



Understanding Each Other

*Explorations in context, language and
action to help dialogue between
faith communities and government,
public sector, voluntary and community
bodies in the South East*

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Summary	2
1. Foreword	3
2. Understanding the context of dialogue in the South East	4
3. Understanding each other when we do talk	10
4. Understanding the variable geometry of dialogue	18
5. Understanding the nature of the partners for dialogue	24
6. Starting, and moving beyond talk	28
7. Building in hope – <i>A Common Word between Us and You</i>	33
 Appendices	
1. References	34
2. 2002 Census data for religion: South East by Unitary Authority, County and Borough	35

NOVEMBER 2008

SUMMARY

This paper has been produced by the South East England Faiths Forum, to help develop contact, dialogue and partnership in our region between actors in government and the public sector, in the voluntary and community bodies, and in faith communities.

Section 2 explores the significant place that faith has in our society in shaping attitudes and behaviour; it acknowledges also the influence of the rejection of faith. These need to be recognised by listening to each other, and on the basis of this recognition and respect, by building trust.

The South East has a fairly average distribution of faiths, but as elsewhere contains communities which remain largely separate from each other. Its closeness to London makes it more urgent to find our own way ahead.

The task is however complicated, because faith combines with culture, age and economic status to produce a huge diversity within all faiths and all denominations.

Listening to each other also requires that we understand enough of the context, and the content, of what we say and how we say it. The need for this 'literacy' has to be recognised by all potential partners. Otherwise, dialogue will be less fruitful than it should be. The purpose of Section 3 is to set out a number of areas where language and thought might be misunderstood.

Section 4 moves towards developing dialogue. It explores in greater detail the complexity of the faith scene in our region. It then draws the conclusion that to be effective dialogue should be undertaken in many different ways and contexts. Women and young people should be enabled to form their own contacts. Dialogue may be valuable even within a faith community. And partners from different branches of government and from voluntary and community bodies should seek to develop contacts appropriate to their context.

Section 5 offers some help in finding partners.

Section 6 explores the way in which contacts may lead on to action, and draws on the experience of inter-faith groups across the South East region.

Section 7 notes briefly in conclusion the recent initiative by a large group of Islamic scholars to draw out fundamental principles shared between Islam and Christianity. This initiative, and its extension in local dialogue, may help strengthen the platform of cooperation and understanding among all faiths, and with regional and local government.

1. FOREWORD

This paper has been produced by the South East England Faiths Forum (SEEFF). It flows from the Government's recent paper, 'Face to Face and Side by Side', and is a contribution at regional level to building the Framework for Partnership which that report encourages.

This paper aims to:

- look particularly at faith and dialogue in the South East England region, although of course the issues involved go far beyond the region
- encourage contact and dialogue at as many different levels as possible, between
 - faith bodies and government
 - faith bodies themselves across the denominations
 - faith communities within their own faith group
 - faith bodies and local community services such as schools, colleges, health care and voluntary organisations
- be of use to leaders in government, in faith communities, and in other community public and voluntary services
- favour small, specific and local initiatives.

As there is much already written, its aim is also to be brief and suggestive, rather than longer and attempting to be exhaustive. It may simply open up questions, and give greater confidence to ask them. Above all, we hope that it will encourage contact, dialogue and relationship across the normal boundaries of our society.

It is intended to be a 'living' paper, as is now possible with electronic publication. As such, it will be developed and updated in the light of comments drawn from the knowledge and experience of members of the SEEFF and of other partners.

It is part of a larger project which aims to provide details of the actors and contact points in the development of this partnership. The project will include directories of:

- local government involvement and where available named officers with responsibilities for links with faith communities
- inter-faith groups, down to borough level
- government agencies in the region
- community organisations and volunteer networks.

An economic assessment of the impact on the region of faith bodies is also part of the overall project. It is being prepared separately; work on it has just started.

In preparing the present paper, helpful conversations took place with those listed in Appendix 1. They are warmly thanked for their time and experience of these matters.

2. UNDERSTANDING THE CONTEXT OF DIALOGUE IN THE SOUTH EAST

Faith matters

Faith is a central feature of our society today. It can no longer be thought of as gentle wall-paper providing a pleasant and calming background, as was possible perhaps when for most people faith only conjured up the idea of a country parish church. We are all aware of people of faith in our world, both overseas and in this country. We have learnt again in our time the possibility for faith to contribute to division (Northern Ireland is only one example). We have seen that faith groups can define themselves by the rejection of others. We have seen faith as one factor in tension and – violence.

'Is a tie a Christian symbol?'
This was asked recently of a Christian minister in our region, by someone of another faith. The question is only one of countless others that could be asked by each faith group (and those of no faith) about other groups. It shows the gulf in our understanding of the other. But it was good that the question was asked. It could be, because there was trust between the questioner and the minister, built of earlier contact and friendship.

Dialogue leading to relationship and trust is the only way to build cohesion

There are no short-cuts to building social cohesion, in this as in other areas of our society. This comes only as we acknowledge and accept diversity in our society. Actors in our society need to choose to speak out, to use their voice in word and deed. And as they do, actors also need to listen to the voices of others – voluntary and community bodies as well as public bodies and faith communities, and individuals.

Our speaking and our listening also needs to involve personal contact, to build relationships through true listening and open response. Political acts and formal representation have value. But without personal contact they will not achieve lasting results.

Listening and responding require dialogue; they need each actor in society to have a voice that is both spoken and heard. Where there is no dialogue misunderstandings develop, and this can lead to division and a sense of rejection. Faith communities need to be ready to speak their voice openly; so do voluntary and community bodies, and public agencies and government.

Not all faith communities see the need for dialogue. They may feel strongly the uniqueness of their own faith, and of their own particular understandings and culture. They may fear that contact with others may compromise this. Others who make things happen in society may also believe that it is more effective to go ahead on their own, without giving the time that dialogue inevitably takes.

Time taken to build relationships is however never wasted. And actions that are based on shared understandings will last better than those which have not first explored the faith and culture of those they are designed to help.

The South East – an average region?

Overall, the figures of the 2001 census suggest nothing remarkable about the South East's share of faiths.

Faith distribution by regions, as a percentage of total population (Census 2001)

	All people ('000)	Chris-t-ian	Budd - Hist	Hindu	Jewis h	Mus- lim	Sikh	Other	No relig- ion	not state d
England and Wales	52,041	71.75	0.28	1.06	0.5	2.97	0.63	0.29	14.81	7.71
North East	2,515	80.09	0.12	0.17	0.13	1.07	0.19	0.15	10.98	7.09
North West	6,729	78.01	0.18	0.40	0.42	3.04	0.10	0.16	10.48	7.23
Yorkshire and Humberside	4,964	73.07	0.14	0.32	0.23	3.81	0.38	0.19	14.09	7.77
East Midlands	4,172	71.99	0.18	1.60	0.10	1.68	0.80	0.24	15.94	7.48
West Midlands	5,267	72.58	0.19	1.08	0.09	4.10	1.97	0.21	12.30	7.48
East	5,388	72.14	0.22	0.58	0.56	1.46	0.25	0.29	16.74	7.75
London	7,172	58.23	0.75	4.07	2.09	8.46	1.45	0.51	15.76	8.66
South East	8,000	72.78	0.28	0.56	0.24	1.36	0.47	0.36	16.50	7.46
South West	4,928	73.99	0.23	0.17	0.14	0.48	0.09	0.37	16.75	7.79
Wales	2,903	71.90	0.19	0.19	0.08	0.75	0.07	0.24	18.53	8.07

At 8 million, the South East is the most populous region of the country. In it, there is a significant presence of many faiths. London on our doorstep has the greatest overall share in almost every group, while the North East is the area with the smallest share for most. Interestingly, the South East, along with Wales, the East and the South West regions, shares the highest ratio of those with no religion.

The South East region may appear average compared to others. However, any 'average' area is still unique, for what matters is not global figures but the individuals, families and communities in our houses and streets, our offices and places of worship, our hospitals and shops. It is at individual level that relationships can be built, and trust established.

The census data inevitably deals in large categories. The reality is, as we shall see later on, that each of the faiths is divided within itself by a range of factors which partly also reflect divisions in wider society.

Also, the census data is now some 7 years old. Changes will have happened. A recent paper analyses inward migration into Surrey, using

National Insurance data¹. This seems to show a fairly steady rise in migration into the area, though analysis by country of origin does not give a clear impression of the impact of this flow on the distribution of faiths.

Census figures cannot show it. But our own experience, and that of those around us, shows us that in the South East – despite much effort by many public and other bodies and individuals - our society contains many largely self-sufficient and self-contained communities of many kinds. Also, employment rates by faith and ethnic groups often show great differences². Statistical aggregation is both helpful and – for dialogue - a trap. Figures cannot capture the huge variety of situations they cover.

Each faith is itself divided into smaller groups, and cultural variations are great. And in the mixture of its 8 million people there is a huge variety of backgrounds and faiths. Our cohesion requires that we acknowledge this variety with respect. It means building relationships, which lead on to trust. It means seeking cohesion.

The South East and London

The South East region largely surrounds London. Communications radiate to and from it. The social and economic climate of the capital affects our region, in which a significant part of our population works. We could therefore be tempted to leave efforts to improve relationships to the capital, with any political and psychological advantage that its status may give it.

This would however be a mistake. The South East is different in many ways from the capital. One way is simply our shared dependence on it for some of the region's activities. The region should not run the risk that we might find ourselves importing from the different context of the capital attitudes about relations between faiths which might not be suited to our region. We need to find our own response.

The characteristics of dialogue

Dialogue does not alter responsibility

Government is called to exercise power for the good of the whole of society, and carries responsibility to manage a

Mercy is an attribute to God himself, and earthly power doth then show likest God's when mercy seasons justice'
Shakespeare (Merchant of Venice iv.1)

complex range of instruments to this end. Through legislation, administration and services provided, it seeks to enable each member of

¹ Changing Face; this paper provides data at the level of the borough

² Young, British and Muslim page 28

society to develop her or his full potential, and so to enable society as a whole to grow in fairness and fulfilment. Government represents all through the democratic process, whether or not all vote.

