

Englische Zusammenfassungen der Beiträge (چکیده انگلیسی مقالات)

Harald Seubert outlines how the gauge of human life had already become a central issue concerning the requirements for a human life in Greek ethics. Namely, from Aristotle's point of view, a gauge for the reasonable cannot once and for all arithmetically be determined, but must accord with one's own clever judgement, self knowledge and the knowledge of the other, referring to important situations as well. Modernism and post or hyper modernism however tend to the oblivion of a gauge. Its question is simply denounced to anachronism. The article finally therefore advocates a thinking process which opens up towards wisdom that accompanies life and makes life transparent. Solely to her may the human gauge extrapolate in a unity of thinking and action.

Peter Gerdsen examines thought contents and the connection between the terms ›tolerance‹, ›extremism‹ and ›wise gauge‹. An outline of the contemporary world situation shows that these three terms are of special importance. Tolerance and the wise gauge understood as moderation borne by wisdom are two virtues, which the world situation needs especially. Particularly virtue or the wise gauge are, according to Gerdsen, important regarding the control of extremism. This term is thoroughly scrutinized with special reference to ›hidden extremism‹, which bears methods of disguising itself and often is at first hand not recognized as such. Gerdsen states that in the countries of a ›western community of shared values‹ the virtue of the wise gauge is no longer present. The connection and points of contact between the terms are obvious on the level of thinking and level of consciousness. Gerdsen shows that tolerance and the wise gauge have transcendent fundamentals which result in either the reinterpretation of both virtues in those countries that are influenced by secularism or have no importance.

Christoph Böhr represents the thesis: Who has no belief, which he sees as the ultimate truth, endorses the capability to tolerate foreign beliefs. Böhr clarifies in his article: tolerance is not indifference. Tolerance is not indifference, but a form of compliment towards a third party. Only who knows a

binding truth, which he confesses and acknowledges, can – as Böhr argues – tolerate remarks of foreign and other sounds of beliefs, and that means: to integrate them in their full seriousness and to face them without contempt. Who, however, does not accept a claim of truth, need not tolerate the dissident, because he concedes him no truth like himself. In this case we speak of a diversity of equally-meaning viewpoints: a reciproke indifference. If these regarded as equally-meaning viewpoints each lack a claim of truth, it then can be collocated, be at loggerheads and militantly declaim against each other – the majority at last decides upon what becomes a prevailing view, and however must always adjust adhoc to shrinking to a minority. Tolerance – indulgence – means something completely different: namely, to accept every human being in his dignity without exception and to respect his capability of truth however deceptive his viewpoints may be. To deny him his claim of truth means at the end to despise his being different and to at best regard it as a mood – the Anglosaxons would say: a spleen.

Ali Radjaie exemplifies the Persian term ›Eetedal‹, the wise gauge from five dimensions of academic, economic, sociocultural and political as well as literary viewpoints. In each respectively specialized field he points at the detailed etymological meaning of the term and outlines it in its academic frame. He argues how far ›mediocrity‹ in the five mentioned areas are important for each specialist field and which advantages and disadvantages it bears if they are neglected, overseen or ignored. Structurally seen, it counts, according to its explorations to the main pillars of all specialist fields and activities, yet even to the harmonic existence of every creature, because it emanates from every human-rational, logical thinking and the absolute reason. However, the author negates every extremities, digressions, exaggerations, understatements and imbalance, because they can bring mischief and misfortune. Radjaie clearly shows with good evidence that ›the wise gauge‹ can be an acceptable base for a harmonic and reasonably rooted life in every facette.

In this article **Ghasem Salimi** willingly examines keywords like balance, bigotry, indulgence, etc. in literary works especially the volumes of Persian poets. He thereby tries to find solutions in the works of these Iranian poet-philosophers to excogitate conflicts that emanate from religious disagreements. Salimi focusses after historical priorities on these works in order to determine how far the religious, cultural and mystic teachings of the Irani-

ans, or even better of the Persian-speaking people contributed to the maintenance of the equation and the history of indulgence and tolerance of the region and how far it was important. He shows that they are hardly traceable to the actual religious and cultural teachings, but rather personal reflections of certain groups of the society's leadership have led to these problems. Salimi concludes that these poet-philosophies have always sought for the maintenance of unity and solidarity between the demographic groups and the different peoples and thereby often sacrificed their own tranquility and calmness for the peace of the society.

Hamid Reza Yousefi regards the reciprocity between tolerance and its gauge in a world context and sees a direct connection between this relation and the dialogue between cultures, traditions and civilizations. Yousefi shows that this causal interaction belongs to the socio-theoretical and religious basic considerations of all cultures and peoples. The point thereby is basically to find out what tolerance is, resp. what it is not and why tolerance as an interpersonal virtue can be the basis of every communication, whether intercultural or interreligious. Tolerance certainly requires the virtue of renouncement to refrain from what disturbs communication and to undertake action towards what inspires a dialogue and supports an appreciative and acceptable opinion. Tolerance, as Yousefi conceives, has its border where the dignity of a human being is indirectly or directly endangered. Interreligious resp. intercultural debates about the practice of value systems are without such a term of tolerance and its gauge impossible.