

Bearing Together the Weight of Reality: The Mission of a Jesuit University in Nurturing an Ethic of Collaboration for the Common Good in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia

Author: Paulus Bambang Irawan

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:104938>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2016

Copyright is held by the author. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>).

Boston College
School of Theology and Ministry

**BEARING TOGETHER THE WEIGHT OF REALITY:
THE MISSION OF A JESUIT UNIVERSITY IN NURTURING
AN ETHIC OF COLLABORATION FOR THE COMMON GOOD
IN POST-AUTHORITARIAN INDONESIA**

A Dissertation

by

PAULUS BAMBANG IRAWAN, S.J.

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Sacred Theology

JANUARY 2016

© Copyright BY PAULUS BAMBANG IRAWAN, S.J.

2016

ABSTRACT

**Bearing Together the Weight of Reality:
The Mission of a Jesuit University
in Nurturing an Ethic of Collaboration for the Common Good
in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia**

By Paulus Bambang Irawan, S.J.

Director: David Hollenbach, S.J.

Readers: Lisa Sowle Cahill and Andrea Vicini, S.J.

This dissertation tries to show the contribution and challenge of a Jesuit university in nurturing an ethic of collaboration for the common good by responding to the problem of fragmentation in post-authoritarian Indonesia. The history of compartmentalization since Dutch colonization, the unleashing of greedy elites after the fall of the Suharto regime and the silent penetration of neoliberal ideology through commodification of higher education on one hand contribute to the decline of the massive civic movement in higher education, but on the other hand open a new form of social movement through various local initiatives (Chapter I). It is in responding to this tension that an ethic of collaboration proves to be helpful, both in initiating a strong alliance among various groups and in respecting the plurality of its manifestations. The tradition of post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching, especially in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Caritas in Veritate*, provides a solid grounding for proposing such an ethic of collaboration with its three recurring important themes: solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good (Chapter II). This normative vision of collaboration for the common good is not alien to the Indonesian world view. Three Indonesian pedagogues (Ki Hajar Dewantara, Nicolaus Driyarkara and Mochtar Buchori) not only support the possibility of a cross-cultural dialogue between an ethic of collaboration for the common good based on Post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching and the Indonesian virtue of *gotong royong* (working together), but also show how the didactic of such a

vision should be started in various forms and levels of education (Chapter III). Therefore, enlightened by Ignacio Ellacuría, the historical mission of a Jesuit university in the context of a post-authoritarian society is to provide space to engage with the people's struggle to attain its personal and communal wellbeing. This commitment to be a-different-kind-of-university is carried out through research, pedagogy and community service (Chapter IV). In so doing, Jesuit higher education in post-authoritarian Indonesia will embody the mystique of service and bears a theological dimension in its various collaborative practices to historicize the reign of God which is in process toward its fullness (Chapter V).

Dedicated to the loving memory of my father,
Fransiskus Xaverius Sardi Cokro Atmojo [1935-2015]
whose life embodied the commitment to education
and to work across ethnic and religious boundaries

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iv
A Note on Indonesian and Javanese Spellings	vi
List of Map, Tables, and Figures	vii
 Introduction	 1
1. Locating the Challenge of Fragmentation in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia.....	1
2. Reclaiming the Resources of Collaboration for the Common Good through Higher Education.....	4
3. The Thesis of the Dissertation.....	5
4. Methodology	7
5. Overview of the Chapters	8
 Chapter I: The Challenge of Fragmentation in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia and the Dynamic of Student Activism: A Socio-Political Analysis	 14
1. Desire for a Strong Leader in a Fragmented Nation	15
2. Factors of Fragmentation in Indonesian Society	20
2.1. Internal Pluralism of Islam in Java: Conflicting Visions and an Ongoing Search for Building Alliances	20
2.2. Military and the Rise of the Powerhouse State	33
2.3. The Rise of Predatory Elites in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia.....	42
2.4. Conclusion	49
3. Higher Education and the Emergence of Public Space in Indonesia	51
3.1. The Rise of <i>Mahasiswa</i> (University Student) from the Colonial Period to the Early Suharto Era.....	53
3.2. Ebbs and Flows of Student Movements during the Suharto Era	57
3.3. Several Attempts to Build Solidarity in Disorganized Indonesia	59
3.4. Conclusion	63
4. The Decline of a Collaborative Movement: The Challenge Ahead	64
4.1. Massification and Commodification of Higher Education in the Post-Suharto Era	66
4.2. Lack of Vision in Education	70
4.3. Conclusion	76
5. Summaries and Reflection for Reading Catholic Social Teaching	76
 Chapter II: An Ethic of Collaboration for the Common Good in Post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching	 80
1. The Legacy of Vatican II in Preparing the Space for Collaboration within the Catholic Church.....	81
2. Three Themes of Collaboration in Post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching	89
2.1. Solidarity as Praxis of Collaboration	90
2.1.1. Multilayered Notion of Solidarity	91
2.1.2. Collaboration: The Praxis of Solidarity	103

2.2. Localizing Collaboration through Subsidiarity	106
2.2.1. Development of the Concept of Subsidiarity	106
2.2.2. Subsidiarity and Collaboration	112
2.3. The Common Good as the Goal of Collaboration	115
2.3.1. Two Approaches to the Notion of the Common Good	115
2.3.2. The Legacy of These Two Approaches in the Post-Vatican II Social Encyclicals ..	120
2.3.3. The Common Good and Collaboration	126
3. Contributions and Challenges of an Ethic of Collaboration Based on CST in a Post-Authoritarian Society	128
3.1. Contribution of an Ethic of Collaboration to a Post-Authoritarian Society.....	128
3.1.1. Collaboration and the Deep Sense of “Being a People” in a Decentered Society ..	128
3.1.2. The Recognition of Non-State Actors in the Praxis of Collaboration in a Post-Authoritarian Society	130
3.2. Some Challenges for an Ethic of Collaboration Based on CST in a Post-Authoritarian Context.....	132
3.2.1. Collaboration and the Reality of Social Sin	132
3.2.2. Constructing a Cross-fertilizing Approach to Collaboration	137
4. Conclusion.....	139
 Chapter III: The Didactic of <i>Gotong Royong</i> in the Changing Indonesian Society	140
1. Preliminary Remarks for Understanding <i>Gotong Royong</i> in its Socio-Political and Cultural Settings	141
1.1. <i>Gotong Royong</i> : An Invented Tradition	143
1.2. <i>Gotong Royong</i> and Re-invention of Pancasila Personhood through Education During the Authoritarian Suharto Regime.....	148
1.3. Re-emergence of <i>Gotong Royong</i> in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia	151
2. Re-appropriation of <i>Gotong Royong</i> through Education: Three Indonesian Pedagogues in the Spirit of their Times	153
2.1. Soewardi Soerjaningrat/Ki Hajar Dewantara: National Education Embedded in the Life Stories of the People.....	153
2.1.1 Sociality as a Natural Social Praxis in Pre-Independence Indonesia	155
2.1.2 The Tri-Con Principles and Three Spheres of Education.....	161
2.1.3 Conclusion: National Education Embedded in the Life Stories of the People.....	167
2.2. Nicolaus Driyarkara: The Possibility and the Limits of Our Human Sociality	169
2.2.1 Driyarkara on <i>Gotong Royong</i> as the <i>Grundform</i> of Sociality.....	169
2.2.2 <i>Serat Wedhatama</i> : Education as Humanization	176
2.2.3 Conclusion: Education to be Friend for and with Others	183
2.3. Mochtar Buchori: Collaboration for Transformation of Indonesian Society.....	185
2.3.1 Technocratic Development and its Effects on Indonesian Society	186
2.3.2 Democratic Education: Preparing the Space for Working Together in a Pluralistic Society	190
2.3.3 Conclusion: Abrading the Enclave Mentality through Education	192
3. Cross-fertilization Approach between <i>Gotong Royong</i> and Catholic Social Teaching	193
3.1. <i>Gotong Royong</i> : A Network of Solidarity between Active Yet Equal Agents.....	193
3.2. Education for the Common Good: Immersion into the Life Stories of the People.....	196
3.3. The Didactical Aspects of the Common Project in Uprooting Social Sin.....	199

4. Conclusion.....	201
--------------------	-----

Chapter IV: Bearing Together the Weight of Reality: The Mission of a Jesuit University in a Post-Authoritarian Society

1. Ellacurían Framework: Proposing a Different Kind of University	204
1.1. Three Approaches to University	204
1.2. Return to Reality: The Historical Mission of a University	208
1.3. The Mystique of Service of a University Toward the Reign of God.....	216
1.4. Transforming Our Privileges: Building Solidarity for the Common Good in an Unequal World.....	220
1.5. Conclusion: A University at the Service of the Human Dignity of the People	225
2. Bearing Together the Weight of Reality: The University in a Post-Authoritarian Society ...	227
2.1. Return to the Reality of Post-Authoritarian Society	228
2.2. Collaboration as Propheticism and Utopia: Nurturing a Different Kind of University ..	231
2.3. Plurality of Asian Cultures and How that Shapes our Understanding of Being an Asian Jesuit University	235
2.4. The Didactic of <i>Gotong Royong</i> as a Habit of the Heart for a Structural Reform.....	239
2.5. Excursus: Academic Freedom in the Challenge of Historical Reality	243
3. Conclusion.....	247

Chapter V: Best Practices of Collaboration for the Common Good at Sanata Dharma University

1. A Preliminary Consideration: A Local Entrance into National and Global Solidarity	249
2. Striving to Combine Academic Excellence and Humanistic Values	253
2.1 Structural Mechanisms for Collaboration in Civil Society.....	256
2.1.1 Strategic Planning.....	256
2.1.2 Leadership	261
2.1.3 Pedagogy	264
2.1.4 Research Center.....	267
2.2 Complementary Mechanism for Collaboration in Civil Society	271
2.2.1 <i>Berbeda itu biasa!</i> (Being Different is Ordinary!).....	272
2.2.2 <i>Pekan Kreativitas Mahasiswa Nasional</i> [National Student Research Competition].....	274
3. The University as a Space of Rehearsal for Collaboration for the Common Good: Concluding Reflections and Recommendations.....	276
3.1 Points of Reflection.....	276
3.2 Recommendations.....	280
4. Conclusion.....	283

General Conclusion	286
---------------------------------	------------

Bibliography	290
---------------------------	------------

Acknowledgments

This dissertation would never have been completed without the generous assistance of friends and colleagues in Boston and Indonesia. I owe a tremendous debt to David Hollenbach, SJ, my *Doktorvater* who introduced me to the complexity of understanding the common good in a pluralistic society through his writings and classes. He has been very generous with his time in mentoring and guiding this project from its initial phase through to its completion. I also owe a great debt to Lisa Sowle Cahill who always gave me very thoughtful questions for every chapter she read. Thank you to Andrea Vicini, SJ, for his careful reading and detailed suggestions on the chapters and Bernhard Kieser, SJ, who served as the external reviewer. Thank you also to John R. Sachs, SJ, and James Bretzke, SJ, the directors of the STD program at BC STM.

Boston College Doctoral Ethics Seminar is a community of learning with its thoughtful, respectful and amicable environment. I am blessed to be one of the participants in numerous conversations over the last four and a half years (2011-2016).

Sanata Dharma University and Robert Bellarmine Jesuit Community have been nourishing me with their wisdom and friendship throughout the years, especially during my field research for the fifth chapter. Thank you to the past presidents of SDU: Paul Suparno, SJ, and Paulus Wiryana Priyatamtama, SJ, and also to the current president, J. Eka Priyatma. Many thanks to Patricius Mutiara Andalas, SJ, Innugraha Budi Santosa, SJ, Benedictus Hari Juliawan, SJ, Antonius Febri Harsanto, and T. Sarkim. They have been generous in sharing their reflections and hopes in bearing this important mission of higher education in the complexity of post-authoritarian Indonesia. *Terima kasih!*

My study at Boston College would not be possible without the generosity of the Jesuit Conference of the United States. Bradley Schaeffer, SJ, my previous rector, and James Gartland, SJ, always accompany me in navigating between the light and dark of my life in Boston. Brad and Jim are my role models on how to live with young Jesuits from all corners of this world. From the beginning, Robertus Bellarminus Riyo Mursanto, SJ, my previous Provincial and Petrus Sunuhardiyanto, SJ, my current Provincial, always trusted me to carry out this mission to pursue further study in Christian Social Ethics. Thank you!

Since English is not my native language, I am very much indebted to Simon Smith, SJ, for his assistance. He was always generous with his time in correcting word by word my shabby English, and transforming it into the present forms.

I am grateful to be part of international community at Xavier House of the Faber Jesuit Community for the last four and a half years. I am also surrounded by the great company of the STD-PhD cohort in Faber Jesuit Community: Gonzalo Villagrán, René Micallef, Grégoire Catta, Román Gurudi, Antuan Ilgit, Mario Inzulza, Francis Alvarez.

My spiritual journey in United States has been nourished by the heartfelt friendship of the Indonesian Catholic Community in Boston, New Hampshire and Atlanta. In listening and sharing our shared experiences as Indonesian Catholics in “the land of the free and the home of the brave,” I learned to be a priest and a friend on faith in this earthly journey.

Finally, I am grateful for the love and tremendous encouragement from my family: my mother, Maria Immaculata Antoinette Netty; my sisters, Laurentia Endang Ariyantini, and Florentina Endang Ratriyantini; my brother Yohanes Joko Riyanto; my brothers-in-law, Ridwan Darmono and Alexius Yulianto; my sister in law, Badriyah; my nieces, Rea, Sandra, and Gendis; and my nephews, Rendy and Awan.

A Note on Indonesian and Javanese Spellings

I follow the 1972 Indonesian spelling system (*Ejaan Yang Disempurnakan*). Any exceptions to that, i.e., using the older spelling system for well-known figures (e.g., *Koentjaraningrat*), will be noted in the references

List of Map, Tables, and Figures

Map 1. The Map of Indonesia	17
Table 1.1. Indonesia's four political streams of the 1950s	23
Table 1.2. Gross enrollment ratios in Asia	66-67
Table 1.3. National Public Expenditure on Education, 2001-2008	67
Table 1.4. Higher education expenses for the academic year 2004-2005	68
Table 1.5. Higher education institutions in Indonesia by type	70
Table 1.6. Tilaar's analysis of the complexity of the educational system in Indonesia	71-73
Table 2.1. Four possible combinations of subsidiarity and solidarity	111
Figure 1.1. Military presence in a local public elementary school	37
Figure 1.2. Weekly mandatory flag ceremony at a school	58
Figure 1.3. Students occupied the House of Representatives in May 1998	62
Figure 5.1. Campaign with street art	274
Figure 5.2. Budiyanana's painting: " <i>Mendhem Ilmu</i> ," 2008.	284

Introduction

Catholic Social Teaching (CST) provides an important framework for Catholics around the world on navigating how to live their faith in this fluid and changing pluralistic society. When a new document of CST appears, Catholics from Yogyakarta, Indonesia to Nairobi, Kenya will listen to the vision of the leaders of the Catholic church and engage through creative and dialogic reception toward such a document. However, this yearning to provide a global normative vision on living faithfully in a pluralistic society should acknowledge the growing demands on plurality of more bottom-up and locally based proposals on theological ethics.¹ The tradition of CST itself emerges and is largely shaped from a very specific worldview, which is European. The question then is how does a unique societal and ecclesial context mold a new and creative approach to CST? As an Indonesian Jesuit, hoping to work in the Indonesian Jesuit university in the context of a post-authoritarian era, that question brings me to the research about the emerging role of a higher education institution as a space for the rehearsal of collaboration for the common good in a pluralistic society.

