

Reinhold Mokrosch

How Tolerant Do Religions Need to Be to Serve Peace? Considerations of Tolerance and Satire after the Attacks in Paris and Copenhagen in January and February 2015

Preliminary Remarks

As the appointment of a “Representative on Freedom of the Media” shows, the OSCE strongly supports the right to freedom of expression and to a free and pluralistic media in its 57 participating States and beyond. In addition, as reiterated by the OSCE’s Ministerial Council in Dublin in 2012, combating terrorism is one of the Organization’s key tasks. And finally, an “Advisory Council on Freedom of Religion or Belief” was created with the goal of maintaining religious freedom in all OSCE States and beyond.

In my opinion, this focus on freedom of expression, media freedom, and freedom of religion challenges the representatives of the OSCE to reflect on whether and to what extent the extreme satire of the kind that is being created in many parts of the world today may endanger these liberties – or even strengthen them. And the OSCE needs to ask religious communities if they are prepared to exercise tolerance with regard to such satire. For religious communities are an important political factor for securing peace in Europe. Can the OSCE rely on them to co-operate on the basis of tolerance, respect, and esteem? Following the attacks in Paris in January 2015 and in Copenhagen in February, and given the smouldering resentment of anti-Islamic groups such as Pegida, this question has taken on a greater urgency. The following considerations seek to encourage reflection on these issues.

Are Religions Capable of Tolerance at All?

The answer is no, according to Jan Assmann, a sociologist of religion and Egyptologist.¹ Many experts and laypersons alike would agree. In his view, at least the three monotheistic revealed religions are intrinsically, i.e. by their very nature, preoccupied with the exclusion of unbelievers, the superstitious, and blasphemers, and can by no means recognize or tolerate other religions or

1 Cf. above all, Jan Assman, *The Price of Monotheism*, Stanford 2010; Jan Assman, *Monotheismus und die Sprache der Gewalt* [Monotheism and the Language of Violence], Vienna 2006; and Jan Assman, *Leitkultur und doppelte Mitgliedschaft. Überlegungen zur Toleranzdebatte* [Core Culture and Dual Membership. Thoughts on the Tolerance Debate] in: Myriam Bienenstock/Pierre Bühler (eds), *Religiöse Toleranz heute – und gestern* [Religious Tolerance Today – and Yesterday], Freiburg im Breisgau 2011, pp. 109-127.

world views. Extrinsically, however, i.e. with regard to actual religious practices and the spirit of specific periods and cultures (the “zeitgeist”), political reason and the Enlightenment spirit of modernity mean that other religions and world views are frequently tolerated as a means of enabling coexistence. Yet, in Assmann’s view, that kind of tolerance amounts at best to sufferance. Not more! In their essence, religions are not really tolerant.

Are religions capable of tolerance? “Yes”, according to the Catholic theologian Hans Küng.² Only a few experts and laypersons would agree. All religions agree on the createdness of all human beings, the need for reverence for all life, the “golden rule” (“do as you would be done by”), and the universality of the human relation to the transcendent, and use this as the basis for cultivating a culture of fraternity, non-violence, and tolerance. They are, according to Küng, intrinsically capable of tolerance in the sense of mutual recognition. Yet in their extrinsic practice, contrary to Assmann, political unreason and the demands of the zeitgeist often make them intolerant and violent. Küng’s view is precise the opposite of Assmann’s.

Are religions capable of tolerance? “Yes and no”, according to the American historian and sociologist of religion Scott Appleby, whose views are shared by many experts, but only a few judicious and unprejudiced members of the public.³ The sacred is always ambivalent, and religions will thus always produce both peace *and* violence, and will act in ways that are both tolerant *and* intolerant. Appleby does not distinguish between intrinsic and extrinsic factors, but does separate the dogmatic and the practical: In their dogmas, religions tend to promote peace, non-violence, and tolerance, while in practice, the doctrine of the “just war” is used everywhere to justify violence and intolerance.

