

**Transatlantic Discourse on Integration**

**The Role of Religion  
for the Integration of Migrants.  
A Conference Report**

**Sybille Drexler  
Friedrich Heckmann**

**Bamberg, December 2005**

**European Forum for Migration Studies**

Institute at the University of Bamberg

Katharinenstraße 1

D-96052 Bamberg

fon +49-951-932020-0

fax +49-951-932020-20

efms@sowi.uni-bamberg.de

<http://www.efms.de>



---

## Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Contents of the Workshop .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Integration and Religion in the United States and Germany .....	5
2.2	Religious Ethics, Inter-religious Relations and Integration .....	7
2.3	Religion, State and Integration.....	9
2.4.	Conclusions .....	12
<b>3.</b>	<b>The Participants of the Workshop.....</b>	<b>13</b>



---

## 1. Introduction

After World War II sociological theorists developed a field called modernisation theory, which was rather broadly accepted. One of the expectations and hypotheses connected with this theory was that the relevance of ethnicity in social life would decrease. Instead, there has been a resurgence of ethnicity in the modern world, both in social life and in sociological theory. Another expectation was that of increasing secularisation with modernisation. This has proven not to be completely wrong, but at the same time religion has continued and is continuing to be of prime importance in social and individual life. The resurgence of religion is relevant in manifold contexts, e.g. in the context of democratic politics, in the context of political extremism and terrorism, or in the context of integration or non-integration of immigrants. Some of the ongoing discussions are connecting the latter two, particularly religious-political extremism and terrorism with failed integration. There are, however, positive contributions of religion to integration as well. This is true particularly for the American immigration-integration experience.

The current debate is mainly focusing on the role of Islam for the integration of migrants. Consequently a lot of seminars deal with this topic. The idea of this workshop was to widen this perspective, and to have a somewhat broader look at the role or at different roles that religion could play in the integration process. The workshop, entitled “The Role of Religion for the Integration of Migrants”, took place on November 25, 2005 at the Katholische Akademie in Berlin. It brought together 27 experts from Europe and North America, including representatives of government, academia, non-governmental organizations, the education system and different religious groups. The conference was designed as a one-day workshop and therefore only a limited number of participants was invited. To stimulate intensive discussions enough time for exchange was allowed for in the conference programme. The workshop is part of the “Transatlantic Discourse on Integration”, a series of seminars which is organized by the *European forum for migration studies (efms)* and supported by the German Marshall Fund of the United States. The main goal of these seminars is to increase the knowledge on integration by a transatlantic exchange within experts’ communities and to increase mutual understanding of the integration discourse between Europe and the United States.



---

## 2. Contents of the Workshop

After the welcome and introduction the workshop programme consisted of three sessions: “Integration and Religion in the United States”, “Religious Ethics, Inter-religious Relations and Integration”, and “Religion, State and Integration”.

- 9 a.m.           **Welcome**  
Prof. Dr. Friedrich Heckmann, *Director of the european forum for migration studies, Bamberg*
- 9.15 a.m.       **Session I: Integration and Religion in the United States and Germany**  
Prof. Dr. Charles Hirschman, *University of Washington, Seattle*  
Prof. Dr. Johannes Lähnemann, *Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg*
- 10:15 a.m.      Coffee break
- 10:30 a.m.      **Session II: Religious Ethics, Inter-religious Relations and Integration**  
Prof. Dr. Peter O’Brien, *Trinity University, San Antonia, Texas/Fulbright Gastprofessor Humboldt Universität zu Berlin*  
Dr. Karsten Lehmann, *Universität Bayreuth*  
Dr. Jürgen Micksch, *Interkultureller Rat in Deutschland, Darmstadt*  
Prof. Dr. Yasemin Karakasoglu, *Universität Bremen*
- 12:30           Lunch
- 1:30 p.m.       **Session III: Religion, State and Integration**  
**Law and Legal Regulations**  
Prof. Dr. Matthias Rohe, *Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg*  
Dr. Eli Bar-Chen, *Universität München*  
**Religious Instruction in Schools**  
Hayrettin Aydin, *Universität Bremen*  
Lamya Kaddor, *Universität Münster, Lehrerin für Islamkunde an der Hauptschule Glückauf in Dinslaken-Lohberg*  
Jeanette Lim, *U.S. Department of Education, Washington D.C \**
- 3:30 p.m.       Coffee break

---

\* Mrs. Lim could not participate in the workshop, but sent a paper.



