Jewish–Christian dialogue has thrived during the last few decades, attracting both public and scholarly attention. The dialogue has mostly occurred between the liberal sects of Christianity and Judaism, which share a common politico-cultural vision that transcends their differences. This has apparently been facilitated by the weakening of radical Christian and Jewish voices, who are allegedly hostile to interreligious relations, as well as the emergence of moderate dialogical approaches that enable rational and pragmatic interfaith discussion. Jewish–Christian dialogue has particularly evolved in the predominantly secular and liberal setting of the postwar West and utilizes a modern, regulated, and universal religious language.

However, there are two limitations of this common perception of the nature and scope of Jewish–Christian dialogue. First, it does not fully reflect the concept of dialogue. As suggested by the studies discussed at the workshop, several dialogical initiatives do not meet liberal criteria, which assume a rational agreement about the place of religious commitment and its contribution to a diverse society. In fact, and surprisingly, dialogical inclinations occur in illiberal settings. Second, the liberal narrative of Jewish–Christian dialogue mainly focuses on the geographical and political settings of Europe and North America, ignoring other regions and their unique concerns. Non-Western dialogical initiatives utilize alternative religious languages and have political objectives that are often explicitly opposed to those of liberals.

Toward establishing a broad approach to religious dialogue, the workshop focused on two activities. First, the participants conducted an empirical examination of a variety of projects performed in contexts usually not considered amenable to dialogical logic due to their being narrowly understood. Exposition of such initiatives, which are often neglected in the liberal dialogical framework, directly contributes to a better understanding of Jewish–Christian dialogue in its variety. Second, the workshop participants used a critical examination of a variety of dialogical initiatives to examine the logic behind the basic concept of dialogue. The objective was to develop a language suitable for diverse dialogues and thereby stimulate new thinking including on issues that have hitherto been narrowly understood within the liberal dialogical framework.