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Abstract
This paper explores the experience of grace in the interreligious dialogue activists. The involvement of Catholic activists in this movement can be a locus for the experience of grace. Several theologians have recently discussed grace in a historical dimension. One of the theologians of the Second Vatican Council, Karl Rahner, had the idea of the experience of grace. Martin Heidegger's phenomenological hermeneutic method explores the experience of the grace of Catholic activists. In-depth interviews were used as a data collection technique. The research subjects were two Catholics, the National Meeting of Indonesian Youth from the Youth Commission of the Indonesian Bishops' Conference and one Catholic Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community. The results' novelty shows that the research subjects did not recognize grace as an extraordinary phenomenon. Inspired by the Church's teachings, they understand that grace is experienced as a process of living life's roles, unique abilities, and gifts to become better. The study’s conclusion confirms that grace can be identified in everyday life and is not limited to a superstructure metaphysical idea.
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Introduction
Discussions about grace in interreligious dialogues seem to be merely an insertion of theological knowledge and are only assumed to be experienced by each Catholic. Catholics often hear the word grace through the priest's homily in the Eucharist and other sacramental services, even for certain people talking about grace is not foreign in their ministry. Apart from that, grace is not only present in the
supernatural dimension of man but as pointed out by Matthew Petillo, "grace is a reality that can be not only professed in worship… but also experienced in the depths of consciousness" (Petillo, 2010, p. 586). Nevertheless, grace can certainly be experienced in real terms, not just a theological idea that is separate from concrete experience.

In this article, I will explore the experience of grace from the perspective of interreligious dialogue relations from Catholic activists in the National Meeting of Indonesian Youth from the Youth Commission of the Indonesian Bishops' Conference and the Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community. Interreligious dialogue becomes the locus theologicus or historical dimension of grace. Daniel Franklin Pilario says, “religious dialogue should primarily take place at the grassroots and religious discourse must return to the rough grounds” where he refers to relations within, “the grassroots community serve as the new locus theologicus” (Pilario, 2011, pp. 327, 341). Thus, Catholic activists in the interreligious dialogue movement can be guided to recognize the grace movement in their activities. Moreover, the interreligious dialogue movement has spread to several important cities in Indonesia. This movement is a response to political competition that uses religion and supports the religious moderation movement initiated by the Indonesian Ministry of Religion in 2019.

If we look at the axiom of the grace of Saint Thomas Aquinas "Cum enim gratia non tollat naturam, sed perficiat", it is clear that grace does not destroy nature but perfects it (ST I, q.1, a.8, ad.2). Aquinas perfected the idea of the Doctor of Grace, namely Saint Augustine of Hippo (354-430), “without grace men do nothing good when they either think or wish or love or act” (On Reprimand and Grace, 2.3; see ST I-II, q.109, a.2). For Augustine, grace works absolutely in the face of human freedom because human nature is absolutely corrupted. As Enggar Objantoro wrote about Augustine’s thought, "Humans cannot help-themselves so that they will get justification from God. Salvation is God’s grace" (Objantoro, 2020, p. 58). Meanwhile, for Aquinas human nature is not totally corrupted and requires grace as divine help to be able to receive further grace and do good. God’s grace can perfect human nature which is hurt by original sin. This axiom shows that grace and nature are related. On the other hand, human nature will not move towards its perfection without the actualization of grace upon it. If this condition happens in interreligious dialogue, then grace does not become an experience in that dialogue. Grace gives extraordinary power to nature because grace is not something foreign to nature. It means that it is not proper to recognize grace as outside or separate from nature.

The attention of theologians in recent years has been directed to the historical dimension, namely the concrete human experience. The presence of grace in the soul cannot be separated from the history of life, conveyed by Francisca Hildegardis Chimhanda. According to her, at this time tends to "to see grace as God’s way of being present and active in human history and life" (Chimhanda, 2011, p. 2). Meanwhile, Adrianus Sunarko evaluates the history of grace theology by saying that "anthropological aspects need attention," and "a view that does not complete understanding of grace leads to an unequal view of human beings" (Sunarko, 2018, p. 68). Sunarko emphasizes, "the historical aspect of the mediation of grace" (Sunarko, 2018, p. 82). For Mary E. Hines argues "intimacy grace" is not just an individual experience of grace, he said, "grace is often understood as an individual experience, problems or social movements can also be experienced as the presence of God (grace) that moves the Church" (Hines, 2018, p. 62).

