 ISSN 2312-7112

Отримана 10.10.2024

Прорецензована: 18.10.2024

Прийнята до друку: 12.11.2024

Електронна адреса: dmytro.shevchuk@oa.edu.ua

kateryna.yakunina@oa.edu.ua

DOI: 10.25264/2312-7112-2024-27-3-9

Shevchuk Dmytro, Yakunina Kateryna. The possibility of interreligious dialogue in times of war: the experience of Ukraine. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія». Серія «Філософія»* : *науковий журнал.* Острог : Вид-во НаУОА, 2024. № 27. С. 3–9.

УДК 2-675(477)

Dmytro Shevchuk, Kateryna Yakunina

THE POSSIBILITY OF INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN TIMES OF WAR: THE EXPERIENCE OF UKRAINE

The article is devoted to the problem of interreligious dialogue in Ukraine during the war. Ukraine is a country that unites different cultural traditions, religious communities, and systems of beliefs and values. During the years of independence (since 1991), this multiculturalism and polyreligiosity has not caused civil conflicts. Moreover, forming a national identity based on interethnic and interreligious dialogue, and thus a civic idea, has become increasingly pronounced over the years of independence. Only external interference from the Russian Federation led to the war in 2013, which in 2022 turned into a full-scale invasion and occupation and illegal annexation of part of Ukrainian territories. As a conceptual framework for understanding the processes in Ukrainian society related to interreligious dialogue in times of war, the authors choose the theory of Leonard Swidler and his understanding of dialogue as two-way communication between persons who hold significantly differing views on a subject, with the purpose of learning more truth about the subject from the other. One of the tasks of our article is to correlate this theory of interreligious dialogue and the principles that have been developed on its basis (DCEC: Deep-Dialogue, Critical Thinking, Emotional-Intelligence, and Competitive Cooperation) in order to strengthen the practice of dialogue in Ukraine (in particular, religious dialogue), to understand possible ways of developing interfaith relations in a country that, on the one hand, is characterized by ideological and religious pluralism, and on the other hand, is experiencing a profound existential crisis caused by the state of emergency (with all its legal, economic, and social restrictions, and a real threat to security and life) due to the war.

Keywords: *religion, interreligious dialogue, Ukraine, religious communities.*

Дмитро Шевчук, Катерина Якуніна

МОЖЛИВІСТЬ МІЖРЕЛІГІЙНОГО ДІАЛОГУ ПІД ЧАС ВІЙНИ: ДОСВІД УКРАЇНИ

Стаття присвячена проблемі міжрелігійного діалогу в Україні під час війни. Україна – країна, яка об'єднує різні культурні традиції, релігійні спільноти, системи вірувань і цінностей. За роки незалежності (з 1991 року) ця мультикультурність і поліконфесійність не стала причиною громадянських конфліктів. Більше того, формування національної ідентичності, заснованої на міжетнічному та міжрелігійному діалозі, а отже, і громадянської ідеї, за роки незалежності набуває все більшої виразності. Лише зовнішнє втручання з боку Російської Федерації призвело до війни у 2013 році, яка у 2022 році переросла у повномасштабне вторгнення та окупацію і незаконну анексію частини українських територій. Концептуальною основою для розуміння процесів в українському суспільстві, пов'язаних з міжрелігійним діалогом в умовах війни, автори обрали теорію Леонарда Свідлера та його розуміння діалогу як двосторонньої комунікації між особами, які дотримуються суттєво відмінних поглядів на предмет, з метою дізнатися більше істини про предмет від іншої сторони. Одним із завдань нашої статті є співвіднесення цієї теорії міжрелігійного діалогу та принципів, які були розроблені на її основі (DCEC: Deep-Dialogue, Critical Thinking, Emotional-Intelligence, Competitive Cooperation) з метою посилення практики діалогу в Україні (зокрема, релігійного діалогу), розуміння можливих шляхів розвитку міжконфесійних відносин у країні, яка, з одного боку, характеризується ідеологічним та релігійним плюралізмом, а з іншого – переживає глибоку екзистенційну кризу, спричинену надзвичайним станом (з усіма його правовими, економічними та соціальними обмеженнями, реальною загрозою безпеці та життю), зумовленим війною.

