Reciprocity:
A Human Value in a Pluralistic World

Edited by
Tianen Wang, Peter Jonkers & Astrid Vicas

Table of Contents

Introduction

WANG Tianen & Peter JONKERS

Reciprocity is a fundamental anthropological characteristic and a moral value. In the first sense, it refers to the fact that human beings are in a relationship of interaction with other human beings, groups of people, and societies. No one can survive as a human being alone; no one can even think as a human being without interacting with other people. Interaction can take on many forms, and the exchange of material and immaterial goods is one of them. When persons or groups give something to others, there is an exchange between them. In this context, the term reciprocity is commonly used to attribute an important moral qualification to the kind of exchange that human beings and societies strive for, namely that it should be fair and equal.

The Chinese language and Western languages have a different understanding of reciprocity. The Chinese character that is typically used as a translation of the English word "reciprocity" means "mutual benefit" or "mutually beneficial cooperation." In comparison, the Latin word "reciprocus," from which reciprocity is derived, covers an important mechanism, a movement of give-and-take and back-and-forth. Reciprocity as a human value and a fundamental anthropological characteristic has always been important for personal, societal, and international relations. Therefore, it deserves to be examined from many perspectives, philosophical, anthropological, political, and theological. This volume aims at exploring four important dimensions of reciprocity.

Part I discusses the nature and characteristics of reciprocity; the first paper by the late Vincent SHEN, entitled "Reciprocity and Generosity: Ethical Praxis and Ontological Foundation," starts from the observation that the whole world is in the process of globalization, thus emphasizing the act of reaching out to many others to obtain recognition and establish new reciprocal relationships. Reciprocity is indeed what we achieve when we establish a relationship with a new counterpart. On the other hand, globalization is characterized by boundary-crossing and can be experienced as various kinds of "transcendence," that is, "going beyond." Shen proposes to practice mutual strangification with many others to increase mutual understanding instead of conflict, clash, or even war. The idea of mutual strangification involves a positive meaning of intersubjectivity, leading to reciprocity because intersubjectivity in the strict sense might only be seen as an extension of modern subjectivity. Just like the Hegelian concept of *Anerkennung* could be only a way of recognizing the others' subjectivity as well as one's own, a minimal understanding of intersubjectivity might be only a way to recognize that I am a subject and you are a subject too. However, first, there should be an act of

reaching out to someone who breaks the ice to establish reciprocity. Therefore, the original generosity implied in this act of reaching out should now be seen as the condition *sine qua non* of all reciprocal relationships. Shen's paper aims to find in the Confucian ethical tradition and the Daoist onto-cosmological traditions the cultural and philosophical roots that still can inspire us today in dealing with the issues of reciprocity and generosity. First, he analyzes the Confucian notion of *shu* (translated as strangification), which is regulated by the principle of reciprocity. Thus, this principle becomes a guiding idea of social and political philosophy. Shen then continues with a discussion of the onto-cosmological foundation of generosity and reciprocity in Daoism. The Constant, another name of *dao,* does not stay within itself, but generously reaches beyond itself to give birth to all things in the universe; all these things then return to *dao.* Hence, it is by way of assistance and mutual interaction that a series of creative actions takes place, which implies reciprocity and regulation.

The second paper by WANG Tianen, entitled "Reciprocity: Mutually Beneficial Cooperation and Radical Anthropological Characteristic," starts with distinguishing between reciprocity as a practice of exchanging things with others for mutual benefit and reciprocity as a relation of mutual influence, mutual action, and dependence; examples of the latter are creative activities or thought productions. In this latter sense, reciprocity means that human beings are not able to function properly and even survive without it, so reciprocity can be qualified as a radical anthropological characteristic. It is this kind of reciprocity that Wang Tianen's paper discusses.

There are three basic levels of this kind of reciprocity: a physical level, a mental level, and a spiritual level. The lowest level is physical mutual dependence, and the highest form of cooperation is the reciprocal sharing of creative ideas, which will typically emerge as a consequence of the rise of the information civilization. This kind of civilization is a very different era in the development of humankind because information differs from physical matter and energy. In Wang's view, the main feature of information civilization is "sharing." Information is not only sharable but also shared differently in comparison with other shared material objects. People are agents in the sharing of an information civilization. The more participants there are to share with, the more information one receives from sharing. Sharing is one of the main characteristics of reciprocity as a fundamental anthropological characteristic.

With regard to human information civilization, Wang argues that the crucial fact is the superposition of the radical character of information and anthropology, which is an important basis to research information civilization. It involves reciprocity – a radical characteristic of information and anthropology. The superposition of the reciprocity of information and anthropology that is highlighted in the information civilization era is anything but a coincidence. It reflects the inherent correlation between the form of existence of people and information. This fact is important to have an in-depth understanding of information civilization and to clarify the concept of reciprocity.

Thomas MENAMPARAMPIL in his paper "Reciprocity: A Great Value in a Pluralistic World" argues that, while all developing societies are eager for economic growth, they do not pay sufficient attention to holding on to their skills of remaining human and helpfully relating with others. Again, if neighboring communities on the way to rapid development do not keep their expectations realistic and in complementary relationships, there is a possibility of a clash of perceived interests. Conflicts can also arise about claims over natural resources, job opportunities, political disparities, or the rapid demographic growth of a particular community. What is important for all communities is to build a consciousness of being called by nature to play complementary roles in human growth, promote healthy *reciprocal relationships,* and allow space for each other as individuals and communities. Communities that may have had the advantage of early education or a specialized skill that has become a part of their heritage are quick in taking up financially rewarding jobs. Others can look at the situation as a threat. Diversity of natural talents, acquired knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural heritage are mutually stimulating, not threatening. If there are intelligent and sensitive leaders, who adopt a human and humane approach to each other in periods of tension and provide an inspiring and complementary vision, the communities concerned easily move forward with a great sense of serenity and self-confidence to the advantage of all. According to Menamparampil, the only way forward is to consciously cultivate an attitude of *reciprocity*: fostering a creative form of dialogue with others, listening, affirming, appreciating, questioning, and searching together. Hence, reciprocity comes down to being human in different contexts. In Menamparampil's view, a fact that we should not forget is that we belong to a cosmos that exists as a "web of cooperative and symbiotic relationships" and that everything is connected to everything else. When we forget this law, we are on the path to self-impoverishment. Being committed to reciprocity means respecting the other; it means appealing to the humanity and natural goodness in the heart even of an opponent and not embittering him or her with denunciations. It means adopting a persuasive style of approach; it means changing one's grievance into a stimulating message. It means being above partisan interests, cultivating sensitivity toward smaller and weaker groups and individuals, developing a common vision for the future. It means promoting ideas of collaboration and fostering a natural sense of fairness. This, then, is Menamparampil's message: "Reciprocity is a Great Value in a Pluralistic World."