1. Locating the Challenge of Fragmentation in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia

Political studies show that the democratization process in post-authoritarian states has a unique character compared to more stable democratic societies. Heryanto and Hadiz define post-

¹ For the discussion of this topic, see: Agbonkhianmeghe E. Orobator, S.J., “*Caritas in Veritate* and Africa’s Burden of (Under)Development,” *Theological Studies* no. 71 (2010): 320-334; Agnes M. Brazal, “East Asian Discourses on Harmony: A Meditation for Catholic Social Teaching,” in Daniel McDonald, S.J., ed., *Catholic Social Teaching in Global Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2010), 118-146; Lisa Sowle Cahill, “Toward Global Ethics,” *Theological Studies* no. 63 (2002): 324-344; David Hollenbach, S.J., “Sustaining Catholic Social Engagement: A Key Role for Movement in the Church Today,” *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 10, no. 2 (2013): 431-447.

authoritarian states as “hybrid” states where authoritarianism and democracy work at the same time.² Even when authoritarian leaders are trampled down, the legacy of their authoritarian systems still exists especially in the state bureaucracies and their judiciary systems. On the other hand, there are forceful aspirations for “free society” in the popular movements. This hybrid analysis shows how “the institution of power and mechanisms of popular participation are shaped and maintained, or can be altered and challenged” in specific contexts.³ Defining post-authoritarian states as hybrid states also leads us to analyze the “differing relations of power and interest that underlie the way in which institutional frameworks of governance are distinctly shaped...the potential and actual contradictions through which they may be transformed at a given moment of history.”⁴

In the context of post-authoritarian Indonesia, 18 years after the fall of the Suharto regime with 35 years of mass-violation of human rights and the fabrication of a cultural ghetto based on racism and religion, Indonesia still has to be patient with a long and circular process of democratic transition. Thirty-five years of the Suharto regime have left Indonesia as one of most corrupt nations in Asia.⁵ Another challenge faced by post-authoritarian Indonesia is cultural and religious conflict. In recent years, Indonesia witnessed an increase of cases of religious intolerance, not only toward minorities but also toward different branches of Islam, such as the Ahmadiyya. The weak democratic state is unable to uphold the rule of law and protect the rights of minorities.

² Ariel Heryanto and Vedi R. Hadiz, “Post-Authoritarian Indonesia: A Comparative Southeast Asian Perspective,” *Critical Asian Studies* 37, no. 2 (2005): 253.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Vedi R. Hadiz, “Reorganizing Political Power in Indonesia: a Reconstruction of So-called ‘Democratic Transitions,’” *The Pacific Review* 16, no. 4 (2003): 591-641.

⁵ Reuters, “Indonesia most corrupt of key Asian nations PERC,” accessed Jan 22, 2016. <http://in.reuters.com/article/2010/03/08/idINIndia-46740620100308>

Nevertheless, the problem of the decentered character of Indonesian society is hardly a unique phenomenon. Sociologists of social action theories (especially Manuel Castells and Richard Sennett) show how globalization influences such dynamics within developing countries across the globe. In economic activities, Castells argues that the compression of time and space, as the hallmark of globalization, initiates

a process of profound restructuring, characterized by greater flexibility in management; decentralization and networking of firms both internally and in their relationships to other firms; considerable empowering of capital *vis-à-vis* labor, with the concomitant decline in influence of the labor movement, increasing individualization and diversification of working relationships.⁶

Flexibility and productivity become a new mantra in working relationships. In this type of neoliberal globalization, any critical evaluations of the flexibility of capital flows become threats. Labor movements slowly decrease, as the state gets tougher on any movements against its “investment friendly” policy. The experience of inequality and an unforeseeable future due to the short term contracts, has left blue collar workers less trustful of their fellow workers, and feeling betrayed because the flexibility of the job market makes loyalty run only from the bottom up and not *vice versa*.⁷ Distrust of cooperation finally hinders one’s capability to work on a common project.

Putting post-authoritarian Indonesia within the global framework of neoliberalism helps us to understand the complexity and layers of conflicting factors within the decentered character of Indonesian society. The rise of the Suharto regime has been influenced and supported by

⁶ Manuel Castells, *The Rise of Network Society* (Malden, MA: Polity, 2000), 2.

⁷ See also David K. Shieler, *The Working Poor: Invisible in America* (New York: Vintage, 2005); Simeen Mahmud “Why do garment workers in Bangladesh fail to mobilize,” in Lisa Thompson and Chris Tapscott, eds. *Citizenship and Social Movement: Perspectives from the Global South* (London: Zed, 2010), 68.

global corporations.⁸ Global corporations collaborated with the Suharto regime in securing their mutual economic interest. During Suharto's regime, privatization of public goods and extraction of natural resources achieved its highest degree. Labor unions were forced to merge into a single national labor union backed by the government which was less interested in promoting the improvement of the quality life of its members.

If Indonesian society wants to move forward in unleashing its full potential, it must address the fundamental problem of decentralization orchestrated by the former regime and influenced by neoliberal ideology.

2. Reclaiming the Resources of Collaboration for the Common Good through Higher Education

While Indonesian post-authoritarian society is still facing internal tension, fortunately, such a hybrid state also has other resources for transformation, namely civil society. Hadiz shows that during the last 35 years, the Suharto regime tried to exert total control of civil society and to transform citizens into a mass obedient to the "Father of National Development." Suharto successfully disorganized and demobilized civil society, but civil society continues to exist. But its disorganized character make Indonesian civil society fail "to embody organized interests that fundamentally challenge the persistence of predatory power...by promoting a coherent rule of law or a social justice agenda."⁹ In the face of the decentered character of Indonesian society, the big task ahead is how citizens of the disorganized Indonesian society can find a way to collaborate with one another for a social justice agenda.

⁸ Bradley R. Simpson, *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and U.S.-Indonesia Relations, 1960-1968* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008).

⁹ Hadiz, "Reorganizing Political Power in Indonesia," 594.

While most studies of post-authoritarian Indonesia focus on strengthening social relations and creating just structures through democratic elections, there is limited study on the role of higher education as a strategy for building collaboration for a social justice agenda. The purpose of this research is to fill such a lacuna, especially from the Christian minorities perspective.

If Martha Nussbaum was right that humanistic education will help the youth become more compassionate and ready to engage in common projects,¹⁰ then this dissertation will ask: what is the contribution of Jesuit higher educational institutions in creating the space for collaboration in post-authoritarian Indonesia? If civic virtues are so fundamental in sustaining the life of democracy, then what would be the role of higher education in cultivating such virtues? What conditions need to be in place for such a praxis of working not only for one's own benefit but also for the benefit of others to be realized in a more adequate form in modern societies? In seeing education as the locus of collaboration, how does this new spirit of learning reshape our understanding of mission and what would be the contribution of Christianity in nurturing such a spirit? This dissertation tries to answer those questions from the point of view of a Jesuit university, especially in the context of post-authoritarian Indonesia.

3. The Thesis of the Dissertation

In facing the problem of the decentered character of Indonesian society, this dissertation will show the contribution of Jesuit higher education in enhancing the common good of the pluralistic Indonesian society by providing a form of education that supports the growth of a spirit of solidarity and subsidiarity. This dissertation will argue that Indonesian society needs to re-emphasize the role of education—especially higher education—as a space for collaboration

¹⁰ Martha Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).

for the common good in all its aspects: teaching, research and community service. Higher education should enable the *civitas academica* to look beyond institutional confines and learn to work across a wider range of educational settings and with a wider range of partners. In this line of thought, the Jesuit mission in higher education could be understood as preparing young members of society, especially the ones who live on the margins, to be able to collaborate with others in this pluralistic society. Therefore, in such a practice of collaboration, they would both comprehend their dignity and contribute to the common good. A Jesuit higher education in Indonesia should embody the new spirit of learning “by developing our understanding of others, and of their history, traditions and spirituality...[so that] we can make a joint analysis of the dangers and challenges of the future, encourage the realization of joint projects or the intelligent and peaceful handling of the inevitable conflicts.”¹¹

Two documents of CST, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (SRS) and *Caritas in Veritate* (CV) will help us in proposing an ethic of collaboration for the common good. These two documents capture the dynamic within the Catholic church after Vatican II in pushing efforts to work across boundaries in the spirit of solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good. SRS and CV also highlight the emerging role of the non-state actors in bearing the common good in pluralistic society. In line with this argument, three Indonesian pedagogues (Ki Hajar Dewantara, Nicolaus Driyarkara and Mochtar Buchori) help us to accentuate and explicate this vision in the context of Indonesian society and education. Dewantara, Buchori and Driyarkara said that the commitment to engage in the shared project for a just society should start by forming social character embedded in the tradition of working together (*gotong royong*) to respond to the urgent needs of

¹¹ UNESCO, “Learning: The Treasure Within,” in Alain Touraine, *Can We Live Together? Unity and Difference* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 280.

the local community. This social character will become a constant disposition to engage in the long, winding road of structural transformation envisioned by CST.

Ignacio Ellacuría will help us in wrapping this proposal for an ethic of collaboration for the common good into the mission of a Jesuit university. The historical mission of a Jesuit university is to engage with the struggle of people to attain their dignity by creating just structures within community so that everyone will be able to participate in the project of personal and communal flourishing. The commitment to engage with this historical mission will develop a mystique of service in a Jesuit university. Immersed in this mystique, therefore, any collaborative action that a Jesuit university performs bears a theological dimension of historicizing the reign of God which is in progress toward its fullness.

4. Methodology

The methodology of this dissertation follows the approach proposed by Ignacio Ellacuría in doing theology from the point of view of the people who live on the margins of society.

Ellacuría argued that engaging reality has a three-fold dimension:

becoming aware of the weight of reality [el hacerse cargo de la realidad], which entails being present in the reality of things (and not merely being present before the idea of things or being in touch with their meaning)...
shouldering the weight of reality [el cargar con la realidad], an expression that points to the fundamentally ethical character of intelligence, which has not been given to us so that we could evade our real commitments, but rather to take upon ourselves what things really are and what they really demand;
taking charge of the weight of reality [el encargarse de la realidad], an expression that points to the praxical character of intelligence, which only fulfills its function, including its character of knowing reality and comprehending its meaning, when it assumes as its burden doing something real.¹²

¹² Ignacio Ellacuría, "Laying the Philosophical Foundations of Latin American Theological Method," in *Ignacio Ellacuría: Essays on History, Liberation, and Salvation*, edited by Michael E. Lee (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014), 80.

Chapters of this dissertation will be outlined following these three movements suggested by Ellacuría. *The first movement* in engaging the post-authoritarian reality is by being present in the reality itself. Historical experience becomes the foundation for the whole project. The first chapter of this dissertation shows this movement, when we analyze the contributing factors of fragmentation of post-authoritarian Indonesian society and possible resources to reverse such a process. *The second movement*, as suggested by Ellacuría, is finding the ethical character of reality. Since theological ethics is embedded in a certain tradition, I am drawing from three traditional resources: as a member of the Catholic church, as an Indonesian and finally as a Jesuit. Documents of Catholic Social Teaching provide important insights in finding what collaboration means for the Catholic church. As an Indonesian, I retrieve the pedagogical vision of three important figures in modern Indonesia. As a Jesuit, Ellacuría provides the most important reflection on the intersection between the mission of higher education and the commitment for social justice as suggested by current General Congregations of the Jesuits. *The third movement* is finding praxical character. In the fifth chapter, we will see the possibility or impossibility for such a theological ethics in the context of Sanata Dharma University. This third movement is also helpful in showing the future challenges of my theological explorations.

5. Overview of the Chapters

This dissertation consists of five chapters. *The first chapter* of this dissertation focuses on the problem of fragmentation in post-authoritarian Indonesia. The logic of the neoliberalistic economy has opened the door for an open fight between the oligarchs who were subservient under Suharto's regime. They infiltrated and hijacked the emerging democracy as a race to extract the country's natural resources, not only through national but through local politics. This

spirit of the time also influenced education, especially higher education. The student who once claimed a position as the moral voice of the nation operates to no different degree than a group of corporations looking for economic gain. In this dire situation, we ask: could a university become a place for nurturing an ethic of collaboration for the common good in a decentered post-authoritarian society? If that could be the case, how do we define collaboration so that it will both respect the emerging desire to bring democracy closer to the local community and initiate an inter ethnic/religious movement toward a shared goal of social justice? What kind of arrangement within the university can make that vision possible?

In *the second chapter*, I will outline the contribution of post-Vatican II social encyclicals, especially John Paul II's *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (SRS) and Benedict XVI's *Caritas in Veritate* (CV), in proposing an ethic of collaboration for the common good in a post-authoritarian society. Influenced by the ecclesiological stance of Vatican II, which saw the church journeying together with other communities in the world (*Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes*), post-Vatican II social encyclicals consistently provide three constitutive themes that can be used as the foundation for proposing an ethic of collaboration for the common good in a post-authoritarian society, namely: solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good. These three themes always appear in post-Vatican II social encyclicals as the ethical basis for building joint action among people of goodwill to build the kingdom of God. I argue that the ethic of collaboration should be based on the interlocking of these three themes. With the common good, collaboration finds the goal of its existence. With solidarity, collaboration finds the driving force that makes joint action possible. With subsidiarity, collaboration finds its proper limit in respecting the diversity of local actions that contribute to the common good.

The ethic of collaboration for the common good based on post-Vatican II documents can help a post-authoritarian society in two foundational ways: a) giving a deep communitarian awareness of being a people in a decentralized society; b) recognizing the active yet unique role of non-state actors in pursuing the common good. Nevertheless, this ethic of collaboration for the common good must face two challenges: a) the reality of structural sin that demands a change of heart sustained through just structures; b) the need to undertake a cross-fertilizing dialogue with the local culture.

In *the third chapter*, I will show the cross-fertilizing dialogue between an ethic of collaboration for the common good based on the post-Vatican II social encyclicals and an Indonesian worldview on social cooperation named *gotong royong*. This cross-fertilizing dialogue is perceived from the educational point of view by asking: how could education help society to nurture the spirit of collaboration? How does the specific context of Indonesian society pose a challenge in developing a pedagogy of solidarity for the common good? What are the resources to bring it about? How does the Indonesian approach to *gotong royong* shape our understanding of Catholic Social Teaching (CST), and *vice versa*?

This chapter consists of three sections. In the first section, I show the definition of *gotong royong* as an invented tradition, its political and cultural appropriations from the pre-independence era until the authoritarian Suharto regime, and the growing interest in such ideas in post-authoritarian Indonesia. In the second section, I expound the idea of *gotong royong* as sociality in Indonesian society and the role of education in sustaining it according to three important Indonesian pedagogues, Ki Hajar Dewantara (1889-1959), Nicolaus Driyarkara (1913-1967) and Mochtar Buchori (1926-2011). In the third section, I facilitate a cross-fertilizing dialogue between the three Indonesian pedagogues with their concept of *gotong royong* and the

notion of collaboration in CST. This cross-fertilizing approach pinpoints three important insights. First, *gotong royong* as social collaboration emerges from a network of solidarity between active yet equal agents. Second, education based on the daily experience of people's struggles could help bring about such collaborative action for the common good. Third, in uprooting social sins, education should pay attention to the practices that hinders any liberative yet collaborative projects.

In *the fourth chapter*, we come to the central argument for this dissertation: what is the role of a Jesuit university in sustaining the spirit of solidarity for the common good in the context of the post-authoritarian Indonesia? In order to answer this fundamental question, we must first understand the mission of higher education in a pluralistic society. I argue that Ellacuría's approach to the university is helpful in answering this question. Our proposal in this chapter is based on Ellacuría. But in reading Ellacuría, we will use insights that we have found in the previous chapter. Critical engagement with Ellacuría will bring us to see a possible generalization of his contribution to the theology of the mission of Jesuit higher education while at the same time remaining respectful of his unique social context.

This fourth chapter consists of two sections. The first section is an overview of Ellacuría's idea of the historic mission of a Jesuit university and its call to be faithful and immersed in the reality of the people. In the second section we create a critical dialogue between Ellacuría and our previous chapter, which concerns the socio-political analysis of post-authoritarian Indonesian society, an ethic of collaboration for the common good based on Catholic Social Teaching (CST) and the didactic of *gotong royong*. Then we come to a conclusion that collaboration for a shared agenda of social justice is an urgent task of any Jesuit university in being faithful to the reality of post-authoritarian society. Amid the facts of

disintegration and decentralization on the one hand and the richness of religious and cultural diversity on the other, collaboration is both propheticism and utopia. Therefore, it is in the continuous commitment to bear together the weight of reality, that a Jesuit university in a post-authoritarian society finds the heart of its mission.

