

Abstracts

Should Religion be excluded from Public Space?

Secularism, Neutrality and Impartiality

Sune Lægaard, Adjunkt, Center for studier af lighed og multikulturalisme, Københavns Universitet

In debates about religion and politics general claims are often made that there should be »less religion in public space«. Such claims are often justified with reference to ideals of secularism, neutrality or impartiality. The article first distinguishes between three different senses of »public space«, and then discusses the ambiguous ideas about secularism and neutrality that the demand for less religion is often based on. The article then addresses the recent Danish debate over whether Muslim headscarves can be permitted in public positions as an example of the issues of religion in public space. Focus is on the government's recent proposal for a prohibition against judges displaying religious symbols. It is analyzed how neutrality and impartiality can be understood in this context and it is argued that relevant versions of these requirements fail to imply that judges should not wear Muslim headscarves.

From critique of secularism to critical secularism

Anders Berg-Sørensen, Lektor, Institut for Statskundskab, Københavns Universitet, abs@ifs.ku.dk

Secularism constitutes the lens through which we – in the Western world – see the relationship between religion and politics: How do we understand this relationship, and how should we regulate religion and politics according to our political and democratic ideals? The article describes and discusses political doctrines of secularism and critiques of secularism. The aim is to reflect how political secularism can improve by including some of the criticism of secularism. In other words, the aim is to sketch a self-critical and critical secularism.

»There's a wind from the Orient« – Salafism and Jihadism in Denmark/Europe

Manni Crone, Seniorforsker, DIIS – Dansk Institut for Internationale Studier, mcr@diis.dk

Public discourse often takes for granted that terrorists are »militant Islamists«. The young men involved in recent Danish terror-trials were not, however, Islamists, but Salafists. But what is the difference between Islamism and Salafism? And how are we to understand the relationship between Salafism and terror? Is Salafism the *cause* of terror? Are terrorists of today driven by religious *motives*? Or does Salafism *inspire* young Muslims to commit terror? The article shows how the ideological and political evolution of Islamism has paved the way for Salafism in the religious-political field. Subsequently, it deals with the

relationship between religion and terror. It argues that religion is not the trigger of terrorism, but that a militant engagement today often takes a religious form.

**»London Bridge is Falling Down«
– The hidden religion at war**

Morten Brænder, Ph.d.-stipendiat,
Institut for Statskundskab,
Aarhus Universitet, mortenb@ps.au.dk

This article is about the ultimate sacrifice, the death of the soldier, socially and individually seen. Sacrifices are about religion: Religion, not in its traditional essentialist meaning, but understood as the fulfilment of a social function. What I call the »hidden religion« is this, the cult of social unity. In the first part of the article I argue that soldier sacrifices not only call for justification, but also serve a justifying function: The soldier shows that society is worth dying for by dying in the name of the nation. The point of departure here is studies in the function of the ultimate sacrifice in American society, and an analysis of the Danish version of »London Bridge is Falling Down«. In the second part of the article I ask in whose name the American soldier actually dies? The answer to this question has undergone significant changes in the last century.

What kind of policy is research policy – now?

Niels Mejlgaard, Seniorforsker,
Dansk Center for Forskningsanalyse,
Aarhus Universitet, nm@cfa.au.dk
Kaare Aagaard, Ph.d.-stipendiat,
Dansk Center for Forskningsanalyse,
Aarhus Universitet, ka@cfa.au.dk

Danish research policy is undergoing rapid change on multiple dimensions. We assess the major reforms between 2002 and 2009, based on an article by Hanne Foss Hansen from 2002, in which she highlights characteristics in Danish research policy. We conclude that the pace of changes has increased as research policy is gaining an ever more central position on political agendas. This entails positive consequences in terms of growing attention and funding, but also an increased level of conflict as research policy is becoming more interwoven with innovation policies and new public management approaches. These conflicts between contradictory concerns are manifest not only between the political-bureaucratic system on the one hand and the academic system on the other hand, but also within these systems. Attempts to change the multiinstitutional character of the research sector by means of economic and organisational condensation have so far exacerbated rather than reduced these conflicts.