

RECON Online Working Paper 2010/15

Two Stories about Toleration

Rainer Forst



Rainer Forst
Two stories about toleration

RECON Online Working Paper 2010/15
August 2010

URL: www.reconproject.eu/projectweb/portalproject/RECONWorkingPapers.html

© 2010 Rainer Forst
RECON Online Working Paper Series | ISSN 1504-6907

Rainer Forst is is Professor of Political Theory and Philosophy at Johann Wolfgang Goethe University, Frankfurt. E-mail: forst@em.uni-frankfurt.de.

The RECON Online Working Paper Series publishes pre-print manuscripts on democracy and the democratisation of the political order Europe. The series is interdisciplinary in character, but is especially aimed at political science, political theory, sociology, and law. It publishes work of theoretical, conceptual as well as of empirical character, and it also encourages submissions of policy-relevant analyses, including specific policy recommendations. The series' focus is on the study of democracy within the multilevel configuration that makes up the European Union.

Papers are available in electronic format only and can be downloaded in pdf-format at www.reconproject.eu. Go to Publications | RECON Working Papers.

Issued by ARENA
Centre for European Studies
University of Oslo
P.O.Box 1143 Blindern | 0317 Oslo | Norway
Tel: +47 22 85 87 00 | Fax +47 22 85 87 10
www.arena.uio.no

Abstract

In current social conflicts in European societies such as the ones concerning the crucifix in classrooms or the foulard or the burka worn in public, toleration is a concept claimed by all involved. The paper uncovers the historical and conceptual reasons for such ambivalence about the notion of toleration. It starts from a conceptual analysis and then reconstructs two stories about toleration which lead to two different conceptions of it - the hierarchical permission conception and the democratic respect conception. The paper applies these to current conflicts and argues for an understanding of toleration based on a certain form of mutual respect despite deep ethical disagreement.

Keywords

Bayle - Critical Theory - Democracy - Diversity/homogeneity - Locke - Permission Conception - Respect Conception - Right to Justification - Normative Political Theory - Toleration

1. In its 3 November 2009 judgment in the case of *Lautsi v. Italy*, the European Court of Human Rights ruled that the Italian practice of displaying crucifixes in public schools violated the basic rights to freedom of education and to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.¹ Cases of this kind are typical in European societies² and they often exhibit similar structures. Whereas one party sees the crucifix (or cross) as a symbol of Christian faith, others reinterpret it as a symbol of Western culture generally and of its values of equality and tolerance, as the Veneto Regional Administrative Court had done in the *Lautsi* case. The Consiglio di Stato had held that the 'cross had become one of the secular values of the Italian constitution and represented the values of civil life',³ which is also what the Italian government argued in the proceedings before the European Court. Such cases raise a number of important issues about the traditions of Western societies and what they mean, about religious or non-religious symbols, about state neutrality and about fairness to minorities. What is especially interesting, however, is that both sides of the conflict claim the virtue of tolerance for themselves: the defenders of the crucifix in the classroom see it as a symbol of toleration and find the critique of that practice intolerant of religion and social traditions, whereas the plaintiffs in such cases see that symbolic practice as a sign of intolerance toward religious minorities. Obviously, then, in such conflicts toleration is an important concept, yet its application is highly contested.

But maybe not only its application is disputed. For if we look at these conflicts closely, they might also reveal an ambivalence concerning the interpretation of what toleration essentially means. For some, it merely implies that minorities are not forced to adopt a religion different from their own or to revere symbols of a certain faith, while for others toleration is the virtue accompanying state neutrality. For the first party, toleration means that the majority does have the right to determine the character of schools, for example, as long as it leaves room for minorities to differ, while for others that right is an unjustifiable privilege and majoritarian exercise of domination. If that is what toleration means, they argue, Goethe was right when he said: 'Tolerance should be a temporary attitude only: it must lead to recognition. To tolerate means to insult'.⁴ So we encounter here an instance of a long-standing debate about toleration in our societies, a debate that attests to the ambivalence that inheres in that concept.

To gain a deeper understanding of this ambivalence, I want to tell two stories about toleration, a dark and pessimistic one and a bright and optimistic one, and I want to argue that from a sufficiently complex critical historical perspective, both of them are true. More than that, they are not just historically true, they still inform the contemporary meaning and practices of toleration. Toleration can be based on mutual respect, and it can also be an expression of disrespect and domination. On the basis of an analysis of this

¹ European Court of Human Rights, case of *Lautsi v. Italy*, application no. 30814/06, 3 November, 2009. The case will be re-examined by the Grand Chamber of the court.

² I discuss a similar one in the German context in 'A Tolerant Republic?', in J.-W. Müller (ed.), *German Ideologies Since 1945. Studies in the Political Thought and Culture of the Bonn Republic* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 209-20.

³ *Lautsi v. Italy*, at p. 3.

⁴ ['Toleranz sollte nur eine vorübergehende Gesinnung sein: sie muss zur Anerkennung führen. Dulden heißt beleidigen'], Goethe, J. W. 'Maximen und Reflexionen', *Werke* 6 (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1981), at p. 507.

ambivalence, I will try to develop a normative justification for toleration that is based on an adequate understanding of democratic justice.

2. But before I start with my two stories, a word about the general concept of toleration. Its core can be explained by the three components of *objection*, *acceptance*, and *rejection*.⁵ First, a tolerated belief or practice has to be judged as false or bad in order to be a candidate for toleration; second, apart from these reasons for objection there have to be reasons why it would still be wrong not to tolerate these false or bad beliefs or practices, i.e., reasons of acceptance. Such reasons do not eliminate the reasons of objection; rather, they trump them in a given context. And third, there have to be reasons for rejection which mark the limits of toleration. These limits lie where reasons of acceptance run out, so to speak. All three of those reasons can be of one and the same kind – religious, for example – yet they can also be of different kinds (moral, religious, pragmatic, to mention a few possibilities).

Obviously, this definition is very general, and the problems begin once these components are fleshed out: What can or should be tolerated, for what reasons, and where are the limits of toleration? Toleration as such, it seems to me, is a *normatively dependent concept*, one that is in need of other, independent normative resources in order to gain a certain content and substance – and in order to be something good at all. Hence an important aspect of every story about toleration is how the three components gain substantive content.