In *the fifth chapter*, I will show the best practices of collaboration for the common good initiated by Sanata Dharma University (SDU). In this chapter, I argue that through its numerous practices, SDU is trying to be a place of rehearsal for collaboration for the common good in the context of post-authoritarian Indonesia, with its success and failures.

This fifth chapter consists of three sections. In the first section, I reexamine the general scholarship on the changing patterns of the student movement in post-authoritarian Indonesia. There is a consensus of studies that the post-authoritarian student movement is operating at a more local level and responding to a wide range of issues. This new pattern of movement gives an opportunity to build a more localized approach but also poses a challenge for a university in bringing this local movement toward wider audiences across their noticeable differences. The second section talks about the praxis of collaboration performed by SDU. Using Martín-Baró's approach, the best practices of collaboration in SDU are analyzed after dividing them into two categories: structural and complementary mechanisms. The structural mechanism focuses on the changing vision of SDU within ten years of the post-Suharto era, the complexities faced by leadership in grounding these visions, the promotion of Ignatian pedagogy as an alternative approach to highly statist Indonesian higher education, and the contribution of two important research centers as the response of SDU *qua* university to the problem of a post-authoritarian society. The complementary approach examines the SDU vision into various practices. Two are presented here, namely the *Berbeda itu Biasa!* [Being different is ordinary!] campaign and the

annual *Pekan Nasional Kreativitas Mahasiswa* [National Student Research Competition]. In the third section, I propose three points of reflection for understanding the importance of these practices for Indonesian society. I also propose six recommendations for better praxis in the future.

Chapter I

The Challenge of Fragmentation in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia and the Dynamic of Student Activism: A Socio-Political Analysis

In this first chapter, I locate three contributing factors of the fragmented character of post-authoritarian Indonesia and the dynamic of student movements in responding to the crisis that brought it about. Using a socio-political analysis, I show the history of power contestation influenced by internal pluralism in religious tradition and the legacy of the Suharto regime staffed by military (1966-1998), which contributed to the rise of predatory elites in the post-Suharto era (1998-present).¹ In responding to such dynamics, I also locate the role of the student movements in securing a social justice agenda for Indonesia. In its limited capacity, higher education also was used as a locus for collaboration with other elements in a pluralistic society. I also argue that amid the massification and commodification of higher education, Indonesia today urgently needs to find a pedagogical vision so that the vibrant democratic movement of the last 70 years will not vanish.

This chapter consists of five sections. In the first section, I will describe the portrait of fragmentation in post-Suharto Indonesia and the rise of public desire for a strong leader as a symbol of the inability to deal with the root causes of fragmentation. In the second section, using scholarly works in political studies, I will analyze three root causes of Indonesian fragmentation, namely: the internal pluralism of the religious tradition (especially Islam in Java), the rise of a powerhouse state staffed by armed forces during the Suharto era, and the rise of predatory local

¹ After the Dutch colonial period (from early 18th century to 1945), Sukarno was the first Indonesian president (1945-1966), followed by Suharto (1966-1998), B.J. Habibie (1998-1999), Abdurrahman Wahid (1999-2001), Megawati Sukarno Putri (2001-2004), Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (2004-2014), and Joko Widodo (2014-present).

elites and oligarchs using the weak democratic transition after the fall of Suharto. In the third section, I will show how the student movements became key players in resisting the conflict of interest starting from the early independent movement to the post-Suharto era despite a highly controlled and centralized educational policy. I will also show two cases when student movements could have built coalitions with other players in the social movement in order to resist the military powerhouse state. In the fourth section, I show the challenge of massification and commodification of higher education institutions and the lack of a vision of education that could evaporate the organized student political activism. The fifth section is the conclusion and a bird's eye reflection on Indonesian politics. This reflection will become the basis for interpreting Catholic Social Teaching in the following chapter.

1. Desire for a Strong Leader in a Fragmented Nation

“When he was around, you could feel his presence”² said Endah, an ordinary resident of Solo, Central Java, commenting on the death of the longest dictator in the world, Suharto, in 2008. She stood in the street, waving with hundreds of Indonesians at the convoy of the Indonesian former and current ministers, businessmen and Suharto's family who traveled to bring Suharto's body to *Istana Giri Bangun*, a royal burial ground in Solo, Central Java, Indonesia. Susilo Bambang Yudoyono, the Indonesian president at that time, offered homage to Suharto and acted as the leader of his state funeral ceremony. A few months later, there emerged the discussion in the House of Representatives to convey the title of national hero on Suharto and to commemorate him by naming the street near the presidential palace in Jakarta in his honor.

² Jason Tedjakusuma, “Indonesia Bids Farewell to Suharto,” *Time*, Jan 29, 2008, accessed Jan 24, 2016, <http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1707754,00.html>.

These images of the mourning Indonesians were staggering if compared to what happened ten years before, during May 1998. Thousands of protesters occupied Jakarta and major cities in Java, demanding that Suharto step down. Prior to his resignation, in May 13-15, anti-Chinese riots exploded in Jakarta and some big cities, killed nearly 1,100 people, and more than 100 Indonesian-Chinese women were brutally raped.³ Students and activists were shot dead and kidnapped. Many of them have not returned to their families until today.

The contrasting images in just ten years refer to the syndrome popularly called “missing Suharto” (*Rindu Suharto*). In the eyes of common citizens, Suharto was a figure of “the father” who gave assurance and order, something missing from all his successors. Shortly after his death, popular among Indonesians was a picture of Suharto with the caption: “How are you? My era is still much better, isn’t it?” [*Piye kabare? Penak Jamanku to?*]. This picture depicts the frustration among Indonesians in realizing that so-called democratic transition does not make the condition of social life in Indonesia any better.

The dawn of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first century are “the years of living dangerously” for Indonesians. Between 1994-1997, several local deadly riots happened in provincial towns and cities in Indonesia. In 1997-1998, anti Chinese riots emerged in Jakarta and stimulated the same disturbances in the cities of Solo, Medan, Palembang. This epoch left deep trauma for the Indonesian Chinese minority. In January 1999, religiously influenced mob killings exploded in Ambon, Moluccas, and Poso, Central Celebes, and killed nearly 4000 people, Muslim and Christian. In response to this “Muslim massacre,” Islamic paramilitary groups gathered themselves under the name of The Jihad Army Command (*Komando Laskar Jihad*). They launched a jihad campaign against Christians in the Moluccas

³ The real number of mass rapes in Jakarta during May 1998 is still unclear because many survivors refused to give testimonies or left the country.

islands while creating religious tensions in relatively harmonious cities of Java. This ‘religious war,’ which started from small-scale intra community brawls, continued sporadically until the Malino peace conference in early 2001. The communal violence continued during March 1999 until early 2001. The armed native Dayak groups attacked and killed hundreds of Madurese immigrants in West Kalimantan. This riot made thousands of Madurese families live in refugee camps and become internally displaced persons.



Map 1: The Map of Indonesia

In 2000, communal violence took another form, jihad. During Christmas Eve 2000, several bombs exploded in Catholic Churches in Indonesia mostly in Jakarta killing 16 people and injuring more than 90. After several bomb explosions in 2000-2002, on October 12, 2002, 202 people died and hundreds were injured, most of them Australian tourists, after a bomb exploded in Bali, the most attractive Indonesian tourist spot. The bomber was captured and opened a link to an underground terrorist network, affiliated with a *madrassa* in Solo, Central Java. Between 2002-2012, there were more than 16 bomb explosions around the country which left nearly by 100 casualties.

During this disturbing time, political theorists started to argue about the “Balkanization” of Indonesia. This verdict was not unfounded. Indonesia has a problem similar to that of the USSR prior to its collapse: a strong and centralized government was torn apart by regional conflict. In these years of living dangerously, Indonesian citizens then idealized the Suharto era as a time of peace and order. Missing Suharto comes from the despair of ongoing violence and the weak power of the state in protecting the lives of its citizens, especially the minority. If Suharto’s fall promised a reform to a more democratic society, then why does democratic transition fail to bring peace and prosperity? Why do the “children” start to kill each other after the “father” steps down?

Going back to Suharto is the quick answer to such yearning. And this popular image was not left unattended because the family of Suharto started a monument in a village where Suharto was born, called Monument Suharto. In this monument, the visitor will see all Suharto’s achievements during his reign. In the front of the museum, a Suharto statue stands firm with a commanding presence to greet the visitors. Everyone coming to the monument will sense the glorious past of the dictator and his sense of “taking charge” of the nation, a sense that is missing among the current Indonesian leaders. Around 600-800 people visit the museum most days and many more during the school holiday season, some of them even come from distant cities.

Of course we could not find any traces of Suharto’s 30 years of violence in this Suharto museum. Nor will the critical visitor find any portrayal of how corrupt the Suharto family was, nor of its legacy of crony capitalism. The visitor also will not find any record of mass murders during 1965 that marked the beginning of Suharto’s regime. After the so-called failed communist coup on the morning of October 1, 1965, Suharto conducted a cleansing of all his enemies—labeled as communists— and killed nearly 500,000 people and sent thousands of people to Buru

island. All the visitor can see in the museum is the glory of “law and order” in the Suharto era, even if this “law and order” caused hundreds of thousands of people to die or become political prisoners.

But, whether “missing Suharto” is a temporary pathological phantasm orchestrated by the former regime or not, the basic questions that should be answered are: what conditions contribute to fragmentation of Indonesian society? Who are the actors who contribute to the escalation of conflict? In a more positive way, what are the possible sources of collaboration and how can the dynamic of ebb and flow of such collaboration influence the cohesion of Indonesian society? And the last question: what can we learn from this fragmented Indonesian society and its movement toward more a collaborative society?

These questions are urgent for Indonesia, a nation with more than 500 ethnic groups, more than 14,000 islands, the home of 6,000 inhabited islands where population density varies from 1,302 people per square kilometer in Java to 6.4 people per square kilometer in Papua.⁴ In this diverse nation, I argue that, without understanding the key political actors in Indonesian politics (i.e., their religious affiliation in *aliran* politics of the Sukarno era, the dual functions of the military in the Suharto era, students as political agents), any proposal to build collaboration within civil society will be hard to attain. Only by identifying key actors and streams in Indonesian politics, can we move toward a vision of how to “embody organized interests that fundamentally challenge the persistence of predatory power...by promoting a coherent rule of law and a social justice agenda.”⁵

⁴ A.R. Welch, “Blurred Vision? Public and Private Higher Education in Indonesia” *Higher Education* 54, no. 5 (Nov, 2007), 667.

⁵ Vedi R. Hadiz, “Reorganizing Political Power in Indonesia: A Reconstruction of So-called ‘Democratic Transitions,’” *The Pacific Review* 16, no. 4 (2003), 594.

2. Factors of Fragmentation in Indonesian Society

2.1. Internal Pluralism of Islam in Java: Conflicting Visions and an Ongoing Search for Building Alliances

To understand the problem of fragmentation in post-Suharto society, we must take into account the importance of Islam in Java⁶ with its internal pluralism. I follow R. Scott Appleby in defining internal pluralism as diversity within a religious tradition in responding to the ambivalence of the sacred.⁷ The multivalence of traditions will ensure both a search for a trans-generational argument and a demand for continual adaptation and evolution. The socio-political context helps to shape the pendulum movement between the two.

There are two reasons for seeing the internal pluralism of Islam in Java. First, Islam is the religion of almost 89% of Indonesian. As I showed in the previous section, several ethnic conflicts in the post Suharto era were related—either closely or remotely—to religion, especially Islam. Second, Java is the center of the nation with 153 million Indonesians (60% of Indonesia population) living on this island, making it the most populous island in Indonesia. Especially, in the following section, we will witness the process of “Javanization” of Indonesia during the Suharto regime, a legacy that persists until today. Therefore, understanding the breadth of features of Islam in Java is necessary in order to understand the history of power contestation between various segments in Islam and also the possibility for an alliance to build a more stable democracy in Indonesia.

⁶ I understand that the term “Islam in Java” is also problematic. Some prefer the concept “Javanese Islam” to highlight the reception of Islamic tradition within Javanese mysticism which finally emerges into a very unique form of Islam. Other scholars still want to maintain the concept “Islam in Java” to underline the commonality of Islam across the world. I use the word “Islam in Java” not to downplay the importance of argument beneath the term “Javanese Islam” which I deeply appreciate, but simply in a more generic sense.

⁷ R. Scott Appleby, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000).

In other words, this section tries to show that, on the one hand, internal pluralism in Islam has bred open tension, even conflict, within the Islamic community. But, on the other hand, Islamic internal pluralism could be a powerful resource for challenging a totalitarian view as proposed by some in the name of Islam. Looking into this internal pluralism in Islam also affirms the position of some sociologists who argue that the problem of fragmentation in Indonesian society should not be seen as a unique post-Suharto phenomenon. It has embedded itself in the long history of Indonesian society since the colonial era and religious traditions have influenced the creation of the midpoint between conflicting visions.

This discussion brings us to the dynamic of Indonesian society before its independence. Dutch colonial power used the politics of compartmentalization (*verzuiling*) as the key to maintain law and order in its colonies (*divide et impera*). After the Java War (1825-1830), which almost made the Dutch lose their colonial grip on the East Indies due to massive Javanese resistance, Dutch colonialism was firm in not letting the group coalitions grow in the East Indies and deployed a harsh segregation based on ethnicity and religious affiliation.

This history of compartmentalization then influenced Clifford Geertz to propose a theory of *politik aliran* (stream politics) that classified the traditional Javanese community in three different cultural streams, namely: *abangan*, *santri*, and *priyayi*.⁸ Before Hinduism came to Java around 400 AD, animism was the religion of the Javanese. After the diminishment of the Hindu kingdom and the beginning of the Islamic kingdom around 1500 AD, these two traditions had correlated extensively within their daily life and had created a unique character of Javanese society. The indigenous religious tradition of Java “has proved, over the course of the centuries, remarkably able to absorb into one syncretized whole elements from both Hinduism and Islam.”⁹

⁸ Clifford Geertz, *Religion of Java* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).

⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

This syncretic group is called *abangan* (literally “the red”). As farmers, their religious expression focuses around the cycle of farming ritual, called *slametan* (thanksgiving). The practice of magic and sorcery are part of their cosmic worldview.

The second group is *santri*, observant and traditional Muslim. Since they are educated in *madrasa* (Islamic schools), the *santri* group maintains strong and careful Islamic rituals, e.g., praying five times daily, fasting during the holy month of Ramadan, and pilgrimage to Mecca. *Santri*’s opportunity to make an expensive pilgrimage to Mecca (called *Hajj*) is due to their economic networking with the Middle East traders.

The third group is *priyayi* (the royal), heirs of Javanese aristocrats. After the Dutch conquered Java, native aristocrats turned to civil service. They conserved the pre-colonial religion and still “cultivate a highly refined court etiquette, a very complex art of dance, drama, music and poetry.”¹⁰ They did not stress the animistic worldview of the *abangan* or Islamic teaching of the *santri* but rather Hindu-Buddhist mysticism.

The categorization of religious groups is also highly related to economic and political resources. The *abangan* group are farmers with limited resources and land. During the colonial era, this group was the major supplier of cheap labor for Dutch overseas plantations, called the *collie*. The *santri* circle emerged around local business networks with links to Middle East traders. The *priyayi* are the bureaucrat class, the white collar class in Javanese society. With their access to the Dutch educational system, the *priyayi* were also open to the meeting of Western ideas with Javanese society.

These three groups have their own interests and ideologies, and they created different types of associations shortly after Independence to promote their idealism.

As well as its political organization proper, each party has connected with it,

¹⁰ Ibid., 6.

formally or informally, women's clubs, youth and students groups, labor unions, peasant organizations, charitable associations, private schools, religious or philosophical societies, veterans' associations, savings clubs, and so forth, which serve to bind it to the local social system. For that reason, each party with its aggregation of specialized associations provides a general framework within which a wide range of social activities can be organized, as well as an over-all ideological rationale to give those activities point and direction.¹¹

As political organizations, they organized mass movements, published their own newspapers and created a distinctive literary genre and cultural activity. All these streams fought hard to “make” Indonesia in their own image.

