is a journalist willing to step away from his reporting role and declare him or her on any one side of particular issue, thus moving the dime and creating the necessary impetus for change and corrective action. The example of Christiane Amanpour, CNN International Correspondent, is rather instructive in this regard and it testifies to the potency media can have. She says;

“I found my voice and my mission in Bosnia. I learned to seek the facts, to tell the truth no matter how difficult or unpopular. I learned that objectivity meant covering all sides and giving all sides their hearing, but never to draw a false moral equivalence when none exists. I learned never to equate victims with their aggressors. I learned that there are limits to the style of journalism that goes: “On the one hand, on the other hand.” Most of all, I learned that as reporters our words and our actions have consequences and that we must use this powerful platform, television, responsibly. But how many times have people asked me, when I’ve come back from a place like Bosnia or Rwanda: Is it really that bad? I have found that many people want to believe that I am exaggerating. I guess they do not want to believe such evil can exist. Or perhaps they just do not want to be pushed into that moral space where they would have to take a stand and do something.”  

Often, issues that are not visible turn out to be pivotal issues of our time. Such was the case of Bosnia which got attention too late and subsequently consumed the attention of the entire political world. Because of the likes of Mr. Gutman and Ms. Amanpour, whose media reports managed to push the society over the critical awareness threshold, policy makers were moved to action as they had lit- 

tle choice but to intervene and change the core posture of their policy choices from inaction to active engagement. Eventually, Bosnia got the needed attention from international community primarily through American leadership.

These examples speak to the very purpose of the C-1 World Dialogue and its Annual Dialogue Report and the need to study and highlight the issues that are simmering in the background and correctly address them before more damage is done. To be able to achieve this one has to be cognizant of a simple truth:

"Whether in business or government, the immediate rises to the top, the important tends to go to the bottom...I used to tell my self... remember to go to the bottom, push on the strategic issues, because that is going to be the legacy..."³

These are the words of Mr. Anthony Lake, a former Clinton National Security Adviser and a leading member of Senator Obama’s foreign policy team during the election campaign, setting the tone of a foreign policy legacy for then Senator, and now President Obama. It is important to point out that Mr. Lake was a pivotal engineer of Clinton’s foreign policy particularly in Bosnia that culminated in Richard Holbrooke persuading all parties to sign on to the Dayton Peace Accords and thus ending the Genocide in Bosnia.

With this wisdom in mind, it is critical to acknowledge that media can do much as a corrective force in our society. In fact, Media is often the catalyst moving us to action. For this reason it is appropriate that the Annual Dialogue Report give special consideration to Media reporting in the context of the critical issues facing West-Muslim relations.

To be able to fully appreciate the value of this approach, it is apposite to review the Bosnia case, as it demonstrates the point that foreign policy is a matter of generational effort and not a single event. It can be profoundly influenced by public opinion and is sustained by the ethical choices of political actors. The agenda setting effect

³ Anthony Lake, Interview with PBS by Chris Bury, September, 2000
of the media and their capacity to bring what is unknown and wrongly neglected before a wide public is well illustrated by the positive role played in exposing the Bosnian genocide. With this power comes responsibility and media analysis can provide the tools—in themselves neutral—which can facilitate an informed fulfillment by the media of the responsibilities and goals they have themselves identified. The matter of how to reverse the consequences of the Bosnian genocide remains a live one with very current issues I have reviewed more fully elsewhere (give reference) and it is much to be hoped that the media will continue its pioneering earlier work by giving continued coverage to these issues. If the Bosnian injustices and issues presented by the anomalous creation of the artifical Republic of Srpska are not addressed a lasting peace in the region will not have been secured.

Search for truth and justice in the context paralyzed with political realities of war time adversarial motivations is bound to produce no long-term agreement. This is particularly true in the context where war crimes were committed.

As suggested by Walzer “...moral discourse is always suspect, and the war is only an extreme case of anarchy of moral meanings...Judgments of necessity are in this sense always retrospective in its character – the work of historians, not political actors.”

Retrospective approach historians take is useful in defining the context, but by no means sufficient in justifying ex post morality of the ensuing conditions of violent conflict. That said, morality should be understood as having only an ex ante quality as its true nature should be universal and unchanging even if that is to be in its minimalist form that accounts for vast cultural differences.

Consequently, with all of the Bosnia’s complexity in mind, a starting point of discussion should be agreement of what is morally acceptable outside of the context of any specific war but rather within the context of humanity. Humanity is the only true context we all share.

4 Walzer, Just and Unjust Wars, page 11
5. **How to Reduce the Heat: Consequences from a journalist’s point of view**

by Kai Diekmann

Love often starts with a fight. In my case, that fight was a dispute with the largest Turkish daily newspaper Hürriyet over the election campaign of a prominent German-Turkish politician in 2004. BILD had run a series of articles criticising what we thought were very misplaced remarks about Turkish EU membership. And Ertuğrul Özkök, Hürriyet’s Editor-in-Chief, defended the man in an open letter to me in his paper. He was very obviously not pleased.

I wrote Ertuğrul back, an equally open letter. But I did not run that letter in the paper. Instead, I went to Istanbul and delivered it in person. We drank tea and looked at the Bosphorus. And we talked. It was then that I began to understand the way that not only Ertuğrul Özkök thought and functioned - but also his country and, to some extent, the incredibly rich culture he comes from. And it was then that I understood more vividly than ever before, that there are only three things that are really important in any cross-cultural dialogue: reason, respect and continuous discussion.

It is in this spirit that I decided to join the Executive Board of the C-1 World Dialogue. Because even if, let us face it, some may see this institution as yet another talking shop - I tend to believe that more talk is not exactly the worst thing that can happen to a relationship as difficult, at times tense, but also as potentially great and immensely rewarding as that between the West and the Muslim world.

At least that is what my own experience has taught me - if I may take myself as an example again. Because after Ertuğrul Özkök and I had become friends on that evening in Istanbul, we began to work together as well whenever we thought it would further the understanding and peaceful co-operation between our two countries. And mostly, that was whenever misunderstandings occurred.
We ran joint editorials in our respective newspapers following Pope Benedict XVI.’s much-criticised remarks on the Prophet Mohammed in 2006, calling for calm, non-violence and the simple willingness to give the respective other side credit for its arguments. We did the same during the controversy around the publication of caricatures of the Prophet in Denmark in 2005. We even wrote a book together last year, which we called „Süper Freunde“ – „Super Friends“. And we published it in German and Turkish, in Germany and Turkey. The joint OpEd piece in 2006 carried the headline: „We Are Friends“. Was that exceptional? Was it difficult? Did it require anything but the most basic of human norms and values? No. All that it took was some honest and serious conversation.

And that is what I expect most from the C-1 World Dialogue: honesty. Religious debates have often been heated and always been emotional. But if we are to establish channels of communication that are governed by reason, we need a concrete, scientific picture of reality. This is especially valid within my own trade, the media. Newspapers, websites or television channels can be powerful tools to spread messages of peace and tolerance. But they can also be prone to over-simplification if they lack data. Factual findings such as the ADR will in my view therefore cause an immense echo - indirectly possibly even more than directly - and fill informational gaps that are hitherto much too often filled with subjectivities. And in a world as medialised as ours, that prospect is probably more important than anything else.

The last few years have made me rather optimistic about the possibility of seeing this kind of dialogue – in a way the same kind that Ertuğrul Özkoğ and I practise, just on a larger scale. It was good to see the efforts being undertaken by the UN Alliance of Civilization early in 2008 to inform journalists around the world about their impact on the way people think and act. It is good to know that this year’s Annual Dialogue Report will be discussed in public at the UN AoC Conference only one week after our launch and in the run-up to the G20 Summit. And it is good that this forum, the C-1 World Dialogue, finally exists. I am very much looking forward to it.
6. Arabic Television and Genuine Dialogue
by Nakhle El Hage

Al Arabiya news channel, a 24/7 free-to-air news and current affairs satellite outlet, was launched in 2003 and soon became the news source of choice for Arabs seeking credible news and information about the Middle East and the world beyond. Al Arabiya’s reputation for balanced reporting now extends beyond its natural geographic and cultural domain, i.e. the Middle East. A number of renowned international news organisations and research institutes interested in the Arab and Islamic worlds regularly monitor Al Arabiya.

Al Arabiya runs an extensive global network of correspondents and reporters to provide its audiences with the latest updates, scoops, interviews, and exclusives. With nearly 30 offices around the world and large-scale presence in several key countries such as Iraq, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Yemen, Al Arabiya enjoys a competitive edge in providing on-the-ground, first hand coverage of major events of relevance to its audience and the world at large.

Al Arabiya’s charter embodies an independent editorial policy based on providing its viewers with a speedy news service and balanced analysis that is thoughtfully accurate, comprehensive and objective.

Since its inception, Al Arabiya has helped in changing various preconceptions about the Arab and Muslim world in a credible way, effectively breaking the monopoly of” Al Jazeera” over broadcasting in/from the Middle East.

Al Arabiya soon became a commercial success endorsed by the region’s largest advertisers & trusted by business decision makers.

Speaking the language of CEOs & Top Business Decision-Makers

In record time, Al Arabiya became a commercial success; it’s endorsed by the largest advertisers as the right vehicle to reach CEOs,
top business decision makers, affluent people & key opinion leaders. Al Arabiya has the ability to act as a “driving force” behind regional business – thus fostering greater economic activity & prosperity.

Al Arabiya has the ability to reach regional “Influencers” – thus actively participating in shaping the Agendas of Arab Rulers & Governments and political/financial capital & High-Tech centers.

**On Cultural Dialogue**

Al Arabiya somehow represents the Arab World’s commitment to the cause of openness, reform, gradual change, progress & universal values. It has the power to foster understanding & establish a genuine dialogue across cultural, linguistic, ethnic & national boundaries. As a catalyst of debate and dialogue, Al Arabiya tackles real issues and acts as a springboard for gradual change & development in the region.

**On the Recent Gaza/Lebanon Wars**

As the primary source of credible and trusted political, economic and business news, Al Arabiya always distinguishes facts from comments in all its coverage and reporting. It is seen to be accurate, objective, comprehensive, trend-setting & reflecting different perspectives.

**On Obama’s recent interview on Al Arabiya**

President Obama’s recent appearance on Al Arabiya is a reflection of its commitment to breaking news and building bridges through debate and mutual understanding.
In 2006 People to People International reached the half-century mark. My grandfather, U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, founded our organization on September 11, 1956. Haunted by the horrors of World War II, Granddad believed that everyday citizens of the world wanted peace and could attain it much more effectively without government interference or representation. He said, “People want peace so badly that someday governments are going to have to get out of the way and let them have it.”

As we Celebrate 50 Years of Peace through Understanding, it seems fitting that I share with you a portion of Granddad’s farewell address. It captures the essence of our organization and the remarkable individuals, like you, who strive to enhance educational, cultural and humanitarian efforts around the world.

He said, “We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.”

Today, members of the PTPI family worldwide embrace our mission to enhance international understanding and friendship. An NGO with a U.S. not-for-profit tax rating, PTPI has a presence in 135 countries with more than 80,000 individuals actively participating in PTPI programs. Let us do all we can together to keep this momentum going as we launch the next 50 years.

The purpose of People to People International is to enhance international understanding and friendship through educational, cultural and humanitarian activities involving the exchange of ideas and
experiences directly among peoples of different countries and diverse cultures.

People to People International is dedicated to enhancing cross-cultural communication within each community, and across communities and nations. Tolerance and mutual understanding are central themes. While not a partisan or political institution, PTPI supports the basic values and goals of its founder, President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Through People to People International’s Awards Program, world leaders have been recognized for their contributions toward peace. Among the recipients of PTPI’s most prestigious award, the Eisenhower Medallion, are Mother Teresa - 1988; Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin - 1996 (posthumously); President Anwar el Sadat - 1996 (posthumously); Save the Children - 1998; His Grace the Archbishop Desmond M. Tutu - 2000.

“I have long believed, as have many before me, that peaceful relations between nations requires understanding and mutual respect between individuals.” President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Founder of People to People International.
8. **Documentation: President Obama’s Speech in Cairo, June 4th, 2009**

**Remarks by the President on a New Beginning**

Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt

Thank you very much. Good afternoon. I am honored to be in the timeless city of Cairo, and to be hosted by two remarkable institutions. For over a thousand years, Al-Azhar has stood as a beacon of Islamic learning; and for over a century, Cairo University has been a source of Egypt’s advancement. And together, you represent the harmony between tradition and progress. I’m grateful for your hospitality, and the hospitality of the people of Egypt. And I’m also proud to carry with me the goodwill of the American people, and a greeting of peace from Muslim communities in my country: Assalaamu alaykum.