Ключові слова: *релігія, міжрелігійний діалог, Україна, релігійні громади.*

Introduction

The war poses new challenges and opportunities for religious communities. This statement sounds like a paradox, but it reflects the essence of the problem. On the one hand, religious communities and their members feel an existential threat. The enemy is destroying sacred buildings, refugees are moving to safer places, and military and civilians need spiritual support. In times of challenges and threats, people tend to seek support from transcendent forces and, therefore, turn to God more often. At the same time, religious communities are beginning to pay more attention to spiritual, psychological, and moral support for people

affected by the war. The religious situation in a country at war is challenging. War is always radicalism based on "friend-enemy" relations. The situation of emergency caused by war can lead to the closure of the community and the formation of a system of values and ideological attitudes that will be exclusively focused on internal consolidation and mobilization to protect their identity. This closeness does not encourage the search for dialogue, as community members (political, religious) feel existentially threatened by the outside. From the other side we should note, that war doctors the religious relations. For example the support for war, especially in its modern form as it's evident in case of Russian Orthodoxy, contradicts the very foundations of religious faith and its moral principles. This contradiction is indicated, for example, by Dragan Stanar, who analyzes why the use of modern war machines, namely Unmanned Combat Vehicles (UCV) and Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS), cannot be justified in Eastern Christian-Orthodox ethics of war [8]. At the same time, it is a prerequisite for internal dialogue and understanding, which is especially evident in multicultural and multireligious communities. Ukraine is a country that unites different cultural traditions, religious communities, and systems of beliefs and values. During the years of independence (since 1991), this multiculturalism and polyreligiosity has not caused civil conflicts. Moreover, forming a national identity based on interethnic and interreligious dialogue, and thus a civic idea, has become increasingly pronounced over the years of independence. Only external interference from the Russian Federation led to the war in 2013, which in 2022 turned into a full-scale invasion and occupation and illegal annexation of part of Ukrainian territories.

Interreligious dialogue in Ukraine can be viewed in the context of social dialogue in general, which has significantly intensified during the war. This intensification of dialogue can be explained through the phenomenon of "rallying around the flag." Analyzing the phenomenon of "rallying around the flag," Mykola Riabchuk notes that Russian aggression has led to a new stage of unity in Ukrainian society and overcoming contradictions and misunderstandings. "Faced with the phenomenon of absolute evil brought from outside, Ukrainians are now learning to look at internal problems in a different way – non-confrontationally, in solidarity. Russian aggression has prompted not only unity but also civic thinking in terms of national interest and the rejection (or postponement) of particular interests as secondary" [6, p. 184]. Mykola Ryabchuk notes that "rallying around the flag," as the experience of other societies in similar crisis situations shows, usually does not last long – no longer, in any case, than the crisis that catalyzed this rallying. We cannot hope for a miraculous cleansing of Ukraine from traditional sores deeply rooted in everyday culture and mentality without systematic work on reforming and further modernizing society [6, p. 187]. Nevertheless, this unity of the Ukrainian people demonstrates the potential that society expresses through various forms of dialogue – social, political, and religious.

As a conceptual framework for understanding the processes in Ukrainian society related to interreligious dialogue in times of war, we choose the theory of Leonard Swidler and his understanding of dialogue as "two-way communication between persons who hold significantly differing views on a subject, with the purpose of learning more truth about the subject from the other" [13]. One of the tasks of our article is to correlate this theory of interreligious dialogue and the principles that have been developed on its basis (DCEC: Deep-Dialogue, Critical Thinking, Emotional-Intelligence, and Competitive Cooperation) in order to strengthen the practice of dialogue in Ukraine (in particular, religious dialogue), to understand possible ways of developing interfaith relations in a country that, on the one hand, is characterized by ideological and religious pluralism, and on the other hand, is experiencing a profound existential crisis caused by the state of emergency (with all its legal, economic, and social restrictions, and a real threat to security and life) due to the war.