*Table 1.1. Indonesia's four political streams of the 1950s*¹²

Stream	Religion/Culture	Class	Political Affiliation (1950)
<i>Abangan</i>	Nominal Muslims with loose associations with Islam and beliefs in Javanese mysticism and its rituals	Ordinary villagers and workers	Indonesian Communist Party (<i>Partai Komunis Indonesia</i> -PKI)
<i>Priyayi</i>	Hinduistic aristocratic culture with beliefs in Javanese mysticism	State officials with aristocratic roots	Indonesian National Party (PNI)
<i>Santri</i> Modernist	Devout Muslims with a commitment to formal Islamic rituals, such as fasting, attending mosque and pilgrimage. Doctrinally, modernist embracing Islamic reform issues, in practice becoming more conservative	Petty traders and small farmers with some urban intellectuals and artisans on the outer islands	Masyumi Party
<i>Santri</i> Traditionalist	Devout Muslims as <i>Santri</i> modernist above. Doctrinally traditionalists upholding culturally rooted Islamic traditions, in practice remaining fairly liberal	Petty traders and small farmers with <i>ulama</i> (religious scholars) and their followers	Renaissance of Ulama Party (<i>Partai Nahdlatul Ulama</i> -NU)

¹¹ Clifford Geertz, *Peddlers and Princes: Social Development and Economic Challenge in Two Indonesian Towns* (Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1963), 14; see also Andreas Ufen, “From *aliran* to dealignment: Political Parties in Post-Suharto Indonesia,” *South East Asia Research* 16, no. 1 (2008), 7.

¹² Jacqueline Hicks, “The Missing Link: Explaining the Political Mobilisation of Islam in Indonesia,” *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 1 (2012), 42. The result of the 1955 national election was: Indonesian National Party (PNI 22.3%), Masyumi (20.9%), Nahdlatul Ulama (18.4%) and the Communist Party (16.4%).

However, Geertz's typology of Islam in Java inflamed strong responses and critiques. *First*, Koentjaraningrat argued that Geertz was wrong in seeing the *abangan* and *santri* as two distinct religious entities because both of them actually belong to the same spectrum of Islam only with different faces.¹³ In his analysis of Islam in Tengger, East Java, Hefner also argued that, in general, the source of *slametan* as a main *abangan* ritual is not Hinduism/Buddhism but an Islamic sufism. So, *abangan* and *santri* actually are Muslim groups, only with different degrees of inculturation into Javanese culture.¹⁴ *Second*, Koentjaraningrat also questioned Geertz' categorization of *priyayi* as a religious group. *Priyayi* is more about social class in feudal Java than it is a religious stream.

In responding to Geertz, Mark R. Woodward proposed another point of view for understanding internal pluralism in Islam based on the work of Geertz. Contrary to Geertz, Woodward's fieldwork research in Central Java concluded that there was no trace of Hindu and Buddhist elements within Javanese mysticism (*kejawen*). Following Marshal Hodgson, Javanese mysticism was vivid evidence why the triumph of Islam in the Javanese worldview was so complete. Woodward argued that "Islam has penetrated so quickly and so deeply into the fabric of Javanese culture because it was embraced by the royal courts as the basis for a theocratic state."¹⁵

Woodward seemed less enthusiastic than Geertz in proposing any typology of Islam in Java in order to show that a typology failed to acknowledge fluidity of identity, a fundamental feature in Javanese Islamic mysticism. Nonetheless, he indicated a perennial debate of Islam in

¹³ Koentjaraningrat, *Javanese Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).

¹⁴ Robert W. Hefner, "Islamizing Java? Religion and Politics in Rural East Java," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46, no. 3 (1987), 533-535.

¹⁵ Mark R. Woodward, *Islam in Java: Normative Piety and Mysticism in the Sultanate of Yogyakarta* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1989), 3.

Java: one is “catholic in extreme”¹⁶ and the other is fundamentalist. The former is traditionalist, influenced by sufism and Javanese tradition. The latter is reformist, seeking to purify Islam through normative piety. He explained this typology as follows:

The catholic tradition of which al-Ghazzālī, the Moghul emperor Akbar, and the Yogyakarta royal cult are examples, seeks to unify divergent Muslim traditions by establishing their doctrinal, ritual, and social interdependence. Muslim fundamentalism, including that of the Arabian Wahhabi sect and Middle Eastern, South Asian, and Javanese reformists, seeks to exclude all who fail to conform to a rigid and essentially arbitrary notion of “orthodoxy” from the great family of Islam. While both of these views have gained ascendancy at specific points in time and space, the Muslim tradition as a whole has resisted both purification and unification.¹⁷

This debate continues to exist in today’s Java. In 2008, Woodward wrote a small article on the topic of the rise of Neo-Wahhabi colonialism in Yogyakarta by showing the continuous ideological struggles between the radicals and moderates for “the soul of Islam.”¹⁸ Woodward was concerned about the penetration of exclusivist Neo-Wahhabi Islam financed by wealthy Arab princes as another form of colonialism toward a tolerant and peaceful Javanese Islam. The Wahhabis were active through various social welfare programs after the 2007 devastating earthquake in Yogyakarta, provided generous scholarships to study in the Saudis’ Islamic universities and continued to support their graduates.

In responding to the Geertz-Woodward discussion, Timothy Daniels provided an interesting middle ground. According to Daniels, Geertz failed to recognize the influence of Sufism in his typology, but at the same time, “Woodward tends to overplay Sufi mysticism and

¹⁶ When Woodward used the word “catholic,” he did not intend it in the “Roman Catholic” sense but in “all-embracing” attitudes (*katholikos*) of Islamic Sufism.

¹⁷ Ibid., 241.

¹⁸ Mark Woodward, *Resisting Wahhabi Colonialism in Yogyakarta*, CSC Center for Strategic Communication. Accessed November 20, 2015. <http://csc.asu.edu/2008/11/06/resisting-wahhabi-colonialism-in-yogyakarta/>.

underestimates continuities of Hindu-Buddhist and animist elements.”¹⁹ These Hindu-Buddhist and animist elements can still be found in some local practices of Javanese Islam. Daniels even argued that dealing with Javanese mysticism is not a story unique to Islam but also a challenge that Catholic and Protestant missions have to face in Java.²⁰ Social location also shaped the different approaches of Geertz and Woodward. Woodward worked within the royal court of Yogyakarta, while Geertz brought the village and the urban experience. Geertz focused on the social and political cleavage of Islam in Java; Woodward sought to find the historical continuity of trans-generational ideas of Islam as it is practiced in Java. Daniels then concludes that “an approach somewhere in between the ideal types of Geertz and Woodward”²¹ is the most helpful approach for understanding the internal pluralism of Islam in Java.

Whether using Geertz (with its *abangan*, *santri*, *priyayi* categories) or following Woodward’s traditionalist—reformist distinction, Islam in Java at least loosely gathered itself into one category “*pribumi*” (the natives).²² This nativist sentiment emerged as a reaction to the other important player in the colonial era: the Chinese immigrants and their *peranakan* (locally born Chinese).²³ Woodward portrayed the conflicts by showing the data that only Chinese and Indians are not allowed to live within the walls of the Yogyakarta royal court, although non-Javanese Indonesians, even European Christians, can live there freely.²⁴

¹⁹ Timothy Daniels, *Islamic Spectrum in Java* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 39.

²⁰ On the encounter between Catholic missions and Javanese mysticism, see Albertus Bagus Laksana, *Muslim and Catholic Pilgrimage Practices: Exploration through Java* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014).

²¹ *Ibid.*, 39.

²² Jacques Bertrand, *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 60.

²³ *Peranakan* means descendant; it refers to the second generation of Indonesian Chinese.

²⁴ Actually, the rules say that no Christian and foreigner should be allowed to live within the walls of the Yogyakarta royal court in order to preserve the ritual purity of the court. But, this rule was never strictly enforced. It is interesting, though, that this accommodation does not apply to Chinese and Indians. Woodward, *Islam in Java*, 18.

Immigrants from the southern part of China came to the coastal Javanese cities centuries before European colonization as part of trade between the kingdoms of the East Indian archipelagos and China. Mixed marriages between the Chinese and indigenous women led to their offspring establishing permanent settlements and they assimilated easily into the local community. In the mid-eighteenth century, VOC (*Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie*) or Dutch East India Company took control, dominated the economy of the Dutch colonies, and started “a new pattern of segregation and ghettoization.”²⁵ VOC appointed Chinese in the communities as *Kapitan Cina* (Chinese Captains) to work as the middlemen between the Dutch and the colonies.

Every business activity then had to deal with the Chinese, from top to bottom. As James Rush vividly reports about the Chinese commercial activity:

They were shippers, warehousemen, and labor contractors; builders and repairmen; and suppliers of *all things* to town and country. They were tinsmiths, leather tanners, and furniture makers. They bought and sold real estate, worked timber concessions and speculated in the plantation economy... Those Chinese who acted as officials were not only merchants but Java's biggest and richest entrepreneurs.²⁶

Although *Kapitan Cina* attained upward mobility and gained commercial control in almost every commerce, VOC imposed the rule of ghettoization by “confining Chinese to designated neighborhoods and severely restricting their movement throughout the island by requiring them to possess short-term travel passes.”²⁷ This type of segregation and favoritism in economic activity reversed the progress of assimilation with the Javanese community, as noted by G. William Skinner's argument:

²⁵ John T. Sidel, *Riots, Pogroms, Jihad: Religious Violence in Indonesia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 22.

²⁶ James Rush, “Placing the Chinese in Java on the Eve of the Twentieth Century,” in “The Role of the Indonesian Chinese in Shaping Modern Indonesian Life,” *Indonesia*, Special Issue (1991): 17-18; cited in Sidel, *Riots, Pogroms, Jihad*, 23.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 22.

(1) that the complete assimilation of the descendants of Chinese immigrants into Javanese society—and especially into the elite strata—was not uncommon prior to the mid-eighteenth century; (2) that *Peranakan* communities were first stabilized in north coast towns only after these towns had been isolated from the royal courts and their local rulers humbled, subjected, or deposed by the Dutch; (3) that rates of Chinese assimilation into the Javanese elite steadily declined for Java as a whole during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; and (4) that at any given point in time during those two centuries assimilation rates tended to be lower in the areas of Java directly administered by the Dutch than in the indirectly ruled principalities of central Java, where the traditional Javanese elite retained considerable prestige and formal power.²⁸

The differences between the Javanese community and the emergence of *Kapitan Cina* as the middlemen started the history of class conflict and struggle in Indonesian society with its legacy continuously felt up to the post-authoritarian era. For example, anti-Chinese sentiment in the Suharto and post-Suharto era can trace its origin to the politics of Dutch colonial compartmentalization and its continuation in post-independence Indonesia.

From the perspective of the internal pluralism of Islam in Java, we can also understand the underlying motives of the debate about the form of Indonesian government shortly after its independence. After Sukarno and Mohammad Hatta were appointed to proclaim Indonesian independence on August 17, 1945, representatives of all the islands came to Jakarta to discuss the form of temporary administration and its constitution. In the first draft of the constitution's preamble, there are seven words that manifest the role of Islam in independent Indonesia: *dan kewajiban menjalankan syariat Islam bagi pengikutnya* (with the obligation to carry out Islamic *sharia* for its adherents). This first draft was famously known as *Piagam Jakarta* (Jakarta Charter). When the draft was brought for consultation with all representatives, the nationalist and

²⁸ G. William Skinner, "Creolized Chinese Societies in Southeast Asia," in Anthony Reid, ed., *Sojourners and Settlers: Histories of Southeast Asia and the Chinese* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1996), 66-67; cited in Sidel, *Riots, Pogroms, Jihad*, 21.

Christian representatives²⁹ challenged these seven words. From their perspectives, these seven words would jeopardize Indonesian unity by favoring one religion (Islam) over others since the plurality of religions and cultures was the hallmark of this new country.

The nationalist faction argued that the role of religion was already clear and settled by approving *Pancasila* as the state philosophy (*Panca* = five; *Sila* = principles). Sukarno proposed *Pancasila* during the general assembly of the committee for Indonesian independence on June 1, 1945, as the unifying philosophy of this diverse Indonesian society. Sukarno argued that *Pancasila* were the basic principles in Indonesian society even long before the colonization began. These five principles are:

1. Belief in the One Only God,
2. Just and civilized humanity,
3. The unity of Indonesia,
4. Democracy guided by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberations amongst representatives,
5. Social justice for all of the people of Indonesia.

If we look closely at the *Pancasila*, unity is the main value. Sukarno realized that with highly diverse Indonesian society, it is the language of unity which binds all factions into the future nation of Indonesia. *Pancasila* was proposed as the overlapping consensus for all factions because through this philosophy the demands of each faction (especially the *radical santri*

²⁹ It is also important to mention that the nationalist movements were also enormously present in the Catholic communities, Hindu communities (especially in Bali), and Buddhist communities. In 1925, the Catholic nationalist movement created *Partai Katolik* (Catholic Party) with I. J. Kasimo as their prominent leader. Soegijapranoto, S.J.—the first native Indonesian bishop—was a close friend of Sukarno and had played an important role in garnering support of the Indonesian Catholic Church for Indonesian independence. At a time when Christianity was identified with Dutch colonization, Soegijapranoto proclaimed his famous nationalist motto: “100 % Indonesian, 100% Catholic.” Gerry van Klinken, *Minorities, Modernity and the Emerging Nation: Christians in Indonesia—A Biographical Approach* (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2003).

group) were respected. Indonesian democracy is not based on total separation between church and state because the first principle clearly states that the nation believes in “the one only God,” a notion that was highly influenced by monotheistic religions, especially Islam. The first principle, in the nationalist argument, is a form of accommodation between *santri* aspiration on the one hand and Christian representatives on the other hand.

The argument of the nationalist and Christian representatives was accepted by the assembly and the seven disputed words, which contained the aspiration of implementing *sharia*, were deleted entirely from the first Indonesian constitution. However, the discussion and aspiration to put back the Jakarta Charter is still alive in some Muslim groups and has always been the subject of debate or even conflict throughout Indonesian history. In 1999, one year after Suharto fell, there was a proposal from Muslim parties to reopen the case of the Jakarta Charter in the House of Representatives, but this proposal never passed on the house floor because there was not enough support from the House of Representatives (the majority of which are Muslim). The fact that the aspiration to pass the *sharia* law was unable to garner support even from a majority Islamic community again showed that Islam is a broad “term” which contains different streams.

What can we learn from this section especially in understanding the fragmentation of post-authoritarian society? *First*, the thesis of internal pluralism is helpful in understanding the plurality of traditions as being practiced by Javanese Islam. These practices were shaped and then used by contesting power relations in the post-independence era. There are always struggles in making overlapping consensus within these traditions. Using Benedict Anderson’s study on development of the idea of nationalism in South East Asia, Indonesia is always made up of “imagined communities.” Indonesia is imagined because the members of this nation with more

than 500 ethnic groups “will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”³⁰ “Communities” refers to the pluralistic background of this nation and how religion shapes the imagination of its communities and how they will relate to each other. In these “imagined communities” there is always tension and conflict, and the future of such imagination is based on the ability of each community to maintain such conflict and share a willingness to live with each other.³¹

After the failed rebellion of Masyumi (1956-1959),³² Sukarno with his Javanese philosophy of family tried to unite all *aliran* in his project called: NASAKOM (*Nationalism, Agama, Komunisme*—Nationalism, Religion and Communism). In his imagining of Indonesia, the collaboration of these *aliran* would create order and avoid conflict. But, history shows that Sukarno’s forced coalition could not tame the decisive conflict between various *aliran*, especially when Sukarno himself showed close alliance with the communist party.

