

ENRIQUE BANÚS

THE ART OF INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE

ABSTRACT

Enthusiasm for intercultural dialogue is given: conferences and symposia praise it as a key concept for the pacific coexistence in societies which are becoming more and more multicultural and in a globalising world. But intercultural dialogue, if it shall be effective, has to be held «on the street», by the «common» citizen, who is experiencing alterity in his/her daily life and who has to react seeing in it not a problem or a threat but an enrichment. It has not to be forgotten that intercultural dialogue supposes a change of paradigm: in fact, we are used to experiencing/confirming «our» (collective) identity in antagonism to «the other». Moreover, the view we have of «the other» is marked by images and stereotypes, which makes difficult the open encounter. In a certain sense, intercultural dialogue is an art which has to be learned. Therefore, education to intercultural dialogue plays a very relevant role.

THE ENTHUSIASM FOR INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE

Enthusiasm for intercultural dialogue is given: Google shows it without any doubt: 557,000 documents were found on 26 August, at 6.40 pm, when looking for intercultural dialogue – whereas the Library of Congress offers only 3 books with this word combination in the title; 9 offers the British Library (two of them linked with environmental issues). We will come back to this surprising gap between internet and the world most relevant libraries. But, looking at internet, no doubt is permitted: a certain enthusiasm for

intercultural dialogue is given; its presence in the new agora is relevant, although not comparable with «nationalism», «national identity» or also «cultural identity», which achieve several millions¹.

On the first places of the intercultural dialogue list you find very honourable webs: the UNESCO is there, opening the dance, and well accompanied by the European Union, the Council of Europe, the Spanish Ministry of Culture, the Food and Agriculture Organisation of UN: very worthy partners in a project, which seems decisive for nowadays world. The web offers clear evidences for the high appreciation of intercultural dialogue: «In an increasingly globalised and interdependent world, where encountering cultural difference can scarcely be avoided, the ability to enter into a tolerant and respectful dialogue is a vital skill for nations, communities, and individuals» – is said in the page of the International Association of Universities, which is linked to UNESCO². As so many others, the Council of Europe does see a connection between intercultural dialogue and conflict prevention and «post-conflict social reconciliation»³. «Intercultural dialogue is intimately linked to the fundamental ambition underlying the construction of Europe, namely to bring together the peoples of Europe» – argues the European Commission in its proposal for the establishment in 2008 of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue⁴.

It seems that – quoting a maybe malicious web from Hungary – «The intercultural dialogue machinery has been set in motion»⁵.

FROM THE TRAVEL LITERATURE TO DAILY LIFE

In front of so extended enthusiasm, the temptation to play the role of the *advocatus diaboli* is given, bringing to the fore the limits and difficulties for intercultural dialogue. But intercultural dialogue is a «must», and, therefore, we have to reflect also about these issues if we would not to realise it only in special events organised or encouraged by international organisations, States or civic society bodies.

In the 18th and 19th century, travel literature was extremely popular – so popular that also authors who never had visited the «travelled» countries were writing «travel journals»⁶. Society was fascinated by the description of «exotic» encounters with «the others», with different cultures, far away from daily life. Nowadays, the encounter with the multiplicity of cultures doesn't need the

literature: it happens in daily life, in the normal environment in which citizens are living their life. The world has become closer, and former «exotic» human beings are now citizens in the same urban spaces. Therefore, under the precondition of avoiding «ghettoisation»⁷, many intercultural encounters are given in daily life, on the street, the market⁸ and the supermarket, the school, the sport clubs, all the places in the city in which people convene and develop their professional, social, cultural and family life. All these situations of daily life can be transformed (or even not) in intercultural dialogue, all these situations we have thousandfold automatically when we go out from our house, walk (or drive) through the city, buy the newspaper, drink a coffee, etc. Here are two major questions arisen:

1. It is obvious that not all the intercultural encounters are intercultural dialogues or, at least, that kind of intercultural dialogues that contributes to form inclusive societies (the plural is deliberate, because every human being is member of different societies); the question is how to guarantee that the encounters become dialogues, and that the dialogues contribute to create inclusive societies? And this referred to all this richness of the daily life in which ways are crossing and the city's squares and places are functioning as «catalyst» for the encounters.

