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Introduction to the Mobilities, Transitions, Transformations
Conference Proceedings

The Mobilities, Transitions, Transformations - Intercultural Education at the Crossroads Conference was jointly organized by the International Association for Intercultural Education (IAIE) and the Institute of Intercultural Psychology and Education (IIPE) at the Faculty of Education and Psychology of the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary, in cooperation with the International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education (IASCE) and the Tom Lantos Institute as supporting organizations 05-09. September 2016, Budapest, Hungary. The conference explored the ways in which social, cultural and geographical mobilities, transitions and transformations are interpreted, constructed and re-constructed through the theory and practice of intercultural education and aimed to create an open forum for intercultural education theorists, practitioners, and students to engage with current issues.

Current and recent events, both in national and global contexts, demonstrate the continuing importance of intercultural education. Turmoil and uncertainty have a negative impact on the educational environment and hinder the capacity for learning to take place and often result in the reinforcement of barriers between people. The task for educators is therefore immense, and therefore this volume of conference papers provides a platform for those who are actively involved in helping to break down these barriers. In this respect papers published in this volume discuss diverse issues and concerns, and are organized according following the structure of the conference.

The papers in this volume are organized in eight larger chapters. The first chapter deals with the issues of how to challenge power, dominance and educational hegemony, and what dilemmas these bring to intercultural education. It is focused on the subtle and explicit ways in which power, dominance, and hegemony are exerted in educational contexts through policy and practice, particularly in relation to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion, and linguistic heritage, and how individuals and organizations are addressing these
into resources may take place as an experimental and situated learning process, where social competences develop as a result of constructively lived multicultural experiences. The author argues that there is a close link between intercultural education and cooperative learning, which may serve as an effective tool for fostering equality and social justice at school.

Nataša Sturza Milić and Tanja Nenedimović discuss how globalization regarding may influence what sports activities children may prefer, and how educators, coaches, trainers and parents may facilitate these choices. They call for a comprehensive, holistic approach, a flexible discourse, constant questioning and systematic care of the society, and keeping the children’s need in focus instead of the globally enhanced values of success, results and fame.

Papers in chapter eight are loosely connected to intercultural education, but discuss social and historical issues that are interesting and valuable from an intercultural perspective.

In her paper Ana Babić discusses the challenges of ensuring the right to quality education for the third culture children. The globally relevant issue of access to education guaranteed by the law, but not realized in practice, due to the lack of integration mechanisms in the educational system is discussed through the example of Croatia, and formulates recommendations for creating a more just and accessible education system.

Sándor Földvári in his paper discusses the concept of intercultural communication from the perspective of interfaith dialogue through the example of Pope John Paul II from a historical perspective. It calls the attention on what influence diplomatic speech may have on the general discourse, and also focuses at the role of churches at managing intercultural challenges, such as the challenges of migration, youth and poverty.

JeongA Yang and Jae-Bong-Yoo in their second paper give an overview of research methodology for intercultural education. They argue that applying diverse methodologies support researchers in understanding issues and challenges of multicultural societies better.
ABSTRACT

Intercultural communication has evolved due to the activity of The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) in the United States, in a result of efforts to solve the FSI’s failures in communication with another nations or civilizations. – In parallel, actually, the church evolved its own theory and practice of intercultural communication, too, since and after the Second Vatican Council. Especially in Saint John Paul II’s activity, who was canonized in 2014 by the recent Pope Francis, who seemed to follow his great predecessor and it was evaluated by such Israeli politicians as Simon Perez. – Saint John Paul II’s entire pontificate was full of intercultural actions: praying together with the Dalai Lama in Assisi (1986), while putting a Buddha on the altar; and he was who has first visited the Jewish synagogue of Rome. -- All these led to the culmination of the interfaith communication in his address to the Muslims in the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus, May 6, 2001.

Keywords: InterculturalCommunication; Interreligious_Dialogues; John Paul II Pope; Second Vatican Council; Islam Christian Dialogues; Peacemaking

Although in the recent times, intercultural communication is usually taught at the business schools with purposes to give more chances to explain the partner that the particular item or product is of a great value, it was not the only aim neither the main one of this field when it was evolved. Originally, it was elaborated as the study of methods how to introduce ourselves and how to understand the others more and more better, in particular, in order to help the partner. This was, has been and hopefully will

---
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be the basic motivation, even the axial one of the intercultural communication, that is, the bridge-making and conflict managing as in the everyday life as in the sphere of international relations. If so, no wonder the religions especially the Christianity picked up this new field even more, they evolved something pretty similar to that was named “intercultural communication” by the foreign services.