In "Reciprocity and Reference," Astrid VICAS examines another characteristic of reciprocity. She starts from the observation that all human cultures have in common referential communication or symbolization, in contrast with communication by signaling, which humans also share with animal communities. In her paper, she explores the thesis that certain patterns of reciprocating activity are needed to acquire referential competence, in contrast to the ability to respond to signals. Vicas highlights the importance of now relatively neglected work in developmental psychology in making the case that patterns of reciprocation are tied to the comprehension of reference.

The main piece of evidence concerning the connection between patterns of reciprocation and the acquisition of reference comes from studies of first language acquisition elaborated by developmental psychologists from the 1960s and 1970s, namely Hans Werner and Elizabeth Bates. Werner proposed the construct of the primordial sharing situation and Bates developed the construct of the gestural complex. Part of Vicas's paper is aimed at outlining what these constructs are and the specific kinds of reciprocating activities they highlight.

Werner's and Bates's constructs drew on two bodies of work: 1) observations that had been accumulating in diaries of caregivers from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries; and 2) a set of claims that stemmed from Johann Gottfried Herder, Johann Gottlieb Fichte, and Wilhelm von Humboldt, developed in the late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries. It is especially the thesis adopted by Humboldt, in his reflection on a Fichtean conception of agency, that referential communication requires the understanding of norms, rather than only the following of norms, which has an important implication for the examination of practices of reciprocation. The implication is that practices of reciprocation have a strong bearing on the understanding of norms. Thus, Vicas brings to light relatively neglected work in theorizing about the development of symbolic competence and its significance to appreciating the relationship between practices of reciprocity and the understanding of norms.

QIU Renfu's "Reciprocity and Human Symbiosis" argues that reciprocity, as an important mechanism of human symbiosis, shows multiple levels, such as interdependency, mutual benefit, sharing, and mutual achievement, which gradually develop from a low to a high level and form a hypercycle process of spiral escalation. Only by continuously seeing the mechanism of reciprocity in human symbiosis can we exhibit the common values of humankind, facilitate constant mutual achievements in the future progress of human civilization, and promote humankind as a whole to move toward a higher level of civilization.

Andrew Tsz Wan HUNG in his "Reciprocity in Friendship: The Dialogical Transformation of Friendship" explores to what extent reciprocity is essential in various forms of friendship. He first discusses Aristotle's three concepts of friendship and analyzes the debates about whether friendships based on utility and pleasure entail goodwill toward friends. Are they true friendships? Aristotle assumes that our altruistic regard toward others arises only through our appreciation of our friends' virtuous characters. However, our ordinary experience reveals that our friendships usually initiate as utility or pleasure friendships and then may be transformed into character friendships through continuous dialogue and association. By using the idea of the dialogical self, proposed by Charles Taylor and Mikhail Bakhtin, Hung argues for the transformative nature of friendship, in which the self is transformed into connected selves, and friendship has become a kind of mutually virtuous con-

stitutive relationship. Hung concludes that the exploration of dialogical transformative relationships not only affirms the intrinsic value of friendship but also helps us re-evaluate the value of utility or pleasure friendships.

Asha MUKHERJEE's paper, entitled "Reciprocity and Justice as the Boundaries of Human Relationship: A Philosophical Concern," discusses the tensions between the rules of justice, which require individuals to sacrifice their welfare for the good of others, and reciprocity, according to which all the benefits I give to the other have to be returned to me in full. Furthermore, in love, friendship, and family relationships parties are connected by mutual affection and benevolence, which is at odds with reciprocity. If so, then justice, reciprocity, and benevolence must define the boundaries within which people pursue their most intimate relationships. Based on these observations, Mukherjee demonstrates the importance and limitations of reciprocity as the basis of justice. In the next section of her paper, she shows that reciprocity gets a much broader meaning in the context of family relations. Finally, she discusses the limitations of reciprocity in the case of people's (moral) obligations toward senior citizens, orphans, deserted children, etc. All this shows how difficult it is to get a good general conception of reciprocity.

Part II analyzes the dimensions of human reciprocity in a pluralistic world. In "Reciprocity as a Source of Reconciliation," Denys KIRYUKHIN discusses to what extent reciprocity can contribute to answering the vexing question of reconciliation in cases of gross violations of human rights. The author demonstrates that the option of reciprocity and reconciliation is preserved even in a situation that might be called a manifestation of radical evil. The resolution of acute crises of human and intercultural relations manifested in tragic events, such as the Holocaust or other genocides, lies in reciprocity through forgiveness, on the one side, and in reciprocity through justice (ethical equality of the conflicting parties), on the other side. This is an extremely complicated and hardly realizable task in the decades to come. However, according to Kirkyukhin, we have no alternative to solving this problem. Reciprocity, in the broadest sense of the word, as our obligation toward others to return to them the advantages they give to us, is one of the basic prerequisites of the very possibility of social cooperation. The discussion of ways of reconciliation – especially its legal aspects – is more typical for Western European culture based on the tradition of Christianity. Nevertheless, this does not mean that there are no possibilities for reconciliation in Islam, Confucianism, or any other cultural or religious tradition. Therefore, it is extremely important in the globalizing world firstly to study and to update knowledge of the various "reconciliation cultures" represented in various traditions and ethoses, and secondly to look for opportunities for reconciliation understood as peaceful coexistence and accommodation of superficially warring positions and cultural and religious concepts.

