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The roots of violent conflicts among groups and nations are always multiple, and while these conflicts are invariably fueled by political, economic, and military interests, religious vindications are almost never absent. Even when a particular war is first engaged in on purely secular grounds, it will not be long before leaders on opposing sides will invoke God’s name to justify and even bless it. This demonic complicity in war and violence is not exclusive to any religion. No religion is innocent in this regard, and the role of one’s own religion in promoting or at least condoning violence must be honestly and humbly acknowledged, especially by those engaged in peacebuilding. Furthermore, there have been wars and communal acts of violence that were carried out from explicitly religious motives, especially when the opposing sides belonged to two different religions with a long history of mutual hostilities and when members of one religion were or perceived themselves to be victims of persecution and discrimination perpetrated by the members of the other religion.

In the current political situation, whenever conversation turns to religious violence, Americans almost instinctively conjure up images of Osama bin Laden and Muslim fundamentalists (venerated as “Islamofascists”) and their jihad—often translated “holy war”—and the suicide bombers, or, as they prefer to be called, “self-chosen martyrs,” of the Middle East. It is also necessary to recall that violence and war are not the reserved domain of Muslims. A quick glance at contemporary world politics reveals that acts of violence and war prosecuted by believers of all religions have been justified by means of religious worldviews: Muslims and Christians in Nigeria and the Philippines; Serbian Orthodox, Croatian Catholics, and Bosnian Muslims in the former Yugoslavia; Hindus and Muslims, and Sikhs and Hindus in India; Buddhists and Hindus in Sri Lanka; Buddhists and Muslims in Thailand; Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. In the United States acts of violence against abortion clinics and abortion doctors were justified on Christian principles by Rev. Michael Bray and Rev. Paul Hill; against homosexuals by Eric Robert Rudolph; against the federal government by Timothy McVeigh and various militia movements whose aim is to make the United States a “Christian” nation. As far as Christians are concerned, they too have a lion’s share in violence and war, as anti-Semitism, the Crusades, the Inquisition, the Thirty Years’ War, and the Holocaust, to mention only a few notorious cases, amply demonstrate. Concerning the Crusades, in particular, it is well to remember that they were officially called for and sponsored by popes and Christian princes as a holy war. Whereas soldiers, prior to the Crusades, had to do penance for killing, even for a just cause, in the Crusades the slaughter of Muslims—vindicated by Pope Urban II in his impassioned sermon at Clermont, France, in 1095, as “an accursed race, utterly alienated from God”—was considered a penitential act to which indulgences were attached.

Given the long history of violence in the name of religion, it may seem ironic that interreligious dialogue is presented as a means for reconciliation and peacebuilding. Nevertheless, alongside its undeniable misuse to promote war and violence, religion can no doubt be, and in fact has been, an immense force for justice and peace. In terms of peacebuilding and reconciliation, faith and religious institutions of various kinds have been marshaled to build a just and peaceful society, and where there is armed conflict, they have played an important role in reconciling the warring parties and restoring harmony and peace. There is some truth in Hans Küng’s oft-quoted dictum: “No peace among nations without peace among the religions. No peace among the religions without dialogue between the religions. No dialogue between the religions without investigation of the foundation of the religions.” Consequently, peace activists should not hesitate to infuse their strategies and tactics for peacebuilding and reconciliation with faith and religious ideals.

In recent decades, especially under the pontificate of John Paul II, peacebuilding and reconciliation have been understood in the Catholic Church to be a constitutive dimension of the Christian mission and are therefore endowed with a religious foundation. Furthermore, there has been a growing insistence, by both the papal and episcopal magisterium and grassroots peacemaking organizations, that this faith-based task must be accomplished in collaboration not only with other Christians (ecumenical dialogue) but also with the followers of other religions (interfaith dialogue).

However, to understand the relevance of interreligious dialogue for peacebuilding and reconciliation, it is necessary to consider all the forms in which it must be undertaken. In the West, especially in academic circles, the word dialogue usually conjures up images of a leisurely conversation and friendly exchange of ideas among intellectuals, normally at colleges and universities, or at conferences and symposia, where new ideas and research results are expounded and challenged, in an atmosphere of mutual respect and a genuine quest for truth. This image of dialogue as an intellectual
give-and-take is often transferred to interreligious or interfaith dialogue, with intellectuals being professional theologians, experts in religious matters, and religious officials such as rabbis, bishops, priests, monks and nuns, and imams and mullahs. Needless to say, such intellectual exchange is both necessary and useful for peacemaking and reconciliation, since the religious dimensions of conflicts more often than not arise out of ignorance and misunderstanding of the teachings and practices of other religions.

The necessity of this kind of dialogue has been recognized by the Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences, the regional association of episcopal conferences that has spoken out most explicitly about dialogue. The FABC was founded in 1970, on the occasion of Pope Paul VI’s visit to Manila, Philippines. For the FABC, interreligious dialogue goes far beyond intellectual exchange. Taking a cue from a joint document of the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples and the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, the FABC maintains that interreligious dialogue consists of a fourfold activity:

a. The **dialogue of life**, where people strive to live in an open and neighborly spirit, sharing their joys and sorrows, their human problems and preoccupations. b. The **dialogue of action**, in which Christians and others collaborate for the integral development and liberation of people. c. The **dialogue of theological exchange**, where specialists seek to deepen their understanding of their respective religious heritages, and to appreciate each other’s spiritual values. d. The **dialogue of religious experience**, where persons, rooted in their own religious traditions, share their spiritual riches, for instance, with regard to prayer and contemplation, faith and ways of searching for God or the Absolute.

While the necessity and usefulness of the “dialogue of theological exchange” for peacemaking and reconciliation are not denied, it is important to note that for the FABC the other three dialogues are far more effective for the same purpose. Living “in an open and neighborly spirit, sharing their [people’s] joys and sorrows, their human problems and preoccupations” (“dialogue of life”); collaboration among Christians and others “for the integral development and liberation of people” (“dialogue of action”); and above all, sharing one’s spiritual riches “with regard to prayer and contemplation, faith and ways of searching for God or the Absolute” (“dialogue of religious experience”)—these three activities, the last being the most challenging and yet the most transformative, are not merely preparatory steps toward peacemaking and reconciliation but constitute the very process of peacemaking and reconciliation itself. Reconciliation occurs precisely in the acts of living together, working together, and praying together.

These modes of dialogue, which are open to all people irrespective of educational level, social standing, and religious status, have the advantage of avoiding the dangers of elitism and intellectualism inherent in the dialogue of theological exchange. Furthermore, they alone are able to correct biases and prejudices, erase deep-seated hatreds, heal ancient wounds, and forge a new way of life because they promote day-to-day communication and sharing, grassroots activism for justice, and above all, common and communitarian experiences of the Divine or the Absolute. Only thus can both sides—the victimized and the victimizers—learn how to go beyond negotiation, conflict resolution, and reparation—all necessary steps toward reconciliation—to a new place where the victimizers find the grace to feel genuine sorrow and accept responsibility for the evils they have committed and to ask for forgiveness, and the victimized are empowered to go beyond the vindication of their rights and restoration of their human dignity and to forgive with all their hearts.

This chapter focuses on how dialogue between the Catholic Church and other religions can contribute to peacemaking and reconciliation. It begins with reflections on the official Catholic teaching on interreligious dialogue and its role in peacemaking and reconciliation, with special attention to John Paul II. Next it discusses various activities and strategies for peacemaking and reconciliation in the context of interfaith dialogue, with references to the interreligious activities of Asian Catholics, particularly in the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Indonesia. Finally, in light of these grassroots interfaith activities for peace and reconciliation some insights are offered on the Catholic theology of peacebuilding and on the Catholic practice of interreligious dialogue to achieve peace, justice, and reconciliation.