We meet at a time of great tension between the United States and Muslims around the world – tension rooted in historical forces that go beyond any current policy debate. The relationship between Islam and the West includes centuries of coexistence and cooperation, but also conflict and religious wars. More recently, tension has been fed by colonialism that denied rights and opportunities to many Muslims, and a Cold War in which Muslim-majority countries were too often treated as proxies without regard to their own aspirations. Moreover, the sweeping change brought by modernity and globalization led many Muslims to view the West as hostile to the traditions of Islam.

Violent extremists have exploited these tensions in a small but potent minority of Muslims. The attacks of September 11, 2001 and the continued efforts of these extremists to engage in violence against civilians has led some in my country to view Islam as inevitably hostile not only to America and Western countries, but also to human rights. All this has bred more fear and more mistrust.

---

1 [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-Cairo-University-6-04-09/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-at-Cairo-University-6-04-09/)
So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, those who promote conflict rather than the cooperation that can help all of our people achieve justice and prosperity. And this cycle of suspicion and discord must end.

I’ve come here to Cairo to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world, one based on mutual interest and mutual respect, and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap, and share common principles – principles of justice and progress; tolerance and the dignity of all human beings.

I do so recognizing that change cannot happen overnight. I know there’s been a lot of publicity about this speech, but no single speech can eradicate years of mistrust, nor can I answer in the time that I have this afternoon all the complex questions that brought us to this point. But I am convinced that in order to move forward, we must say openly to each other the things we hold in our hearts and that too often are said only behind closed doors. There must be a sustained effort to listen to each other; to learn from each other; to respect one another; and to seek common ground. As the Holy Koran tells us, “Be conscious of God and speak always the truth.” That is what I will try to do today – to speak the truth as best I can, humbled by the task before us, and firm in my belief that the interests we share as human beings are far more powerful than the forces that drive us apart.

Now part of this conviction is rooted in my own experience. I’m a Christian, but my father came from a Kenyan family that includes generations of Muslims. As a boy, I spent several years in Indonesia and heard the call of the azaan at the break of dawn and at the fall of dusk. As a young man, I worked in Chicago communities where many found dignity and peace in their Muslim faith.

As a student of history, I also know civilization’s debt to Islam. It was Islam – at places like Al-Azhar – that carried the light of learning through so many centuries, paving the way for Europe’s Renaissance and Enlightenment. It was innovation in Muslim communities it was innovation in Muslim communities that developed the
order of algebra; our magnetic compass and tools of navigation; our mastery of pens and printing; our understanding of how disease spreads and how it can be healed. Islamic culture has given us majestic arches and soaring spires; timeless poetry and cherished music; elegant calligraphy and places of peaceful contemplation. And throughout history, Islam has demonstrated through words and deeds the possibilities of religious tolerance and racial equality.

I also know that Islam has always been a part of America’s story. The first nation to recognize my country was Morocco. In signing the Treaty of Tripoli in 1796, our second President, John Adams, wrote, “The United States has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Muslims.” And since our founding, American Muslims have enriched the United States. They have fought in our wars, they have served in our government, they have stood for civil rights, they have started businesses, they have taught at our universities, they’ve excelled in our sports arenas, they’ve won Nobel Prizes, built our tallest building, and lit the Olympic Torch. And when the first Muslim American was recently elected to Congress, he took the oath to defend our Constitution using the same Holy Koran that one of our Founding Fathers – Thomas Jefferson – kept in his personal library.

So I have known Islam on three continents before coming to the region where it was first revealed. That experience guides my conviction that partnership between America and Islam must be based on what Islam is, not what it isn’t. And I consider it part of my responsibility as President of the United States to fight against negative stereotypes of Islam wherever they appear.

But that same principle must apply to Muslim perceptions of America. Just as Muslims do not fit a crude stereotype, America is not the crude stereotype of a self-interested empire. The United States has been one of the greatest sources of progress that the world has ever known. We were born out of revolution against an empire. We were founded upon the ideal that all are created equal, and we have shed blood and struggled for centuries to give meaning to those words – within our borders, and around the world. We are shaped by every culture, drawn from every end of the Earth, and dedicated to a simple concept: E pluribus unum – “Out of many, one.”
Now, much has been made of the fact that an African American with the name Barack Hussein Obama could be elected President. But my personal story is not so unique. The dream of opportunity for all people has not come true for everyone in America, but its promise exists for all who come to our shores – and that includes nearly 7 million American Muslims in our country today who, by the way, enjoy incomes and educational levels that are higher than the American average.

Moreover, freedom in America is indivisible from the freedom to practice one’s religion. That is why there is a mosque in every state in our union, and over 1,200 mosques within our borders. That’s why the United States government has gone to court to protect the right of women and girls.

So let there be no doubt: Islam is a part of America. And I believe that America holds within her the truth that regardless of race, religion, or station in life, all of us share common aspirations – to live in peace and security; to get an education and to work with dignity; to love our families, our communities, and our God. These things we share. This is the hope of all humanity.

Of course, recognizing our common humanity is only the beginning of our task. Words alone cannot meet the needs of our people. These needs will be met only if we act boldly in the years ahead; and if we understand that the challenges we face are shared, and our failure to meet them will hurt us all.

For we have learned from recent experience that when a financial system weakens in one country, prosperity is hurt everywhere. When a new flu infects one human being, all are at risk. When one nation pursues a nuclear weapon, the risk of nuclear attack rises for all nations. When violent extremists operate in one stretch of mountains, people are endangered across an ocean. When innocents in Bosnia and Darfur are slaughtered, that is a stain on our collective conscience. That is what it means to share this world in the 21st century. That is the responsibility we have to one another as human beings.

And this is a difficult responsibility to embrace. For human history has often been a record of nations and tribes – and, yes, religions –
subjugating one another in pursuit of their own interests. Yet in this new age, such attitudes are self-defeating. Given our interdependence, any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail. So whatever we think of the past, we must not be prisoners to it. Our problems must be dealt with through partnership; our progress must be shared.

Now, that does not mean we should ignore sources of tension. Indeed, it suggests the opposite: We must face these tensions squarely. And so in that spirit, let me speak as clearly and as plainly as I can about some specific issues that I believe we must finally confront together.

The first issue that we have to confront is violent extremism in all of its forms.

In Ankara, I made clear that America is not – and never will be – at war with Islam. We will, however, relentlessly confront violent extremists who pose a grave threat to our security – because we reject the same thing that people of all faiths reject: the killing of innocent men, women, and children. And it is my first duty as President to protect the American people.

The situation in Afghanistan demonstrates America’s goals, and our need to work together. Over seven years ago, the United States pursued al Qaeda and the Taliban with broad international support. We did not go by choice; we went because of necessity. I’m aware that there’s still some who would question or even justify the events of 9/11. But let us be clear: Al Qaeda killed nearly 3,000 people on that day. The victims were innocent men, women and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody. And yet al Qaeda chose to ruthlessly murder these people, claimed credit for the attack, and even now states their determination to kill on a massive scale. They have affiliates in many countries and are trying to expand their reach. These are not opinions to be debated; these are facts to be dealt with.

Now, make no mistake: We do not want to keep our troops in Afghanistan. We see no military – we seek no military bases there. It is agonizing for America to lose our young men and women. It is costly and politically difficult to continue this conflict. We would
gladly bring every single one of our troops home if we could be confident that there were not violent extremists in Afghanistan and now Pakistan determined to kill as many Americans as they possibly can. But that is not yet the case.

And that’s why we’re partnering with a coalition of 46 countries. And despite the costs involved, America’s commitment will not weaken. Indeed, none of us should tolerate these extremists. They have killed in many countries. They have killed people of different faiths – but more than any other, they have killed Muslims. Their actions are irreconcilable with the rights of human beings, the progress of nations, and with Islam. The Holy Koran teaches that whoever kills an innocent is as – it is as if he has killed all mankind. And the Holy Koran also says whoever saves a person, it is as if he has saved all mankind. The enduring faith of over a billion people is so much bigger than the narrow hatred of a few. Islam is not part of the problem in combating violent extremism – it is an important part of promoting peace.

Now, we also know that military power alone is not going to solve the problems in Afghanistan and Pakistan. That’s why we plan to invest $1.5 billion each year over the next five years to partner with Pakistanis to build schools and hospitals, roads and businesses, and hundreds of millions to help those who’ve been displaced. That’s why we are providing more than $2.8 billion to help Afghans develop their economy and deliver services that people depend on.

Let me also address the issue of Iraq. Unlike Afghanistan, Iraq was a war of choice that provoked strong differences in my country and around the world. Although I believe that the Iraqi people are ultimately better off without the tyranny of Saddam Hussein, I also believe that events in Iraq have reminded America of the need to use diplomacy and build international consensus to resolve our problems whenever possible. Indeed, we can recall the words of Thomas Jefferson, who said: “I hope that our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us that the less we use our power the greater it will be.”

Today, America has a dual responsibility: to help Iraq forge a better future – and to leave Iraq to Iraqis. And I have made it clear to
the Iraqi people I have made it clear to the Iraqi people that we pursue no bases, and no claim on their territory or resources. Iraq’s sovereignty is its own. And that’s why I ordered the removal of our combat brigades by next August. That is why we will honor our agreement with Iraq’s democratically elected government to remove combat troops from Iraqi cities by July, and to remove all of our troops from Iraq by 2012. We will help Iraq train its security forces and develop its economy. But we will support a secure and united Iraq as a partner, and never as a patron.

And finally, just as America can never tolerate violence by extremists, we must never alter or forget our principles. Nine-eleven was an enormous trauma to our country. The fear and anger that it provoked was understandable, but in some cases, it led us to act contrary to our traditions and our ideals. We are taking concrete actions to change course. I have unequivocally prohibited the use of torture by the United States, and I have ordered the prison at Guantanamo Bay closed by early next year.

So America will defend itself, respectful of the sovereignty of nations and the rule of law. And we will do so in partnership with Muslim communities which are also threatened. The sooner the extremists are isolated and unwelcome in Muslim communities, the sooner we will all be safer.

The second major source of tension that we need to discuss is the situation between Israelis, Palestinians and the Arab world.

America’s strong bonds with Israel are well known. This bond is unbreakable. It is based upon cultural and historical ties, and the recognition that the aspiration for a Jewish homeland is rooted in a tragic history that cannot be denied.

Around the world, the Jewish people were persecuted for centuries, and anti-Semitism in Europe culminated in an unprecedented Holocaust. Tomorrow, I will visit Buchenwald, which was part of a network of camps where Jews were enslaved, tortured, shot and gassed to death by the Third Reich. Six million Jews were killed – more than the entire Jewish population of Israel today. Denying that fact is baseless, it is ignorant, and it is hateful. Threatening Israel with destruction – or repeating vile stereotypes about Jews – is
deeply wrong, and only serves to evoke in the minds of Israelis this most painful of memories while preventing the peace that the people of this region deserve.

On the other hand, it is also undeniable that the Palestinian people – Muslims and Christians – have suffered in pursuit of a homeland. For more than 60 years they’ve endured the pain of dislocation. Many wait in refugee camps in the West Bank, Gaza, and neighboring lands for a life of peace and security that they have never been able to lead. They endure the daily humiliations – large and small – that come with occupation. So let there be no doubt: The situation for the Palestinian people is intolerable. And America will not turn our backs on the legitimate Palestinian aspiration for dignity, opportunity, and a state of their own.

For decades then, there has been a stalemate: two peoples with legitimate aspirations, each with a painful history that makes compromise elusive. It’s easy to point fingers – for Palestinians to point to the displacement brought about by Israel’s founding, and for Israelis to point to the constant hostility and attacks throughout its history from within its borders as well as beyond. But if we see this conflict only from one side or the other, then we will be blind to the truth: The only resolution is for the aspirations of both sides to be met through two states, where Israelis and Palestinians each live in peace and security.

That is in Israel’s interest, Palestine’s interest, America’s interest, and the world’s interest. And that is why I intend to personally pursue this outcome with all the patience and dedication that the task requires. The obligations – the obligations that the parties have agreed to under the road map are clear. For peace to come, it is time for them – and all of us – to live up to our responsibilities.

Palestinians must abandon violence. Resistance through violence and killing is wrong and it does not succeed. For centuries, black people in America suffered the lash of the whip as slaves and the humiliation of segregation. But it was not violence that won full and equal rights. It was a peaceful and determined insistence upon the ideals at the center of America’s founding. This same story can be told by people from South Africa to South Asia; from Eastern Europe to Indonesia. It’s a story with a simple truth: that violence
is a dead end. It is a sign neither of courage nor power to shoot rockets at sleeping children, or to blow up old women on a bus. That’s not how moral authority is claimed; that’s how it is surrendered.

Now is the time for Palestinians to focus on what they can build. The Palestinian Authority must develop its capacity to govern, with institutions that serve the needs of its people. Hamas does have support among some Palestinians, but they also have to recognize they have responsibilities. To play a role in fulfilling Palestinian aspirations, to unify the Palestinian people, Hamas must put an end to violence, recognize past agreements, recognize Israel’s right to exist.