The birth of intercultural communication was the failure in cases of the post-war supports were to be given by the United States to countries those suffered much during the II World War and were quite underdeveloped. Then the officials of the US faced the problem the representatives –moreover, the people- of the third-world and to-be-helped countries, did not understand them. They did not accept the help as they were not being able to be convinced that was a real help. Many development programs failed not because of poor design but because of how they were implemented. Generally, the contacts between an average –even educated- American person and someone from the third-world-countries were sometimes dialogues between the deaf; even in the case they spoke English excellent. What was the matter? The costumes, ways of expressions, methods of turning to the other, and such circumstance seemed not to be accidental but essential factors. According to Rogers and Steinfatt (1999:61) many programs failed because of “inept, culturally insensitive technicians, working in Third World Nations whose language and culture they did not understand.” Thus: “An important lesson learned from these failures was that cultural factors needed to be given more weight in training and program development.” (ibidem) The culture we live in, determines our meaning, therefore, if to speak to the others, one must acquire not only their language but their culture, too. The culture is such a subject to learn as the language, in the case one wants to talk to others and to understand them! Culture and language are equal, essential channels of the communication; both of them are inevitable to be acquired up
to the perfection if one wants express him/her to the others. This was the great discover which inspired the Foreign Service Institute of America to support investigations on problems of the intercultural communication, as this field got its name that time, too. This institution was established in order to train diplomats and clerks to work abroad. One FSI anthropologist, Edward Hall, combined his practical work with people in different cultures with his training in order to establish the new discipline of intercultural communication. After he wrote his best-selling book on nonverbal communication, more people began to study the impact on nonverbal messages. (Hall, 1959) From the middle of the twentieth century, the intercultural communication has dynamically developed to a wide and compounded discipline. The first university courses in ICC were introduced in the 1960s. The basic textbook was published by Samovar and Porter in 1972 under the title Intercultural communication: A Reader. As a result by 1980s, more than 60 US universities taught graduate courses and about 200 offered undergraduate ones. (Hickson, Stacks, Moore, 2004.) For an example from the non-business even non-diplomatic fields of intercultural communication, the case of the international congresses may be taken, as Hickson and Stacks (1992) give advices for academic chairs, as well.

In parallel, actually, the church evolved its own theory and practice of intercultural communication, as Ecclesiam Suam by Pope Paul VI and Dives in Misericordia or the Redemptoris Missio by John Paul II.

It was an act setting example that an old-fashioned structure as the Catholic Church tried to renew by opening its horizon to the rest of the world and contemporary values. As it was stated in the constitution about the role of the church in the [contemporary] world, name on its initials as Gaudium et spes (“Joy and hope”; furthermore GS): as the human dignity is the axial value of the world, and the church
exists in the world, the church must be hold a dialogue with the world. As the GS was proclaimed at the end of 1965, no wonder the cited sentence reflexes the first Encyclical Ecclesiam Suam by Pope Paul VI, who exerted already pressure on the Council by his Opening Speech to the second session of the V2 on Sept 29, 1963. – The title of its 7th chapter was quite meaningful: “The dialogue of the Church with the Contemporary World” (Dialogo della Chiesa con il mondo contemporaneo: subtitles are given in Italian –secondary-official- text, but not in the Latin version) [underline mine] and he stated out in § 7.7 (the Latin text is to be cited as generally the Latin version is the most official text, published in the AAS, the official journal of the Holy See): “Aetatem hanc nostram eiusque varias at pugnantes significationes summa benevolentia prosequimur…” (Latin: Allocutio, AAS 1963: 856.) “Seguiamo con estrema simpatia questa nostra epoca e le sue varie e contraddittorie manifestazioni…” (Italian, Discorso…, 7.) That is from Latin, literary: “Toward our time [=world] and toward its various –even struggling- manifestations, we must be disposed with all the good will [of ours]…” – and from Italian, literary: “We follow with all the sympathy [of ours] toward our epoch and its various and ambiguous manifestations…” (translations mine; no English version on the Vatican site). — Let’s pay attention to the significant differences between the published official text in Latin and the delivered opening address in Italian. The Latin at conjunction is quite sharp, determined for expressing the ambiguity: “even, even, even though”. While the Italian text contains e “and” which is neutral. Italian verb seguere “to follow, to accompany” is far not strong as its etymological relative, Latin prosequor “follow sb/sg; deal with sb, treat sb” which implies more active energy taken by the agent, even being a part of the idiomatic phrase prosequor aliquem benevolentia “be well/kindly disposed toward somebody”. As it already is a well-known fact, the Second Vatican Council was a terrene of sharp fights between the conservative and
realist wings of the Catholic Church; especially the “German lobby” fought for the innovations and reformation (Wiltgen, 1978). Therefore, an opening address by the new pope, who was just elected as successor to John XXIII, the “Pope of the Synod”, had to be modest, counterbalanced, at the same time determined and unhesitant. Cardinal Montini was an adherent of the progressive wing but not as sharply as the “German lobby”; when he became the Pope he definitely interposed into the process of the Synod, supporting the progressives, using his pontifical authority but apparently respecting all kinds of opinions, even conservatives. Two months later, when the text was published as an official pontifical teaching by the Head of the Church, the Latin version already expressed, the goodwill “benevolantia” toward the secular world, the modern times clearly, more definitely. This was a step for the intercultural communication by the Catholic Church, and it demonstrated the different versions of the Vatican texts in various languages were to be considered as for investigating its particular meaning and significance.