### A Catholic Theology of Interreligious Dialogue

**John Paul II and Dialogue with Other Religions**

It is now a commonplace that interreligious dialogue was given official approval and strong encouragement by the Second Vatican Council. Among its many statements the following is no doubt the most quoted:

The Catholic Church rejects nothing of what is true and holy in these religions. With sincere respect she looks on those ways of conduct and life, those precepts and teachings which, though differing on many points from what she herself holds and teaches, yet not rarely reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all human beings. But she proclaims and must ever proclaim Christ, the way, the truth, and the life” (Jn 14:6), in whom human beings find the fullness of religious life, and in whom God has reconciled all things to himself (cf. 2 Cor 5:18–19).

And so the Church has this exhortation for her children: prudently and lovingly, through dialogue and collaboration with the followers
of other religions, and in witness to the Christian faith and life, acknowledge, preserve and promote the spiritual and moral good, as well as the socio-cultural values found among them.10

Of all popes, John Paul II was no doubt the foremost advocate, exponent, and practitioner of interreligious dialogue.11 He promoted this dialogue not only through his many theologically significant statements on the theme but also by means of richly symbolic gestures of appreciation and respect for other religions. Absorbed by a passion for literature, especially dramatic literature, and for the theater, John Paul II had an acute sense of the power of symbolic gestures. It is neither possible nor desirable to recount all of John Paul's activities, large and small, in the service of interreligious unity during his twenty-seven-year pontificate. I mention only a few.

With regard to interfaith dialogue in general, at the top of the list stand the World Day of Prayer for Peace held in Assisi on October 27, 1986, and its sequel on January 24, 2002. Like his predecessor, John XXIII, whose decision to call for an ecumenical council was greeted with vehement objections, John Paul startled some senior officials of the Roman Curia with his announcement on January 25, 1986, of his initiative to invite non-Christian leaders (in addition to non-Catholic Christians) to come to Assisi to pray for peace. The meeting was criticized as skirting dangerous syncretism. It was left to Bishop Jorge Mejía, then secretary of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, to explain that the purpose of the Assisi meeting was not to have religious leaders "pray together"—that would be syncretism—but "be together to pray."

In his address to the religious representatives in Assisi, John Paul clarified the purpose of the meeting:

The fact that we have come here does not imply any intention of seeking a religious consensus among ourselves or negotiating our faith convictions. Neither does it mean that religions can be reconciled at the level of a common commitment in an earthly project which would surpass them all. Nor is it a concession to relativism in religious beliefs, because every human being must sincerely follow his or her upright conscience with the intention of seeking and obeying the truth.

Our meeting attests only—and this is its real significance for the people of our time—that in the great battle for peace, humanity, in its very diversity, must draw from its deepest and most vivifying sources where its conscience is formed and upon which is founded the moral action of all people.12

Despite this comprehensive explanation, the October Assisi meeting continued to rankle leading curial cardinals. To allay their fears the pope presented a lengthy defense in an address to the Roman Curia on December 22 of the same year.13 But even this papal apologetics did not quell their opposition.

John Paul had to fight against their resistance to further activities of this kind. Reportedly, he told Monsignor Vincenzo Paglia, chaplain of the Sant'Egidio Community,14 to whom he had entrusted the organization of future meetings of prayer for peace: "Don Vincenzo, today I fought for you... and we won."

Of non-Christian religions no doubt Judaism was closest to John Paul's heart.15 Among John Paul's many symbolic gestures toward Judaism several deserve notice. The first was his visit to the Roman Synagogue on April 13, 1986, the first pope ever to do so. He conceived the visit not just as a social or political gesture but as an explicitly religious act, the purpose of which was to pray together with Jews. Under John Paul, the "Fundamental Agreement: Israel—Holy See" was signed on December 30, 1993, providing for the recognition of the rights of the Jewish people in the Church in Israel and negotiation toward full diplomatic relations between the two states. Another grand gesture was John Paul's trip to the Holy Land in March 2000, where he prayed at the Western Wall and visited the Yad Vashem. In addition, throughout his long pontificate the pope held numerous meetings with various official Jewish organizations such as the American Jewish Committee and the International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations, with Israeli politicians such as Shimon Peres, and with diverse groups of local Jews on his many travels. Another powerful symbolic gesture was John Paul's appointment of Jean-Marie Lustiger, the son of Polish Jews who had migrated to France, as archbishop of Paris, to the consternation of the French church.17

Next to Judaism in John Paul's areas of interreligious concern was Islam, the second largest religion after Christianity. With about 1.3 billion members, it is now larger than the Catholic Church (most recently estimated at 1.2 billion). Unlike the Christian-Jewish relation, where Christians generally dominate, that between Christians and Muslims has often been associated with a struggle between rivals of comparable political and military powers.

John Paul's relations with Muslims increased in frequency and importance during his long pontificate, often in response to political events. The first significant contact was his meeting with eighty thousand Muslim youths at a stadium in Casablanca, Morocco, on August 19, 1983, at the invitation of King Hassan II of Morocco. For the first time ever a pope addressed a Muslim audience. During the Iran-Iraq War (1980-88), John Paul dispatched Cardinal Roger Etchegaray to Tehran and Baghdad to help ease the conflict. Again, following Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait and prior to the 1990-91 Gulf war, the pope repeatedly called for a nonviolent solution to the problems in the Middle East. Finally, before the Iraq War, John Paul did everything he could to prevent it from happening. In all of these peaceful activities John Paul's concern was not only with the morality of war and its impotence to resolve political issues but also with the enormous sufferings and destruction of Muslim communities.
Within the church John Paul continued to foster friendly relations with Muslims through the Commission for Religious Relations with Muslims in the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue (which is parallel to the Commission for Religious Relations with Jews in the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity). At the 1995 special assembly for Lebanon of the Synod of Bishops, representatives of the Islamic community in Lebanon, one Sunni, one Shi'a, and one Druze, were invited to take part in and address the assembly. They were also invited to share meals with the pope.

In all his addresses to Muslims, John Paul highlighted the Christian and Muslim common belief in the one God and expressed his admiration for the high ethical and religious demands Islam makes upon its followers, especially in terms of prayer, fasting, and almsgiving. At the same time he also expressed his concern about restrictions on the religious and civil rights of Christians in Islamic countries and even violent persecutions against them, especially in Africa, the Middle East, and Southwest and Southeast Asia. He repeatedly urged Christians and Muslims to work together for peace and justice, despite differences in their beliefs.

Finally, another religion with which John Paul had significant personal experiences was Buddhism. The pope’s first public encounter with Buddhism was at the 1986 World Day of Prayer for Peace at Assisi mentioned above. Among Buddhist participants was the Dalai Lama, with whom he met several other times subsequently. The pope also met with different groups of Buddhists, especially the Japanese (the Zen, Pure Land, Shingon, and Nichiren schools), Korean, Sri Lankan, and Thai Buddhists.18

John Paul II’s Theology of Interreligious Dialogue

Undergirding John Paul’s varied and numerous activities in interreligious dialogue is a theology of salvation and religion that is deeply rooted in Vatican II’s teaching on the relationship between Christianity and other religions. It is common knowledge that Vatican II marks a watershed event in the Catholic Church’s attitude toward non-Christians and non-Christian religions. With regard to the former, the council affirms that they can, under certain conditions, obtain eternal salvation. On the other hand, Vatican II affirms that through the church’s missionary activities “whatever good is found sown in people’s hearts and minds, or in the rites and customs of peoples, is not only saved from destruction, but is purified, raised up, and perfected for the glory of God, the confusion of the devil, and the happiness of humanity.”20

Vatican II’s fullest teaching on non-Christian religions is found in its declaration Nostra Aetate. The council begins by noting the unity of all humankind by virtue of its common origin and destiny, namely, God. “It sees religions as diverse attempts at answering fundamental questions concerning the meaning of human existence. It goes on to expound briefly on different non-Christian religions, from the so-called primitive religions to world religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism. In this context the council declares that “the Catholic Church rejects nothing of what is true and holy in these religions. With sincere respect it looks on those ways of conduct and life, those precepts and teachings which, though differing on many points from what she herself holds and teaches, yet not rarely reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all human beings.”21

The above brief summary of Vatican II’s teaching on non-Christian religions and interreligious dialogue serves as an indispensable background to John Paul’s theology of the same realities. In fact, John Paul’s theology of religion and interreligious dialogue is deeply indebted to Vatican II, as his repeated and numerous quotations from the conciliar texts make abundantly clear. As a result, it bears the notable theological openness of Vatican II. By the same token, it also inherits some of the ambiguities inherent in the council’s teaching.