3. My first story about toleration and recognition starts in 16th century France. In the course of the second half of that century, the party of the *politiques* gained and propagated the conviction that the principle of *une foi, une loi, un roi* could no longer be sustained, for the price to be paid for oppressing the Calvinist minority of the Huguenotes was too high, economically, politically and morally. Political unity could only be saved if the aim of religious unity was to a certain extent given up; *constituenda religione* and *constituenda republica* had to be separated and the monarch had to play the role of sovereign empire and ruler. It took, however, a long time up until 1598 before Henri IV issued the famous Edict of Nantes. This Edict clearly recognised the Huguenots as French citizens, though as citizens of a second class. They were granted the liberty to practice their religion only at specified places (not in Paris) and at certain times, and the Edict carefully explained which public offices they could hold, where and what kinds of schools and universities they could found and where they could build ‘security zones’ with armed forces. Hence the Calvinist minority became recognised and was protected by law, but at the same time the law fixed their position in a situation of being ‘merely’ tolerated, being dependent upon the good-will of the authority and always taking second

⁵ With respect to the first two components I follow King, P. ‘Toleration: Philosophical Perspective’, in id., *Toleration* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1976), pp. 21-72; Newey, G. ‘The Basic Structure of Toleration’, in *Virtue, Reason and Toleration* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999) also distinguishes between three kinds of reasons in his structural analysis of toleration (which, however, differs from mine in the way these reasons are interpreted). For a more extensive discussion, see Forst, R. ‘Toleration, Justice and Reason’, in C. McKinnon and D. Castiglione (eds) *The Culture of Toleration in Diverse Societies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), pp. 71-85; see also Forst, R. *Toleranz im Konflikt. Geschichte, Gehalt und Gegenwart eines umstrittenen Begriffs* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2003). Translation forthcoming with Cambridge University Press as *Toleration in Conflict*.

place after Catholics in everyday life. This kind of recognition/toleration, to be sure, was a great advantage compared to the prior situation (and later periods of oppression), yet it also meant a certain form of cultural and social stigmatisation, political powerlessness and dependency.

This is the kind of toleration that Goethe had in mind when he spoke of the insult of toleration, and also what Kant meant when he criticised the 'presumptuous title of tolerant [*hochmüthig*]', and what led Mirabeau to say that toleration is a sign of tyranny.⁶ These quotations also show that the almost 200 years between the Edict of Nantes and the French Revolution had not altered the structure of this kind of toleration. For example, we also find it in the Toleration Act of 1689, right after the 'Glorious Revolution', which was declared to be 'an Act for Exempting Their Majesties Protestant Subjects, Dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws',⁷ which shows that this act clearly defines which dissenters (Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists and Quakers) fall under these exemptions from the - still valid - laws of uniformity and conformity with the Church of England and which do not (the unitarian Socinians, for example, and of course atheists). Also, Catholics were excluded from toleration by the oath of allegiance that subjects of the king had to take. The result is a complex picture of inclusion and exclusion, of a majority and of various minorities some of which were tolerated and some of which were not. Those who were tolerated were at the same time included and excluded; they enjoyed a certain recognition and security that the others did not have, but they were dependent upon the protection of the monarch and thus had to show extreme loyalty. A complex matrix of power had developed that worked with different forms of recognition.

The same holds true of another example, which I want to mention briefly, the so-called *Toleranzpatente* of the Habsburg Emperor Joseph II in 1781 who - in contrast to his mother Maria Theresia who wanted to enforce religious unity - understood that in a time of intense religious strife, the most rational form of exercising political power was a kind of discipline and peace through granting freedom: This 'enlightened monarch' was enlightened enough to know that toleration was the more effective policy toward powerful dissenters. Thus he granted the liberty of the *Privat-Exercitium* of religious duties (not the public exercise of religion) to three minority confessions, the Lutherans, the Reformed ones and the Greek Orthodox. It was exactly defined what they were allowed to do. For example, their churches could have neither bells nor entrances onto the street. This form of liberty, Joseph was convinced, would produce good subjects out of religious dissenters who would automatically have become political opponents if no toleration was practised. Toleration was the price to be paid for loyalty, and on the side of the subjects, loyalty was the price to be paid for certain liberties and security. Conformity in exchange for nonconformity.

⁶ Kant, I. 'An Answer to the Question: "What is Enlightenment?"', in H. Reiss (ed.) *I. Kant, Political Writings*, [trans H. B. Nisbet] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), at p. 58; Comte de Mirabeau, H. G. R. 'Speech in the National Assembly on 22 August 1789', discussing the 'Declaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen'.

⁷ See the text of the Act in Grell, O. P., Israel, J. I and Tyacke, N (eds) *From Persecution to Toleration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 411-22.

4. Again, what we find here is the complex mixture of freedom and domination, of inclusion and exclusion, of recognition and disrespect that characterises this conception of toleration, which I call the *permission conception*. According to it, toleration is a relation between an authority and a dissenting, 'different' minority (or various minorities). Toleration means that the authority gives qualified permission to the members of the minority to live according to their beliefs on the condition that the minority accepts the dominant position of the authority. As long as their expression of their differences remains 'private' and within limits, and as long as these groups do not claim equal public and political status, they can be tolerated on both pragmatic and normative grounds; on pragmatic-strategic grounds because this form of toleration is regarded as the least costly of all possible alternatives and does not disturb civil peace and order as the dominant party defines it (but rather contributes to it), and on normative grounds because the authority may find it wrong (and in any case fruitless) to force people to give up their deep-seated beliefs or practices. In short, toleration means that the authority that has the power to interfere with the practices of the minority nevertheless tolerates it, while the minority accepts its dependent position. Thus, speaking in terms of the three components of toleration, all three of them are being defined by the authority alone.