Dialogue with faith bodies or others may inform the decisions of government. However, public authorities remain responsible alone for the decisions and actions they take.

Dialogue brings actors together

This said, public bodies, just because they are concerned for all whatever their faith, are well placed to play the role of catalyst in gathering faith groups together. This has been noted with invitations to take part in Local Strategic Partnerships.³

Dialogue is about listening in order to build relationships

In our society today, faith cannot be left out of the framework. Marginalised and hidden, as we have seen, it can erupt in misunderstanding, sense of rejection and possibly even violence. Faith, and its rejection, need to be brought into the open, respected, and seen as a source of richness in diversity in our society.

This requires that we

listen to the other. Listening is difficult. We all know how we sometimes listen but are really only waiting for the chance ourselves to speak again. If we enter dialogue feeling misunderstood, we may see the encounter principally as an occasion to explain our side, rather than to also listen to others. True listening requires as much respect for those to whom we speak as we expect ourselves. True listening asks that we do so in such a way that we are ready to take to ourselves what is heard, to the point that it may change our attitude. Such respectful dialogue can build relationships across what at first seem big divides.

“Dialogue

- *begins when people meet each other*
- *depends upon mutual understanding and mutual trust*
- *makes it possible to share in service to the community*
- *becomes the medium of authentic witness.”*

Four Principles of Inter Faith Dialogue agreed ecumenically by the British Council of Churches in 1981

The context of inter faith dialogue is complex, and needs a complex response

There are many faiths. The census selected only the major faiths. There are many others.

There are many understandings of each faith. Theologians normally define faith by both the holy writings of the faith, and by its scholarly traditions. Over the centuries, these foundations have come to be understood in different ways in most if not all faiths. The result is a large

³ Local Inter Faith Guide, page 12

number of separate 'traditions' within a single faith. In this country, this is most obvious with the many denominations and 'flavours' of Christian churches. But the same has happened in other faiths. Those engaged in these different traditions may have little contact with each other (quarrels within a family are always the most painful).

Faith is often also divided by culture. For most believers in different faiths, belief is linked to practices and understandings which have their origin in the culture of the believers rather than in their religious understanding. Some may be due to geography and the original practices of believers. Some may have been 'imported' from other faiths (an example might be Christmas trees, themselves of no faith value to Christians but a widely used symbol of a season linked to their faith). In some cases, believers may not fully understand the differences between culture and faith.

Faith and family may also be connected. Family history creates important ties with a faith. Family and kin groups can create powerful pressures within a faith group. These however also evolve, as generations pass, and as family ties are weakened by geographical movement and the experience of different cultures. One example of this has also been a rise in marriages between those of different faiths.

Faith, and understandings of it, may also be linked to generation. For faiths mainly held by those who have come to live in the UK from overseas, those who were born and brought up in this country may relate less to the cultural origins of their faith than older generations, even though they stay committed to its theology and practice. For Christians, fewer young than older people practise faith actively.

Faith expresses itself differently. Some find the main expression of their faith through the formal practices of their religion in places of worship. Others will focus more on faith in their place of work, and at home.

Faith practice is also affected by social considerations. Local faith communities are gatherings of people who not only share a faith but who feel comfortable with each other because of shared background, class, family, language, tastes and perhaps age. Such factors unite; by definition, they also exclude. Many will travel some distance to find a place of worship that suits their culture and taste, passing by other worship centres of their faith as they do.

The Directory of the Borough of Runnymede (population of 78,238) lists 34 places of worship within its area. 33 are Christian (11 Church of England, 4 Roman Catholic, 4 Methodist, 2 Baptist, and 12 others), and one Muslim.

All these factors mean that the faith scene in this country is complex. We need to acknowledge and try to understand the overlapping place of:

- faith understanding
- culture
- family and kin
- age and generation
- economic situation.

Those of no faith also need recognition

In our society, we are also aware of the rejection of faith, which is as significant a factor as faith itself, and can be as vehement. In the last Census, the region's share of those who declared themselves as of 'no religion' is high. Dialogue needs to recognise and include not only faiths, but those who reject faith. They may be as committed to relationships as others, they may do as much or more in practical outworking of care and concern as those of faith.

The formal recognition of those of no faith may have a further advantage. At present, in dialogue with those of faith, government representatives may feel the need to speak for those without faith. This need would be removed, if they were represented themselves.

It is not only the faith scene that is complex; so are government and the voluntary sector

Dialogue is needed to improve social cohesion. Yet it is not always clear to many where responsibility lies within government and the wider public sector, with its many levels and roles. Education and health are two major areas where structures are complex, and ultimate responsibility not always clear.

It is also important to have dialogue with and within the voluntary sector. Here also there are many layers and functions, each of which operates in a different way, each of which already has some contacts, each of which may need to do more.

More widely, society is made up of many smaller groupings, especially at local level. Most of us are part of, or are involved with, one, to more or indeed to many such units. This may be living in the same housing estate or village, or sharing a school, a factory, a hospital, a football club, or a special interest group. Each of these itself offers a network of relationships.

Through all these groupings and links there are possibilities for good relations between those of different faiths. It is often at the local and the practical levels that personal contact is easiest, and when trust can best be built, and which can then lead into broader contexts.

Once again, there are no simple approaches. It is a question of 'horses for courses'. The important thing is that those involved in these many areas recognise their need to find the best way for dialogue.

3. UNDERSTANDING EACH OTHER WHEN WE DO TALK

Finding partners for dialogue may be difficult. When a faith group, a public authority or another body does make an effort to open up to others, it is not always easy to find partners. Many believers are content to be taken for granted by others in the hope that they may be left to get on with their own

understandings and practices. When dialogue does get going, there can be problems of understanding each other.

'Finality is not the language of politics'
Benjamin Disraeli, Prime Minister
1874 - 80

Effective dialogue supposes that there is a shared language, however open-ended this may be. Yet experience has shown that this can be a problem. There is much talk of 'illiteracy', of not being equipped to understand each other's faith languages and concerns. To help mutual understanding, in this chapter we try to illustrate some concepts and understandings that people of faith may bring to dialogue involving government and the public sector. Where appropriate, these are contrasted with the possible assumptions of those in public administration.

Accountability and representativity

Those who come forward to represent different branches and agencies of government and the wider public sector, whether themselves elected or official, will do so as appointed to this task, and with a clear structure for their accountability. This is likely to be the case also for those who engage in dialogue on behalf of voluntary bodies.

Those who represent faith will do so on a very different basis. They may be nominated by their community (not always a simple process). However, the dialogue will almost certainly not be central to the activity of the community. So it is likely to be undertaken by those who select themselves by their interest in and commitment to the wider community; this may or may not coincide with the leadership of the community. Some leaders may simply not have the time; those of minority faiths may be looking after several places of worship, perhaps widely scattered. Normally, whether leader or other those who speak for the faith community will not formally represent that community, and will not be able to take any commitment for it.

There may also be difficulties over defining who represents a particular community.

In many areas of the region, where believers in a faith are a small percentage of the population and there is no place of worship, it may be impossible to find members of that faith to represent it in dialogue.

In some cases, representation of faith communities may be indirect. It may be assured by people of faith who are engaged in their society in a different way, and who are ready to meet with others similarly involved. An example might be an association of Asian business people meeting a non-faith business community. Another example may be the group of local residents from different faiths who are concerned about a particular health centre, and come together to present their case.

Faith

The idea of faith is itself open to misunderstanding. Those of no faith may think that faith is, or should be, a private matter. It may freely inspire a person's religious practices, but should have no direct impact on the public sphere.

Those of faith are bound to see their beliefs as an integral part of their whole being that cannot be confined to private matters. Their faith must have an impact on every aspect of their lives, and on their understanding of the choices that face their society more widely.

'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength'
Deuteronomy 6.5
'Love your neighbour as yourself'
Leviticus 19.18

However, people of faith do not have something to contribute on every aspect of public policy. Indeed, many important choices before government do not normally give rise to issues of importance to faith (eg methods of traffic management or sewage provision).

Criteria of judgement

As options of public or other policy are examined, there will be differences of approach between public and voluntary bodies and faith communities.

Statutory authorities will understandably start their assessment of future actions by looking at outcomes, at cost-effectiveness, at evidence-based policy. Previous practice and experience will be critical.

People of faith will tend to seek first guiding principles from their scriptures and traditions. For those of the Abrahamic faiths, terms such as 'prophetic', 'sacrifice', and 'gift' reflect understandings of the actions of God in which his followers are

called to share⁴. Those of Abrahamic faith agree with those of other faiths on a wide range of ethical principles.

Justice is another concept which is likely to convey different meanings. For a statutory body, justice has to be expressed through the legal framework set for it. This applies to all areas including the most complex (eg social housing). For those of faith, justice is likely to mean an underlying principle drawn from their faith, embodying both equity and mercy. It will tend to meet the needs of the marginalised in ways which may not be satisfied by the law or by statutory provision.

Application of principles

Guided by principles such as these, people of faith would try to focus on need. This could extend into provision of schooling as well as housing, into health care choices, into town planning options (provision of recreational space), and many others.

They would wish to see positive relationships strengthened, particularly those of families. This would lead to interest in parenting advice centres, and child care opportunities. They may wish to support young people. This might mean support for children's centres, the provision of toddlers groups or homework clubs, and finding ways to provide facilities for teenagers.

Surrey Appropriate Adult Volunteer Scheme
This scheme is funded through Surrey Youth Justice Team, Surrey County Council Mental Health Team and Surrey Connexions. It provides for a trained volunteer adult to be present when a juvenile or vulnerable adult is being interviewed in custody, when a parent or other representative is not available.

They wish to see fairness, and openness in dealings with others, whether their own, or those of other bodies public or private.

For those of faith, the need to start with such principles does not lead to instant, simple or necessarily shared positions. The position of faith may offer no guidance about how an objective is to be achieved. From the same starting points, faith representatives may well take up different positions on a wide range of issues.

However, people of faith are normally ready to move beyond a statement of principles to being ready to contribute to finding practical solutions in the range of what is possible⁵.

