

BUDDHISM IN DOING INTERRELIGIOUS CONNECTION

(Study in Mindfulness from Thich Nhat Hanh)

Abdul Mujib*

Abstract

Buddhism as religion which prioritizes human being is more open than other religions. In this paper, I examine how Buddhism relates to other religions which have theological concepts, even though Buddhism also has relation into social engagement. I also discuss how Buddhism as a way of life can philosophically encounters with other philosophical religions. Therefore, I view Buddhism as theology or philosophy and also as social in the same time. I will show that although Buddhism does not have concept of God, yet it can build interreligious relation with theistic religions. Therefore, socially engaged and interior dialogue (meditation) can be alternatives for Buddhists to do interreligious connection.

Keywords:...?

A. Background

Buddhism is a religion which has humanistic character. It is not a religion in general sense such as Islam, Christianity and Judaism. Three of them have God concept, but Buddhism does not have it. Because of this reason, in many cases, Buddhism frees to have interreligious connection. Buddhists are not bordered by many rules in establishing interreligious relation.

In conducting interreligious relation, it is still strange for Buddhism because they have different principle's view with other religions, especially in theological concept. Many religions held interreligious relation because of many similarities in their theological concept which can unite them. Theology is basic factor for religions, especially for Abrahamic religions to build interreligious connection, because theologically, it consists narrative story that they, in fact, have similar root and background.

Thich Nhat Hanh as one of Buddhism scholars and also as a monk has an important role to bring Buddhism as peace building. He propagandizes the idea of honoring diversity. He states Buddhism cannot be Buddhism

without other elements, such as Islam, Christianity, or Judaism. He emphasizes that other elements is the main factor to make Buddhism exists (Hanh, 2010: 57).

However, Buddhism has different way to conduct interreligious connection, because of uniqueness as aforementioned. In this paper, there are two questions which describe the trajectory of this paper: First, what is Buddhism's theology that becomes foundation in conducting interreligious connection, according to Thich Nhat Hanh? Secondly is How Buddhists conduct interreligious connection in social engagement?

B. Theology of Buddhism

As stated before, Buddhism in the beginning did not have theological concept. At later period, it has for the sake of legalization, so that Buddhism is regarded as religion. In Indonesian case, if Buddhism did not have system of theology, it would be 'victim' of missionary such as Islam and Christianity. Therefore, in the beginning, Buddhism has arranged a doctrine that has used to introduce their God. Yet, in fact, the Buddha's doctrine is Buddhism's way to eliminate clinging to things, including toward God concept. In Buddhism, clinging to anything only makes *dukkha* (suffering) (Dhirasekera, 1979: 257).

The concept of theology, at glance, is not only important in discussing interreligious relation. Interreligious relation can also be done by social life or social engagement, and establishing interreligious does not always relate with theology. However, for some religious people, they will problematize it through the root of theology. Thereby, academically, we have to discuss from many possible aspects which relate with interreligious relation.

In Buddhism, it is said there are three kinds of characteristic of existence: *anicca*, *dukkha*, *anatta*. (Bodhi, 2000: 37). *Anicca* is Pali language and it has meaning that everything, both mental and physical, is impermanent. Secondly is *Dukkha* means mental due to attachment to something.. Thirdly is *Anatta*, that all is without permanent set. If people have eliminated their clinging, they will not experience mental (Knitter, 2009: 218-219).

Buddhism also has a concept which is forced to be a theological concept, though Buddhist does not believe in it. However, for some religions, it is used for them to make connection with Buddhism as theological or philosophical perspective. The concepts are the true life (*atma*) and the absolute (*brahman*). In the concept of God, that term is regarded as initiator or identically to the purpose, which is God. Buddha also explained the existence of

cycle-of-births-and-deaths, *samsara*, as driven by action-linked-to-its-results, *karma*. Buddhists, in this term, are looking for *nirvana*, (the liberation from the cyclical predicament, through the realization of either the identity or the intimacy of the self and the absolute) (Cornille, 2013, 189).

