

"Diversity Within Unity"

Speech - Prof. Amitai Etzioni, *The George Washington University, USA*

Discussion - Prof. Amitai Etzioni, Susan Neimann, Ralf Fücks

Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung

Berlin, August 23, 2005

Speech

Prof. Amitai Etzioni

I left Köln when I was five, so I can buy ice cream in German, but I cannot talk to you about communitarian philosophy in German, at least you wouldn't want to hear me do that. I have to explain very early - I do not represent the Bush Administration. I was in the White House, but it was the Carter White House, which somehow has different feathers. And just to add one more biographical detail, I started my sociological and philosophical training in Jerusalem with Martin Buber, who was, by the way, a pacifist. But he also hammered into me the importance of dialogue. So, a part of the evening that I am very, very much looking forward to is, when we are going to talk with all of you rather than me lecturing at you. And my last confession, and then I will leave you and be on my way, I came here to recruit, not to give an academic lecture. We are looking for soulmates, we are looking for other people who want to join.

Recently I spoke with the president of Cyprus and Prof. Karl Kaiser, the former head of the German Council of Foreign Relations, who joined this effort to think in a different way about the relationship between immigrants or minorities and a host society. We should not attack people who correctly sense, that they will have to undergo significant changes in their culture, in their society and in their way of thinking, just as host societies have to come to terms with large numbers of immigrants. I don't think it's empirically correct, I don't think it's ethical, I don't think it's

politically wise to talk to everybody who has misgivings about immigration as if their were fascist pigs. I think we have to understand their pain and help them to deal with it and move forward, rather than condemn them. That's half of our position. The way I started to think about that, is when I kept coming to Europe and saw more and more signs of anti-immigrant feelings in surveys, in political expressions and in the streets. And I became increasingly concerned that if we just sit back with Le Pen (in France) and Haider (in Austria) and not deal with them, they're not going to make the kind of changes we need. So, I want to talk very briefly about our position, diversity within unity. I understand there are English and German copies available of our twelve-page-statement and you can also find it on our web page, www.comunitariannetwork.org. There you can also see the names of the people who created this platform.

The essence of our position is, that there are certain elementary values, which are at the quarrel of each of our societies, namely that anyone who wants to become a member of our community has to accept its basic values. And if we assure each other, then our basic values will not change. On the other hand, if people join our communities and are willing to accept our basic respect for rights of the democratic way of life, our respect for law and that the law may be changing, then we should not mind that they will eat different foods, sing different songs, pray to different gods and have an affinity to a different country of origin. That's where this mixture comes from. There is a unity and it is essential for every community. And I think it goes without saying, I hope, Susan will support me in that, that practically everybody defines a nation as a community investing in a state; it's not simply bureaucracy, it's not simply government structure, it's a certain set of values or loyalties we form, in effect a form of a very extended family. We hope to change; one day there may be an European community, I pray for a global community. But for now, part of our loyalties, involvement and identities are wrapped in our national communities.

I know we have misgivings about it, but that doesn't make this fact go away. And therefore, when people join us, the question we have to ask them - not if they're asylum seekers, that's a different

story - but if they come here to better their life and if we need them to become part of our economy, are they willing to accept the fact, that we expect everyone in the world to respect human rights. Surely they have to expect human rights here. Frankly, I find it very puzzling when at least in some places, people insist on human rights in Afghanistan and in Iraq but not on the block. I think, forced marriages for instance, have no place in any of our societies. I deliberately talk that language. I deliberately want to start by talking about misgivings people have - not without reason. We need to reassure them - and I'm not saying what I am saying *in order* to reassure them - that respect for human rights, the democratic way of life and the rule of law are elementary values by which everyone must abide. And if they don't believe in these things, then they don't have to come, wherever we are. When we have laid those foundations, then we can say to them that we will respect their particular communities.

Let me clarify my position by using an image. In all these positions we are looking for images. We contrast our position with strict assimilationism of the kind that France often speaks of, but does not always practice, where everybody is supposed to lose all their ethnic and racial identities and just blend in with the French people. We call that a melting pot and the whole image of the melting pot is that all the differences are melted down into one bland stew.