Lalan Prasad SINGH in his "Reciprocity: A Human Value in a Pluralistic World" argues that the peaceful co-existence of different religions and ethnicities depends upon the cultivation and acceptance of reciprocity as a

human value in the pluralistic world of the 21st century. This can only be realized by transcending the narrow visions of institutionalized religions and ethnicities and by developing a unifying principle, in particular spiritual humanism. This principle resides in the Chinese and Indian religious values and the Western Abrahamic theological interpretations of Christian, Islamic, and Judaic religious scriptures. To realize spiritual humanism, interfaith dialogue is necessary, based on the principle of reciprocity. Singh then shows how this principle plays a central role in the works of prominent political thinkers, such as John Locke, John Stuart Mill, and Karl Marx, just like in several religious and cultural traditions, such as Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism.

In "Bisosiative Dialectic in Pluralism," Wiwik SETIYANI argues that religion teaches moral values that gave birth to the attitude and behavior of love and tolerance toward other religions. Therefore, religion is not only a vertical ideology or doctrine but must also be interpreted contextually and horizontally. This means that religion is not a goal in itself, but is for the benefit of the people. Hence, religious diversity should be understood as a form of competition in obtaining goodness that can be enjoyed or felt by all people. From this perspective, dialectics is the proper way to understand religious pluralism or diversity. Setiyani calls the human ability to articulate pluralism and the creative power to analyze the real conditions in the community bisosiative. The recognition of the existence of other religions encourages people to always reflect and learn from others without raising religious truth claims. The recognition of religious pluralism is a source of inspiration for interpreting the ongoing dialectic of society. Bisosiative dialectic is the dialogical process that occurs through the power of thought and creative action with particular attention to the principles and the personal use of them that can give birth to universal principles.

Kunawi BASYIR discusses the "Religious Pluralism Movement in Indonesia" in his paper. Indonesia is a country with a rich diversity in ethnicities, cultures, tribes, and religions. With this diversity and difference, it comes to be a factor of integration and unity, which has led Indonesia to independence. However, along with the development of modernization, Indonesia experiences a new phase, particularly since the 1998s, with the fall of the new government. Politics is mainly contested along with the claims of freedom of thought, which hurt social order. Since that period and until today, the experience of multiculturalism in Indonesia has always come with conflict and violence, inflicting restlessness and deep concern in the country, despite its pluralist endowment. Therefore, for the last decade, Indonesia is not only renowned as the state with "*Bhineka Tunggal Eka,*" but also as a country with numerous challenges and problems resulting from ethnic, religious, and socio-cultural diversity. The result is that pluralism and multiculturalism in Indonesia will be in danger. Such a condition is the effect of modernization and globalization, bringing changes in thinking among religious people who tend to be aggressive and exclusive. According to Bashir, this situation needs serious attention from all parties, that is, the government, religious figures, and all social communities in general. An approach used by Muslim and Hindu

people in Bali after the unfortunate outbreak of *Bom Legian* (Legian Bombing) involves all elements so that problems regarding humaneness, justice, and equality are quickly resolved and Bali can rise again and become one of the references to build religious pluralism in Indonesia.

The title of Prabhu VENKATARAMAN's paper is "An Enquiry into the Case of Animal Welfare through Reciprocity." The focus of his paper is how reciprocity can be taken as the principle of moral concern in human's relationship with the non-human community, which includes nature and other animal beings. Venkataraman starts from the observation that some thinkers discuss human obligations to animals from the perspective of reciprocity, often discussed in terms of a contract. While Peter Carruthers claims that animals do not merit direct ethical concerns as there is no contract between humans and animals, Mark Rowlands tries to argue in favor of animal rights, thereby basing himself on the same principle of contract. In a similar vein, Bryan Norton talks about protecting domesticated animals based on a mutual contract that humans have with those animals, while there is no such contract with wild animals. Prabhu discusses these positions on the moral considerability of animals through the principle of reciprocity, arguing that in certain spheres of ethical concern we need to go beyond the idea of reciprocity. In his view, reciprocity can be an important point of discussion in moral concerns, but it is not the endpoint.

Part III is devoted to reciprocity on a spiritual and creative level. NING Lina's "Reciprocity of Thinking and Thought from a Logical Perspective" elaborates how thinking and thought as two different concepts have different effects on human behavior. However, the boundaries between them are not clear, so they often confuse people. Ning aims to clarify this confusion from a logical perspective and distinguishes different aspects in the reciprocity of thinking and thought: First, thinking, affective or abstract, as mass characteristic of humanity, produces conformity. Resulting from reflections on thinking, thought is independent, spontaneous, and critical, and thus has a tendency. They influence and interact with each other. Second, the progress of human wisdom and morality shows that thinking generates thoughts, and thoughts refactor thinking. From the perspective of logical epistemology, thinking provides possibilities for thoughts, while the main body of thoughts constantly enriches the connotations of thinking during the process of cognition. Third, thinking in order to become thought needs to clean up ambiguity and contradictions, and obtain effectiveness through logical analysis and inference. Thought traces the origin of the conclusion and confirms the belief when reforming the mode of thinking.

In "Information, Community, and Reciprocity from the Perspective of Axiology," ZHANG Yanfen discusses that a human being acquires his/her definition from the community, which is characterized by reciprocity. She argues that reciprocity is to be distinguished from the division of labor in a community, in which people are only extrinsically related. Reciprocity is rather the exchange of existential experiences; it is not immediate but mediated

by information. Correspondingly, information becomes essential in the pursuit of community. In our era, facts in terms of information are the most primary and universal ones conveyed by internet technology. As a result, the information community proves to be a way of life for human beings. Finally, the information community has a vision of the future because mediation is diachronic. And reciprocity and community are characterized authentically by the information of the absent subject.

SHEN Haiyan explores "Reciprocity as the Sign for a Buddhist Understanding of Truth." She starts from the observation that reciprocity as a sign contributes to our understanding of the world so that its implementation can serve as a bridge between the objective and the subjective world. Shen attempts to explore reciprocity as a sign for revealing truth in Chinese Buddhism. Based on his sign interpretation, master Zhiyi in Chinese Tiantai Buddhism can demonstrate his insight into the Ultimate Truth. Consequently, his method of interpreting signs to present Tiantai teaching has an impact on the Chinese Chan Buddhist method of teaching. Chan masters use varieties of signs to either indicate their stages of striving for enlightenment or to describe their insight into truth or as skillful means of guiding others to make a breakthrough in their course of practice.