Meanwhile, when it comes to interreligious dialogue, the discussion about grace is directed at the relationship and the attitude of dialogue. Close relationships among activists can be a place where grace works. However, the attitude of dialogue amid differences world view also needs to be considered.
Armada Riyanto pointed out, “Close relationships between humans are a place where God bestows grace and signs of His presence” (Riyanto, 2010, p. 154). Grace can be manifested in the relationship. According to Jean-Marie Hyacinthe Quenum, “Through created grace, God acts inwardly upon human beings…transforming them through their religious experiences into sharers of his life.” (Quenum, 2011, p. 16). Meanwhile, Therese Ignatio Bjornaas discusses the attitude of dialogue. She argues that interfaith dialogue can potentially be carried out but needs to be vigilant because "In a pluralistic world, rejection for absolute values is assumed appropriate" and "we must end up underestimating the major obstacle between us: the difference of following two different prophets" in search of the value of togetherness (Bjornaas, 2018, p. 46). Then Francis Clooney reflected on Pope Francis’s attitude to interreligious dialogue that He, "takes on a performative and interpersonal tone, and includes getting to know our neighbours, in the fullness of the socially and politically inflected lives” and the goal is, “proper respect for our neighbours…by bothering to learn about them, in order to work with them on matters of common concern” (Clooney, 2017, p. 281).

I will use Karl Rahner's theology of grace to bridge the gap between the existence of grace and its actualization in interreligious dialogue. His theology of grace shifts the paradigm of grace from Neo Scholasticism which has long considered grace as something extrinsic to human nature to the integralism of nature and grace. Martin Hendri asserts, “Rahner obviously wished to avoid extrinsicism” while at the same time avoiding “God’s grace is indistinguishable from creation” (Henry, 2001, p. 297). Karl Rahner's theology of grace is based on God's will to save all humanity. Regarding this, Riyanto said, “Rahner reconciled the mercy and salvation of God which is universal in saving everyone…” (Riyanto, 2010, p. 285).

The Rahner’s theological used is based on the views of several theologians. Jeannine Hill Fletcher once said, “It is hard to name a theologian who has singularly influenced the contemporary discourse on religious pluralism more than Karl Rahner” (Fletcher, 2005, p. 235). Some theologians such as Douglas Pratt, Anita C. Ray et al. noted that Rahner with several consultants at the Second Vatican Council marked a shift in the attitude of the Catholic Church from exclusive to inclusive (Pratt, 2010, p. 248; Ray, D’Arcy May, & Dupuche, 2013, p. 97). According to Paul G. Crowley, “Rahner’s transcendental method could serve as an important tool for entering into interreligious encounter” (Crowley, 2010, p. 570). Rahner's ideas were absorbed in several documents of the Second Vatican Council. O’Collins calls the Church Documents Lumen Gentium (1964), Nostra Aetate (October 1965), and Ad Gentes (December 1965) following Rahner's idea “in speaking of the elements of ‘grace and truth’ to be found in those who had not or had not yet heard and accepted the gospel (O’Collins, 2013, p. 56). Mary E. Hines said, “The great theologian of grace, Karl Rahner, envisioned a world of grace” (Hines, 2018, p. 62).

Several journals discuss Karl Rahner's theology of grace but none have discussed the concrete experience of grace in interreligious dialogue. Gloria L. Schaab understands Rahner's idea of grace as a gift of divine self-communication that fills the cosmos and draws human experience into relationships. He stated, “Perhaps there is no more accurate writer on the nature of grace as divine self-communication than the German theologian Karl Rahner” (Schaab, 2012, p. 209). Schaab develops the idea as, “God's grace and God as grace are always present in the cosmos” (Schaab, 2012, p. 210). In his analysis, Rahner's notion of grace draws the human person “into self-transcendence within oneself and in relation to others” (Schaab, 2012, p. 214). He describes the grace that reaches Rahner, “applies to interpersonal relationships” (Schaab, 2012, p. 215). Then Son Thai Nguyen said, “Rahner's theology of mercy targets
the daily activities of normal people as human subjects” and “about the subject's encounter with grace…in love” (Nguyen, 2013, p. 67). Jose Celio dos Santos observed, “Rahner insists that we cannot say anything about God without also saying something about man, and vice versa” (Santos, 2018, p. 39). Santos understands that “in the a priori human structure…is God's grace given to every human being” and sees that Rahner's supernatural theology asserts, “the a priori human structure as the possibility of receiving God's revelation” (Santos, 2018, p. 40).