We also differentiate our position from multiculturalism, at least in an extreme expression. Sometimes people talk about it like a salad. There are different pieces of different color and they lie there together but they don't really get mixed. They stay each in their own particularities. Our image is that of a mosaic. A mosaic has different pieces, different sizes, different colors, but also a shared framework and a globe. And very important, very important, the framework can be recast over time. It's not there forever; under the influence of immigration, history and changes, the framework itself changes. But there is something which holds us all together to avoid civil war, to avoid strife, to rule out violence against each other. What goes exactly into the framework? What exactly is the unity part? And what do we find [in terms of] enrichment and beauty by having multicolor, multi-units? It's debatable. Some

people place language as a very important part of the unity section, but some people do not. We could spend a whole month easily arguing about these specifics. But the essential point is, that we accept this differentiation, the two sides of the ledger.

Now, let me make this a little more specific - schools. This is a principle which leads us to some very specific policy conclusions. We don't think it's a good idea, but we cannot stop people from attending segregated schools their whole life, like Catholic schools, Jewish schools or Koran schools. I think it's best, but not always doable, that all children should go to the same public schools, so that they will all meet children from other backgrounds and spend a social life with them. A large part of the curriculum will be shared, and every child will take the same civic classes and the same historical classes. And then we allow for fifteen percent or twenty percent of the curriculum to be composed of ethnic, racial and other electives.

We can argue about the details. So, if somebody wants to learn more about Turkey, they are welcome. If somebody wants to study the Koran more, they are welcome, but within these options, within a basic framework. Now, I know, that it's not always practical. For instance, in Holland they have such a long tradition of schools separated by religion and ethnicity, that it's very difficult for them to even think about such a shared system. The second best option will be where all the schools, whether private or public or religious or secular, will have 85% shared curriculum, where the state makes sure that they all share the basic framework and then welcome the 15% differences. We must also make some efforts to bring children from different schools together in sporting events or something. Again, we may differ enormously about the details, but I think it is as good an illustration as I can give you. What we mean is, there are some things that we all need to share and then we should welcome the differences.

Next comes the question of law. Frankly, as somebody who lives on the other side of the ocean, it stuns me how much energy can be spent on the question of whether a court clerk in Amsterdam or a teacher in Germany can or cannot wear a headscarf, or if somebody can wear a yarmulke in a school in France, or if someone can wear and a little cross but not a big cross. If you think about it a

little longer, it reminds me of people who are divorce lawyers, who tell us about a couple who has had a very difficult divorce and finally it's all settled. However, in the last minute there's a terrible fight about a tea pot and suddenly the agreement almost falls apart, because both insist to have their teapot. The teapot is trivial. What it really stands for, of course, are some very fundamental disagreements and emotional differences. I cannot help but feel that the question of whether a court clerk wears a headscarf or not, is really not about the headscarf, but about the question of whether are we willing to accept people who have religious differences.

I think once we sort out the underlying issue, there is no reason to insist upon everybody praying to the same god or praying to anybody. These are symbolic issues which we will be able to settle more quickly. But when it comes to the law, the question becomes under what conditions do we make exemptions. And under one condition, you insist that everybody will follow the same law. I will give you an American example. We of course have laws, rightly only, against the use of what is called drugs or controlled substances. But we have a church of Native Americans, which uses peyote for their religious services. And one of our major court cases was the following: Everybody in the United States is not allowed to use drugs, so how could the Native Americans use peyote for their religious services. And the question is again - an illustration of my basic points - are we going to say here, everybody has to be the same and a unity? Does peyote belong into the unity box or does it belong in the particularism box, where you are welcomed to be different? How will you make the decision? The principle we advocate, is that you have to see this compelling public interest.

We cannot find a compelling public interest, if indeed this is used for religious purposes. And therefore, after enormous struggle, which again is symbolic of deeper issues, Native Americans were finally allowed to proceed. The tradition [is similar to that of] the Catholics [that were] allowed to use wine during the prohibition and many other such exemptions. We don't have to insist that everybody close their shop on Sunday. Instead, we can insist that they close them one day a week. I can go on and on to illustrate one

more time, this time not with reference to schools but reference to the law, how we sort out what belongs on the particularistic side and what belongs on the side of things we all need to share.