2. The organised intercultural dialogue is able to convoke those wanting – more or less – to establish an intercultural dialogue, which means, having a positive, at least an open attitude towards «the other», wanting to listen to them or – more often – to tell about their situation, to induce comprehension. These are often citizens organised in the frame of what we call «civic society». But we have to be aware that «civic society» is in no case identical with «society». There are thousands of citizens not organised in the ways we consider representative for the «civic society». And some of them want not to establish an intercultural dialogue or are rejecting it explicitly, because, for instance, they fear it could influence negatively their «cultural identity»⁹. It is in that circle in which conflicts and problems can emerge which can destabilise a society or parts of it. So the question is how to involve in intercultural dialogue citizens (and groups) refusing it? The answer is definitely very complex. But it is evident that also these citizens enter (except in case of absolute closeness in their «ghetto») in intercultural encounters, again in the squares and places, in the urban transports, etc. What the organised events could not realise, it is realised in daily life. But – again – what

are the conditions for guaranteeing that contacts become communication, communication dialogue, and dialogue stresses the networks of comprehension which form a really human society?

Probably, education is the only key for creating «experts in daily life intercultural dialogue». It would be great if all the well meaning citizens (all citizens being open for dialogue with citizens with a different cultural background) could be «ambassadors of intercultural dialogue». Of course, this is a utopia, but education could help to reinforce the (sometimes naturally given) capacity to overcome distances, to build bridges. And to abolish attitudes which create or amplify distance, that destroy bridges. The encounter is inevitable, and in every encounter there is communication, expression of the inner world, of the attitude towards the other. Indeed, this is manifested not only verbally but in the different languages we automatically use in every encounter: with the face, the reaction, the gesture, the way we look. Before the first word is said, a inner world is been exteriorised, transmitted to the other.

If democracy means «rule by the people», such a rich presence of (casual) intercultural dialogues would really be an essentially democratic part of social life. The proposal to work «on the street» is, therefore, not only caused by pragmatic considerations – for example, the conviction that the institutionalised intercultural dialogue is not enough – but by the desire to establish a profound link between this dialogue and the democracy.

THE REALITY OF INTERCULTURAL ENCOUNTERS

In a certain sense, every contact is an intercultural contact – because culture is essentially linked to the human being. Culture is not only a human right, but a natural element of human life: on a natural way, we react culturally to the challenges of life, we ask questions, we want to know reasons, to avoid the *horror vacui*, we try to express love and hate, fear and joy, admiration and surprise. And all this is culture, the «cultural world» of everyone, a «cultural world» made by a very complex – a very rich – mixture of elements, coming from different traditions and from our own way of life, our own biography. The «cultural world» is a very personal one. But with the different languages we are able to communicate parts of this cultural world; moreover, what all we do, we say, but also remaining silent we

are communicating a part of the «cultural world», codified in our behaviour. We are always living in a space of communication, the space of normal social life, which is made by the net of messages we are sending and receiving, we are coding and decoding. And because we are carrying our «cultural world» with us, all these messages are cultural messages, and all the dialogues are intercultural dialogues.

In daily life we have contacts with other human beings, here and there, «on the street». And we experience that, in that contacts, our «cultural world» is meeting other «cultural worlds». And there a fullness of communications is established: greetings, looks, conversations. These contacts are sometimes more cordial, sometimes cool, according to the part of the space everyone shares with this concrete «other».

DIALOGUE AS AN ART

From encounter to communication, from communication to dialogue: this could be the program for transforming the city in a space of inclusiveness. For getting this a clear conscience about the difficulties is needed.

For example: there is not always an exact correspondence between codification and decoding, because the sent messages are not always univocal, they are open, they allow different interpretations¹⁰. And the receptor is decoding from his or her position, «Sitz im Leben»¹¹, with prejudices and experiences which can facilitate or complicate the encounter or also hinder it completely. A part of these prejudices is also the image one has in his or her mental world from «the other», according to the history which lies behind the present encounter, the history of previous encounters and according to the story in which you, in your mental world, have included this history: because in the mental world only the stories are living, not the history. And these stories (which we erroneously identify with the history) are creating – positive or negative – prejudices which are activated in every new contact, in every new conversation or rejection of the dialogue, looking to the opposite part of the square or greeting with a frozen handshake and a courtesy smile. Expectations are configuring the reality.