⁴ Moral, page 90

⁵ Moral, page 48 - 49

It is also clear that those of faith have no claim to the ethical high-ground. Those with other faiths, and those with none, may be as or more ethical.

Subsidiarity

'Who should do what?' This may also be a principle that enters into debate. The word conveys the meaning that each action should be carried out at a level as close as possible to those concerned. Local actions in local communities should take priority over more centralised provision, unless this latter offers clear advantages.

The Roman Catholic Church has advanced the principle that 'government should undertake only those initiatives which exceed the capacities of individuals or private groups acting independently. Government should not replace or destroy smaller communities and individual initiative'.

Faith bodies will tend to work on this assumption, and be reluctant to see actions provided locally and on a voluntary basis being taken over at government level. They may also prefer to see new actions undertaken locally with support if needed, rather than to be expected to contribute to a centrally organised action.

Public sector bodies may have a different perspective, giving weight to the advantages of centralised supervision and management.

Time horizons

Another tension may arise over short-term and long-term horizons. Government bodies, faced with constraints of annual funding, may be ready to consider actions that are planned to last only for a limited, possibly trial period. Faith bodies may give greater weight to longer-term actions that are capable of confronting need over many years, to reflect their understanding of the enduring faithfulness of God⁶.

The nature of community, and engagement with it

For government, society includes all in their context of need and potential. It is concerned with economics, commerce, education, housing, physical health, recreation and many other services. It rightly includes everyone in an area without distinction. It operates within a legal context which seeks to ensure this equality. While this is never perfect, government bodies need to

⁶ cf Moral, page 89

consider that the law is the ultimate guide for its actions to serve everyone.

Faith communities look at their society with rather different eyes – as in some sense a place where God is to be found. Most (although not all) faith communities believe in God, and see God as creator of all, which means both of the whole cosmos but also of the earth's environment and of their neighbours. This has been brought out by many Islamic scholars in the very important initiative *A Common Word between Us and You*⁷.

As faith communities look at the need of their neighbour, they are likely to see

- their own members, for each faith grouping is held together by its members' sense of belonging, sustained by mutual care and love. This may be accentuated in some cases by the cultural and family ties which may unite a faith community⁸.
- those amongst whom they live. As God created our fellow humans, love and respect for neighbour are principles of faith that are universally shared and call to be worked out locally.
- those beyond the local context, elsewhere in this country or overseas. These may be connected by culture and faith, or by awareness of need. Many faiths are involved in specific, faith-based, charitable relief and development organisations. However, the claims of the needy are not limited by creed, and many faith-based organisations work together, and work across or taking no account of faith boundaries.

Community engagement and evangelism, mission or proselytising

Many faiths are at heart committed to finding new members. This is because they are founded on claims to the truth which their members accept. They hope that others will come to share their understanding of the truth.

However, the purpose of engagement in the local community may be different from one member of a faith community to another:

- Some believers see contacts with those beyond their faith as chiefly an occasion to bring them to know the truth of their faith, and therefore its benefits. For them, this would be both an act of love towards those outside the faith in question, and an obligation of the believer.
- Other believers see the needs of the young, the homeless, the hungry, the sick, the dying, and the grieving as

⁷ Details and texts may be found at <http://www.acommonword.com>; see also Section 7 below

⁸ Young, *British and Moslem*, pp 46ff discusses the impact of Pakistani *biradari* or kin groups

occasions in which their own faith calls on them to offer help and consolation without any concern for the faith of those in need.

- Others again – probably the majority of people of faith – are between these two positions. They wish to and do respond to the needy without any limitation, discrimination or condition. They may hope that their service will of itself be attractive, and perhaps lead to questions about the faith which inspired it, and so may draw some to accept it. But if this did not happen the service offered is itself sufficient.

Of course, concern with the needy is not confined to faith communities. Members of faith communities share with many others a commitment to seeking to help the needy. Like others, too, they fail as much as they succeed.

Experience and knowledge of community

Different faith communities have varying experience and knowledge of their wider community. The Church of England, by its history as the established church and as

'Heart to God, Hand to Man' - The Salvation Army's motto, showing its commitment to service of those in need

historic provider of many social services, will often but not always feel a deep engagement with the wider community. The Salvation Army was founded on a commitment to serve those in the harder areas of community. Other churches, and other faith groups, may feel this less, especially when they are – as is mostly the case – a small part of the overall social mix. But there are many exceptions, where small communities undertake large commitments towards their neighbours.

Faith communities which engage with the needy – for example, offering open youth work; debt counselling, furniture supplies and food distribution; accommodation to the homeless; or simply including among their members those who live in difficult circumstances – may have a knowledge of individuals in their context in the local community which is different and deeper than that of most public authorities (though it may be comparable to some of the social services and the police). This could be a valuable resource in helping to shape local responses to public need.

Taking this a step further, one of the riches which representatives of faith communities are often able to bring to dialogue is a holistic view of the needs of some of the marginalised in society.

Social protection

Another area of reserve between government and faith bodies has been levels of social protection offered, especially of children. These are very important. In general, faith groups are now as committed to social protection as statutory bodies. Particularly for children, they have put in place meticulous systems of protection which are as extensive as those in the statutory sector. However, this has not always been known to or recognised by statutory agencies. Reservations about such issues need to be spoken, and then checked. Faith bodies should also be able to ask questions of statutory agencies. In this way, all will be confident that levels of protection are secure.

Realism about resources

Resources of money and people are sometimes seen as the motive for dialogue and partnership. Most partners will have plans and hopes that need funds and people. Each party therefore may come to dialogue in the hope of finding resources from the others. While in some cases this may become possible, it is important that this should not be seen as the main reason for dialogue, and that each party should be clear about expectations.

As far as the public sector is concerned, few realise the extent to which the use of funds is constrained by a mixture of existing and binding obligations, and by instructions from higher authority. The vast majority of a local borough's expenditure is committed. Local councillors have only very limited room to modify their authorities' spending.

On the faith side, because faith bodies often use large buildings and have some paid staff, there is a widespread impression beyond the faith community itself (and sometimes even within it) that they have significant resources of finance and people. This is nearly always false. Almost all faith communities depend on the giving of their members. All costs have to be raised from the regular worshippers or – occasionally - from other donations and in a few cases accumulated savings. This includes not only salary provision for paid staff, but also their pensions.

For historic reasons, the one denomination which used to be able to draw on central funds was the Church of England. In practice, this has completely gone for all but very few and specialised expenses (eg the cost of Bishops and Cathedrals).

It is important that this situation be recognised by all involved. Dialogue is not about finding new sources of funding from either side. It is about enabling the statutory sector to fulfil its roles

better. It is also about building recognition and understanding both between the faith bodies and government and also between

the faith bodies themselves, so that faith bodies may play their part more effectively.

Partnership sharing resources and skills, based on trust

Despite these cautions, there may be occasions when partnership develops, and skills, experience and funding may be shared. Examples might include a local authority youth centre with some services provided by a faith group, or a service for the elderly provided by a faith group which receives financial support from the public sector. Many other possibilities exist, and may be developed.

The critical condition for the development of such initiatives is trust. This turns us back to the main focus of this paper – the development of dialogue out of which trust may grow.

4. UNDERSTANDING THE VARIABLE GEOMETRY OF DIALOGUE

Dialogue and partnership should take many different shapes

There isn't a single shape for dialogue and partnership. There will be as many shapes and differences as there are contexts and purposes. It is important that the participants recognise that there is no abstract model, and no hierarchy of contacts. What matters is what is right for the purpose in hand.

For government, this may be at the level of the region, unitary authority, county or borough. It may be brought into being by a public agency. It may be something which is needed by a commercial group, or a voluntary or community body. It may be a dialogue between or within faith communities.

It is also important to accept that not everyone will be able, or want, to be involved. Rather than wait for perfection, participants should be ready to go ahead as soon as a reasonably mixed group is ready to take part⁹.

Faiths vary in their presence across the South East

In this context, the starting point is the uneven distribution of faiths (and of no religion) across the region. Census data from 2001 show the declared distribution of different faiths across the SE region. A summary table is attached¹⁰. Below is a table which extracts some highlights. This shows that:

- while *Christian* believers are by far the largest group, the lowest declared shares of Christians are in areas where other faiths have a significant presence (Milton Keynes, Reading, Oxford, Brighton and Hove, Slough).
- the share of those who declare themselves with *no religion* varies substantially across the region, and the higher areas are also those where Christians are fewer in number (Brighton and Hove, Oxford, Reading, Southampton, Milton Keynes).
- *Muslims* are present in the highest shares in Slough, with also High Wycombe, Woking, Crawley and Oxford.
- *Hindu* believers are highest also in Slough, then Crawley, Epsom and Ewell, Milton Keynes.
- *Sikh* believers are mostly in Slough, then in Gravesham, and thereafter in South Bucks, Southampton and Medway.
- *Buddhist* followers are highest as a share of the population in Brighton and Hove, then Reading, Epsom and Ewell, Elmbridge and Portsmouth.
- Those of *Jewish* faith are most in Brighton and Hove, then in Oxford, Elmbridge, Chilterns and South Bucks.