These contradictory expert opinions are confusing, as are the feelings, opinions, and prejudices of German citizens:⁴ Germans are uncertain as to whether Islamism and Islamists (0.8 per cent of Muslims in Germany are Islamists) belong to Islam at all; and depending on current news coverage of Islamism (most of which concerns Islamic State and al-Qaeda, and is thus usually not from Europe), the percentage of Germans who oppose Islam varies from between 50 and 70 per cent. Equally confusing is the behaviour of many religious communities: Many Muslim organizations, Jewish communi-

2 Cf., in particular, Hans Küng, *Projekt Weltethos* [Towards a Global Ethic], Munich 1990; Hans Küng, *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, Oxford 1997; and Hans Küng/Karl-Josef Kuschel (eds), *Wissenschaft und Weltethos* [Science and Global Ethic], Munich 1998.

3 Cf. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*, Lanham, MA, 2000.

4 Cf. Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Religionsmonitor – verstehen was verbindet, Sonderauswertung Islam 2015. Die wichtigsten Ergebnisse im Überblick* [Religion Monitor – Understanding the Ties that Bind, Special Study Islam 2015. The Key Findings in Summary], at: http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/Projekte/51_Religionsmonitor/Zusammenfassung_der_Sonderauswertung.pdf. Based on polling carried out in November 2014.

ties, and Christian churches condemn unreservedly any and all (!) religiously motivated violence and accuse those who perform such attacks of seeking to destroy God and their religion. Yet other organizations and communities make no statements at all. How should we understand this? Are religions intrinsically tolerant or intolerant? Or can their tolerance or intolerance only be explained in terms of extrinsic, i.e. external, factors?

I know that this question cannot be answered. I nonetheless want to put this to the test by examining it at two marginal yet globally relevant points; namely by asking: “How do religions deal with satire today and what is their intrinsic attitude to satire – tolerant or intolerant?” This is tied up with the question I ask in my title – “How tolerant do religions need to be to serve peace?”

A brief note on definitions: I am speaking about religious satire as a form of art. And I distinguish hierarchically between the following five forms of tolerance (from the lowest to the highest): sufferance, coexistence, dialogue, co-operation, and respect and esteem.⁵

Satire and Religion – Recent Events

Osnabrück, October 2014

At his show in Osnabrück, the German political comedian Dieter Nuhr denounced the practices of Islamists in a sarcastic, viciously ironic, derisive, and disdainful way, garnering an enthusiastic response from his audience:

Seventy-two virgins await every suicide murderer, and as soon as they are used up, their virginity is restored (laughter) [...] Whoopee: The sun is out, the heavens laugh, Yussuf's blown himself in half (derisive laughter) [...] Female martyrs are greeted by their husbands (roaring laughter) [...] For the first theft, the right hand is chopped off, for the second, the left – and for the third? (some laughter) [...] the Arabs just can't get it together: Countless illiterates! But everything is the fault of Israel and the USA [...] All over the world, new technologies are being patented, just not in the Arab countries; and when they are, then it's for an automatic stoning device (laughter) [...] Islam is only tolerant when it has no power! Let's make sure it stays that way (silence, perhaps because the audience does not understand the profundity of this sentence).⁶

5 This typology was conceived by Rainer Forst, *Toleranz, Gerechtigkeit und Vernunft* [Tolerance, Justice and Reason], in: Rainer Forst (ed.), *Toleranz* [Tolerance], Frankfurt 2000, pp. 119-143, here: pp. 123-130.

6 Author's translation based on personal notes taken at the event.

Outside the hall, 15 Muslims demonstrated with placards whose slogans included “Stop Hate Preacher Nuhr!” and “*Nu(h)r Lügen*” (German for “only lies” – a pun on his name). Their leader, Erhat Toka, filed a complaint with the public prosecutor against Nuhr for hate speech against both Muslims and Arabs. The complaint was initially pursued, but dropped after a short time: The court later ruled that Toka could continue to describe Nuhr as a “hate preacher”, but that Nuhr was also allowed to continue to perform his satire, as his exercising of his artistic freedom did not demonstrate xenophobic intentions, and was not religious or racial hate speech. Osnabrück breathed a sigh of relief! Instead of a bomb attack, Nuhr faced only an orderly legal process.

Throughout Germany, however, a frenzied debate developed in newspapers and radio and on the internet, in which I also became a target. I had expressed my opinion in print that anyone who feels that their religious feelings have been seriously attacked has the right to take legal steps, and that a complaint filed with the public prosecutor is still better than a bomb.⁷ The reaction was a death threat and merciless abuse from Pegida supporters.