At the same time, Israelis must acknowledge that just as Israel’s right to exist cannot be denied, neither can Palestine’s. The United States does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements. This construction violates previous agreements and undermines efforts to achieve peace. It is time for these settlements to stop.

And Israel must also live up to its obligation to ensure that Palestinians can live and work and develop their society. Just as it devastates Palestinian families, the continuing humanitarian crisis in Gaza does not serve Israel’s security; neither does the continuing lack of opportunity in the West Bank. Progress in the daily lives of the Palestinian people must be a critical part of a road to peace, and Israel must take concrete steps to enable such progress.

And finally, the Arab states must recognize that the Arab Peace Initiative was an important beginning, but not the end of their responsibilities. The Arab-Israeli conflict should no longer be used to distract the people of Arab nations from other problems. Instead, it must be a cause for action to help the Palestinian people develop the institutions that will sustain their state, to recognize Israel’s legitimacy, and to choose progress over a self-defeating focus on the past.

America will align our policies with those who pursue peace, and we will say in public what we say in private to Israelis and Palestinians and Arabs. We cannot impose peace. But privately, many
Muslims recognize that Israel will not go away. Likewise, many Israelis recognize the need for a Palestinian state. It is time for us to act on what everyone knows to be true.

Too many tears have been shed. Too much blood has been shed. All of us have a responsibility to work for the day when the mothers of Israelis and Palestinians can see their children grow up without fear; when the Holy Land of the three great faiths is the place of peace that God intended it to be; when Jerusalem is a secure and lasting home for Jews and Christians and Muslims, and a place for all of the children of Abraham to mingle peacefully together as in the story of Isra as in the story of Isra, when Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed, peace be upon them, joined in prayer.

The third source of tension is our shared interest in the rights and responsibilities of nations on nuclear weapons.

This issue has been a source of tension between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran. For many years, Iran has defined itself in part by its opposition to my country, and there is in fact a tumultuous history between us. In the middle of the Cold War, the United States played a role in the overthrow of a democratically elected Iranian government. Since the Islamic Revolution, Iran has played a role in acts of hostage-taking and violence against U.S. troops and civilians. This history is well known. Rather than remain trapped in the past, I’ve made it clear to Iran’s leaders and people that my country is prepared to move forward. The question now is not what Iran is against, but rather what future it wants to build.

I recognize it will be hard to overcome decades of mistrust, but we will proceed with courage, rectitude, and resolve. There will be many issues to discuss between our two countries, and we are willing to move forward without preconditions on the basis of mutual respect. But it is clear to all concerned that when it comes to nuclear weapons, we have reached a decisive point. This is not simply about America’s interests. It’s about preventing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East that could lead this region and the world down a hugely dangerous path.
I understand those who protest that some countries have weapons that others do not. No single nation should pick and choose which nation holds nuclear weapons. And that’s why I strongly reaffirmed America’s commitment to seek a world in which no nations hold nuclear weapons. And any nation – including Iran – should have the right to access peaceful nuclear power if it complies with its responsibilities under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. That commitment is at the core of the treaty, and it must be kept for all who fully abide by it. And I’m hopeful that all countries in the region can share in this goal.

The fourth issue that I will address is democracy.

I know – I know there has been controversy about the promotion of democracy in recent years, and much of this controversy is connected to the war in Iraq. So let me be clear: No system of government can or should be imposed by one nation by any other.

That does not lessen my commitment, however, to governments that reflect the will of the people. Each nation gives life to this principle in its own way, grounded in the traditions of its own people. America does not presume to know what is best for everyone, just as we would not presume to pick the outcome of a peaceful election. But I do have an unyielding belief that all people yearn for certain things: the ability to speak your mind and have a say in how you are governed; confidence in the rule of law and the equal administration of justice; government that is transparent and doesn’t steal from the people; the freedom to live as you choose. These are not just American ideas; they are human rights. And that is why we will support them everywhere.

Now, there is no straight line to realize this promise. But this much is clear: Governments that protect these rights are ultimately more stable, successful and secure. Suppressing ideas never succeeds in making them go away. America respects the right of all peaceful and law-abiding voices to be heard around the world, even if we disagree with them. And we will welcome all elected, peaceful governments – provided they govern with respect for all their people.

This last point is important because there are some who advocate for democracy only when they’re out of power; once in power,
they are ruthless in suppressing the rights of others. So no matter where it takes hold, government of the people and by the people sets a single standard for all who would hold power: You must maintain your power through consent, not coercion; you must respect the rights of minorities, and participate with a spirit of tolerance and compromise; you must place the interests of your people and the legitimate workings of the political process above your party. Without these ingredients, elections alone do not make true democracy.

The fifth issue that we must address together is religious freedom.

Islam has a proud tradition of tolerance. We see it in the history of Andalusia and Cordoba during the Inquisition. I saw it firsthand as a child in Indonesia, where devout Christians worshiped freely in an overwhelmingly Muslim country. That is the spirit we need today. People in every country should be free to choose and live their faith based upon the persuasion of the mind and the heart and the soul. This tolerance is essential for religion to thrive, but it’s being challenged in many different ways.

Among some Muslims, there’s a disturbing tendency to measure one’s own faith by the rejection of somebody else’s faith. The richness of religious diversity must be upheld – whether it is for Maronites in Lebanon or the Copts in Egypt. And if we are being honest, fault lines must be closed among Muslims, as well, as the divisions between Sunni and Shia have led to tragic violence, particularly in Iraq.

Freedom of religion is central to the ability of peoples to live together. We must always examine the ways in which we protect it. For instance, in the United States, rules on charitable giving have made it harder for Muslims to fulfill their religious obligation. That’s why I’m committed to working with American Muslims to ensure that they can fulfill zakat.

Likewise, it is important for Western countries to avoid impeding Muslim citizens from practicing religion as they see fit – for instance, by dictating what clothes a Muslim woman should wear. We can’t disguise hostility towards any religion behind the pretense of liberalism.
In fact, faith should bring us together. And that’s why we’re forging service projects in America to bring together Christians, Muslims, and Jews. That’s why we welcome efforts like Saudi Arabian King Abdullah’s interfaith dialogue and Turkey’s leadership in the Alliance of Civilizations. Around the world, we can turn dialogue into interfaith service, so bridges between peoples lead to action – whether it is combating malaria in Africa, or providing relief after a natural disaster.

The sixth issue – the sixth issue that I want to address is women’s rights. I know – I know – and you can tell from this audience, that there is a healthy debate about this issue. I reject the view of some in the West that a woman who chooses to cover her hair is somehow less equal, but I do believe that a woman who is denied an education is denied equality. And it is no coincidence that countries where women are well educated are far more likely to be prosperous.

Now, let me be clear: Issues of women’s equality are by no means simply an issue for Islam. In Turkey, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, we’ve seen Muslim-majority countries elect a woman to lead. Meanwhile, the struggle for women’s equality continues in many aspects of American life, and in countries around the world.

I am convinced that our daughters can contribute just as much to society as our sons. Our common prosperity will be advanced by allowing all humanity – men and women – to reach their full potential. I do not believe that women must make the same choices as men in order to be equal, and I respect those women who choose to live their lives in traditional roles. But it should be their choice. And that is why the United States will partner with any Muslim-majority country to support expanded literacy for girls, and to help young women pursue employment through micro-financing that helps people live their dreams.

Finally, I want to discuss economic development and opportunity.

I know that for many, the face of globalization is contradictory. The Internet and television can bring knowledge and information, but also offensive sexuality and mindless violence into the home. Trade can bring new wealth and opportunities, but also huge dis-
ruptions and change in communities. In all nations – including America – this change can bring fear. Fear that because of modernity we lose control over our economic choices, our politics, and most importantly our identities – those things we most cherish about our communities, our families, our traditions, and our faith.

But I also know that human progress cannot be denied. There need not be contradictions between development and tradition. Countries like Japan and South Korea grew their economies enormously while maintaining distinct cultures. The same is true for the astonishing progress within Muslim-majority countries from Kuala Lumpur to Dubai. In ancient times and in our times, Muslim communities have been at the forefront of innovation and education.

And this is important because no development strategy can be based only upon what comes out of the ground, nor can it be sustained while young people are out of work. Many Gulf states have enjoyed great wealth as a consequence of oil, and some are beginning to focus it on broader development. But all of us must recognize that education and innovation will be the currency of the 21st century and in too many Muslim communities, there remains underinvestment in these areas. I’m emphasizing such investment within my own country. And while America in the past has focused on oil and gas when it comes to this part of the world, we now seek a broader engagement.

On education, we will expand exchange programs, and increase scholarships, like the one that brought my father to America. At the same time, we will encourage more Americans to study in Muslim communities. And we will match promising Muslim students with internships in America; invest in online learning for teachers and children around the world; and create a new online network, so a young person in Kansas can communicate instantly with a young person in Cairo.

On economic development, we will create a new corps of business volunteers to partner with counterparts in Muslim-majority countries. And I will host a Summit on Entrepreneurship this year to identify how we can deepen ties between business leaders, foundations and social entrepreneurs in the United States and Muslim communities around the world.
On science and technology, we will launch a new fund to support technological development in Muslim-majority countries, and to help transfer ideas to the marketplace so they can create more jobs. We’ll open centers of scientific excellence in Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia, and appoint new science envoys to collaborate on programs that develop new sources of energy, create green jobs, digitize records, clean water, grow new crops. Today I’m announcing a new global effort with the Organization of the Islamic Conference to eradicate polio. And we will also expand partnerships with Muslim communities to promote child and maternal health.

All these things must be done in partnership. Americans are ready to join with citizens and governments; community organizations, religious leaders, and businesses in Muslim communities around the world to help our people pursue a better life.

The issues that I have described will not be easy to address. But we have a responsibility to join together on behalf of the world that we seek – a world where extremists no longer threaten our people, and American troops have come home; a world where Israelis and Palestinians are each secure in a state of their own, and nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes; a world where governments serve their citizens, and the rights of all God’s children are respected. Those are mutual interests. That is the world we seek. But we can only achieve it together.

I know there are many – Muslim and non-Muslim – who question whether we can forge this new beginning. Some are eager to stoke the flames of division, and to stand in the way of progress. Some suggest that it isn’t worth the effort – that we are fated to disagree, and civilizations are doomed to clash. Many more are simply skeptical that real change can occur. There’s so much fear, so much mistrust that has built up over the years. But if we choose to be bound by the past, we will never move forward. And I want to particularly say this to young people of every faith, in every country – you, more than anyone, have the ability to reimagine the world, to remake this world.

All of us share this world for but a brief moment in time. The question is whether we spend that time focused on what pushes us
apart, or whether we commit ourselves to an effort – a sustained effort – to find common ground, to focus on the future we seek for our children, and to respect the dignity of all human beings.

It’s easier to start wars than to end them. It’s easier to blame others than to look inward. It’s easier to see what is different about someone than to find the things we share. But we should choose the right path, not just the easy path. There’s one rule that lies at the heart of every religion – that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us. This truth transcends nations and peoples – a belief that isn’t new; that isn’t black or white or brown; that isn’t Christian or Muslim or Jew. It’s a belief that pulsed in the cradle of civilization, and that still beats in the hearts of billions around the world. It’s a faith in other people, and it’s what brought me here today.

We have the power to make the world we seek, but only if we have the courage to make a new beginning, keeping in mind what has been written.

The Holy Koran tells us: “O mankind! We have created you male and a female; and we have made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another.”

The Talmud tells us: “The whole of the Torah is for the purpose of promoting peace.”

The Holy Bible tells us: “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.”

The people of the world can live together in peace. We know that is God’s vision. Now that must be our work here on Earth.

Thank you. And may God’s peace be upon you. Thank you very much. Thank you.
Interview with S. Abdallah Schleifer

Q: Being one of the eminent supporters of bridging the gap between the Middle East and the West: Do you feel the willingness for Dialogue has improved since 2006?

Yes I believe it has improved significantly.

Q: Where do you see improvements?

In part that is because the tendency to confrontation and blame-seeking rather than dialogue and empathy on both sides of the Muslim-West divide since 9/11 has accomplished nothing. On the other hand thanks to the efforts of a core group of Muslim religious scholars and intellectuals several of whom now serve as executive members the new C-1 World Dialogue – a significant number of Muslim scholars and intellectuals were persuaded to join together in a direct Open Letter Appeal known as “A Common Word” to the Christian religious leadership – His Holiness the Pope, the Orthodox Patriarchs, the Archbishop of the Church of England and leader of the Anglican Communion and the leaders of the Protestant churches associated with the World Council of Churches and Evangelical unions. The theme of that appeal: that for the sake of world peace Muslim and Christians had to acknowledge that whatever their differences, they shared (in the words of The Quran) A Common Word – love of God and love of Neighbor. The response to this has been extraordinary – major and successful dialogues in Rome, Cambridge and at Yale, that in turn have encouraged any number of local initiatives between Muslim and Christian communities that far surpass the number of scholars, theologians and intellectuals initially engaged in this initiative.

