

THE DIALOGUE DECALOGUE: GROUND RULES FOR INTER-RELIGIOUS, INTER-IDEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE

Leonard Swidler

*Reprinted with permission from Journal of Ecumenical Studies 20-1,
Winter 1983 (September, 1984 revision).*

Dialogue is a conversation on a common subject between two or more persons with differing views, the primary purpose of which is for each participant to learn from the other so that he or she can change and grow. This very definition of dialogue embodies the first commandment of dialogue.

In the religious-ideological sphere in the past, we came together to discuss with those differing with us, for example, Catholics with Protestants, either to defeat an opponent, or to learn about an opponent, so as to deal more effectively with him or her, or, at best, to negotiate with him or her. If we faced each other at all, it was in confrontation – sometimes more openly polemically, sometimes more subtly so, but always with the ultimate goal of defeating the other, because we were convinced that we alone had the absolute truth.

But dialogue is not debate. In dialogue, each partner must listen to the other as openly and sympathetically as he or she can in an attempt to understand the other's position as precisely, and, as it were, as much from within, as possible. Such an attitude automatically includes the assumption that, at any point, we might find the partner's position so persuasive that, if we would act with integrity, we would have to change, and change can be disturbing.

We are here, of course, speaking of a specific kind of dialogue, an inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue. To have such, it is not sufficient that the dialogue partners discuss a religious-ideological subject, that is, the

meaning of life and how to live accordingly. Rather, they must come to the dialogue as persons somehow significantly identified with a religious or ideological community. If I were neither a Christian, nor a Marxist, for example, I could not participate as a “partner” in Christian-Marxist dialogue, though I might listen in, ask some questions for information, and make some helpful comments.

It is obvious that inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue is something new under the sun. We could not conceive of it, let alone do it, in the past. How, then, can we effectively engage in this new thing? The following are some basic ground rules, or “commandments,” of inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue that must be observed if dialogue is actually to take place. These are not theoretical rules, or commandments given from “on high,” but ones that have been learned from hard experience.

FIRST COMMANDMENT:

The primary purpose of dialogue is to learn, that is, to change and grow in the perception and understanding of reality, and then to act accordingly. Minimally, the very fact that I learn that my dialogue partner believes “this” rather than “that” proportionally changes my attitude toward them; and a change in my attitude is a significant change in me. We enter into dialogue so that we can learn, change, and grow, not so we can force change on the other, as one hopes to do in debate – a hope realised in inverse proportion to the frequency and ferocity with which debate is entered into. On the other hand, because, in dialogue, each partner comes with the intention of learning and changing themselves, one’s partner, in fact, will also change. Thus, the goal of debate, and much more, is accomplished far more effectively by dialogue.

SECOND COMMANDMENT:

Inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue must be a two-sided project – within each religious or ideological community, and between religious or ideological communities. Because of the “corporate” nature of inter-religious dialogue, and since the primary goal of dialogue is that each partner learn and change themselves, it is also necessary that each participant

enter into dialogue, not only with their partner across the faith line – the Lutheran with the Anglican, for example – but also with their co-religionists, with his fellow Lutherans, to share with them the fruits of the inter-religious dialogue. Only thus can the whole community eventually learn and change, moving toward an ever-more perceptive insight into reality.

THIRD COMMANDMENT:

Each participant must come to the dialogue with complete honesty and sincerity. It should be made clear in what direction the major and minor thrusts of the tradition move, what the future shifts might be, and, if necessary, where the participant has difficulties with their own tradition. No false fronts have any place in dialogue.

Conversely – each participant must assume a similar complete honesty and sincerity in the other partners. Not only will the absence of sincerity prevent dialogue from happening, but the absence of the assumption of the partner's sincerity will do so as well. In brief: no trust, no dialogue.

FOURTH COMMANDMENT:

In inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue we must not compare our ideals with our partner's practice, but rather our ideals with our partner's ideals, our practice with our partner's practice.

FIFTH COMMANDMENT:

Each participant must define himself. Only the Jew, for example, can define what it means to be a Jew. The rest can only describe what it looks like from the outside. Moreover, because dialogue is a dynamic medium, as each participant learns, they will change, and hence continually deepen, expand, and modify their self-definition as a Jew – being careful to remain in constant dialogue with fellow Jews. Thus, it is mandatory that each dialogue partner defines what it means to be an authentic member of their own tradition.

Conversely – the one interpreted must be able to recognise themselves in the interpretation. This is the golden rule of inter-religious hermeneutics, as has been often reiterated by the “apostle of inter-religious dialogue”, Raimundo Panikkar. For the sake of understanding, each dialogue participant will naturally attempt to express for themselves what they think is the meaning of the partner’s statement; the partner must be able to recognise themselves in that expression. The advocate of “a world theology”, Wilfred Cantwell Smith, would add that the expression must also be verifiable by critical observers who are not involved.

SIXTH COMMANDMENT:

Each participant must come to the dialogue with no hard-and-fast assumptions as to where the points of disagreement are. Rather, each partner should not only listen to the other partner with openness and sympathy, but also attempt to agree with the dialogue partner, as far as is possible, while still maintaining integrity with their own tradition; where they absolutely can agree no further without violating their own integrity, precisely there is the real point of disagreement – which, most often, turns out to be different from the point of disagreement that was falsely assumed ahead of time.