Pope John Paul II was the first who wittingly spoke about intercultural communication, moreover, distinguished between the dialogues of different cultures and the dialogue of the Gospel with the world. (The latter was one of the main ideas of Paul VI’s encyclicals Ecclesiam suam and Populorum progressio, too, and other speeches of him as we mentioned above. But Paul VI did not distinguished enough between dialogues of cultures and the dialogue by church with cultures; the latter was of the only importance to him, and any other thing was subordinate to the relations between the church and secular world. The first who directly treated the intercultural communication it was his second successor on papal throne.) Thus JP2 was the first pope paid attention to the communication between different spheres of the contemporary world as a current task of the main factors of the humankind (such as politicians, capitalists, arts and
churches as well) and, on the other hand, the special communication with purposes to spread the Gospel. The first, the “intercultural communication” means in his texts the “dialogues between cultures”, the second, the [mere] “cultural communication” means “dialogue between Gospel and The Cultures”. (Török, 2010, idem, 2011)

He highlighted the interfaith and intercultural dialogues were important as tools and ways for peacebuilding and solving such global problems as the migration. The church had to take an active and effective role in this, as John Paul II emphasized it: “Despite the problems I have mentioned, the world of immigrants can make a valid contribution to the consolidation of peace. Migration can in fact facilitate encounter and understanding between civilizations as well as between individuals and communities. The enriching dialogue between cultures, as I wrote in my Message for World Day of Peace 2001, is an »obligatory path to the building of a reconciled world« (n. 3). This happens when immigrants are treated with the proper respect for the dignity of each one…” (John Paul II, Pope 2003: no.5)

In the eighth year of the pontificate of him, thus relatively earlier (for his long officiate as pope), in Assisi, October 27, 1986 he invited the leaders and representatives of the “World Religions” which means he organised a very interreligious meeting. It was entirely his iniciative, and as to the pray for peace, the latter was based on the iniciative by Community Saint Egidio. He there prayed together with the representatives of other religions, and he was criticized for taking a statue of Buddha on the altar of the Christian church. It was a real act of intercultural communication, though within a small number of “establishment” of different religions but not in the presence of the wide audience, thanks to media reports. However, none of his predecessors would do this way, either with their opportunities given by those times, or their capability for innovations toward the openness in dialogue with the world. It is the most popular even
already commonplace to recall the great act of the Pope who has first visited the Jewish synagogue of Rome. It was taken very soon in 1986, as in the sixth year of twenty-seven years pontificate of him, let’s pay attention to the required length of preparing such a diplomatic act, too, thus it can be stated the visit of a Jewish synagogue was one of the first serious plans of JP2, maybe he had intended such an act with purposes to (re)establish peaceful relations between Jews and Christians.

The date of Assisi meeting was carefully planned: the Guelf War was moving, which was, according to several commentators, occasional, but in the opinion of the Pope, it followed in regular consequence of the wars in Vietnam, Lebanon and that time in Afghanistan.

On the common pray there were represented almost every branch of Christianity (Orthodox Patriarchs of Constantinople, Moscow, Antiochia and others; leaders of Protestant Churches, too) – and what is of more significance, leaders of eleven non-Christian world religions: representatives of Jews, Indians of America, animist from Africa, Buddhists, Bahaists, Hindus, Jainists, Muslims, Sintoists, Sikhs and Zorostrians.