- 3:45 p.m.      **Religion, state and integration (continued)**  
**Religious pluralism and religious extremism**  
Ulrich de Taillez, *Bayerisches Staatsministerium des Innern, München*  
Dr. Birgit Klein, *Institut für Jüdische Studien, Universität Düsseldorf*
- 4:30 p.m.      **Concluding discussion**
- 5 p.m.          Adjourn

## 2.1 Integration and Religion in the United States and Germany

The purpose of the first session was an introduction into the role of religion for the integration of migrants in the United States and Germany. **Charles Hirschmann** opened the workshop with the statement that immigration changed American society including religious institutions throughout the entire American history. Colonial America was not particularly religious and quite intolerant. Not until the proportion of the population affiliated with churches increased over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the United States slowly became a more religious society. The most visible manifestation of the impact of new immigrants on American religion has been the establishment of thousands of new churches and temples that serve the particular needs of immigrant communities. Founding a church or temple became one of the most common features of the “Americanization” process. In order to explain the role of religion for the integration of migrants Hirschman referred to the classical model of Herberg and Handlin. “To become American”, according to this theory, does not require complete assimilation. New immigrants must acquire a new language, develop new loyalties, and learn the basic of political culture, but they are not required to change their religion. Immigrants become Americans by first becoming ethnic Americans. New immigrants become more religious after arrival in the U.S. in order to maintain cultural continuity following the trauma of international migration. Twentieth century America according to Herberg and Handlin was not one big melting pot, but three, and the three major religious faiths (Catholics, Protestants and Jewish) provided enduring ethno-religious identities that persist along generations. First generation national origin identities blended into religious identities in subsequent generations. Inter-marriage in second and third generations weakened the solidarity of national origin-groups, but rarely bridged the strong divides between Protestants, Catholics and Jews. Hirschman stated that Herberg and Handlin are partly right, but that “there is much more to the story” concerning the centrality of religion to immigrant communities as the search for refuge, respectability and resources: Immigrants search refuge for physical safety as well as psychological comfort after the trauma of losing family, language and homeland community. Churches can also provide respectability or opportunities for status recognition and social mobility that is denied in the broader society. Moreover churches and temples become central to the lives of immigrants by catering to their needs through the provision of resources, services and communication networks for every social demographic group. The multiple services offered to newcomers include information about housing, employment opportunities, and other problems. Concluding his presentation Hirschman emphasized that this model of religious organization has not only helped successive generations of immigrants and their children to become Ameri-



can, but has also created a unique American religious landscape that is pluralist, generally observant, and very responsive to the cultural and socioeconomic needs of adherents.

**Johannes Lähnemann** began with the statement that Samuel Huntington's controversial, though extremely powerful thesis of the "Clash of Civilizations" must be responded by a "Dialogue of Civilizations". He highlighted his point of view by quoting Hans Küng's principles of the "Projekt Weltethos" (Project for a Global Ethic): "-no peace in the world without peace in the religions -no peace in the religions without dialogue in the religions -no dialogue in the religions without fundamental research on religions". Accordingly a lasting peace can only be achieved by including all religious groups (Christians, Muslims, Jews, Buddhists, and Hindus) as well as people of non religious faith in a dialogue between different communities with different world views. Lähnemann emphasized the need for visions that reach beyond today's conflict resolution, but questioned the illusion that living together in harmony would be the automatic outcome of such visions. Integration, he stated, is rather the result of hard work, of careful and thorough analysis and of patience. It is a process with setbacks and with uncertain success. Politicians and representatives of different religions and humanistic organizations should consider more than ever the role that religions and ideologies take in conflict prevention, conflict resolution and in finding meaning and motivation to assume responsibility for society. Referring to Hans Küng again Lähnemann explained that the religious communities should become more self-reflecting and open-minded from a theological, educational and social point of view. That means examining and expounding the foundations of one's own faith and knowledge clearly and intelligibly, handling one's own faith and the nature of one's faith community with self-criticism, working towards a "theology of the religions" in order to develop "identity and understanding", talking with hardliners in one's own ranks and tackling the glaring deficiencies in the basic knowledge about other religions in theology, religious education courses and school education. Additionally, dialogue between the religious groups or ideologies means to encounter and to understand one another within a coherent, systematic framework. Inter-religious dialogue should happen continuously as a meaningful and comprehensive task and not only sporadically or in reaction to arising problems. On the contrary such a dialogue implies facing the beliefs –both moral and spiritual- by which others live and not only the exchange of friendly words at religious festivals. An established programme to develop understanding and building confidence between the religions is needed. Regular contact, e.g. between "The Round Table of the Religions" as a "coordinating council" and bodies at federal and state level, would provide such an opportunity. Cooperation also means awareness of joint social responsibility within one's own country and Europe. Since the German society has become very pluralistic, religions and ideologies have to play a major role as advocates for humanity, solidarity and freedom. Even though the relationship between different religions and ideologies is often characterized by competitiveness and conflict, religions should work more often together to express their common political, economic, cultural and social concerns more effectively in the future. Lähnemann concluded his presentation by expressing his conviction that a constructive cooperation between the different religions and ideologies is still a remote vision, but can come true by bringing it nearer to reality step by step.



