

# “East is East and West is West”?

Talks on Dialogue in Beirut

edited by  
Leslie A. Tramontini

BEIRUT 2006

---

ERGON VERLAG WÜRZBURG  
IN KOMMISSION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	7
Leslie Tramontini: “... and Never the Twain Shall Meet” – Introduction to a collection of texts on dialogue between the Arab and the Western World.....	11
<b>I. CULTURAL DIALOGUE.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Ghassan Salameh <i>Some Observations on Dialogue.</i> <i>A transcript of oral remarks.....</i>	25
Abbas Beydoun <i>The West and Us Now.....</i>	31
Abdo Abboud <i>Literary Models for the Dialogue of Civilizations and Cultures.....</i>	41
<b>II. RELIGIOUS DIALOGUE.....</b>	<b>57</b>
John J. Donohue s.j. <i>Translating God in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century:</i> <i>Are we all fundamentalists?.....</i>	59
Ridwan al-Sayyid <i>Fundamentalism versus Orthodoxy.....</i>	79
Thomas Scheffler <i>Neither East nor West.</i> <i>Inter-religious Dialogue and Local Politics in the Age of Globalization.....</i>	87

Günter Seufert <i>Unwavering Designation, Contradictory Processes.</i> <i>The changing role of "Islam" in the Interior Politics of the Turkish Republic</i> .....	101
Muhammad Noureddine <i>Islamism in Domestic Politics in Turkey:</i> <i>The Kemalist Secularism Predicament</i> .....	115
Jørgen Bæk Simonsen <i>Islam and Muslims in Denmark and Europe</i> <i>From silent migrants to active citizens</i> .....	123
Jamal Malik <i>Encountering Muslims in Germany</i> .....	137
Mathias Rohe <i>Muslims between Qur'ān and Constitution.</i> <i>Religious Freedom within the German Legal Order</i> .....	151
<b>III. POLITICAL DIALOGUE</b> .....	177
Volker Perthes <i>The Involvement of European Foreign Policy in the Middle East</i> .....	179
Fadia Kiwan <i>US - EU, and the Middle East</i> .....	189
Chibli Mallat <i>The Need for a Paradigm Shift in American Thinking.</i> <i>Middle Eastern responses to 'What we are fighting for'</i> .....	193
<b>ABOUT THE AUTHORS</b> .....	217

## ***“... AND NEVER THE TWAIN SHALL MEET”?***

*INTRODUCTION TO A COLLECTION OF TEXTS ON DIALOGUE  
BETWEEN THE ARAB AND THE WESTERN WORLD*

LESLIE TRAMONTINI

*Arnold Bergstraesser Institut, Freiburg*

In the 1990's Europe and the Arab world suddenly realized that their relations needed readjustment. For a long time, Europe's sporadic overtures were met with disinterest and apathy. Then came 9/11 and with it the awareness of the necessity for serious dialogue. The result has been an explosion of literature on this subject as well as conferences, panel discussions and roundtables.

The history of the relations between Europe and the “Orient,” is packed with religious wars, political power struggles, colonization and interference, but also with common values, cultural exchange, and cross-fertilization. This positive side of the relations is continuously being forgotten or downplayed. The new North-South divide adds yet another dimension to the old “East/West”-fault line, the dismissal of globalization as new Western imperialism is its latest aspect. Dialogue is needed; but what kind of dialogue? No matter how we may define it, dialogue demands that we put aside our obsolete divisions of the planet into different incompatible worlds. The acceptance of pluralism and diversity of cultures and societies means the refusal of the one-dimensional theory of the “clashes” between civilizations. In a time of general reflection on the relationship between cultures, positions have to be revised, re-adjusted, and eventually redefined. Each attempt at understanding the Other will lead to understanding more of oneself, and each interpretation of the Other will reveal insights into one's own positions. The effects of a sincere dialogue will change not only the perception of the Other, but also self perception.