Understanding the topics which is the importance of the experience of grace and the rise of the interfaith dialogue movement, I see the problem that grace’s movement in interreligious dialogue has not been really recognized. So the status question is how can grace be interpreted in interreligious dialogue relation? Thus, the purpose of this article is to understand the meaning of grace’s movement in interreligious dialogue for Catholic activists.

Method
The method used is phenomenology Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). He was a student and assistant to Edmund Husserl (1909–1911) (Gorner, 2001, pp. 1–3). Heidegger’s idea is phenomenology as a hermeneutic of Being (Heidegger, 2001, p. 59-60). For him, phenomenology as “to let that which shows itself be seen from itself in the very way in which it shows itself from itself” (Heidegger, 2001, p. 58).

However Being has been forgotten in the sciences and he chose a special entity that can question its existence, namely Dasein (Hardiman, 2016, p. 30-31, 53).

The process of Dasein becoming Being is called existence (German: Existenz). It's a matter of being authentic or inauthentic. Note: Dasein's relationship with his Being is "ontological" is called existential (German: existenzial) and Dasein's relationship with other entities is "onts" is called existentiil (German: existenzial) (Heidegger, 2001, p. 33; Hardiman, 2016, p. 59).

The character of Dasein's existence is being in the world (In-der-Welt-sein) (Heidegger, 2001, pp. 78–79). The three forms of Dasein relations in the world consist of: a) Dasein relations with entities as present at hand (Vorhandenes), b) Dasein relations with entities as ready to hand (Zuhandenes). Dasein will focus attention on the entity only if it influences him, c) Dasein's relationship with other Dasein (MitDasein). He knows his Being through the Being of others and himself (Heidegger, 2001, p. 155).

Dasein is always shaped by his context.

Dasein can contemplate his being, when he experiences an existential moment (Heidegger, 2001, p. 173). The fact is Dasein forgets about his being. As a result, Dasein experiences fear and anxiety when the existential moment comes. Dasein is vibrated by feeling (Stimmung) then realize his thrownness (Geworfenheit).

Two responses of it: a) Dasein tends to run because he feels uncomfortable. Dasein is immersed in daily activities (Besorgen) with those who are not Dasein and concern (Fürsorgen=care) for other Dasein (Heidegger, 2001, p. 121). The results of Dasein are inauthentic and have a fall (Verfallenheit). Dasein become “human” (das Man), b) Dasein responds by understanding the thrownness. Existential moment evokes understanding (Verstehen). The understanding of Being itself is a characteristic of Dasein (Heidegger, 2001, p. 32).

Implications for research. For Moustakas, “the research participants have experiences the phenomenon, is intensely interests in understanding its nature and meanings” (Moustakas, 1994a, p. 107). The subject of research is he who lives interreligious dialogue. John Creswell provides clues to
phenomenology involving three to ten people (Creswell & Creswell, 2018, p. 186). I have selects three people. Its validity lies in the life suitability of the three subjects.

Data collection by interview. The theme of the questions is according to the focus: 1) Interreligious dialogue relations 2) the experience of grace 3) The meaning of grace for activists. Things to explore: existential moments and responses, various inspirations and influences, relationships with others, interreligious dialogue activities, and the meaning of life. The form of open-ended questions.

Research site. For Denny Firmanto, it is necessary to limit the scope of the discussion to understand the phenomenon under study (Firmanto, 2018, p. 264). Sites studied: Youth Interfaith and Peacemaker Community (YIPC) and Temu Kebangsaan Orang Muda (TemBang).

Data analysis refers to Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) by Jonathan A. Smith (J. A. Smith, Flower, & Larkin, 2009, bag. A.5) Reread the results of the interviews, take notes, classify sub-themes and classify major themes, look for relationships. Hermeneutic phenomenology pays attention to the connection of sub-themes and major themes and vice versa.