We went on to examine the question of historical responsibility and that may be of some special interest to you. Look, I came to the U.S. as an immigrant and I didn't have a slave, my family didn't have a slave and we never traded in slaves. Why should I be responsible for slavery? But my answer to this question is, if I join the American community, I can't pick and choose. I can't say I like the literature but I don't like our historical responsibilities. I feel, if you become a member of a community, you have to take the good and the bad. And we all have dark moments in our history, although some of them are darker. But anybody who joins our community has to accept not just Goethe and Beethoven, but also the Holocaust. And that is our position. That belongs to the unity box. And in our judgement, there is no second guessing here.

Now, I can go into details, but I want to save time to talk about two different parts of this question. First of all, how did we get here, aside from our concern about the enormous increase in anti-immigrant feelings and their political expression. And I think we are going to see more of this before too long. Communitarianism, unfortunately in many minds, is associated with the idea that the community should take priority over rights. That is not my kind of communitarianism. That is the kind of communitarianism which some people call East-Asian-Communitarianism, which is practiced in Singapore and Malaysia. I would prefer to call them authoritarian. My idea of communitarianism is that a good society has a carefully crafted balance between concerns for individual rights and concerns for the common good. The conversation should start by not allowing either the common good to trump rights or assume that rights always trump the common good.

We must start a conversation in which we realize that there are two essential principles which both command our attention. From this starting point we have to work out how we are going to get to square these two conflicting principles. We should not be scared that society is not organized neatly by one simple principle. The libertarians want to derive everything from liberty. We have to

recognize that societies are complicated creatures, which consist of conflicting principles, and often, we need to make room for them. Again, I could give a six-month-seminar on this little point, but I don't want to take more time. But I just want to say, when we come and say that there is room both for unity and for diversity and the main question is a question of balance, then we might be trying to make it all unity or all diversity. This is not an accidental position which some of us dreamed up. It has a fairly profound philosophical foundation. The same holds true for our very essentialist notion that each [one] of us has rights, but each [one] of us also has responsibilities. That's why we want to give the immigrants rights, but we also want to ask them to accept the responsibilities to the society in which they want to live in.

How did we get to this specific statement? I must admit, it was one of these accidents in life which got me started. I was growing increasingly aware of all kind of anti-immigrant expressions, some were political and some were in the streets. But then there came a turning point, and I admit it reflects my personal prejudices. I heard about a racist party in Denmark, and frankly, I had an image of Denmark where everything was wonderfully green: green meadows and cows with big bells and everybody is loving and happy. It is the same image people have of Switzerland. When they got a racist party, I said, wait a moment, we need to do something about that. And so, it was kind of an ultimate straw, which broke the back of at least of this camel. So, we got together, eighty people from different countries, in Brussels and we spent two days drafting this statement and then, you know, the usual rewrites, and faxes and e-mails.

But we finally nailed this down with many more details about citizen tests, religion and about holidays and rituals, which make this "Diversity Within Unity" platform. Then we started seeking endorsements. And we started getting endorsements from public intellectuals, from some elected officials, but far from enough. So, what I'm looking for, is people who will take this on in at least two ways. Firstly, inform yourselves, so much more than I can do tonight, about what the "Diversity Within Unity" platform stands for and help us think it through. What does it mean for all kinds of other policy areas which we have not tackled? Or how should we improve those we spelled out in a very preliminary fashion? So,

there is a lot of policy and intellectual thinking that needs to be done.

And secondly, we very much hope to have this conversation introduced in the political dialogue. My good friend Lord Pratt, who headed the British Commission on Racism came out with this idea that if you abolish Britishness and from then on never use the word or identity again and talk about only various tribes, which live on this island called England, Welsh, Scots, English, West-Indies and Pakistanis and such, that that will solve the problem. I'm not sure if I would like that if it could be done but I don't think - I don't know if this translates well - that the notion to tell the British people that we should stop thinking about Britishness has a lot of legs. I don't think it walks any place. And so, I don't think that's a starter for a productive conversation.