## 2.2 Religious Ethics, Inter-religious Relations and Integration

**Peter O'Brien** argued that three broadly conceived and practiced philosophies or ethical systems of how we should deal with the cultural diversity spawned by large-scale immigration currently compete for moral and political preeminence in Europe. He summarized these three philosophies as liberalism, nationalism and postmodernism. Then he critically assessed their desirability in relation to the salient headscarf debate in Europe. Liberalism, he stated, harbours the greatest potential to protect and to liberate individuals oppressed by their religion or, more precisely, its too often self-appointed promoters. Nationalism, in contrast, can provide a welcome safeguard against liberal "imperialism" by showing great sensitivity and appreciation for the importance of one's broader culture in forming a critical dimension of individual expression and identity. Wearing a headscarf holds a prized, time-honoured place in Muslim culture. Yet, it is not difficult to imagine European nationalists who would perceive the headscarf as a perilous threat to and dangerous dilution of the native national character. Postmodernism harbours the greatest potential to stand firm against either liberal or nationalist coercion. According to postmodernism it is possible to coexist with one another in the absence of mutually acknowledged absolute rules or principles. O'Brien emphasized that it does not make sense to persist in incriminating and dismissing those who do not share our views, as is the current convention. Instead we should rather work towards opening a genuine dialogue in which we not only air our differences philosophically but put them to the practical test of how they actually work well or poorly in the real world of relations among diverse peoples.

**Karsten Lehmann** gave a presentation about the local integration processes of Christian immigrants. Recently, two new trends can be observed: On the one hand the Charismatic and Evangelical groups try to reach out beyond a specific community. On the other hand, there is an increasing number of international and interfaith groups or informal meetings, which are heading towards the wider public and are not restricted to a particular community. Concerning the setting of integration processes in German cities no linear development, neither to integration nor to segregation, exists. The process, instead, is rather of a complex nature. These developments confront the wider society with religious pluralism. At least some immigrants try to establish their groups as new suppliers on the German religious market which forces integration processes. Conflicts form a characteristic as well as indispensable part of this development. The debate on the role of religion has to take a very complex setting into account. Some of these aspects are, e.g. the variety of different religious groups stepping into the public arena, the multi-layered reactions of different parts of the wider society and the existence of groups still limited to their community. Due to the fact that the social and cultural setting is highly controversial, integration has to reflect this complexity and has to focus on emerging conflicts.