As I said, it is this conception that Kant, Mirabeau and Goethe criticise; toleration appears to be a strategic or at least a hierarchical policy, and the form of recognition that is granted to minorities both gives them certain liberties *and* turns them into dependent subjects and second-class citizens. Not rights but permissions are granted, and they can always be revoked (as the Edict of Nantes was in 1685). This form of toleration had *liberating* as well as *repressive* and *disciplining* effects (the latter in Foucault's sense): liberating because it clearly was an advantage as compared to the previous oppressive policies, repressive because to be tolerated meant to accept one's weak and underprivileged position, and disciplining because those policies of toleration 'produced' stigmatised, non-normal identities that were at the same time socially included and excluded.⁸ The 'toleration' of the Jews from the Middle Ages to modern times is an obvious example of such forms of excluding inclusion; toleration always had to be paid for by stigmatisation and by subservience.

5. If we look at the present discourses and practices of toleration through the lens of what I would call a *critical theory of toleration*, based on an analysis of repressive and disciplining forms of toleration, we see that the 'dark' story is not yet over.⁹ For contrary to what many believe, the end of absolutism was not the end of the permission conception; rather, it is still very active and valid in our societies, though now in a different, a *democratic* form: the tolerating authority now appears as the authority of a

⁸ On this point, see also Brown, W. *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

⁹ See the examples I discuss in Forst, R. 'Die tolerante Gesellschaft', in id., 2003, *supra*, note 5, and Forst, R. 'A Critical Theory of Multicultural Toleration' in A. S. Laden and D. Owen (eds) *Multiculturalism and Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 292-311. I should note here that I use the term 'repressive tolerance' in a way that differs from Herbert Marcuse's classic essay 'Repressive Tolerance', in R. P. Wolff, B. Moore and H. Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965), pp. 81-118. Whereas he calls a system of toleration 'repressive' that veils unjust relations of power in an ideological way by neutralizing real opposition (in ideas and practice), I call forms of toleration 'repressive' when they help to uphold unjustifiable relations of power by forcing those who are dominated to accept their inferior position.

democratic majority. Of course, the authorities I mentioned in my three examples were also backed by overwhelming religious and political majorities, but within a democratic regime things look different, for now it is part of the very self-understanding of the regime that it grants basic equal liberties to all citizens – and that the citizens recognize each other as free and equal. Yet still in many contemporary practices of toleration, the permission conception has survived. I do not want to go into the many examples one could give for that, but only mention in passing that opponents of gay marriage laws often speak in favour of toleration but against equal rights in such cases (compare the slogan of the Christian Democratic Union in Germany in the context of the debate about a certain form of gay marriage: 'Tolerance yes, marriage no!'). In the famous German (or Bavarian) crucifix case very similar to the Lautsi case, many citizens, politicians, courts and speakers for the churches found that to tolerate non-Christian minorities such that they are not forced to give up their beliefs is one thing, but to grant them equal public and symbolic status and remove Christian symbols from classrooms of public schools would be quite another: it would be anti-democratic, anti-religious and would jeopardise the very foundations of the Federal Republic.¹⁰ Hence the power structure of this form of toleration is still very much at work: inclusion and exclusion, freedom and domination at the same time.

6. But as I remarked earlier, there also is a second, more optimistic story about toleration – which begins in the Netherlands of the 16th century. In the course of the fights of the primarily Protestant provinces in the north against Spanish rule and the enforcement of Catholicism we find two important developments in struggles for religious liberty, esp. in the writings of the Calvinist monarchomachs like Duplessis-Mornay. First, a natural right to religious liberty – as God-given – was proclaimed as a basic political right, and second, a king who did not respect this basic right had to be resisted, out of a sense of political *and* religious duty. Such a tyrant had broken both the *foedus* with God and the *pactum* with the people; religious liberty accordingly was not something *granted* by the rulers, it was a natural *right* given by God and thus a basic demand of political justice: There could be no legitimate state that did not grant this right. The revolutionary result of that claim was the splitting off of the northern provinces in the 'Union of Utrecht' in 1579, leading to the new republic that would become an example of toleration in the 17th century.

As the story goes on, the revolutionary claim of religious and political liberty as a 'birthright' reappears in the context of the English Civil War. The opposition to the king was justified by a 'fundamental law' of justice that called for political and religious liberty; government was no longer directly instituted by God but by men in order to safeguard the natural rights given by God to men as a special kind of 'property'. In the eyes of levellers like Lilburne¹¹, this kind of God-given liberty meant that any exercise of power, be it religious or political, had to be justified to the people who were 'affected' (or better: 'well-affected') by the laws. The right to freedom of conscience was justified with the Protestant argument that conscience was directly bound to obey and follow God and

¹⁰ See Forst 2003, *supra*, note 5.

¹¹ See Lilburne, J. 'England's Birth-Right Justified' [1645], in *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution*, Volume III, W. Haller (ed.) (New York: Octagon, 1965), pp. 257-308.

not men: a theory of the free and at the same time unfree conscience (as the 'work of God', as Luther had said) that also figures prominently in Milton's thought and later in Locke's *Letter Concerning Toleration*. William Walwyn expressed this – in the debates between Independents and the Presbyterian majority in parliament – in a paradigmatic way:

'That which a man may not voluntarily binde himself to doe, or to forbear to doe, without sinne: That he cannot entrust or refer unto the ordering of any other: Whatsoever (be it Parliament, Generall Councils, or Nationall Assemblies:) But all things concerning the worship and service of God, and of that nature; that a man cannot without wilfull sin, either binde himselfe to doe any thing therein contrary to his understanding and conscience: not to forbear to doe that which his understanding and conscience binde him to performe: therefore no man can refer matters of Religion to any others regulation. And what cannot be given, cannot be received: and then as a particular man cannot be robbed of that which he never had; so neither can a Parliament, or any other just Authority be violated in, or deprived of a power which cannot be entrusted unto them'.¹²

An early liberal argument of this sort for toleration is, however, highly ambiguous. On the one hand, the claim that there is a natural right to religious and political liberty does connect the demand for toleration with a radical demand for political *justice*, i.e., the basic demand for the general justification of the exercise of political power. In this perspective, toleration is not merely an 'exemption' being 'granted' to some 'non-normal' subjects, but a general rule of the way citizens treat each other within the confines of natural right. We see here the glimpse of a new, different conception of toleration, the *respect conception*, according to which democratic citizens respect each other as legal and political equals even though they differ greatly in their ethical-religious views about the good and true way of life.