On the one hand, John Paul restricts himself to reaffirming Vatican II’s teaching on the possibility of salvation of non-Christians and on the presence of elements of truth and grace in non-Christian religions, and does not settle the controversial question of whether non-Christian religions play a positive role in the salvation of non-Christians. On the other hand, some of the pope’s statements, and, in particular, his symbolic gestures, do open up new horizons in which to think further on some of the issues left open by Vatican II. At the basis of John Paul’s theology of religion is his bedrock and oft-repeated faith conviction that Jesus is the unique and universal savior. This is the cantus firmus of the pope’s innumerable encyclicals and speeches on mission and interreligious dialogue, whether addressed to his fellow Christians or to the followers of other religions. He would reject any theology of religion and any interreligious dialogue that jeopardized this christological truth of faith.22

Affirmed with equal firmness and frequency is John Paul’s conviction about the mission of the church to proclaim Christ as the only and universal savior for all humanity. John Paul sees no conflict between evangelization and interreligious dialogue; on the contrary, he maintains that the latter is an intrinsic part of the former: “Interreligious dialogue is part of the Church’s evangelizing mission. Understood as a method and means of mutual knowledge and enrichment, dialogue is not in opposition to the mission ad gentes; indeed, it has special links with that mission and is one of its expressions. . . . Salvation comes from Christ and . . . dialogue does not dispense from evangelization.”23

With regard to the possibility of salvation of non-Christians and the famous formula extra ecclesiam nulla salus [outside the church there is no salvation], John Paul offers an extensive commentary. The pope reaffirms Vatican II’s teaching that salvation is possible outside the visible confines of the church. He notes, however, that this possibility does not justify the relativistic position of those who maintain that a way of salvation can be found in any religion, even independently of
faith in Christ the Redeemer. ... Rather, we must maintain that the way of salvation always passes through Christ, and therefore the Church and her missionaries have the task of making him known and loved in every time, place and culture. Apart from Christ “there is no salvation.”24

John Paul is deeply convinced that true dialogue, especially interreligious dialogue, is a spiritual discipline with its requisite virtues, without which it degenerates into a monologue in search of domination. Because dialogue “presupposes the search for what is true, good and just for every person, for every group and every society,” it demands first of all that there be “openness and welcome”; that “each party should accept the difference and the specific nature of the other party”; that one search for “what is and what remains common to people, even in the midst of tensions, opposition and conflicts” and for “what is good by peaceful means.”25

Why does John Paul think that sharing religious experiences among the followers of different religions is the best way to bring about interreligious harmony and world peace? The answer to this question broaches an aspect of the pope’s theology of religion that seems to represent a step beyond Vatican II. It is this theology that undergirds his initiative of inviting representatives of various religions to come to Assisi to pray for peace, a project that, as has been mentioned above, caused much opposition among some officials of the Roman Curia.

In his lengthy address to the Roman Curia on December 22, 1986, John Paul appeals to the teaching of Vatican II, especially as contained in the texts of Lumen Gentium and Nostra Aetate cited above, to argue for the necessity of all people, not only Catholic and non-Catholic Christians, to pray for peace. The reason for the acceptability of prayer of all people, he goes on to say, is that “every authentic prayer is under the influence of the Spirit who intercedes insistently for us ... because we do not even know how to pray as we ought,” but he prays in us “with unutterable groaning” and “the one who searches hearts knows what are the desires of the Spirit” (Rom. 8:26–27). We can indeed maintain that every authentic prayer is called forth by the Holy Spirit, who is mysteriously present in the heart of everyone.26

So far, John Paul’s affirmation of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the heart of every praying human being is a rather uncontroversial extension of Vatican II’s teaching on the possibility of salvation for non-Christians. In a later authoritative writing, i.e., his encyclical on mission, Redemptoris Missio (December 7, 1990), John Paul takes a step further in affirming this presence of the Holy Spirit not only in individuals but also in religions:

The Spirit, therefore, is at the very source of man’s existential and religious questioning, a questioning which is occasioned not only by contingent situations but by the very structure of his being. The Spirit’s presence and activity affect not only individuals but also society and history, peoples, cultures and religions. Indeed, the Spirit is at the origins of noble ideals and undertakings which benefit humanity on its journey through history. ... It is the Spirit who sows the “seeds of the Word” present in various customs and cultures, preparing them for full maturity in Christ.

Thus, the Spirit, who “blows where he wills” (cf. John 3:8), who “was already at work in the world before Christ was glorified” (Ad gentes 4), and who “has filled the world ... holds all things together (and) knows what is said” (Wisdom 1:7), leads us to broaden our vision in order to ponder his activity in every time and place (cf. Dominum et vivificantem, 53). I have repeatedly called this fact to mind, and it has guided me in my meetings with a wide variety of peoples.27

While affirming the presence of the Spirit in all peoples’ cultures and religions, John Paul insists strongly and repeatedly on the fact that this Spirit is the same Spirit who was at work in the incarnation and in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus:

He is therefore not an alternative to Christ, nor does he fill a sort of void which is sometimes suggested as existing between Christ and the Logos. Whatever the Spirit brings about in human hearts and in the history of peoples, in cultures and religions serves as a preparation for the Gospel (Lumen gentium 16) and can only be understood in reference to Christ, the Word who took flesh by the power of the Spirit.28

However the relationship between Christ and the Spirit and between their respective activities in history is conceived, it is undeniable that John Paul’s pneumatology offers a theological basis for an affirmation of the positive role of non-Christian religions that does not contradict Vatican II but represents a small but nonetheless significant step beyond the council. Whereas Vatican II does affirm that “the unique mediation of the Redeemer does not exclude but rather gives rise to a manifold cooperation which is but a sharing in this one source,”29 the “manifold cooperation” referred to is the role of Mary in the history of redemption. Taking a step beyond Vatican II, John Paul extends this notion of participation or sharing to non-Christian religions and recognizes in them “participated forms of mediation of different kinds and degrees,” though “they acquire meaning and value only from Christ’s own mediation, and they cannot be understood as parallel or complementary to his.”30