Yet there was also civilized discussion of the following questions: Did Nuhr go too far? Is even his vicious sarcasm protected by the German constitution (Article 5 of the Basic Law, on freedom of expression, arts and sciences)? Did he injure the religious feelings of Muslims or the ethnic sensitivities of Arabs? Is satire allowed, as Kurt Tucholsky claimed, to do everything? Does artistic freedom override the protection of religions from insult and discrimination in this case? According to Tucholsky, satire should encourage its targets to think again; it should criticize the powerful and give the oppressed a voice. Did Nuhr achieve this? Or are religions humourless and intolerant if they cannot cope with satire of this kind?

Nuhr enjoyed strong support among the general public. They considered the freedom of the arts and of satire as an inalienable higher good, accused Islam of intolerance, and no longer distinguished between Islamists and Islam. Who was right?

Paris, Editorial Offices of Charlie Hebdo, Kosher Supermarket; Montrouge, January 2015

The horror of Paris is well known. After murdering eleven journalists and caricaturists and one bodyguard, the murderous brothers Said and Cherif Kouachi, who were not typical suicide-murderers, but rather cowardly assassins, shouted “Allahu Akbar! We have avenged the Prophet!” On the street outside the offices of Charlie Hebdo, they murdered a Muslim police officer. And their accomplice Amedy Coulibaly shot a police officer in Montrouge and four Jews in a kosher market in an anti-Semitic attack. The three murderers, all of whom were shot dead, did not leave any theological arguments at-

7 Cf. articles in the *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung* (NOZ) from 24 and 29 October 2014; and 12 and 22 January 2015.

tempting to justify their actions. They merely wanted to avenge the prophet and hurt Israel. They would not have been capable of making a decent legal case against Charlie Hebdo.⁸ The only instrument they were capable of using was the murderous violence of the Kalashnikov. Investigations have since revealed that they were unfamiliar with Islam, the Koran, and the hadith. They carried out their murders on behalf of al-Qaeda and Islamic State.

Would they still have murdered if the leaders of (Sunni) Islam had called for tolerance of caricatures of Mohammad and satire of Islam in general? I would suggest that the answer is “no” with regard to the two (Al-Qaeda-influenced) murderers of the Charlie Hebdo staff and “yes” with regard to the (Islamic State-inspired) murderer of four people in the kosher supermarket. Islamic State is concerned with the creation of a global theocracy and not with avenging the prophet. Al-Qaeda, on the other hand, seeks to spread Islamism and (supposedly) protect the Prophet.

A call for tolerance towards cartoons of Mohammad is conceivable in Islam for a number of reasons: The ban on images is not obligatory in Islam (though it is in Judaism). Furthermore, the prohibition of violence, and hence the call for tolerance in purely religious matters, is unambiguous in Islam. Sura 2.256 states: “There is no compulsion in religion.” And that also implies that there should be no violence between religions. And finally: The prophet’s injunction to negotiate rather than fight with those of different (or no) beliefs,⁹ also supports tolerance, if only at the level of sufferance and coexistence, and not that of mutual respect.

Certainly, calls for tolerance towards caricatures of Mohammad have to be accompanied by demands that the cartoonists set limits to their satire, and use it solely to call for the humanization of Islam and Islamism. This kind of mutual arrangement between Islam and the Western world is not inconceivable, and could be accepted by both sides. But they would not stop non-religious ideological fanatics such as Islamic State from pursuing their path of murder and destruction (whose targets ultimately include Islam and the prophet himself). Religious tolerance, even when it only takes the form of sufferance, can have no effect on pseudo-religious ideological fanatics and fundamentalists. It can only find fertile soil among genuine believers.

8 An attempt to bring criminal charges against Charlie Hebdo would probably have failed in any case. The Catholic Church in France had attempted several times to instigate bring charges against the magazine as a result of pornographic cartoons featuring the Virgin Mary and the Pope and a portrayal of the Holy Trinity engaging in anal sex. In vain! The cartoonists’ artistic freedom was always considered more important than the protection of religion from execration.

9 Cf. Reinhold Mokrosch/Thomas Held/Roland Czada (eds): *Religionen und Weltfrieden. Friedens- und Konfliktlösungspotentiale von Religionsgemeinschaften* [Religions and World Peace. The Peace and Conflict Resolution Potential of Religious Communities], Stuttgart 2013, pp. 139-148.