Findings

From the result of the interview, there are three major themes: experience of grace, interreligious dialogue relations, and the meaning of life. The following table is a verbatim quote from the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Research Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience of Grace</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential Moment</td>
<td>• accused of jealousy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By</td>
<td>• best Moslem friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond</td>
<td>• hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>• no reply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Grace</td>
<td>• process becomes more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• accused of Christianization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moslem Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• give up for a moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• doing something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• making better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interreligious Dialog Relation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspective</td>
<td>• reduce a prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble dialogue</td>
<td>• patience amid differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common good</td>
<td>• everyone has the same rights and freedoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• tolerance and diversity campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reduce discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning of Life</strong></td>
<td>• fruitful for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• become a stove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• God’s calling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experience of Grace**

See Table 1, When subjects of research (not a real name) were asked to tell their experience of the existential moment, all of them have a bitter experience with Moslem. There is experience with a best
Moslem friend, a friend of childhood, and a Moslem organization. Each of them had a unique response to that moment. Otherwise, all of them seem to have the same positive response movement. For RS1, she did not reply the same thing for what her friend had done. She said,

my best friend...he is Padang...we had a conflict...badmouthed me on social media but I...didn't reply by doing the same thing...This friend of mine lives with me and is dating my best friend...his religion is Christian...I said...it's good that you don't continue this relationship because this will be very hard for your family...(she) caught me I'm jealous...she posted on social media that I was jealous ...we lived together and were friends for decades...but she felt...I didn't support her relationship...she left the house and lived in an apartment. Even though her family gave her permission to leave the house because she lived with me...it really hit me but I didn't reply...trying to maintain a good relationship with her.

RS2 did a similar response that he encourage to find out the fact about discrimination,

basically why I wanted to join an interfaith community, to find out what the truth was...maybe it was my first experience of discrimination...I played with Moslem neighboring friend...I still remember in my memory, I was ridiculed. stupid Christian...quite a bitter experience...it doesn't take me to heart...it may not directly encourage me...to join an interfaith organization, to find out whether it happens often or not.

RS3 had an experience of being bullied by a Moslem organization and accused of being Christianized as a volunteer teacher for Moslem children. Her response was positive. She said,"about being accused of being Christian...one month I gave up...I thought I needed to do something other than praying, getting angry, and crying."

From exploration of their experience, there a connection about their understanding of Grace with their respond. As RS3 mentioned that for her Grace is,"blessing, something that was given...because God loves me. And my gratitude, doing something again with that grace.” Similar with that, RS1 understands that every person has a role and grace as a process of growing in the role. She mentioned,”…talk about true grace: tested to be like a knife to be sharper, like a stone to be tougher. The process has sharpened the role.” Confirm her opinion, RS2 “is sure we have a line and are given the grace to walk our path.” Grace for him is “personal grace that God wants to give.” As he explains more,

I believe we have a line and were given the grace to go our separate ways. My friend is an expert in singing, now he is a music composer. Why am I not good at music, even though I can make music, but why am I not as good as him? It's a grace.

Then we have finding: grace experiencing in positive response as something that moves a person forward to do better. For live everydayness, grace seems something movement from the deep of existential human Being and not an extraordinary manifestation.

**Interreligious Dialogue Relations**
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See Table 1. The results of the interview show that the articulation of the dialogue attitude of the three subjects shows an effort to understand their Moslem friends. This is still related to the previous existential moment.

RS1 experiences that she has a principle that she does what she wants others to do with her. In dialog with her best friend, shows that she had already done like that with didn’t reply the same did. Word “did” is mean to dialogue. That shows in this dialogue,

I know we are both angry that it goes with our respective choices…and let's be professional. Because I had guaranteed she entered the office where I work…I do not want to disappoint, what I feel, that her mother is also my mother. I don't want this good relationship to deteriorate because of a fight. I believe that time will restore…I also believe in God's providence, why it was me who received the notification of her mother's death. Why did I have to calmly accompany…And I feel that this is the time for me to show that I care.

RS1 knows that her best friend is prejudiced jealous of her. But the bond with his best friend's mother adds to her fortitude to spend time, so that her best friend's prejudices fade. As she did in the dialogue activities in TemBang, which tried to fade prejudice among young people due to the political situation. There is a common good which is everyone has rights and freedoms. She conveys,

For example, about prejudice again, after meeting for example...Christians are asked if they habitually hang out with their Christian friends, it's usually more open after attending a meeting interacting in the assignment earlier, their prejudices begin to reduce so it's easier to blend in and some even because they are very exposed from what is called the awareness that everyone has rights and freedoms.