At this point it may be asked whether John Paul II’s theology of interreligious dialogue has anything to contribute to the concrete work of peacebuilding and reconciliation. To begin with, it may be said that his pneumatological theology of religion allows him to gather leaders of various
religions in Assisi "to be together to pray for peace," albeit not "to pray together." John Paul's insistence on prayer and spirituality in general as the soil in which interreligious dialogue can grow is perhaps one of his most distinctive and long-lasting contributions to interreligious dialogue. For him, prayer is the most powerful link uniting all believers: "What seems to bring together and unite, in a particular way, Christians and believers of other religions is an acknowledgment of the need of prayer as an expression of man's spirituality directed toward the Absolute." Addressing the 1995 Plenary Assembly of the Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, the pope, referring to the assembly's theme, "The Dialogue of Spirituality and the Spirituality of Dialogue," says: "The theme of spirituality constitutes a natural meeting point for followers of different religious traditions and a fruitful subject for interreligious dialogue." Indeed, according to John Paul, it is the spiritual encounter in interreligious dialogue that gives "a depth and quality which will preserve these [interreligious activities] from the danger of mere activism." It should be noted that, as of this writing, John Paul II's successor, Benedict XVI, has not developed a distinctive teaching on interreligious dialogue as such. But there are adumbrations of his stance in some of his writings. In a letter to Marcello Pera, the former president of the Italian Senate and a professor of philosophy at the University of Pisa, with whom the pope had co-authored a book while still a cardinal, Benedict XVI writes to praise Pera for his 2008 book Perché dobbiamo dirci cristiani? (Why we must call ourselves Christians); the pope commends Pera for "explaining with great clarity why interreligious dialogue in the strict sense of the term is not possible" and for "urging instead intercultural dialogue that deepens the cultural consequences of the basic religious decisions." Benedict goes on to assert that "while on basic religious decisions a real dialogue is not possible without bracketing one's faith, it is necessary to explore in public discourse the cultural consequences of such basic religious decisions. Here, dialogue and mutual correction and enrichment are both possible and necessary." That Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger—now Benedict XVI—has not been enthusiastically supportive of interreligious dialogue is widely known. Apparently, for him, such dialogue would require a bracketing of one's own faith, which is unacceptable. In his view, only a discussion of the consequences of faith decisions on cultural practices is possible (and necessary); hence, the possibility and necessity of intercultural rather interreligious dialogue.

In response to Benedict's assertion, first it must be noted that it is not clear what Benedict means by "interreligious dialogue in the strict sense of the term" (emphasis added). Whatever the pope's understanding of the term, at the very least it must be said that it is by no means obvious that interreligious dialogue necessarily requires a bracketing of one's faith. It is a fact that interreligious dialogue in the fourfold modality as explained above has been practiced by many believers and in different parts of the world without in any way bracketing one's faith. Indeed, such a dialogue has been most fruitful where it is animated by faith and where one's religious beliefs are clearly asserted and maintained. Furthermore, the separation between culture and faith and by implication between intercultural and interreligious dialogue, while possible in the West, especially after the Enlightenment, makes no sense in other parts of the world, especially in Asia, where religion is culture and vice versa. Hence, to advocate intercultural dialogue or dialogue about the cultural consequences of religious decisions in opposition to interreligious dialogue, that is, dialogue about religious matters as such, is counterproductive to the very intercultural dialogue the pope tries to promote, especially where the goal of such a dialogue is peacemaking and reconciliation.

Interreligious Dialogue and Artisans for Peace and Justice

There is no doubt that in the post–Vatican II era the Catholic Church has developed a rich theology of interreligious dialogue. The question is whether this theology provides an effective framework for peacemaking and reconciliation in situations of conflict, especially where causal factors regarding religion have been added. To answer this question, I examine how the Catholic Church in Asia has collaborated with other religions for the sake of peace. This Asian focus is highly appropriate, because Asia is the birthplace of all world religions, including Christianity, and is arguably the continent where interreligious dialogue is both most vibrant and most sorely needed to achieve peace and reconciliation among religious groups and nations.

That Asia is the site of longstanding geopolitical conflicts is hardly news. Besides the war in Iraq, the nuclear threat of Iran, and the armed struggle between the Palestinians and Israel, there are in the Asia-Pacific area simmering hostilities between different nation-states, nation-states of the same ethnic group, different ethnic groups within the same nation, and various religious factions. Strained relationships have occasionally erupted into dangerous conflicts, potentially catastrophic because of the nuclear capabilities of many countries, between Japan and China, China and Taiwan, China and Tibet, North and South Korea, Japan and South Korea, Vietnam and Cambodia, Indonesia and East Timor, India and Pakistan, the Sinhalese and Tamil communities in Sri Lanka, and ethnic groups in Afghanistan.

Fortunately, some of these conflicts have been minimized thanks to efforts by religious leaders working for nonviolence and reconciliation, either within their own religious communities or in interreligious collaboration. These peacemaking projects have been carried out, for example, in India, Sri Lanka, East Timor, the Philippines, Thailand, and Cambodia.

Consequently, a serious study of how religions have been used to justify violence and yet can contribute to peacemaking and reconciliation is an
The Philippines

The Philippines were colonized by the Spanish in the early 16th century. The Spanish controlled the Philippines until 1898, when they were forced to surrender to the United States after the Spanish-American War. After independence, the Philippines remained a U.S. protectorate until 1946, when it gained full independence.

The independence of the Philippines led to a period of rapid economic growth and development. However, it also brought about a period of political instability and conflict, with various groups vying for power and control.

The Marcos regime

The Marcos regime was a highly authoritarian government that lasted from 1965 to 1986. During this time, the government suppressed political opposition and engaged in human rights abuses.

The Marawi conflict

The Marawi conflict is a ongoing conflict in the southern Philippines, between government forces and Muslim rebels. The conflict began in 2017 and is characterized by violent attacks and clashes.

These efforts were eventually successful, and the peace agreement was signed in 1996. The peace agreement led to a period of relative peace and stability in the Philippines.

Under the Marcos regime, the government faced numerous challenges, including economic downturns, political instability, and human rights abuses.

The current situation

Today, the Philippines remains a diverse and complex society, with a rich history and culture. It is a member of the United Nations and is working towards economic development and social progress.

During the Marcos regime, the government faced several challenges, including economic downturns, political instability, and human rights abuses.

The government of the Philippines continues to work towards stability and development, facing ongoing challenges in the country.

In summary, the Philippines is a diverse and complex society with a rich history and culture. It is a member of the United Nations and is working towards economic development and social progress.

During the Marcos regime, the government faced several challenges, including economic downturns, political instability, and human rights abuses.

The government of the Philippines continues to work towards stability and development, facing ongoing challenges in the country.

The Philippines continues to face challenges, including economic development, human rights issues, and regional conflicts.

The government of the Philippines continues to work towards stability and development, facing ongoing challenges in the country.

In summary, the Philippines is a diverse and complex society with a rich history and culture. It is a member of the United Nations and is working towards economic development and social progress.
and the MNLF. However, Bishop Tuddud’s pastoral strategy of keeping a low profile for the church where it constitutes the dominant majority and maintaining a close rapport with the Moro community contributed to a peaceful resolution of conflicts between the two religious communities, especially in 1986, in the midst of kidnappings, killings, bombings of churches, and burnings of villages and towns. As Bishop Tuddud’s ideas found acceptance, many Catholic religious congregations, both female and male, as well as unofficial groups and NGOs, joined the project of interreligious dialogue for peace and justice.

In the 1990s, as the peace talks between the Ramos government and the MNLF were reaching a breakthrough, some Catholic and Protestant bishops, led by Archbishop Fernando Cappella of the Archdiocese of Davao, sought to open new venues for the Christian-Muslim dialogue. The Episcopal Commission on Interreligious Dialogue of the Catholic Bishops’ Conference of the Philippines provided a channel of communication and coordination for different groups engaged in interreligious dialogue. However, it must be said that of all the three levels of dialogue—top, middle, and grassroots—it is the last that proved to be most effective in peacebuilding and reconciliation between Muslims and Christians.

In his report on various grassroots interfaith activities for peacebuilding and reconciliation between Catholic and Muslims in Mindanao, Karl M. Gaspar highlights nine locations, all but two of which are marked by longstanding hostility between the two religious groups. In Malabang, a barangay (village) of Sultan Gumadar, the interethnic and interreligious tension between the Muslim native population, the Moro Maranaos (90 percent), and the Catholic settlers (10 percent) was exacerbated by the Maranao practice of rido (feud leading to vendetta).