⁹ Local inter faith guide page 18

¹⁰ Appendix 1

The profile of the distribution of faiths in the SE Region: the Census 2001 areas (in census order) in which the percentage of population for each faith group (or no religion) is one of the 5 highest in the region (or, for Christians, the 5 lowest)

	All people	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jew-ish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
SOUTH EAST	8,000,645	72.78	0.28	0.56	0.24	1.36	0.47	0.36	16.50	7.46
<i>Unitary authorities:</i>										
Medway	249,488	71.97	0.22	0.68	0.08	1.05	1.22	0.34	16.70	7.76
Reading	143,096	62.63	0.48	0.99	0.29	4.00	0.55	0.36	22.00	8.70
Slough	119,067	53.75	0.25	4.48	0.12	13.35	9.09	0.30	10.97	7.70
Milton Keynes	207,057	65.54	0.36	1.25	0.23	2.34	0.38	0.40	21.56	7.94
Brighton and Hove	247,817	59.10	0.70	0.52	1.36	1.47	0.10	0.85	27.02	8.88
Portsmouth	186,701	68.07	0.40	0.44	0.13	2.15	0.17	0.39	19.95	8.31
Southampton	217,445	65.55	0.33	0.71	0.13	1.92	1.29	0.44	21.62	8.01
<i>Boroughs</i>										
Chiltern	89,228	74.72	0.23	0.50	0.54	1.88	0.12	0.27	15.02	6.72
South Bucks	61,945	75.58	0.33	1.23	0.52	1.13	1.58	0.26	12.46	6.91
Wycombe	162,105	69.06	0.23	0.62	0.27	6.49	0.25	0.24	15.59	7.24
Gravesham	95,717	72.30	0.25	0.63	0.06	0.80	6.66	0.27	12.02	7.02
Oxford	134,248	60.41	0.80	0.78	0.81	3.85	0.23	0.49	23.89	8.73
Elmbridge	121,936	74.40	0.46	0.91	0.77	1.32	0.22	0.29	14.69	6.95
Epsom and Ewell	67,059	72.98	0.50	1.84	0.35	1.91	0.12	0.27	14.79	7.22
Woking	89,840	71.34	0.29	0.68	0.26	5.06	0.11	0.29	15.12	6.84
Crawley	99,744	67.28	0.19	3.42	0.11	4.43	0.68	0.28	16.77	6.85

Listing these places also makes it clear that there is a clustering of believers around existing communities across government boundaries.

These overall impressions must at once be qualified by the huge variety of situations in each locality, which statistics can hide. It is only by making local contacts, by talking and learning, that the reality of these situations emerges.

There is a great variety of purposes for dialogue

- *dialogue between faiths*

For some, the main aim of dialogue may be for one faith community to meet those of other faiths, to begin to understand something of their beliefs and perhaps their culture, and to grow in mutual trust. This may be relatively straightforward in areas where several faiths are present in significant numbers. Here it is quite easy to contact the leaders of the local communities, to see what forms of dialogue are of interest. Indeed such groupings already exist in many areas of the SE Region.

It is harder where – perhaps in a more rural area - there is only one dominant faith (normally Christianity) whose members would like to know more of other faiths and to grow in understanding and trust. Here, however, there are examples of building links with interfaith bodies in nearby more urban areas, or inviting speakers from other faiths who come from outside the immediate area.

- *dialogue between women, and young people*

It is important that dialogue is not limited to relatively formal contexts in which representatives may often be men.¹¹

Very successful contact can be organised for women. Perhaps they may be more available for suitable contacts, as for some faiths women may have more time as they are less likely to have paid jobs. Indeed, women may be more open to sharing on many matters than men. As always, such contacts need to be arranged with care for religious and cultural sensitivities.

Perhaps even more important for mutual understanding between different faiths is to find ways to bring young people together. They represent a significant share of the total population of some faiths. Often, they may be of a second or later generation. They are seeking to relate for themselves to the society which has become theirs, in a way that is inevitably different from that of their parents.

At national level, within each religious group women were more likely than men to be economically inactive. The main reason was that they were looking after the family and home. Muslim women were more likely than other women to be economically inactive. About seven in ten (69 per cent) Muslim women of working age were economically inactive, compared with no more than four in ten women of working age in each of the other groups. Christian women were least likely to be economically inactive (25 per cent).

Overall, Muslims have the youngest age profile of all the religious groups in Great Britain. About a third of Muslims (34 per cent) were under 16 years of age in 2001, as were a quarter (25 per cent) of Sikhs and a fifth (21 per cent) of Hindus. There are very few older people in these groups – less than one in ten were aged 65 years or over. The Jewish and Christian groups have the oldest age profiles with one in five aged 65 years or over (22 per cent and 19 per cent respectively).

¹¹ The information in the boxes comes from the web-site of the Office of National Statistics

While arranging such dialogue is a challenge, its potential is great¹².

- *dialogue within faiths*

Interfaith work may be complicated by the differences that often exist within single faiths. Not all Christian communities share the same view on a range of important issues, including the role of interfaith dialogue itself and the possibility of meeting those of other faiths without compromising their own beliefs. There are comparable divisions within Islam and other faiths. Such divisions often give rise to more emotion than those between faiths. The need to be able to talk to other faiths may be a catalyst leading to more contact and understanding within faith groups.

- *dialogue with government*

Of course, all are represented in government through the normal democratic process. But because faith does affect society in many ways, it is helpful to recognise it specifically, as often now other dimensions of society (eg business and commerce) are also given a special place in dialogue. This principle is firmly recognised, as for

Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) are non-statutory, multi-agency partnerships which match local authority boundaries. At a local level LSPs bring together different parts of the public, private, community and voluntary sectors; allowing initiatives and services to support one another in order to work together more effectively.

example the desire to see local faith representatives take part in Local Strategic Partnerships. Government is also increasingly aware of the need to take account of the needs and sensitivities of different faith communities in very practical ways (eg how can a sports centre be made suitable for use by Muslim women?).

While public bodies are committed in principle to dialogue, they continue to have reserves, particularly about requests for finance. There is general sense that the practice of faith should not be supported from public funds. While specific activities run by faith bodies for the benefit of the wider community are occasionally supported, there is a sometimes unspoken concern that to do so may in some way finance the practice of the faith. Issues of this kind need to be brought into the open and discussed. Unvoiced fears undermine dialogue; such openness enables it to be effective.

¹² Young, British and Muslim, page 53 ff

On the other side, some faith bodies are hesitant to engage with public authorities or other faiths for fear of compromising their independence, and of needing to modify the way in which they

speak of their beliefs. These fears also need to be recognised openly, and ways found to make them irrelevant.

- *dialogue with other bodies*

There are also many other situations for dialogue and for seeking to build local trust. This may be in the context of a school or hospital, a new commercial development, or a planned new service to be provided by one faith grouping. Each situation will produce its own framework for dialogue.

A further context for dialogue may be between professional or business groups which have developed in many areas to share and to explore faith and the work-place¹³.

An example: links between state schools and religious teaching:

Many faiths teach the children of their families the essentials of their beliefs at special religious schools which meet after school or at the week-end (eg Muslim *madrasas*). To help all pupils reach their full potential through education, it may be helpful to hold dialogue between leaders of both types of education. It may also be possible for leaders from different faiths to go into schools together.

- *schools, colleges and universities*

There is a particular need for dialogue across faith groups in schools, and on campuses of colleges and universities. In schools, the shared institutional framework may help such events as joint visits by local leaders of different faiths, to lead an assembly or take part in another activity. Colleges and universities are harder, especially as these are places when idealism is rightly strong. On the other hand, this idealism should also include respect for the other, and the search for true understandings. This means openness to the scholarship of others, and a conscious effort to identify and reject misconceptions.¹⁴

The purpose of dialogue needs to be defined at the start

The need for dialogue comes in different contexts. It may be to exchange information in order to learn about each others' faith. It may be to explore specific issues. It may be to shape and

¹³ Young, British and Muslim page 61ff

¹⁴ Young, British and Muslim page 74

possibly run a specific project. Whatever the purpose, it needs to be clearly agreed and stated at the beginning, to avoid later disappointment and misunderstanding¹⁵. If the dialogue develops well, trust may grow, and at a later stage, the purpose of the dialogue may be redefined at a wider or deeper level. But the initial definition will be important until trust has been established.

¹⁵ Local inter faith guide, page 17

5. UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE OF THE PARTNERS FOR DIALOGUE

The need for dialogue is great. It offers the way to overcome differences of language and understanding, and to gather wide experience to enrich society and improve decision taking. However, public authorities are usually under many pressures. Also the faith situation across the region is hugely varied, as are the needs for dialogue and partnership. Often, faith communities remain within their own grouping. So, how do willing people make contact?

The structures of government and public bodies and agencies

The formal structures of public sector bodies usually make individual responsibilities clear. With this goes the status and role of both elected representatives and of officials. Because of these defined structures, when appropriate those who take part in dialogue or partnership for public sector bodies will usually be able to make commitments, or to seek commitments from higher authority.

There is a problem that many do not understand the division of responsibilities between central, regional, county, unitary and local authorities (and indeed the

In 2007, Council tax revenue was only 14.8% of total local government expenditure. Local Government Financial Statistics 2008

European Community). Also, the way in which responsibilities at local level are often determined by central government decisions is not appreciated, with which go limits on local budget freedom. This is a general problem, not limited to dialogue with faith communities.

The structure of different faith bodies

Faith bodies have evolved distinctive structures over their usually very long histories. These reflect their origins, their theology, and their culture.

The Church of England offers the clearest structure. It has been present throughout the SE Region and the country for very many centuries. Over those years, it has been engaged in much social

In the SE region, the Church of England has 7 dioceses, 19 archdeaconries, 118 deaneries and 2,118 parishes (Church of England Year Book 2008)

work, in education, care and pastoral support. In more recent times, the state has taken over many of these functions. But the Church has kept its commitment to the whole local as well as

national community¹⁶. In some areas, this is expressed by law: for example a non-Christian couple may choose to exercise the right to be married in their parish church (and some do), while many funeral services are willingly held by request for people who are not members of a church.

Geographically, the Church of England is divided into dioceses which (more or less) correspond to counties. These are subdivided into archdeaconries, deaneries and parishes (which as a network cover the entire country). Corresponding to these areas, there are bishops (who have a central diocesan staff covering various areas of responsibility), archdeacons, area or rural deans, and – at parish level – clergy (known sometimes as rector, as vicar or as priest-in-charge; and as curate) and lay churchwardens.

The Roman Catholic, Methodist and United Reformed Church churches have comparable structures, but their areas are usually larger than those of the Church of England. The Salvation Army also has a strong national structure to support its local network.

Baptist churches, while linked nationally, are the responsibility of local elders who appoint their minister. This pattern is also normal for Pentecostal, Kings, Brethren, Gospel Hall and other free churches. Likewise Quaker communities have a very large degree of local independence.