But we experience also on the places and squares that some people are going out like us, are walking (or driving) like us, are buying the

same newspapers as we do and drinking coffee like us. Others are doing the same things in a different manner or are doing different things: are buying other newspapers or not drinking coffee. We experience feelings of familiarity or of strangeness and – linked with them – maybe of acceptance or rejection. The overcoming of the distance becomes on that way another key question for converting encounters in dialogue. But dialogue always has a hermeneutic structure, a structure in which perceptions and expectations are intertwined, are continuously mixing together, and are interacting. Therefore, clearness about the own prejudices towards «the other» is a decisive exercise for learning the art of dialogue.

This is at the end the inner structure – a complex structure – of intercultural dialogue. Indeed, sometimes the sensation of strangeness dominates, the perception of distance is not carrying to overcome it, but to maintain or even amplify it; there are situations in which prejudices are not a starting point but an immovable fix point, which can be confirmed again and again¹² – and with each «confirmation» the prejudice is growing, and the incapacity to perceive the real messages is dying under the burden of the prejudices. This is the *circulus vitiosus*, the vicious circle, which describes brilliantly the Swiss writer Max Frisch in a short text under the title: *Du sollst Dir kein Bildnis machen!*, actually a recording in his *Diary*. The image we have in mind is according to Frisch the end of the always open communication, the end of the disposition to react to the other's transformations, in the idea, that transformations are not possible: «Der Mensch (ist) fertig für uns», Frisch wrote.¹³

But the result of the encounter, and even of the prejudices and the distance, is not predetermined: human freedom, the willingness to establish dialogue is able to move expectations and prejudices. In the cases in which strangeness, prejudices, distance predominate, in that cases the automatic non-encounter has to be substituted or at least complemented not only by transmitting the art of dialogue, but also by creating the willingness to overcome distance.

A CHANGE OF PARADIGM?

Intercultural dialogue is maybe not only an art, but also a change of paradigm, because it means to overcome the normal procedures, the normal strategies for mental survival in a complex world.

For example: the continuous openness can create insecurity: it seems that we need some fix points, that we are unable to live in a world in which *panta rhei*. In front of other human beings «fix points» are necessary not only when there is a willingness to dominate them or also a (maybe professional) need to examine them. Prejudices are in a certain sense necessary, for not being forced to begin again and again starting from zero, but as necessary as the prejudices is the attitude to examine continuously the prejudices according to the permanent flow of information, of contacts, of dialogue. Because between «fix points» and «closeness» there is a huge difference.

On the other side, we are used to experiencing/confirming «our» (collective) identity in antagonism to «the other». This is a very common procedure to experience collective identity: the inhabitants of any two small neighbour villages commonly recognised themselves as member of *this* village by differentiation from the neighbour, from the member of *the other* village. The supremacy of the state in modern Europe has suggested that the collective identity *par excellence* was the national identity, and to this identity also the scheme of the simple differentiation between «us» and «the others» has been applied.

The European integration project after WW II was an attempt (relatively successful till nowadays) to show that «the other» is not the antagonist of «us», but a necessary partner in some issues, which are mixed with other issues in which «the other» is a competitor. The balance between these two roles, between issues in which individual interests dominate and issues in which common interests are stronger is given in a permanent dialogue, in never ending multilevel negotiations. In a certain sense, this political project could be a model of how to bring to the fore the common interests without losing one's own identity and interests. In fact, the main reason for the closeness to the dialogue, for adhering to the prejudices, and even for the resistance against influences and dialogue is the fear that «the other» supposes a threat for the own identity.

IDENTITY AND DIALOGUE

Intercultural dialogue is in this sense a change of paradigm, the recognition that «the other» is not only a threatening antagonist, but

a necessary complement; in the dialogue the identity is experienced, precisely in the capacity to establish a dialogue everyone is realising his or her «being himself or herself» – and, of course, he or she is clarifying his or her thoughts when expressing them to «the other» (was not Kleist who spoke about «Die allmähliche Verfertigung der Gedanken beim Reden»? – «The Gradual Formulation of Thoughts while Speaking» is the common translation, but I think Kleist is referring not only to the formulation but also to the formation of the thoughts while speaking¹⁴). If the thesis is correct, the distance to the interlocutor will force me to a greater clarification of my thoughts, in order to overcome the distance (taking into account that the distance is the main hermeneutic problem, the problem also that creates most of the divergences between codification and decoding of a message). Intercultural dialogue is a very useful exercise also even in an egoistic sense, in the effort of better understanding myself!