Jayatilke also comments about theology and says “I think that one of the reasons why Buddhism adopted a non-dogmatic attitudes was that at its very inception it had to face a plurality of contending religio-philosophic theories about the nature and destiny of man” (Jayatilke, 1975: 4). From this, Buddhists are very emphasizing non-dogmatic, because very often, dogmatic only cause violence, even war.

C. The Prominent Figures in Buddhism

1. Thich Nhat Hanh

Thich Nhat Hanh is a Vietnamese. He is one of victims in Vietnam’s conflict. Since he was child, he had been excluded to his grandmother in France, because in Vietnam’s situation did not support to be lived. In Vietnam, beside communism, it also had conflict with America. Therefore, in that nation, there was no possibility for developing the idea of freedom (Hanh, 2010: 9).

After he was in France, he studied more in his living-experience. He started thinking about the idea of “home”. When he lived in Vietnam, he did not feel like living in home, or when he lived in France. However, in once time he feels comfort because of there was no hatred. Thus, he concluded that home was shaped by the-self, it did not depend on place, situation or anything.

Hanh also argues that home is the here and the now. Home does not depend on place, thus home can be found in everywhere and anywhere. And it also happens for now; it does not depend on time or situation, but now can be found anytime. However, Hanh claims that concept of home relates with breathe. When someone can feel his breath, he will feel free, even no violence. Therefore, Hanh aptly emphasizes on mindfulness of breathing (Hanh, 2010: 25).

Regarding to suffering’s idea, he tells a lot about his experience with his mother, and he wrote it into book entitled “Together We are One”. In this book, he also reported his problem about Vietnam to Martin Luther King Jr, because when he was back to Vietnam, he could not feel home too. As com-

monly the ideas of Buddhism, if something is clinging, it only makes suffer. Therefore, home disallows in clinging.

He, then, moves the idea of home toward Buddhism. He illustrates that Buddhism and other religions are like flower. At glance, the flower seems to be alone, but when it is seen in detail and with mindfulness, growing of the flower cannot be separated from other factors, for instance soil in which flower grows and sunshine for processing photosynthesis. Therefore, Buddhism can grow and develop because of its encountering with others such as Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism. He argues that every religious people are inter-being, that they are mutually contacting and shaping unity (Hanh, 2010: 57)

Together we are one is his contemplation when he saw the difference of religion. Thich Nhat Hanh gives description that by diversity it can make us in similarity. Thereby, diversity cannot be as basic for reasoning to engage into unites into one. Instead, we can communicate with others, and we can unite into one in diversity.

2. Sulak Sivaraksa

I use concept from Sulak Sivaraksa only for emphasizing of Thich Nhat Hanh idea. Both of their ideas have many similarities in struggling freedom in diversity and establishing interreligious connection, especially from Buddhism.

Sulak Sivaraksa is one of figures from Buddhism which struggles democracy in Thailand. Generally, democracy has always embedded with freedom. The concept of freedom in Buddhism consists of three levels, that are freedom begins with generosity (*dana*), leads to moral living (*sila*), and in turn leads to mindfulness (*bhavana*). (Sivaraksa, 1998: 63).

A brief description of three levels are: First is *dana* or generosity, that is circumstance in which it does not want and moves through giving what is dear to us. Practically, it can eradicate the desire of capitalism and consumerism to the outer of world. Second is *sila* or moral, that is the foundation (for Buddhist) to conduct something. Generally, it has been become the most basic for Buddhists. It consists of five: to avoid killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, lying, and intoxication. The third is *bhavana* or mindfulness, Sivaraksa states:

“Buddhists are to make a meaningful contribution to world peace and liberation of the modern world from violence and oppression, they must confront these three root causes of evil: greed, hatred, and delusion, not only in the individual person but also in their social and structural dimensions.” (Sivaraksa, 1998: 64).

Buddhist aptly emphasizes on mindfulness. In mindfulness, people, especially for Buddhists, can control and organize themselves, thus they can give something good to others. (Sivaraksa, 1998: 66). Furthermore, Thich Nhat Hanh has repeatedly pointed out that “mindful breathing is a tool that can be used to surround feelings of hatred, greed, and delusion that arise within oneself, shining *metta* (loving kindness) onto these feelings until they crack and it is possible to look into them and see their roots”. (Sivaraksa, 1998: 67).