**Jürgen Micksch** explicated how religion can prevent successfully to the integration of migrants. Religion, he stated, is of great importance for the integration of religious immigrants and has the greatest impact when it is locally defined. In this context, especially prayer houses are of utmost significance. Whereas the integration of migrant communities in native religious communities of the same faith in general did not succeed, their own religious communities provide a wide range of benefits which compensate for the often denied acceptance by the majority society. Thereby religious mi-



grant communities step by step evolve into “parallel communities“, which offer a place of refuge which probably even contributes to facilitate integration. These “parallel communities“, Miksch emphasized, are usually not directed against the receiving society and only raise problems if either the majority society or the migrant community itself refuse cooperation. In contrast, religious migrant communities are usually interested in having a good relationship with society. However, disintegrative attitudes within those communities can also be observed. This usually happens if the communities depend too much on their countries of origin or if they do not gain recognition by the receiving country. In addition, police operations regarding mosques can turn out to be very disintegrative, especially if hundreds of raids only result in a few arrests. Instead, improved structures of cooperation and more intensive dialogues between organisations of migrants and of the receiving society, as well as a qualified education of teachers for religious instruction, are essential to ensure successful integration.

**Yasemin Karakasoglu** focused on the aspects of inter-religious relations and integration with special reference to religious orientations among Muslim youth and the headscarf debate. Lack of recognition because of religious background poses a common problem for the second migrant generation. The very widespread feeling not to be accepted by the majority society among young Muslims in Germany is even increasing since September 11th. Whenever integration of the biggest migrant community in Germany, the Turks, is discussed, the headscarf is mentioned as a visible symbol of the Turkish-Muslim society’s lack of integration and its presumed tendency to Islamic fundamentalism. Due to the religious freedom guaranteed by the German Constitution, Muslim students at schools and universities in Germany are principally free to wear headscarves in classrooms. Nevertheless, the issue repeatedly leads to very emotionally held debates on the question whether it should be permitted or not for teachers. The case of Fereshta Ludin, a young Muslim woman who sued for her right to wear the headscarf in classroom as a teacher, demonstrated that German state authorities, much like a considerable part of the population, still tend to regard veiled teachers to be a potential danger for a democratic, integrative and tolerant education by possibly trying to impose a radical-Islamic world view on their pupils. However, these assumptions do not correspond to Karakasoglu’s findings which suggest that religious orientation is not necessarily related to a conservative and dogmatic attitude. The Ludin case is especially interesting, because it reveals the current tension between the understanding of religious freedom and of integration. Integration, according to Karakasoglu, seems to be rather measured by the degree of superficial adaptation than by the ability to master the most important cultural techniques. However, Muslim immigrants themselves started to revitalize the debate on the role of religion by increasing their demand for equal participation in every realm of society. In this respect the position of Islam in a secularized, yet on Christianity founded society, is one of the most crucial issues which raises the question to what extent Islam will be offered the opportunity to achieve a socially integrative position similar to that of the Christian churches. In Germany, the acceptance of Islam and of Muslim claims will not only depend on the official state policy towards Muslim demands or the ability of Muslim organizations to unite and present a central spokesman for their interests, but also on the extent to which young Muslim academics will be able to achieve key positions within the German democratic system. If they succeed, they might develop and articulate new approaches to transform Islam from a foreign to an integral element of German society.





## 2.3 Religion, State and Integration

**Mathias Rohe** spoke about religious freedom and Islam in Europe from a German perspective. Even though the current perception of Muslims being a homogenous group of people with a strong religious affiliation is simply wrong, an obviously increasing number of Muslims is eager to define their identity –including the practical fulfillment of Islamic rules- within the framework of European legal orders and societal needs. The idea of introducing a religiously or ethnically orientated multiple legal system in Europe does not represent a realistic or even desirable option. The main conflicts between “Islamic” and European legal thinking concern the constitutional and human rights such as the equality of sexes and of religious beliefs. Freedom of religion includes the freedom to change one’s religion or not to belong to any religion at all. This freedom would be unduly constrained by forcing people into a legal regime defined by religion. However, Muslims are free to create legal relations within the scope of private autonomy and the limits of public policy and to agree on ways and results of non-Judicial dispute resolution. Concerning the present situation in Europe, an extraordinary example of law influenced by Islam is England, where an “angrezi shariat” (English Sharia) is obviously developing. In some cases mainly regarding family relations, they seek socially acceptable solutions for legal problems within the Muslim community by the aid of accepted mediators. The decisions are not legally enforceable in England, but they seem to be recognized in the country of origins as well as within the religious communities. On the one hand extra-judicial dispute resolution can serve as an instrument to achieve socially accepted solutions within a community living in remote segregation from society as a whole. On the other hand, community members who refuse to use the community’s special bodies for conflict resolution may easily face reproaches. Accepting such communitarian bodies would thus, Rohe criticized, lead to an ongoing cultural segregation and is therefore not desirable. Moreover the empowering of potential Islamist as arbitrators and opening ways for them to funds is dangerous. In sum, except in the U.K. the European way of dispute resolution among Muslims is not communitarian, but the “common” way of judicial or informal dispute resolution.