On the other hand, the French notion that we all have to give up all our differences to become good members of the community is also impoverishing. We benefit from different insights, tastes and interests, which people of different backgrounds bring with them. And second, we just alienate and make people hostile by insisting that we cannot respect their differences in those areas in which they are acceptable. So, I hope that at least some of you will take the trouble of either reading our document or visiting our web page. It's much more than I can do in half an hour about our position. Help us elaborate it and apply it and help us to join the political dialogue. And of course, all you have to do is use your mouth and join the list of endorsers. This will be on the record of people supporting our position. Thank you very much.

Discussion

(Amitai Etzioni, Susan Neimann, Ralf Fücks)

Amitai Etzioni on *The Clash of Civilizations*

I'm working on a major project, which I call, "the fault line within civilizations." Huntington's notion of a "clash of civilizations" basically states that our civilization is dedicated to human rights and freedom, and therefore, we are good and rational and everybody else is irrational, passionate and a bigot. Bush says

that we don't have a quarrel with Islam, we just have a quarrel with those who hijacked it for terrorism and he says Islam has 1300 years to prove otherwise. They are all terrorists. To devise a clash of civilizations is a notion in which whole civilizations are fundamentalists and basically incompatible with rights and democracy. I think it's a horrible mistake.

Let me start with Islam. If you look at the majority of Muslims in Indonesia, Bangladesh, Kyrgyzstan and India, they all are very moderate people and in some cases, like in India, they are comfortable with a democratic form of government. Yes, there are fundamentalists in Islam, but there are also fundamentalists in Christianity and in Judaism, just as they exist in Socialism. The fault line really doesn't lie between civilizations, but cuts through all civilizations. In the West Bank there are some Jews who would be all too happy to start their holy war. They are not that different. Once you look at all these fundamentalists, Christians and Muslims, they have very interesting things in common. They all believe women are second class people or third class, they all hate homosexuals and they all have no respect for rights.

And on the other side of the fault line, you have people who are religious to varying degrees but it's no problem. For instance, in Islam, there is no compulsion in religion. That's the line that I heard when I was a guest of the reformers in Iran. They don't want a society which forces people to pray. They don't want a secular society. They want a society where people want to pray. Well, we shouldn't quarrel with that. My problem is not with the Christian fundamentalists in the U.S. for their viewpoint. They are entitled to their viewpoint. My problem is when they try to force it down our throat, when they try to pass legislation and when they try to sneak into public schools and make it part of the universal curriculum. The fault line lies where you move from difference of viewpoints to the use of force. That's what separates jihad as a holy war from jihad as a spiritual journey. That's what separates Judaism at a point of a gun from Judaism as a set of values. That's what separates some of the Christian fundamentalists from the rest. There is where you have walls. You can find a system of values in each. The difference between the Stalinists and the Social Democrats is exactly on the same fault line.

Amitai Etzioni on *Fundamentalism*

If you look at all the liberated states, whatever way they were liberated, either because their old regime collapsed or because the Taliban were taken out. What could be more different than Afghanistan, Iraq and Bulgaria? What they all have in common is once the police state was removed and they did not develop a new informal set of values. You invite one kind of fundamentalism or the other. Turkey is where you should look. Why is fundamentalism rising in Turkey? There you have secularism and you have democracy. Liberals do not speak even to the profound issues of morality of the day, they don't tell you what you owe to your children and they don't tell you what you owe to your parents. There is no liberalism even about the environment. There is a notion that we have obligations: why are we born to die and why we are cast on that odd planet?

These are all questions which everybody wants to answer. And the liberal language doesn't even begin to speak to them. When you create a moral vacuum that exists for decades and decades, fundamentalism steps in, because there is no other source of profound transcendental values. That's what happens in the United States. The Democrats keep talking the job opportunities, which of course they should. They keep talking about prejudices and of course they should talk about prejudices, but they do not tell me, when more and more Americans are in nursing homes, what my obligation is to my old parents. Do I have to visit them once? Do I have to support them? Do I leave them to the state? We are talking about the basic moral language and they have nothing to say to it. As a result, where do people go then?