Copenhagen, February 2015

Five weeks after the Charlie Hebdo attacks, a 22-year-old man of Palestinian descent, Omar Abdel Hamid El-Hussein, followed the example of the Paris attackers and murdered the film director Finn Nørgaard at a cultural centre in Copenhagen (his intended target was probably the Mohammad caricaturist Lars Vilks). Nørgaard was taking part in a discussion on “Art, Blasphemy and Freedom of Expression” at the time. A few hours later, he shot and killed a guard at Copenhagen’s Great Synagogue. He was not motivated by religion, but rather by anti-Israeli and pro-Palestinian sentiment – together with feelings of social exclusion. He had no links with Syria, Iraq, or Islamic State, yet imagined he was killing on behalf of the latter. Perhaps he was just one of those copycats whose feelings of alienation and victimhood drew him towards the goals of Islamic State, like many other violent criminals, some of whom remain isolated while others become part of a mob.

Could calls for tolerance from Islamic leaders have changed him? Unlikely. He would just have found another murderous gang of thugs to attach himself to.

Does Satire Have Limits?

In the light of these horrific events, I would like to attempt to outline criteria for distinguishing between acceptable and unacceptable religious satire:

- Religious satire should not be more extreme than other forms of satire that are capable of hurting feelings (and thereby precisely miss their targets), e.g. satire at the expense of modern art, youth subcultures, feminism, or ethnic traditions. If limits to free expression are called for in these cases, then the same should apply to religion.
- Every satire aims to challenge those that it mocks to reconsider their position and undertake self-criticism. Religious satire should therefore seek to attack injustices within religious communities, while protecting those that suffer from them.
- As Tucholsky believed, satire should criticize the powerful while giving a voice to the oppressed. Religious satire should not lose sight of this social component of satire.
- Religious satire always needs to consider the consequences of its criticisms. To do this, it needs to assess the ability of the religions it is attempting to satirize to tolerate criticism. It cannot disturb public order – or indeed world peace – with the argument that “religious believers need to learn to cope with criticism”.
- Satire needs to make distinctions and beware of sweeping negative judgements. In the case of religious satire, Islam must be distinguished

from Islamism, Christianity from Christian ideology, and Judaism from Jewish ideology. Indeed, in my opinion, satire should not attack religion per se but rather religious ideologies, fanaticism, and fundamentalism, i.e. perversions of religion.

- Religious satire should maintain aesthetic standards. When Charlie Hebdo responded to the child-abuse scandal in the Catholic Church by portraying the trinity of God the Father, God the Son and the Holy Spirit engaging in anal sex, this may indeed have been an effective criticism of the terrible scandal, but, in my opinion, also crossed this line.
- Is it legitimate for satire to caricature God? To blaspheme? In principle, yes, but it should always take account of the feelings of those addressed. Should Germany's blasphemy law be abolished (para. 166 of the German Penal Code)? I don't believe so, as this would open the door to anti-Semitic and anti-Islamic fanatics.
- And finally: When does religious satire abuse the feelings, convictions, and faith of believers? Should believers be allowed to determine this themselves? For themselves, yes. But not for others. That remains something for the courts to decide. Believers may only express their own subjective feelings of having been insulted. It is not legitimate for them to react to satire by taking the law into their own hands and seeking revenge in the name of other members of their religious community, let alone in the name of God or the Prophet. It is legitimate for a believer who feels insulted to file a legal complaint. But they may not act in the name of an institution, and certainly may not use violence.

Is it reasonable to ask religious satirists to act according to these criteria? And is it reasonable to ask religious believers to display this level of tolerance? How much tolerance do religions need to display to be able to learn from satire and to serve peace?

Recapitulation: Are Religions Capable of Tolerance at All?

When the Abrahamic monotheistic religions – those I am focusing on here – emerged, the concept of tolerance did not exist – though its essence did. It can be found in the various holy books in concepts such as forgiveness, peace, reconciliation, endurance, and compromise. I will therefore examine the various holy scriptures from this point of view, asking if this says anything about their religions' capacity for tolerance.¹⁰

¹⁰ See the relevant articles in Werner Haussmann/Hansjörg Biener/Klaus Hock/Reinhold Mokrosch (eds), *Handbuch Friedenserziehung, interreligiös, interkulturell, interkonfessionell* [Handbook of Peace Education – interfaith, intercultural, interdenominational], Gütersloh 2006.