TU Xiaofei discusses the relation between "Confucian Reciprocity and the Debate on Humanitarian Intervention." He starts with discussing a great number of theoretical studies about the pros and cons of humanitarian intervention and illustrates this by some recent examples of (un)successful interventions. He then confronts these views and examples with a Confucian perspective and draws some important moral lessons from them. Based on this discussion, Tu concludes with several criteria to assess the viability of international intervention.

In "The Confucian Idea of Reciprocity," WU Liqun discusses how Confucianism emphasizes "this-worldly" affairs and is human-oriented. The nucleus of Confucianism is about reciprocity issues. Because Confucianism holds that the same structure applies to ethical virtues and political institutions, it offers a unique perspective on the different dimensions of reciprocity. Human nature is an important clue to interpret reciprocity issues. Confucianism states that we should keep our eyes open for human nature when we investigate human real life and ideal life, which are fundamental themes in Confucianism. Wu shows that Confucianism distinguishes two dimensions of reciprocity: One is reality-oriented for real life and the other is transcendence-oriented for the ideal life. On the one hand, Ritual *(Li)* and Social Virtue *(Ren)* embody the dimension of reality. People realize their essential attribute of being human in "this-world." On the other hand, *Tao* manifests the transcendent dimension. *Tao,* which is also regarded as an essential attribute of human beings, is about spiritual values that surpass the concrete "this-world" and reveal an inherent aspiration of transcending "this-world."

Part IV focuses on the problem of reciprocity between cultures and nations in an era of globalization. Peter JONKERS asks whether "Reciprocity

Can Be the Principle of a Global Ethics." He argues that reciprocity is an ethical principle in almost all religious and secular cultures and philosophies of the world. However, the attempts to implement this principle in a globalized world have been unsuccessful. The "Declaration Toward a Global Ethics" (1993) tried to solve this problem based on the principle of reciprocity. However, despite its obvious merits, this Declaration has raised fundamental criticisms, and Jonkers discusses two of them. The first one stresses the importance of the economy of the gift, which goes beyond reciprocity. A society based on the principle of reciprocity alone is unforgiving because it fails to take into account the importance of asymmetric relations, i.e., the altruistic attitude of giving something without expecting something in return. Therefore, the principle of reciprocity needs to be complemented by an economy of gift, based on the abundance of love. The second critical response confronts the principle of reciprocity with the challenge of particular ethical traditions. What is the relevance of a global ethic if it proves unable to address concrete, pressing moral questions? Ethical life does not only rest on moral obligations but needs to be nourished and substantiated by the experience of the good life. These moral sources are particular, bound to the specific way of life in a given community. To bridge the gap between universal moral principles and particular traditions, Jonkers concludes that one should start from a profound self-reflection on one's tradition. This means that a global ethic does not emerge by transcending particular traditions, but by taking the insights of these concrete traditions seriously. This can lead to the recognition that other people can endorse the same moral principle (e.g., the principle of reciprocity) from a different point of view than ours, i.e., from their embeddedness in a different tradition.

ZAIRU NISHA's paper entitled "Vedic Ideals of Reciprocity for the Globalized World" observes that during the last three decades the term "globalization" has been used to characterize the emerging future shape of the world. A reading of the literature on globalization indicates that the votaries and critics of globalization pick up selective features to present rosy or bleak scenarios in support of their respective opposite claims. It seems arbitrary, unfair, and misleading to make a selective pick to imagine and construct one's preferred narrative for the future yet to come. Zairu Nisha argues that, despite the story of conflicts, wars, brutal oppressions, what is common to the entire humanity is an aspiration to live in peace, harmony, and cooperation. We need to recognize the urgency of taking decisions at the global level to work together for saving the planet Earth from disaster. Zairu Nisha attempts to work out how the Vedic ideals of reciprocity can be used for the sharing of information, skills, and resources to make the world a less dangerous and less insecure place for humanity to live as a family. This is expounded in the *Rig Veda* in terms of "Vasudhaiv Kutumbhakam" i.e., the world is a family.

Irina BOLDONOVA in her paper "A Hermeneutic Dialogue for Sustainable Development" illustrates the application of a hermeneutic methodology for the justification of a dialogue among such bordering countries as Russia, China, and Mongolia regarding common actions in the achievement of

reciprocity in a Eurasian context, including the Lake Baikal Nature Reserve. The hermeneutic mode in the relationship of the neighboring countries is connected with the concept of sustainable development and focuses on the perspectives of mutual cooperation around the Baikal region, which was announced as the model territory of transition to sustainable development, or a platform for the implementation of environmentally-protecting technologies and social projects. The countries have already been engaged in a dialogue on concerns raised by the global age.

The principles of philosophical hermeneutics, such as the hermeneutic circle and interpretation, the dialectics of question-answer, understanding history, prejudices, fore-conception of completeness as part of pre-understanding, the importance of cultural tradition, etc., provide a framework for the scientific-analytical approach realized in Boldonova's paper. The main subject of research is a comparative view of traditional Confucian moral values and traditional ethnic-ecological values applied to the level of environmental awareness, and their importance as heuristic resources for sustainable development and philosophical reflection in the future. The theory of sustainable development, a new paradigm of a mentality and an ecological type of civilization, is supposed to rethink moral values and teaches how to balance human material satisfaction and these moral values. This new vision would place the inner world and moral values on a higher level than material satisfaction.

The analysis of dialogic relations also contains certain issues concerning the sustainable development of the Baikal region: preservation and environmental protection of natural resources, watershed and forest management, green economics and ecotourism, and other topics. The use of the hermeneutic approach provides a more holistic interpretation and a deep understanding of reciprocity between different cultures and countries.