Dialogue as an ontological dimension of communities

In the twentieth century, philosophy realized that dialogue has an ontological dimension. It is not just expressed through communication but also creates a specific space between people, which is full of recognition of the Other and responsibility for him. This expands the range of relationships that can be dialogic. For example, Martin Buber broadly understands interpersonal relationships, including relationships with animals, plants, and people. One of the relationships he is most interested in is between a person and a person [7]. Intersubjectivity can save us from the pressure of individualism, which leaves us alone with ourselves, as well as from collectivism, which suppresses human individuality. The relationship of man to man is a fundamental given of human existence. Only when a person realizes the Other as his or her otherness and when, on this basis, he or she tries to penetrate the Other can he or she break the vicious

circle of loneliness. The most essential thing in human existence is to turn to the Other and answer the call of the Other. The meaning of human existence is revealed only when a person turns to the Other and the Other responds. Moreover, according to M. Buber, the I-Thou relationship is mutual, even if the person to whom I say You is not aware of this in his or her experience. This is how the understanding of dialog as a fundamental ontological dimension of human existence and society is formed.

This understanding of dialog is essential for creating a new paradigm of community. It forms a social vision that ensures the creation of a community and a common desire for its realization, which aims to achieve the common good. In this aspect of understanding dialogue, it is quite appropriate to support the concept of Leonard Swidler, who finds the principle of dialogicity at the heart of the universe. In particular, in *Dialogue for Interreligious Understanding*, he writes the following: "Dialogue – understood in its broadest sense as the mutually beneficial interaction of differing components – is at the very heart of the Universe, of which we humans are the highest expression: from the basic interaction of matter and energy (in Albert Einstein's unforgettable formula, E = MC2; energy equals mass times the square of the speed of light), to the creative interaction of protons and electrons in every atom, to the vital symbiosis of body and spirit in every human, to the creative dialogue between woman and man, to the dynamic relationship between individual and society. Thus, the very essence of our humanity is dialogical, and a fulfilled human life is the highest expression of the Cosmic Dance of Dialogue" [9, p. 37].

Dialogue is essential to keep communities alive. If there is no dialog, the community collapses. It becomes a resource for the establishment of authoritarian power. In addition, as Leonard Swidler notes, all members of society should be involved in the dialogue. If the dialogue is only imposed from above, from representatives of the authorities, and even if it involves experts, it will not play any role in establishing cooperation and understanding between different communities in modern multicultural societies. Swidler, in particular, notes, "[…] dialogue, rather, should involve every level of the religious, ideological communities, all the way down to the persons in the pews. Only in this way will the religious, ideological communities learn from each other and come to understand each other as they truly are" [9, p. 24].

Interreligious dialogue supports the rationality of social practices related to religious beliefs. In particular, this stems from the close intertwining of dialogue and rationality. As Swidler states, rational thinking at its very core is critical and dialogic [9, p. 106]. Rationality in the context of interreligious dialogue implies the ability to think logically, critically analyze, and take a conscious approach to religious beliefs and practices. It helps to avoid extremism, fanaticism, and intolerance, allowing people of different religions to coexist peacefully despite their differences. In addition, rationality in interreligious dialogue is manifested as a prerequisite for openness to new ideas, readiness for discussion, and respect for the other point of view. A rational approach also requires recognizing that there are different paths to truth and that no religious tradition has a monopoly on truth. In Swidler's concept, critical thinking is known to be a component of his DCEC model. He writes about it: "[…] to open oneself to Deep-Dialogue, it is also necessary to develop the skills of thinking carefully and clearly, the skills of Critical-Thinking (critical, from the Greek, krinein, to choose, to judge [...]). We need to understand what we, and others, really mean when we say something and why we say it, so as to 'choose,' to 'judge' where we believe the truth lies and what the implications are. In brief, we must answer three questions: What? Whence? Whither?» [9, p. 62]. Critical thinking is extremely important in terms of ensuring resilience in conditions of uncertainty and emergency (for example, in our case, a situation caused by war). Social dialogue is possible only if the parties take a rational approach and critical thinking and do not succumb to mythologies and ideologies that promote radicalism and rely primarily on the emotional and unreflective nature of the consumer of mythological and ideological narratives. Relying on rationality creates a universal prerequisite for communication and mutual recognition.