Beside of those levels, there is an important stuff that must be fulfilled for Buddhist. According to Sivaraksa, “*kalayanamitta* (good friends) are the most important external element for everyone. We need to have good friends, good companions, and good friendship, to learn from others in developing ourselves and our societies toward peace and justice, starting with peace and justice within ourselves”. (Sivaraksa, 1998: 68).

These figures have been using interpretation in theology for establishing interreligious connection. Sivaraksa regards that all human are friends in pursuing peace and justice. It has to embody and become social justice, not based on subjectivity only from particularly religion, but all of religious people participate in unity.

D. Inter-Religious Connection

1. A Brief History of Interreligious

Interreligious connection has been showed precisely by Islam and Christianity. A common-word document has become witness that among religions seriously conducted for peace and living harmony. It also become an extended global handshake of interreligious goodwill, friendship and consequently of the world (A Common-world, 7). Islam and Christianity, in this convenient, make a deal with in keeping peace, therefore, many points or big rules to keep peace, especially for them.

However, this document has inspired for other religions to do interreligious and has built dialogue among them. Paul Knitter distinguishes a categorization of interreligious dialogue that was initiated by Vatican council. There are four different types: (Cornille, 2013: 134)

- a) The *dialogue of theology* is based on study, the attempt to understand one another’s beliefs, doctrines, and teachings. It is more textual as well as written in sacred text in each religion. This dialogue tends to make same perception in building interreligious connection.

- b) The *dialogue of spirituality* seeks to go deeper – to the experiences that give rise to, or are brought about by, the beliefs. In this term, doing dialogue is based on mystics, so religious experience is emphasized into interreligious connection.
- c) The *dialogue of action* is where participants get their *hands* dirty – but they do so together. This interreligious dialogue is more action in social reality. Here, among religious people are mutual coexistence in living harmony and solve common problems together.
- d) The *dialogue of life* – the interaction that takes place when people from different religions live in the same neighborhood.

By these characteristics, Buddhists take the types of interreligious connection to other religious adherents. They establish in relating by theology, spirituality, action or life. Beside these types, Mega Hidayati, also shows another type. She compares interreligious dialogue connection in ways between Paul Knitter and Gadamer (she analyses Gadamer's idea in relation to interreligious dialogue). She explains that there are four kinds of interreligious dialogue (Hidayati, 2010: 47):

- a) The Replacement Model

In this model, people from other religions must have statement that their religions are also the only true religion. Thereby, there is tolerance in other world religions. However, they still need Higher Power to help them to find the solution. The similarities of truth claim must be defended from other, yet it is not for competition but it is for inviting cooperation (Hidayati, 2010: 48-52).

- b) The Fulfillment Model

Hidayati states that this model wants to balance between universality and particular of God's love (Hidayati, 2010: 52). Knitter also illustrates in Jesus save that there many ways in which God's spirit find expression in different culture and time (Knitter, 2002: 105). Therefore, Gadamer concludes that dialogue in this model does not emphasize in supporting our own opinion, but our opinion can also be strengthened by their opinion (Hidayati, 2010: 53).

- c) The Mutuality Model

The different among other models is in mutually model dialogue. It is the most important that others, prominently about appreciating in diversity or plurality. Among religious people are stepped forward to mutually need each other (Hidayati, 2010: 54). Gadamer gives require-

ment to this model that there has to a common religious experience to establish it. Because understanding outside of their tradition is the basic of this model (Hidayati, 2010: 59).

d) **The Acceptance Model**

In this model, according to Hidayati, there are no common grounds among religions, thus among religious adherents can cooperate without seeing from what religion of the opposite. Acceptance model wants to delete the border, in term of religions which always become barrier among different religious people (Hidayati, 2010: 62). In other word this model can be belonged as pragmatic.