On the other hand, the argument for freedom of conscience based on the theory of the 'unfree free conscience' mentioned above is not only compatible with the permission conception of toleration; it is also potentially exclusive of those persons who do not have the right form of conscience: atheists and Catholics, for example, as Locke famously argued (and with him Milton, differing from the more tolerant Levellers and baptists like Roger Williams). In Locke's first *Letter*, for example, it is clear that there can be no justified claim to the freedom *not* to believe in God. Indeed, we could call the fear that without a particular religious basis there could be no morality and no functioning state *Locke's fear*¹³ (shared by many later Enlightenment thinkers such as Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire) – a fear, to be sure, still very much present in contemporary societies. Cases like *Lautsi* – and the opposition to judgments like the one by the Court – attest to that.

¹² Walwyn, W. *A Helpe to the Right Understanding of a Discourse Concerning Independency* [1644/45], in J. R. McMichel and B. Taft (eds) *The Writings of William Walwyn* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1989), p. 136f.

¹³ 'The taking away of God, tho but even in thought, dissolves all', Locke, J. *A Letter Concerning Toleration*[1689], J. Tully (ed.) (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1983), at p. 51.

7. To continue our more optimistic story about toleration, we thus need to turn to a different voice in the historical discourse of toleration, one that questioned Locke's fear (though not as a direct reaction to Locke): the Huguenot philosopher Pierre Bayle (writing in exile in Rotterdam).¹⁴ In his *Pensées diverses sur la Comète* (1683) he introduced the so-called 'Bayle's paradox' by saying that religion was not necessary to support morality which rested on other motives (the desire for social recognition) and insights (of natural reason) independent of religious belief, and that religious fanaticism rather than atheism was the main danger for morality and the state. He even ventured the courageous idea that a 'society of atheists' would be possible – and possibly be more peaceful than religious societies.

What is more, one of Bayle's decisive insights was that *mutual toleration* among persons with different religious beliefs could only be possible if there was an independent moral basis of respect among human beings that would rule out the exercise of religious force. In his *Commentaire philosophique sur ces paroles de Jésus-Christ 'Contrain-les d'entrer'* (1686), he provides such a justification of toleration which avoids the problems that Locke's defence of religious liberty faced. For from studying Augustine's famous arguments about the possibility and productivity of *terror* in freeing men from religious error and enabling them to see the truth 'from the inside', so to speak, if properly informed¹⁵, Bayle already knew what Locke had to acknowledge after being confronted with Jonas Proast's critique: that although authentic and sincere beliefs could not be directly produced by outward force, there were many other indirect ways to block men on a road of error and to make them turn around.

'[...] I readily grant that Reason and Arguments are the only proper Means, whereby to induce the Mind to assent to any Truth, which is not evident by its own Light: and that Force is very improper to be used to that end *instead* of Reason and Arguments. [...] But notwithstanding this, if Force be used, not in stead of Reason and Arguments, i.e. not to convince by its own proper Efficacy (which it cannot do,) but onely to bring men to consider those Reasons and Arguments which are proper and sufficient to convince them, but which, without being forced, they would not consider: who can deny, but that *indirectly* and *at a distance*, it does some service toward the bringing men to embrace that Truth, which otherwise, either through Carelessness and Negligence they would never acquaint themselves with, or through Prejudice they would reject and condemn unheard, under the notion of Error?'¹⁶

¹⁴ I discuss Bayle's view more extensively in Forst, R. 'Pierre Bayle's Reflexive Theory of Toleration', in M. S. Williams and J. Waldron (eds) *Toleration and its Limits*, Nomos XLVIII (New York: New York University Press, 2008), pp. 78-113.

¹⁵ For Augustine's justification of the duty of intolerance, see especially his letter to Vincentius, letter number 93, written in 408; Augustine, *Letters*, Volume II, [trans. Sister W. Parsons] (New York: Fathers of the Church Inc., 1953).

¹⁶ Cf. Proast, J. *The Argument of the Letter Concerning Toleration, Briefly Consider'd and Answer'd*, reprint of the edition of 1690 (New York and London: Garland, 1984), at p. 4f. For a convincing critique of Locke on the basis of Proastian considerations, see especially Waldron, J. 'Locke, Toleration, and the Rationality of Persecution', in id. *Liberal Rights. Collected Papers 1981-1991* (Cambridge University Press, 1993). Where I disagree with Waldron, however, is his claim that Locke did not find a plausible counterargument to Proast. For that, however, Locke had to change his position and move towards the epistemological-normative

To avoid such counterarguments to a classic defence of the freedom of conscience, Bayle argued on normative grounds that every person had a moral duty to mutually justify any exercise of force – a duty that could be seen by the means of ‘natural reason’¹⁷ – and he argued on epistemological grounds that in a case in which there was a stand-off of one religious reason versus another, there was no sufficient justification for using force on either side. And this not because Bayle was a religious skeptic (as many have thought), but because Bayle insisted on faith being *faith* and not knowledge: as long as there was no reasonably non-rejectable proof as to the truth of one religion or confession, the duty of mutual justification called for tolerance (but not for scepticism, for knowing that one’s faith ultimately is faith – based on ‘relative evidence’¹⁸ – one has good reasons to regard it as true as long as it does not run against natural reason).¹⁹ From that perspective, the claim of people like Bossuet²⁰ who believed that they were in possession of the truth and therefore could legitimately exercise force – according to Augustine’s interpretation of the saying *compelle intrare* (Luke 14, 15ff.) – would turn into nothing but a pure and illegitimate exercise of domination. According to Bayle, in an argument about the norms and laws that are to regulate the common life to assume precisely what is contested, namely the truth of one church rather than another, is ‘childish’ and ‘ridiculous’;²¹ if such arguments were legitimate, ‘there would be no kind of crime which could not become an act of religion by this maxim’.²² As Bayle points out, a society can only exist peacefully if there is a generally acceptable definition of right and wrong independent of struggles about the true church.²³

argument that we find in Bayle (in superior form). In his later letters on toleration, Locke argues that the use of religious-political force is in need of mutual justification, and that Proast’s main assumption of the undeniable truth of the Church of England is unfounded. See especially Locke, J. ‘A Second Letter Concerning Toleration’ in id. *The Works of John Locke*, Volume VI (Aalen: Scientia, 1963), at p. 111, where he asks Proast to put forth a mutually justifiable argument ‘without supposing all along your church in the right, and your religion the true; which can no more be allowed to you in this case, whatever your church or religion be, than it can to a papist or a Lutheran, a presbyterian or anabaptist; nay, no more to you, than it can be allowed to a Jew or a Mahometan’.