Interreligious dialogue should be viewed primarily from the perspective of communities. Leonard Swidler asks the question: who can, who should, engage in interreligious, interideological dialogue? He answers that there is a fundamental communal aspect to such a dialogue. Swidler writes: "For example, if a person is not either a Lutheran or a Jew, s/he could not engage in a specifically Lutheran-Jewish dialogue. Likewise, persons not belonging to any religious, or ideological, community could not, of course, engage in interreligious, interideological dialogue. They might, of course, engage in meaningful religious, ideological dialogue, but it simply would not be interreligious, interideological, between religions, or ideologies" [9, p. 23].

Forming a religious dialog is very important in the modern world. In the twenty-first century, it is becoming increasingly clear that interreligious dialogue is not taking place. On the contrary, religious communities are

often involved in conflicts, although these conflicts do not have a distinctly religious character. Researchers of the social and political aspects of religion note that one can observe a gradual shift in the focus of the perception of religion by transnational and national actors: from a predominant awareness of religious institutions as objects of manipulation aimed at legitimizing political regimes to a growing awareness of the role of religion in shaping the relevant types of political culture, the compatibility/incompatibility of certain major religions with democracy, and the essential content of the evolution of its forms under religious influences [1, p. 281]. In times of war, the religious factor becomes one of the key ones. At the same time, it reinforces the (im)possibility of dialogue at the general social and intercommunity levels and the level of individual religious denominations.

In such a context, dialogue in society, especially interreligious dialogue, is complicated by the ideological components in it, and as Swindler notes: "We are here, of course, speaking of a specific kind of dialogue, an interreligious, inter_ideological dialogue. To have such, it is not sufficient that the dialogue partners discuss a religious-ideological subject, that is, the meaning of life and how to live accordingly. Rather, they must come to the dialogue as persons somehow significantly identified with a religious or ideological community" [12].

In his work "*The Dialogue Decalogue*," the author offers ten "rules" (commandment) that should be followed in order for dialogue actually to be implemented. According to the Second Commandment, "Interreligious, inter-ideological dialogue must be a two-sided project – within each religious or ideological community and between religious or ideological communities" (Swidler 2010), which, on the one hand, emphasizes the equality of the dialogue participants and, on the other, determines their jointly interested inclusion in the communication process. These recommendations are understandable and accessible, emphasizing the fundamental foundations of dialogue – reciprocity, trust, and desire. The Eighth Commandment reflects the same idea: "Dialogue can take place only on the basis of mutual trust" [12].

However, if we take the conditions of conflict, confrontation, competition, and rivalry in any sphere of social life, it is difficult to imagine the "fuse" that can promote effective dialogue. Swindler in the Ninth Commandment offers a variant of such a fuse – self-critical. Since the promulgation of Kant's moral imperative, personal responsibility and fear for one's well-being have been considered effective regulators of human coexistence. In his recommendation, Swindler relies not only on introspection but also on a deep understanding of one's essence and tradition, as well as the need and desire for development: "A lack of such self-criticism implies that one's own tradition already has all the correct answers. Such an attitude makes dialogue not only unnecessary, but even impossible, since we enter into dialogue primarily so we can learn – which obviously is impossible if our tradition has never made a misstep, if it has all the right answers" [12]. The set of ten recommendations proposed by Swindler is a kind of instruction on inter-ideological dialogue, which allows starting a dialogue on a parity basis. However, the actual conditions of (non)dialogue often lead to its ineffectiveness.

Maintaining a Dialogue: Religious Communities in Ukraine in the Time of War

The situation of war and existential threats give rise to several positions on the implementation of interreligious and interfaith dialogue in Ukraine. In particular, researchers of the religious sphere in Ukraine identify three most common positions: 1) anti-dialogue (representatives of this position argue that it is impossible to conduct a dialogue during the war: there is nothing to talk about when there is a war. Therefore, it is necessary to freeze everything, to stop any negotiations for a certain period of time); 2) neutral position (representatives of this position argue that the relations that have developed in peacetime should not be destroyed, but also not activated, frozen or initiated, i.e., put on hold); 3) active position (representatives of this position are convinced that the dialogue should be intensified and that we should work on achieving peaceful coexistence, since only in the unity of all – believers and non-believers – can we overcome Russia's plans to destabilize the situation in Ukraine. This position implies the active restoration of all dialogue formats and platforms) [4, p. 7].