From many kinds of interreligious models, furthermore, in terms of Catherine Cornille's "virtues for dialogue," that "a socially engaged dialogue will be able to identify or construct what *connects* the diverse religious without minimizing or exploiting what makes them diverse", I argue that by socially engagement, religious adherents can learn and open (minded) when they want to cooperate with other. They will not see basically from what theological, because they will conduct as social interest and religion's position only as supporting circumstances (Cornille, 2013: 140). In addition inter-religious dialogue has an important role to play in peace building, especially in ethno-religious identity conflicts (Cornille, 2013: 149).

2. Buddhism in Interreligious Connection

Sometimes, in inter-religious activities emerge problem. One issue that presents a problem in inter-religious worship is the difference between theistic and non-theistic religions. Buddhists, for example, do not believe in a personal creator or God. (Cornille, 2013: 96). Usually, inter-religious community conducts gathering together. They often discuss their connectivity through text scripture and ritual in pursuing God. Buddhism, here, is very complex because they do not have God's concept, but mindfulness as the way to experience peace.

With regard this problem; Michael Amaladdos divides inter-religious connection into two kinds. On the one hand, among religions can gather into one in the issue of common purposes such as how to embody harmony of life, creating and keeping peace and so forth. On the other hand, they use scripture as the foundation to determine the attitude. Thus, in second part, they have deeply relation to know each other through scripture text, song, symbol and experience with the transcendent (Cornille, 2013: 97).

However, when Buddhism is establishing interreligious connection with other religions which have theological concept (transcendent), the other religions see Buddhism which does not have theological concept. But, sometime other religions also see Buddhism has theological concept. In this part, I will describe only from world religions such as Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism.

1. Buddhism and Islam

Imtityaz Yusuf is one of scholars who focus on relation between Muslim and Buddhist. According to him, as theological, Buddha, Hindu and Islam cannot be separated. He argues the encountering between the Hindu view of *moksha* (liberation) through the Hindu notion of monism, and the Buddhist notion of *Dhamma* (Truth) through the realization *sunyata* (emptiness), and the Islamic concept of *fana'* (the passing away of one's identity by its merging into the Universal Being) are embodied in the monotheistic pantheism of the Sufis (Cornille, 2013: 362). Nevertheless Buddhism does not believe in God, but on the way to achieve God, they have same concept.

Another similarity between Buddhism and Islam is in the concepts of *al-insan al-kamil* and the *bodhisattva*. Both of them are active and practical encouragements toward emulation for religious adherents, in their aspiration to become similarly perfect human beings (Cornille, 2013: 367). In addition, these both concepts are the way from Islam and Buddhism can encounter, especially in Southeast Asia such Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, in theistic or non-theistic arena. According to Yusuf, there was dialogue among them, in Islam there is monotheistic and pantheism and in Buddhism and Hinduism with monistic and non-theistic traditions. However, this encountering, in formation of interreligious communities, brought the moral value of religious tolerance (Cornille, 2013: 369).

In social arena, there is gap between Muslim and Buddhist as minority. In Muslim minorities, automatically Buddhist as majority such as in Sri Lanka, Buddhist are concerned about maintaining their ethno-religious identities, protecting and preserving political status as citizen in face of rising Buddhism. Meanwhile in Buddhist as minority such as in Pakistan, Malaysia and Indonesia are concerned about protecting their status and freedoms in facing of the rise of Islamic puritanism, exclusivism and religious intolerance (Cornille, 2013: 370). Therefore, when they are as minority, they always make tension and probably cannot live peaceful in co-existence.

Particularly, Yusuf suggest if Islam wants to foster harmonious life between Buddhists and Muslims, probably in Indonesia which there is way such as promoting religious pluralism, protecting minority groups and building constructive relationships between Buddhist and Muslim youth leaders, as future leaders of the nation (Cornille, 2013: 372). In addition, he also raises the statement that “Without seeking to Buddhicize Islam or Islamize Buddhism, I argue that paradigms drawn from religious phenomena can serve as mediums for understanding and dialogue between these two religions and their societies” (Cornille, 2013: 371). In this term, the relationship between Islam and Buddhism is not built only from single aspect, but it must be establish by many aspects such as factors of doctrinal, ethnic, political nature, and social.