If you want to fight fundamentalism, then support the Sufis - the moderate Islam. If you want to fight the West Bank, support the reform Jews. But that's not kosher. That's not the right language. Because they are not secular, you don't have to support the reform Jews and you don't have to support the Sufis, but you have to support something which has a moral content. The reason it's Bush country is because he has no competition. Nobody lets a glove on him. It is what you call the values debate. Let me give you an example. I don't know to what degree you follow all the details of our nutty life. We have people who want a mandate in public schools

to teach creationism as a science. And they want public schools to teach that the world was created in six days and God put together all the little pieces like a Lego center. That's what they're fighting about.

Well, that's nutty. I'm sorry, this is not nice. This is fundamentalism. When this didn't go very far they came up with something else and that's called intelligent design. And they say, look at the world, it's so miraculous. If you look at a cell it's so complicated. If you look at a heart, nobody is able to create a machine, which works for 75 years and beats 60 times a minute, without repairs and lubrication. This is the miracle of life. Who started it all? The Big Bang? Apes? What's a more meaningful answer? Maybe there was a creator who started the process. Einstein wouldn't have a problem at all with that question.

But the Democrats say: "Oh, my God that's terrible. It's horrible. You can't talk about it. This is religious." Vacuum does not fill anything. That's the problem with Bush. Bush does fill the vacuum with his simplicity and his confidence. He reads texts and if he loses his text, he is up the creek without a paddle. It doesn't really matter if it's a speech written for him, but he has to feel the speech for himself and that's the reason he has such a wide appeal.

I will give you an interesting detail which you will see here the next weeks. People will vote for somebody as long as they don't see a viable alternative. After this tremendous economic success, peace and everything else, you will not give up on a father figure or mother figure. In our case, unfortunately, it's always a father figure, if there is no other papa. And so, Bush is in at the moment. He has the moral field - not in any sincere way - and the moral language all to himself and that's exactly what we talked about. We need a shared moral language.

I can't emphasise enough, that it's not empirically or morally or politically wise to call them all fundamentalists. It's very common. Many people call Muslims and Christians fundamentalists. I would like to divide them. I like to divide those who simply have strong beliefs from those who are willing to support incursion in any shape or form. That's step one.

Step two: We need to be open and we should not be scared by people who have different values. If we will believe in liberty and so on and they have different values, let's talk to them and let's see who'll convince whom. We have to have something to say on the subject. For example, I paid for my sins by trying to teach ethics at the Harvard Business School. It was a complete failure, by the way. We had a seminar convened by the liberals at Harvard. There were professors present, very important people. And the question we were going to talk about was values. Some people mentioned justice and fairness and so on. And I said, let's talk about the future of the family. And then at the end of the meeting they listed all the topics to be discussed in all the future seminars and there was no mention of the family. I'm not used to this. Sometimes people will get angry and sometimes happy, but I'm very rarely ignored. I was wondering, what happened here. So, I asked somebody, why it wasn't on the list. And he said, "it's very difficult for liberals to talk about it."

You can talk about gay marriages, you can talk about lesbians and you can talk about single parents. It's much easier not to talk about the future of the family." I'm sorry, but we have to talk about the future of the family, whatever position you want to take. You want to say, that it's no longer needed. Well, then let's talk about that. If you want to talk about peer marriage, which I favour, then let's talk about that. But to leave the field to the fundamentalists gives them a field day. We need to confront those who have strong values with a different set of values. We need to jail those who want to bomb us. My view of Europe, frankly, is that you are too soft and radical Islam is too hard on soft Islam.

My last point is equally important. We talk statically too much. Germany is not the same as it was in the Prussian days. It's not the same as it was in 1848, it's not the same as it was in the 1930s and it's not the same as it was in 1989. The society changed a lot. At the moment, everybody says it's my tribe, it's my country and it's changing. The Germans are becoming more informal. Is that true? Not enough as the Americans? A little less hierarchical? Otherwise, how could they be green? I think we have to look at this not as static snapshots, but as trends and in that sense, I think, we are moving to subtle changes. Some day accumulation will make

European societies and Japan more complicated, more nuanced, more diverse, and hopefully, instill a lasting framework.