Thus, the positive impacts of Assisi were of great significance. As we could see, the time of the first Assisi meeting was hot, it was at the beginning of the guelf war, and the world were still divided for socialist and capitalist regimes, the Soviet Union still existed. Pope Saint John Paul II stated out, standing in the crossfire of the critics, he decided to arrange the interreligious meeting in every case, and, as his secretary put it, according to the catholic face, his decision “was justified by the Holy Spirit” (by the God), as that day no person falled victim to wars. (Dziwisz, Svidercocoschi 2008)

The aim of the interreligious meetings is the managing of peacemaking! – stated out the Pope in Assisi. As he wrote in the cited above teaching documents (especially concerning the Pontifical Council of the Cultures), the Catholic Church had to organise
meetings with “the learned elite” of different religions and different cultures. What was the role of “The Pontiff” in this field, he demonstrated by meeting the pontiffs of others: common pray together as of equals, and disourse on hope and love between each others as equals.

Following by apostolic visits, this interreligious meeting opened the way for intercultural communication in diplomacy, too, which was a significant part of the activity of JP2. As the William Cenkner (1997: 138, note 7) raised the question of “Mission and/or Dialogue” stating out: “Pope John Paul II in his visits around the world, including the United States and western Europe but especially in Asia and Africa, meets consistently with religious leaders of other faiths. His talks in Asia and Africa have been considerably more progressive than in the West in which he has advanced dialogue and inculturation.”

Soon it was followed by interreligious dialogues in the field of peacemaking, around the world, for example: a Buddhist-Christian meeting as a day of prayer for the 1200th anniversary of the Buddhist monastic complex on Mount Hiei, in Japan, August 3-4, 1987 (scarcely a year after Assisi, when a Buddha was put on the altar by the Pope); then a meeting of the World Council of Churches’ Ecumenical Consultation on Spirituality in Interfaith Dialogue that met at the Kansai Seminar House in Kyoto, Japan, from December 1 to 5, 1987 (though was “only” ecumenical but not interreligious, its final document deserved attention in intercultural aspect as issued by church representatives who were either native Asians or Westerners who have lived long enough in Asia to call one of these Asian countries an adopted home; then a discourse between Buddhists, Christians, Muslims, and Hindus that held in Colombo, Sri Lanka, from August 23 to 29, 1987, coming to the final declaration in the very spirit of John Paul II (though he did not take part on it): "Opting for the Poor: The Challenge
to the Universal Religions.” (Editorial, 1988: 187.) The first declaration recalled directly the Assisi meeting, moreover, attenuates the significance of the mere pray and emphasizes the duty of prayers in active managing the current problems: “Our being together here to pray for peace signifies a continuation of the same open spirit in which the Day of Prayer was observed at Assisi in October 1986, when the leaders of different religious traditions came together to pray for peace. […] When we pray, we cannot but confess our unworthiness for the task of peace. […] Praying for peace involves also working for peace, and even suffering for peace.” (Editorial, 1988: 188.) The second document, on the event where all participants were Christians but of different churches, highlights the importance of different cultures in the aspect of enriching Christianity by acquiring “strange” values of non-Christian religions: “In the Hindu and Buddhist traditions especially, we have found forms of practice and prayer that have been both challenging and enriching. For some, it was reading a book such as the Tao Te Ching or experiencing the worship of Hindu friends that seized us and moved us to look more deeply. For those of us who are monastics, it has been the dialogue with brothers and sisters in other contemplative traditions that has motivated our journey. And for those of us involved in social action programs, it has been in the very work of joining hands with people of other faiths in the struggle for a new society that we have been spiritually renewed.” (Editorial, 1988: 189.) What a grat step forward, made by Christians, after the careful diplomat Paul VI, due to Saint John Paul II, the Pope of single heart! Last but not least, the “representative group of Hindus, Muslims, Christians and Buddhists from the Third World countries” who deliberated on the “Opting for the Poor”, pointed out: There is an ambivalence in all religions. In its enslaving forms, religion encourages us to work with the powerful-Kings and Priests-in contradiction to the Primordial
Liberative Experience […] Participating in the struggle of the poor will invariably bring real possibilities of renewal to all religions.” (Editorial, 1988: 191)