Second, despite the shortcomings of Geertz’ thesis and its lesser influence on the political parties of post-authoritarian Indonesia (which circled around the post-Suharto strong figures rather than its religious alliance) understanding *aliran* politics is a preliminary step to enter the jungle of contesting power and alliance-building in every phase of Indonesia’s history. It was precisely this contesting power that gave opportunity and was used by the Suharto regime. Of course, we should also acknowledge the influence of Cold War politics between West and

³⁰ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised Edition (New York: Verso, 2006), 6.

³¹ Mark Woodward, *Java, Indonesia and Islam* (New York: Springer, 2011), 267.

³² From 1956 to 1959, there was an anti-government revolution led by army officers and caused by growing dissatisfaction with the Sukarno leadership and the gap in economic development especially for people who lived outside Java. Some Masyumi leaders supported this revolt and caused a setback for the Masyumi as a political party. In 1959, the Sukarno administration crushed the rebellion and dissolved Masyumi as a political party. John Olle, “The Majelis Ulama Indonesia versus “Heresy”: The Resurgence of Authoritarian Islam,” in Gerry van Klinken and Joshua Barker, eds., *State of Authority: State in Society in Indonesia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009), 97.

East that gave Suharto the upper hand in trampling down Sukarno. However, the contesting power during the 1960s provided the possible actors needed by Western countries to cooperate in fighting the Leftist ideology. *Aliran* politics during 1960s showed us how social actions were shaped by cultural alliance especially in the process of “javanization” during Suharto’s regime.³³

Third, the study of ghettoization and stigmatization of the Chinese community is also useful to understand the unending racial policy toward the (Christian) Chinese community until today. During the Suharto era, all Chinese Indonesians had to change their Chinese names into Javanese names as a sign of their loyalty to the nation. At the same time, Suharto used the Indonesian Chinese community’s business network as the financial source of his political campaign. Labeling them as “*non pribumi*” (non-native Indonesian) helps to sustain the spark of hatred toward the Chinese community: a hatred that will be used as a political tool in creating disturbances during 1998.

After the 1965 failed coup, Suharto’s regime required that all Indonesians should adhere to only five official religions (i.e., Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism). There was a popular analysis in historian and anthropologist circles that, due to the history of conflict with *santri* and more open gestures from the Catholic Church during the 1965 crisis, a great number of *abangan* and Chinese Indonesians converted to Christianity. With this influx, the number of Catholics rose sharply in this era.³⁴ Of course, this popular analysis was a broad stroke which in some cases did not fit with the complexities of the problem of post-1965 events. Instead of a rising number of baptisms, some parts of Java—for example Tegalrejo, Magelang—experienced a process of “santri-nization” when the nominal Muslims intensified their learning

³³ Benedict Anderson, “The Idea of Power in Javanese Culture,” in Claire Holt, ed., *Culture and Politics in Indonesia* (Singapore: Equinox, 2007), 3.

³⁴ Baskara T. Wardaya, ed., *Truth will Out: Indonesian Accounts of the 1965 Mass Violence* (Clayton, Australia: Monash University Publishing, 2013), 161-162.

of Islamic ritual and tradition.³⁵ It seems that this “santri-nization” happened because in such areas there were no previous intense conflicts between the communists and *santri*.

In the following section, we will see how the group conflicts were used and escalated into a violent conflict by other players in Indonesian politics: the armed forces.

2.2. Military and the Rise of the Powerhouse State

Marcus Mietzner argues that while the military is an important player in Indonesian politics especially during Suharto’s regime, however the military itself is never a single solid unity.³⁶ Since the beginning of the Indonesian republic, confrontation and coalition among elite military generals influenced the direction of military political orientation. PERMESTA (*Piagam Perjuangan Semesta*—Universal Struggle Charter) rebellion in the 1950s shows an early resistance from the military outside Java to the central command in Jakarta.

From a comparative point of view, seeing the post-independence Indonesian military in a plural sense helps us to understand the characteristic of Indonesian military politics compared to other military regimes, like Egypt. In Egypt, Gamal Abdel Nasser’s coup was a military coup against the former political elite establishment. What happened in Indonesia’s new order military was a process of strengthening a military group (Suharto group) within the inter-military conflict of the Sukarno regime. After Suharto’s group took power, they launched a process of total suppression of other military factions which ideologically affiliated with Sukarno and the Communist party.³⁷

³⁵ Bambang Pranowo, “Islam and Party Politics in Rural Java,” *Studia Islamika* 1, no. 2 (1994): 15.

³⁶ Marcus Mietzner, *The Politics of Military Reform in Post-Suharto Indonesia: Elite Conflict, Nationalism, and Institutional Resistance* (Washington, DC: East-West Center, 2006).

³⁷ Harold Crouch, *The Army and Politics in Indonesia* (Singapore: Equinox, 2007), 23.

During the last years of Sukarno, inter-military factions emerged strongly between Sukarnoist generals and military groups who would give birth to the “New Order” (*Orde Baru*) under the tutelage of Suharto, as opposed to the “Old Order” (*Orde Lama*) of Sukarno. The event of September 30, 1965 was a vivid manifestation of this inter-military conflict that cost Sukarno his throne and the disbandment of the communist party.

Conflict between the communist party and *Santri* leaders started in the early 1960s. Communist leaders proposed a populist land reform in Indonesia that would give Indonesian lower class farmers (*abangan*) greater access to land and their own harvest, with their slogan “*Tanah untuk petani*” (Land for the Farmer).³⁸ This populist land reform proposed by communist leaders threatened the financial resources of *Santri* leaders who were traditionally known as local landowners. In their campaign for land reform, *santri* leaders were listed as “devils of the village” (*setan desa*) who used religion to enlarge their land and sucked the blood of the poor farmer.³⁹

On September 30, 1965, eight top army generals were brutally killed. A group of lower ranking generals under Suharto then used this momentum to accuse the communist party and its military backers as the ones who organized the killing.⁴⁰ This military group then stirred existing conflict between *santri* and the communists to get grassroots support and legitimation to purge communist party members.

³⁸ D.N. Aidit, *Kibarkan Tinggi Pandji Revolusi* [Hoist High the Banner of Revolution] (Jakarta: Pamburuan, 1964), 14.

³⁹ D.N. Aidit, *Kaum Tani Mengganjang Setan-Setan Desa* [The Farmer fights against the devils of the village] (Jakarta: Pamburuan, 1964), 21.

⁴⁰ The event of September 30, 1965 is still a subject of debate among Indonesian historians. There are at least three theories about this event. First, it was an inter-military conflict between low-ranking generals with their commanders. Second, it was a failed coup from a radical military faction affiliated with the communist party. That was the official Suharto version. Third, the communist party is a scapegoat for all anti-communist segments (nationally and internationally) who want to find any legitimation of their disbandment. In my view, the first theory is the most logical and it is supported by many scholars.

Weeks after the September event, Indonesia witnessed its darkest history of atrocities. More than 500,000 members of the communist party and Sukarno's supporters were killed. The following report illustrates the Indonesian political situation following the September event:

The country's prisons, particularly in Java, became packed with detainees. Also new prison camps were quickly constructed. Between 1966 and 1972 over half a million people passed in and out of this prison system. Isolated from their families and any resort to legal protection, the prisoners were in many cases not even interrogated but simply thrown into gaol and forgotten. Miserably provided for, they were at the mercy of guards often nearly as deprived as themselves. Parcels sent in by relatives were plundered, bribes were exacted to allow authorized family contact, and in some cases the families of prisoners were harassed and blackmailed.⁴¹

Bertrand Russell reported that "in four months, five times as many people died in Indonesia as in Vietnam in twelve years." This tragedy produced national trauma and a phantom of the so-called "communist threat."⁴²

The tragedy of the communist and Sukarnoist purge should also be understood in the global context of the Cold War between U.S. and Russia. With the rise of the communist party, Sukarno seemed to distance himself from the West and was more inclined to build close relationships with China and Russia. Simpson then shows how U.S. foreign political policy gave strong support to Suharto's New Order campaign through abundant aid in economic, political and cultural resources.⁴³ Lyndon Johnson's administration also provided training to Indonesian armed forces through SESKOAD (*Sekolah Staff Angkatan Darat*, Army Staff and Command College) and was sponsored by RAND Corporation. Suharto aides were sent to study economy at U.C. Berkeley and became key players in the Indonesian economy during the early Suharto era.

⁴¹ Hamish McDonald "Suharto's Indonesia," in Mujiburrahman, *Feeling Threatened: Muslim-Christian Relations in Indonesia's New Order* (Leiden: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 25-26.

⁴² Ariel Heryanto, "Where Communism Never Dies: Violence, Trauma and Narration in The Last Cold War Capitalist Authoritarian State," *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 2, no. 2 (1999), 151.

⁴³ Bradley R. Simpson, *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and U.S.-Indonesian Relations, 1960-1968* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008).

They helped to secure U.S. economic interests in Indonesia and open the liberal political economy, an ideology clearly rejected during Sukarno's regime. In culture, the Rockefeller Center provided funds for translating anti-communist literary works into the Indonesian language.⁴⁴

With support from the international community, Suharto then applied the concept of “military dual function” (*Dwi Fungsi ABRI*) as an idealization of the military role in his regime. Military dual function is a doctrine that not only allowed the military to deal with national security but also opened the space for them to engage in the political and economic systems. With its dual function (security and especially politic/economic), the armed forces had access, for example, to open their own newspapers and set up their own business network. During the 1965 social unrest, the armed forces newspapers—*Angkatan Bersenjata* (the armed forces) and *Berita Yudha* (the war news)—played important roles in disseminating “imagination” that the army is the savior against treacherous communists and the purge is a national mandate in securing the nation. During the early 1980s, active and retired military personnel occupied most of the higher central bureaucracy and dominated the policy of cabinet departments. Even in this era, half of Indonesia's ambassadors were military. The army also took dominant positions on profitable government-owned corporations (e.g., oil, mining, agribusiness, and banking).⁴⁵

Tod Jones argues that the increasing level of state intervention into the daily life of its citizens is a phenomenon called “the rise of the powerhouse state.”⁴⁶ The rapid growth of intervention especially of military personnel and their programs has a direct effect on decreasing

⁴⁴ Wijaya Herlambang, *Cultural Violence: Its Practice and Challenge in Indonesia* (PhD. Dissertation, The University of Queensland, 2011), 9.

⁴⁵ Michael R.J. Vatikiotis, *Indonesian Politics under Suharto: The Rise and Fall of the New Order*. Third Edition (New York: Routledge, 1998), 71.

⁴⁶ Tod Jones, *Culture, Power and Authoritarianism in the Indonesian State: Cultural Policy across the Twentieth Century to the Reform Era* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 150.

citizen participation in every strategic political decision. The end result of the rise of the powerhouse state is to promote hyper-obedience toward the state (Suharto) because political participation as the artery of democratic life was closed. The state through the department of information and communication closely regulated the media. Any critical investigative reports on



Figure 1.1. Military presence on local public elementary school, giving order and direction to the pupils. Source: Saya S. Shiraishi, *Young Heroes: The Indonesian Family in Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Cornell University, 1997),147.

Suharto and his allies caused the press permit to be revoked. The paradise of free press during the Sukarno era ended.

In maintaining this hyper-obedience to Suharto, army intelligence played a vital role in testing the waters in an

already disintegrated Indonesian society. Yuwono Sutopo, the head of Indonesian Military Intelligence, exposed the role of the military during the Suharto era:

The funny thing about the world of intelligence is the technique of psywar [psychological warfare]. As intelligence officers, we make up issues, and we disseminate them in the press, radio or television. We treat them as if they are real. When they are already widespread, usually people will talk about them and they tend to add to and exaggerate the issues. Finally the issues will come back [to the intelligence bodies] in reports. What is so funny is that these reports incline us to believe that these issues are real, hahaha. In fact, we get terrified and begin to think, ‘what if these issues are real?’ Hahaha.⁴⁷

Creating unrest and fear by intelligence agents was coupled with the most destructive Suharto policy on people’s political rights, namely: the politics of floating mass (*politik massa*

⁴⁷ Heryanto, “Where Communism Never Dies”, 155-156.

mengambang). In this policy, political parties—with the exception of Golkar, Suharto’s own political machine—were not allowed to organize mass gathering so that the humble and simple Indonesian villagers would not be troubled with political issues (*isu-isu politik*). General Ali Murtopo, the man behind this concept, explained the reason for this floating mass as follows:

The political parties were always trying to marshal mass support by forming various affiliated organizations based on the ideologies of their respective parties. The mass of the people, especially those in the villages, always fell prey to the political and ideological interests of those parties. Their involvement in the conflicts of political and ideological interests had as its result the fact that they ignored the necessities of daily life, the need for development and improvement of their own lives, materially as well as spiritually.

Such a situation should not repeat itself... For this reason it is justifiable that political parties are limited to the district level only [that is, are banned from the villages]. Here lies the meaning and the goal of the *depoliticisation* (the process of freeing the people from political manipulation) and the *deparpolisasi* (the process of freeing the people from political party allegiances) in the villages.

In this way people in the villages will not spend their valuable time and energy in the political struggles of parties and groups, but will be occupied wholly with development efforts. Through this process there emerges the so-called “floating mass”, i.e. people who are not permanently tied to membership of any political party.⁴⁸

While political parties were cut off from direct contact with villagers, the military at the same time strengthened its territorial surveillance at every level of government: from the national level up to the village level.

In the Suharto policy of “floating mass,” the people’s political rights were strictly limited, and it is not surprising that Golkar with massive funds and real presence in the villages through the military always won national elections. With the politics of floating mass, the question is: how did the *aliran* politics operate at this time? Max Lane argued that the floating mass policy basically destroyed the *aliran* politics or at least put it in a dormant mode. Due to the prohibition of mass gatherings and the real achievement of economic stability during the Suharto era, mass

⁴⁸ Max Lane, *Unfinished Nation: Indonesia Before and After Suharto* (New York: Verso, 2008), 45-46.

organizations like trade unions and peasant groups had only a limited space to create direct relationships with the people. But, Hamayotsu provides a different argument. The rise of the powerhouse state simplified *aliran* politics into two categories: *hijau* (political Islam) and *merah putih* (secular and nationalist).⁴⁹ It is true that in political Islam itself there is a wide spectrum, from a radical political Islam with fervor for establishing an Islamic state manifested in the aspiration to restore the Jakarta Charter (as I discussed in the first section), to moderate and democratic political Islam which wants to incorporate basic values of *sharia* within Indonesian constitutional democracy. However Hamayotsu's categories show an unresolved tense relationship which influenced not only Indonesian civil society but also the military.

During the height of the Suharto powerhouse state in the mid of 1980s-1990s, the armed forces were divided between: *Militer Hijau* (Green Military) and *Militer Merah Putih* (Nationalist Military). Green military comes from strong Islamic background while nationalist military comes from various backgrounds with their prominent star, Benny Murdani, a Catholic and most trusted Suharto's general. In the eyes of the *santri* movement, Benny Murdani had an important role in suppressing the Islamic movement and securing the interests of Christian-Chinese groups. The contesting power of ABRI *Hijau* and ABRI *Nasionalist* was manifested in promotions to higher office which meant the ability to control power. Suharto's close alliance with Islam in the latter part of his presidency placed the green armed forces in the upper position. This same military group was believed to give support and was behind the numerous Islamic paramilitary groups which defended Suharto during the 1989 crisis.

Winters and other political theorists argued that inter-military factions had a big influence in supporting (or at least doing nothing to stop) mass demonstrations that caused the Suharto

⁴⁹ Kikue Hamayotsu, "Islam and Nation Building in Southeast Asia: Malaysia and Indonesia in Comparative Perspective," *Pacific Affairs* 75, no. 3 (2002), 365.

regime to fall apart.⁵⁰ Hefner also showed that the rise of Abdurahman Wahid, the third Indonesian President and a prominent Muslim cleric and scholar, after the reform era (*era reformasi*) was not possible without the support of nationalist military behind him.⁵¹ When Abdurahman Wahid tried to reform the armed forces radically, to revoke the army's dual function and more importantly to diminish their financial sources, the armed forces allied with Wahid opponents in parliament and impeached him after only two years of his presidency. The next two presidents after Wahid realized the real power of the military in Indonesian politics and applied only a moderate reform to the armed Forces. Even though the armed forces' dual function had been revoked during Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's presidency, the military with its internal conflict and factions continues to shape Indonesian politics, culture, and economic life.