2. Buddhism and Christianity

There is similarity between Buddhists and Christian in theological concept. According to Paul O. Ingram, they are compared and contrasted not only in theological, but also in philosophical as ultimate reality, human nature, evil and suffering. It happened in the role of the historical Jesus in Christian faith and practice and the role of the Buddha in Buddhists faith and practice (Cornille, 2013: 377)

Regarding to that encountering, Sallie B. King analyzed Thich Nhat Hahn’s notions about “Socially engaged Dialogue” to describe Buddhist traditions of social activism. That notion is about “inner work,” or meditation, such as mindfulness from Thich Nhat Hanh as aforementioned, it has to emerge non-violent “outer work,” or “social engagement” with the systemic structures of injustice. In addition, Buddhist and Christian also emphasizes in interior dialogue, for example by meditation and centering prayer or contemplative prayer. Among conceptual, social engaged, and interior dialogue has different emphasizing, or they are interdependent (Cornille, 2013: 377)

In term of interior, King concludes that there are four ways to respond interior dialogue:

- 1) “A Buddhist form of dialogue would be non-confrontational in stance-one could see that it is not so much a matter of “Buddhists” and “Christians” facing each other as it is persons variously in process, in religious identity a sin all other ways.
- 2) Second, a Buddhist form of dialogue incorporating interior dialogue would emphasize the importance of and encourage the cultivation of self-knowledge and mindfulness.

- 3) Third, the interior dialogue would help ensure that one remain mindful of the hermeneutical circle and would thus properly relativize the dialogical proceedings.
- 4) Fourth, interior dialogue would also help ensure that the response of the total person, not only the intellect or only the emotions, would be engaged in the dialogue.” (King, 1990: 126)

As theologically, it has been explained by Thich Nhat Hanh about his experience in “We are One”, interior dialogue is important because it makes self-aware before encountering with other religious people. However, it becomes influential factor to know that we have changed, because of encountering. Knitter conducted it in his book that he can be Christian because he has been passing over to Buddhism. Therefore he could appraise himself as religious people after he clashed with other factors or religions (Knitter, 2009: 216).

Although Buddhists tended to be more attracted in socially engaged dialogue than theological dialogue, Christian theological dialogue with Buddhists has also interested in connecting Buddhism to issues of social, environmental, economic, and gender justice.

Thich Nhat Hahn has important role to introduce “socially engaged of Buddhism” in description Buddhist when anti-war movement in Vietnam (Cornille, 2013: 383)

Ingram defines Buddhist social engagement into three elements.

“First, Buddhist social activism in all of its forms must, in the words of Thich Nhat Hahn, “be peace” in order to “make peace.” Or as Dalai Lama phrases the same principle, “Everyone loves to talk about calm and peace, whether in family, national or international contexts, but without *inner* peace, how can we make peace real? *Second*, this means that Buddhist understandings of compassion are not only grounded in the doctrine of interdependence, but also in the doctrine of non-self. *Third*, the doctrine of *karma* plays an important role in Buddhist practice of social engagement in two ways: (1) the role karma plays in the construction of one’s present and future identity, and (2) violent reaction against a person who does injury, that is, returning violence with violence, always causes negative results for both the receiver of violence and the perpetrator of violence.” (Cornille, 2013: 384).

The idea of peace becomes foundation to conduct social engagement, and also the replying of what we have done to other. Here, *karma* is really convicted by Buddhists in order to they can become Buddha. If as social engagement doing peace, so they will get peace as replying.

In contemporary Christian and Buddhist encounter, the idea of conceptual, socially engaged, and interior dialogue are interdependent. Conceptual dialogue and interior dialogue apart from socially engaged dialogue is dead for the same reasons that “faith without works” is dead. In central point of Christian and Buddhist practice or dialogue is to liberate of human beings and all creatures in nature from forces and injustice, and also mutual creative transformation of persons in community with nature (Cornille, 2013: 391).