**Eli Bar-Chen** started his speech with some biographical remarks. His parents first moved from Morocco to Israel and then to Europe. He therefore experienced the challenges arising from migration and integration processes himself. Regarding integration, he stated, no religion could fit better for the topic of the workshop than Judaism. To illustrate this point of view he referred to the amazing capacity of the Jewish to integrate quickly, which they demonstrated thousandfold within different societies and throughout the entire history. Two different aspects of this capacity can be distinguished: the “inside” and the “outside”. The “inside” aspect is related to the developing of the first Diasporas after the destruction of the Temple in the 6th century B.C.. Being a vulnerable minority Jews afterwards had to live under the authority of foreign rulers and had to learn how to accept and obey orders of others in order to survive. “The law of the land is the law of God” became their primary code of behavior. From a theological approach, Jews did not consider the Diaspora as a coincidence, but as a punishment of God for having destroyed the Temple. Secular Jews today are mostly unconscious about this historical fact, yet it still remains present in Jewish tradition. The second aspect concerns the “outside”, i.e. the environment of Judaism. After the French revolution Jews were accepted as citizens if they were willing to become “better” people. As a result of the constant effort to adapt,



Jews step by step changed their attitudes, neglected symbols and integrated into a “neutral” society. Concluding his presentation Bar-Chen stated that he felt quite unsure, if the Jewish integration history was a useful model for the integration of other minorities.

**Hayrettin Aydin** gave an overview of the development in Germany regarding religious instruction for Muslim pupils in public schools. Since the end of the nineties a vivid discussion about the possible contribution of religious instruction to integration started. Although the migration of Muslims to Germany already began at the beginning of the sixties, the issue did not appear on the agenda until a few years ago. The main reason for this delay can be seen in the misperception on both sides, majority society and de facto-immigrants as well, that the bigger part of the migrants sooner or later would return to their countries of origin. Today most experts and politicians of the different parties agree in principle that the introduction of religious instruction for Muslim pupils is one of the most important steps to integrate young Muslim immigrants or descendants of them. In most federal German states pilot projects already started and will probably be generally initiated within the next years. Because the broadening demand of teachers already exceeds the momentary need, the education of teachers on academic level should be enlarged soon. Aydin stressed that the impact of religious instruction for integration is an obviously important, but too much emphasized aspect. Religious instruction should not only be introduced to facilitate integration, but should also be regarded as part of the implementation of equal citizenship. Besides, he stated, equality in participation opportunities strengthens the sense of responsibility, which automatically contributes to weaken the often lamented tendencies of self-isolation and segregation. Even though the introduction of religious instruction in public schools on the basis of equality is still in process and final results of this development are still unclear, a more pluralistic picture in the future is expectable.

**Lamya Kaddor** gave an overview about her personal experience with Islam instruction at school. She illustrated her everyday work by giving various examples, e.g. that Muslim parents especially of Turkish origin often criticize her for lecturing in German and not in the children’s mother tongue. Growing up in Germany poses a number of challenges for Muslim children because they have to comply with the expectations of their often religious families while contemporaneously striving for integration into a mainly Christian influenced society. About 70% of the children Mrs. Kaddor is teaching attend Islam instruction at mosques as well, where they most often have to memorize verses from the Koran and rules of Sharia without understanding their meaning. Yet, a profound knowledge of religion is crucial. In respect of school’s curriculum it does not seem appropriate to teach only about Islam; the teacher has to be faithful as well. Being a “good” Muslim and taking actively part in a modern and democratic society such as Germany should not cause any contradictions. Islam instruction at mosques can hardly be controlled and can therefore easily be abused in extreme examples to impose a radical and antidemocratic world view on Muslim children, which contradicts the real nature of Islam as a very peaceful religion in its core. Therefore Islam instruction as a duty of the whole society should not be primarily left to mosques, but has to be enlarged at public schools.