All the mentioned tendencies of seeing antagonisms between «identity» and «alterity» are paradoxically reinforced in societies, like nowadays, in which the dominant presence of the state is crumbling away¹⁵, with (partially strong) regional/national movements within the states and with a globalisation and interrelation which also diminish the state's power. Moreover, the societies are also becoming diverse in themselves, in their inner structure: squares and places are not only «ours», but reflect the world plurality. The local level is approaching the global level. This can create uncertainty, and new forms of collective identity have become popular – so that aforementioned «cultural identity», which seems to forget that «culture» is at first a personal right and a personal quality, and sometimes gives priority to the constituency of the group and not to the personal realisation of a human being¹⁶.

But this tendency to look for newer forms of collective identity is the expression of the need for «feeling of belonging»¹⁷ in a world which is sometimes like a family feast being visited not only by family members coming from close or far regions, but having something in common, common stories which can be evoked together. At the family feast now there are «others», the parents of the bride, with which apparently there is no other connection than the caprice of one family member to fall in love with a girl coming from far away.

But also in that situation, if the participants are patient and do find a common language, little by little communication not only

starts but becomes richer and richer, because common elements are discovered, and, on the other hand, the «new world», which is presented by the interlocutor, is experienced not only as exotic, but also as fascinating – if you are willing to be fascinated and have not installed yourself in the permanent shake of the head as sign of disapproval. Here again, openness or narrow-mindedness are strongly connected with the educational process, the education to intercultural dialogue, which is also an education of the capacity to discover that «alles Menschen gewesen sind» – as Goethe wrote¹⁸. It is the discovery, in the different forms of expression, of what is common to the human being¹⁹. The experience of «otherness» as threatening or enriching ourselves can also be educated, is submitted not to the logic of determinism but of human freedom.

Education has been mentioned several times. And probably it is time to recognise that the formal education, at school, plays an eminent role in developing the consciousness of the need of overcoming mental borders and establishing dialogue and in creating «experts in daily life intercultural dialogue». But at the same time it has to be underlined that formal education is not enough. The family is influencing the young citizens in a time in which they are not aware that the vision of the world which is transmitted there is not the world itself but only one vision of it – of the many different existing ones. Often there can be also a contradiction between messages received by the young citizens at school and those received at home – this dichotomy can cause inner trouble and deactivate the positive messages coming from the «official education». Later on, the group of friends will influence considerably the opinions and attitudes. So, all the educating instances have to be involved in the atmosphere of creating a positive environment for intercultural dialogue. And this, again, can be realised only «on the street», in the encounters which are inevitable. Some families, some groups are not accessible for the state's action nor for the organised civic society, but only for the casual encounters.

THE DISCOVERY OF A LITTLE PRINCE

It has to be transmitted the insight that the world of the other can enrich my world. In Antoine de Saint Exupéry's *Le Petit Prince* the desperate little prince, coming from another star to the earth, meets

the fox. And the fox becomes his master for discovering what means friendship, what means to discover another world. At the end, when the prince has to go back to his planet, the fox shows him in which way this friendship has opened new insights of its own world: parts of the world that had no sense now have become relevant: «You see the grain-fields down yonder? I do not eat bread. Wheat is of no use to me. The wheat fields have nothing to say to me. And that is sad. But you have hair that is the color of gold. Think how wonderful that will be when you have tamed me! The grain, which is also golden, will bring me back the thought of you. And I shall love to listen to the wind in the wheat [...]»²⁰.

The only problem is that we are not living in the world of the little Prince, as created by Saint-Exupéry, but in the real world, in which recent experiences show that also apparently successful politics of inclusion can mask extremely dangerous situations of mental and moral distance to the including society. In fact, *naïveté* seems not the adequate attitude in the complex world we have to deal with. The «deliberative democracy» is a high appreciated value nowadays²¹; another quality of democracy, which has been developed mainly in post-war Germany and after the experiences in the Republic of Weimar, could be evoked here: the «wehrhafte Demokratie»²², a democracy which is able to recognise the risks for freedom and democracy and to react in front of them, a democracy in which the state has the capacity to react²³ – but this is probably today the less interesting dimension of this concept. More relevant is the education of the citizens for being able to maintain the difficult balance between openness and recognition of the founding values – one of the most fascinating chapters in a democracy.