There has been considerable coverage of this initiative in both the Western and Muslim world press and in part one could say that the success of Common Word has inspired
some of the key movers of “A Common World” – The Grand Mufti of Egypt Dr. Sheikh Ali Gomaa, The Grand Mufti of Bosnia Sheikh Mustafa Ceric, and HRH Prince Ghazi bin Muhammed of Jordan who is the head of the Aaal al Bayt Institute for islamic Thought (which was the organizing vehicle for A Common world) to work to expand this dialogue beyond Muslim-Christian religious communities into a broader dialogue of civilizations – a Muslim-West Dialogue which has been warmly received by both religious and secular leaders in the West. There are other important initiatives in this field – the Brookings Institution in Washington DC holds an annual US- Islamic Forum in Qatar that has fostered dialogue and better understanding among journalists, political personalities and scholars from America and the Muslim world.

At the same time there has been a fundamental shift in the American political establishment which cannot but have global implications. Our new President Barack Obama seek dialogue and cooperation based on mutual respect instead of confrontation between the Muslim world and the West as he has made most clear in his recent speech in Cairo as well as by a series of both measures undertaken and statements that he has made from the time of his inauguration. By taking the initiative for “changing course” in American-Muslim world relations – a phrase President Obama uses which is also the name of a policy paper presented to Obama prior to his inauguration, and to which he has responded positively and has already begin to implement – a policy proposal which was prepared by a group of American political, academic, religious and intellectual leaders, and which interestingly singled out Common Word as the sort of dialogue that the American government must welcome and encourage. So President Obama has contributed tremendously to inspiring global opening to dialogue.
Q: Whom do you recognize as main supporters for these improvements?

All of the individuals who have come together to establish C-1! World Dialogue are already involved in Muslim-West Dialogue and now the combination of their efforts in one global organization will add further momentum, particularly since this sort of initiative has already been welcomed by outstanding religious as well as political, business and academic leaders in both the West and the Muslim world.

Q: Where do you see fall backs? Whom do you recognize as the player primarily responsible for these fall backs?

There is a certain hostility to this groundswell of dialogue manifest in negative comments by some militantly anti-Western elements in the Muslim world and their counterparts in the West. But overall the trend, in comparison to just four years ago is running in favor of dialogue.

Q: As a journalist what do you want to see coming in place from a media point of view?

I would like to see the media, particularly in the Muslim world, more positive, more responsive, less suspicious to our goal of dialogue, mutual respect, and concrete areas of cooperation. The Western press has been very positive in its response, here in the Muslim world (and I write as an American Muslim resident in Egypt) suspicion is part of the heritage of post-colonial conditioning and in part of political radicalism whether cloaked in religious or nationalist sentiment. I think the time now is to move beyond inspiring declarations into the realm of action that media can comprehend and report on and I believe C-1 will be encouraging precisely that.
Q: Where do you see this growing easier: in the Middle East or in the West?

*It will be easier in the West, but of greater importance at this moment in time, in the Middle East or the Arab world.*

Q: Have you experienced any best practice in the field of journalism within the last 12 months? In case yes, please name your top 3 in the region and in the West.

*As far as the West, and in particular the USA which I am most familiar with, I would note the coverage in local and national media of the initiative undertaken by the Islamic Society of North America to establish cordial relations and joint projects between hundreds of mosques in America with hundreds of synagogues. Then there is the positive response of major American media – The New York Times, the Washington Post, The Philadelphia Inquirer and many other major publications to several important initiatives such as Common World, the “Changing Course” policy paper prepared by the U.S.-Muslim Engagement Project that I alluded to earlier.*

*I would also call attention to the celebration of the 5th Anniversary of the Doha Debates in Washington DC. The Doha Debates are an extraordinary development in which eight debates a year on topics that would have been inconceivable for public debate in the Arab world a decade ago, are debated in Doha before an audience of largely Qatari university students who then vote at the end of the one hour debate. The Doha Debates are broadcast by BBC World television service and is one of the most popular programs on BBC world and so many Arab journalists have participated in these debates, watched these debates and reported upon them. The Washington Times Doha Debates when the 5th anniversary debate was held at Georgetown University.*

Q: What is in your expectation concerning the disposition towards the Dialogue between the religions for the next 6 months: is it going to grow or remain where it is or decrease – and why?
I am convinced it will continue, and will grow. The very establishment of C-1 World Dialogue incorporates religious dialogue in its very formation – our co-chairmen are world recognized clerical figures – the Grand Mufti of Egypt and the Bishop of London, our two deputy co-chairs are also very prominent religious figures, so I am convinced that C-1 will further advance religious dialogue.
Official launch of ADR 2009 at Yale Conference Cairo, June 2009
Appendix I: Charter of the C-1 World Dialogue
CHARTER
OF THE C-1 World Dialogue*

The C-1 World Dialogue is a high-level International Body for the advance of peaceful and harmonious West-Islamic Relations. It aims to be the foremost global platform promoting understanding and improved relations between the Western and Islamic Worlds.

Article 1: The Mission and Vision
The aim of the C-1 World Dialogue is to support and promote, propagate and preserve, peace, harmony and friendship between the Western and Islamic Worlds and between Christians and Muslims in particular, on the widest possible scale. It seeks to do this in accord with the two greatest Commandments given us, namely to love God and our neighbour—as called for by the historic A Common Word Open Letter of October 13th 2007.

Thus, the members of the C-1 World Dialogue come together also to promote the core common moral values of respect for human life, dignity and mind; basic human rights; commitment to peace; protection of community and family; social justice and truth; brotherhood and practical compassion for the poor and those in need.

The Mission of the C-1 World Dialogue as thus stated in this article may not be changed except with the written unanimous consent of all the members of the C-1 World Dialogue.

Article 2: The Way and Means
The C-1 World Dialogue (hereafter referred to as the “C-1”) brings together representatives from key stakeholder communities including decision makers, religious, business and intellectual leaders as well as representatives from the media. These leaders, supported by the commitment of leading international organizations as well as governments, NGO’s and the business sector, aim to provide the knowledge base and strategic insights required to enable practical change.
In order to secure the intellectual integrity, continuity and security of its work, the C-1 will seek to establish an endowed Foundation supporting an Institute for the Advance of West-Islamic Relations which it is intended shall be of global standing. This will provide a base for its work and secure the effective implementation of its mission on a long term basis.

**Article 3: The Role of the C-1**

It is intended that the C-1 will catalyse work engaging cultures and societies at all levels and to this end it will seek:

- to be a significant knowledge base and source of strategic insight on dialogue and West-Islamic issues through an Annual Report and other publications;
- to improve the mutual understanding in and between cultures and religions;
- to bring together those engaged in dialogue who wish to share insights and ideas that can enhance practical initiatives;
- to promote partnerships and collaboration between the various sectors of society and across cultures (including governments, private sector, media, civil society, religious communities and academia);
- to catalyze new projects and to mobilize additional support for existing work with proven record of success

A key element in this work will be the research and publications (such as the said Annual Report outlined further in section 5 below) that will support deeper understanding and improved West-Islamic relations through

4. provision of data and research which addresses key knowledge deficits and which provides the basis for

5. strategic insight and thought leadership enabling

6. solutions to the critical challenges identified.
Article 4: Composition and Governance

4.1 The Co-Chairs

The C-1 is a multi-stakeholder community, bringing together leaders from political, religious, business, media and academic spheres drawn from across the world.

The C-1 has two founding Co-Chairs:

- The Rt. Hon. and Rt Revd. Richard Chartres, Bishop of London
- His Excellency, Sheikh Ali Gouma, the Grand Mufti of Egypt

Subsequent Co-Chairs shall be voted into office by the Executive Committee, every five years, though the Executive Committee may chose to renew either or both of the Co-Chairs’ term.

The role of the Co-Chairs (who shall normally be two in number) shall be to:

   a) guide the Executive Committee and generally to facilitate the work of the C-1;

   b) represent the C-1;

   c) be the highest executive authority of the C-1.

   d) appoint the Director-General on a three-year basis (though the Director-General may be renewed)

Either Co-Chair may select another member of the Executive Committee to deputize for him in all his/her functions.
Vice Chairs

The C-1 has two founding Vice Chairs.

- His Beatitude Theophilus III., The Patriarch of Jerusalem, representing in a special way Christians living in the Middle East.

- His Excellency Dr. Mustafa Cerić, The Grand Mufti of Bosnia, representing in a special way Muslims in Non-Muslim majority countries in the West.

In case of a dispute between the Co-Chairs the Executive Committee will vote on the contested matter which will be determined by a majority vote.

4.2 Patrons

The C-1 shall be free to seek patrons:

a) to give support to the work of the C-1 through the prestige given by their names (i.e. senior public figures) who can symbolize the significance and importance of the Council’s work;

b) to provide financial support through governmental funding (as in the instance of a Head of State).

4.3 The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall be comprised of an odd number of persons normally between 5 and 21 in total number (including the two co-chairs and the Director-General) and shall comprise, insofar as possible, a balanced representation between the Western and Muslim worlds, while also including such others voices as may be considered helpful (such as one or more Jewish or secular representatives).

Members of the Executive shall normally serve for a term of five years.
The role of the Executive Committee shall be (in coordination with the Director-General, who shall be a member ex-officio) to:

1. set the agenda of the C-1’s meetings and activities;
2. set the annual program of goals and work to be achieved by the Institute/Foundation;
3. ensure distribution of all documents to be discussed in good time (at least fourteen days) before any meeting at which decisions are to be made;
4. identify potential funding sources that might help to sustain the work of the C-1;
5. oversee any activities undertaken by the C-1;
6. resolve any questions arising including those in regard to the makeup and membership of the C-1 (i.e. ensure representation of members only with no delegates or other substitutes);
7. form further Sub-Committees in relation to particular issues, or projects where such committees shall be free to draw upon the expertise of non-members as circumstances require and as the Cochairs approve);
8. elect the new Co-Chairs normally after a tenure of five years by simple majority normally from among themselves or the wider C-1 membership.
9. approve the minutes of previous meetings, which shall be prepared by the Director-General.
10. resolve questions or issues regarding interpretations of this charter or any other unforeseen problems that may arise in relation to it and its implementation or because of lack of clarity in it.
11. determine the annual budget and use of funds of the Institute/Foundation and all the paid staff associated with it.

A quorum for a meeting of the Executive Committee shall be a simple majority of the members. Decisions shall be taken by a majority of those in attendance.
Members of the Executive Committee shall automatically lose their memberships in this committee for failing to attending three meetings in a row, or five meetings in total.

The Co-Chairs may appoint a small management committee comprising no more than five persons from the Executive in addition to themselves to act between meetings of the Executive Committee.

4.4 The Director-General and Secretariat

The secretariat will be headed by the Director-General. It will be established and funded by the Council (Foundation or Institute) in support of its work (as detailed in a separate description of the secretariat as agreed by the Executive Committee and administered by the Personnel Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee or the whole Executive Committee as shall from time to time be agreed).

The role of Director-General shall be to serve as, the chief administrator of the Institute-Foundation, and in addition he or she shall serve as the Secretary and Archivist of the Executive Council assisted by such staff as may be duly appointed according to the procedures the Executive Council shall agree. He or she shall be responsible to the 2 Co-Chairs.

Advisors (to be designated, “High Level”, “Special” or as deemed appropriate) may be appointed to assist the work of the Secretariat by the Director General with the approval of the Executive Committee.

4.5 The General Conference of the C-1

The annual meeting of the C-1, attended by the Co-Chairs and the Executive Committee along with the wider membership shall collectively comprise the General Conference of the C-1. The General Conference shall have a President to serve as the chairman or chairwoman of its proceedings and that person shall be appointed by the Co-Chairs normally from among the members of the Executive Committee.


4.6 The Role of the Members

The role of the members (who shall normally be between 60 and 100 in number) shall be to:

a) Elect the members of the Executive Committee, who shall normally be eligible to stand for election after five years.

b) To serve on any work groups or sub-committees on different relevant spheres, such as religion, business, media, politics, women and youth as well as for specific purposes such as publications (Which sub-committees shall operate under the Executive Committee).

c) Attend the C-1 meetings and propose in writing to the Executive Committee courses of action for the Institute/Foundation (such proposals shall require the written support of at least 3 members in order to be considered).

d) To amend the Charter as per the other articles of this charter.

The quorum of the members shall be a simple majority.

Members not in attendance at three annual meetings in a row shall automatically forfeit their memberships.

Membership shall normally be for 2 terms of five years which may be renewed as determined by a simple majority vote of the Executive Committee.

Article 5: The Institute/Foundation

In order to provide institutional stability and continuity a Foundation will be established for the support of the work of the C-1 (probably through an Institute) and to this end, major funding will be solicited for an endowment in furtherance of this work. The Foundation and/or Institute and such legal entities, or corporations as may be needed in support, shall be based in one or more countries as agreed by the Executive Committee, which shall also be empowered to employ staff for the Secretariat in such locations and upon such terms as it deems expedient, in close consultation with
the Director-General who will be in charge of preparing the needed proposals and documentation for this.