Mietzner argued that Yudhoyono's success in controlling the military was due to his accommodation in not touching a more sensitive issue within the military: their financial resources.⁵² Yudhoyono himself was a military general. However, revoking the military dual function also did not affect much of the military influence on politics. The military successfully transformed itself into one of the political players within Indonesian politics. Many retired generals entered easily into local and national elections, even if they had a previous record of human rights violations. The most vivid example of this phenomenon was the candidacy of General Prabowo Subiyanto, as a 2014 Indonesian Presidential candidate, although he was believed to be the man behind deadly anti-Chinese riots in Jakarta and the kidnapping of democratic activists in 1998.

⁵⁰ Jeffrey A. Winters, *Oligarchy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 135-207.

⁵¹ Robert W. Hefner, "Islam and Nation in the Post-Suharto Era," in Adam Schwarz and Jonathan Paris, eds., *The Politics of Post-Suharto Indonesia* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1999), 40-72.

⁵² Mietzner, *The Politics of Military Reform in Post-Suharto Indonesia*, 49-58.

What we can learn from this period is a process of uprooting the political consciousness and blocking the democratic channels performed by the regime. During Sukarno's regime *aliran* politics garnered support and animated popular movements through their associations. While there were conflict between *aliran*, these conflicts also showed a vibrant political life where every democratic channel was used to voice their inspirations. It is interesting that in the open conflict of *aliran* politics during the Sukarno era, the number of deadly civil conflicts was lower than in the era of the surveillance state of Suharto. The Uppsala-PRIO conflict data set estimated that during 1950-61, there were 40,000 victims due to revolts and rebellions with the Sukarno government. When the military played as the engine of the powerhouse state, the human rights violence was skyrocketing. The victims of the 1965 purge alone were more than 500,000 and thousands were sent to prison without trial or were exiled to Buru island.⁵³

As shown by Tyson's studies,⁵⁴ we can also conclude that the rise of paramilitary groups at the end of the Suharto era gave a certain legacy to the ongoing struggle of vigilantism in the post-Suharto era. Vigilante leaders have been used by the military for supporting their hidden operations. NGO reports on the Moluccas' conflict between 2001 and 2002 showed the hidden operations of the paramilitary in keeping the spark of conflict alive on both sides (Muslim and Christian) so that the military could have legitimacy to intervene and portray themselves as "savior" in maintaining law and order. As van Bruinessen argued during the transition from the Wahid to the Megawati government:

There is almost a consensus among Indonesian political observers that all inter-ethnic and inter-religious violence of the past few years was provoked by power struggles between rival elite factions, or deliberately fomented by certain factions with the aim of destabilizing Wahid's (and Megawati's) government. There is no

⁵³ Mohammad Zulfan Tadjoeeddin, *Explaining Collective Violence in Contemporary Indonesia: From Conflict to Cooperation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 28.

⁵⁴ Adam Tyson, "Vigilantism and Violence in Decentralized Indonesia: The Case of Lombok," *Critical Asian Studies* 45, no. 2 (2013): 201-230.

doubt that inter-elite rivalry is a major destabilizing factor and that most of the violence is financed by military and civilian interest groups.⁵⁵

With his powerhouse state, Suharto was able to control all ruling elites and oligarchies under his command. The collapse of the dictator unleashed the centralized control of these predatory elites, and spread and penetrated into all political levels. In the following section, we witness how the elites were transformed into one of the democratic players and how the vigilantes—who were previously used by the army to destabilize civil society—served their patrons who run for election.

2.3. The Rise of Predatory Elites in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia

The East Asian financial crisis in 1997 triggered popular unrest in Indonesia. The price of basic daily needs rose almost 300% in just six months. This economic hardship fueled the mass unrest that led to Suharto's resignation on May 21, 1998. Before stepping down from his office, Suharto realistically signed a petition to demand a loan from the International Monetary Fund. Then IMF entered more deeply into Indonesian society through this catastrophe. Once considered as the miracle of East Asia with an average annual growth rate of seven percent in the 1980s and eight percent in the 1990s, Indonesia became the patient of an IMF Structural Adjustment Program with minus two percent economic growth in 1997-1999.⁵⁶

As mentioned in many studies on IMF Structural Adjustment Programs for economic recovery in Asia, the IMF saw that the only remedy to the problem was creating an economic environment that was welcoming the flow of fresh capital, especially from the developed world. Deregulation and decentralization became the key mantras to boost foreign direct investment so

⁵⁵ Martin van Bruinessen, "Genealogies of Islamic Radicalism in post-Suharto Indonesia," *South East Asia Research* 10, no. 2 (2002), 117.

⁵⁶ John Bresnan, "Economic Recovery and Reform," in John Bresnan, ed., *Indonesia: the Great Transition* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005), 192.

that, in the end, the incoming fresh capital would solve the crisis. With its economic tactics, the IMF then opened the door for neoliberalism to enter vividly in Indonesian politics and economy.

Neoliberalism can be defined as “a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade.”⁵⁷ From this definition, neoliberalism can be broken down into three different spheres:⁵⁸ (1) neoliberalism with an intellectual face, embedded from the Anglo-American libertarian tradition; (2) neoliberalism with a bureaucratic face by limiting state intervention in the market by privatization and deregulation; (3) neoliberalism with a political face: when the state gives preference to particular actors in finance, and neglects the others (trade unions).

Neoliberalism spanned across the globe in the last three decades and metamorphosed its foundational theories so that it will fit into the new context without losing its essential character on how to allocate economic resources in new cultural, political, and economic areas. What we witness in the post-Suharto era is not a total “copy and paste” of North American neoliberalism, but a contextualization of the North American neoliberal vision into the Indonesian context. Neoliberalism was used by the previous political economic power in Suharto’s Indonesia to control the Indonesian economy and society. The marriage of neoliberalism and the previous ruling elite gave birth to a new neoliberal vision of a predatory state. At the same time, the greed of the predatory elites also shaped the cohesion within *aliran* itself. As Aspinall argues, the contestation in Indonesian post-Suharto politics is no longer between separate *aliran* but between

⁵⁷ David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, cited in Edward Aspinall “A Nation in Fragments: Patronage and Neoliberalism in Contemporary Indonesia,” *Critical Asian Studies* 45, no. 1 (2013), 28.

⁵⁸ Anggun Trisnanto Hari Susilo, *The Indonesian National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM) Rural: Decentralization in the Context of Neoliberalism and World Bank Policies* (Thesis, Institute of Social Studies, 2012), 2-3.

elites in the single *aliran*. A new combined effort of different *aliran* due to the common predatory interest also emerged.

As required by the IMF Structural Adjustment Program, Indonesia started to deregulate and liberalized its state-owned corporations and services. Water services in some provinces were handed over to International Corporations, even though there is no sign of improved service after privatization. The decreased funding for public education—especially at the higher education level—opens the privatization of high-ranking state universities to gain capital. Before the privatization era, top state universities would subsidize bright students from low-income families to get the best possible education in the country. After the liberalization era, the high level tuitions made it harder for them to gain the country's best education and gave more spaces to the middle and upper class students who could pay the skyrocketing tuitions.

But the most damaging effect of the IMF Structural Adjustment Program to Indonesian politics is its policy of decentralization. The rationale for decentralization is to reverse the powerhouse state of the Suharto regime. In the Suharto regime, all decisions were made from Jakarta and by Suharto aides. The central government controlled all national policy especially the allocation of the budgets and revenues. There were no direct elections for state governor or city major. All candidates had to be approved by the central government and then the local house of representative could officially “elect” them.

This centralized bureaucracy opened the door to crony capitalism. In his study of the Indonesian oligarchy, Jeff Winters argues that, before Suharto took power in 1966, there were no oligarchs in Indonesia.⁵⁹ There were rich men especially from *priyayi* groups due to the large land they inherited, but they were not rich enough to be considered as oligarchs with big influence on government policy. Suharto used *kapitan cina* as the source of funding of his

⁵⁹ Winters, *Oligarchy*, 144.

political activities. In return, the Chinese community gained privileges to extract Indonesia's rich natural resources. Suharto and the Chinese oligarch operated by the ethic of *bagi-bagi* (sharing the money). Each oligarch had its own part in sharing, and in the end the oligarch will fund all Suharto political campaigns.

The ethics of *bagi-bagi* also relates to obtaining a developmental project. "To get a project" (*mendapat Proyek*) is a degenerated term with a connotation of corruption and nepotism referring to any government developmental project.⁶⁰ The booming in developmental projects started in the 1980s when Indonesia was showered by petro dollars and international development aid/loans. Lack of control and transparency made the World Bank loans go more to elite political leaders and less to the development project itself. Development projects became the major financial sources for Suharto's family. Suharto's children controlled any economic activity from toll construction to national transportation (airline, shipping and so-called *mobil nasional* [national car]). They also received a tax haven for their import/export activities.

Therefore, the rationale of the IMF decentralization was to bring back decisions to the local community. Provinces with high natural resources received more share for their income. In the IMF's point of view, the role of central government is to be a "night watch" for a vibrant democratic process at the local level. With the help of the World Bank and international donors, the idea of "civil society" became a trend in post-Suharto era. Vibrant civil society will bring democracy to operate at the local level and will give better response to local needs.

In May 1999, the Indonesian House of Representatives passed two decentralization laws: Law 22/1999 on regional governance and Law 25/1999 on the balance of funds. Decentralization laws, for example, guaranteed the transfer of management of natural resources from the central government to the regions and increased the share of revenue to the regions. While these new

⁶⁰ Aspinall, "A Nation in Fragments," 30.

laws seemed promising in giving the regions more power, the two decentralization laws were “formulated with insufficient preparation and planning, resulting in inconsistencies and ambiguities within and among different laws and regulations.”⁶¹

Sadly, this sacred idea of decentralization from IMF neglected the *realpolitik* of clientelism which was embedded in and has grown during the Suharto era. The IMF persistently argued that a good system will always operate well in any given context. If liberalization and decentralization work in the West, so they will work in Indonesia. This over optimism then did not consider the contesting factor of power relations in Indonesian society since its inception. The ethic of *bagi-bagi* has been able to sustain the patron-client relationship that kept the Suharto regime powerful. Suharto was successful in controlling the spirit of clientelism focused on his circle.⁶² But when the head of the family collapses, patron-client relationships do not automatically cease. Instead they transform into a new form and use a new opportunity.

Decentralization then becomes “decentralized corruption and crony capitalism.” Winters argues that during Suharto’s regime—before his family took control—oligarchy only operated at the high level of decision-making. After the reformasi era, *politik bagi-bagi* (crony politics) penetrated into the lowest level of decision-making. Money politics became part of the “elections industry.” In order to get into the election race, the candidate should provide hefty payments to local and central party officials. In his study on ninety local elections in Indonesia, Rinakit

⁶¹ Ida Aju Pradnja Resusudarmo, “Closer to People and Trees: Will Decentralisation Work for the People and the Forests of Indonesia,” *European Journal of Development Research* 16, no. 1 (2004), 112.

⁶² I follow Hamayotsu in defining clientelism as a political relationship where “recruitment, promotion and overall political success of rank-and-file members are ultimately dependent on their personal relations with, and loyalty to, party elites or patrons. They are rewarded with party positions and/or access to state offices and resources in return for their personal loyalty to particular party elites.” Kikue Hamayotsu, “Bringing clientelism and institutions back in: The rise and fall of religious parties in Indonesia’s electoral democracy,” in Dirk Tomsa & Andreas Ufen, eds., *Party Politics in Southeast Asia: Clientelism and Electoral Competition in Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2013), 128.

estimates that the bribes for the political party were one fifth of the candidate's campaign fund. After their names appear in the ballot, candidates will provide lump sums of "buying votes." For a mayoral race, a candidate should provide at least US\$1.6 million in funds, while the gubernatorial race costs an average of US\$10 million.⁶³

Beside money politics, militias, thugs or mass organizations affiliated with the party were used to provide muscle power and protection for the contending parties. "With their camouflage uniforms of distinct colors and regalia, they represent private armies that can be mobilized on behalf of the rich, the powerful and the ruthless."⁶⁴ It is interesting to note that in performing the security business, militias also publish tabloids (which appear irregularly and only during elections or disputes between local political parties) in favor of their clients.

Moreover, in the context of the ongoing conflict and corruption of the local level, decentralization failed to foster any accountability mechanism. It is true that now local communities in resource-rich areas can gain direct benefits from natural exploration more than before, but their share is mostly limited. The biggest share goes to the corporation and the district apparatus. In the context of forest concession permits (*Hak Penggunaan Hutan*), lack of accountability and poor infrastructure for monitoring allow corporations to extract beyond the permitted areas, even in the national park or conservation forest. Only within four years, 50 percent of the 400,000 acres of national forest in Kalimantan was destroyed and left barren. Serious levels of encroachment also happen in many of Indonesia's other national parks and protected forests.

The estimated loss of government revenue due to illegal forest extraction (logging) was up to Rp. 70 billion (US\$700 million). When the local community started to organize a protest, it

⁶³ Cited in Vedi R. Hadiz, *Localizing Power in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia: A Southeast Asia Perspective* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 121.

⁶⁴ Hadiz, *Localizing Power in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia*, 138.

was intimidated and terrorized.⁶⁵ In 2010, one protester was shot to death during a conflict between Wirasakti Corp.—an Indonesian pulp corporation—and the local community in Lampung, Sumatra. Of course there are some best practices. Local governments could promote a just share and demand more rigorous environmental consideration as happened in West Sumatra where the local government rejected a coal permit application in the Kerinci National Park for environmental reasons. But, the prevalent cases are far from ideal. Local governments work closely with corporations. They do not build mechanisms of control for their natural resource explorations. For example, in Betung Kerihun National Park, West Kalimantan, the local government hires only one ranger to oversee 27,580 acres of national forest.⁶⁶

Local government attitudes to corporations are understandable if we refer back to the high cost for a candidate to get into a local government position. With this high expenditure to get a political post, the elected official will try to get his/her money back. Natural resource extraction permits are one possible income. It is then understandable that the house representative becomes the subject of inquiry for the National Task Force on corruption. Prior to the 2004 national elections, the Indonesia attorney general's office reported that 352 members of the house of representatives (either at national or local level) were charged with corruption of national and local budget. In South Aceh, a district with rich natural resources, 20 out of 25 elected members were contractors who received and maintained developmental projects from government, such as building roads, bridges and traditional markets.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Moch N. Kurniawan "Money, Guns destroy protected forest in West Kalimantan," *Jakarta Post* Feb 20, 2003, accessed June 24, 2014. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2003/02/10/money-guns-destroy-protected-forest-central-kalimantan.html>

⁶⁶ Resusudarmo, "Closer to People and Trees", 123.

⁶⁷ Edward Aspinall, "Elections and Normalization of Politics in Indonesia," *South East Asia Research* 13, no. 2 (2005), 146.

The ethic of *bagi-bagi* and “to get a project” show the effect of decentralization of bourgeois’ interests into local politics especially in preying on development projects. The rise of predatory elites also transforms cultural alliances in *aliran* politics. During the Sukarno era, there were almost no records of internal conflict within *aliran* politics, because *aliran* became the source of one’s identity. *Aliran* as a religious and cultural alliance influences one’s political stance and creates a sense of connection with other people who share the same *aliran*. But, because of the rise of clientelism, this strong alliance within *aliran* was slowly eroding. The relationship is no longer on religious and cultural identity but is highly influenced by patron-client relationships. As we can see in the *bagi-bagi* and “to get a project” culture, inner political cleavages start to emerge. In the 1999 election, the first elections after 32 year of Suharto’s regime, there were 200 new political parties. The majority of the new parties arose from internal conflict within *aliran* politics. Therefore it is not exaggerating to conclude that what we witness in the post-Suharto era is “a gold rush mentality [that] took over...state budgets, regional assets and natural resources.”⁶⁸

2.4. Conclusion

Using sociological analysis, this section identified three contributing factors and actors for the decentered character of Indonesian society. The first factor is the rise of *aliran* politics and its influence during early independence until the end of the Sukarno era (1940-1965). The second one is the rise of the military and the powerhouse state during the Suharto era that created and sustained the regime through a strong surveillance state. This powerhouse state produced a patron-client relationship with support from the militia. The third factor is unleashing political

⁶⁸ Aspinall, “A Nation in Fragments”, 38.

elites and oligarchs, which once were ruled under Suharto, into a new form of neoliberal democratic contestation.