Christianity

The Old Testament of the Christian Bible, which also includes passages where God as military leader encourages murder in the most brutal terms, also contains calls for understanding between peoples and rudimentary international law (Amos 1-2 and Deuteronomy 20). The Old Testament contains many further fascinating references to peace: When “righteousness and peace kiss each other” (Psalms 85:10); when “the wolf will live with the lamb” (Isaiah 11:6); when “they will beat their swords into plowshares” (Isaiah 2:4); and when an “Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace” (Isaiah 9:6) is born, God’s will and nature shall be realized.

In the New Testament, Jesus calls in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7) for his followers to love their enemies, to pray for those who persecute them, and to show aggressors the other cheek.¹¹ There is also the “Golden Rule”, which is also a part of the moral teaching of every other religion. The biblical version is: “So in everything, do to others what you would have them do to you” (Matthew 7:12). This imprecation may not inspire respect and esteem, but it does call for mutual sufferance; and this could be expanded to include the former two. Paul calls for Christians to “overcome evil with good” (Romans 12:21). That requires tolerance in the form of forgiveness. Christians are therefore not only capable of practising tolerance in the sense of sufferance and coexistence, but also to expand this to encompass loving forgiveness, respect and esteem. Christianity is capable of tolerance.

Islam

Those who consider tolerance a central tenet of Islam¹² frequently refer to Sura 2:256 of the Koran, which states “There is no compulsion in religion”.¹³ From this call to non-violence within the religion, they conclude (correctly in my opinion) that there should also be no compulsion among religions, but rather understanding, reconciliation, peace, and tolerance. While the Koran states that such a peace of tolerance is based on an accord – “But if the enemy incline towards peace, do thou (also) incline towards peace, and trust in God” (Sura 8:61) – this is not a requirement but rather the outgrowth of patience and forgiveness (Sura 7:199: “Hold to forgiveness; command what is right”). A procedure of this kind can be correctly described as tolerance in the form of co-operation, but certainly not yet in the form of respect or esteem. Sura 5:32 also points to tolerance: “[...] if any one slew a person [...] it would be as if he slew the whole people; and if any one saved a life, it would be as if he saved the life of the whole people.” In my view, this doctrine of solidarity should be understood as an exhortation to peaceful fraternity and

11 Cf. Reinhold Mokrosch, *Die Bergpredigt im Alltag* [The Sermon on the Mount in Everyday Life], Gütersloh 1995.

12 Cf. Adel Theodore Khoury, *Toleranz im Islam* [Tolerance in Islam], Munich 1980.

13 Compare also Sura 10:99: “If it had been thy Lord’s Will, They would all have believed, All who are on earth! Wilt thou then compel mankind?”

general tolerance. The Golden Rule (“None of you will believe until you love for your brother what you love for yourself”)¹⁴ can – but need not – also be interpreted in terms of respect for one’s “brother”. But that is a matter of interpretation.

Of course, other Suras, with their calls for violent action, speak against tolerance in Islam. Yet there can be no doubt that Muhammad was in favour of tolerance in the form of sufferance and coexistence – if not generally cooperation, let alone respect, or mutual esteem. Muslims should adopt this minimum level of tolerance. Islam is capable – must be capable – of tolerance.

Judaism

In the Jewish tradition, the ethics of peace and tolerance concentrate on scriptural passages such as Psalms 34:15 “Shun evil and do good, seek peace and pursue it.” In the rabbinic tradition, *shalom* is considered to be “the yeast of creation”. And paralleling the Koran, the Jerusalem Talmud states that “Whoever destroys a soul, it is considered as if he destroyed an entire world. And whoever saves a life, it is considered as if he saved an entire world.”¹⁵ As in the Koran, this passage does not specify a certain class of person (Jews, believers), but rather refers to all human beings. That also suggests awareness of a peaceful fraternity of all people and thus for awareness of a tolerance inherent in every person. In Judaism, the Golden Rule is formulated as “What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbour.”¹⁶ This resembles the German saying “*Was du nicht willst, dass man dir tu, das füg auch keinem andern zu*” [What you do not wish done to yourself, do not inflict upon others], i.e. a passive coexistence of people, while the Christian formulation calls for active, loving togetherness. But that too is a matter of interpretation.