To define clearly what dialogue is and where it should lead is a difficult task. A very simple but concise definition that does not belittle the subject itself could be: dialogue is an open confrontation with the Other, a critical and self-critical encounter; its precondition is knowledge of one's self, and its aim is acceptance

of the Other without denial of one's self. So dialogue is a permanent delicate balance between Me and You, between Us and Them. This "minimal-position" is applicable to all levels of dialogue, in politics, religion, and everyday life. It means the absence of armed aggression, of violence, hate and fear, and the readiness to accept the Other on the basis of diversity and equality. Through the abuse and misuse of the word dialogue, especially in recent times, an inflation of the meaning has set in, diluting its primary meaning of (communication) "via the word". This meaning posits the term exactly as the counterpoint to violence and terrorism. Dialogue is a challenge, a fragile and risky enterprise that requires the willingness to get involved and impressed, and consequently, changed.

President Khatemi of Iran called the year 2001 the *International Year of Dialogue*<sup>1</sup>, a fact that perhaps would have slipped into general oblivion had it not been that exactly in that year a very serious rupture happened: September 11 opened the rift not between two cultures but rather between two diverging *Weltanschauungen*. To simplify this rift as a conflict - or even a clash - between two religions or civilizations means ignoring the existence of conflicting and contradictory approaches to modern reality and its problems within each of these civilizations. This rift however, is fostered by those people in both cultures for whom life is measured in absolute terms, and who claim incompatibility of the other culture and exclusivity and superiority of their own.

The perception of the Other is shaped through different modes and forms, often relying on old stereotypes buried in the collective memory. Repetition and reprocessing of a given image without any variation or verification may, in the worst case, form a kind of de-legitimization and de-humanizing of the Other. The media have their share in shaping the conscience and attitude of a people, contributing to stereotypes through misrepresentation and simplification. They draw on historical prejudices and misconceptions. Now, especially after the events of 9/11, when in the US - and to a lesser degree in Europe - fears of an invisible and ungraspable terrorism are transformed into negative-images of Islam, as a whole, mixing terrorism and Islam into one unity, people are thrown back to their pre-conceptions of Islam where old patterns of understanding (or misunderstandings) re-emerge. Moving beyond stereotyping requires the will for rational analysis and for a certain amount of integrity and truth. Factual knowledge is the pre-requisite for achieving this.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.unis.unvienna.org/mis/pressrels/2000>.

Between the Arab World and Europe, there is a long history of confrontations and exchange. Europe looks back on century-long fighting with the East, with both religious and political motivations (its crusades, its expulsion of the Spanish Arabs from Andalusia, the Islamic expansion into Europe and the battles it involved, its long colonial past in the Arab countries). Europe however, also possessed a huge heritage from the science and philosophy of the Arab world, from which it had profited throughout the Middle Ages and which traces back common roots to the old Hellenistic culture. Through this, and especially in the early colonial times, the West, embedded in its Euro-centricity, had developed a romantic idyllic view of the Orient, - not derived from real open-minded encounter with the Other but rather from a pre-fixed view of an imagined Orient, of how the East should be. Then in the course of colonial times and the early exploitation of the region, the "Orient" became the counter-image, the mirror of the West, enabling the West to shape its own identity against the Other. In the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century this world then faded into oblivion and obscurity for the general public, and even the wars of the 1960's and 1970's in the Arab World, the rising terrorist activities of the 1970's, and the oil embargo, did not thoroughly shake this apathy. It was 9/11 that forcefully and definitely changed this situation and put the Western limelight back on the Middle East.