Intercultural dialogue seems to suggest that culture is always and every time a positive manifestation of the human spirit. After the 20th century with its Auschwitzs and Gulags a naive exaltation of culture and also of dialogue is no more possible. The culture includes the best and the worst made by the human being – and all that what lies between the best and the worst. Part of the education to intercultural dialogue is also the transmission of the necessary critical sense to avoid cultural relativism and to combine tolerance (which is often praised) and intolerance (which is often denigrated²⁴): intolerance with the Auschwitzs and Gulags in the heads and the hearts.

Let us come back to the beginning of this presentation: a lot of

web pages, but only a handful of books²⁵ – what does it mean? Probably, that we are dealing with a relatively new phenomenon, a very vivid part of social life, but for which it is very difficult to establish consolidated knowledge. In this floating situation a pragmatic approach («let us do Intercultural Dialogue, do not complicate things too much!») is not enough: simplification could actually make things worst, provoking negative reactions precisely under the members of society who are not open for dialogue and who seen in simplification a confirmation of the prejudices.

The richness of intercultural dialogue is a challenge for the whole society.

¹ This method to determine the social presence of some issue is obviously very imperfect. According to this method «Ethnocentrism» (with 660,000 entrances) would have more presence than intercultural dialogue, which is more present than «cultural resistance» (213,000). Of course, an «all time's classic» like the «nation-state» seems unbeatable, with 4,660,000 documents. But, not – «nationalism» is more than three times present in the web: 14,100,000 documents! «Alterity», with 372,000 cannot compete with «identity» (239,000,000).

² See www.unesco.org/iau/id/index.html.

³ See www.coe.int/t/e/cultural_co-operation/culture/action/Dialogue/.

⁴ Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008) (presented by the Commission), Document [SEC(2005) 1202], available at http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2005/com_2005_0467en_01.pdf.

⁵ «The Budapest Observatory»: Memo July 2006, available at www.budobs.org/news/memo/memo-july-2006.html; consulted on 27 June 2006.

⁶ This time has been described as «Zeit des Reisens und des Reiseschrifttums» (H.-J. Lope, *Der Reiz des Fremden*, in *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, vol. 16, Wiesbaden, Aulma, 1985, p. 620).

⁷ See the paper of Léonce Bekemans in this volume.

⁸ Maybe it is useful to evoke that the European integration has been realised supported by the idea that an open market can create contacts, dialogues, can help to overcome prejudices and to establish new relations among the peoples.

⁹ To this concept and some scepticism in front of it see: E. Banús and D. Ruiz, «*Cultural Identity*» - *A Myth?*, in «*Culturelink*», n. 29, 2003, pp. 99-110.

¹⁰ The open character of the literary text is a common place in theory of reception. «A text – so Roman Ingarden – contents “places of indeterminacy! that are read in different manners by the different readers» (see R. Ingarden, *Das literarische Kunstwerk: Eine Untersuchung aus dem Grenzgebiet des Ontologie, Logik und Literaturwissenschaft*, Halle, Niemeyer, 1931 and W. Iser, *Die Appellstruktur der Texte. Unbestimmtheit als Wirkungsbedingung literarischer Prosa*, Konstanz, Druckerei und Verlagsanstalt Konstanz Universitätsverlag, 1970). Probably, this theory can be applied also to other forms of human communication.

¹¹ To the conditions of decoding see H.-R. Jauss, *La historia de la literatura como provocación*, Barcelona, Península, 2000, pp. 163-166; *El lector como instancia de una nueva historia de la literatura*, in J.A. Mayoral (ed.), *Estética de la recepción*, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 1987, p. 74, and *La Ifigenia de Goethe y la de Racine. Con un epílogo sobre el carácter parcial*

de la estética de la recepción, in R. Warning (ed.), *Estética de la recepción*, Madrid, Arco/Libros, 1989, pp. 243 and 248.