Although the Hebrew Bible, the Tanakh, is full of calls for violence and intolerance, it also contains rudiments of a call for tolerance, which have been and will continue to be followed by countless Jews. Judaism is capable – must be capable – of tolerance.

The three Abrahamic religions are thus clearly capable – at least potentially – of exercising tolerance. Whether their followers are able to do so can, however, certainly be called into question. Their actions often suggest that they are not. Violence and intolerance are found not only in Islamism and ideologized Christianity and Judaism, but also in the three religions themselves. Can that all be put down to individuals? Not entirely. It is also the fault of the holy books of these religions themselves. They create peace *and* violence. Nonetheless, their followers could be tolerant and create peace. Yet it still remains to ask:

14 *The 40 Hadith of An Nawawi*, Number 13.

15 Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrin 4:1.

16 Rabbi Hillel, *Babylonian Talmud: Tractate Shabbath*, Folio 31a.

How Tolerant Do Religions Need to Be to Serve Peace?

With this, I return to my initial question. In the course of this discussion I have distinguished five kinds of tolerance, in ascending order: sufferance, coexistence, dialogue, co-operation, and respect and esteem.

We could consider the goal of all religions to be the highest form of tolerance – respect and esteem – as all religions see human beings as God’s creation, and hence as brothers and sisters, who should live together in peace and tolerance. Religious people can meet the objection that God could not have created murderers with the distinction between actor and action: God created the murderer, but the evil act is the product of the human individual.

But tolerance in the form of respect and esteem is indeed a distant or even utopian goal. As we have seen, the holy books themselves rather promote tolerance in the forms of sufferance and coexistence. The Old Testament concept of understanding between peoples and the Islamic concept of a peace accord do not propose that one admires one’s enemies, but merely that one tolerates them and learns to coexist in order to survive. The Bible and the Koran are almost entirely free of references to dialogue and co-operation between peoples and religions, let alone respect and mutual esteem. Only the Sermon on the Mount, with its call for us to love our enemies, can be understood in this sense. While the “Golden Rule” can be interpreted in this way, it need not be. When calls for tolerant coexistence are expanded into calls for mutual understanding, forgiveness, and respect, this is a matter of interpretation, not of the texts themselves.

Religions cannot therefore be expected to pursue tolerance in the forms of dialogue, co-operation, and esteem on the basis of their holy books. Calls for these kinds of tolerance can only be expected in the history of religions when the extrinsic culture or zeitgeist demands them. But when this zeitgeist is lacking, as it has been in many societies – including many Jewish, Christian, and Muslim communities – then the most that can be expected is tolerance in the form of sufferance and coexistence. Yet this can and should be expected by everyone, as it is expected and indeed demanded by God.

In Europe, the core of the OSCE area, the spirit of tolerance in the form of dialogue and mutual respect predominates. Within Europe, therefore, we can and should expect the religions to show a willingness towards dialogue, co-operation, and respect. That means that, in cases of conflict, religions must respect the rule of law in their dealings with each other and spurn private justice. Furthermore, believers should maintain a proper perspective on themselves, be self-critical, take an interest in interfaith dialogue, and even to cultivate a sense of humour with regard to religion. The initiative for this *must* be taken by the leaders of the various religions.

I experienced a good example recently in a mosque: The Imam was discussing Mohammad’s humour, as preserved in certain hadiths, and his deep belief and faith that God himself played an active role on earth and in human

history. He concluded with the sentence: “We don’t need to defend God; God defends himself and he defends us.” That evening in the mosque, Christians, Muslims, and Jews met for an interfaith discussion about Abraham. During this discussion, Abraham was interpreted as the “father of faith”, who placed his life entirely in God’s hands.

It is the spiritual leaders who must make the call for interfaith encounters, dialogue, and tolerance. And they need to practise tolerance themselves. If they are then followed by believers then tolerance in the form of dialogue, co-operation, and mutual esteem could be the result.

In my view, the task of the OSCE is to remind Europe’s spiritual leaders of their duty to call for tolerance.