Olayiwola Victor OJO discusses "Sino-Nigeria Relations: Exploring the Roles at Play" by showing that Sino-Nigeria ties have been growing for many years. Bilateral relations between these countries have expanded, based on economic complementarities rooted in growing bilateral trade and strategic cooperation. The surge in terms of bilateral trade between the Asian giant and the most populous country in Africa has made Nigeria the third-largest trading partner of China in Africa. Thus, China has provided extensive economic, military, and political support for Nigeria while Nigeria has since become an important source of oil and petroleum for China's rapidly growing economy and huge population. Ojo explores the roles at play between the two countries, focusing on the historical development of the China-Nigeria relations; his paper also investigates the nature, benefits, and character of the economic and trade relations and other strategic cooperation between Nigeria and China.

Rachel CHAN Suet Kay speaks about "Reciprocal Bilingualism: The Case of "Bananas," or Purely English-Speaking Malaysian Chinese." In her view, in the conceptualization of the bridge between individualism and collectivism in the era of globalization, one dimension that can be examined is language. The effort to overcome linguistic divides may indicate a greater

level of cosmopolitanism. Chan examines the case of multilingual socialization through education and mass media. The case in point is a group of Malaysian Chinese who have received education in the English language and the national Malay language, and are not literate in the Chinese language. In Malaysia, due to the availability of multilingual education systems, there are Malaysian Chinese who choose to pursue Chinese-language education and those who do not. Research has shown that collectivist values tend to be associated with students who attend Chinese-medium schools, while individualist values tend to be associated with students who attend English-medium schools. Chan's study delves into the phenomenology of interaction among the English-literate Malaysian Chinese, colloquially known as "bananas" (white on the inside) with their Chinese-literate counterparts. By using a focus group interview, she identifies values of reciprocity among these individuals, discerned through their exchange of meanings with one another. The role of education and mass media as agents of socialization is discussed. Chan locates these values as important cultural capital in the context of globalization and the need for enhanced competitiveness in a global labor market.

The papers of this volume were presented at an international symposium on "Reciprocity: A Human Value in a Pluralistic World," which was held in Shanghai in June 2016 and was organized by Shanghai University and the Council for Research and Values in Philosophy.

Part I
The Nature and Characteristics of Reciprocity

10

Bisosiative Dialectic in Pluralism

Wiwik SETIYANI

Religious diversity or plurality is a necessity, for it is a source of inspiration to learn from what is taught and what values are good for humankind. Understanding the teachings of each religion can eliminate the truth claims of religion and good religious teachings that are worthwhile and *maslahah/* helpful for others can be implemented in everyday life. Religion should not only be seen at the level of theology but also in actions of its adherents. Actions of religious believers can be done through a dialectic with the public good, personal and universal. Dialectics is not limited to dialogue but must be translated into concrete actions. Human thought is a major foothold for analyzing the conditions of people in a situation of (religious) diversity. The action which is good and true based on religious teachings can create a sense of love and benefit people. *Ummatan wahidatan* is a manifestation of human values. Religious believers should reflect on other religions which can be examples of religions' goodness. One should recognize and understand pluralism as a real action. Understanding pluralism means recognizing and humanizing human beings through human values. Human reasoning is the main tool to view and generate concrete actions through a comprehensive interreligious dialogue.

Religion as Actions

People have become a major asset in realizing social harmony through various activities. Social harmony is a picture of a society that is dynamic and creative. A harmonious society can be realized if a religious community can implement good behaviors. Religious doctrines should be contextual, not textually understood. Hence, religion itself is not the main purpose, but the benefit of people, as described in the Qur'an:

> Indeed, Allah does not feel shy in citing any parable, be it that of a gnat or something above it (in meanness). Now, as for those who believe, they know it is the truth from their Lord; while those who disbelieve say, "What could Allah have meant by this parable?" By this He lets many go astray, and by this, He makes many find guidance. But He does not let anyone go astray thereby except those who are sinful (Qur'an 2:26, Mufti Taqi Usmani translation)

Through the guidance of a religious person, people come closer to God and expect His Grace. Good deeds multiply the vertical (religious) and hori-

zontal (social) dimension. Religion comes with the mission of kindness, sacredness and is loaded with universal values. Its goal is that people live in peace and harmony with the environment by the rules and teachings of God. Religion teaches people unity and peace and mutual respect. Indeed, every religion has its own teachings and uniqueness in social life. Peace and unity of the *Umat* (*ukhuwah wat}ani>yah/ ukhuwah insa>niyah*) is a normative teaching of Islam, which respects not only religious differences but also the diversity of race, gender, nationality, and ethnicity. The Qur'an teaches universal brotherhood and the acceptance of pluralism in a society that can generate social harmony.

Religious diversity is a necessity. When explaining the importance of religious harmony, Swami Bhajananda points out that there are two significant reasons: first, religious conflicts are caused either internally, namely, by religious doctrines looking at "other religions," or externally, that is, by the manipulation of religion by outsiders. Second, the history of religious conflict is largely due to the issue of religious independence. These two reasons indicate that religion is conceived only vertically, not horizontally, thus the offense occurs among religious followers. Therefore, attention to religion should not only be theological, vertical, but also horizontal. A horizontal interpretation of religion is constructed through community activities, in which people are closely related to one another and develop an attitude of appreciation and belonging (tolerance). The attitude is necessary because mutual tolerance would not cause wars but peace, harmony, and respect for each other. This can foster social harmony. Islam teaches social harmony through mutual help among people.

According to Bourdieu's theory of habitus and field, habitus can be described as the logic of the game in a practical sense that encourages agents to act and react practically, while a field is a concrete social situation governed by a set of objective social relations. Adherents of religion play a role in building social harmony in their environment through religious activities. Understanding Islam should not only take place at the level of doctrine but also cover the implementation through concrete activities. This could have an impact on people. Teaching routine activities can help the community or congregation understand religion more deeply to establish patterns of healthy relationships and social services by sharing with others love, which would be a buffer zone and give birth to harmony among communities. These attitudes are implementations of religion as acts or behaviors which spawn social harmony. Hence, belief in religion, in confident interpretations of truth, meaning, and intention is very urgent. Adherents of religion carry out obligations, such as the implementation of religious teachings (religious rituals). This implementation may establish togetherness, solidarity, kindness, and most importantly create peace and harmony between people. Therefore, there are two things necessary to understand religion: first, the history of religion must be seen and understood without exception as a cultural phenomenon. Second, the cultural experience before the modern era was based on the locus of the community alone. Religion, as a social construction, was related to the system

of symbols in which people found a universal meaning in their social living. All societies have ways of thinking and patterns of behavior, and people are expected to have the maturity to understand religion properly through the implementation of religious teachings in everyday life.