**Jeanette Lim** could not participate in the workshop, but sent a paper which provides information about the current state of the U.S. law concerning constitutionally protected prayer in public schools and which clarifies the extent to which prayer in public school is legally protected. The relationship between religion and government in the United States is governed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, which both prevents the government from establishing religion and protects privately initiated religious expression and activities from government interference and discrimination. The First Amendment thus establishes certain limits on the conduct of public school officials as it relates to religious activity, including prayer. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the First Amendment requires public school officials to be neutral in their treatment of religion, showing neither favouritism toward nor hostility against religious expression such as prayer. The Supreme Court's decisions over the past forty years set forth principles that distinguish impermissible governmental religious speech from the constitutionally protected private religious speech of students. For example, teachers and other public school officials may not lead their classes in prayer, devotionals readings from the Bible, or other religious activities. Nor may school officials attempt to persuade or compel students to participate in prayer or other religious activities. Teachers may, however, take part in religious activities where the overall context makes clear that they are not participating in their official capacities. Public school students are allowed to pray voluntary at any time before, during, or after the school day. Schools have the discretion to dismiss students to off-premises religious instruction or excuse them from class to remove a significant burden on their religious exercise, where doing so would not impose material burdens on other students. For example, it would be lawful for schools to excuse Muslim students briefly from class to enable them to fulfil their religious obligations to pray during Ramadan.

**Ulrich de Taillez** stated that the most important condition for the integration of Muslims is the acceptance of the existing legal system without reservation. In this respect, he claimed, the relationship to Islam turns out to be rather difficult in Western democracy. Most of the three million Muslims living in Germany are peaceful, but about thirty thousand belong to the group of Islamic extremists. De Taillez argued that the Bavarian Ministry of Interior has unsuccessfully urged Muslims to inform the police if they got knowledge about possible or real criminal offences. Besides, problems with very religious Muslims in everyday life arise from their growing rigidity and intolerance. Due to the fact that the Sharia as an important feature of Islam contains parts which are not compatible with democratic law, the willingness to use violence often increases with the degree of religiosity. Therefore integration can only be successful, if migrants of other cultural background and other religious faith such as Islam accept Germany as their own country and identify with its values based on constitutional law.

**Birgit Klein** stated right at the outset of her presentation that she totally agreed with Eli Bar-Chen concerning the astonishing flexibility of Jews to integrate in other societies. JKlein pointed out that Jews often had to violate Jewish law, e.g. the rules of Shabbat, in order to comply with citizenship duties. Hence the integration into modern society implicated the constant challenge to adjust without abandoning Judaism as a whole. Jews succeeded by developing new ways of behavior and by



redefining Judaism as a private religious faith which is not contradictory to the law of the country they are living in.

## 2.4 Conclusions

In the U.S. as well as in Europe, a resurgence of religiosity in social life can be observed. Religion continues to be of prime importance in many contexts. The wide range of benefits often provided by religious communities is especially interesting for immigrants because it helps them to overcome various difficulties emerging from their new living conditions in a foreign country. Hence, these communities can either contribute or prevent successful integration. On both sides of the Atlantic religious freedom is granted by law. Concerning integration policies, are there differences in the perception of the role of religion for integration in both countries? Are Americans and Germans judging possible dangers and opportunities resulting from religious influence similarly or differently?

The following conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the workshop presentations and the ensuing discussions.

- Religious and inter-religious relations play an important role in the migrant integration process.
- In the U.S., new immigrants become more religious after arrival in order to maintain cultural continuity following the trauma of international migration. Religion is central for the integration of immigrant communities by offering refuge, respectability and resources. Religious organisations and the founding of churches or temples not only helped successive generations of immigrants and their children to become American, but also created a unique American religious landscape.
- To achieve a lasting peace between the different civilizations a dialogue which includes all religious groups as well as people of non religious faith is required. Religious communities have to become more self-reflected and open from a theological, educational and social point of view whereas politicians have to acknowledge the role religion could play in the prevention and resolution of possible conflicts.
- In the U.S., the relationship between religion and state is governed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, which both prevents the government from establishing religion and protects privately initiated religious expression and activities from government interference and discrimination. In school, public officials are required to be neutral in their treatment of religion, showing neither favouritism nor hostility against religious expression such as prayer.
- The introduction of a religiously or an ethnically orientated plural legal system does not represent a realistic or even desirable option. The fundamental principles of democracy, the rule of law and the protection of human rights should not be submitted to any religiously or ethically motivated legislator possibly intending to reduce or abolish them.
- Jews possess an astonishing capacity to integrate in different societies. Throughout time they developed new ways of behavior and redefined Judaism as a private religious faith which mostly