Similarly, mosques and Islamic prayer centres are the responsibility of their own boards of trustees, who appoint the imam and other staff who serve their communities. While there are several national bodies to which local mosques may belong, these do not have practical or theological authority over individual mosques. Broadly speaking, the same is true of Jewish synagogues, Hindu temples, Sikh gurdwaras, Jain temples as also of Buddhist temples. There are also other faith communities less clearly related to shared places of worship in this country eg Baha'i.

Other faith communities, such as Christian Scientists, the Church of the Latter Day Saints and the Jehovah's Witnesses, often seem to have little contact with other faiths. This might be extended to faiths seen by others as sectarian, such as Scientology.

There is a further group of faiths, more recently organised, which include wicca and other 'new age' beliefs and practices, often with a strong emphasis on nature and creation. These seem to be much less structured than the other faiths, and are built on

¹⁶ Presence, page 8 ff

local communities which may have connections with one another without formal groupings.

Lastly, there are those of no faith, who do not have comparable structures, but who may be connected to the Humanist Society and similar bodies. Local meetings often take place. In any interfaith dialogue at present, those of no faith are not normally invited, though it is possible that they happen to be present in specific professional capacity. Their absence may lead others involved to try to speak for them.

Humanism is an approach to life based on humanity and reason - humanists recognise that moral values are properly founded on human nature and experience alone. Our decisions are based on the available evidence and our assessment of the outcomes of our actions, not on any dogma or sacred text. (from the British Humanist Association web site)

Finding representatives of the faith bodies

These different structures mean that no single style of approach may serve to contact each faith body.

Local contact may be best for local purposes. Web-sites for local places of worship, advertisements and notices usually give points of contact. Where there is no local place of worship, it may be necessary to contact either a local faith forum, if one exists, or a national representative body. They may be able to provide details of local contacts. The choice of person within the faith community will also be made in different ways according to the methods of work of each community, as well as according to the needs of the particular form of dialogue or partnership. They may be leaders of their community, or they may be others chosen because of their interest in the dialogue or activity.

Normally, faith representatives will not be able to commit their faith community, but will speak more in a personal capacity.

Contacting local faith bodies

Many areas within the South East Region have local groups which bring together representatives of local faiths. Elsewhere on this web-site is an up to date list of these bodies in the region, with a brief description of their activity and details of contact points.

The *Inter Faith Network for the UK*¹⁷ maintains a list of its member and also lists national faith bodies which may be able to provide details of local contacts.

Dialogue when there are few of other faiths in a local area

In many parts of the South East, the numbers of those of other faiths is small. Yet it is good in these areas to learn more of other faiths and cultures. There are many examples of this, such as:

- inviting speakers from a more multi-faith area
- arranging visits to places of worship
- developing twinning links with a group in a more diverse area¹⁸

Dialogue around a local project

Some of the best dialogue between faiths takes place when people of different backgrounds come together for a shared purpose without thinking of themselves as formally engaging in interfaith dialogue, but just working together.

¹⁷ www.interfaith.org.uk

¹⁸ Local inter faith guide page 59

6. STARTING, AND MOVING BEYOND TALK

Experience from the many who have embarked on the path of dialogue and partnership gives some straightforward points to bear in mind.

Clear and realistic expectations

Everyone benefits from fixing clear objectives and expectations before starting. Invitations to take part will be better received if they set out aims and limits. Then the participant will be chosen to match.

It is best to be realistic and not ambitious, in setting initial aims. The foundation for further development is that good relationships have been built. Therefore simply meeting together, and sharing time and small talk, perhaps over some simple refreshment (just a cup of tea or similar), is important. Some objective beyond this is needed, to provide the reason for the gathering. But if it is not achieved quickly, it doesn't matter if relationships are growing.

<p>'Multi faith' is normally used to describe an organisation or project in which several faiths cooperate to achieve goals. 'Inter faith' is used to describe dialogue between faiths. 'Intra faith' is used to describe contacts within a single faith</p>
--

It is good also to be realistic about participation. Those setting out on this path are likely to seek to include representatives of as many faiths as possible. But it is hard to find representatives of faiths who do not have an active gathering point in the area concerned. It may be most sensible to start with those coming from local centres of faith, and together judge later whether representatives of other faiths should be sought out, perhaps through the nearest centre for that faith, or through that faith's national body.

It may also be that as the existence of the group becomes known, representatives of other faiths may come forward and ask to be included. Adding to the group will need a decision from its existing members, in order to maintain the trust of all the participants. In most cases this will be straightforward. In some cases issues may need to be carefully weighed.

Suitable publicity

In some though not all cases, it is right to want to give a public profile to a coming together of different faiths. The extent to which publicity is sought should be an early issue to be discussed by the group.

On the whole, the local media are likely to be sympathetic, provided their need for clear information and, sometimes, suitable photographs can be met.

Web sites are these days also very important.

Planning activities

Each group will want to plan activities that are appropriate to their aims, area and possibilities. It is best to start with simple and achievable actions. These will build confidence for later, perhaps more ambitious, initiatives.

Where a group has a very specific purpose, these activities are directly linked to its purpose (eg a group brought together to develop a multi-faith centre in a college or hospital, or to provide guidance to a faith participant in a local strategic partnership).

Reading Interfaith Group produce each year a simple calendar of the main religious festivals of the main faiths (whose dates often vary each year). This also includes details of the Group's own planned actions. The Borough helps with distribution.

Where the aim is wider, to develop good relations between faith communities and to show to the public at large that such relations are possible, a programme of activities may include events to:

- provide space to meet each other
- provide a calendar of the religious festivals of the different faiths
- teach about different faiths
- visit places of worship
- involve special groups eg women, young people
- offer public witness through joint walks or shared representations.

Eating together is one of the best ways of building relationships. Faith practices on diet may make this difficult, but it is certainly possible if planned openly and carefully.

Sport offers many possibilities of bringing communities together. This is particularly useful to draw young people into joint activities.

Youth events are great. However, in each tradition, this is an age when the commitment of believers is often greatest. Concern about compromising belief may be an issue. This requires careful preparation, perhaps to find ways of focussing on shared experience and on ethical issues. For young people as for older ones, hearing people's stories is very valuable, to learn 'how it is for you'.

Here are some examples of straightforward activities by area inter-faith groups in our region. They are listed not because they are special - most are paralleled by many other groups – but because they are feasible for new groups setting out:

Reading Faith Forum

The Faith Committee participated in the Reading Council for Racial Equality's campaign to get people to vote in the European election in order that extremist parties should not win a propaganda victory. The press conference was on TV.

Maidenhead Inter-faith

Almost £600 was collected for the Red Cross Afghan Crisis fund, after a Maidenhead Together event held outside the Town Hall, which included prayers for peace from Christian, Jewish, Muslim and Sikh traditions, and candle-lighting by Maidenhead children

Windsor and Maidenhead Community Forum

Inter-faith Netball and Soccer Tournaments are held.

The group also supported a touring puppet show in local primary schools, highlighting the importance of and reward from respecting the rights and interests of other people's faith and culture.

Interfaith Milton Keynes

A service was held in the Quaker Meeting Room which was led by the women's group

Hampshire Interfaith Network

A special exhibition was organised, called 'Connections: hidden British histories'. It brought out the hidden histories of Asian, Black and Jewish immigrants who came from different parts of the world at different times and for different reasons and who had a difficult time and little contact with the 'host community'

Southampton Council of Faiths

A local secondary school each year produces a World Religions mural, which becomes a permanent fixture in the school. The aim is to understand different faiths better while encouraging a sense of ownership of the school environment and to give them a chance to try new art processes and, for the gifted, to bring their work into the public arena.

Elmbridge Multifaith forum

Visits are arranged to different places of worship.

Brighton and Hove Interfaith Contact Group

A [Green Faith day was arranged to explore spiritual traditions and the environment](#)

Political issues that are often seen to divide by faith, even when this is a great oversimplification, are both very difficult and also important. Some groups have tried to tackle issues such as the Middle East, seeking to listen honestly to each other. However, it is necessary first to build trust between participants, in less contentious areas. And whatever the event, planning needs to be shared, in order to achieve balance. It may be that shared support for victims of a disaster may be a first step.

There is excellent and very practical advice on organising events, including catering, in the *Local Inter faith Guide*.

Partnerships between faith and public sector bodies

Faith communities are playing an important part in local communities through working with public authorities in ways which do not need elaborate new structures. Examples are:

- inner city chaplaincies ('street angels'), working with police and social services
- networks of local prayer, coordinated with the police in hard areas
- shared chaplaincies in hospitals and prisons.

When it comes to the provision of social services, it seems that budgetary pressures are leading local authorities (and other parts of the public sector) to re-examine some boundaries between the public and private sectors. There is a new interest in finding partners to whom some tasks can be entrusted, or who would be ready to share in the provision of services. This applies in areas such as services for the young, the elderly and those with learning disabilities.

Faith communities may be suitable partners for the public sector. They often have buildings which are already or could be used for services that the community needs, sometimes imaginatively using space that is at other times used for worship. They may also have access to some at least who would benefit from the service. And they may have people motivated to help provide a service, even if they are unlikely to have much in the way of financial resources.

Forms of partnership can be difficult to construct between faith and public sector bodies. There needs to be clarity from the outset about:

- who takes legal responsibility. Faith bodies are often themselves not structured to take on significant liability towards others
- what happens if one or other partner can no longer provide finance

- who recruits staff; and what part if any may faith play in selection; who supervises the staff
- how necessary insurance is provided
- who assures day to day management (eg, who exercises discipline in a jointly run youth centre)
- how publicity is managed; and what its aims are
- what the requirements are of social protection for young or other vulnerable people
- how the faith of faith community partner(s) may affect the day to day running of the service?

These different issues – others may arise – are all surmountable. One way is to create a special legal body eg a company to manage a project. This may also be a requirement of Charity Commission rules on accounting. Once again, the important point is to stress the need for openness and realism.

Provided these are brought to bear, people of faith will consider that there is every reason to welcome a move to the provision of many services with the help of many faith communities, as used to be the case by the Christian church in earlier centuries.

7. BUILDING IN HOPE – A COMMON WORD BETWEEN US AND YOU

The purpose of this paper is to explore the context, language and scope for acts of dialogue between government and the faith communities of our region. It does not attempt to explain or develop the faith positions of the many faiths involved.