Moreover: the interreligious meetings must not be “mere” spiritual exercises for some romantic love of each other as demonstrating brotherhood in faith, but serious acts for managing the recent problems of the humankind. Why? Because religions represent huge crowds of people, thus religious leaders are responsible for playing active role in solving the sharp questions of the world, that is, the very recent World; dependless of their respective teaching on the hereafter. Those living in this world, and having authority and reputation in this world, are responsible for this world but not only for the other world. What is of significance, this approach is derived from principles of all religions, in the declaration: “The dichotomy between the spiritual and the secular is a false one and true spirituality does not take us away from the world and its harsh realities but leads us right into it, strengthened for the tasks of full human living. Spirituality must pervade the economic, social, political, and cultural domains, not only the religious domain.” (Editorial, 1988: 192)

None the less was the impact made by John Paul II on the diplomacy in Europe and shaping the Union as well. As Mudrov (2011) emphasizes, citing Leustean (2009), the European Community (now European Union) must establish contacts between European institutions and religious ones, which was made relatively later, although the religious issues in EU are of increasing importance. According to Mudrov, Christianity represents the majority of religious people in EU – which nowadays seems to be changed. (Thus Europe is becoming a terrene of interreligious dialogues, too, though he examines only the role of Christianty.) The liberal approach conduces to the minimasing influence of religions on the people, as “privatised religion” is excluded from public and political issues. On contrary, “The process of secularisation, occurring in some areas of
the Union, is not applicable to the EU at large. … one can expect that the degree of influence and involvement of Churches goes according to confessional lines. We can expect a higher degree of influence and involvement of the Roman Catholic Church on the supranational level, while on the national level this depends on the circumstances of a given country” (Mudrov, 2011: 376). — John Paul II gave a good example for this, too. It concerns the intercultural communication inasmuch as European countries and nations are different in their respective costumes and mentality. Still being Cardinal Karol Wojtiła, he travelled in France, Belgium, Germany, had good acquaintances in West, and this led to his election for the Pope, too, among other factors. (Weigel, 2005) Thus, against the above quoted Cenkner (1997) who said that John Paul II’s talks in Africa and Asia would be of greater success, the truth was the Pope’s role in European diplomacy were of significance, too, though not so spectacular as those in the Third World. The papal diplomacy played active role in the European policy in the twentieth century, too. (O’Mahony, 2009) The fact is, the European integration is a terrene of the intercultural communication, too, even today, when the tensions are to be reduced, let’s recall the case of Greece (Orthodox country), the national government in Hungary (though multi-confessional country, with Catholic and Calvinist majority, its churches have increasing political power), and respective role of churches in the national identity of Ireland, Scotland, Poland and other monoconfessional countries. (Mudrov, 2011: 375.) John Paul II urged the peacemaking in the war on the Balkans, too, in 1990-ies; and his role was well-known for the transitions of East European countries from socialism into democratic society were peaceful.

Another good example of the intercultural communication was the alliance between Muslim politicians and John Paul II on the “Conference on the Development” held by the United Nations in Cairo, 1996. It was a significant case of the role played by
Pope John Paul II in the field of international relations when he stood up against the abortion on the conference on UN on the Growth and Development in Cairo, 1994. “Islamic leaders have begun to line up with the Vatican in condemning a landmark U.N. document on population and development, saying it condones extramarital sex, homosexuality, abortion and possibly prostitution.” reported the Washington Post. (Lancaster 1994) According to Raymond Flynn, then-ambassador of the United States at the Holy See in Vatican, then-president Jimmy Carter and his liberal politicians planned to solve the overpopulation of the world by supporting abortion and strict birth control, paying less attention to the better distribution of goods and more effective developing the third world poor countries. Pope John Paul II wanted to consult with the US President thus Ambassador Flynn took much effort for it, with less success. The Pope could not speak to Carter before the US submitted its proposals. As Flynn described in his book on his diplomatic mission in the Vatican, Pope called the ambassador for a personal visit himself, too, urging him to procure Carter to give chance for a direct phone-talk by the hot line. In a vain result, the USA diplomacy did not change its conception on the Cairo conference of the United Nations, on the other hand, some Muslim leaders noticed the political conception of the Pope and they shared it. Although the western press focused on the question of the abortion, the matter was the global economic development and the fair distribution of goods in the Globe. Benazor Bhutto and some other leaders welcomed the Pope’s initiatives. Thus not only the religious leaders accepted some points of views of the Pope, as of Al-Azhar, but political ones, too. Those who shared his opinion on the positive approach, that is, not only stop something as the birth, but spreaden something, as the goods. (Flynn, 2001)