¹⁷ See Bayle, P. *Philosophical Commentary* [trans. A. G. Tannenbaum (ed)] (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), at p. 30: ‘[B]ut if it’s possible to have certain limitations with respect to speculative truths, I don’t believe there ought to be any with regard to those practical and general principles which concern morals. I mean that all moral laws without exception, must submit to that idea of natural equity, which, as well as metaphysical light, enlightens every man coming into the world. [...] I would like whoever aims at knowing distinctly this natural light with respect to morality to raise himself above his own private interest or the custom of his country, and to ask himself in general: “Is such a practice just in itself? If it were a question of introducing it in a country where it would not be in use and where he would be free to take it up or not, would one see, upon examining it impartially, that it is reasonable enough to merit being adopted?”’ (emphasis in original).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, at p. 93.

¹⁹ Hence from a Baylean perspective, contrary to Barry, B. *Justice as Impartiality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), at p. 179, in matters of religion it seems quite possible and reasonable that ‘certainty from the inside about some view can coherently be combined with the line that it is reasonable for others to reject that same view’.

²⁰ See Bossuet, J.-B. *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture* [trans. P. Riley (ed)] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

²¹ Bayle, *supra*, note 17, at p. 13.

²² Bayle, *supra*, note 17, at p. 47.

²³ Bayle, *supra*, note 17, at p. 85.

In his famous *Dictionnaire historique and critique* (1696), Bayle carefully explained the distinction between knowledge and faith and the possibility of a form of 'natural' practical reason that would lead to an insight into the duty of mutual justification. Faith was not seen, in a fideist sense, as being *against* reason but, as Bayle said, as being *beyond* reason [*dessus de la Raison*]: faith was not irrational, but at the same time reason could not prove the true faith.²⁴ Human reason had to accept its own boundaries and finitude and the unavoidability of (what Rawls later called) 'reasonable disagreement'²⁵ in matters of faith. According to Bayle, those who would give up their faith because of that – because they cannot prove its truth in a demonstrative way – and would become skeptics or atheists are no good believers:

'Once again, a true Christian, well versed in the characteristics of supernatural truths and firm on the principles that are peculiar to the Gospel, will only laugh at the subtleties of the philosophers, and especially those of the Pyrrhonists. Faith will place him above the regions where the tempests of disputation reign. [...] Every Christian who allows himself to be disconcerted by the objections of the unbelievers, and to be scandalized by them, has one foot in the same grave as they do.'²⁶

8. For our story, Bayle's insights are essential. A justification of toleration such as Bayle's does avoid the pitfalls of a traditional argument for the liberty of conscience, which are (a) that the claim *credere non potest homo nisi volens* (Augustine) does not provide an argument against the suppression of religious errors or against religious 'guidance' because it is possible that 'mild' force can bring about sincere beliefs, and (b) that such toleration could only extend to *authentic* religious beliefs (whereas a criterion for such beliefs seems to be lacking), and of course only to *religious* beliefs (and not to atheists). Bayle's alternative justification also avoids, if we look at the recent history of liberal thought, the problems of the view that religious liberty as part of a wider notion of political liberty is justified because personal autonomy is a precondition for the good life, for only the life 'lived from the inside', on the basis of autonomously chosen values, could be good.²⁷ This is a plausible, though non-generalisable conception of the good life, for it is not clear whether a life lived according to traditional values that are not chosen but simply taken over in a conventional, non-critical way would be worse (i.e., subjectively less fulfilling and objectively of a lesser ethical value) than one that is autonomously chosen. The politically *free*, the personally *autonomous* and the ethical *good* life may be three separate things.

²⁴ '[D]ifference in opinion seems to be man's inherent infelicity, as long as his understanding is so limited and his heart so inordinate', Bayle, *supra*, note 17, at p. 141.

²⁵ See Rawls, J. *Political Liberalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), at p. 54-66; Larmore, C. 'Pluralism and Reasonable Disagreement', in *The Morals of Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

²⁶ Bayle, P. *Historical and Critical Dictionary: Selections* [trans. R. H. Popkin] (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991), Third Clarification, at p. 429.

²⁷ See Kymlicka, W. *Multicultural Citizenship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), at p. 81. For a critique of Kymlicka's view, see Forst, R. 'Foundations of a Theory of Multicultural Justice', *Constellations* 4 (1997): 63-71 (with a reply by Kymlicka in the same issue).

Of course, my alternative view also calls for a certain kind of respect for the autonomy of persons. Yet this kind of respect is not based on a particular *ethical* conception of the good, but on a *moral* notion of the person as a reasonable being with (what I call) a *right to justification*.²⁸ This right to justification is based on the recursive general principle that every norm that is to legitimise the use of force (or, more broadly speaking, a morally relevant interference with other's actions) claims to be reciprocally and generally valid and therefore needs to be justifiable by reciprocally and generally non-rejectable reasons. *Reciprocity* here means that neither party makes any claim to certain rights or resources that are denied to others (reciprocity of content), and that neither party projects its own reasons (values, interests, needs) onto others in arguing for its claims (reciprocity of reasons). One must be willing to argue for basic norms that are to be reciprocally and generally valid and binding with reasons that are not based on contested 'higher' truths or on conceptions of the good which can reasonably be questioned and rejected. *Generality*, then, means that the reasons for such norms need to be shareable among all persons affected, not just dominant parties.

I should emphasise the word 'shareable' here, for the criteria of reciprocity and generality allow for judgments as to the justifiability of claims even if – as is to be expected – no consensus is to be found.²⁹ A few brief examples: Those who argue for the equal legal respect of intimate relationships between homosexuals may have, given the criterion of reciprocity, superior arguments as compared to those who argue on the basis of a mutually contestable, religious understanding of 'nature'. Those who want to forbid persons from wearing headscarves in schools (be they teachers or students) must be able to show in how far the practice of wearing such symbols really violates basic rights and democratic principles. And those who want crucifixes to be put up in public classrooms by law need to show in how far this is compatible with the equal rights of citizenship in a religiously pluralist political community. And it is questionable whether such arguments have been presented in the latter two cases.