However, it is right to conclude with a brief reference to an initiative taken by a large group of Islamic scholars in 2007. In that year, they addressed an open letter and call to the leaders of all the different branches of the Christian church. In this letter they underline the importance and need for peace between Muslims and Christians. Through scholarly analysis, they then point to the basis for this peace and understanding. For both faiths, there are shared foundational principles: love of the One God, and love of the neighbour. This leads on to a careful and detailed examination of texts in both the Bible and the Qur'an, and of the writings of the ancient scholars of the two faiths, which confirms this shared quality of these foundational principles.¹⁹

This initiative has led to equally reflective and scholarly responses from Christian leaders, including Archbishop Rowan Williams. Continuation of the discussion is assured. There are also comments on this initiative from Jewish scholars, for these principles are equally enshrined in texts that this faith also consider holy.

Some local groups have taken up dialogue around this initiative, both to explore it together and to make it more known in their areas. Its impact depends on people knowing of it, and studying it to enter into its reasoning. So it is important that at local level ways are found to encourage the faith communities and the public at large to become aware of the initiative and the dialogue that is following.

The Bishop of Guildford has met local Islamic leaders to explore together the meaning of the initiative. There are plans to make it more widely known in this area.

Love of neighbour, one of the two principles, is also able to include many other faiths.

The *Common Word between Us and You* initiative is therefore able to support not only shared understandings, but also the coming together of many faiths in dialogue and in action to meet the needs of the society of which we are all part.

At this time, there is every reason for hope that we will be able to move forward in dialogue and action between faith groups and with government in its many forms.

¹⁹ The summary and full text of the initiative may be found at www.acommonword.com. This site also contains the text of responses, and of other related texts, as well as useful links to other sites and sources.

Appendix 1 - References

A. Papers consulted:

A Common Word between Us and You; www.acommonword.com; 2007. This site also contains the text of responses, and of other related texts, as well as useful links to other sites and sources

Believing in Local Action; Rose Edwards; Church Urban Fund, Department for Communities and Local Government, NAVCA; Church Urban Fund; 2008

Beyond Belief?; Sarah Lewis for SE England Faith Forum; SE England Regional Authority, SE England Faith Forum, SE England Development Agency; 2004

Building Good Relationships with people of Different Faiths and Beliefs; The Inter Faith Network for the UK; 2005

Changing Face of Surrey – a snapshot of inward international migration; Sian Sangarde-Brown, 2007 (prepared for Surrey CC, unpublished)

Face to Face and Side by Side; Department for Communities and Local Government; Crown Copyright; 2008

Faith in the System; Department for Children, Schools and Families; Crown Copyright 2007

Guidance on Community Cohesion; LGA Publications; 2002

Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society; Home Office; Crown Copyright; 2005

Moral but no Compass; Francis Davis, Elizabeth Paulhus, Andrew Bradstock; Von Hügel Institute, St Edmund's College, Cambridge; Matthew James Publishing Ltd; 2008

Presence and Engagement; Church of England; 2005

The Local Inter Faith Guide; Inter Faith network for the UK; 2005

Young, Muslim and British; Philip Lewis; Continuum; 2007

B. People consulted:

Revd Richard Cook, Diocesan Interfaith Adviser, Diocese of Guildford

Zafar Iqbal, Senior Policy Adviser, Woking Borough Council

Andrew Pearson, Director of Administration and Leisure, Runnymede Borough Council

Appendix 2

**2002 Census data for religion (Table KS07 Religion):
South East Region, by Unitary Authority, County and Borough**

<i>Urban areas are those with 1500 people or more</i>	All people (number)	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jewish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
ENGLAND AND WALES	52,041,916	71.75	0.28	1.06	0.5	2.97	0.63	0.29	14.81	7.71
<i>Remainder</i>	5,246,977	78.44	0.19	0.11	0.16	0.20	0.06	0.29	13.33	7.21
<i>Urban areas</i>	46,794,939	71.00	0.29	1.17	0.54	3.28	0.70	0.29	14.98	7.76
ENGLAND	49,138,831	71.74	0.28	1.11	0.52	3.10	0.67	0.29	14.59	7.69
<i>Remainder</i>	4,717,150	78.74	0.18	0.12	0.17	0.21	0.07	0.29	13.06	7.16
<i>Urban areas)</i>	44,421,681	70.99	0.29	1.22	0.56	3.41	0.73	0.29	14.76	7.74
SOUTH EAST	8,000,645	72.78	0.28	0.56	0.24	1.36	0.47	0.36	16.50	7.46
<i>Remainder</i>	888,349	77.28	0.22	0.17	0.27	0.32	0.07	0.36	14.14	7.18
<i>Urban areas</i>	7,112,296	72.22	0.28	0.61	0.23	1.49	0.52	0.36	16.79	7.50
UNITARY AUTHORITIES										
Medway	249,488	71.97	0.22	0.68	0.08	1.05	1.22	0.34	16.70	7.76
<i>Remainder</i>	6,332	76.64	0.17	0.14	0.09	0.25	0.33	0.52	15.18	6.66
<i>Urban areas</i>	243,156	71.84	0.22	0.69	0.08	1.07	1.24	0.34	16.73	7.79
Bracknell Forest	109,617	72.01	0.28	0.99	0.17	0.68	0.19	0.29	17.96	7.43
<i>Remainder</i>	5,346	79.03	0.30	0.37	0.45	0.41	0.13	0.26	11.32	7.73
<i>Urban areas</i>	104,271	71.65	0.28	1.03	0.15	0.69	0.20	0.29	18.30	7.41
West Berkshire	144,483	75.93	0.25	0.24	0.19	0.40	0.10	0.28	15.71	6.90
<i>Remainder</i>	31,382	76.70	0.32	0.11	0.27	0.19	0.04	0.29	14.67	7.41
<i>Urban areas</i>	113,101	75.71	0.24	0.28	0.17	0.45	0.11	0.28	16.00	6.76
Reading	143,096	62.63	0.48	0.99	0.29	4.00	0.55	0.36	22.00	8.70
<i>Remainder</i>	491	53.77	-	-	-	3.26	-	0.61	30.35	12.02
<i>Urban areas</i>	142,603	62.66	0.48	0.99	0.29	4.01	0.55	0.36	21.97	8.68
Slough	119,067	53.75	0.25	4.48	0.12	13.35	9.09	0.30	10.97	7.70
<i>Remainder</i>	289	67.82	-	1.38	-	2.42	3.81	-	16.61	7.96
<i>Urban areas</i>	118,777	53.71	0.25	4.49	0.12	13.38	9.10	0.30	10.96	7.70
Windsor and Maidenhead	133,626	73.68	0.34	0.99	0.43	2.39	1.21	0.27	13.86	6.82
<i>Remainder</i>	9,877	77.10	0.24	0.40	0.31	0.63	0.32	0.21	13.87	6.90
<i>Urban areas</i>	123,749	73.41	0.35	1.04	0.44	2.53	1.29	0.27	13.86	6.82
Wokingham	150,229	72.78	0.28	0.82	0.36	1.33	0.97	0.26	16.59	6.60
<i>Remainder</i>	10,396	74.63	0.12	0.17	1.90	0.50	0.25	0.20	14.52	7.70
<i>Urban areas</i>	139,833	72.64	0.29	0.87	0.25	1.39	1.02	0.26	16.75	6.52
Milton Keynes	207,057	65.54	0.36	1.25	0.23	2.34	0.38	0.40	21.56	7.94
<i>Remainder</i>	12,199	71.21	0.29	0.49	0.23	0.63	0.20	0.38	19.21	7.37
<i>Urban areas</i>	194,858	65.19	0.37	1.30	0.22	2.45	0.40	0.40	21.70	7.98