In Malabang, a town in Lanao del Sur, the same rido practice intensified the hostility between the Muslim Maranaos (75 percent of the population) and the Catholic Bisayas. In the 1970s this hostility reached murderous proportions as the Muslim militia group known as the Baracuda and the Catholic/Bisaya paramilitary group called the Iliga perpetrated unspeakable atrocities on each other. The situation became even more bloody when the army—consisting mainly of Christians—occupied Malabang. In the nearby town of Balabagan, a stronghold of the MILF, a cycle of attacks and reprisals took place between the Baracuda and the Iliga after the murder of Catholic priest Martin Dempsey by a Maranao youth.

In Sapal, a municipality of Lanao del Norte, the native Maranao inhabitants were pushed off their land by the resettlement policies, thanks to which the Catholics eventually constituted one-half of the total population. In the 1960s the Maranaos took up arms and killed Bisaya settlers, who retaliated, and the cycle of violence was begun. In 1970–72, fighting between the Baracuda and the Iliga spread to Dinas, one of the most important cities of Mindanao. Dinas was originally inhabited by the Subanen, a Muslim people. In the late eighteenth century the Maguindanaons, also a Muslim people in the central part of Mindanao, came to settle in Dinas. After the Second World War a group of Catholics, the Bisayas, whose ancestors inhabited the Visayas in central Philippines, also came to settle in Dinas. In the armed struggle all peoples—the Subanen, the Maguindanaons, and the Bisayas—suffered numerous atrocities.

Fortunately, two sites have enjoyed peaceful relations between Muslims and Christians, namely, Campo Muslim in Cotabato City and Muryamville in Sultan Kudarat. In both places the Archdiocese of Cotabato has helped establish resettlement centers for Catholics and Muslims. The last two sites, however, fell victim to interreligious and interethnic violence. Bual, a barangay in Sultan Kudarat, originally the home of Muslim Maguindanaons, was settled by Catholics in the 1950s. In 1996 land disputes arose between the two groups, and a group of Catholics decided to resolve the disputes by burning more than two hundred Muslim homes. In Zamboanga City, in the Zamboanga peninsula, the Lutoa, the Subanen, the Tausog, and the Samal Dilaut, all Muslim, were the first settlers. The first Christians who settled in the city were infantry regulars of the Spanish army from the Visayas. In the 1970s, as war erupted, many Catholic refugees came to settle in the city and thereby changed its demographics.

On the “top” level of peacebuilding, mention must be made of the Bishops-Ulama Forum in Mindanao, now known as Bishops-Ulama Conference (BUC), founded in 1996. It was originally composed of Catholic bishops (it now also includes Protestant leaders from the National Council of Churches in the Philippines) and influential Muslim leaders from the Ulama League of the Philippines. BUC’s mission is to provide top-down support for cooperation and dialogue within their respective communities in view of peacebuilding and reconciliation.

Currently, two endeavors to promote healing and reconciliation between Christians and Muslims deserve a brief mention, both directed by Catholic priests in conjunction with lay people and both occurring in Zamboanga City, Mindanao. The first is the Mislimah Dialogue Movement with its Harmony Village under the direction of Sebastian D’Ambra, an Italian priest and missionary of the Pontifical Institute of Foreign Missions. The goal of the movement, carried out at the Harmony Village, is to build peace and reconciliation through action, silence/prayer, and harmony. The second is under the direction of Angelo Calvo, an Italian Claretien priest and missionary. Its current main endeavor is to form villages in which Muslim families, with financial assistance from Fr. Calvo’s organization, build houses for themselves after being evicted by the government from their squats. In these villages Christians and Muslims live together in peace and harmony.

Tensions between Muslims and Christians in Mindanao are far from resolved. But the historical examples cited here indicate the kind of work that has been and continues to be done in that part of the Philippines.
Sri Lanka

Formerly known as Ceylon, Sri Lanka, officially the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, an island in the Indian Ocean, has a long history of colonization, beginning with the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, then the Dutch in the seventeenth century, and lastly the British in 1802, until it gained independence in 1948. Religiously, of twenty million Sri Lankans, 70 percent are (mostly Theravada) Buddhist, 15 percent Hindu, 7.5 percent Muslim, and 7.5 percent Christian (88 percent of these are Catholic). Ethnically, 74 percent of the population are Sinhalese, 12 percent Sri Lankan Tamil, 18.1 percent Tamil, and 7.1 percent Muslim (Islam is also regarded as an ethnic identity). Clearly, the two major groups of the Sri Lankan population are divided by both ethnicity (Sinhalese and Tamil) and religion (Buddhism for the former and Hinduism for the latter).

The violent conflict between the Sinhalese majority and the Tamil minority, dubbed the “No Mercy War” by the International Committee of the Red Cross, raged between 1983 and 2009. Though religion plays a role in the conflict between the Sinhalese and the Tamil communities, most Sri Lankans view it as rooted more in ethnic than religious differences. The conflict has its roots in British colonialism, which favored the Tamils. After independence, successive Sinhalese governments attempted to institute policies to redress what they perceived as unequal treatment. These policies favor Buddhism and marginalize Tamil language and education. Despairing of obtaining justice from the state, some Tamils organized a group called The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) to fight the government with a view to form a separate Tamil state made up of the north and the east of the island. After decades of bloody fighting, the government and the LTTE agreed to a ceasefire in 2002, but the war erupted again in 2006. The government regained control of the Eastern Province in 2007, and in 2008 it officially withdrew the ceasefire and began engaging the LTTE militarily in the northern part of the country, a military campaign that led to the LTTE surrender in May 2009.

There was a general consensus among the Sri Lankans that the war between the government and the LTTE could not be won on the battlefield, and various civil society organizations worked to create a space for a political settlement. Meanwhile, the majority of the war victims were women (widowhood, rape, and prostitution) and children (widespread recruitment of child soldiers). Religiously, though the war was between Buddhists and Hindus, other religious groups, particularly Muslims, were caught in the crossfire and were forced to evacuate from their villages, especially those living in the north of the country.

Christians, even though concentrated along the western coastal belt of the island and therefore removed from the immediate theaters of war, were also victims. Acts of violence against Christians have recently been reported, especially in Ampara, where a Protestant minister was killed in February 2008, in Mathugana, where church services were disrupted in February 2008; in Lunuwila, where ten Christian students were beaten in March 2008; and in Mulaitivu District, where a church was set on fire in March 2008. Christians were targets of attack by the Sinhalese Buddhist nationalists who regarded them as supporters of the LTTE and as a threat to their hegemony. Though any movements for peace were attacked by Sinhalese and Tamil extremists, Christians attempted to bridge the Sinhalese-Tamil divide. Shirley L. Wijesinghe has reported on some of these activities at the grassroots level.

In Vavuniya, a town in the north that has a mixed population of Tamils, Sinhalese, Christians, and Muslims, and which was the only road to the LTTE-held territory called Vanni, peace efforts were undertaken by Buddhists, Catholics, the Assembly of God, and the Boy Scouts of Vavuniya. The chief monk of the Vavuniya Buddhist Temple set up the Vanni Peace Foundation to dialogue with the LTTE. During Lent 2000, the pastor of the Catholic parish began the practice of daily fasting and prayer for peace, which subsequently was adopted by all the parishes of the Diocese of Mannar. The Assembly of God Church has both Tamils and Sinhalese as members and is a living example of how the two groups can live together in peace. The Boy Scouts organization in Vavuniya also has Tamil, Sinhalese, and Muslim members.