²⁸ On this point, see Forst, R. *The Right to Justification. Elements of a Constructivist Theory of Justice* (New York: Columbia University Press, forthcoming).

²⁹ Here, I agree with Waldron, J. 'Toleration and Reasonableness' in McKinnon and Castiglione, *supra*, note 5, pp. 13-37, that in a pluralist society there will always be contestation about the 'compossibility' of different ideals and practices of the good. And I do not want to suggest that I have developed what he radically doubts, a 'Kantian algebraic liberalism' that would provide a general formula for solving such conflicts in a clearly non-rejectable way. Yet I want to claim that with the help of the criteria of reciprocity and generality, we can plausibly identify better and worse arguments for generally valid norms in many cases, looking at the claims and the reasons given. An argumentative 'asymmetry' (*ibid.*, at p. 30) of claims and reasons then is important for such judgments. Is the claim, to use Waldron's Rushdie-example, to be protected from blasphemous insult as strong as the claim to be protected from being threatened in life and liberty because of what you think and say? Can the first claim be generalised and supported with reciprocally valid reasons in the same way as the second? I doubt that it can. What seems to me undisputed, however, is that toleration is the attitude of those who are willing to engage in such arguments, who accept the criteria of reciprocity and generality and who accept in a given case that their arguments do not suffice to be the basis of general law. Still, given Waldron's justified doubts, it is important to add another reason for toleration connected to this: the toleration of those who see that a debate remains in a standstill and that therefore no side can show its claims and reasons to be superior. In such a case, toleration means to accept that other grounds for the regulation of a conflict have to be found, by way of compromise.

The normative ground for this conception of toleration is the moral demand to respect each other's autonomy as a reason-giving and reason-receiving being. Whether those who are respected in that way will eventually lead an ethically better life can therefore be the object of disagreement; there must be no disagreement, however, about the duty of justification and the criteria of reciprocity and generality. This is the *normative* component of that justification of toleration, while the *epistemological* component consists of an insight into the finitude of reason: that reason is not sufficient to provide us with the one and only, ultimate answer about the truth of the good life which would show that all other ethical beliefs are false.

Most important in this context, however, is the insight that according to this conception of toleration to be tolerant implies the willingness and the capacity to distinguish between one's *ethical* beliefs about the true and good life and the general *moral* norms and principles one thinks every person, regardless of his or her view of the good, has to accept (or, better: cannot reciprocally and generally reject).³⁰ Bayle's theory clearly implies such a distinction, and looking at the history of toleration one may say that such a differentiation, in theory as well as in practice, may be the greatest achievement within the discourse of toleration. It comes, however, at a certain cost, which makes tolerance (according to the respect conception as I sketched it) into a demanding *moral-political virtue*³¹: the cost is that in the case in which you cannot present reciprocally and generally non-rejectable arguments for your ethical judgments, you have to accept that you are not justified to make these judgments the basis for generally binding legal norms.³²

9. Referring back to the three components of toleration, the main difference between the permission conception and the respect conception is that according to the former all three components are determined by the ethical views of the dominant majority or authority, while in the respect conception things look different. The *objection* may be based on one's particular ethical (or religious) views; the *acceptance*, however, will be based on a general consideration of whether the reasons for objection are good enough to be reasons for *rejection*, i.e., whether they are reciprocally and generally justifiable. If they turn out to be sufficient for a negative *ethical* judgment, but not for a negative *moral* judgment, the case for toleration arises: for then one has to see that one's ethical objection does not justify a moral condemnation and a rejection. This is the insight of toleration.

And this is why in a political context, toleration and democracy must be seen as components of political justice: of the imperative not to force others to live under norms and laws that cannot be adequately justified toward them. Toleration then is not just and not primarily a virtue of subjects of democratic law, it is primarily a virtue of democratic citizens as *law-makers*. Toleration means, for example, that you come to see that even if you firmly believe that the cross is the symbol of the true faith, you also have to accept that it would be wrong to have it put up in classrooms of public schools by law. Such an

³⁰ On this distinction, originally drawn from Jürgen Habermas' discourse ethics, and the difference of various 'contexts of justification' as well as of 'contexts of recognition', see Forst, R. *Contexts of Justice*, [trans. J. Farrell (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002)].

³¹ On this point, see Forst, R. 'Tolerance as a Virtue of Justice,' *Philosophical Explorations* 4(2001): 193-206.

³² Bayle himself, one should add, only saw this as a moral and civic virtue; politically, he stood in the tradition of the *politiques* arguing for a strong sovereign like Henri IV.

insight is an insight of justice and of fairness toward minorities. Most often it does not come naturally; rather, such insights are generated in practices of social justification where the terms and relations of justification are such that minorities do have a chance to exercise what we could call the 'force toward the better argument'. So here, again, toleration is part of practices of power, but in a different way as compared to the hierarchical permission conception. The respect conception presupposes that the 'power of justification' that all those who are part of a social conflict can generate – a social and public form of power constituted by assent and agreement – is available such that minorities can develop sufficient argumentative strength to make their case heard and, in fact, effectively undeniable, if they fulfil the criterion of reciprocity and others don't – and if the public and political institutions are arranged such that this justificatory advantage becomes visible and counts. Hence a critical political theory of toleration has to focus on the *relations of justification* in a given society, i.e. the major discursive, formal and informal ways in which justificatory power can be generated, especially by minorities.³³

10. As I already indicated, our story would be far too optimistic if we thought that historically this has become the dominant conception of toleration, which is neither true given the practices of toleration nor given the most important writings on toleration. Enlightenment thought before Kant hardly reached the height of Bayle's conception. Therefore the general idea that the Enlightenment marked the highpoint of thinking about toleration and then also made the step *beyond toleration* by positively institutionalizing the right to religious liberty in the American and French Revolutions is mistaken. No doubt the idea of a basic right to religious liberty does take a decisive step beyond the permission conception of toleration, but it is wrong to assume that this takes one 'beyond toleration', for (a) toleration is still called for, as I said, but now on the horizontal level of citizens as authors and addressees of the law and (b), from a critical perspective, the permission conception is still very much alive in the interpretations of what a right to religious liberty means: Does it simply mean not being forced to give up one's minority religious views, or does it entail equal public and political status for minorities? In democratic states, the old absolutist permission conception is gone, but there is still a constant struggle going on between the democratic form of the permission conception and the democratic form of the respect conception. Hence, if we want to develop a genealogy of our sense and practice of toleration, both of my stories have to form a *single* one. Toleration is a dialectical concept.

