

1. Religious experience is surely an experience of the type you would call "intentional" (Method in Theology, passim); that is, it is "experience of . . . ." But you do not call it, as many writers do, "experience of God". Could you describe the intentionality of religious experience?
2. The paper, "Prolegomena . . .", accepts the view that there is a common factor in the religious experience of different world religions, with their differences attributable to the suprastructure of their formulations in the context of various traditions or milieux. The Christian finds a basis for this view in his doctrine (v.g., in 1 Tim. 1:4), but that does not provide a basis for dialogue among the religions. Some students of world religions attempt to find a common element through analysis of the different expressions, formulations, objectifications of the religious experience; but then the adherents of a particular religion are apt to repudiate what the students are saying they (the adherents) really experience. Is there a third way to approach the "common" factor; if not, can one improve the use of the two that are mentioned above?
3. It does not seem that the Christian can ever regard other world religions as anything but inferior to his; at best they are perhaps some kind of praeparatio evangelica for the Christian message. It is perhaps a question for Christians themselves (and the author of PROLEGOMENA... might venture an opinion on this) whether their claim to absolutism can be mitigated; but what can be said more generally of the effects of such a claim on dialogue among the religions?
4. You seem pessimistic about the achievement of self-knowledge (end, p.3) yet the second enlightenment seems to be based on it and require it. Would you comment?
5. Would you consider the work of Ira Progoff to add to what you speak of on pp. 4, 5?
6. You speak of "The line of least resistance" of large establishments (p.8), later (end p. 12) you speak of a role for the second enlightenment in countering alienation caused by them. Would you see a possibility of their transformation from within?
7. You speak (p. 9) of maximization of profit as disastrous. Could you please enlarge on this?
8. Would you comment on the relation of your own work in Method in Theology to the aspirations of Whitson and Panikkar?