Benazir Bhutto criticized some western liberals denied the religion and democracy may coexist, especially in the Muslim countries. She evidenced it was not
true even on the base of the Noble Quran. Therefore, special forms of religious societies had to be provided; those preserve the global human values. On this platform the “clash of civilization” (Huntington) can be avoided, as no clash is inevitable but the reconciliation is the natural and regular way of the development of humankind – stated Bhutto, 2008. The traditional frameworks of the society became elastic, the new generation seeks for values; if so, religions must be considered as frameworks, cultural heritage and representers also holders of general values. It does not contradict to the modern society and progress. (Bhutto, 2008.) — The recent decades show off the time of the revival of religion, thus we can not deal with current problems without considering it – writes Ali A. Allawi, the former minister of the transition governments in Iraq the professor at Georgetown and other universities. (Allawi 2009)

As for the Muslim initiative, it is worthwhile to pay attention the city of Baku also joined the centers of Islam and played significant role in interfaith dialogues, in the past years of the pontificate of JP2,. Its great mufti, Allahshükür Hummat Pashazade organized interreligious meetings, with participation of Garegin II, the Armenian Catholicos (even when their countries made war against each other!), and Moscow Patriarch Kirill, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church, and Cardinal Jean-Louis Tauran, then chair-person of *The Pontifical Council for The Interreligious Affairs* in the Vatican. Cardinal Tauran confirmed that Muslims in Azerbaijan were remarkable for their tolerance. Allahshukur Pashazade, great mufti of Azerbaijan demonstrated by his activity that the word “Islam” in Arabic was derived from “salam” what meant “peace”. While his country was making war with Armenia, he invited the Catholicos (religious leader of the Armenian Nestorian Church) Garegin II for interreligious peacemaking meetings to Baku. “As the Armenian patriarch, I find it very important to continue our efforts with the head of the Muslim of Caucasus, Sheikh ul-Islam Allahshukur
Pashazade, to continue our work and try to find a solution for the problem. This is our duty” – said Garegin. (Radio Free Europe 2010) The Vatican took part actively in the religious meetings in Baku, too. Cardinal Jean-Louis Tauran, whom we mentioned above, represented the Holy See in Azerbaijan, as then-head the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogues. According to the Russian-language version of the Vatican (I did not find his whole contribution on the English site, however), Cardinal Tauran said: “The believers must become the hope of the World”, and the Caucasian Muslims took much toward this noble goal: “Muslims in Azerbaijan are of great tolerance”. (Radio Vatican 04/05/2010)

Last but not least, let’s see the address of Pope John Paul II in Damascus. He was the first of leaders of the Catholic Church who delivered a talk in a Muslim mosque, even in a mosque of much high rank. Thus it would be regarded as a festive sermon like opening addresses, but it was rather an occasional speech, a policy-making speech, as for its message and friendly style. The invocation means far more than it can be interpreted on the English version: My Friends! As-Salamu ‘alaiqum! The “Friend” in Arabic Sādiq (صدق يقيق) means “that whom I trust” as the root sadaqa means “to tell truth”. Therefore, the Pope expressed he trust his Muslim audience as true people. It is emphasized with the adjective “Dear”. The greeting is not only some mere polite words but it means: “Peace with you!” And it recalls the Catholic greeting in the beginning of a pontifical mass in Latin: Pax vobiscum (“Peace with you”). Then he recall what is common in both Islam and Christianity, the Holy Land, Mary, Jesus – though he deals more with Mary than Jesus, as the resurrection of Jesus is the dividing point between two religions, but Mary’s figure is more appropriate for linking. After these arguments, he points out the main task is the peacebuilding, especially the new
generation must be educated in the spirit of love and respect to the others. (John Paul II, 2001a Eng)

In a conclusion, what can teach us the intercultural communication of Saint Pope John Paul II? First, diplomatic processes can be and must be continued. Then, churches can be and must be play more active and effective role in managing of such problems as the question of migrants, the perspective of youth, the sharing of good avoiding starvation, and making the life of humankind more human. Last but not least, let’s quote some words of the recent pontiff, Pope Francis on it: “Dialogue is a school of humanity and a builder of unity, which helps to build a society founded on tolerance and mutual respect” – told he on Ecumenical and Interreligious Meeting in Sarajevo, 6 June 2015 (Francis, Pope 2015)
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