3. Buddhism and Hinduism

As said by Yusuf, Buddhism and Hinduism have the same historical background. Because of same historical background, in many parts, they have similarities and dissimilarities. Their debating is in philosophically. Either Hinduism or Buddhism has many similarities in Upanishad, such as the true life (*atma*) and the absolute (*brahman*). In the concept of God, that term is regarded as initiator or identically to the destination, which is God. In Buddha also explained that they believe life is cycle-of- births-and deaths, *samsara*, as driven by action-linked-to-its-results, *karma*. Buddhist, in this term, is looking for *moksa*, (the liberation from the cyclical predicament, through the realization of either the identity or the intimacy of the self and the absolute) (Cornille 2013, 189).

There are many problems in relation between Buddhism and Hinduism. Historically, when they encounter with other, they always restrict in philosophical tradition. According to David Peter Lawrence, Buddhism’s original and continuing disagreements with Hindu traditions may be summarized under three headings:

- “1) Buddhists agree with most Hindus, along with other indigenous South Asian religions, regarding the predicament of temporal finitude in *samsdra* due to *karma*, and the goal of pursuing *moksa* from the same – which they usually call *nirvana*, “blowing out.” They are generally skeptical or agnostic about any explanation of what is liberation, *nirvana*. It is not immortality, not annihilation, not both, not neither.
- 2) Abdul Mujib, *Buddhism in Doing...*
Buddhists generally deny the value of theories about the ultimate nature of things. At one level, they claim that such theories are simply a distraction from the pursuit of *nirvāna*.
- 3) The Buddhist doctrine of “dependent origination” (*pratityasamutpāda*) provides intellectuals of Buddhist traditions with a tool for supporting

1 and 2, and ostensibly refuting all Hindu and any other competing doctrines of enduring conditions of existence and nonexistence, or combinations thereof". (Cornille, 2013: 190)

Regarding to these limitation, in some extent they intertwine interreligious as well as done by their figure in previous, for instance Mahatma Gandhi and Dalai Lama who have voice in spreading peace, and they are stated point from humanistic value.

Thich Nhat Hanh, in the concept of mindfulness, explains that we must be aware if there are many factors, such as the concept of flower as mentioned by Thich Nhat Hanh above. By realizing the existences of other religions have made Buddhism exist too. Therefore, among religion must have interreligious connection, especially in peace, in order to show existence.

In globalization era, both of them, Buddhism and Hinduism raise issue about ethics. They conduct interreligious to talking about universal issue. Especially they argue ethic from non-Western and Western. In the short time, they forget with their history and make interreligious relationship in certain arena (Cornille 2013, 202). Therefore, by certain issue, interreligious dialogue can unite them and endeavor to reconcile their conflict due to history. Here, they together commit in embodying peacefulness.

A Response to Buddhism Interreligious Connection

In establishing interreligious connection, generally among religions, they use theology as a connector, whereas, Buddhism does not have theological concept. However, Buddhists are forced to change their view that they believe in doctrinal concept into theological concept, precisely in term of pursuing in the same purpose that is looking for God (Cornille, 2013: 189). I argue that shifting (from doctrinal into theological) can be manipulated by Buddhist as a way of life, so it is philosophical. Philosophically, the Buddhists do not believe in God, but they have to look for achieving in liberation, in order to be free from reincarnation.

The importance of theological dialogue makes Buddhism allow to negotiate their doctrines to become theological concept. This term cannot be separated from the history of religion, in which Christianity became as prototype of religion. (King, 1999: 67). Fortunately, in that time, Christian doctrines had system of God, text scripture, prophet and so forth. However, the other religions, if they wanted to be recognized as religion must have those requirements. Buddhism as one of religions which does not have the

concept of God had to already change their doctrinal as if it has system of God. However, privately, Buddhists still perceive their faith that they do not have God. They only have purpose, which is achieving *nirvana*. I consider that in this contemporary era, should religions obey the criterion made by Christianity? Whereas, every religion is unique, and it has different characteristic. I agree with Thich Nhat Hanh as he illustrated religions with elements (Hanh, 2010: 57). Every element is unique, but they need each other as complementary.