In this context, the activities of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations (established in late 1996) are worth noting. The goal of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations is uniting the efforts of denominations in the spiritual revival of Ukraine and coordinating interchurch dialogue both in Ukraine and abroad, as well as participating in the development of draft regulations on church-state relations and implementing comprehensive charitable activities. Today, it includes 16 churches and 1 interchurch organization, which unite a significant part of religious organizations in Ukraine (over 90%) of Christian, Jewish, and Islamic faiths. Such an association allows not only to

represent religious organizations at the state level but also to take an active part in the public life of Ukrainians and to act as an official representative of Ukraine in the international arena. Even before the full-scale invasion, the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations repeatedly reaffirmed its primary mission in communiqués and strategies. Thus, in a communiqué of April 3, 2014, the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations noted the importance of strategic partnership between religious organizations of Ukraine, state authorities, and society [2]. The Strategy for the Participation of Churches and Religious Organizations in Peacebuilding "Ukraine is Our Common Home" of December 10, 2017, proposed the slogan "Hear! Understand! Act Together!" which is aimed at gradually building peace in Ukrainian society. This initiative is specified in the following activities:

– pray for peace in Ukraine, for healing and overcoming social fractures, restoration of justice, justice and the rule of law;

– to refuse to use hate speech against each other, including against representatives of other faiths, communities, social groups, political parties, and government authorities;

– develop interfaith cooperation in various areas aimed at establishing justice and building peace;

– to create a culture of ecumenical and interreligious cooperation in society for the benefit of all citizens, to encourage positive initiatives, and to celebrate positive experiences of cooperation [3].

In 2023, Peter Mandaville, Advisor on Religion and Inclusive Societies at the United States Institute of Peace, evaluated the more than 25 years of work of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations. During a meeting with the head of the State Service of Ukraine for Ethnic Policy and Freedom of Conscience, Viktor Yelensky, he noted that "the unique role of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations, which can serve as a model of fruitful and effective cooperation for many European countries" [5].

The long-term cooperation of religious organizations in the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organizations confirms the possibility of dialogue. However, it is worth quoting Swindler's words, "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" [12] because dialogue should be precisely dialogue, not debate. Other interreligious or interconfessional associations in Ukraine (Ukrainian Interchurch Council, All-Ukrainian Council of Religious Associations, The Council of Representatives of Christian Churches of Ukraine) emphasize the desire for dialogue and the impossibility of building it at certain levels, which causes multi-vector interactions between religious organizations.

It is essential that interreligious dialogue takes place at the level of horizontal relations, directly between members of religious communities. This aligns with global trends in establishing a dialogue between denominations and religions. In his writings, Leonard Swidler also notes the spread of this type of interreligious dialogue worldwide. In his book *The Age of Global Dialogue*, he notes that it is essential to note that interreligious, interideological dialogue is not something to be limited to official representatives of communities. Actually, the great majority of such dialogue that has occurred worldwide, particularly in recent decades, has not been carried on by official representatives. However, that dialogue has been happening with increasing frequency [10]. In addition, during the war, the horizontal relationships that gave rise to the dialogue turned from spontaneous to networked. Ukrainian researchers Lyudmyla Fylypovych and Oksana Horkusha note that the network stage of interfaith dialogue implies that under the influence of situational opportunities and needs, several actors whose interests coincide in a particular area or sphere create a platform for interfaith dialogue. The goal of the dialogue, the topic, the language (the system of identifiers for determining the meanings used), methodological approaches, criteria for the rules of conduct, and the subjects invited to the dialogue are usually set by the organizers of such dialogue platforms in accordance with their autonomous expectations of the proper result in the discourse of the paradigm that is leading for them (driven by their corporate and institutional interests) [4, p. 6]. This networking has created several projects to support and assist each other in times of war.