³³ On this, see Forst, R. 'First Things First. Redistribution, Recognition and Justification', *European Journal of Political Theory* 6(3) (2007): 291-304, and Forst, R. *Justification and Critique* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, forthcoming).

RECON Online Working Papers

2010/15

Rainer Forst

Two Stories about Toleration

2010/14

Zdenka Mansfeldová and Petra

Rakušanová Guasti

The Quality of Democracy in the Czech Republic

2010/13

Emmanuel Sigalas, Monika Mokre,

Johannes Pollak, Peter Slominski

and Jozef Bátora

Democracy Models and Parties at the EU Level

Empirical Evidence from the Adoption of the 2009 European Election Manifestoes

2010/12

Antje Wiener and Uwe Puetter

Informal Elite Dialogue and Democratic Control in EU Foreign and Security Policy

2010/11

Erik Oddvar Eriksen

European Transformation

A Pragmatist Approach

2010/10

Justus Schönlau

The Committee of the Regions

The RECON Models from a Subnational Perspective

2010/09

Asimina Michailidou and Hans-Jörg Trenz

2009 European Parliamentary Elections on the Web

A Mediatization Perspective

2010/08

Kolja Möller

European governmentality or decentralised network governance?

The case of the European Employment Strategy

2010/07

Kjartan Koch Mikalsen

In Defence of Kant's League of States

2010/06

Nora Schleicher

Gender Identity in a Democratic Europe

2010/05

Christian Joerges

The Idea of a Three-Dimensional Conflicts Law as Constitutional Form

2010/04

Meltem Müftüler-Baç and Nora Fisher

Onar

Women's Rights in Turkey as Gauge of its European Vocation

The Impact of 'EU-niversal Values'

2010/03

Neil Walker

Constitutionalism and Pluralism in Global Context

2010/02

Dominika Biegoń

European Identity Constructions in Public Debates on Wars and Military Interventions

2010/01

Federica Bicchi and Caterina Carta

The COREU/CORTESY Network and the Circulation of Information within EU Foreign Policy

2009/19

Rachel Herp Tausendfreund

The Commission and its Principals

Delegation Theory on a Common

European External Trade Policy in the WTO

2009/18

Marianne Riddervold

Making a Common Foreign Policy

EU Coordination in the ILO

2009/17

Uwe Puetter and Antje Wiener

EU Foreign Policy Elites and Fundamental Norms

Implications for Governance

2009/16

Emmanuel Sigalas, Monika Mokre,
Johannes Pollak, Jozef Bátora and
Peter Slominski

**Reconstituting Political Representation
in the EU**

The Analytical Framework and
the Operationalisation of the
RECON Models

2009/15

Meltem Müftüleri-Baç and Yaprak Gürsoy

**Is There an Europeanisation of
Turkish Foreign Policy?**

An Addendum to the Literature
on EU Candidates

2009/14

Maria Weimer

**Applying Precaution in Community
Authorisation of Genetically
Modified Products**

Challenges and Suggestions for Reform

2009/13

Dionysia Tamvaki

**Using Eurobarometer Data on Voter
Participation in the 2004 European
Elections to Test the RECON Models**

2009/12

Arndt Wonka and Berthold Rittberger

How Independent are EU Agencies?

2009/11

Tanja Hitzel-Cassagnes and Rainer
Schmalz-Bruns

Recognition and Political Theory:

Paradoxes and Conceptual Challenges of
the Politics of Recognition

2009/10

Hans-Jörg Trenz and Pieter de Wilde

Denouncing European Integration

Euro-scepticism as Reactive Identity
Formation

2009/09

Pieter de Wilde

Designing Politicization

How Control Mechanisms in National
Parliaments Affect Parliamentary Debates
in EU Policy-Formulation

2009/08

Erik Oddvar Eriksen

Explicating Social Action

Arguing or Bargaining?

2009/07

Hans-Jörg Trenz, Nadine Bernhard
and Erik Jentges

Civil Society and EU

Constitution-Making

Towards a European Social Constituency?

2009/06

Kjartan Koch Mikalsen

**Regional Federalisation with a
Cosmopolitan Intent**

2009/05

Agustín José Menéndez

European Citizenship after

Martínez Sala and Bambaust

Has European Law Become

More Human but Less Social?