The Arab World looks back on the same history of confrontations and exchange but from another angle and perspective: it mourns its lost domination of the world, and its highly-refined culture in the High Middle Ages which slipped into decline some hundreds of years ago. It looks back on an ever growing imbalance of power. While pride in the past is unbroken, self-confidence and self-esteem are at a low. The West never ceased to "be there" for the East. In terms of technology, military and economic power, societal development, people in the Arab world felt their backwardness and strove hard to overcome it. Colonial rule had divided the Arab World conveniently into small manageable countries, counting on patriotism as counterweight to pan-Arab nationalism. The foundation of Israel and the expulsion of the Palestinians in the aftermath of WWII added another trauma, one that - even through military putsches and after the take-over of many Arab governments by military regimes - could not be resolved. Since nationalism and socialism failed to deliver their promises of equality, justice, and freedom, the return to Islam as the true and only response to the problems was all too natural. While colonial rule had very often consolidated old patterns of local rule (whether with tribal, feudal or confessional orientation), the post-

colonial times witnessed the consolidation of a new class of rulers who - supported by the West - maintained a certain amount of “stability” in the region,- very often at the expense of national and individual freedoms. In the name of regional stability and security-oriented policies, the request of enlightened intellectuals and reformers in the Arab World to *apply* the modern notions of self-determination, independence, or more democratic structures, were ignored or suppressed.

So Islam lent itself as the better solution. Its focus on social justice promised a brighter future if only Islamic principles were seriously applied. Islamic “fundamentalists”, in their quest for authenticity claim to adhere to a tradition that goes back, unchanged, across centuries to a past perceived as the “golden age”. Tradition however, is not a static bulk of beliefs, practices and customs but is, in itself, a dynamic process, subject to steady re-interpretation, re-adaptation and even re-invention. Contrasting definitions of fundamentalism abound, but all connect it to the reaction to modernity/individuality and an apparent rejection of rationalism while at the same time accepting the (technological) advantages of modernity. As a religious response to globalization, fundamentalism, a worldwide phenomenon, tries to explain change in a simplified way and to assert the self. Exclusiveness, selectiveness, self-righteousness<sup>2</sup>, absolutism in its authority, but also a new sense of values, meaning, and hope for its followers are always parts of fundamentalist approaches to reality.

There is a clear dividing line between fundamentalism and *terrorism*: The topic is prone to clichés in public opinion in Europe, with misinformation and neglect very often leading to a simplification of the facts. In a way terrorism could be called a *strategy of communication*, with violence as its means for spreading the message, while fundamentalism usually does not engage in violence. In an interview with Abbas Beydoun, the Syrian philosopher and critic Sadiq al-Azm<sup>3</sup> compared the sympathy “normal, moderate” Muslims are feeling for the militant Islamist extremists to the sympathy the European leftists felt towards the German terrorists in the 1970’s and 1980’s. Social discontent breeds violent reactions within certain circles of society who want to escape their alienation, their feeling of helplessness, and who want to change the world in a moment’s time, taking violent “shortcut-solutions” as a desperate attempt to break out of the historical impasse instead of following the longer and harder way of negotiation and

---

<sup>2</sup> Spengler’s description of Puritanism as “religion without a smile” applies to fundamentalism, too.

<sup>3</sup> In *al-Safir*, 13.9.2002; as well in his talk at the *Orient-Institut*, 26.11.2002.



dialogue. It is not Islam, as such, that is radical and extreme, but rather that Islam - as with any other religion, ideology, or political philosophy - can be exploited and misused by radical violent forces. Talking about *ghadab Allah* (the ire of God) and impatiently rejecting contemporary politics, giving up on their society and on mainstream Islam, they have no other outlet than criticism and despair, or else withdrawal and acknowledgment of defeat. Samuel Huntington's reduction of civilization=culture and culture=religion and religion=archetypal constant, is in full concordance with the Islamists' worldview who follow the same logic. A speculative discourse about the relation between terrorism, nowadays fashionably called "jihadism", and the "Islamic movements", - which include the whole spectrum of "political" Islam, "fundamentalist" Islam, and "revivalist" Islam - has willfully drawn connections that remain unverified. The ambiguity of the term "terrorism"<sup>4</sup> offers a chance to label different acts and different organizations as "terrorist", and the American-led "war on terror" provides Arab governments with pretexts of cracking down on their own critics and dissidents<sup>5</sup>.