Amitai Etzioni on *Community Building*

One of the things which particularly I need to emphasise as a sociologist, as a communitarian is a difference between society and state. There is a lot of tendency to reduce them to each other. And in effect when the Communitarian platform was translated to German, the word membership was translated as a Bürger. And when I went back and said, wait a moment, Bürger is a citizen, don't you have a word for membership, there was a long silence. Then someone offered the word Mitglieder, but that is not the same either. It is not accidental that there is no really good term for membership as far as I know. It's civil society that we are talking about.

Now, it's true, that it's often historically been invested in a state and that what we call a nation. We are struggling now in effect to separate the two again. We feel uncomfortable. This can be seen especially in Germany, though in reference to identifying community. People used to talk about a nation state, and the European experiment for a while was an attempt to create a larger community.

Now there is a lot of talk about a global civil society. But, at the moment, our major community investments are either local or they still invest in the government. But it's not fixed, we keep changing the content. That is what I mean when I say that you can talk about nation rebuilding or a community rebuilding. When we say immigrants are going to play a larger part in the society, we will need to sort out what's shared and what we will allow [to be] different. Historically we are not used to that. That is what I would call community rebuilding. And if you like it or not, that's what's happening. It's the pain of a new birth. I must say, and I noted it never works right.

I'm very sorry that the debate about a "Leitkultur" went off on such a wrong foot. What happened is stupid. The question behind it was the following question: what does it mean to be a German? And it set off a switch of some kind for horrible conservatives, right wing. I think that's exactly what we need to talk about. What is essential and what are we willing to vary? It is a part of this

rebuilding I'm talking about and I think, to some extent, it's taking place. Part of it we sorted out in the civil society and not in legislation. What about the labor force? It is in part an empirical question; clearly there is no Equal Opportunity but the question is, if things are improving or not. I'm just not qualified to answer that question.

With regard to cultural hegemony, we are adapting. Sweden, like the other Scandinavian countries used to be Lutheran, period. If you went to public school we were taught Lutheranism, the king had to be Lutheran and the cathedrals were Lutheran, period. Now they say that that's really not right anymore and the king doesn't have to be Lutheran. We are going to support mosques and synagogues the way we support cathedrals. We are giving extra money to cathedrals as historical monuments not for religious purposes. So, we fudge things a little. And so, in Israel they talk about the Rock of Israel. For the seculars it means the Israeli army, but for the religious people it means God. We talk about the Rock of Israel and everybody can project on it what they please.

We don't have to force people to understand exactly what it means. In law, in rights, we shouldn't dream of that. What is Christmas? We try to separate it from a religious event, so it becomes more a kind of end-of-the-year-celebration, while for some other people it continues to be a religious event. At least, this is as good an example as I can give of where we allow the majority not to feel completely caught off of its history and its rituals, but allow the immigrants not to feel that they have to buy into something which is not theirs.

There is a Mexican holiday called Cinco de Mayo. Cinco de Mayo was a Mexican holiday, and it was adopted by the United States. Now we have a holiday Cinco de Mayo, which a lot of Americans, probably more Americans of non Mexican origins, participate in than Mexicans. Again, I understand we are different from that viewpoint. But to put it very bluntly, I think, the dynamics push the non-immigrant-societies, including Japan, in the direction that they have to tackle that issue and realistically face basic talk of opportunities. Or they will not deal with it and we will build alienation on both sides. The French Muslims feel it and the right wing feels it and it leads to this kind of horrible clash with the

Le Pens in the world. They are not all the same, but they are all troubled. We need to find a way to help people make the transition. That, in essence, is what it's all about.

Amitai Etzioni on *What belongs to the "particularism side"*

It's a perfect quote: "you will not allow them to be particular, but it's OK to be particular." That's exactly what it's all about. So, you can go from here in two directions. They're not going to go away and you can't build a wall high enough to stop them. I don't think you want to have a wall all around Germany, but if you did, it still wouldn't stop this, just as people from Mexico keep coming to the United States. You know, a wall doesn't stop people. They're coming. Aside from the fact that you need them. I don't think it's a good argument that you need them. It's an economic utility argument.