**Article 6: The Annual Report**

In accord with the intent that the C-1 will be the foremost global resource for information and data on dialogue and Muslim Western relations, the publication of an Annual Dialogue Report shall be a primary objective of the C-1.

The Annual Report will seek to provide objective data on attitudes and perceptions among relevant peoples and groups along with other survey data covering such critical matters as how the Media have represented the key issues. Objective data that is relevant will also be collected and displayed in the report. A central aim will be to facilitate and highlight insights not otherwise available and to do so in ways that can enable practical constructive change. Annual Reports may focus on particular themes and contain input from both C-1 members and others with relevant and compelling insights on the matters at hand.

Other work and publications may be undertaken as the Executive Committee may from time to time approve.

**Article 7: Annual Schedule and Initial Timelines**

The Executive Committee shall establish a calendar of meetings and activities for each calendar year and make this known to the members.

Because of the unique value in bringing together this group of global leaders, the C-1, as a whole shall normally meet once each year for an Annual Meeting also known as the General Conference of the C-1 (as per section 3.5 above). Such meetings may be held in association with other appropriate major gatherings or events. They may be held anywhere in the world.

The Executive Committee of C-1 shall normally meet twice each year (including once on the margins of the General Conference) and will identify a particular theme for deliberations at each the C-
1’s full Annual meetings. Other meetings may be arranged from time to time as the Executive Committee shall determine.

**Article 8: Nominations and Membership**

Each member of the C-1 may propose suitable candidates for membership along with a CV and a statement of recommendation explaining their suitability to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will decide who shall be invited to join, in coordination with the Secretariat, which will first undertake appropriate due diligence by way of background research, before any decision is taken.

Persons proposed for membership of the C-1 should:

- have standing nationally and internationally with a record of interest and practical success in the dialogue arena;
- be articulate and in a position to influence and educate;
- have a capacity to listen and think openly and critically;

The deliberations of the C-1 shall be confidential unless otherwise agreed and all members must respect this as a condition of membership.

C-1 membership is linked to professional status, however, members shall be understood to speak for themselves only and not for their organizations or countries.

The Council may, in exceptional cases only, speak out on behalf of list members but only where there is a unanimous consensus to do so.

Published statements shall always be understood as being made on behalf of the authors and not the C-1 as a whole.

Changes in the Charter (with exception of Article 1) will be effected by a two-thirds majority of the members during the annual meetings.

* Subject to final revision and ratification.
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Sheikh Ali Gomaa’a (Arabic: عَلَيْ جُمَّاح) is the Grand Mufti of Egypt through Dar al-Ifta al-Misriyyah succeeding Ahmad El-Tayeb. He has been called „one of the most widely respected jurists in the Sunni Muslim world,“ and described as „a highly promoted champion of moderate Islam,“ gender equality, and an „object of hatred among Islamists.”

Ali Gomaa was born in the Upper Egyptian province of Bani Suwayf (also spelled Beni Suef) on March 3rd 1953 CE (7 Jumadah al-Akhirah 1371 AH). He is married and has three adult children.

After completing a B.A. in Commerce at Ain Shams in 1973, Gomaa enrolled in Cairo’s prestigious al-Azhar University, the oldest active Islamic institution of higher learning in the world. He received a second B.A. from al-Azhar, then an M.A., and finally a Ph.D with highest honors in Juristic Methodology (usul al-fiqh) in 1988.

Gomaa taught in the faculty of Islamic and Arabic Studies at al-Azhar University from the time he received his M.A. until he was appointed Grand Mufti, first as an assistant professor, and finally as a full professor.
Ali Gomaa was appointed Grand Mufti in late September 2003 by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, replacing former Mufti Sheikh Mohamed Ahmed El-Tayeb. El-Tayeb was appointed Al-Azhar University president, taking over from Ahmed Omar Hashem.

His office, the Dar al Ifta (literally, the house of fatwas), a government agency charged with issuing religious legal opinions on any question to Muslims who ask for them, issues some 5,000 fatwas a week, including both the official ones that he himself crafts on important issues and the more routine ones handled via phone and Internet by a dozen or so subordinate muftis.

He was educated at Hertford Grammar School and studied history at Trinity College Cambridge. Before ordination he taught Ancient History at the International School in Seville.

He was ordained in 1973 and served as a curate in St Andrew’s Bedford. In 1975 he was appointed Chaplain to Robert Runcie, then Bishop of St Albans, and from 1980-84 he served as the Archbishop’s Chaplain at Lambeth and Canterbury.

He moved to St Stephen’s Rochester Row in the Diocese of London in 1984. During eight years in the parish he also served as Director of Ordinands for the Central Area and as Gresham Professor of Divinity.

He was consecrated Bishop of Stepney in 1992.

After his move to the see of London, he was appointed Dean of HM Chapels Royal in 1996 and a Privy Counsellor. This accounts for the curious fact that the Bishop of London is the only bishop who bears the title ‘Right Honourable’ in addition to the usual ‘Right Reverend’. He is an ex officio member of the House of Lords.
H.R.H. Prince Ghazi bin Muhammad bin Talal  
Founder C-1 World Dialogue Foundation

Date of Birth: 15th October 1966.

Education:

  Ph.D. (Cantab.) in Modern and Medieval Languages and Literatures (July 1993)

  B.A., Comparative Literature (June 1988). (Graduated with Highest Honours, *Summa cum laude*.)

- Harrow School: (1979-1984)  
  ‘O’ and ‘A’ Levels.

Official Work:

- **Personal Envoy of H.M. King Abdullah II and Special Advisor to H.M. King Abdullah II of Jordan.**  
  (October 6th 2003 to present.)

- **Advisor for Tribal Affairs and Cultural Secretary to H.M. King Abdullah II of Jordan.**  
  (From February 7th 1999, until October 6th 2003.)

- **Advisor to His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan for Tribal Affairs.**
(July 2\textsuperscript{nd} 1998 to February 7\textsuperscript{th} 1999.)
(in addition to the post of \textit{Cultural Secretary}).

- \textit{Cultural Secretary} to His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan.
  (October 4\textsuperscript{th} 1994 to February 7\textsuperscript{th} 1999.)

- \textit{Officer} in the Royal Jordanian Desert Police Force (June 1989-
  December 1992):
  Promoted to \textit{First Lieutenant} (November 14, 1992).
  Commissioned as a \textit{Second Lieutenant} (November 1989).

\textbf{Regent of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan:}

- Has served Jordan as \textit{Regent} in the absence of H.M. King Ab-
  dullah II from the country.

\textbf{Publications:}

- \textit{True Islam and the Islamic Consensus on the Message of Am-
  man / Kitab Ijma’ Al-Muslimin ‘ala Ihtiram Mathahib al-Din} (compiler, editor and author of introduction [in Arabic and English]; \textit{The Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, Am-
  man, Jordan, 2006}). (Limited 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} and rev. 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition published as: \textit{The Book of the Schools of Islamic Jurisprudence / Kitab Ihtiram Al-Mathahib}; \textit{The Aal al-Bayt Institute for Is-
  lamic Thought, Amman, Jordan, 2006}).

- \textit{Al-Insan} (Man), (et al.; published, in Arabic, by the Jordanian
  Ministry of Education as the text-book for the 12\textsuperscript{th} Grade Na-
  tional Curriculum for General Studies, Amman, 2001; revised
  2\textsuperscript{nd} edition in 2007 ).

- \textit{The Sacred Origin of Sports and Culture} (published by
  \textit{Fons Vitae}, KY, USA, 1998). (Trans. into Turkish and
  published by \textit{Insan Yayinlari}, Istanbul, 2002.)

- \textit{The Holy Sites of Jordan} (ed.; published by \textit{Turab}, Am-
  man, 1996; 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition 1999).

- \textit{The Tribes of Jordan at the Beginning of the Twenty-first Cen-
  tury} (published by \textit{Turab}, Amman, 1999).
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The Rt. Hon. Tony Blair, Former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom

President of the General Conference of the C-1

Tony Blair became the youngest British prime minister of the 20th century when he took office in 1997. Blair was born in Scotland but spent much of his childhood in Durham, England. He studied law at Oxford and then practiced law until 1983, when he was elected as member of Parliament from Sedgefield. Blair was a member of the Labour Party, which at the time was dominated politically by the Conservative Party of Margaret Thatcher. Blair was soon a rising star of what became known as the „new Labour“ movement, with positions more centrist on fiscal affairs and social issues like crime. He became leader of the Labour Party in 1994, and three years later was named prime minister, replacing John Major, when Labour won a Parliamentary majority. Blair was 44, making him the youngest British prime minister since Lord Liverpool in 1812. (Blair was often compared with the sitting U.S. president, Bill Clinton, who was 46 when he took office in 1993.) Blair was re-elected in Parliamentary elections in 2001 and 2005. He stepped down as the prime minister on 27 June 2007 and was succeeded by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gordon Brown.
His Beatitude Theofilos III Patriarch of the Holy City of Jerusalem and all Palestine (known in the world as Elias Giannopoulos, his parents, Panagiotas-Triseugenia) was born in Gargalianes in County Trifylia of Messinia, in 1952.

He arrived in Jerusalem in July 1964 and enrolled in the School of the Patriarchate, graduating in 1970. On 28th June 1970 he was tonsured a monk, receiving the name Theofilos, by Benedictos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in the great Hall of the Patriarchate.

On 9/22-08-2005 he was unanimously elected by the Holy and Sacred Synod, Patriarch of the ancient Patriarchate of Jerusalem. His enthronement took place on 9th /22nd November 2005 at the Holy Church of the Resurrection, in the presence of representatives from all the Orthodox Churches, as well as from the Jordanian Government and the Palestinian Authority, and by His Excellency Papoulia, the President of Republic of Greece, and the Representative of the Emir of Qatar.

After His enthronement His Beatitude Theofilos III, beyond his active work in all the areas for the restoration of the smooth operation of the Patriarchate and the improvement in the spiritual life of its Flock, as well as for the proprietary stability of the Holy Shrines also took care to enhance the participation of the Church of Jerusalem in the inter-orthodox and inter-faith proceedings in order to
guard both the ecclesiastical order and the Holy Canons of the Church, and strengthening the international rights and the role of the Church of Jerusalem. So, he took part in the divided Synod, concerning the succession in the throne of the Cypriot Church, at Sambezi, in Geneva, in 2006. In the same month he went to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople on a Peace Mission. He reconfirmed the participation of the Jerusalem Patriarchate even by His presence at the „World Council of Churches” and the „Council of Churches in the Middle East”.


Among His many other concerns, he took care to elaborate on accepted historical studies and translations on the history of the Church of Jerusalem. He took part as a Lecturer in scientific seminars and conferences in Jerusalem and in Greece.

In September 2008, at the invitation by the European Parliament, His Beatitude Theofilos III went to Brussels where he presented the framework and the problems of the Church of the Holy Land, known by the Officials of the European Community and the European Council.

In October he took part in the Synod of the Primus of all the Orthodox Churches at the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.
H.E. the Grand Mufti of Bosnia, Mustafa Cerić

Vice Chair of the C-1

Dr. Mustafa Efendi Cerić (born 1952 in Visoko, Bosnia and Herzegovina, then Yugoslavia) is the Grand Mufti (reis-ul-ulema) of Bosnia-Herzegovina. He is serving his second 7-year term until 2013. He is fluent in Bosnian, English and Arabic, and cites a „passive knowledge“ of Turkish, German and French. Cerić is married and has two daughters and a son.

He was the co-recipient of the 2003 UNESCO Felix Houphouet-Boigny Peace Prize and recipient of the International Council of Christians and Jews Annual Sternberg Award „for exceptional contribution to interfaith understanding“. One of the latest international recognitions he received was „2007 Theodor-Heuss-Stiftung award for his contribution to spreading and strengthening democracy“. In 2007 he was named the recipient of Lifetime Achievement Award by the Association of Muslim Social Scientists UK „in recognition of his distinguished contributions to better understanding between Faiths, outstanding scholarship, for promoting a climate of respect and peaceful co-existence, and a wider recognition of the place of faith in Europe and the West“. He is also a 2008 recipient of Eugen Biser Foundation award for his efforts in promoting understanding and peace between Islamic and Christian thought. In 2008 Cerić accepted the invitation of Tony Blair to be on the advisory council of the Tony Blair Faith Foundation.
Cerić graduated from the Madresa in Sarajevo and received a scholarship to Al-Azhar University in Cairo, Egypt. After several positions home and abroad, he officially became the Grand Mufti of Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1999.
Muna Abu Suleyman, Secretary General and Executive Director of the Alwaleed Bin Talal Foundation, founding co-host of MBC TV’s social programme: Kalam Nawaem

Muna Abu Sulayman is a leading Saudi media personality in the Middle East. As a founding co-host of one of MBC TV’s most popular social programs, Kalam Nawaem, she has become an easily recognizable celebrity in the Middle East and abroad. As a public and media personality, major organizations and companies often ask her to speak on issues relating to Arab society, media, and building bridges of understanding between the East and West. In 2005, she became the first woman in Saudi Arabia to be appointed by the United Nations Development Program as a Goodwill Ambassador.