2009/04

Giandomenico Majone

**The 'Referendum Threat', the
Rationally Ignorant Voter, and the
Political Culture of the EU**

2009/03

Johannes Pollak, Jozef Bátora, Monika

Mokre, Emmanuel Sigalas and

Peter Slominski

On Political Representation

Myths and Challenges

2009/02

Hans-Jörg Trenz

In Search of Popular Subjectness

Identity Formation, Constitution-Making

and the Democratic Consolidation of the

EU

2009/01

Pieter de Wilde

Reasserting the Nation State

The Trajectory of Euro-scepticism in the

Netherlands 1992-2005

2008/20

Anne Elizabeth Stie

**Decision-Making Void of Democratic
Qualities?**

An Evaluation of the EU's Foreign and

Security Policy

- 2008/19
Cathleen Kantner, Amelie Kutter and Swantje Renfordt
The Perception of the EU as an Emerging Security Actor in Media Debates on Humanitarian and Military Interventions (1990-2006)
- 2008/18
Cathrine Holst
Gender Justice in the European Union
The Normative Subtext of Methodological choices
- 2008/17
Yaprak Gürsoy and Meltem Müftüleri-Baç
The European Union's Enlargement Process and the Collective Identity Formation in Turkey
The Interplay of Multiple Identities
- 2008/16
Yvonne Galligan and Sara Clavero
Assessing Gender Democracy in the European Union
A Methodological Framework
- 2008/15
Agustín José Menéndez
Reconstituting Democratic Taxation in Europe
The Conceptual Framework
- 2008/14
Zdzisław Mach and Grzegorz Pożarlik
Collective Identity Formation in the Process of EU Enlargement
Defeating the Inclusive Paradigm of a European Democracy?
- 2008/13
Pieter de Wilde
Media Coverage and National Parliaments in EU Policy-Formulation
Debates on the EU Budget in the Netherlands 1992-2005
- 2008/12
Daniel Gaus
Legitimate Political Rule Without a State?
An Analysis of Joseph H. H. Weiler's Justification of the Legitimacy of the European Union Qua Non-Statehood
- 2008/11
Christopher Lord
Some Indicators of the Democratic Performance of the European Union and How They Might Relate to the RECON Models
- 2008/10
Nicole Deitelhof
Deliberating ESDP
European Foreign Policy and the International Criminal Court
- 2008/09
Marianne Riddervold
Interests or Principles?
EU Foreign Policy in the ILO
- 2008/08
Ben Crum
The EU Constitutional Process
A Failure of Political Representation?
- 2008/07
Hans-Jörg Trenz
In Search of the European Public Sphere
Between Normative Overstretch and Empirical Disenchantment
- 2008/06
Christian Joerges and Florian Rödl
On the "Social Deficit" of the European Integration Project and its Perpetuation Through the ECJ Judgements in *Viking* and *Laval*
- 2008/05
Yvonne Galligan and Sara Clavero
Reserching Gender Democracy in the European Union
Challenges and Prospects
- 2008/04
Thomas Risse and Jana Katharina Grabowsky
European Identity Formation in the Public Sphere and in Foreign Policy
- 2008/03
Jens Steffek
Public Accountability and the Public Sphere of International Governance

2008/02
Christoph Haug
Public Spheres within Movements
Challenging the (Re)search for a European
Public Sphere

2008/01
James Caporaso and Sidney Tarrow
Polanyi in Brussels
European Institutions and the
Embedding of Markets in Society

2007/19
Helene Sjursen
Integration Without Democracy?
Three Conceptions of European
Security Policy in Transformation

2007/18
Anne Elizabeth Stie
**Assessing Democratic Legitimacy
From a Deliberative Perspective**
An Analytical Framework for Evaluating the
EU's Second Pillar Decision-Making System

2007/17
Swantje Renfordt
**Do Europeans Speak With
One Another in Time of War?**
Results of a Media Analysis
on the 2003 Iraq War

2007/16
Erik Oddvar Eriksen and
John Erik Fossum
**A Done Deal? The EU's Legitimacy
Conundrum Revisited**

2007/15
Helene Sjursen
Enlargement in Perspective
The EU's Quest for Identity

2007/14
Stefan Collignon
**Theoretical Models of Fiscal
Policies in the Euroland**
The Lisbon Strategy, Macroeconomic
Stability and the Dilemma of
Governance with Governments

2007/13
Agustín José Menéndez
The European Democratic Challenge

2007/12
Hans-Jörg Trenz
**Measuring Europeanisation of
Public Communication**
The Question of Standards

2007/11
Hans-Jörg Trenz, Maximilian
Conrad and Guri Rosén
**The Interpretative Moment of
European Journalism**
The Impact of Newspaper Opinion
Making in the Ratification Process

2007/10
Wolfgang Wagner
**The Democratic Deficit in the EU's
Security and Defense Policy - Why
Bother?**

2007/09
Helene Sjursen
'Doing Good' in the World?
Reconsidering the Basis of the Research Agenda
on the EU's Foreign and Security Policy

2007/08
Dawid Friedrich
Old Wine in New Bottles?
The Actual and Potential Contribution of
Civil Society Organisations to Democratic
Governance in Europe

2007/07
Thorsten Hüller
Adversary or 'Depoliticized' Institution?
Democratizing the Constitutional Convention

2007/06
Christoph Meyer
**The Constitutional Treaty Debates as
Revelatory Mechanisms**
Insights for Public Sphere Research and
Re-Launch Attempts

2007/05
Neil Walker
Taking Constitutionalism Beyond the State

2007/04
John Erik Fossum
Constitutional Patriotism
Canada and the European Union

2007/03

Christian Joerges

Conflict of Laws as Constitutional Form

Reflections on International Trade Law
and the *Biotech* Panel Report

2007/02

James Bohman

Democratizing the Transnational Polity

The European Union and the
Presuppositions of Democracy

2007/01

Erik O. Eriksen and John Erik Fossum

Europe in Transformation

How to Reconstitute Democracy?

Reconstituting Democracy in Europe (RECON)

RECON seeks to clarify whether democracy is possible under conditions of complexity, pluralism and multilevel governance. Three models for reconstituting democracy in Europe are delineated and assessed: (i) reframing the EU as a functional regime and reconstituting democracy at the national level; (ii) establishing the EU as a multi-national federal state; or (iii) developing a post-national Union with an explicit cosmopolitan imprint.

RECON is an Integrated Project financed by the European Commission's Sixth Framework Programme for Research, Priority 7 – Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-based Society. Project No.: CIT4-CT-2006-028698.

Coordinator: ARENA – Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo.

Project website: www.reconproject.eu

RECON Online Working Paper Series

The Working Paper Series publishes work from all the researchers involved in the RECON project, but it is also open to submissions from other researchers working within the fields covered by RECON. The topics of the series correspond to the research focus of RECON's work packages. RECON Online Working Papers are widely circulated and included in online social science databases. Contact: admin@reconproject.eu.

Editors

Erik O. Eriksen, *ARENA – University of Oslo*

John Erik Fossum, *ARENA – University of Oslo*

Editorial Board

Ben Crum, *Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*

Zdzislaw Mach, *Jagiellonian University Krakow*

Yvonne Galligan, *Queen's University Belfast*

Agustín José Menéndez, *University of León*

Christian Joerges, *University of Bremen*

Helene Sjursen, *ARENA – University of Oslo*

Ulrike Liebert, *University of Bremen*

Hans-Jörg Trezn, *ARENA – University of Oslo*

Christopher Lord, *ARENA – University of Oslo*

Wolfgang Wagner, *Peace Research Institute Frankfurt*