¹² Ernst Gombrich has impressively described this possibility when he comments: «Was man den hermeneutischen Zirkel genannt hat, die Suche nach Erhärtung der ursprünglichen Intuition, wird dort, wo nur vermeintliche Bestätigungen gelten dürfen, zu einem ganz gewöhnlichen Zirkelschluß» (E. Gombrich, «Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen». *Zum Kulturrelativismus in den Geisteswissenschaften*, in A. Schöne (ed.), *Kontroversen, alte und neue. Akten des VII. Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses*, Göttingen, Niemeyer, 1985, Bd 4, Tübingen, p. 22).

¹³ *Du sollst Dir kein Bildnis machen*, in *Tagebuch 1946-1949*, Frankfurt/M., Suhrkamp, 1950, pp. 31-34: «Unsere Meinung, dass wir das andere kennen, ist das Ende der Liebe, jedes Mal, aber Ursache und Wirkung liegen vielleicht anders, als wir anzunehmen versucht sind – nicht weil wir das andere kennen, geht unsere Liebe zu Ende, sondern umgekehrt: weil unsere Liebe zu Ende geht, weil ihre Kraft sich erschöpft hat, darum ist der Mensch fertig für uns. Er muss es sein. Wir können nicht mehr! Wir kündigen ihm die Bereitschaft, auf weitere Verwandlungen einzugehen. Wir verweigern ihm den Anspruch alles Lebendigen, das unfassbar bleibt».

¹⁴ See as an argument in favour of my theses the following Kleist sentence: «Ich glaube, daß mancher großer Redner, in dem Augenblick, da er den Mund aufmachte, noch nicht wußte, was er sagen würde».

¹⁵ It is inevitable to quote in this context B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso, 1983.

¹⁶ To the possible conflict between «cultural identity» and the human rights see E. Banús and D. Ruiz, *Seeing Utopia or: Is dialogue between cultures possible?*, in *Differentiation and Integration of Worldviews: Existential and Historical Experience*, «EIDOS», n. 20, 2004, pp. 64-84.

¹⁷ Who would be able to translate the German term «Geborgenheit», which would be here the most adequate?

¹⁸ «“Was hat dich nur von uns entfernt?” / Hab’ immer den Plutarch gelesen. / “Was hast du denn dabei gelernt?” / Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen» (J.W. von Goethe, *Zahme Xenien*, in *Sämtliche Werke. Jubiläumsausgabe in 40 Bänden*, Stuttgart, Cotta, 1902-1907, vol. 4, p. 73). Ernst Gombrich wrote an excellent comment of this poem in the quoted article.

¹⁹ See Johann Gottfried Herder’s words: «Wie nun der Wanderer kein süßeres Vergnügen hat, als wenn er allenthalben, auch wo ers nicht vermuthete, Spuren eines ihm ähnlich, denkenden, empfindenden Genius gewahr wird: so entzückend ist uns [...] die Echo aller Zeiten und Völker» (J.G. Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, in B. Suphan (ed.), *Sämtliche Werke*, Hildesheim, Olms-Weidmann, 1967, vol. XIV, p. 231).

²⁰ A. de Saint-Exupéry, *The Little Prince*, translated by K. Woods, London, Heinemann, 1997, chapter 21.

²¹ See Maria Karasinska-Fendler’s paper in this volume.

²² The «Gundgesetz» does not mention explicitly this term, but it includes several of its elements; the doctrine has been considerably developed by the Constitutional Court, which has described Germany’s democracy as «wehrhaft» and also «streitbar». This concept, often translated as «militant democracy», has been introduced 1937 by Karl Loewenstein and «translated» by Karl Mannheim (see K. Loewenstein, *Militant Democracy and Fundamental Rights*, in «American Political Science Review», vol. 31, n. 417, 1937, pp. 417-433 and 638-658, and K. Mannheim, *Diagnosis of Our Time. Wartime Essays of a Sociologist*, London, Kegan Paul & Co., 1943, pp. 4-8).

²³ See M. Thiel (ed.), *Wehrhafte Demokratie. Beiträge über die Regelungen zum Schutze der freiheitlichen demokratischen Grundordnung*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

²⁴ See as a very clear example the article on «Intolerance» in Wikipedia, the internet encyclopaedia (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intolerance>; consulted on 27 August 2006).

²⁵ It has to be taken into account that a high percentage of the books are the outcome of workshops or symposia.