Ms. Abu Sulayman highly sought after public speaker. She addresses high level international conferences, business meetings and corporations. She frequently appears as a panelist at the Davos World Economic Forum, Jeddah Economic Forum, C-100 of the World Economic Forum, Brookings Institute Conferences and many other venues.

Ms. Abu Sulayman also serves as Secretary General and Executive Director of the Alwaleed Bin Talal Foundation. In this capacity, she is developing and implementing the Foundation’s mission, vision, and operations for strategic philanthropy and humanitarian assistance. She is responsible for the global philanthropic activities, projects, and donations that reach the globe. Since 1997, Ms. Abu Sulayman has served as lecturer on American literature at King Saud University in Saudi Arabia.
Timothy C. Collins is the senior managing director and chief executive officer of Ripplewood Holdings L.L.C. Mr. Collins founded Ripplewood in 1995. Previously, Mr. Collins managed Onex Corporation’s New York office. Ripplewood has done several of the largest private equity investments ever, including the acquisition of Shinsei, the former Long-Term Credit Bank. Shinsei was to date the most profitable private equity investment ever. Mr. Collins serves as a director and co-CEO of RHJ International, a publicly listed diversified holding company headquartered in Brussels.

Mr. Collins began his career as a member of the U.A.W. at Cummins Engine Company in 1974. Ripplewood has invested in Reader’s Digest, Japan Telecom, Aircell, Denon, the Commercial International Bank of Egypt, and a broad array of companies around the world. Ripplewood has made investments in nearly a dozen industry groups, each with a rigidly defined strategy and led by an experienced industry executive (“Industrial Partner”). Ripplewood is unique in its depth of international experience.

Mr. Collins is a director of several public companies, a number of Ripplewood’s private portfolio companies, and Weather Investments. He is involved in several not-for-profit and public sector activities, including the Trilateral Commission, Yale Divinity School Advisory Board, Yale School of Management Board of Advisors, American Friends of the British Museum, and the Board of Over-
seers of the Weill Cornell Medical College, and is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Mr. Collins is also a trustee of the Carnegie Hall Society.

Mr. Collins has a B.A. degree in philosophy from DePauw University and a master’s degree in public and private management from the Yale School of Management. Mr. Collins received an honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters from his alma mater in 2004.
Kai Diekmann, Editor of Bild and on Executive Board of Hürriyet (Turkey)

Kai Diekmann (born June 27, 1964 in Ravensburg) is a German journalist. From 1998 until 2000 he was editor of Welt am Sonntag. Since January 2001 he is editor of Bild. He is also a member of the executive board of the Turkish daily Hürriyet.

Diekmann grew up in Bielefeld. After school military service, he studied at the University of Münster. He interrupted his studies in 1985 when he began his traineeship at the Axel Springer AG through the Axel Springer Journalist School, from which he quickly began a career for the publisher, beginning as a correspondent in Bonn. From 1989-1991 he was the chief reporter for the Hubert Burda Media-published illustrated Bunte, a lifestyle weekly. After a short detour at the Ullstein-Verlag-published tabloid B.Z., in 1992 he transferred to Bild, the best-selling daily in Germany. In 1992, he became editor of Welt am Sonntag, and in 2001 returned to Bild where he became editor. Since 2004, in addition to being editor, he is also the publisher of Bild as well as Bild am Sonntag.
Prof. Robert Eisen, Professor of Religion and Judaic Studies at the George Washington University B.A., Yale University; Ph.D., Brandeis University

Prof. Eisen’s areas of interest include medieval and modern Jewish philosophy, biblical interpretation, Jewish ethics, and comparative religion. He is author of two books, Gersonides on Providence, Covenant, and the Chosen People (SUNY Press, 1995) and The Book of Job in Medieval Jewish Philosophy (Oxford University Press, 2004). He is currently editing a book for the University of Maryland Press on philosophers and the Bible. He is also working on a study on Jewish perspectives on violence and peace. Professor Eisen is active outside the university as well, devoting much energy to adult Jewish education as a lecturer and teacher. He is also a consultant on issues of religion and international conflict with a particular interest in fostering better global relations between Jews, Christians, and Muslims. He has participated in a number of high-level dialogues and consultations in Washington and abroad concerning those relationships.
Mary Eisenhower was born in Washington, D.C. during President Eisenhower’s first term and was christened in the Blue Room of the White House. She grew up in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, on the Eisenhower Farm, where President Eisenhower retired after his time in office. Ms. Eisenhower attended Westtown School in Pennsylvania until her father, John Eisenhower, was appointed Ambassador to Belgium. She lived in Belgium from 1969 to 1972. Eisenhower began her career working on Capital Hill and then managed an engineering firm. She also has served as a Fellow at Stanford University.

During her work with People to People International, Ms. Eisenhower visited Morocco to represent her family to the King on the 50th anniversary of the Casablanca Conference. She also traveled to the beaches of Normandy to meet many of the veterans who served with her grandfather on the D-Day invasion. In the last six years, Ms. Eisenhower has left US soil over 70 times and visited over 40 countries. Missions have ranged from meeting first families to distributing foodstuffs in developing countries to cultural and humanitarian exchanges. Inspired by an orphanage she visited in Morocco, Ms. Eisenhower launched the People to People International Friendship Fund in 1999. After the September 11th terrorist attacks, Ms. Eisenhower became intently focused upon bringing young people from around the globe into contact with one another in order to expose them to diverse cultures and conflict management tools that might facilitate the amelioration of long-standing disputes.
David F. Ford, Professor of Divinity, University of Cambridge, Director of the Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme

David F. Ford is the Regius Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge and Director of the Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme (focusing on Judaism, Christianity and Islam). He first read Classics at Trinity College Dublin, and then studied Theology in Cambridge, Yale, and Tübingen. From 1976-1991 he taught in the University of Birmingham. Prof Ford co-founded the Scriptural Reasoning movement and is a Trustee of the Center of Theological Inquiry in Princeton. He is an Academic Member of the Community of 100 Leaders for West-Islamic World Dialogue in the World Economic Forum. His academic work relates to a wide range of commitments in journals, academic projects, lecture series, the Society for the Study of Theology, the American Academy of Religion, universities in Europe, North America, the Middle East and Asia, inter-faith engagement in Britain and around the world, the Christian churches, the Clinton Global Initiative and the L’Arche Communities. Prof Ford has an Honorary DD from the University of Birmingham and holds the Sternberg Foundation Gold Medalion for Inter-Faith Relations. He is a Fellow of Selwyn College, is on the Foundation of Trinity College, Cambridge, chairs the Centre for Advanced Religious and Theological Studies (Cambridge University) and is a trustee of the Golden Web Foundation. He is married to Revd Deborah Ford and they have three children.

Prof. Ford’s books include: Christian Wisdom: Desiring God and Learning in Love (2007), Shaping Theology: Engagements in a Re-
Anthony Grayling MA, DPhil (Oxon) FRSL, FRSA is Professor of Philosophy at Birkbeck College, University of London, and a Supernumerary Fellow of St Anne’s College, Oxford. He has written and edited many books on philosophy and other subjects; among his most recent are a biography of William Hazlitt and a collection of essays. For several years he wrote the „Last Word“ column for the Guardian newspaper and is a regular reviewer for the Literary Review and the Financial Times. He also often writes for the Observer, Economist, Times Literary Supplement, Independent on Sunday and New Statesman, and is a frequent broadcaster on BBC Radios 4, 3 and the World Service. He is the Editor of Online Review London, Contributing Editor of Prospect magazine. In addition he sits on the editorial boards of several academic journals, and for nearly ten years was the Honorary Secretary of the principal British Philosophical Association, the Aristotelian Society. He is a past chairman of June Fourth, a human rights group concerned with China, and has been involved in UN human rights initiative. Anthony Grayling is a Fellow of the World Economic Forum, and a member of its C-100 group on relations between the West and the Islamic world. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature and also a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, and in 2003 was a Booker Prize judge.
Nakhle El Hage, Director News & Current Affairs, Al-Arabiya, Dubai

Experience:

- Currently Director of News & Current Affairs of Al Arabiya News Channel.
- Head of current affairs in Al Arabiya & MBC Channels, established the Current Affairs department in AA, and launched 15 programs for AA.
- Editor in Chief in MBC Channel, supervised the move of MBC from its London Head quarters to Dubai.
- Editor of the day in MBC Channel in London.
- Joined MBC as chief sub editor.
- Worked as a war correspondent for Tele Liban.
- Worked as a news writer reporter/ Announcer in Radio Voice of Lebanon.

Education:

- Holds a Bachelor of Arts degree on Media from the American University in Lebanon.
Professor Ibrahim Kalin, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Founding-Director of the SETA Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research based in Ankara, Turkey

Dr. Kalin is the founding-director of the SETA Foundation for Political, Economic and Social Research based in Ankara, Turkey. He has hosted a discussion program on the Turkish national TV TRT 1.

Dr. Kalin is among the signatories of the Common Word (www.acommonword.com), a major initiative to improve Muslim-Christian relations (the Prince Alwaleed ibn Talal Center at Georgetown University will hold a major conference on the Common Word in March 2009).

Ibrahim Kalin received his Ph. D. from the George Washington University, Washington DC. As a broadly trained scholar of Islamic studies, he teaches a number of courses on Islamic history and culture. His field of concentration is post-Avicennan Islamic philosophy with research interests in Ottoman intellectual history, interfaith relations, and comparative philosophy.

Dr. Kalin has published widely on Islamic philosophy and the relations between Islam and the West.
Sayyed Jawad Al-Khoei is the grandson of the late Grand Ayatollah Sayyed Abul Qasem Al-Khoei, the supreme religious leader of Shia Muslims between 1970 and 1992.

Born in Najaf where he spent his early years, he migrated to Iran after the assassination of his father Sayyed Mohammed Taqi in 1994, and began his theological studies in Qum which are still ongoing at the higher levels.

After receiving his BA in Islamic Theology from the International Colleges of Islamic Sciences, UK, he is currently pursuing a Master’s Degree in Islamic Theology at World Islamic Sciences & Education University, Usul Al-Deen University College, Jordan, where his research is about the commonalities between the religions in the Quran.

Sayyed Jawad is the Assistant Secretary-General of Al-Khoei Foundation and Director of its Iraq branch. He is also involved with many interfaith educational and dialogue organisations.

As a researcher in Islamic Affairs, Sayyed Jawad has authored various studies and articles on the religious minorities in Iraq and the need for interfaith dialogue.
Archbishop Diarmuid Martin was born in Dublin on 8th April 1945. He attended schools in Dublin (Oblate School, Inchicore; De La Salle School, Ballyfermot; Marian College, Ballsbridge). He studied philosophy at University College Dublin and theology at the Dublin Diocesan Seminary (Holy Cross College, Clonliffe).

He was ordained priest on 25th May 1969. He later pursued higher studies in moral theology at the Pontifical University of St Thomas Aquinas (Angelicum) in Rome. In 1973-74 he was Curate at the Parish of St Brigid in Cabinteely. In 1975 he was responsible for the pastoral care of Dublin pilgrims during the Holy Year in Rome.

He entered the service of the Holy See in 1976 in the Pontifical Council for the Family. In 1986 he was appointed Under-Secretary of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, and in 1994 Secretary of the same Pontifical Council. On 5th December 1998 he was appointed Titular Bishop of Glendalough and received the Episcopal ordination at the hands of Pope John Paul II in St Peter’s Basilica on 6th January 1999.

During his service at the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, Archbishop Martin represented the Holy See at the major United Nations Conferences on social questions in the 1990’s. He also participated in activities of the World Bank and the International
Monetary Fund, especially on the theme of international debt and poverty reduction.

Roland Schatz is the founder and CEO of InnoVatio in 1985 and Media Tenor International in 1993, and one of the leading experts in the field of media impact research. His interests include media monitoring, organizational development, East-West and German-American relations, culture management, new ways in education and business ethics.

In his role as the CEO of Media Tenor, the Research Institute of InnoVatio Verlags AG, Mr. Schatz has focused on improving global media. With over 180 employees and offices worldwide in Beirut, London, New York, Pretoria, St. Petersburg, Tianjin, Windhoek, and Zurich, Media Tenor is the world’s leading provider of ongoing international media content analysis, including in-depth analysis of new and traditional global media content.

In 2007, Mr. Schatz had the honor of opening the first Arab Media Institute at Emory University. He has been teaching strategic communication management at universities in Augsburg, Atlanta, Berlin, Bonn, Lugano, and Prague.

