

30 October 2016

## Arguing Religion

Chair: Paolo Costa, Maria Chiara Giorda, Boris Raehme, researchers at FBK-ISR, Trento, Italy

The Centre for Religious Studies at Fondazione Bruno Kessler (Trento, Italy) explores the interaction of religion and innovation (<http://isr.fbk.eu/mission-0>). Our 2016-2018 research project 'Arguing Religion' focuses on the goals, the prospects and the reach of argumentative debate in responding to religious disagreements. Whereas the problem of accommodating religious disagreements in ethically, politically, and legally legitimate ways has been the topic of extensive research, the question of how much room this kind of disagreement leaves for argumentative debate in its own right and terms has attracted less attention. In June 2017 we will convene in Trento an international three-day conference (16 speakers, names already available if required), bringing together philosophers, theologians, and researchers in religious studies. In this workshop we propose to inform about the outcome of our conference and further progress on our research according to the following description.

Religious disagreements will be considered in three different settings: between believers of the same faith (intra-faith disagreement), between believers of distinct faiths (cross-faith disagreement), and between believers and non-believers (either atheists or agnostics). The role, the goals, and the reach of argumentative debate can be expected to differ across these settings and in relation to the religious faiths that are, respectively, involved. Often, convergence of judgment or even consensus are taken to be the intrinsic goals of argumentative debate. However, this convergence or consensus-based conception of the goals of public argumentation would seem to be rather problematic in the case of arguing religion. Are there promising alternatives? The session will address this and three of the following questions to be selected together with the scientific committee:

1. What is a religious disagreement, and what kinds of religious disagreement are there?
2. What is a religious argument and how can religious arguments be told apart from non-religious arguments?
3. To what extent can and should religious disagreements be conceived of as disagreements in which at least one of the disagreeing parties commits an epistemic mistake (holds a false belief)?
4. How is the goal of arguing religion best to be understood? Is it to convince the other, or rather to persuade or to convert her? Or something else altogether?