Interfaith as Pluralism

Religious life constantly refers to the teachings of religion as a guideline to be true theologically. Each religion has a horizontal impact on humans and the universe. The belief of adherents of a doctrine becomes a medium for dialogue and for religious thought to be translated into life: Translating each faith should result in the decision that leads to actions with a view of the good of all humankind.

Actions of religious followers who have the right intention can lead to a good competition between religions, as in the teaching of Islam, which teaches competition in goodness. Goodness in every religion's teaching can be applied by any religious observant. Observance of religious teachings is the duty of every believer who loves his/her religion. There are three important aspects: first, to understand the process of salvation; second, to make changes correctly; and third, to achieve these naturally. Different interpretations can give birth to different actions, for example, the implementation of religious celebrations with a variety of rituals. Rituals become cultural as well as characteristic of the present culture; religions without cultures can emerge, but cultures without religions cannot. Cultural actions in the name of religion can give birth to a variety of inter-religious groups with the purpose of safe transformations.

Among the solutions in the name of religious processes, changes and objectives acquire the appreciation of the faithful. The practice of religious celebration is the action of salvation in a religious ceremony in Java, Indonesia. Geertz classifies four sections: first, the salvation of life crisis, such as birth, circumcision, marriage, and death; second, the salvation of the events in the calendar; third, social integration; and fourth, non-normal events, for example, leaving for a long journey, moving, changing the name of a person, chronic disease, witchcraft, etc. A wide variety of actions executed in a culture can be understood as an expression of pluralism. The diversity of religious communities is a necessity in society and shapes society in the form of a cultural collectivity. Through religious practices, religious people find the meeting point of religion which gives birth to social harmony irrespective of ideology, tribe, gender, nationality, and ethnicity. Pluralism enables one to solve cultural differences. The Qur'an teaches universal brotherhood and the acceptance of pluralism in society.

The history of Islam in Indonesia, especially in Java, is dominated by clerics (*kyai, Ajengan, master teacher, tengku, buya*), whose role and position have contributed to the Islamic community. The struggle at the level of both formal religious institutions and informal local leaders forms a relationship that is not based on organization. Religious actors have a major influence in

shaping the culture because believers trust the truth that is based on the local clerical leadership and the leadership of the institution of Islamic organizations. The local leadership is the inspiration and foundation of religious believers. This fosters a culture of local wisdom, which is a form of pluralism with a mission of salvation for all people.

All religions aim at salvation and truth-value following the argument of their respective religions. In pluralism, they should not be compared or contrasted. The reality of pluralism is a necessity of thought and human action when unity is needed. Pluralism is a view that all religions are on the same road to the core of religious reality. No one is superior to the other because all religions are considered valid to God. As revealed by Nicholas Rescher, the appreciation of pluralism means to appreciate the view of the other either individually or collectively. This view is also confirmed in Islamic thought, in that is there is no compulsion in religion, reality can be understood by doing acts of kindness through religious teachings.

Understanding Religion with Dialectics

Religion teaches dogmas (theology) about the Lord. Religious dogma can be applied not only vertically, but also horizontally. The implementation of religious teachings often results in understanding of religion as an ideology, whereas religion is a higher value than ideology. Many people present religion as a source of ideology to its adherents. However, religious understanding spawns a variety of interpretations, which can create a new culture in the community. The interaction of religion and culture has two different aspects, namely a vertical and a horizontal one. Horizontal interpretation is constructed through the dialectic of society. Dialectics between people in the generation of ideas is diverse. The implementation of religious teachings is done by establishing interreligious relations through dialectic, which serves as a communication bridge between religious communities. Religion, along with the culture of the region, builds tolerance in the community. From an Islamic perspective, several ways can be used as a foothold in the framework of thinking; first, the belief of every Muslim and mutual respect for any religion or any culture; second, people of different religions as the reality of God's will and personal choice of each people; third, every Muslim not burdened with the infidels; fourth, every Muslim following justice, doing good deeds, and not violating the law.

There are two ways to understand religion, the metaphysical aspect (belief) and aspects of expression (tradition). Beliefs and traditions always form religious history, a collection of important stories through which a tradition is known and understood cumulatively in the wider community. Cumulative tradition is not static but alive and dynamic, because cumulative traditions are active participants in shaping the convergence of human diversity. Convergence always exists in particular religions or religious traditions, which look at other religious traditions as their own. The experience of other traditional

religions should be interpreted as a cultural heritage in general and not considered strange or irrelevant because they are also involved in the life of God. A dialectics of religion can be done with some religious teachings, such as those concerning God, rituals, traditions, and mysteries. All religions believe in God, although the mention of God varies in Islam (Allah), Christianity (the Father in Heaven), or Hindu-Buddhism (*Sang Hyang Widi wasa*). These religions believe that God's religion is a universal religion. Each religion has a normative foundation contained in its holy book.

Aspects of ritual, tradition, and mysticism in every religion have things in common, although they are different in execution. In this respect, religion has both outside (exoteric) and inside (esoteric) characteristics. According to Frithjof Schuon's explanation of the goals of religions, the real nature of the divine is hidden inside. The outside and inside characteristics uniquely strengthen the position of religion because religion can be studied from different points of view or approaches. Some of the approaches emphasize that religion is universally well-studied at the level of authenticity. Interreligious dialectics show that Islam recommends doing good to people of other faiths. This principle is also taught in all religions: to keep a good relationship with anyone. Tolerance or understanding other religions is the key to religious life. The symbol of the power of religion can be seen in the form of worship of different religions, for instance, mosques, churches, synagogues, and temples. Practices or religious rituals are performed in each religion as a form of submission to a higher force. On the other hand, the practice of religion as a social and cultural force is also important because the dialectics of religion is the actualization of the theology of humanity.