Regarding the philosophical concepts of many religions, precisely, Abrahamic religions have similar concept in their teachings to adjust with Buddhism, in order to build interreligious connection. Whereas in doing interreligious relation is not only by theological or philosophical concept. Aforementioned, Buddhism also has its own ways in establishing interreligious connection, that are socially engaged and interior dialogue. (Cornille, 2013: 377). I argue that even though Buddhists are good in establishing social relation, but they have to strive to make theological relation. Buddhists use their doctrine such *karma*, *moksa*, *samsara* and *nirvana* as the way to achieve the ultimate reality (God). In this term, it will make Buddhists feel comfort in amidst of other religious people.

From Thich Nhat Hanh' theory, I try to connect Buddhism in interreligious spheres, as he illustrated that Buddhism and other religions are like flower. At glance, the flower seems to be alone, but when it is seen in detail with full of mindfulness, the flower cannot be separated from other factors. Therefore, Buddhism can grow and develop because of encountering with others like Islam, Christianity, and Hinduism. He argues that every religious people are inter-being, that is they are mutually contacting and shaping unity (Hanh, 2010: 57). Hanh also emphasizes in interior dialogue or mindfulness or meditation. According to him by knowing the breath, he argues that peace can be found, and home is the now and the here. I suppose Hanh wants to embrace all religion to make peace and he uses religions as agents of peace building.

Therefore, from many types of interreligious dialogue that have mentioned above, and Buddhists aptly use mindfulness as their connection. Thereby I suppose that, here, what is done by Thich Nhat Hanh, he uses acceptance model that is a model of interreligious dialogue without differentiating from what religions (the opposite of dialogue) are. On the other hand, I think this model is also more humanist and suitable with his concept. In addition, as

Paul Knitter explained, I prefer to choose the dialogue of action. Buddhism's idea is proper to social reality. As mentioned by Thich Nhat Hanh that Buddhism wants to establish living harmony and to solve common problems together. Both of those models of dialogue, acceptance model and dialogue of action, have basic similarity that is those two models do not differentiate the opposite of dialogue and without enforcing particularly idea.

E. Conclusion

Although Buddhists do not believe in God in the sense of Abrahamic religions, yet they can conduct interreligious to connect with other religions using their philosophy, and in socially engagement and interior dialogue, sometime they are more ethic and humanist. In socially engaged, Buddhist build relation in interreligious by living together in peace and harmony in social life. Meanwhile, Buddhists as interior dialogue do interreligious connection by aware self in mindfulness or meditation.

Thich Nhat Hanh shows that by mindfulness, Buddhists and other religious adherents can realize that they cannot live without the existence of each other. He illustrates it like flower that it cannot be exist without sun, water and soil. Therefore, appreciating among others is very important to be aware, in order to make interreligious connection and keeping peace in the world.

References

- A Common world. Online Source: A Common Word between Us and You, 5-Year Anniversary Edition.
- Abdul Mujib, *Buddhism in Doing...*
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu, *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha*. Boston: Wisdom Publication, 2000. Cornille, Catherine (Ed), *The Willey-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue*. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons Ltd, 2013
- Dhirasekera, Jotiya (Ed), *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism vol. 4*. Sri Langka: The Department of Printing Sri Langka, 1979.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat, *Together We Are One: Honoring Our Diversity, Celebrating Our Connection*. Berkeley California: Parallax Press, 2010.
- Hidayati, Mega, *Human Finitude and Interreligious Dialogue*. Adelaide: ATF Press, 2010.
- Jayatilleke, *The Buddhist Attitude to Other Religions*. Sri Langka: Karunaratne & Sons Ltd, 1975.

- King, Richard. *Orientalism and religion: post-colonial theory, India and the mystic East*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- King, Sallie B., *Toward a Buddhist Model of Interreligious Dialogue*. Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990.
- Knitter, Paul, *Theologies of Religions*. New York: Orbis Books, 2002.
- Knitter, Paul, *Without Buddha I Could not be a Christian*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2009.
- Sivaraksa, Sulak, *Buddhism and Human Freedom*. Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.

- **Abdul Mujib**, CRCS UGM Yogyakarta.