SEVENTH COMMANDMENT:

Dialogue can take place only between equals, or par cum pari as Vatican II put it. Both must come to learn from each other. Therefore, if, for example, the Muslim views Hinduism as inferior, or if the Hindu views Islam as inferior, there will be no dialogue. If authentic inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue between Muslims and Hindus is to occur, then both the Muslim and the Hindu must come mainly to learn from each other; only then will it be “equal with equal,” *par cum pari*. This rule also indicates that there can be no such thing as a one-way dialogue. For example, Jewish-Christian discussions, begun in the 1960s, were mainly only prolegomena to inter-religious dialogue. Understandably, and properly, the Jews came to these exchanges only to teach Christians, although the Christians came mainly to learn. But, if authentic inter-religious dialogue between Christians and Jews is to occur, then the Jews must also come mainly to learn; only will it then, too, be *par cum pari*.

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT:

Dialogue can take place only on the basis of mutual trust. Although inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue must occur with some kind of “corporate” dimension, that is, the participants must be involved as members of a religious or ideological community – for instance, as Marxists or Taoists – it is also fundamentally true that it is only *persons* who can enter into dialogue. But a dialogue among persons can be built only on personal trust. Hence, it is wise not to tackle the most difficult problems in the beginning, but, rather, to approach first those issues most likely to provide some common ground, thereby establishing the basis of human trust. Then, gradually, as this personal trust deepens and expands, the more thorny matters can be undertaken. Thus, as in learning, we move from the known to the unknown, so in dialogue, we proceed from commonly-held matters – which, given our mutual ignorance resulting from centuries of hostility, will take us quite some time to discover fully – to discuss matters of disagreement.

NINTH COMMANDMENT:

Persons entering into inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue must be, at least minimally, self-critical of both themselves and their own religious or ideological traditions. A lack of such self-criticism implies that one’s own tradition already has all the correct answers. Such an attitude makes dialogue not only unnecessary, but even impossible, since we enter into dialogue primarily so we can learn – which obviously is impossible if our tradition has never made a misstep, if it has all the right answers. To be sure, in inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue, one must stand within a religious or ideological tradition with integrity and conviction, but such integrity and conviction must include, not exclude, a healthy self-criticism. Without it, there can be no dialogue – and, indeed, no integrity.

TENTH COMMANDMENT:

Each participant eventually must attempt to experience the partner’s religion or ideology “from within”; for a religion or ideology is not merely something of the head, but also of the spirit, heart, and “whole being”, individual and communal. John Dunne here speaks of “passing over” into

another's religious or ideological experience, and then coming back enlightened, broadened, and deepened. As Raimundo Panikkar notes, "To know what a religion says, we must understand what it says, but, for this, we must somehow believe in what it says". For example, "A Christian will never fully understand Hinduism if he is not, in one way or another, converted to Hinduism. Nor will a Hindu ever fully understand Christianity unless he, in one way or another, becomes Christian."

Inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue operates in three areas: the practical, where we collaborate to help humanity; the depth or "spiritual" dimension, where we attempt to experience the partner's religion or ideology "from within"; the cognitive, where we seek understanding and truth. Inter-religious, inter-ideological dialogue also has three phases. In the first phase we unlearn mis-information about each other, and begin to know each other as we truly are. In phase two, we begin to discern values in the partner's tradition and wish to appropriate them into our own tradition. For example, in the Buddhist-Christian dialogue, Christians might learn a greater appreciation of the prophetic, social justice tradition – both values traditionally strongly, though not exclusively, associated with the other's community. If we are serious, persistent, and sensitive enough in the dialogue, we may at times enter into phase three. Here we, together, begin to explore new areas of reality, of meaning, and of truth, of which neither of us had even been aware before. We are brought face to face with this new, as-yet-unknown-to-us dimension of reality only because of questions, insights, probings produced in the dialogue. We may thus dare to say that patiently-pursued dialogue can become an instrument of new "re-evaluation", a further "unveiling" of reality – on which we must then act.

There is something radially different about phase one, on the one hand, and phases two and three, on the other. In the latter, we do not simply add on quantitatively another "truth" or value from the partner's tradition. Instead, as we assimilate it within our own religious self-understanding, it will proportionately transform our self-understanding. Since our dialogue partner will be in a similar position, we will then be able to witness authentically to those elements of deep value in our own tradition that our partner's tradition may well be able to assimilate with

self-transforming profit. All this, of course, will have to be done with complete integrity on each side, each partner remaining authentically true to the vital core of their own religious tradition. However, in significant ways, that vital core will be perceived and experienced differently under the influence of the dialogue, but if the dialogue is carried on with both integrity and openness, the result will be that, for example, the Jew will be authentically Jewish, and the Christian will be authentically Christian, not despite the fact that Judaism and/or Christianity have been profoundly “Buddhised,” but because of it. And the same is true of a Judaised and/or Christianised Buddhism. There can be no talk of syncretism here, for syncretism means amalgamating various elements of different religions into some kind of a (con)fused whole, without concern for the integrity of the religions involved – which is not the case with authentic dialogue.