did not come into conflict to the law of the country they were living in. Whether the Jewish integration history can serve as a useful model for other minorities, e.g. for the Muslims, has still to be analyzed in detail.

- The introduction of religious instruction for Muslim pupils at state schools is one of the most important steps to integrate young Muslim immigrants in Germany. Religious instruction is not only crucial to facilitate integration, but should also be regarded as part of the implementation of equal citizenship.
- In most federal German states pilot projects of Islam instruction already started and will probably be generally initiated within the next few years. At the same time qualified education of teachers for religious instruction is needed and should be enlarged soon.
- If young Muslim academics succeed to achieve key positions within the democratic system, they might develop new approaches to transform Islam from a foreign into an integral element of society.

### 3. The Participants of the Workshop

**Hayrettin Aydin**, wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter Institut für Religionswissenschaft und Religionspädagogik an der Universität Bremen

**Dr. Eli Bar-Chen**, Abteilung für Jüdische Geschichte und Kultur am Historischen Seminar der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

**Nicole Bosch**, europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms), Bamberg

**Sibylle Drexler**, europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms), Bamberg

**Wael El-Gayar**, Referat Analyse Islam, Informationszentrum Asyl und Migration, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF), Nürnberg

**Heinz Grunwald**, Regierungsvizepräsident, Regierung von Mittelfranken, Ansbach

**Prof. Dr. Friedrich Heckmann**, europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms), Bamberg

**Prof. Dr. Charles Hirschman**, Department of Sociology, University of Washington

**Prof. Dr. Krystyna Iglicka**, Centre for International Relations, University of Warsaw

**Prof. Dr. Barbara John**, Berliner Senatsverwaltung für Bildung, Jugend und Sport, Koordination Sprach- und Bildungsmaßnahmen für Migranten

**Lamya Kaddor**, Assistentin am Lehrstuhl für Religion des Islam an der Universität Münster und Lehrerin für Islamkunde an der Hauptschule Glückauf in Dinsklaken-Lohberg

**Prof. Dr. Yasemin Karakasoglu**, Erziehungs- und Bildungswissenschaften, Interkulturelle Bildung, Universität Bremen

**Dr. Birgit Klein**, Institut für Jüdische Studien, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

**Prof. Dr. Johannes Lähnemann**, Lehrstuhl für Religionspädagogik und Didaktik des Evangelischen Religionsunterrichts, Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg



---

**Dr. Karsten Lehmann**, Lehrstuhl für Religionswissenschaft II, Universität Bayreuth

**Dr. Ursula Mehrländer**, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Bonn

**Dr. Jürgen Miksch**, Interkultureller Rat in Deutschland, Darmstadt

**Prof. Dr. Peter O'Brien**, Professor of Political Science, Trinity University and Fulbright Gastprofessor Humboldt Universität zu Berlin

**Mario Peucker**, europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms), Bamberg

**Prof. Dr. jur. Mathias Rohe**, Institut für Zivilrecht und Zivilprozessrecht, Bürgerliches Recht, Internationales Privatrecht und Rechtsvergleichung, Universität Erlangen

**Dr. Tarik Tabbara (LL.M.)**, Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, Berlin

**Ulrich de Tallez**, Bayerisches Staatsministerium des Innern, München

**Dr. Levent Tezcan**, Institut für Interdisziplinäre Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung, Bielefeld

**Wolf Walther**, Projektgruppe „Integration und Islam“, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF), Nürnberg

**Dr. Andrea Witt**, The German Marshall Fund of the United States, Berlin

**Susanne Worbs**, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF), Nürnberg

**Dr. Tanja Wunderlich**, europäisches forum für migrationsstudien (efms), Bamberg