Now that colonial rule seems to be re-introduced, "democratization" of the Middle East is the new slogan. A process that took the Western world hundreds of years, bloody wars, painful experiences and - most important - all that without outside interference, cannot simply be exported; it has to grow and take roots. The "overstretch" of the word democracy in Western politics has led to ambivalent perceptions of this term in the Arab world, revealing an immense magnitude of contrasting interpretations: A popular reaction in the region is to refuse the term straight-out as a Western-borrowed term indicating a purely Western historical development. There are attempts at vilifying "democracy" as a kind of Western enforcement of a totally alien concept on non-Western people. Other reactions argue in the opposite direction: that a kind of democracy was already being lived and practiced by early Islam, quoting the principle of *shura* and the first "*constitution of Medina*", and the only thing left to do now is to establish a truly Islamic democracy.

Arab and Islamic reformers, human rights activists and intellectuals are the real agents of change who have to be involved and drawn to participation, be it by

---

<sup>4</sup> While the first proposal for unifying the diverging meanings of the term "terrorism" was submitted to the League of Nations as early as 1937, it never came about. Until now, the UN has not yet agreed on a common definition. Efforts to end this impasse are undertaken; see the website: [http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism\\_definitions.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html).

<sup>5</sup> See the *Arab Human Development Report 2004*, where the authors reach this conclusion.



their governments or by Western decision-makers. Any attempt from the “West” to induce change from outside without consulting those voices is doomed to failure, the latest example being the “Greater Middle East Initiative” in early 2004 when it was leaked to the London-based Arabic newspaper *al-Hayat*.<sup>6</sup> It led to angry reactions from all sides of the spectrum, not because of the content but because the initiators neglected to consult with Arabs, themselves, and because the centrality of the problem of Israel was not acknowledged. Only change brought about from within will produce a “sense of ownership”.

The texts in this book are a collection of talks, held at the German *Orient-Institut* in Beirut<sup>7</sup> in the year 2002. Within the framework of a series of talks called *East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet...?*<sup>8</sup>, *Challenges of Dialogue*, lecturers from the Arab world and Europe participated<sup>9</sup> and exchanged

---

<sup>6</sup> *Al-Hayat*, 13.2.2004.

<sup>7</sup> In Lebanon, dialogue in its myriad of forms has always been a kind of “business”, promoted by various official and civil society actors. The most recent work on this subject is the doctoral thesis of Anne Françoise Weber: «*On peut dialoguer sans vivre ensemble, et on peut vivre ensemble sans dialoguer*». *Relations interreligieuses et construction d'une unité nationale au Liban*. Unpublished PhD-thesis, Freiburg i.Br./EHESS, 2005.

<sup>8</sup> Rudyard Kipling's verse is one of the most widely quoted verses in English literary history. Its conciseness and apparent message makes it a subject of very controversial discussions about Kipling's alleged racism and arrogance towards the people of the “East”. The verse does not end just like this but the following lines run: *Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great Judgment Seat / But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth / When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they come from the ends of the earth!* It is clear that Kipling did not seek to belittle “Eastern” culture and civilization (whatever it may have meant at his time) but, to the contrary, that he stresses the equality of men, the individuality of each, from wherever they may be. It is very remarkable that these end-lines are much less often quoted or even known, and with a bit of bad will one might suggest that the reason for this omission or negligence lies in the fact that the audience selected what suited them most, their fears and their attitudes. So, in a way the verse chosen as motto of the series symbolizes in a very provocative manner what dialogue is all about: (mis)conceptions, (mis)perceptions, and what we *think* we understood.

<sup>9</sup> The original schedule had 14 talks and a one-day-conference, financed by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Lebanon with 10 participants.

