

THE DIALOGUE DECALOGUE

Ground Rules for Interreligious, Interideological Dialogue
Leonard Swidler dialogue@temple.edu

The 1st version of these guidelines—just four—was published as “Ground Rules for Interreligious Dialogue,” in the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 15, 3 (Summer, 1978), 413f.; expanded to “The Dialogue Decalogue: Ground rules for Interreligious Dialogue,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 20,1 (Winter, 1983): 1-4; from 1984 on titled “Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious, Interideological Dialogue.” It has been reproduced in 39 different publications in 9 languages. They are named “Dialogue Decalogue” for mnemonic pedagogical reasons: Members of the Abrahamic religions—Judaism, Christianity, Islam—will all recognize and easily remember the term the “Decalogue,” the “Ten Commandments”; in addition, the alliteration of D.... D also aids recall.

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 s/he 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 her or him, 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 s/he 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, speaking of a specific kind of dialogue—*inter*-religious, *inter*-ideological dialogue. To have such, it is not sufficient that the dialogue partners discuss a religious-ideological subject, i.e., the “ultimate meaning of life and how to live accordingly.” Rather, they must come to the dialogue as persons significantly identified with a religious or ideological community. If I were neither a Christian nor a Marxist, e.g., 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 interreligious, interideological dialogue is something new. We could not conceive of it, let alone do it in the past. How, then, can we engage in this new thing? The following are basic ground rules, or “commandments,” of interreligious, interideological 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 her; 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 realized 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 herself, 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: *Interreligious, interideological dialogue must be a two-sided project—within each religious or ideological community and between religious or ideological communities.* Because of the “communal” nature of inter-religious dialogue, and since the primary goal of dialogue is that each partner learn and change himself, it is also necessary that each participant enter into dialogue not only with his partner across the faith line—the Lutheran with the Anglican, for example—but also with his coreligionists, with his fellow Lutherans, to share with them the fruits of the interreligious 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 her 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 interreligious, interideological dialogue we must not compare our ideals with our partner’s practice,* but our ideals with our partner’s ideals, our practice with our partner’s practice, e.g., compare the Hindu practice of burning live widows (*suttee*) with the Christian practice of burning witches and *auto da fes*.

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, he will change and hence continually deepen, expand, and modify his self-definition as a Jew—being careful to remain in constant dialogue with fellow Jews. Thus it is mandatory that each dialogue partner define what it means to be an authentic member of his own tradition.

Conversely—the one interpreted must be able to recognize herself in the interpretation. This is the golden rule of interreligious hermeneutics, as often reiterated by the “apostle of interreligious dialogue,” Raimon Panikkar. For the sake of understanding, each dialogue participant will naturally attempt to express for herself what she thinks is the meaning of the partner’s statement; the partner must be able to recognize herself 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 his own tradition; where he absolutely can agree no further without violating his 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—both coming to learn, 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 interreligious, interideological 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 is no one-way dialogue. For example, Jewish-Christian discussions begun in the 1960s were mainly only prolegomena to interreligious dialogue. Understandably and properly, the Jews came to these exchanges only to teach Christians, although the Christians came mainly to learn. But, if authentic interreligious dialogue between Christians and Jews is to occur, then the Jews must also come mainly to learn; only then will it too be *par cum pari*.

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT: *Dialogue can take place only on the basis of mutual trust: approach first those issues most likely to provide common ground, thereby establishing human trust.* Although interreligious, interideo-logical dialogue must occur with some kind of “communal” 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 interreligious, interideological dialogue must be at least minimally self-critical of both themselves and their own religious or ideological traditions.* A lack of 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 interreligious, interideological 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 try 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, *The Way of All the Earth* (New York: Macmillan, 1972). here speaks of “passing over” into another’s religious or ideological experience and then coming back enlightened, broadened, and deepened. While retaining our own religious integrity, we need to find ways of experiencing something of the emotional and spiritual power of the symbols and cultural vehicles of our partner’s religion—and then come back to our own, enriched and expanded, having experienced at least a little of the affective side of our partner’s religion or ideology.

Interreligious, interideological dialogue operates in four *areas*—Dialogues of the Head, Hands, Heart & Holy: *practical* (Dialogue of the *Hands*), where we collaborate to help humanity; *aesthetic/spiritual* (Dialogue of the *Heart*) where we attempt to experience the partner’s expressions of beauty and her/his religion or ideology “from within”; *cognitive* (Dialogue of the *Head*), where we seek understanding and truth, and the *integrative area* (Dialogue of the *Holy*).

Interreligious, interideological dialogue has *three phases* (see www.jesdialogue.org for the *Seven Stages*). In the *1st* phase we *unlearn misinformation* 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—e.g., in the Buddhist-Christian dialogue Christians might learn a greater appreciation of the meditative tradition, and Buddhists 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-velation*,” a further “*un-veiling*” of reality—on which we must then act.

There is something radically different about phase one on the one hand and phases two and three on the other. In the latter we do not simply quantitatively add another “truth” or value from the partner’s tradition. Instead, as we assimilate it, it will proportionately transform our self-understanding. Since this will also be true for our dialogue partner, we will then be able to witness authentically to those elements of deep value in our tradition that our partner’s tradition may also 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 his/her 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, e.g., the Jew will be even more authentically Jewish and the Christian more authentically Christian, *not despite* that Judaism and/or Christianity have found and adapted something of deep value in the other tradition, *but because of it*. There can be no talk of a syncretism here, for syncretism in the pejorative sense means amalgamating various elements of different religions into some kind of a *confused* whole without concern for the integrity of the religions involved—which is not the case with authentic dialogue.