These factors help us to understand the structural factors that led to the escalation of conflict in the post authoritarian era. It is true that we cannot make a very broad stroke on each Indonesian conflict in the post Suharto era. They should be studied in their own uniqueness which would require another dissertation. But, by identifying the three factors mentioned above, we can understand the cultural and politico-economic background that shaped conflicts in the post-Suharto era. Violent conflicts are not due to primordial animosity or the clash of cultures, but are the direct result of contesting political powers in fragmented Indonesia. Decentralization provides material for conflict and facilitates mechanisms in regional violence. As we witnessed in the deadly ethnic riot in May 1998 or in the Moluccas Christian-Islam conflict in 2001, these riots are never spontaneous events due to unfolding democratic transitions. The deadly conflicts were prepared long before the event themselves. The conflicts were used by military and political elites to destabilize the country. Moreover, these conflicts indicate why the rule of law is always insufficient in the face of vigilantes, since the paramilitary group were kept alive by the same apparatus which was constitutionally obliged to maintain law and order.

Identifying the actors in such political contestation (i.e., *aliran* politic, military, vigilante, oligarch, and local elite) also will help us to find the antidote for such conflict: other actors of democratic movements who still hold a social justice agenda. In the following section, we will analyze at length the role of higher education in enacting the spirit of resistance throughout Indonesian history.

3. Higher Education and the Emergence of Public Space in Indonesia

In the previous section, we traced the factors of fragmentation and the decentered character of Indonesian society. Post-authoritarian scholars are helpful in criticizing the derailment of the 1998 reform for no longer serving the Indonesian people but local political elites who worked closely with oligarchs in robbing Indonesian natural resources. As Hadiz frequently argues, former authoritarian apparatchiks “hijacked” the democratic transition to serve their predatory interests. But, moving beyond their critiques, questions arise: is this predatory group left unchallenged? What are the resources for dealing with this problem? If the Indonesian community wants to attain the high hope that emerged from the *reformasi* era, they should start to find the possible resources to move forward and challenge the derailment of the 1998 reform projects. In this section, I want to show how higher education could strengthen Indonesian civil society.

While we cannot neglect the ongoing conflict of interests starting from the open conflict of *aliran* politics to the rise of predatory local elites, genuine popular movements can challenge such derailments. Sometimes, these popular movements are scattered, some even failed, but in many cases the movements also received public attention and support. Giving attention to popular movements in Indonesia helps us to frame how civil society is not silent in shaping the movements of Indonesia. While civil society is prone to fall into a “floating mass” as in the New Order era, portraying Indonesian society as only a victim of predatory regimes or political elites is indeed exaggerating.

Within the Indonesian civil society, popular movements consist of many actors. In the labor movement, for example, Benny Juliawan brilliantly shows the ebbs and flows of labor

movements in relatively free Post-Suharto era.⁶⁹ Juliawan responds to the critique of the failure of labor movements to use the momentum of a freer era in the post- Suharto period. While there is the fact of disorganized labor movements, street level politics proves to be successful in reviving the street as the theater of people who continuously challenge the senate because the senators are always prone to their predatory interests.

Juliawan's analysis is closely related to Barbara Hatley's argument that even in the midst of Suharto's total control of Indonesian society (circa 1990), there were resurgences of popular theater as a form of cultural resistance.⁷⁰ During the 1990's, Suharto used Javanese shadow puppets—a traditional and popular cultural performance in Java—to promote his vision of Indonesia. He supported and financed many shadow puppeteers to perform a specific story from the Javanese version of the Mahabharata, the self-revelation of Semar (*Semar Mbabar Jati Diri*). In this story, through the shadow puppeteer's hand, Suharto portrays himself as the new “Semar,” a holy man and caretaker of Pandhava—“the good band of brothers” in Mahabharata stories. Therefore, Suharto will take care of “good and faithful Indonesians” as Semar did. In response to this imagination, Hatley traced the counter-imagination in popular theater, especially in *ketoprak* and *reyog*. In these popular presentations, actors portrayed themselves as the people (*rakyat*) who make fun of the glamour of the rulers' life and their authoritarian attitude. Ketoprak influences the coming of the newer genre of popular theater (*teater rakyat*) that gave more direct and open criticism to the regime.⁷¹ Popular theater was used to increase awareness among

⁶⁹ Benny Juliawan, “Street Level Politics: Labour Protest in Post-authoritarian Indonesia,” *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 41, no. 3 (2011): 349-370.

⁷⁰ Barbara Hatley, “Theater as Cultural Resistance in Contemporary Indonesia,” in Arief Budiman, ed., *State and Civil Society in Indonesia* (Monash, Australia: Center of Southeast Asian Studies, 1994), 321-348.

⁷¹ Popularity of popular theater during Suharto powerhouse state was influenced by the growing interest in the work of Paulo Freire, especially his idea of conscientization.

audiences of the root of their social problems, or in James Scott terms: a form of “everyday forms of resistance.”⁷²

By noticing the plethora of popular movements in Indonesian history we will ask: what is the role of education in nurturing the spirit of resistance to predatory actors in Indonesian society? What are its characteristics? How can students collaborate with larger spheres of society?

3.1. The Rise of *Mahasiswa* (University Student) from the Colonial Period to the Early Suharto Era

In the history of resistance in modern Indonesia, we see that educational institutions, especially higher education, place themselves as the seeder of *aksi* (movement). The legacy of student movements can be traced back to the last phase of colonial resistance. Drawing from Anderson’s study on the birth of nationalism, the Indonesian concept of nationalism emerged in school movements in contrast to the 17th century European idea of nationalism that was influenced by the revolution in printing and vernacular media.⁷³

At the end of the 19th Century, as a form of so-called “*ethische politiek*” (ethical policy) toward their colonies, the Dutch started to build a school system for the native Indonesians. This elementary school became the initial form of public school in Indonesia. They provide basic literacy skills. During this time, mass organizations affiliated with *aliran* also started their own school movement. Traditional *santri* of Nahdlatul Ulama continued their traditional *madrasa*, while reformist *santri* started the network of modern schools, combining the *madrasa* style with the Dutch public school. The Catholic church—especially the Jesuits—also started high schools

⁷² James C. Scott, *Weapon of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985).

⁷³ Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 37.

and a college for teacher training, based on the European Jesuit college system but with a high dose of local content. Due to their restricted movement and the urge to maintain their native origin, Chinese schools also served the urban Chinese community, combining the Dutch system with much flavor of Chinese culture.

This network of school movements based on *aliran* and the emergence of public schools around the 1920's generated a conversation on the idea of nationhood, preparing the young student to enter the debate on *res publica* and seeding the idea of proclaiming independence.⁷⁴ The school movement also prepared the new generation of Indonesian intellectuals. STOVIA, the first higher education institution in Indonesia for training midwives and native doctors, played an important role in the formation of *Budi Utomo*, the first pro-nationalist movement in the colony in 1908. Sukarno himself graduated from Bandung Institute of Technology (*Institut Teknologi Bandung*). As a university student, he was the founder of *Algemene Studieclub* (General Study Club) which organized the student movement and public discussions on Dutch colonization. Indonesian students in the Netherlands—e.g., Mohammad Hatta, Sutan Sjahrir, Ki Hajar Dewantara—established *Indische Vereeniging* (Indonesian Union).

Anderson provides interesting data. Although some university students in the colonial era established pro-independence movements, it was the youth with high school diplomas or *madrasa* students who radically joined the physical revolution against the Dutch. The image of *pemuda* (the youth) with long hair and “a fierce commitment to unrelenting struggle against the Dutch became one of the lasting symbols of revolution.”⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Taufik Abdullah, *Schools and Politics: The Kaum Muda Movement in West Sumatra (1927-1933)* (Singapore: Equinox, 2009).

⁷⁵ Edward Aspinall, “Indonesia: Moral Force Politics and The Struggle against Authoritarianism” in Meredith L. Weiss & Edward Aspinall, eds., *Student Activism in Asia* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 157.

The important event of the youth movement happened in 1928 with the first youth congress. The members of the congress came from many parts of the country, representing the diverse background of the East Indies. The congress made a prominent pledge, which will mark the “ideal situation” of Indonesian people: namely, *Sumpah Pemuda* (the Youth Pledge). They pledged:

Firstly, we the sons and daughters of Indonesia, acknowledge one motherland, Indonesia.

Secondly, we the sons and daughters of Indonesia, acknowledge one nation, the nation of Indonesia.

Thirdly, we the sons and daughters of Indonesia, uphold the language of unity, Indonesia.⁷⁶

This mythic symbol of populism and the nationalist idea of *pemuda* resonate powerfully to Indonesian youth throughout generations. Subsequently, the youth were considered the voice of morality (*suara moral*) of the nation at that time.

After Independence in 1945 and until 1960, universities blossomed throughout the country. Between 1924 and 1940, the total number of university graduates was around 532, while the total population in the colony was 70 million. Of those 532 graduates, only 230 were native Indonesians. In the period 1950-1960, the number of higher education institutions increased up to 135 with almost 60 to 70 thousand students. But, the proliferation of university students did not correspond to the vibrant life of the social movements. Aspinall notes that “most university students being hedonistic, elitist and apolitical.”⁷⁷

In the 1960s, cold war tensions escalated the friction within Indonesian society especially among three large Indonesian factions: communist, *santri*, and nationalist. Political parties started to see the increasing number of student as the potential for mass organization.

⁷⁶ English translation of Sumpah Pemuda (Youth Pledge) is taken from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Youth_Pledge, accessed June 27, 2014.

⁷⁷ Aspinall, “Indonesia: Moral Force Politics and The Struggle against Authoritarianism,” 157.

Masyumi—the devout *santri* parties—built strong alliances with *Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam Indonesia* (Islamic Students Association). Students affiliated with the communist party established *Consentrasi Gerakan Mahasiswa Indonesia* (Indonesian Student Movement Concentration). The nationalist party created *Gerakan Mahasiswa Nasional Indonesia* (GMNI). The Catholic Student movement (PMKRI) affiliated themselves with small *Partai Katolik* (Catholic Party) and had an ideological alliance with the nationalist faction.

Heightened political friction led to conflict between student organizations which belonged to different party affiliations. Shortly after the September coup in 1965, the communist party became the common enemy and the *Kesatuan Aksi Mahasiswa Indonesia* (KAMI, Indonesian Student Action Front) came into being. It demanded the disbanding of the communist party and asked that Sukarno step down. KAMI—backed by HMI as well as Catholic and Protestant supporters—organized large protests and rallies to push the reform agenda. Sukarno dismissed these movements as groups of students “with shiny shoes, pleated skirts, wearing lipstick and incredible hair-dos.”⁷⁸ The economy was in very bad condition due to political instability. The inflation rate increased up to 500%, economic growth shrank to – 0.4%. The poverty rate in Java was 61% and in the outer islands 51%. With back-up from the military and such poor economic conditions, KAMI successfully overthrew Sukarno and got public support for their cause, called TRITURA (*Tri Tuntutan Rakyat*, Three People Demands), which are: disbanding the communist party, reconfiguring the cabinet, cutting down the high price of primary goods.

In Aspinall’s analysis, while KAMI’s success was used as a legitimization of Suharto’s military campaign to purge the communist and leftist factions, KAMI was able to claim and change populist mythic from *pemuda* (the youth, with high school and traditional *madrasa* in

⁷⁸ Ibid., 159.

colonial era) into *mahasiswa* (university student). It is now the university students who are the next heirs of Indonesian moral conscience: an imagination deeply imbedded in Indonesian society until today.

3.2. Ebbs and Flows of Student Movements during the Suharto Era

Suharto's policy on education can be described in four phases. The first phase (1965-1974) was the time of consolidation. In this era, Suharto badly needed public support due to the social and economic crisis that led to Sukarno's fall. He also needed wider support for his campaign to destroy the communist and Sukarnoist structure. During this consolidation era, Suharto played "semi-open" gestures to democratic movements. While he opened the channel for critics, he kept the forces of opposition at a tolerable level so that critics from among the activists would not jeopardize his political decisions. In this semi-open relation between Suharto and civil society, there was no direct opposition until 1974.

The second phase (1974-1983) was the strengthening phase of *étatisme* and the disorganizing of civil society. The consolidation moment ended after the Malari affair in January 1974. At the beginning of 1970, some KAMI students started to stand up for open criticism to the Suharto corruption and wasteful and unnecessary government spending on national projects initiated by Suharto's wife. With support from internal conflict within the military by those who were disappointed with their share after supporting Suharto's military campaign against the communists, anti-Japanese riots exploded in Jakarta. Suharto harshly suppressed the movements. He established Golkar (*Golongan Karya*) as his political machine and forced political parties to unite into two parties according to the affiliation of the political ideology of each. After some student protests with a direct anti-Suharto message, even demanding his impeachment, Suharto,



Figure 1.2. Weekly Mandatory Flag Ceremony at a school, honoring the nation. Source: Shiraishi, *Young Heroes*, 144

through the Ministry of Education and Culture, issued a presidential order called “normalization of campus life/board of student coordination” (NKK/BKK, *Normalisasi Kehidupan Kampus/Badan Koordinasi Kemahasiswaan*). This policy basically forbade all student political activities, and made the campus sterile from any student activities which related to politics. Students who opposed the NKK/BKK’s edict were sent to prison.

In the third phase (1983-1990), Suharto attained the highest control of the nation. Suharto

also started to build an image as a national hero by sponsoring publications and films on his success in suppressing the communists. During this period, Suharto emerged as the figure of a “father” who will take care of “his sons and daughters.” Communists were then portrayed as the bogeymen who can suddenly attack families. As a part of this propaganda, Indonesian students from kindergarten up to high school were obliged to watch the film *Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI* (Treachery of G30S/PKI). Each year, on the night of September 30, TVRI—the only television channel and a government station—aired the film. As noted by Saya Shiraishi, this massive Suharto political campaign marked the transition of Indonesian politic into the politics of family.⁷⁹ Suharto supported the seminars on the philosophy of *Pancasila* that served his political purpose. *Pancasila* in Suharto’s hands was not being interpreted as finding a working consensus

⁷⁹ Saya S. Shiraishi, *Young Heroes: The Indonesian Family in Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Publications, 1997).

among diverse cultural backgrounds as proposed by Sukarno during the discussions in Indonesia's early independence. *Pancasila* for Suharto is a project of forming forced unity by eliminating diversity, especially critical opinions toward the regime.

The fourth phase (1990-1998) marks the dawn of Suharto's regime and the moment of preparation for its downfall. Suharto no longer saw Islamic groups as possible threats but as new allies. While in the third phase he showed himself to be more open to Javanese *Kebatinan* (Javanese spirituality), by the late 80's Suharto started to make the Hajj pilgrimage. Suharto also supported the installment of Indonesian Muslim Scholars Association (ICMI, *Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Indonesia*) and also opened the channel for Islam to influence educational policy. Nevertheless, Muslim scholars were aware that Suharto's favor to political Islam was due to the decline of political support to Suharto especially when the economic crisis hit Indonesia in early 1997. The economic crisis triggered a more vigorous democratic movement that was able to challenge Suharto openly and demanded that he step down.

3.3. Several Attempts to Build Solidarity in Disorganized Indonesia

By tracing the history of student movements, we can realize that the potentiality of students as agents of change was influenced by Suharto's policy on education. Another challenge faced by student movements was the internal tension. This question should be answered then: amidst the ebbs and flows of educational policy during the New Order regime and the challenges of internal tension, how do student movements try to build coalitions? In the following section, I will describe the two cases of student attempts to build solidarity, not only with other student movements but also with other democratic actors within Indonesian society.