In Batticaloa, a coastal town southeast of Vavuniya, Canadian artist Paul Hogan and Jesuit priest Paul Sarkunanyayagam co-directed a program named the Butterfly Garden for Tamil and Muslim children affected by the war. In Colombo, Tissa Balasuriya, an OMI priest, founded the Centre for Society and Religion in 1971 to study ways in which economic and sociopolitical problems in Sri Lanka can be justly resolved. The center, under the direction of Oblate Father Oswald Firth, organized village-level and school-level programs for Sinhalese and Tamil children to teach about peacemaking.

Unfortunately, anti-Christian violence was carried out by extremist Buddhists in late 2003 and in early 2004 under the pretext that Christians (mostly evangelicals) were engaged in “fraudulent conversions” by means of bribes and social assistance. At least three Catholic churches in or near Colombo were burnt. To prevent further violence, Oswald Gomis, archbishop of Colombo, designated February 1, 2004, as a day for Catholics to pray and fast for peace. The bishops of Sri Lanka also issued a document condemning proselytism and at the same time demanding respect for individual conscience and the right of every person to change his or her religion.

Of course, not only Catholics but also other Christian denominations as well as the Sinhalese and the Tamils themselves have engaged in peacebuilding and reconciliation. Shirley Wijesinghe has narrated the work of a group of forty residents of Batticaloa, a town situated on the eastern coast. In order to prevent the army from destroying their town in retaliation for the LTTE’s murder of over nine hundred Sinhalese policemen in 1990, these men founded the Peace Committee of Batticaloa. Besides having averted the destruction of their city, this Peace Committee was also able to resolve the
deadly conflict between local Tamils and Muslims in 1990. Reconciliation work was also carried out in Nagelanda, a town in the southeast coast, by Tamil and Sinhalese farmers with the help of the Anglican priest Nirmal Mendis.

On the Catholic side, a remarkable organization called Kirusara (Light of Christ) was formed by a group of Roman Catholic youth after the tragic events of the 1980s for reflection, prayer, and action to restore peace. The organization publishes a monthly Sinhalese magazine called Kirusara to advocate for the rights of the Tamils. It also publishes a Tamil-language magazine called Oli Et Nakki (Towards Light) with the original purpose of helping to end the war and to restore justice to the Tamils. The organization also has Catholic youth from the south go to the north to become educated about the situation of poverty and oppression of their Tamil fellow nationals. Kirusara also celebrates the work of four Catholic priests who have sacrificed their lives for peace: Mary Bastian in Mannar, Chandra Fernando in Batticaloa, Michael Rodrigo in Buttala, and Srilal Ameratunga in Negombo. To this list of martyrs should be added Nicholas Pillai Paliyanjuth, a priest of the Diocese of Mannar, who had worked on behalf of internally displaced people and was killed on September 26, 2007.

Indonesia

Formerly known as the Dutch East Indies, Indonesia, along with India, is perhaps one of the most challenging and fertile sites for interreligious dialogue in the service of peacebuilding and reconciliation. Although religious freedom is recognized by Indonesia’s Constitution, only six religions are considered official: Confucianism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Protestantism, and Roman Catholicism. Though not an Islamic state, Indonesia has the largest Muslim population in the world, with 86 percent of 240 million Indonesians declaring themselves Muslim. Of Indonesians 9 percent are Christian, of whom roughly two-thirds are Protestant. Catholics make up about 3 percent of the population (about 7 million). Though a minority, Hinduism (2 percent) and Buddhism (1 percent) remain influential elements of Indonesian culture.

Catholicism came to Indonesia in 1534, with Portuguese colonizers. One of the first missionaries was Saint Francis Xavier. Today, Catholics form the majority in the island of Flores.

As pointed out above, Indonesia has the largest Muslim umma (community). It also has the largest body of Christians of any Muslim country. With its motto Bhinneka tunggal ika (many yet one, or unity in diversity), Indonesia has developed a sense of national identity and unity, reinforced by its Pancasila ideology and its one national language (the bahasa Indonesia).

Thanks to these unifying elements, the relationships among ethnic and religious groups, particularly between Islam and Christianity, have remained generally peaceful since the country’s independence in 1949. Unfortunately, in recent decades, because of economic and political upheavals, including the Asian market meltdown and the secession of East Timor (which has an overwhelming Catholic majority) from Indonesia, there has been a politicization of religion.

Acts of violence have been committed by Muslim fanatics against Christians, with their chants of “Allahu Akbar,” “Death to all Christians,” “Burn the Churches,” and “Death to the Crusaders.” There were burnings of Catholic church properties and killings of Christians in Jakarta and the Moluccas. Nearly seven hundred thousand Christians requested to evacuate from the Diocese of Ambon. For centuries Christian Indonesians did not interact with their Muslim compatriots, focusing instead on their internal welfare. Today, with the rise of Muslim extremists and their jihad, Christians, both Protestant and Catholic, can no longer ignore the necessity of interreligious dialogue.

In this context the work of the Catholic priest, architect, social worker, novelist, and essayist Yusuf Bilyarta Mangunwijaya (1929–99) is of great significance. He was ordained a priest in 1959. After graduating as an architect from the Westfälische Technische Hochschule in Aachen in 1966, he began pastoral work in Muntilan. In 1981 he asked to be relieved of parish duties and went to live among the poor at Kali Code. A proponent of liberation theology, Romo Mangun, as he was affectionately called, fought for the people who lost their land in the construction of the Kedung Ombo dam. He also defended Bishop Carlos Filipe Ximenes Belo of the Diocese of Dili in his struggle for the independence of East Timor, advocated for the reform of the Constitution, and urged the formation of a federal Indonesia.

With regard to relations with other religions, Mangunwijaya proposed what he called the “diaspora-gospel,” a way of living as a religious minority. The purpose of Christian mission is not converting people of other religions and expanding membership. His ideal missionary is not Francis Xavier, who came to evangelize Asia along with the military and merchants, but Thérèse of Lisieux, the Carmelite nun, who missionized through her prayers. Mangunwijaya considers the strategy of the Catholic Church in Indonesia misguided, which gives priority to creating a separate community, with its own schools, hospitals, publications, and systems of social service. On the contrary, as life has become more migratory, with people constantly moving for work and recreation, the church must focus not on its own institutions where the clergy and religious predominate, but on the family of Christians. The family must be the primary unit to which the church’s mission must be directed.

Mangunwijaya’s ideas were not favorably received by all. Many feared that he was too accommodating to the perpetrators of violence. Nevertheless, he was asked, together with the Jesuit Ignaz Magnus Suseno, to draft the pastoral letter of the Catholic bishops for Easter 1997, which was signed by Cardinal Justinus Darmaatmadja. The letter interpreted the violence of the previous years not as an interreligious conflict but as the result of sociopolitical and economic oppression. Subsequently, in a series of seven
articles published in the Catholic weekly *Hidup Katolik* (in March and April 1997), Mangunwijaya argued that sixteenth-century Catholic Portuguese were far more fanatic and cruel than the Protestants and the Muslims, and certainly the Buddhists and Hindus of their times. Today, the church, existing amid other religions, must be in a diasporic situation and must work for the coming of the reign of God and not for its own institutional self-aggrandizement.

**How Can Interreligious Dialogue Contribute to Peacebuilding?**

In this last part I review the work of peacebuilding and reconciliation that the Catholic Church has done in dialogue with people of other faiths—mainly Muslims, Buddhists, and Hindus—in the three countries studied above in order to assess Catholic social thought on peacebuilding and reconciliation and on the role of interreligious dialogue in such an enterprise. Several questions will be kept in mind in this rapid review: What useful lessons emerged from these interreligious dialogues? How can interreligious dialogue contribute to the wider quest for peace and reconciliation? What elements of interreligious dialogue should be given priority? How can interreligious dialogue for peace enrich Catholic teaching on justice, peacemaking, and reconciliation? Finally what Christian, and more specifically, Catholic, interreligious spirituality would be most appropriate to peacebuilding?