Connecting Faith in the South East
Understanding Each Other

<i>Urban areas are those with 1500 people or more</i>	All people (number)	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jewish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
Brighton and Hove	247,817	59.10	0.70	0.52	1.36	1.47	0.10	0.85	27.02	8.88
<i>Remainder</i>	3,023	45.02	1.52	1.19	1.65	2.32	0.43	0.63	40.22	7.01
Urban areas	244,794	59.28	0.69	0.52	1.35	1.46	0.09	0.85	26.85	8.91
Portsmouth	186,701	68.07	0.40	0.44	0.13	2.15	0.17	0.39	19.95	8.31
<i>Urban areas</i>	186,701	68.07	0.40	0.44	0.13	2.15	0.17	0.39	19.95	8.31
Southampton	217,445	65.55	0.33	0.71	0.13	1.92	1.29	0.44	21.62	8.01
<i>Urban areas</i>	217,445	65.55	0.33	0.71	0.13	1.92	1.29	0.44	21.62	8.01
Isle of Wight	132,731	73.72	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.28	0.02	0.45	17.27	7.89
<i>Remainder</i>	20,014	77.33	0.14	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.01	0.32	14.50	7.44
<i>Urban areas</i>	112,718	73.08	0.18	0.10	0.10	0.31	0.03	0.47	17.76	7.97
COUNTIES AND BOROUGHES										
BUCKINGHAM-SHIRE COUNTY	479,026	72.59	0.23	0.62	0.33	3.62	0.35	0.26	15.12	6.89
<i>Remainder</i>	77,627	77.38	0.22	0.29	0.40	0.59	0.18	0.26	14.02	6.65
<i>Urban areas</i>	401,399	71.66	0.24	0.68	0.31	4.20	0.38	0.25	15.33	6.94
Aylesbury Vale	165,748	73.78	0.20	0.45	0.20	2.67	0.10	0.27	15.69	6.64
<i>Remainder</i>	40,280	78.06	0.19	0.12	0.27	0.42	0.03	0.30	14.14	6.47
<i>Urban areas</i>	125,468	72.40	0.20	0.56	0.18	3.39	0.12	0.26	16.19	6.69
Chiltern	89,228	74.72	0.23	0.50	0.54	1.88	0.12	0.27	15.02	6.72
<i>Remainder</i>	12,719	75.62	0.35	0.47	0.55	0.58	0.08	0.28	14.78	7.28
<i>Urban areas</i>	76,509	74.57	0.21	0.50	0.53	2.10	0.12	0.27	15.05	6.63
South Bucks	61,945	75.58	0.33	1.23	0.52	1.13	1.58	0.26	12.46	6.91
<i>Remainder</i>	7,354	74.75	0.35	1.31	0.91	0.71	1.48	0.30	13.03	7.17
<i>Urban areas</i>	54,591	75.69	0.33	1.22	0.47	1.19	1.59	0.25	12.39	6.87
Wycombe	162,105	69.06	0.23	0.62	0.27	6.49	0.25	0.24	15.59	7.24
<i>Remainder</i>	17,274	78.19	0.16	0.11	0.38	0.93	0.06	0.15	13.62	6.41
<i>Urban areas</i>	144,831	67.98	0.24	0.68	0.25	7.16	0.28	0.25	15.83	7.34
EAST SUSSEX COUNTY	492,324	73.61	0.26	0.16	0.21	0.61	0.03	0.50	16.49	8.13
<i>Remainder</i>	86,572	76.22	0.23	0.09	0.21	0.49	0.01	0.51	14.37	7.87
<i>Urban areas</i>	405,752	73.06	0.27	0.18	0.21	0.63	0.03	0.50	16.94	8.18
Eastbourne	89,667	72.80	0.34	0.24	0.29	0.98	0.05	0.46	16.70	8.14
<i>Urban areas</i>	89,667	72.80	0.34	0.24	0.29	0.98	0.05	0.46	16.70	8.14
Hastings	85,029	67.39	0.32	0.27	0.13	0.75	0.04	0.47	21.36	9.28
<i>Urban areas</i>	85,029	67.39	0.32	0.27	0.13	0.75	0.04	0.47	21.36	9.28
Lewes	92,177	72.02	0.30	0.15	0.29	0.44	0.03	0.40	18.18	8.21
<i>Remainder</i>	16,059	73.46	0.32	0.11	0.26	0.15	0.02	0.46	16.36	8.87
<i>Urban areas</i>	76,118	71.72	0.29	0.16	0.29	0.50	0.03	0.38	18.57	8.07
Rother	85,428	76.50	0.18	0.14	0.15	0.64	0.03	0.35	13.91	8.10
<i>Remainder</i>	27,878	75.88	0.24	0.11	0.12	1.08	0.01	0.41	14.30	7.84
<i>Urban areas</i>	57,550	76.80	0.16	0.15	0.16	0.43	0.04	0.32	13.73	8.22
Wealden	140,023	77.20	0.20	0.08	0.19	0.37	0.01	0.70	13.86	7.38
<i>Remainder</i>	42,635	77.47	0.19	0.08	0.26	0.23	0.01	0.59	13.66	7.51

Connecting Faith in the South East
Understanding Each Other

Urban areas are those with 1500 people or more	All people (number)	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jewish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
Urban areas	97,388	77.08	0.20	0.08	0.16	0.43	0.02	0.75	13.95	7.32
HAMPSHIRE COUNTY	1,240,103	76.19	0.18	0.25	0.11	0.35	0.14	0.33	15.55	6.91
Remainder	135,188	79.14	0.17	0.12	0.17	0.14	0.08	0.31	13.33	6.54
Urban areas	1,104,915	75.83	0.18	0.27	0.10	0.37	0.14	0.33	15.83	6.96
Basingstoke and Deane	152,573	74.02	0.16	0.45	0.12	0.51	0.22	0.33	16.98	7.22
Remainder	20,878	79.09	0.19	0.19	0.10	0.29	0.06	0.28	13.22	6.58
Urban areas	131,695	73.21	0.15	0.49	0.12	0.55	0.24	0.34	17.57	7.32
East Hampshire	109,274	77.03	0.21	0.13	0.16	0.25	0.03	0.34	15.36	6.50
Remainder	21,829	77.61	0.28	0.14	0.23	0.10	0.05	0.36	14.65	6.58
Urban areas	87,445	76.89	0.19	0.13	0.14	0.29	0.02	0.33	15.53	6.48
Eastleigh	116,169	76.67	0.17	0.34	0.07	0.31	0.50	0.29	15.23	6.43
Remainder	1,014	77.51	0.30	-	-	0.30	-	0.30	16.17	5.42
Urban areas	115,155	76.66	0.16	0.34	0.07	0.31	0.50	0.29	15.22	6.44
Fareham	107,977	77.96	0.14	0.15	0.08	0.35	0.06	0.45	14.19	6.61
Remainder	1,737	77.37	0.23	-	0.17	-	0.81	0.81	14.28	6.33
Urban areas	106,240	77.97	0.14	0.16	0.08	0.36	0.04	0.45	14.19	6.62
Gosport	76,415	75.33	0.15	0.13	0.04	0.31	0.03	0.33	16.59	7.07
Urban areas	76,415	75.33	0.15	0.13	0.04	0.31	0.03	0.33	16.59	7.07
Hart	83,505	77.17	0.21	0.30	0.13	0.37	0.12	0.27	15.06	6.38
Remainder	10,071	79.41	0.14	0.21	0.27	0.28	0.11	0.19	13.11	6.30
Urban areas	73,434	76.86	0.22	0.31	0.11	0.38	0.13	0.28	15.33	6.39
Havant	116,849	73.58	0.14	0.14	0.09	0.25	0.06	0.29	17.44	8.01
Remainder	2,046	78.20	0.20	0.44	0.15	-	0.20	0.49	14.47	5.87
Urban areas	114,804	73.50	0.14	0.13	0.09	0.25	0.06	0.28	17.50	8.05
New Forest	169,331	78.31	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.17	0.03	0.31	13.96	6.91
Remainder	21,361	78.88	0.15	0.02	0.17	0.06	0.03	0.36	13.25	7.09
Urban areas	147,970	78.23	0.12	0.09	0.10	0.18	0.03	0.31	14.06	6.89
Rushmoor	90,987	73.03	0.39	0.62	0.07	0.74	0.10	0.33	16.78	7.95
Urban areas	90,987	73.03	0.39	0.62	0.07	0.74	0.10	0.33	16.78	7.95
Test Valley	109,801	78.11	0.14	0.23	0.11	0.32	0.25	0.30	14.20	6.35
Remainder	28,693	80.56	0.15	0.09	0.15	0.13	0.11	0.30	12.05	6.44
Urban areas	81,108	77.24	0.13	0.28	0.09	0.39	0.30	0.30	14.96	6.32
Winchester	107,222	76.16	0.24	0.24	0.17	0.36	0.07	0.35	15.91	6.51
Remainder	27,560	79.23	0.13	0.13	0.17	0.12	0.04	0.25	13.60	6.33
Urban areas	79,662	75.09	0.28	0.28	0.17	0.44	0.07	0.38	16.71	6.57
KENT COUNTY	1,329,718	75.13	0.22	0.37	0.13	0.49	0.61	0.32	14.92	7.80
Remainder	196,935	77.92	0.18	0.14	0.16	0.21	0.06	0.35	13.59	7.38
Urban areas	1,132,783	74.65	0.23	0.41	0.12	0.54	0.71	0.32	15.15	7.88
Ashford	102,661	76.45	0.17	0.26	0.12	0.56	0.07	0.30	14.63	7.44
Remainder	33,165	78.47	0.16	0.07	0.13	0.15	0.01	0.38	12.95	7.69
Urban areas	69,496	75.49	0.17	0.35	0.12	0.76	0.10	0.26	15.43	7.32
Canterbury	135,278	73.28	0.38	0.38	0.16	0.64	0.09	0.42	16.66	7.99
Remainder	17,000	77.04	0.21	0.22	0.20	0.21	0.08	0.54	14.59	6.91
Urban areas	118,278	72.74	0.40	0.40	0.16	0.70	0.10	0.40	16.96	8.15