In 2008 Roland Schatz was appointed Global Media Expert to the UN Alliance of Civilizations by High Representative Jorge Sampaio, former President of the Portuguese Republic.
S. Abdallah Schleifer, former Washington D.C. bureau chief for Al Arabiya News Channel

S. Abdallah Schleifer, former Washington D.C. bureau chief for Al Arabiya News Channel, and former Cairo bureau chief for NBC News is a veteran journalist who has covered the Middle East for American and Arab media for more than 40 years. Schleifer now serves as Distinguished Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication at the American University in Cairo, where he had previously served for two decades as founder and first director of the Kamal Adham Center for Television Training and Research. Upon retirement from full-time teaching in Fall 2005, Schleifer was awarded the title of Professor Emeritus.

Schleifer is founder and first editor of the electronic journal Transnational Broadcasting Studies, now known as Arab Media and Society where he remains as a member of the international editorial board. Schleifer is the executive producer of the award winning documentary, “Control Room,” an Adjunct Scholar at The Middle East Institute in Washington; and a Senior Fellow at both the Royal Aal al Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought in Amman, Jordan and the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia. A former Visiting Fellow at St. Antony’s College, Oxford (2006), he is a Global Media Expert for the UN Alliance of Civilizations and a member of the board of directors of the Center for the Study of Islam and Democracy.

Schleifer is one of the 34 members of the Leadership Group of the U.S.-Muslim Engagement Project whose Fall 2008 policy recom-
mendations– “Changing Course: A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World” was widely endorsed in public policy circles critical of the direction of U.S. foreign policy over the past decade. Schleifer is also one of the original signees of both the Amman Message condemning extremist theological error and “A Common Word” and served in the delegation of “Common Word” Muslim scholars and intellectuals that met with His Holiness the Pope and participated in the first Catholic-Muslim Forum in Rome this past November.

Born in New York, Schleifer graduated in 1956 from the University of Pennsylvania with a BA in Political Science. In 1964, after a year living in Morocco, Schleifer embraced Islam. Schleifer’s first job as a journalist in the Middle East was in Arab Jerusalem in the fall of 1965 where he served as managing editor of Jordan’s English-language daily newspaper The Jerusalem Star/ Palestine News. A frequent contributor of articles on mass media as well as Islamic affairs to scholarly and specialist journals, Schleifer’s controversial book The Fall of Jerusalem – an eyewitness account of the 1967 Arab-Israeli War – became an underground classic in academic and intellectual circles in the nineteen seventies.

Schleifer served as NBC News producer/reporter in the Middle East from 1968 to 1983. Initially based in Beirut, Schleifer was the NBC News Cairo bureau chief from 1974 to 1983. At the same time Schleifer managed to maintain an active relationship with the broadcasting industry in general and TV journalism in particular. Retained by NBC as a consultant after stepping down as bureau chief, Schleifer secured and served as a special NBC field producer of the first-ever American coverage of the Hajj in the summer of 1984. In the summer of 1990, Schleifer again served as a special field producer for NBC News in Saudi Arabia, this time covering Desert Shield, the build-up of US and Allied forces in response to the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait. In January 1991, on the eve of fighting, Schleifer returned to Saudi Arabia as executive director of the World Muslim News Service (WMNS), providing TV, print, and photo coverage of the Gulf War to international news organizations.
Miroslav Volf is the Founder and Director of Yale Center for Faith and Culture and Henry B. Wright Professor of Theology, Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, CT. Miroslav Volf was educated in his native Croatia, United States, and Germany. He earned doctoral and post-doctoral degrees (with highest honors) from the University of Tuebingen, Germany. He has written or edited 15 books and over 70 scholarly articles. His most significant books include *Exclusion and Embrace* (1996; winner of Grawemeyer Award in Religion, and one of *Christianity Today’s* 100 most important religious books of the 20th century) in which he reflects on conflicts that are raging around the question of identity; *After Our Likeness* (1998) in which he explores the Trinitarian nature of ecclesial community; *Free of Charge* (2005) in which he examines two modes of grace, giving and forgiving, in the context of a culture increasingly stripped of grace; and *The End of Memory* (2006) on remembering rightly in a violent world. He is actively involved in many top level initiatives concerning Christian-Muslim relations and is a member of the Global Agenda Council of the World Economic Forum.
Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff,

Co-Founder and Director General of the C-1 World Dialogue

Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff, Director General of the C-1 has served as Senior Advisor to the World Economic Forum and its Council of 100 Leaders’ West-Islamic Dialogue. He was also formerly Dean of All Saints’ Cathedral in Cairo where he remains international advisor to Bishop Mouneer Anis Primate of the Anglican Province of Jerusalem and the Middle East. He has also been a Fellow of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington DC. a founding partner of Christian Edge an internet publishing company and a Director of Avancia Consulting Inc. He was educated at the Universities of London and Oxford where he specialized in Philosophical Theology with Professors Richard Swinburne, Brian Davies O.P and Paul Fiddes as his supervisors and also taught Philosophy of Religion. He took an STM Degree at Yale where he also studied International Relations and served as a Research Fellow. He has undertaken extensive international work for the church and assisted on an adjunct basis the work of the Anglican Consultative Council and served as special advisor to Lord Carey of Clifton, the 103rd Archbishop of Canterbury.
H.E. Theodore, Cardinal McCarrick

Special High Level Advisor to the C-1 World Dialogue

Theodore Edgar Cardinal McCarrick (born July 7, 1930) was the fifth Cardinal Archbishop of Washington, DC, serving from 2001 to 2006.

McCarrick was born in New York City, and attended Catholic school at Fordham Preparatory School; he continued his studies at Fordham University. He earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from St. Joseph’s Seminary in Yonkers, New York, United States, in 1954, and a Master’s degree in history from the same institution in 1958. After being ordained to the priesthood by Cardinal Francis Spellman on May 31, 1958 in New York City, McCarrick went on to earn a second Master’s degree in social sciences and a doctorate in sociology, both at The Catholic University of America in Washington, DC. As Archbishop of Washington he also served as the Chancellor of the university, and he remains a member of the school’s Board of Trustees.

He was an auxiliary bishop of New York, the first Bishop of Metuchen, and Archbishop of Newark before becoming Archbishop of Washington.

He is the Cardinal Priest of the Titulus Ss. Nerei et Achillei. He was one of the cardinal electors who participated in the 2005 papal conclave that selected Pope Benedict XVI.
He also serves as the chairman of a task force examining the church’s relationship with Catholic politicians whose voting records conflict with Church doctrine. It is in this position that he has upset many conservatives as he has failed to ever sanction any US politician.

On March 12, 2007, it was announced that Cardinal McCarrick will become a Counselor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.
Haris Hromic, BBA, MPA, MA, FRSA

Senior Advisor for Global Strategy to the C-1 World Dialogue

Mr. Hromic is a Member of the Council of C-1. His professional career includes engagements in academia, government, NGO and private sector. Presently, Mr. Hromic works for Barclays Capital Institutional Client Group in New York. Prior to Barclays he served as Senior Analyst for the New York City Mayor Bloomberg Office of Management and Budget with oversight responsibilities for $1.6 billion capital program. He was a Business Consultant at the NYC Office of the Comptroller and a Research Associate at the Research Foundation of the City University of New York working on a nation-wide study of executive leadership, resource allocation policy, and pressure group politics. He currently serves with the Development Committee of the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs in New York where he also served on the Board of Trustees. He is a Member of the Local Candidates Committee of the Citizens Union of the City of New York. He is a founding Member of the Board of the Bosniak American Advisory Council in Washington DC where he serves as its Director of Foreign Affair. He is a Member of the Advisory Board of the Media Tenor International and a Fellow of The Royal Society of Arts in London. He holds Masters of Arts in Political Science from New York University specializing in International Political Economy, Masters of Public Affairs specializing in Public Management from Baruch College Graduate School of Public Affairs, and a B.B.A in International Marketing from Zicklin School of Business. He has published works in the field of international relations, social reconstruction and genocide, and gender leadership politics.
Appendix III: Contributors to the Annual Dialogue Report
**Dr. Mustafa Cerić** is the Raisu-l-Ulama of Islamic Community in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Grand Mufti of Bosnia since 1993. He is also the Grand Mufti of Sanjak, Croatia and Slovenia. Born in Visoko, Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1952, he graduated from Madrasah in Sarajevo as well as the Faculty of Arabic Language and Literature at the Al-Azhar University in Cairo. In 1987 received his Ph.D. in Islamic studies from the University of Chicago. He has served as an imam and professor in Croatia, Bosnia, Malaysia and the United States; has authored several books; and is co-recipient of the 2003 UNESCO Felix Houphoet Boigny Peace Prize for Contribution to World Peace, recipient of the International Council of Christians and Jews Annual Sir Sternberg Award for exceptional contribution to interfaith understanding, co-recipient of the award "Religion and integration in Europe" Theodor-Heuss for 2007, recipient of 2007 Lifetime Achievement Award from AMSS UK and Eugen Biser Award 2008. He is a member of several different local and international scientific organizations and societies, including International Commission for Peace Research chaired by Dr. Henry Kissinger.

**Tseten Samdup Chhoekyapa** is His Holiness the Dalai Lama’s Representative for Central and Eastern Europe based in Geneva, Switzerland. He was born in a Tibetan refugee camp in Nepal close to the Mount Everest base camp. His parent escaped from Tibet in 1959 following His Holiness the Dalai Lama into exile. A graduate of Columbia University in Journalism in New York, he has worked for His Holiness the Dalai Lama since 1985 first in India, London and currently in Geneva. From 2001 to 2007, he was a marketing manager at a major UK telecom company. In March 2008, he was appointed His Holiness the Dalai Lama’s Representative based in Geneva.
Björn Edlund, Executive Vice President, Head of Group Communications, Royal Dutch Shell plc. Björn Edlund is responsible for reputation management, internally and externally in Shell. He has initiated an integrated communications program centered on key themes and is realigning the global function for proactive business support through more focused messaging and enhanced stakeholder interactions.

Edlund joined Shell in October 2005 from ABB Ltd, where he headed communications from 1998, adding the leadership of sustainability affairs from early 2005.

Edlund has been working in business communications since 1989, when he joined The Rowland Company, a U.S. public relations agency, as a senior consultant based in Zurich. Swiss chemical-pharmaceuticals group Sandoz AG recruited him in 1992 to head its global communications network. After Sandoz merged with Ciba to form Novartis in 1996, Edlund left to set up his own communications consultancy. Clients included Novartis, Schering pharmaceuticals of Berlin, Philip Morris Eastern Europe and the Middle East, and from early 1998 the ABB Group.

Edlund trained as a teacher and taught secondary school in Basel. He began his international career in news agency journalism in 1977 when he joined United Press International as a staff correspondent in Sweden. He later served as UPI’s news editor in Germany and bureau chief in Spain. He covered politics, general news, wars, sports and human-interest stories. He reported from Lebanon 1978 during the civil war, and from Poland during the Solidarity uprising in 1980 and in early 1982 after the democracy movement had been quashed. Other key stories included Spain’s transition to democracy and the 1980 Moscow Olympics. Edlund organized UPI’s 1982 soccer world cup coverage in Spain.

In 1983, he joined Reuters in London as a World Desk editor and later was posted to Mexico as Chief Correspondent. He organized the coverage of the 1986 world soccer cup in Mexico, and reported from the Olympic Games in Los Angeles 1984 and Seoul 1988.
Mark B. Fuller is CEO Co-Founder, Chairman and CEO of Monitor Group. Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Cambridge MA, USA, Degree: Masters in Business Administration (MBA) with Honors, 1979 Harvard Law School, Cambridge MA, USA, Degree: Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD) with Honors, 1979, Member of Harvard Law School Project on Negotiation, Teaching Fellow in Social Science course 174: Managing International Conflict, Award: Award for Teaching Excellence Harvard University, Faculty of Arts & Sciences, Cambridge MA, USA, Degree: Bachelor of Arts (AB) in History with Highest Honors, 1975, Awards: Magna Cum Laude, Dean’s List, Harvard Prize for History, member of Phi Beta Kappa, John Harvard Prize, Detur Prize, Nominated for numerous fellowships

Professional Experience:
1983-present: The Monitor Group (1,400 employees), Co-Founder, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Responsible for Monitor Group overall group strategy, spanning 29 offices in 18 countries. Specific interest and responsibilities for Asia and the Middle East Practice, as well the National Economic Development and Security (NEDS) Practice; Chairman of a number of Monitor Group companies and organizations, including the Monitor Institute, Monitor Capital and Market2Customer (M2C). Author or co-author of books and articles, including “Competition in Global Industries” (1986), “Business as War” (2000), and most recently “Japan’s Business Renaissance” (2006)
1979-1983: Harvard Business School, Assistant Professor of Business Administration in Management Strategy
Designed and taught MBA and Executive Education courses on strategy formulation and implementation, industry and competitive analysis. Author and contributor of 50-60 articles and cases; Co-Director of Harvard's Project on the Auto Industry and the American Economy
Michael Gawthorne is a media analyst based at Media Tenor International in Zürich. Born and raised in Australia, Michael studied Communications and Linguistics at Wollongong University where he specialized in Applied Linguistics for Education. His career path has led him briefly into the world of advertising and teaching in Australia. After moving to Switzerland Michael continued his English language teaching before accepting the chance to transfer his linguistics and communications background to Media Tenor. Michael is specialized in the media’s effect on country images and the effects of regional communication trends on corporate and NGO communication activities.