**The Manifold Roots of Violence and the Role of Religion in Peacebuilding**

The first thing people engaged in peacebuilding through interreligious dialogue must remember is that though their immediate context and focus are religion, the reality of violence that they aim to eliminate or reduce is not rooted exclusively in religion. Of course, it is indisputable that adherents of all major religions—Christianity and Islam prominently among them—have incited or condoned violence. In their introduction to their edited volume on grassroots peacemaking, Bamat and Cieka insist, along with David Martin, on “the importance of taking into account social and historical contexts” in examining the roots of wars and argue that “it makes no sense to single out one generic factor such as religion as the cause of conflict.”

While mindful of the variety of factors contributory to war and violence, it is essential that peacemakers, especially those working for conflict resolution in secular agencies, realize the religious roots of and hence the indispensable role of religion and interreligious dialogue in peacebuilding. This is perhaps the most immediate lesson from the interreligious dialogue in the Philippines and Sri Lanka, where the conflicts are deeply rooted in centuries of hostility among the religions concerned: Christianity and Islam, and Buddhism and Hinduism, respectively. Only by placing these conflicts in their religious contexts can they be fully understood and the legitimate grievances of the opponents adequately addressed. The contribution of religion to peacemaking, peacebuilding, and reconciliation must be frankly acknowledged, and the involvement of religious people acting on their faith convictions for peacebuilding is as necessary as that of politicians, economists, professional negotiators, and nonreligious NGOs. It is fair to say that today, given the clash not only of civilizations but also, and perhaps more fundamentally, of religions, ignoring the faith-based contribution of religious people to peacebuilding is a sure recipe for the failure of the enterprise.

**Grassroots Initiatives and Activities**

While fully acknowledging the important and indispensable role of what John Paul Lederach calls the top and middle levels of peacemaking, the involvements of the grassroots are absolutely required to achieve peace and reconciliation. On the Catholic side, there is no doubt that the pope as a world moral leader (especially John Paul II) and the Holy See, episcopal conferences (in particular those of the Philippines and Indonesia), individual bishops (especially Bishop Tundud in the Philippines), priests, and male and female religious (in particular the five Filipino priests who have been killed and Fr. Mangunwijaya of Indonesia) have played a prominent role in interreligious dialogue for peacebuilding. There are also top interreligious bodies such as the BUC in the Philippines.

In addition, there are middle-level organizations such as the Sadap Muslim-Christian Association for Peace, the Balabag Youth Muslim-Christian Organization, the Dinas Subanen/Moro/Bisaya Interfaith Movement, the Covenant of Peace and Development and Peace Zone of Maladeg, Peace Advocates Zamboanga (all in the Philippines) and the Centre for Society and Religion and the Peace Committee of Batticaloa (both in Sri Lanka), with their important contributions to peacebuilding.

However, it is the ordinary people—men, women, and youth—of all religious traditions who make peace and reconciliation happen. This is clear in the nine sites in the Philippines reported on by Karl Gaspar, the three sites in Sri Lanka described by Shirley Wijesinghe, and the Catholic communities in Jakarta and Flores in Indonesia. In the words of Bamat and Cieka, “Often invisible, these makers of peace at the grassroots have a wealth of experience in everyday peaceful coexistence and considerable experience in dealing with periods of violence and its effects. . . . Their grounded wisdom and their often inspiring initiatives help demonstrate that everyone can contribute to peace.”

**Dialogue of Faith and Life**

Bishop Tundud coined the expression “dialogue of faith and life” to indicate the two areas in which interreligious dialogue needs to be carried out.
The FABC expands them to four: dialogue of life, dialogue of action, dialogue of theological exchange, and dialogue of religious experience. Of the four, church officials and theologians tend to give pride of place to the dialogue of theological exchange. In this dialogue, as is clear from the Roman Catholic theology of interreligious dialogue expounded above, certain issues assume enormous importance, such as the uniqueness and universality of Jesus as the divine Savior of all humankind and the necessity of the church as the unique sign and means of salvation.

From the experiences of grassroots participants of various religious traditions in the peacebuilding process, it is clear that theological truths play a minor if not negligible role in their decision to join the peacebuilding project and on the ways they chose to perform this task.53 Of course, religious beliefs and values were an important source of motivation of the peacemakers, but as Baram and Czajka note, “Religious motivations were much less frequently mentioned than practical, relational, and ideological motivations—and the latter three often occurred together, with practical motivations being the most common.”54 This is a very important finding, one that is of special relevance for religious leaders for whom orthodoxy is taken as a condition sine qua non for interreligious dialogue and collaboration. For successful peacebuilding and reconciliation it is clearly not necessary that partners in dialogue should begin with and base their work on a common agreement on who God, Christ, and church are (or what the Qur’an is and who Mohammad is, or what the Buddha, the dharma, and the sangha—are, the three jewels of Buddhism—are).

Consequently, of the four modes of dialogue mentioned by the FABC, the three most commonly used for peacebuilding are sharing life, collaboration for justice and peace, and sharing religious experiences. The last is perhaps the most important and effective for peacemaking and reconciliation. Again and again the experiences of Buddhists, Christians, Muslims, and Hindus coming together to a common sacred space, praying together for forgiveness and reconciliation, singing and dancing together, sharing foods and drinks with one another are life-transforming spiritual acts that no diplomatic negotiations, conflict-resolution techniques, or theological discussions can match in peacemaking effectiveness.

Catholic Social Teaching and Interreligious Dialogue

Another contribution of interreligious dialogue to Catholic social teaching is an enrichment in the understanding of its basic concepts. Elsewhere I have elaborated at length on how the Catholic teaching on just war may be radically challenged and transformed by the Hindu and Jainist practice of ahimsa (non-injury or nonviolence) and satyagraha (persevering in truth); how the Catholic concept of solidarity is enriched by the Buddhist practice of karuna (compassion); and how the Catholic understanding of peace is enlarged by the Confucian notion of universal harmony.55 Catholic teaching on peace and peacemaking focuses, as Drew Christiansen has shown, on the defense and promotion of human rights, collaboration in authentic and integral human development, building bonds of solidarity among people, and constructing the institutions of world peace.56 In all these four areas dialogue with Asian religions can bring new insights and corrections, just as the Catholic teaching can also complement and enrich the teaching and practices of other religions.

An Interreligious Spirituality for Peacebuilding and Reconciliation

A no less important contribution of interreligious dialogue to Catholic peacemaking and reconciliation is the elaboration of a spirituality for peacemaking and reconciliation. To achieve a reconciliation that is not “forgive and forget” but opens up the space for a journey toward God, one’s enemies, and the self, a special spirituality is called for, beyond the strategies and methodologies of conflict resolution. This spirituality applies to both reconciliation between individuals and reconciliation among nations. Individual reconciliation occurs when two persons, the offender and the victim, are brought together to a new place, the former recognizing his or her guilt, and the latter having his or her dignity restored and forgiving the oppressor. By contrast, social reconciliation, though nurtured by individual reconciliation but not reducible to it, is a process that engages an entire population, involves the reconstruction of an alternative society, and establishes a new moral order.57

Spirituality of reconciliation includes a series of interconnected actions. Protestant theologian Miroslav Volf speaks of a triple remembering: “remember truthfully”; “remember so as to be healed”; and “remember so as to learn.” 58 South African theologian Denise Ackermann proposes reconciliation as “embodied praxis for change” that comprises five acts: coming to awareness of the alienated situation, public acknowledgment of its reality, expressing this acknowledgment in lament, forgiving the wrongdoer, and restoring justice.59 Taking a cue from these suggestions, I propose a spirituality of reconciliation constituted of four interrelated acts: knowing the truth, doing justice, forgiveness, and social reconstruction.