RS2 has a similar articulation dialogue attitude for understanding in his interreligious dialog relation. He asked a question about demonstration for Basuki Tjahaja Kusuma in 2017, to his school Moslem friend for confirmation. Actually, he drives by his brain to gain a new knowledge. He was raised by his family who is open to discussing anything, i.e politic, daily activity, when they gather each other after dinner. This is the family background which is influence him. Then understand if he said,

my Muslim friends asked for their opinion about the political and religious context, the FPI who demoed Ahok. They turned out to have quite moderate thoughts. Maybe in this context Ahok is wrong but there is no need for a demonstration of anarchy, it can be resolved through kinship and we also said that. It's a more mature understanding when we meet them. That's when the fit is right, it's possible to enter into what are equal thoughts and discussions so that they become more mature for each other.

And drove by “to find out whether it happens often or not” (discrimination and tolerance), He stated,”'Persist, persist, because First of all, I think the issue of tolerance and diversity...I believe this is an ongoing issue. I stay in this community because I still want to campaign for it first.” There is a common good which is his motivation.
Strengthening both opinions, RS3 has a similar dialogue attitude in YIPC. That is to reduce prejudice. For example, is fellow of Ahmadiyah in YIPC have the same opportunity in dialog and relation without discrimination. There is a common good for fighting discrimination and reducing prejudice. She stated,

In YIPC everyone is well aware...there are Ahmadiyah colleagues...who come in...kind of open dialogue. Because it's not necessarily the disbandment of Ahmadiyah...There must be a solution...Less fighting...Because there is dialogue...we're just trying. Let the discrimination, prejudice, ridicule be reduced. This is from two directions...But on the surface the cases of intolerance...Indonesia is called Indonesia Bhineka Tunggal Ika, there shouldn't be any.

Then we have finding: dialog interreligious relation has a nice attitude amid difference of world view due to drove by the common good. There is a connection between an understanding of grace in each subject with interreligious dialogue activities. The connection is an orientation for others for better relationships and comprehension. Therefore a good dialogue needs a relation that is driven to a common good.

**The Meaning of Life**

The meaning of life is a questionable part of the subject. The whole subject's experiences especially the subject’s understanding of grace must be deep comprehended. The subject’s engagement in dialog interreligious activities is a stepping stone to understanding the meaning of the subject's life. From the result of the interview, the meaning of grace for subjects is recognized from the connection between their meaning of life and their engagement in dialog interreligious.

When RS1 had questioned, she stated,

I think it's fruitful for other people. The direction seems to be that way from the work of taking care of the community, many people, in the family, in the environment, assisting the community with several interests with hundreds of people.

Agreed with her, RS2 said,

I have been asking for that, but as long as I get the answer for the question and I answered by myself, it maybe I have been there for fruitful for others. Therefore I have joined activities since I kin sharing my own experiences for others. Maybe in my language, I want to be the stove for others. That me more often.

For RS3 confirmed as a Catholic,

So what's the point...I meditate on the Bible in church, every mass listening to ARDAS, there is a poster on the altar to practice Pancasila. What does that mean?...should I do something...when I entered YIPC, the people also had the same dream, slowly bringing this dialogue between Islam and Catholicism and not being divided...And to be honest, yes, because I believe this is a call from God, on the other hand, I want to do something for Catholics and the Catholic Church that I love.
Finding: all of the meaning of life from three subjects are connected and in accordance with their spirit of involvement in dialogue interreligious activities and relation. As seen that their responses to existential moments are positive, in accordance with their understanding of grace as a movement to doing the good thing and making better in dialogue interreligious relation, and that is not in contradiction with the meaning of their life.

Discussion
The discussion will be accounted in three themes: the experience of grace, interreligious relations, the meaning of grace in the frame of the theology of grace, and dialogue by Karl Rahner.

Uniqueness Willingness
First, in Rahner's worldview, the existential moment for humans can be experiencing grace. The moment is also the moment of freedom. Freedom to accept as a free and absolute "yes" or "no" to the source of transcendence called "God" (Rahner, 1993, p. 98). This can all take place amid failure, anger, despair, running a business, doing research, all worldly activities in the sense of awareness activities of thematic or categorical knowledge (Rahner, 1993, pp. 32–33). The choice to accept the existence of the self will lead to the supernatural experience of his existence. This supernatural experience is experienced as the fact that "it comes from something other than itself." Rahner said at that time humans experienced supernatural experiences, this was a gift or experience of grace (Rahner, 1993, p. 34).