The Christian Open Academy is an example of interfaith dialogue through creating a network of interaction and dialogue. The Christian Open Academy is an educational project to spread a holistic biblical worldview and form leaders for the public sphere. An essential component of the project is the networking of Christians to implement practical programs that embody biblical values in various aspects of life and contribute to rebuilding Ukraine. Against the backdrop of Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, The Christian Open Academy became part of the Interfaith Initiative "Christians for Ukraine," a network of Christian leaders of

various denominations united to work together to find and implement a biblical model for the development and revival of Ukrainian society, particularly in the context of war. The Christian Open Academy project is designed to find ideological and practical responses to the challenges of our time, both national and global. Although the war in Ukraine makes it necessary to be more focused on internal issues, this project seeks answers to religious, cultural, political, and social problems of Ukrainian society, taking into account the global spiritual and ideological context.

The ultimate goal of The Christian Open Academy programs is to create local networks among Christians of different denominations who systematically implement projects of Christian impact on society. These networks are formed through the education and interaction of active Christians during and after their studies. Training leaders who combine a holistic biblical worldview, professionalism, and Christian character are key in creating such networks. Another essential element of building such networks is interaction with existing centers operating in the relevant areas. Such interaction is ensured through the functioning of the Interfaith Initiative "Christians for Ukraine," created as a platform for combining efforts, resources, and experience around serving Ukraine. It is important that this project, through its openness to dialogue, supports not only mutual understanding but also the openness to concealment of any intentions. Thus, it can be fully correlated with the principles of inner dialogue as understood by Leonard Swidler. In *The Age of Global Dialogue*, he wrote about inner dialogue that yach participant must come to the dialogue with complete honesty and sincerity. He also states that it is essential to clarify the primary and secondary directions in which the tradition evolves, anticipate potential future shifts, and acknowledge areas where participants struggle with their own traditions. Honest dialogue leaves no room for false fronts. Self-reflection on the tradition of one's own denomination is clearly present in the Christian Open Academy project, which emphasizes the sincerity of the participants.

Such an initiative, according to Swindler, must necessarily include a component of authentic, deep self-determination of each dialogue participant because, without this, we get lost in the identities of others and our desires: "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" [12]. Only then can the dialogue participants implement the following recommendation of Swindler: "…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" [12].

An example of active interreligious cooperation for the common good is the Open Orthodox University of St. Sophia of Wisdom project called "Understanding". This project is focused on "unlocking the peacebuilding potential of Ukrainian religious communities in cooperation with the public to overcome the polarization of Ukrainian society and build peace." As part of the project, thematic webinars, lectures, and discussions were held, a Peacebuilding School was held, and a Strategy for Peacebuilding in Ukraine and practical recommendations were prepared.

At the same time, it is worth noting that in the projects implemented in Ukraine, we see more of a polylogue because in the mission of interreligious or interconfessional organizations, ecumenical associations, third parties are present – society, the state, the nation, precisely as individual respondents, participants in communication, and not as a subject of discussion. Genuine dialogue requires cooperation, a deep understanding of each other and ourselves, and a focus on dialogue. When scaling the dialogue into a polylogue, compliance with these conditions becomes more difficult. That is why it is worth adhering to the sequence of dialogue deployment: "In the first 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 […] 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" [12].

Conclusion

Ukraine is undergoing existential challenges that necessitate rethinking the social contract and creating a new paradigm for the Ukrainian state. Leonard Swidler calls our modern world (following Ewert Cousins) the Second Axial Period and (following Hans Küng) Macro-Paradigm-Shift [11, p. 16]. The social, cultural, political, and religious processes in contemporary Ukraine are entirely consistent with this characterization of our time. Returning to Leonard Swidler's concept, it is worth noting that in this time of global change, dialogue should become a fundamental principle of communication and our relationship with each other and the world at large. Swidler writes: "The turn toward dialogue is, in my judgment, the most fundamental, the

most radical and utterly transformative of the key elements of the newly emerging paradigm [...]. However, that shift from monologue to dialogue constitutes such a radical reversal in human consciousness, is so utterly new in the history of humankind from the beginning that it must be designated as literally 'revolutionary,' that is, it turns everything absolutely around" [11, p. 14]. That is why the Ukrainian social space needs to focus on internal dialog, which can also be an advantage over the authoritarian monologue that saturates Russian ideology.