The fact is, they are here in large numbers and increasing numbers. You can keep on insisting that they should be indistinguishable from Germans fifty years ago, but you, yourself, you're not exactly a copy of them. Then what you're going to get? As somebody said, more hate and more alienation on both sides. The people who want to stick to the traditional script will be frustrated, because there are even more people who will not. They also produce more children by the way. And the others will be frustrated, because you try to keep making them someone they cannot be. So, what is the alternative? The alternative is go back to the drawing board. Societies change all the time anyhow, while they pretend not to change. And ask yourself, is Germany today what it was in 1945, what it was in 1950, what it was in 1968?

So, you go back to the drawing board and just participate in this process and ask yourself the following questions: What does our unity consist of? What is really essential? What really doesn't matter if you allow it to be particularised? You can close your shop on Friday if you are a Muslim and if you are a Jew you close on Saturday. And those of you who have been in the United States know that it's true that you can buy something any day of the week, but still there is a Sunday, Friday and Saturday. Not in New York. New York is really extra-territorial. Maybe the West Coast, too. But if you go to a large part of the United States, there is a South, which

is also on the East Coast. California and New York are exceptions. If you go to Oregon, which is on the West Coast, you will feel Sunday.

And the reason is simply, while everybody is free to choose, there is still a majority, which sets culture. And I bet, if you go down the block, the same thing happens here. Here, increasingly, stores are also open more hours and more days. And still, the Sunday has this special cultural imprint, which reflects the fact, that there is a Christian majority. And this is one of those fudges. We should not be too hostile to fudges. Fudges allow us to have some room for agreement. We are not ambivalent about core values or rights, but if it comes to closing days, we can fudge it a little. We can say, you can close any day you want, but we are going to close on Sundays. And that in fact, the way that we learn to live with each other. If you do that and invite the immigrants to participate in the conversation, I think you are going to be on your way to create this diversity within unity language and reduce the pain of allowing some particularism and not necessarily a homogenisation. That's what this is all about.

Amitai Etzioni on *The Common Good*

We all have to learn to respect the common good. One good example of this is the environment. There are not many better examples than the environment. I don't think anybody has a right to bequeath mother earth in a worse condition to our children than we got it from our parents. That is one of the things everybody has to buy into.

Amitai Etzioni on *Violence*

Some of you, in your bones don't like democracy. You're happy with democracy if your values will prevail and if somebody else's values will prevail you don't like it one bit. I'm sorry. If people go to the ballot and vote for values which you don't like, then you have to go and campaign harder. If you don't succeed the first time, you succeed the second time, and if you don't, there is always public education and campaigning harder. But if you cannot offer a viable alternative, you are going to have to live with people whose values differ from yours. It's a different story, when they come and

say you will not be allowed your basic rights (i.e. prohibiting abortion or driving homosexuals out of town). That's a different question. These are acts of force. But as long as they have different views and you cannot convince them or the majority, which is very moderate, then it's your problem and not theirs. What begets violence? Should we wait for the first bomb or should we deal with it earlier?

Definitely we should deal with it earlier, but the question is, how. Civic education classes are one of the futures of this country, which Japan hasn't even dreamed of yet. It's to your credit. There are many societies which haven't gotten into yet. Maybe they're not good enough or maybe they're not rich enough. But at least Germany made a sincere offer; you have a national service. None of them are perfect, but that is what a society does when it has people it's worried about and wants to bring them in. You don't have to wait until the shooting starts, but people are entitled to different viewpoints. And the essence of our system is that if you disagree with them, convince them or at least convince the majority of the voters. Don't make your life more difficult and help the other side by pushing everybody who has a different viewpoint into the violent camp.

Conclusion

To conclude, I will address the subject of "saving the young". We do not provide them a sensible set of values as parents and as educators, because we think that's not legitimate. That's preaching. They join gangs, because in gangs you find a very strong set of values. And they have a very strong cult and a very strong community. Or they join Zen Buddhism or some other curious cult. Many become fundamentalists, either Muslim or Christian or some other type. A vacuum does not stay empty. Either we can come together with a moderate, rich, civil, moral language, or it will be filled by somebody, which will be very troublesome for all of us.

Edited by Christine Mehta

The text on „Diversity Within Unity“ platform is available online in
English - http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/dwu_positionpaper.html
German - http://www.gwu.edu/~ccps/dwu_positionpaper_german.html