*Perspectives of Dialogue after September 11*; Friedemann Büttner, Freie Universität Berlin

*Translating God: Fundamentalism in the Great Religions*; John Donohue, Université Saint Joseph Beirut

*Muslims in Germany between Qur'an and Constitution: Religious Freedom within the German Legal Order*; Mathias Rohe, Erlangen Universität

*Fundamentalism versus Orthodoxy in Contemporary Islam*; Ridwan al-Sayyid, Maqasid Beirut  
*Stereotypes of Muslims / Arabs in the US - Perspectives and Implications*; Sami Ofeish,

views on their perceptions of each other. A clear commitment to dialogue and constructive engagement was given by all the participants.

The main subject of the talks is the perception of the Other: in culture, religion, and politics. The themes are arranged into three sections: cultural dialogue, religious dialogue with an additional focus on Euro-Islam, and political dialogue, although they may overlap in some instances. In the first section Ghassan Salameh renders a useful definition of dialogue, which is why it is put at the very beginning, followed by Abbas Beydoun who philosophizes on the nature of dialogue and the schism created by the Us/Them-mentality. Abdo Abboud shares some interesting thoughts on literature as means of achieving understanding and compassionate appreciation of the other. Knowing the other through literature is certainly an underestimated and neglected fundamental.

The second section of religious dialogue is the longest one, with contributions covering the role of Islam in different societies. Two texts try to come to terms

Balamand University

*Literary Indicators for the "Dialogue of Civilizations": Defining the Role of Literature therein;* Abdo Abboud, Damascus University (in Arabic)

*Intellectuals in the Arab World Today - Problems and Perspectives;* Elias Khoury, *al-Nahar* Beirut  
*Tolerance on Trial - Violence and Co-existence in Indonesia;* Theodor Hanf, Bergstraesser Institut Freiburg / UNESCO International Centre for Human Sciences, Jubayl

*The West and Us;* Abbas Beydoun, *al-Safir* Beirut (in Arabic)

*Some Thoughts on Islam, Terrorism and the West Today;* Sadiq al-Azm, Damascus University

*Islamic Movements and Terrorism: Myth and Reality;* Saoud al-Mawla, Lebanese University Beirut  
*East and West: Reversing the Paradigm. An Answer to the US Intellectuals' Open Letter "What we're fighting for";* Chibli Mallat, Université Saint Joseph / Mallat Law Offices

*Islam and Muslims in Denmark and Europe: from silent migrants to active citizens;* Jørgen Bæk Simonsen, Danish Institute Damascus

*Encountering Muslim Culture in Germany;* Jamal Malik, Erfurt Universität

Conference: *Neither East nor West - 3 case-studies:*

Keynote speech by Ghassan Salameh, Minister of Culture

Political Dialogue: *The Involvement of European Foreign Policy in the Middle East,* Volker Perthes, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik, Berlin,

Discussant: Fadia Kiwan, Université Saint Joseph, Beirut.

Religious Dialogue: *Unwavering Designation, Contradictory Processes - The Changing Role of "Islam" in the Interior Politics of the Turkish Republic,* Günter Seufert, Berliner Zeitung, Istanbul,  
Discussant: Muhammad Noureddine, Center for Strategic Studies, Research and Documentation, Beirut.

Inter-Religious dialogue: *Neither East nor West: Inter-religious Dialogue and Local Politics in the Age of Globalization* (Lebanon), Thomas Scheffler, Freie Universität Berlin,  
Discussant: Farid al-Khazen, American University of Beirut.

with fundamentalism, a term widely used with great emotion and conviction, but with a very opaque notion of what it really means, lacking a clear-cut definition. John Donohue analyzes fundamentalism in the three world religions, depicting it as the search for identity in a changing world and the return to the roots. In the Islamic context, Ridwan al-Sayyid describes the difference between fundamentalism and orthodoxy, traditionalism in Islam, trying to clarify the confusion of terminology<sup>10</sup>. The fine dividing line between a fundamentalist and a traditional approach to one's religious roots is when religious tradition is transformed into a political ideology that claims absolute truth and, in consequence, power.