Connecting Faith in the South East
Understanding Each Other

Urban areas are those with 1500 people or more	All people (number)	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jewish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
Dartford	85,911	73.28	0.24	0.76	0.07	0.69	1.10	0.22	15.05	8.59
Remainder	4,070	79.83	0.10	0.29	0.07	0.07	0.42	0.10	11.08	8.03
Urban areas	81,844	72.95	0.25	0.78	0.07	0.73	1.13	0.22	15.25	8.62
Dover	104,566	76.60	0.17	0.15	0.07	0.29	0.04	0.28	14.18	8.22
Remainder	17,121	77.31	0.19	0.20	0.11	0.18	-	0.27	13.74	7.99
Urban areas	87,444	76.46	0.17	0.14	0.07	0.32	0.05	0.28	14.26	8.27
Gravesham	95,717	72.30	0.25	0.63	0.06	0.80	6.66	0.27	12.02	7.02
Remainder	3,327	76.98	0.18	0.21	0.18	1.08	0.78	0.33	13.26	7.00
Urban areas	92,390	72.13	0.25	0.64	0.05	0.79	6.88	0.27	11.97	7.02
Maidstone	138,948	76.31	0.23	0.48	0.12	0.53	0.11	0.52	14.33	7.38
Remainder	27,735	78.47	0.13	0.14	0.17	0.21	0.04	0.39	13.13	7.31
Urban areas	111,213	75.76	0.25	0.56	0.11	0.60	0.12	0.55	14.63	7.40
Sevenoaks	109,305	77.02	0.20	0.20	0.15	0.34	0.09	0.27	14.43	7.30
Remainder	23,890	78.07	0.20	0.10	0.25	0.19	0.06	0.35	13.44	7.34
Urban areas	85,415	76.72	0.20	0.23	0.12	0.39	0.10	0.24	14.70	7.29
Shepway	96,238	75.43	0.22	1.04	0.11	0.35	0.02	0.33	14.63	7.87
Remainder	11,555	79.52	0.15	0.08	0.12	0.16	0.03	0.29	12.50	7.17
Urban areas	84,683	74.87	0.23	1.17	0.11	0.38	0.02	0.33	14.92	7.97
Swale	122,801	75.89	0.13	0.20	0.08	0.36	0.09	0.28	15.38	7.58
Remainder	18,944	77.18	0.10	0.17	0.10	0.13	0.05	0.24	14.57	7.47
Urban areas	103,857	75.65	0.14	0.21	0.08	0.41	0.10	0.28	15.53	7.60
Thanet	126,702	73.58	0.27	0.19	0.24	0.49	0.07	0.33	15.86	8.97
Remainder	2,410	80.83	0.17	-	0.17	0.29	-	0.46	10.75	7.34
Urban areas	124,290	73.44	0.27	0.20	0.24	0.49	0.07	0.33	15.96	9.00
Tonbridge and Malling	107,561	76.13	0.15	0.16	0.12	0.30	0.07	0.24	15.01	7.83
Remainder	14,600	76.95	0.14	0.16	0.27	0.21	0.06	0.36	14.43	7.42
Urban areas	92,961	76.01	0.15	0.16	0.09	0.32	0.07	0.22	15.10	7.89
Tunbridge Wells	104,030	75.03	0.26	0.19	0.17	0.57	0.04	0.31	16.02	7.41
Remainder	23,118	77.32	0.35	0.11	0.14	0.36	0.05	0.36	14.39	6.92
Urban areas	80,912	74.37	0.24	0.22	0.18	0.63	0.04	0.30	16.48	7.55
OXFORDSHIRE	605,488	72.52	0.33	0.30	0.33	1.32	0.13	0.31	17.46	7.29
Remainder	114,965	77.15	0.18	0.11	0.31	0.19	0.05	0.32	14.52	7.18
Urban areas	490,523	71.44	0.37	0.35	0.33	1.58	0.15	0.31	18.15	7.32
Cherwell	131,785	75.56	0.20	0.18	0.15	1.22	0.25	0.27	14.98	7.19
Remainder	30,276	77.77	0.11	0.12	0.26	0.24	0.07	0.30	13.48	7.65
Urban areas	101,509	74.91	0.23	0.19	0.12	1.51	0.30	0.27	15.43	7.05
Oxford	134,248	60.41	0.80	0.78	0.81	3.85	0.23	0.49	23.89	8.73
Remainder	1,246	62.68	1.04	-	0.48	0.64	0.24	1.69	23.60	9.63
Urban areas	133,002	60.39	0.80	0.78	0.82	3.88	0.24	0.48	23.90	8.73
South Oxfordshire	128,188	75.46	0.19	0.18	0.24	0.34	0.05	0.24	16.54	6.75
Remainder	34,502	75.78	0.19	0.13	0.38	0.24	0.06	0.30	15.45	7.47
Urban areas	93,686	75.35	0.18	0.20	0.20	0.37	0.05	0.22	16.94	6.49
Vale of White Horse	115,627	75.84	0.22	0.20	0.20	0.48	0.07	0.23	15.75	7.01
Remainder	20,023	77.87	0.18	0.07	0.29	0.12	0.02	0.27	14.43	6.73
Urban areas	95,604	75.42	0.23	0.23	0.17	0.55	0.08	0.22	16.02	7.07

Connecting Faith in the South East
Understanding Each Other

Urban areas are those with 1500 people or more	All people (number)	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jewish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
West										
Oxfordshire	95,640	77.39	0.17	0.11	0.16	0.23	0.02	0.30	15.13	6.49
Remainder	28,918	78.28	0.19	0.09	0.27	0.09	0.02	0.33	14.16	6.55
Urban areas	66,722	77.00	0.17	0.11	0.12	0.28	0.02	0.28	15.55	6.46
SURREY	1,059,015	74.56	0.32	0.70	0.30	1.34	0.19	0.31	15.21	7.07
Remainder	89,631	76.65	0.27	0.30	0.33	0.54	0.05	0.36	14.14	7.37
Urban areas	969,384	74.37	0.32	0.74	0.30	1.41	0.20	0.31	15.31	7.04
Elmbridge	121,936	74.40	0.46	0.91	0.77	1.32	0.22	0.29	14.69	6.95
Remainder	2,652	71.15	0.41	0.83	0.90	0.98	0.45	0.19	16.67	8.41
Urban areas	119,284	74.47	0.46	0.91	0.76	1.33	0.21	0.30	14.64	6.92
Epsom and Ewell	67,059	72.98	0.50	1.84	0.35	1.91	0.12	0.27	14.79	7.22
Remainder	2,566	77.59	0.23	0.51	0.55	0.97	0.12	0.31	13.02	6.70
Urban areas	64,493	72.80	0.51	1.90	0.34	1.95	0.12	0.27	14.86	7.24
Guildford	129,701	73.62	0.35	0.51	0.22	0.85	0.12	0.33	16.85	7.16
Remainder	17,676	77.52	0.25	0.29	0.26	0.24	0.03	0.33	14.17	6.91
Urban areas	112,025	73.00	0.36	0.54	0.21	0.94	0.13	0.33	17.28	7.20
Mole Valley	80,287	75.42	0.23	0.36	0.25	0.56	0.06	0.26	15.57	7.28
Remainder	17,835	75.92	0.32	0.30	0.25	0.50	0.02	0.27	14.77	7.64
Urban areas	62,452	75.28	0.20	0.38	0.25	0.57	0.07	0.26	15.80	7.18
Reigate and Banstead	126,523	73.77	0.25	0.78	0.25	1.29	0.11	0.31	16.12	7.13
Remainder	5,381	73.39	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.85	0.17	0.46	17.21	7.17
Urban areas	121,142	73.78	0.25	0.80	0.25	1.31	0.10	0.30	16.07	7.13
Runnymede	78,033	74.87	0.38	0.64	0.33	0.98	0.28	0.32	14.33	7.88
Remainder	3,477	79.98	0.20	0.17	0.49	0.23	0.20	0.20	11.36	7.16
Urban areas	74,556	74.63	0.39	0.66	0.32	1.02	0.28	0.32	14.47	7.91
Spelthorne	90,390	75.29	0.25	1.05	0.24	0.94	0.72	0.24	14.07	7.20
Remainder	900	78.33	0.33	-	0.56	0.33	-	-	10.89	9.56
Urban areas	89,492	75.26	0.25	1.06	0.24	0.94	0.72	0.24	14.10	7.17
Surrey Heath	80,314	76.35	0.34	0.65	0.18	1.17	0.29	0.24	14.12	6.65
Remainder	3,157	80.61	0.13	0.57	0.29	0.25	0.10	0.25	12.61	5.19
Urban areas	77,158	76.17	0.35	0.66	0.18	1.21	0.30	0.24	14.19	6.71
Tandridge	79,267	76.18	0.22	0.45	0.22	0.52	0.05	0.55	14.94	6.87
Remainder	13,661	75.71	0.21	0.45	0.32	0.45	0.02	0.67	14.11	8.05
Urban areas	65,606	76.28	0.22	0.45	0.20	0.54	0.05	0.52	15.11	6.62
Waverley	115,665	76.34	0.25	0.21	0.19	0.52	0.04	0.31	15.40	6.74
Remainder	20,428	77.20	0.30	0.10	0.37	0.82	0.02	0.31	13.39	7.48
Urban areas	95,237	76.15	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.45	0.05	0.31	15.83	6.58
Woking	89,840	71.34	0.29	0.68	0.26	5.06	0.11	0.29	15.12	6.84
Remainder	1,899	78.20	0.42	0.37	-	0.26	-	0.32	14.48	5.95
Urban areas	87,939	71.20	0.28	0.69	0.26	5.17	0.11	0.29	15.14	6.86
WEST SUSSEX	753,614	74.45	0.23	0.61	0.19	1.01	0.14	0.41	15.60	7.35
Remainder	88,080	77.34	0.27	0.13	0.26	0.24	0.05	0.50	14.11	7.11
Urban areas	665,534	74.07	0.23	0.68	0.18	1.11	0.15	0.40	15.80	7.38
Adur	59,627	73.29	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.70	0.07	0.40	16.82	8.00

Connecting Faith in the South East
Understanding Each Other

Urban areas are those with 1500 people or more	All people (number)	Christ-ian	Budd-hist	Hindu	Jewish	Mus-lim	Sikh	Other	No relig-ion	not stated
<i>Remainder</i>	446	65.92	1.35	-	0.67	-	-	0.90	25.78	5.38
Urban areas	59,178	73.34	0.21	0.24	0.26	0.70	0.07	0.40	16.76	8.02
Arun	140,759	76.60	0.18	0.10	0.19	0.38	0.02	0.29	14.68	7.56
<i>Remainder</i>	5,126	76.45	0.41	0.06	0.39	0.41	-	0.23	14.05	8.00
Urban areas	135,631	76.61	0.17	0.10	0.18	0.37	0.02	0.29	14.70	7.54
Chichester	106,450	77.28	0.29	0.09	0.17	0.26	0.02	0.46	14.24	7.20
<i>Remainder</i>	35,684	78.59	0.33	0.07	0.20	0.17	0.01	0.50	12.94	7.17
Urban areas	70,766	76.61	0.27	0.09	0.15	0.31	0.03	0.44	14.90	7.21
Crawley	99,744	67.28	0.19	3.42	0.11	4.43	0.68	0.28	16.77	6.85
Urban areas	99,744	67.28	0.19	3.42	0.11	4.43	0.68	0.28	16.77	6.85
Horsham	122,088	76.34	0.22	0.19	0.18	0.37	0.08	0.36	15.44	6.82
<i>Remainder</i>	25,525	76.69	0.20	0.17	0.29	0.23	0.06	0.41	14.90	7.05
Urban areas	96,563	76.24	0.22	0.19	0.16	0.41	0.08	0.35	15.59	6.76
Mid Sussex	127,378	75.85	0.21	0.30	0.18	0.61	0.07	0.63	15.34	6.79
<i>Remainder</i>	21,294	76.50	0.20	0.19	0.27	0.32	0.08	0.64	14.89	6.92
Urban areas	106,084	75.72	0.22	0.33	0.17	0.67	0.06	0.63	15.43	6.77
Worthing	97,568	72.14	0.34	0.22	0.26	0.75	0.11	0.46	16.99	8.73
Urban areas	97,568	72.14	0.34	0.22	0.26	0.75	0.11	0.46	16.99	8.73