We have tentatively concluded that grace is experienced as something that moves from within the existential human being that moves a person forward to do better in everyday life. There are no extraordinary manifestations. When we looked at the responses from each subject, they seemed resilient and persisted in their existential moment. Each subject gave a positive response. Even RS3 who decided to delay until he gave up, but then decided she had to do something. Instead of running away, they made a positive decision, namely to join YIPC and TemBang also to be involved in Interreligious Dialogue, not to respond with something bad. Their decision did not distance them from Muslims but instead strengthened relations with Muslims. Such as Rahner mentioned the choice to accept their existence of self amid their problem will draw them to the experience of grace. With Aquinas it became clear that grace is divine help (auxilium divinum) and human nature needs it to do good (ST I-II, q.109, a.3). Therefore any respond that overcomes the natural tendency to avoid adversity is auxilium divinum.

It was found that the answer "yes" was not spoken literally by each subject but in the form of an attitude not to run, give up, take revenge, or hate Muslims. I think of it as the virtue forms of the incarnation of auxilium divinum (grace) that moves a person to desire something beyond nature. No one wants to be insulted and hurt by others. If we use common sense then we will be choosing the advantage of the worldly-category for ourselves. Contextualize with the experience of the subject, the first answer is about “wanting” the supernatural not just considering the common sense. And the response isn't just about what “I can do” but what “I want to do” because it is not about ability instead faith. I believe all subjects desire something supernatural in that this is the common good inspired by the teachings of the Church.

Rahner stated that humans who receive and cooperate with God's grace, grace will work in the basic human structure. That is, grace is efficient (efficacious grace) in human existence because humans accept it freely (Rahner, 1975, p. 416). Subject's willingness to be oriented towards the transcendent to
overcome the advantage of the worldly category makes them resilient and persistent until they experience the benefits of their virtue. RS1 believes that there is a way of God, RS2 can realize the best opportunity, and RS3 can make good friends with many Muslims. In Aquinas’ language, subjects are enabled by grace (gratia praeventiens), they can undergo the process (gratia subsequens) so that they can experience concretely the actualization of grace (actual grace/gratituuous grace). The phenomenon of grace was mentioned by Gloria. L. Schaab is a “strange attraction” amid problems that lure people toward solidarity and community (Schaab, 2012, p. 212). In this article willingness to be oriented towards the transcendentence is a unique willingness. Its uniqueness lies in overcoming the desires of human nature. This uniqueness willingness is a grace. As St. Paul said,” For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Phil 2:13).

The Spirit of Love
Second, Rahner mentioned,”the totality of the dialogue is externalization (Leibhaftwerdung) of grace (Rahner, 1969, p. 125). He was trying to say,”dialogue is the constitutive sign of the one grace of Christ and his Church” (Rahner, 1969, p. 125) and pointed out the scope of the dialogue,

Grace is not only incarnated in the personal supernaturalized activity of man, but also in the acts of the Church as such: not only in the activity of a member of God’’s people, but in the essential activity of the historically constituted people of God, i.e. in the essential activity of the Church in her own public, social sphere (Rahner, 1969, p. 125).

We have tentatively concluded that a good attitude in interfaith dialogue relation is driven by common interests. In this case, grace becomes an auxilium divinum for the subject to be an orientation for others for better relationships and comprehension. In line with Rahner, all subjects are oriented not only to themselves but to others as the social sphere. The experience of grace is not only oriented to oneself but to others, that is, altruistic. The articulation of the dialogue attitudes of the three subjects indicates an attempt to understand their Muslim friends. As a concrete grace is a unique willingness which is drove RS1 to “enlighten one another through honest discussion, preserving mutual charity and caring above all for the common good” (Rahner, 1973, p. 112). While RS1 and RS2 moved on to reduce prejudice and gain new knowledge about Moslem. Such as Rahner said, “in intellectual modesty and prudence…enriches our minds,…for the most part, we continue to differ in our opinions and attitudes” (Rahner, 1973, p. 113). The Subject still “on the way” and “if he enters into dialogue, opens himself out, allows himself to be attacked by others” with attitude to “is willing to learn” (Rahner, 1974, pp. 38–39). Nonetheless, Rahner give a way for this valid dialogue,”Only if the dialogue of the ‘head’ is inspired by this respect for the mysterium ineffabile of the ‘heart’…is the dialogue as it should be if it is to be able to stand before conscience and God” (Rahner, 1974, p. 41). And he based his opinion with 1 Cor. 13 “speak without love, I am simply a gong booming or a cymbal clashing” (Rahner, 1974, p. 41).