Thomas Scheffler focuses on the special relationship between the religions in Lebanon with its long tradition of conflict and co-existence. He describes the difficulties encountered when shaping national policy. The East and West-schism does not seem to be applicable in religion since both Christianity and Islam are universal religions with global reach. It is the new impact of globalization that now defines and influences politics and religion. So how resolve the dilemma that while economic globalization provokes a new kind of "global ethics" the old patterns of inter-religious rivalries still persist or get even more powerful?

The experiments in Turkey with new forms of "democratic Islamism" could serve as models to be emulated by other states. Turkey, the only state in the Middle East that has followed a strict and uncompromising secular agenda, was shaped by Atatürk some 80 years ago who promoted a fierce Turkish nationalism, abolished the caliphate, and introduced secularism: he forbade the veil for women, the *fez* for the men, and changed the alphabet from Arabic to Latin letters. Turkey now is facing a political opposition from a new variation of Islamist thinking that integrates democratic and free-market values in its discourse. Günter Seufert analyzes the role of political Islam, its ambivalent connection to the Turkish state and the dialogue arising from this conflict, while Muhammad Nouredine responds to it.

---

<sup>10</sup> In Arabic, the confusion of terms is even more virulent. The literal translation from the English fundamentalism, *uṣūliyyah*, is usually dismissed as this term already denotes another meaning, the Uṣūlī school of thinking of the Middle Ages. A better option is the term *salafīyyah* which originally applied to the reformers at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and which now indicates Sunni extremists; - it is rendered as the "Neo-Salafīyyah" in Western literature. Muslims who are commonly brandished "fundamentalists" prefer to see themselves as part of *al-ḥarakāt al-islāmiyyah* (Islamist/Islamic movements) which seems to me the most neutral and thus the best term; - or, by another translation from Western languages, as *al-Islām al-siyāsī* (political Islam).

Three articles address the phenomenon of so-called “Euro-Islam”, the Muslim experience in Europe. This term, which is disliked in much of the Muslim world<sup>11</sup>, means the way Islam takes form in the European cultural and societal ambience. In absence of a better term this word indicates the possibilities that Muslims in Western societies have at their disposal for expressing their growing self-awareness, - independent from the religious and political developments in their home-countries. In the attempt of overcoming their marginalization Muslims in Europe are facing the dilemma of identity: of choosing between total adaptation and assimilation or an authentic healthy integration in Western societies.

Jørgen Bæk Simonsen analyses the Danish situation within the complex European context, and the shift of perception in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generations of Muslims migrants while Jamal Malik concentrates in his talk on the encounters between a Muslim minority and an overwhelming secular majority in Germany. Unlike France or Britain, Germany has no colonial past, and its Muslim minority does not consist of members from former colonies. The 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of Turks born in Germany, grew up there and mostly know their home-country Turkey only from some short vacations, - but they do not automatically possess German nationality. The question is how to integrate them into German society without them losing their identity, religion, cultural background; requiring a new process of self-discovery, on both sides. It is in these terms that Muslims are organizing themselves, trying to find some sort of legal framework into which to blend and within which they can express themselves. Problems which may arise for a Muslim believer in living in a secular European surrounding mostly touch daily-life-issues, like *halāl*-slaughtering, wearing the *hijāb* etc. The most outstanding and controversially discussed issue however, is the question of religious teachings of Islam at German schools. Dialogue in this context is an intra-national affair, a dialogue within a given society between members of different religious and cultural background.

Mathias Rohe presents an analysis of the German legal system and the place it allows for Islam. In sharp contrast to France, the German Constitution follows the principle of *religious neutrality*, not of laicity. Within this principle of religious

---

<sup>11</sup> The objections to this term seem to stem from fears of loss of identity, of an absolute adaptation and acceptance of the European way of life, ignoring the positive connotations inherent in the term of equal participation of Muslims in the multi-cultural societies of Europe. See e.g. the interview with Wolfgang Thierse in *Der Spiegel*, 23.12.2001.

neutrality the constitution states the freedom of faith and the equality between all religious groups, claiming religious freedom as a basic human right. In a pluralistic society like Germany all major religious groups - including the Muslims - have the legal right for institutionalized representation. This right is in itself an offer and a challenge for Muslims, as they will have to find their own unique way, unprecedented before in their own tradition and in their home-countries, to be represented in German society and to have their fair share in participating in public life within a peaceful co-existence.