Knowing the Truth

The task of knowing the truth in the process of reconciliation has three aspects: first, establishing the facts of abuses against individuals (who are the victims? who are the wrongdoers? and what has happened to the victims?); second, disclosing the structures of lying and the patterns of violence of the oppressive regime; and third, making public the history of abuses through reports and honoring the memories of the victims.60 This knowing the truth, hinted at by Volf’s precept of “remember truthfully” and Ackermann’s notion of coming to awareness and public acknowledgment of the reality of alienation, is absolutely essential for achieving real reconciliation because, as Schreiter has convincingly shown, systematic violence
is built upon "a narrative of the lie" intended to destroy and replace the truths that provide the victims with a sense of self-identity and security.\textsuperscript{53} This truth seeking is not only necessary for the possibility of closure for the survivors and the relatives of the victims but also establishes a pattern of truthfulness upon which a new moral order can be built (the fourth act of social reconstruction).

**Doing Justice**

Knowing the truth, however, does not necessarily lead to reconciliation. Indeed, it may lead to revenge, hatred, and retribution. To achieve reconciliation, knowing the truth must be followed by doing justice, alluded to by Wolff's second precept of "remember so as to be healed" and Ackermann's concept of "restoring justice." Without justice, reconciliation is immoral. But what kind of justice? Certainly, not simply punitive justice, whereby the wrongdoers are apprehended, tried, convicted, and punished. Punitive justice must also be corrective, providing the wrongdoers with an opportunity for moral conversion; otherwise, punitive justice is not very different from revenge.

There are, however, three other levels of justice, as Schreiter has pointed out, that need to be attended to. First is restitutional or restorative justice, which seeks to make amends by providing reparation or restitution for the victims. Even though reparation can only ease and not erase the damages and the pains inflicted on the victims (the dead cannot be brought back to life, health cannot be restored, and the lost years cannot be recovered), nevertheless it is a necessary and important symbol for the recovery of the dignity of the victim. Second, there is structural justice, by which inequalities in the society are removed. Third, there is legal justice by which a just and equitable legal system is established and the rule of law maintained.\textsuperscript{52}

**Forgiveness**

The third and, by common agreement, hardest part of reconciliation is forgiveness. One reason why forgiveness is hard is that at first sight it appears to require forgetting the violent deeds suffered, as the common adage "forgive and forget" seems to indicate. But, of course, most victims of physical torture and political repression find it impossible to forget their wounds, as these are indelibly burnt into their flesh and their psyche, and consequently feel that forgiveness is beyond their power. To forgive seems to imply betraying the past, especially the dead. Here it is useful to note that rather than "forgive and forget," we should "remember and forgive." Or, as Schreiter puts it, "in forgiving, we do not forget; we remember in a different way." It is possible to remember in a different way because in forgiving the balance of power has shifted from the oppressor to the victim; it is the victim, and the victim alone, who has the power to forgive. In forgiving, the victim breaks loose of the oppressor's hold, becomes free of the power of the past, and is able to live by a story other than that of fear and suffering.

There is another reason why forgiveness is hard. Normally, a condition for forgiveness is the offender's acknowledgment of guilt, repentance, and asking for forgiveness from the victims. But it is a rare oppressor who sincerely does these things, not even when confronted with his or her evil deeds. More often than not, wrongdoers shamelessly deny any responsibility or flee to another country and there enjoy a comfortable life off their ill-gotten wealth, while their victims are left with a greater sense of injustice. It is here that human forgiveness takes on the characteristics of divine forgiveness. According to the Christian faith, God forgives humans not because of but prior to their repentance, out of God's gratuitous love and mercy. It is God's forgiveness that leads the sinner to repentance and not vice versa. Repentance is not the condition but the fruit of God's forgiveness. In imitation of God's gratuitous mercy and love, and by God's grace and power, the victims forgive their torturers and oppressors prior to and not as a consequence of their repentance and asking for forgiveness, with the hope that this forgiveness will lead them to repentance and change. Like God's forgiveness, the victim's forgiveness has a gift-like and miraculous quality. Ultimately, it is this gratuitous forgiveness—beyond truth and justice—that makes real reconciliation between abusers and victims possible. Only then can the legal and social processes of amnesty and pardon be put into action.\textsuperscript{53}

**Social Reconstruction**

The ultimate goal of truth finding, restoring justice, and forgiveness is to build a society in which all citizens can live in freedom, equality, and harmony, and in which, at the minimum, abuses of human rights will not occur again. This task of social reconstruction corresponds to Wolff's imperative to "remember so as to learn" and to Ackermann's overall concept of reconciliation as embodied praxis for change.

Such praxis for change requires establishing structural justice through various social reforms and legal justice through the reform of law and the judiciary. Moreover, there is the need of a democratic system of government in which all citizens can exercise their civil rights and duties. There is a need, as well, for an economic system in which all have an equal opportunity at earning a living wage and in which the basic needs of the poor and the weak are provided for. Last but not least, the cultural and religious dimensions of human life must also be nurtured and developed through education, the mass media, and other means, so that the whole person, and not only certain dimensions of it, can achieve full flourishing.

**Learning from Other Religions on the Way to Peace**

In reflecting on what we can learn from other religions as a path to peace, Jay McDaniel lists five challenges facing religions today.\textsuperscript{49} The first
is compassion: to identify resources within each religious tradition that are conducive to respect and care for the community of life and to live from them, thus helping to build multi-religious communities that are just, sustainable, participatory, and nonviolent. The second is repentance: to acknowledge tendencies within each religious tradition that lead to arrogance, prejudice, violence, and ignorance, to repent for them, and to add new chapters to the religion’s history. The third is simplicity: to avoid excessive consumption and to live simply and frugally, thus lessening the tragedies of poverty and the arrogance of affluence. The fourth is ecology: to recognize that we humans are creatures among creatures on this planet and that we have responsibilities toward other living beings and the whole of life. The fifth is diversity: to promote peace, especially among religions, by befriending people of other faiths.

To carry out the tasks implied in these five challenges we need to practice what McDaniel calls ‘‘deep listening,’’ which is the empathetic presence to others with the intention of affirming and honoring their well-being. In “listening” to others (as opposed simply to “seeing” them), in “listening with the ear of the heart,” to use the expression of Saint Benedict, we try to feel the feelings, understand what they mean (as opposed to what they say), listen to their silences between their words, take their desires and goals as ours, and help bring them about.

Such a listening, which when carried out among people of diverse faiths, is called interreligious dialogue, aims at promoting mutual respect, interaction, and transformation. It is possible only when we explicitly acknowledge that no one religion contains all the truths, even though all contain some of the truths. McDaniel calls this posture “complementary pluralism,” which assumes that “there is more wisdom in all the religions taken together than in any of them considered alone, and that people of different religions have much to learn from each other, because insights from one religion help complete and correct insights from the others.”

In this context of “deep listening” to other religious traditions, there is little doubt that the Roman Catholic teaching on peacemaking and reconciliation will be challenged to correct its weaknesses and will be greatly enriched by the insights of other religions. In this way it will be better equipped to contribute to the tasks of seeking the truth, establishing justice, promoting forgiveness, and building a harmonious world order and to meet the challenges of compassion, repentance, simplicity, ecology, and diversity facing all religions today.
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George Weigel, Witness to Hope: The Biography of John Paul II (New York: HarperCollins, 2005), 522. Unfortunately, we are not told who the opposing cardinals are, but it is not far-fetched to think of the then-prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI.
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