When dialogue about the path of God is carried out, there must be a virtue that brings grace. RS1 is patient amid differences, RS2 learns to mature, and RS3 humbly asks if there is a religious problem. Rahner once said, “the surprise is always in loving one's neighbor” (Rahner, 1983a, p. 73) and “only those who love their neighbor can know who God really is” (Rahner, 1983, p. 71). In the dialogue on interreligious relations, as a Catholic, one must have a spirit of love. John Baptist La Van Ba developed
Rahner's ideas that God's transcendental calling to humans also includes communal and social dimensions, not personal (Le Van Ba, 2012, p. 18). Hence the spirit of love in dialog interreligious relation is a transcendental calling. As St. Paul said, “For you have been called to live in freedom, my brothers and sisters. But don’t use your freedom to satisfy your sinful nature. Instead, use your freedom to serve one another in love” (Gal 5:13).

**The Pneumatic Mission**

Third, the meaning of grace in interreligious dialogue for the subject. The good dialogue occurs in a graceful relationship. That means one of them is an agent of grace. In line with Rahner, they are members of the Catholic Church is a symbol of grace, because the Church was formed by the Holy Spirit as a symbol of grace (Rahner, 1978, p. 18). Thus the power of the Holy Spirit becomes an *auxilium divinum* that brings grace to the world in the Catholic person and is presented in the totality of dialogue with his neighbors in the social-public sphere. As Rahner said that the power of the Holy Spirit, which is inseparable from the Triune God, is the grace of Christ's “ecclesiological mandate” to continue His work in the world by bestowing His power (Rahner, 1993, pp. 332–333). Then he defines,“Grace is God himself, his communication, in which he gives himself to us as the divinizing loving kindness which is himself” (Rahner, 1964, p. 128).

We have tentatively concluded that all of the meaning of life from three subjects are connected with their understanding of grace. However, the three subjects showed that they experienced the grace that made them involved through the existential moment. They recognize grace as a unique willingness such as willingness to be processed, to develop for many people, and to be better. The experience of grace or the Holy Spirit as uncreated grace cannot be through public speaking training, apologetic debate, and catechesis. Social involvement as a social dimension of grace is inseparable from the experience of grace itself. This is the mission of the Holy Spirit in the era of interreligious dialogue.

In The Catechism of the Catholic Church (2007) wrote that grace in the first place is the gift of the Holy Spirit that justifies and sanctifies us. Grace is generosity, voluntary help. which God has given us, that we may answer His call to be children of God (KGK, 1996). Meanwhile, Bradford E. Hines said, the Church is the mediator of God's grace for the world (Hinze, 2020, p. 9). The call of God as His children and the mediator of His grace is the mission of the Catholic church that must be fought for the birth of the man of Grace. This is a call to humanity. This is the mission of the Church in the era of Interreligious Dialogue in the power of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the meaning of the grace of interreligious dialogue for Catholics is a pneumatic mission. As Lucas said in Acts of the Apostles that “But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth” (Act 1:8).

**Conclusion**

This conclusion answers the status question regarding the interpretation of grace in interreligious dialogue relations. The search starts from the phenomenon of interreligious dialogue through the activities of Catholics to the meaning of grace in interreligious dialogue relations. First, the experience of grace is lived as a unique willingness that moves people to continue to struggle in inter-religious relations for the sake of a nobler goal of humanity. Unique desires such as willingness to be processed, to develop for many people, and to be better are understood as divine help only in the sense of faith in Christ. Second, the interreligious dialogue relationship becomes a supernatural calling for humans.
because it is a relationship based on love for God. Supernatural calls as in the attitude of patient amid differences, learns to mature, and humbly asks if there is a religious problem to become a real manifestation of loving God in others. Third, the meaning of grace for inter-religious dialogue activists is a pneumatic mission. The meaning of grace is rooted on the meaning of activists’s life with inspired of understanding of grace as a movement to doing the good thing and making better in dialogue interreligious relation, and that is not in contradiction with the meaning of their life.

It seems that the grace experienced by Catholic activists is something transcendent that transcends nature, but is also at the root of nature. We found that all of the research subjects' experiences were inspired by their understanding of the Catholic faith. However, I realize that the history of grace theology has developed quite sophisticatedly and the findings of this study are limited to the exploration of activists from the two communities. Therefore, research on the experience of grace needs to be further developed.
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