In the third section (political dialogue) Chibli Mallat presents his Open Letter<sup>12</sup> as response to the Open Letter “*What we are fighting for*”<sup>13</sup> by some American intellectuals. In this text which appeared in Feb. 2002, signed by some US intellectuals among them S. Huntington and F. Fukuyama, the signatories agree on a certain definition of justice and a “just war”, basing their opinion on moral principles. The letter legitimizes war, explaining why, ethically and morally, it is not only allowed but required for a democratic peace-loving and peace-promoting country like the US to go to “war on terror”. This letter has triggered a “dialogue” and an exchange over the summer 2002, with responses by Germans,<sup>14</sup> Saudis,<sup>15</sup> and other Americans.<sup>16</sup> The German response shows a totally different way of thinking. The concepts directly derived from the moral discourse of justice like “good and evil”, of classifying whole nations as “bad” (rogue states), certainly is not part of the European political discourse. The Saudi response is rather apologetic, claiming the huge impact of US foreign policy and double standards as root causes to the problem of worldwide terrorism and extremism. But while both the Saudis and the US agree on the notion of “justice”, - without ever providing a clear definition of the term, - the Germans understand justice as a noble virtue, a philosophical and moral principle, but not as a political category. This debate has evoked another inner-American response as well, intellectuals who refuse the Manichean language of good and evil of the current US administration. They

---

<sup>12</sup> An Arabic translation of the talk appeared later on in the Beirut daily *al-Nahar*, 27.1.2003. His open letter triggered an activist initiative of collecting signatures to support it.

<sup>13</sup> See <http://www.americanvalues.org>, 12.2.2002.

<sup>14</sup> Originally published in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2.5.2002; for the English text refer to: [www.americanvalues.org/html/german\\_statement.html](http://www.americanvalues.org/html/german_statement.html).

<sup>15</sup> See [http://www.americanvalues.org/html/saudi\\_statement.html](http://www.americanvalues.org/html/saudi_statement.html), originally published under the title: *How we can coexist* in the site [www.islamtoday.net/english/showme2.cfm](http://www.islamtoday.net/english/showme2.cfm).

<sup>16</sup> See [http://www.americanvalues.org/html/us\\_letter\\_to\\_europeans.html](http://www.americanvalues.org/html/us_letter_to_europeans.html), 29.5.2002.



confirm that 9/11 is not the result of a rejection of American/Western “values” but rather a rejection of US influence politically and economically and the result of the US failure to promote those cherished values abroad.

Volker Perthes highlights the possibilities and the limits of a common foreign policy of the European Union, stressing the fact that European credibility in the Middle East will depend on the EU’s ability to reach a just settlement in the Arab/Israeli conflict. Europe has been making a concerted effort not only for economic but for political union as well. This is quite unprecedented in the history of Europe which for centuries has been characterized by inter-(and extra)European wars and struggles for domination. So now the formulation of a common foreign policy especially towards the Southern Mediterranean neighbors is a new and promising step. Fadia Kiwan responds to this view and criticizes the timidity of the European approach, urging the EU to behave boldly and more independently.



This book is meant to be a small contribution to the rising tide of dialogue. “Dialogue of civilizations” is not about exporting the Western secular, individualist models of society and democracy, but rather about allowing others to find their own forms of political rule and their own way of life. It is not about denying blame and victimizing oneself, but of being ready to admit shortcomings, to study the Other *and* oneself, and to interconnect with the Other. Its aim is peaceful coexistence, and its precondition equality and partnership, critique and self-critique, insight and change. Written before the 2003 US-invasion of Iraq, this book still catches the growing tension of the prelude to war. If communication and dialogue had been given a chance in the build-up to war, the outcome might have been very different.