Leonard Swidler's theory of interreligious dialogue has become an opportunity to analyze and reflect on the religious situation in Ukraine during the war. However, his concept may also be necessary for improving interreligious and interfaith dialogue. In particular, it should be noted that Swidler's concept of dialogue is reasonably practical. In particular, when defining the nature of dialogue, he writes that when discussing dialogue between religions or ideologies, we refer to something specific: a two-way communication between individuals. However, two-way communication can take many forms, such as fighting, arguing, debating, etc. Indeed, none of these examples represent what we mean by dialogue. On the other end of the spectrum is the communication between individuals who share the exact same perspective on a given topic. This is not what we call dialogue; it might be better described as encouragement or reinforcement, not dialogue. By examining these two extremes of two-way communication – neither of which qualifies as dialogue [9, p. 19]. Swidler also notes in his works that after a more or less extensive dialogue, it may be discovered that both sides agree on the subject discussed. This realization doesn't mean the conversation was not a dialogue; instead, it shows that the dialogue was the process through which this agreement – the new truth – was uncovered. However, if the conversation focuses solely on agreement, it transitions from dialogue to reinforcement. Dialogue is a two-way communication between individuals who hold significantly different views on a subject, with the aim of learning more truth about that subject from each other. These reflections on dialogue become guidelines and ideals that regulate current processes in religious life. To this we can add the principle of DCEC (Deep-Dialogue, Critical Thinking, Emotional Intelligence, and Competitive Cooperation). This principle allows us to structure, institutionalize, and improve interaction between different denominations and religions. This structured approach will help avoid the influence of destructive elements generated by wartime. Dialogue between people of different religions and faiths naturally contributes to peace and justice. Dialogue among religions and dialogue between the state and religious communities in modern Ukraine should become a prerequisite and one of the foundations of sustainable peace in Europe.

References:

1. Войналович В. Держава, суспільство і церква: проблеми формування моделі взаємин в умовах російської агресії. *Етнополітика в Україні в умовах сучасних суспільно-політичних змін: реальний стан, виклики, перспективи*. Київ: ІПіЕнД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України, Київ, 2023. С. 279-379.

2. ВРЦІРО. Комюніке засідання Всеукраїнської Ради Церков і релігійних організацій. 2014. https://vrciro.org.ua/ua/events/communique-of-ukrainian-council-of-churches-meeting

3. ВРЦІРО. Стратегія участі Церков і релігійних організацій у миробудуванні «Україна – наш спільний дім». 2017. https://vrciro.org.ua/ua/documents/uccro-peacebuilding-strategy-ukraine

4. 2. Горкуша О. Филипович Л. Міжконфесійний діалог в сучасній Україні: доцільність та ефективність його здійснення в умовах війни. *Українське релігієзнавство*. 2018. № 85. С. 4-16.

5. ДЕСС: Україна: релігійний плюралізм і міжрелігійна взаємодія. 2023. https://dess.gov.ua/vizyt-predstavnyka-instytutu-myru-ssha-do-dess

6. Рябчук М. «Гуртування довкола прапора»: громадянська ідентичність як чинник суспільно-політичної консолідації в умовах війни. *Етнополітика в Україні в умовах сучасних суспільно-політичних змін: реальний стан, виклики, перспективи*. Київ: ІПіЕнД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України, Київ, 2023. С. 161-188.

7. Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. New York, NY: Howard Books, 2008.

8. Stanar D. War Machines and Orthodoxy, *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 2022. vol. 21, issue 63 (Winter2022). P. 3-22.

9. Swidler L. *Dialogue for Interreligious Understanding Strategies for the Transformation of Culture-Shaping Institutions*. New York, NY: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN, 2014.

10. Swidler L. *The Age of Global Dialogue*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick, 2016.

11. Swidler L. The Age of Global Dialogue. *Marburg Journal of Religion*. Volume 1, No. 2 (July 1996). P. 1-16, https://archiv.ub.uni-marburg.de/ep/0004/article/view/3781/3597

12. 3. Swidler L. The Dialogue Decalogue. *Media Development*. 2010. No 3/2010, https://repository.globethics.net/handle/20.500.12424/181439

13. Swidler L. *What Is Dialogue?* 1991. https://dialogueinstitute.org/what-is-dialogue