Muslims are *Khayr ummah ummah Wasat*, which means that Muslims should be able to realize themselves in society with three requirements: first, Muslims can live together with followers of other religions and should not separate themselves from and shut down global life; second, the unity of Muslims and Islamic solidarity should not lead to ethnocentrism or acts of aggression, rather Muslims should cooperate in maintaining peace and promoting morality; third, Muslims should always be willing to listen and learn from the experiences of others and take good things.

The dialectic of the real meaning of religion for human life is logical reasoning, not a narrow viewpoint to understand their religion. The dialectics of religion is a key driver in building strong relationships. The attitude of respect for one another is also a key to producing the ideals of the religions of all nations. Lofty ideals bequeathed to religious communities can create a peaceful order to form a harmonious life that gives birth to culture. Religion is not history, but religious life bears historical and cultural forms. Interesting and unique events are complex phenomena, which can be used as a science to form a logic of history that encompasses power politics, science, social, legal and cultural, and religious phenomena. The essence of dialectics of religions is to explain the achievements of religions to reach "civilization."

Bisosiative Dialectics

The main requirement of dialectics is to find the right way to build interreligious communication. Relationship with one another is the dialectical relationship of mutual interest, with two important parts, the transformation at the macro level, and the revolution at the micro level. The dialectics on macro and micro levels must go through a long process to maximize results.

Contemplation and thought processes performed by the religious communities should be based on rational interpretation. Whereas people who are not religious need to get an explanation and understanding based on reflections and ideas, religion will be able to dialogue with any situation (cultural, political, legal, economic, etc.) at any time. Religion should always be in contact with any subject whose activity is oriented to the values of life taught by religion and who has a rational attitude in responding to any situation. To understand the dialectics of religion, we should consider the whole range of instruments and functions. The role of instruments and the functions of religion is to bring together the power of religious communities in various forms of activities.

Dialectics is done in the form of individual dialogue, which produces a variety of interpretations of each individual based on logical argument. Individual logic allows the logical form of dialectic and understanding of the teachings in the social context to occur through the dialectic of universal interpretation. In the esoteric aspects of religion, religion can only be understood by individuals based on a development that does not neglect an individual's experience as an actor. Dialectics in the form of good dialogue, personal, particular, and universal, enable individual actors to develop their potential through knowledge of objects that produce social values and economic and even political morality. The strength of the individual (subject) and knowledge (object) is to be able to read the situation and the conditions to achieve the objective benefit of the people. The individual with the object of knowledge can analyze social issues and can provide insight to the community. However, people need to understand the mismatch between expectations and what is actually happening with the unity of the community and the culture. The attitude of people is a form of struggle with a variety of strategies aiming at instilling public confidence in social belief (for instance, empathetic behavior through religion).

Frameworks as bisosiative dialectic should take into account a variety of strategies and make the process of dialogue a natural one in ways of a soft manner and a rational interpretation. There are two ways to do this: to understand one's thinking as different from the way of thinking and acting; and to be able to distinguish between oneself and others. The ability of organization is needed to shape a proper personality. The eclectic system of choice is to get the right answer by combining and seeking appropriate solutions with different groups.

Pluralist Actions Produce Bisosiative Actions

The view of pluralism is the right choice because it pays attention to the phenomenon of an increasingly complex society. Pluralism appreciates and understands differences as inevitable, and sees that all religions are on the same road to the core of religious reality. No religion is superior to any other because all religions are considered valid to God. Human beings as God's creatures have a proper way to understand differences of religion, ethnicity, language, tradition, or culture. As Nicholas Rescher explains, to appreciate the existence of pluralism is to appreciate the view of individuals or groups. The ability of individuals to appreciate the views of individuals or groups means to be able to establish an open dialogue with other people.

Pluralism is not an abstract idea or thought. The product of an attitude or action is based on four important aspects: to have an open attitude; to appreciate tolerance; to uphold democratic values; and to create a pluralistic society. The individual attitude that seeks to combine the logic of reason and social reality is called bisosiative action. Bisosiative action can be understood as behaviors or actions of individuals who want to have a meaningful interpretation of the individual's information. Interpretation of individuals is through the generative process of the cognitive formation of ideas or ideas implemented in actions. Individual action is a process of self-realization and emanation, which have a mysterious meaning. The effects of these actions also have a subjective meaning for those who direct the actions of others. Bisosiative action is not obtained only through cognition but also through the affectivity of individuals, namely, by giving explanations in a way that is independent of an objective relation with surrounding people and with the community. Individuals or groups who recognize and understand pluralism are those who always keep the dynamics of society as a form of bisosiative action. The goal is to maintain the sustainability or viability of the secured environment to keep it dynamic and constructive.

Conclusion

Dialectics is one appropriate method to understand pluralism in society. There are three forms of dialectics, the particular dialectic, personal dialectic, and universal dialectic. Individual actors initiate dialectics by integrating personality through bisosiative action. Bisosiative action is the implementation of ideas or thoughts in generative processes of various dialectics with social reality.

Pluralism is a cultural product that originates from the diversity of the complex social reality and gives rise to new thinking for deep analysis. Bisosiative thought contributes significantly to actions with due regard to particular matters, values, etc. It is universal. The diversity of the complex world is a necessity for bisosiative action. Pluralism as a product of culture or religion continues to color world civilization. Bisosiative thought provides an

alternative solution that contributes to reinforcing the meaning of actions of individual actors in the understanding of pluralistic societies.

Bibliography

Adler, Mortimer J. *Truth in Religion the Plurality of Religions and the Unity of Truth.* New York: Macmillan, 1990.

Ahluwalia, Muninder K. and Anjali Alimchandani. "A Call to Integrate Religious Communities into Practice: The Case of Sikhs." Accessed June 20, 2014. http://www.apa.org/education/ce/integrate-religious-communities.pdf.

al Qar}d}a>wy Yu>suf. *Ghoir al Muslimii>n fi> al Mujtama' al Isla>my.* Accessed March 20, 2014. lihat www.al-mustafa.com.

Badawi, Jamal A. *Hubungan Antar-agama: Sebuah Perspektif Islam.* In *Memahami Hubungan Antar-agama.* Translated by Burhanuddin Dzikri. Yogyakarta: Sukses Offset, 2007.

Barkun, Michael. *A Culture of Conspiracy Apocalyptic Visions in Contemporary America.* Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press, 2003.