Frederick S. Kempe, President and Chief Executive Officer, The Atlantic Council of the United States. Fred Kempe has held this position since December 1, 2006. He comes to the Council from a long and prominent career at the Wall Street Journal, where he won national and international prizes while serving in numerous management and reportorial capacities – editor, associate publisher, columnist and correspondent. He is the author of three books, and a regular commentator on television and radio both in Europe and the United States.

Mr. Kempe left the Wall Street Journal following more than a quarter century of distinguished work. His last position with the Journal was in New York, where he served as assistant managing editor, international, and “Thinking Global” columnist. Prior to that, he was for seven years the longest serving editor and associate publisher ever of the Wall Street Journal Europe, simultaneously functioning as European editor for the Global Wall Street Journal from 2002 to 2005. Throughout his tenure as editor and associate publisher, the newspaper won a number of awards including the prestigious Harold Wincott Award as U.K. Business Journal of the Year, the Media Tenor Award as the top international paper in
Europe, and multiple “Business Journalist of the Year” prizes from the World Leadership Forum in London. His teams have participated in two Pulitzer Prizes.

Mr. Kempe joined The Wall Street Journal in 1981 in London before opening the Journal’s Vienna bureau in 1984. He transferred to Washington, D.C. in 1986 as chief diplomatic correspondent, and in 1990 opened the Journal’s Berlin bureau. As a reporter, he covered a number of significant stories, including the rise of Solidarity in Poland and the growing resistance to Soviet rule, the coming to power of Mikhail Gorbachev in Russia and all his summit meetings with Ronald Reagan, war reporting in Afghanistan, Iraq and Lebanon in the 1980s and the American invasion of Panama. He also covered the unification of Germany and the collapse of Soviet Communism.

**Dr. Christian Kolmer M.A.** is a media scientist and historian working with the Media Tenor Institute in Bonn. Born 1965 in Essen, he studied history, communication science and economics in Bochum and Mainz. After his MA thesis on the ascent of Christianity as a process of public opinion, he specialised on research on news selection and did extensive research on the media image of the German Treuhandanstalt, the body in charge of the privatisation of the East German state enterprises. After his graduation from Johannes Gutenberg-University in Mainz with an input-output analysis on news selection he joined Media Tenor, where he is responsible for science contacts and non-governmental clients as well. His fields of interest centre on agenda-setting research and cross-country comparisons, especially in the field of country images.
Sunil John, Chief Executive Officer, ASDA’A Burson-Marsteller. Sunil John has been at the heart of the public relations business in the Middle East for nearly two decades. During this time he has shaped ASDA’A Burson-Marsteller to be the benchmark of public relations consultancy, advising regional governments, international brands and global and local companies.

He has been instrumental in creating the specialised practice team structure in ASDA’A Burson-Marsteller with six areas of expertise – corporate affairs, financial communications, consumer marketing, healthcare, technology and public affairs – all successfully building blue-chip client businesses in the region and internationally.

The success of the company has been widely acknowledged, notably in 2006 when it was named “PR Agency of the Year” by Campaign Middle East. Also in 2007, ASDA’A Burson-Marsteller dominated the Gulf Marketing Review Effectiveness in Marketing Awards for Public Relations, winning two of three awards for its work on the BBC World Service and Emaar Properties.

Sunil has been listed Number 25 in the “Arabian Business Expat 50” of the Most Influential Expats in the Middle East. Sunil is the only PR industry figure to be on the list which was released in May, 2009.

Sunil serves on the National Advisory Council for the College of Communication and Media Sciences at Zayed University and is the UAE National Chair of the International Public Relations Association (IPRA). He is also Vice President of the IPRA Gulf Chapter.
Dr Katharina Nötzold is a RCUK-Research Fellow specializing in Arab media at the Communication and Media Research Institute (CAMRI) at the University of Westminster. A former Research Fellow at the Center for International Peace Operations in Berlin and a Junior Research Fellow at the German Institute for Middle Eastern Studies in Beirut, she has in-depth knowledge about the difficulties of post-conflict peace-building processes and the media’s functioning within it. Her research interests include Arab ‘public service broadcasting’, religion and dialogue in the media, and media and migration. She is editor of Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture (WPCC). She is the author of the forthcoming book Defining the Nation? Lebanese TV Stations: The Political Elites’ Dominance over the Visual Space 1990-2005 and articles on Arab media, the representation of Islam in media, and media and migration.

Canon Alistair Macdonald-Radcliff, Director General of the C-1 has served as Senior Advisor to the World Economic Forum and its Council of 100 Leaders’ West-Islamic Dialogue. He was also formerly Dean of All Saints’ Cathedral in Cairo and a Fellow of the Ethics and Public Policy Center in Washington DC. a founding partner of Christian Edge an internet publishing company and a Director of Avancia Consulting Inc. He was educated at the Universities of London and Oxford where he specialized in Philosophical Theology with Professors Richard Swinburne, Brian Davies O.P and Paul Fiddes as his supervisors and also taught Philosophy of Religion. He took an STM Degree at Yale where he also served as a Research Fellow. He has undertaken extensive international work for the church and assisted on an adjunct basis the work of the Anglican Consultative Council and served as special advisor to Lord Carey of Clifton, the 103rd Archbishop of Canterbury.
David W. Moore, Ph.D. is a Senior Fellow with the Carsey Institute at the University of New Hampshire, and author of *The Opinion Makers: An Insider Reveals the Truth Behind the Polls* (Beacon Press, 2008). He is a former vice president at the Gallup Organization and senior editor with the Gallup Poll, where he worked for 13 years. He is also a former Professor of Political Science at the University of New Hampshire, where he founded and directed the UNH Survey Center. He is the author of two other books: *How To Steal An Election: The Inside Story of How George Bush’s Brother and FOX Network Miscalled the 2000 Election and Changed the Course of History* (Nation Books, 2006) and *The Super Pollsters: How They Measure and Manipulate Public Opinion in America* (Four Walls Eight Windows, 1992, trade paperback edition in 1995).

Prof. Dr. Holli A. Semetko is Vice Provost for International Affairs and Director of Office of International Affairs and The Claus M. Halle Institute for Global Learning at Emory University, where she is also a professor of political science. Before coming to Emory in 2003, Semetko spent eight years at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, as Professor and Chair of Audience and Public Opinion Research in the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences. She served as Chair of the Department of Communication Science and founding Chair of the Board of the Amsterdam School for Communications Research, a school for advanced research recognized by the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences.

Wadim Schreiner is the Managing Director of Media Tenor South Africa in Pretoria. He has a Masters in Journalism from the North West University in South Africa, having written his paper on “News flow in and out of Africa and particularly the image of Africa in international media”. He has and currently is reading in media theories and communication methods at the University of Stellenbosch, the University of Cape Town, as well as the Gordon Institute for Business Science. He has spoken at a several media and journalism conferences in the United States, South Africa, Asia and Africa and has published a number of research articles in international journals on South African and international media trends. He is an editorial member of Ecquid Novi, the African Research Journal and a member of the Council for Communication Education in Africa.
About the Center

The Pew Research Center for the People & the Press is an independent, non-partisan public opinion research organization that studies attitudes toward politics, the press and public policy issues. In this role it serves as a valuable information resource for political leaders, journalists, scholars and citizens.

The Center conducts regular monthly polls on politics and major policy issues as well as the News Interest Index, a weekly survey aimed at gauging the public’s interest in and reaction to major news events. Shorter commentaries are produced on a regular basis addressing the issues of the day from a public opinion perspective. In addition, the Center periodically fields major surveys on the news media, social issues and international affairs.

Formerly, the Times Mirror Center for the People & the Press (1990-1995), the Center has been sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trusts since 1996. The Pew Research Center for the People & the Press is one of seven projects that make up the Pew Research Center, a nonpartisan "fact tank" that provides information on the issues, attitudes and trends shaping America and the world.

All of our current survey results are made available free of charge on our website: www.people-press.org.

Andrew Kohut is president of the Pew Research Center and serves as director of both the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press and the Pew Global Attitudes Project. He is the founder of Princeton Survey Research Associates and former President of the Gallup Organization.
MEDIA TENOR was founded in 1993 by eminent scholars within and outside of the area of communication science and public opinion research like Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, Peter Glotz, Hans Mathias Kepplinger, Wolfgang Donsbach and Hartmut Schiedermaier. Media Tenor was established as the first media research institute to focus on the continuous one hundred percent media analysis of opinion-leading news outlets. Thanks to this unique approach the institute expanded internationally serving universities, NGOs, governments, the media and the corporate sector.

As a strategic partner, MEDIA TENOR helps organizations understanding and leveraging the media. Through partnership with MEDIA TENOR, organizations are able to tailor messages to reach target audiences effectively, consequently reducing advertising cost and increasing the return on investment from an organization’s external communication.

Today MEDIA TENOR is the leading media institute in the field of applied Agenda-Setting research, serving partners in the scientific, government and corporate world with strategic media intelligence. Every year experts and practitioners from media, academia, governments and NGOs meet at the International Agenda Setting Conference to exchange latest trends and improvements in the field of applied media impact analysis. Because MEDIA TENOR analyzes every single report in opinion leading media from print to TV and online media, our partners know whether their media relations activity has been relevant or not. MEDIA TENOR empowers them to create and maintain an active and strategic media presence, strengthening both credibility and reputation.

The database open to the public has grown up to 85 million analysed statements – growing every day.

www.mediatenor.com & www.agendasetting.com
Through his unconventional approach, **Malte Lück** creates innovative thought patterns and forms. Reflection and feeling are as much a part of his development process as are conceptional and solution-oriented thinking. With www.konzeptatelier.com Malte Lück has designed a platform for supporting and creating interdisciplinary projects.

His work and approach have been honored several times, i.e. with the Newcomer Award "contractworld" for the best final exam projects for architecture students in Europe, and the iF Design Award. In 2005 he won an award in the competition “Cruzifix for the 21. Century” of the Museum of the Arch-Diocesis of Munich.

Malte Lück, born 1973, is a freelance designer and artist based in Cologne, Germany.

[www.konzeptatelier.com](http://www.konzeptatelier.com)
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Saleh Nass is a filmmaker based in the Kingdom of Bahrain. He is a graduate of Bournemouth Media School in England, UK. Upon returning to Bahrain he started Elements Productions to take part in the development of media and film in his native region.

Elements Productions, Bahrain, was established by active filmmakers early in 2008 as a video & film production company with a capability of producing world class TV commercials, high quality TV & Film output and Corporate / Training videos in the region.

With a growing list of respectable clientele, we’re a niche high-end outfit that creates innovative, quality content, drawing on our resources in Bahrain, North Africa and the UK.
Impact Print Solutions, based in London’s Clerkenwell, is well placed to serve London’s many business areas and offers both digital and litho print services. We also offer a design and artwork service and handle volume production of CDs/DVDs. We have a wealth of experience in advising our clients on the production methods most appropriate to their needs.

For further information, please contact Simon Smith on +44(0)20 7253 8674 or email to simon@impact-print.com.
C1 Foundation
The C-1 World Dialogue is a high-level International Council for the advance of peaceful and harmonious West-Islamic Relations. It aims to be the foremost global platform promoting dialogue and improved relations between the Western and Islamic Worlds.

The aim of the C-1 World Dialogue is to support and promote, propagate and preserve, peace, harmony and friendship between the Western and Islamic Worlds and between Christians and Muslims in particular, on the widest possible scale. It seeks to do this in accord with the two greatest Commandments given us, namely to love God and our neighbour—as called for by the historic A Common Word Open Letter of October 13th 2007. Thus, the members of the C-1 World Dialogue come together also to promote the core common moral values of respect for human life, dignity and mind, basic human rights, commitment to peace, protection of community and family; social justice and truth; brotherhood and practical compassion for the poor and those in need.

The Annual Dialogue Report
In accord with the intent that the C-1 will be the foremost global resource for information and data on dialogue and Muslim Western relations, the publication of an Annual Dialogue Report shall be a primary objective of the C-1. The Annual Report will seek to provide objective data on attitudes and perceptions among relevant peoples and groups along with other survey data covering such critical matters as how the Media have represented the key issues. Objective data that is relevant will also be collected and displayed in the report. A central aim will be to facilitate and highlight insights not otherwise available and to do so in ways that can enable practical constructive change. Annual Reports may focus on particular themes and contain input from both C-1 members and others with relevant and compelling insights on the matters at hand.
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