Berry, Bonnie. *Social Rage Emotion and Cultural Conflict.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1999.

Bhajananda, Swami. *Harmony of Religion from Standpoint of Sri Ramakrisna and Swami Vivekananda,* Kolkota: Ramakrisna Mission Institute of Culture, 2007.

Bleeker, C. J. *Pertemuan Agama-Agama Dunia: Menuju Humanisme Religius dan Perdamaian Universal.* Translated by Syafaruddin. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Dian Pratama, 2004.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Arena Produksi Kultural; Sebuah Kajian Sosiologi Budaya.* Bantul: Kreasi Wacana, 2012.

Cahill, Michael. *The Environment and Social Policy.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Cantwell, Wilfred Smith. *Kitab Suci Agama-Agama.* Translated by Dede Iswadi. Jakarta: Mizan, 2005.

Durkheim. Emile. *The Elementary Form of Religious Life.* Translated by Karen E. Fields. New York: The Free Press, 1995.

Edgar, André and Peter Sedgwick. *Key Concepts in Cultural Theory.* New York: Routledge, 1999.

Fraklin, Adrian. *Nature and Social Theory.* London: Sage, 2002.

Gabriel, Markus. "The Dialectic of the Absolute: Hegel's Critique of Transcendent Metaphysic." In *The Dimension of Hegel's Dialectics*, edited by Nectarios G. Limnatis. New York: Continuum, 2010.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Hegel's Dialectic: Five Hermeneutical Studies.* Translated by P. Christoper Smith. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976.

Gal, Ofer and Raz Chen-Morris. "Empiricism without the Senses: The Instrument Replaced the Eye." In *The Body as Object and Instrument of*

Knowledge, edited by Charles T. Wolfe and Ofer Gal. New York-London: Springer, 2010.

Geertz Clifford. *Religion of Java*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Greyerz, Kaspar von. *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Europe 1500-1800*. Translated by Thomas Dunlap. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Hick, John. "The Next Step Beyond Dialogue" In *The Myth of Religious Superiority a Multifaith Exploration*, edited by Paul F. Knitter. New York: Orbis Book, 2005.

Hidayat, Komaruddin. *Agama untuk Kemanusiaan dalam Atas Nama Agama*. Bandung: Pustaka Hidayah, 1998.

------. "Dilema Obyektifitas Agama." *Jurnal PERTA* 4, no. 1 (2001).

Hilmy, Masdar. *Islam, Politik dan Demokrasi: Pergulatan antara Agama, Negara dan Kekuasaan.* Surabaya: Imtiyaz, 2014.

Keene, James J. "Baha'i World Faith: Redefinition of Religion." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 6, no. 2 (Autumn, 1967).

Kleman, David E. and William Schweiker. *Religion and the Human Future. An Essay on Theological Humanism.* Singapore: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Klemola, Juhani, ed. *Type of Variation, Dialectal and Typological Interfaces.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1984.

Kuntowijoyo. *Muslim Tanpa Masjid: Essai-Essai Agama, Budaya dan Politik dalam Bingkai Strukturalisme Transendental.* Bandung: Mizan, 2001.

Machasin. *Struggle for Authority between Formal Religious Institution and Informal-Local Leaders.* In *Varieties of Religious Authority*, edited by Azyumardi Azra and Kees Van Dijk. Singapore: ISEAS, 2010.

Madjid, Nurcholish. *Islam Doktrin Dan Peradaban.* Jakarta: Dian Rakyat, Paramadina, 2008.

Mcgrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: an Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Mingers, John. "Information, Meaning, and Communication: an Autopoietic Approach." In *Sociocybernetics: Complexity, Autopoiesis and Observation of Social Systems.* London: Greenwood, 2007.

Mondal, Anshuman A. *Nationalism and Post-Colonial Identity: Culture and Ideology in India and Egypt.* London: Routledge, 2003.

Moore, G. E. "The Value of Religion." *International Journal of Ethics* 12, no. 1 (October 1991).

Munawar, Budhy al-Rachman. *Ensiklopedi Nurcholish Madjid, Pemikiran Islam di kanvas Peradaban.* Jakarta: Mizan, 2006.

------. *Islam Pluralis: Wacana Kesetaraan Kaum Beriman.* Jakarta: Paramadina, 2001.

Nevins, Andrew. *Locality in Wovel Harmony Linguistic Inquiry Monographs.* Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2010.

O'dea, Thomas F. *Sosiologi Agama Suatu Pengenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rajawali, 1987.

OsmaFathi. "Islam and Human Rights, the Challenge to Muslim and The World." In *Rethinking Islam and Modernity*, edited by Abdel Wahab El-Effandi. London: The Islamic Foundation, 2001.

Parsons, Talcott. *Sociological Theory,* New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Rawls, John. *A Brief Inquiry into the Meaning of Sin and Faith with on my Religion.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Rescher, Nicholas. *Pluralism: Against the Demand of Consensus.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Rifa'I, Muhammad Abduh. "Textual and Kontextual Interpretation. Toward Religious Harmony in Indonesia." In *Antologi Studi Agama*, edited by Rahmat Fadjri. Yogyakarta: Jurusan Perbandingan Agama, 2012.

Sarfuddin, Endang Anshari. *Ilmu Filsafat dan Agama.* Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 1987.

Schuon, Frithjof. *Form and Substance in the Religions.* Bloomington, IN: World Wisdom, 2002.

Setiyani, Wiwik. "Hak Azasi Manusia dalam Wacana Keislaman di Indonesia." *Jurnal Islamedia* 11, no. 1 (2011).

Sewell Jr., William H. *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Smart, Barry. *Michael Foucault Key Sociologist.* New York: Routledge, 2002.

Smart, Ninian. "Sebuah Pengantar." In *Aneka Pendekatan Studi Agama,* edited by Peter Cornnolly. Jakarta: Lkis, 2012.

Thompson, Michael, Richard Ellis and Aaron Wildavsky. *Cultural Theory.* San Francisco, CA: Westview Press, 1990.

Vitz, Paul C. *Religion as Psychology: The Cult of Self-Worship.* Michigan, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.

Voltaire. *Traktat Toleransi.* Yogyakarta: Lkis, 2004.