Student Movements in the Kedung Ombo Case

During the height of Suharto's control in 1990, the Kedung Ombo case gained public attention. Kedung Ombo is a small rural area in Central Java. Financed by a loan from the World Bank, Suharto's government planned to build a water dam to support the farming industry in Central Java. Kedung Ombo is a district in the proposed water dam plan. The people were forced to give their land to the government at low reimbursement. "*Jer Basuki Mowo Bea*" (the sacrifice of the few is tolerable for the benefit of the many) was the government propaganda to legitimize forced eviction and low restitution.

The Kedung Ombo case marked the beginning of open confrontation with Suharto after the era of floating mass policy. Students played an important role in providing accompaniment and organization for the victims. In Arief Budiman's analysis, the Kedung Ombo case also brought new characters into the student movements.⁸⁰ *First*, in this case, students worked closely with other members of civil society, especially the farmers. While students were highly involved in building organization, in the end, the choice of action was in the hands of local people. *Second*, students organized the network of support beyond Kedung Ombo as the hot spot. Students organized protests in other cities such as Yogyakarta, Semarang, Surabaya, Surakarta, Jakarta, and Bogor. Solidarity Group for the Victims of Kedung Ombo Reservoir (*Kelompok Solidaritas untuk Korban Pengembangan Reservoir Kedung Ombo*) claimed that they received support from 45 universities in Java and Lombok. There were student protests in Java's central cities. The result of this network of action was the willingness of the minister of internal affairs to dialogue with farmers and students. *Third*, with the help of NGOs, the Kedung Ombo case also received international attention. Since the fund to create the reservoir came from the World

⁸⁰ Arief Budiman & Olle Törnquist, *Aktor Demokrasi: Catatan tentang Gerakan Perlawanan di Indonesia* [Democratic Actor: Overview of Democratic Resistance in Indonesia] (Jakarta: Institut Studi Arus Informasi, 2001)

Bank, international coalitions pushed the World Bank to monitor closely the execution of the program, just restitution, and resettlement.

The Kedung Ombo case inaugurated the building of coalitions in Indonesian civil society and showed the possible contribution of student movements in it. With this case, the students' opposition to Suharto started to escalate but, at the same time, was anchored in grass-roots issues. This coalition of students and many exponents of Indonesian society was a preparation for a more dramatic moment in Indonesian history—May 1998, the fall of Suharto.

Student Movements in the Reform (Reformasi) Era

The most vivid example of how students collaborated with larger civil society to challenge predatory Suharto was the event of May, 1998. May 1998 is the beginning of the reform era, when hundreds of thousands of university students gathered together to demand that Suharto step down from his throne. This massive movement was influenced by the downfall of the Indonesian economy at the beginning of 1997. The unemployment rate rose almost 30%; economic growth in 1997-1998 was -2%. The price of basic needs tripled in six months. The economic recession contributed to Sukarno's fall and triggered the mass protests in 1966, where the same actors, students, gathered together again to demand that Suharto take full responsibility for his inability to handle the nemesis of Indonesian economy and corruption in high places.

This movement cost many students their lives. The Human Rights Commission's report showed that more than 30 students and human rights activists were kidnapped from early 1998 to May 1998. Military courts tried General Prabowo Subianto and held him responsible for kidnapping and killing 13 students during the May unrest. Dozens are still missing today and believed to be dead. In the Yogyakarta region, one student was killed during the protest.

Thousands of his fellow students carried his coffin to the burial ground and this tragedy triggered a greater mass movement in the following days.

Of course, as shown by Aspinall, May 1998 was not a sudden event. The ebbs and flows of previous democratic movements had been preparing this movement and coalition for a long



Figure 1.3. For weeks, Students occupied the House of Representatives, which led to Suharto's resignation on May 21, 1998. Source: © Peter Turnley/Corbis
<<http://www.corbisimages.com/stock-photo/rights-managed/TL038643/students-protesting-suhartos-regime?popup=1>>

time, such as the Kedung Ombo case. Another consideration is that May 1998 was not limited to “Jakarta events.” As the capital city of Indonesia, it is understandable that the Jakarta student movement was highly publicized as if it were the sole representative of student

movements. Studies show that the Jakarta students were comparatively quite late in joining the national protest. Students and labor movements in Yogyakarta and Medan had already set the stage of protest and had prompted the Jakarta students to join the protests.

Student mass demonstrations would not be possible without logistical support from the public. It took almost four months from the early spark of demonstration in February 1998 to Suharto's fall on May 21, 1998. For example, the NGO *Suara Ibu Peduli* (The Voice of Concerned Mothers) coordinated the delivery of food and other supplies to the students who occupied the House of Representatives in Jakarta. During the mass demonstrations, for months there were daily cultural performances organized by artists. There were public lectures on corruption and human rights abuses during the Suharto regime. Even the university

administrations affiliated with students gave special permission for not attending classes and professors brought their students to the mass demonstration.⁸¹

During May 1998, Indonesian society witnessed the possibility of intergroup collaboration and power that emerged from it as portrayed by the famous demonstration chant “a people united is invincible” (*Rakyat bersatu tak bisa dikalahkan*). The *Reformasi* student movement itself was not homogeneous: members came from different groups, from the most radical student groups called City Forum (*Forum Kota*) to *Cipayung* student groups who affiliated with Islamic and Christian interreligious movements. Nevertheless, these groups were brought together by the same vision: reformation of the Suharto regime. The primary challenge ahead was to revive the possibility of building solidarity especially when civil society had to respond to the rise of a predatory elite.

3.4. Conclusion

In this section, I showed the ebbs and flows of university students as a powerful moral force in Indonesian society from the post-independence era until the fall of Suharto. While the dynamics of student movements itself have been influenced by Suharto’s political policy on education, yet two cases of student movement showed the possibility of inter-group coalition, both locally and internationally. Student movements were manifestations of larger democratic movements that challenged political elites and the agenda of oligarchs.

As Aspinall argues, in Indonesian history there were tensions and conflicts within student movements. Nevertheless “the notion that students were national saviors ultimately proved to be a powerful myth and one that contributed greatly to the mobilizations that brought the New

⁸¹ Edward Aspinall, *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005), 229.

Order regime to an end.”⁸² If in the previous era students inherited the mythic image of revolutionary *pemuda* (youth), the question that puzzled Indonesia was: what will the students do in a more open post-authoritarian era?

4. The Decline of a Collaborative Movement: The Challenge Ahead

The first and second part of this chapter showed and analyzed the picture of fragmentation in Indonesian civil society. Literature in post-Suharto political theory identified three actors which contributed to fragmentation and the escalation of conflict in Indonesian society, namely: social and political cleavage due to internal pluralism in religious tradition, the role of the military, and the rise of predator elites in post authoritarian Indonesia. When the IMF launched its Structural Adjustment Program which focused on the ideal of decentralization in order to bring “people closer to government,” it unleashed the dormant previous conflicts and infiltrated even deeper into the local community.

As history showed, education—especially higher education—can play an important role in promoting collaboration to challenge the predatory oligarchy and the elite political parties who were robbing Indonesia of its future. Student movements proved to be powerful and successful in taming two subsequent regimes (Sukarno and Suharto). Nevertheless, student movements themselves also became a reflection of society. They were powerful but disorganized. Of course, we cannot deny the fact that they shaped collaboration as in the case of Kedung Ombo in 1990 and the historic moment of *reformasi* in 1998.

Unfortunately, after the *reformasi* era, we witness a higher degree of evaporation of an organized student movement. Some preliminary analyses have been proposed. Dave McRae argued that in a more open society, the privileged status of student movements as the moral voice

⁸² Aspinall, “Indonesia: Moral Force Politics and The Struggle Against Authoritarianism,” 176.

of the nation started to erode. Student movements became just one among many movements in a democratic society.⁸³ In her analysis of post-Suharto political party recruitment, Hamayotsu also analyzed the impact of a political party's recruitment of the young and ambitious youth to pursue political careers through affiliation with the party; and how at the same time this recruitment caused tensions and competitions with other student groups.⁸⁴

There was also a shift toward more local issues: labor, land, or ethno-nationalist mobilization in the conflicted areas.⁸⁵ When student movements joined the local advocacy groups, in many cases they no longer kept their distinct identity as university students but identified themselves as parts of the larger civil society movements. Some notable local initiatives in post-Suharto era were the collaborations among university students, NGOs and urban poor communities in Jakarta and the collaborative peace movements in Aceh and Papua.⁸⁶

However, in this section I follow Aspinall in analyzing the deeper problem of the decline of student movements, namely the massification and commodification⁸⁷ of higher education that lacks a pedagogical vision of social engagement. With its high expenses and highly influenced by a neo-liberalistic vision of education, the massification and commodification of higher education in the post-Suharto era focuses only on fostering technical abilities that have economical benefits. This post-Suharto neo-liberalistic vision is coupled with the legacy of

⁸³ Dave McRae, *The 1998 Indonesian Student Movement* (Clayton: Monash Asia Institute—Monash University, 2001), 26-33.

⁸⁴ Kikue Hamayotsu, "Beyond faith and identity: mobilizing Islamic youth in a democratic Indonesia" *Pacific Review* 24, no. 2 (2011): 225-247.

⁸⁵ Mikaela Nyman, *Democratizing Indonesia: The Challenge of Civil Society in the Era of Reformasi* (Copenhagen: Nias, 2006), 81-92.

⁸⁶ I will develop this topic of local-based student movements later in chapter V of this dissertation.

⁸⁷ I follow James Keenan in defining commodification as "a mindset, a critical one, which looks at the university in the twenty-first century and contends that for its survival higher education has become simply a commodity and its goods from the degree to education itself gets commodified. Commodification is basically a way of philosophically reflecting on the growing emergence of the administration of the university as corporate business." James F. Keenan, S.J., *University Ethics: How Colleges Can Build and Benefit from a Culture of Ethics* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 174.

Suharto's powerhouse state on education, which successfully limited students' critical minds. In these conundrums of the post-Suharto educational system, we locate massification and commodification of higher education institutions and the lack of vision in education as the root problem of decline of an organized and vibrant student movement. Knowing the root problem helps us to propose an alternative for its reversal.

4.1. Massification and Commodification of Higher Education in the Post-Suharto Era

Aspinall argues that during the 60s, higher education students in Indonesia became a *petite bourgeoisie* that lacked social concern for the plight of the people. If we compare that finding to the vibrant dynamics during the reformed era, student activism in the post-Suharto era is decreasing. The decrease in student movements was caused by the skyrocketing cost of higher education and the penetration of a neoliberal vision into Indonesian education. From a bird's-eye point of view, higher education in Asia is an expensive investment, limited to a certain class of society, with the exception of South Korea. South Korea's higher education enrollment in 2005 was 91%, the highest in the region, even higher than Japan and Singapore—the two leading developed Asian countries.

Table 1.2. Gross Enrollment Ratios (Total Enrollment as a Percentage of Relevant Age Cohorts)⁸⁸

Country	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
South Korea	7	12	37	78	91
Singapore	9	12	34	60	
Japan	18	31	29	47	55
Thailand	3	10	17	35	46
Hong Kong	7	10			32
Malaysia		4	7	26	29
Philippines	18	24	25	30	28
China		1	3	8	20
Indonesia	3	4	8	14	17
Brunei		1		13	15

⁸⁸ UNESCO, "Institute of Statistics, Global Education Digest," cited in Weiss and Aspinall, eds., *Student Activism in Asia*, 7.

Country	1970	1980	1990	2000	2005
Laos			1	3	8
Burma	2	4	5		
Cambodia	1		1	2	4
Vietnam		3	3	9	
World average	9	12	13	19	24
East Asia Pacific	3	5	7	15	24

While the Indonesian percentage is higher than some other South East Asian countries which still struggle with democratic movements like Laos, Burma, Cambodia and Vietnam, enrollment in Indonesia is far behind the Philippines, Malaysia and Thailand, and even behind the world average and that of East Asia and the Pacific. The main reason why enrollment in higher education in Indonesia is below both the World and the East Asia Pacific average is the high cost of tuition and living expenses for students.

However, according to the revised Indonesian Constitution, the state is obliged to provide 20% of its annual budget for education. Nevertheless between 2001 and 2008, national expenditure on education was no higher than 3 % of its GDP as shown in the following table.

Table 1.3. National Public Expenditure on Education, 2001-2008 (in trillion Rupiah)⁸⁹

	2001	2003	2004	2005	2008
National education expenditures	63.4	83.7	76.7	82.8	135.7
National education expenditure (% of GDP)	2.8	3.1	2.7	2.6	3
Total Nominal National Expenditure	363.7	429.9	472.8	528.1	1000.1

The national expenditure mainly focuses on strengthening basic literacy and providing “free” primary and secondary education. According to the mandate of Indonesia’s newest educational law (UU SISDIKNAS 2001), the state should provide free primary and secondary education, but in reality, schools still charge students for their school year activities. For the low income families, the burdens for sending their children to school are transportation and text book expenses which cost parents on average 75% of their children’s expenditures. Thus, the

⁸⁹ Jacques Hicks, “The Missing Link,” 59.

government subsidy for “free” primary and secondary education in Indonesian public schools operationally covers only 25% of parental expenses.⁹⁰

While the state provides a certain level of subsidy to primary and secondary schools, House of Representatives passed the law of privatization of state universities as consequence of decreasing funding from the state. With the increased cost of higher education, students then come from the social class which no longer struggles with basic necessities.

Table 1.4. Higher Education Expenses Borne by Parents and Students for a First Degree, Academic Year 2004-2005 (Indonesian Rupiah [Rp.] converted to US\$ by 2004 PPP estimate \$1=Rp.2255) ⁹¹

		Public		Private
	Special ‘one-time’ or ‘up-front’ fees	Low Public	High Public	High Private
Instructional Expenses	Tuition	Rp. 300,000 [\$ 133]	Rp. 1,000,000 [\$ 443]	Rp. 4,000,000 [\$ 1,773]
	Books & other educational expenses	Rp. 900,000 [\$ 400]	Rp. 1,350,000 [\$ 598]	Rp. 2,250,000 [\$997]
	Subtotal expenses of instruction	Rp. 1,200,000 [\$ 533]	Rp. 2,350,000 [\$ 1,042]	Rp. 6,250,000 [\$ 2,770]
Student Living Expenses	Lodging	Rp. 900,000 [\$ 400]	Rp. 9,000,000 [\$ 3,990]	Rp. 10,800,000 [\$ 4,790]
	Food	Rp. 3,600,000 [\$ 1,596]	Rp. 6,300,000 [\$ 2,793]	Rp. 8,100,000 [\$ 3,592]
	Transportation	Rp. 315,000 [\$ 140]	Rp. 450,000 [\$ 200]	Rp. 2,250,000 [\$ 997]
	Other personal expenses	Rp. 800,000 [\$ 354]	Rp. 2,700,000 [\$ 1,197]	Rp. 3,600,000 [\$ 1,596]
	Subtotal expenses of student living	Rp. 5,615,000 [\$ 2,490]	Rp. 18,450,000 [\$ 8,180]	Rp. 24,750.00 [\$ 10,975]
	Total cost to parent and student	Rp. 6,815,000 [\$ 3,022]	Rp. 20,800,000 [\$ 9,223]	Rp. 31,000,000 [\$ 13,747]

Low Public: low public tuition, living at home with parents.

High Public: high public tuition, living as ‘independent adult’.

High Private: high private tuition, living in dormitory or shared apartment.

If we look closely at 2004-2005 higher student expenses, we can understand the reason for low enrollment in universities as shown in table 1.4. In the survey conducted by Wicaksono

⁹⁰ Hicks, “The Missing Link,” 59.

⁹¹ Teguh Yudo Wicaksono and Deni Friawan, “Recent Developments in Higher Education in Indonesia: Issues and Challenges,” in Shiro Armstrong and Bruce Chapman, eds., *Financing Higher Education and Economic Development in East Asia* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2011), 178.

and Friawan in 2002, 70% of high school graduates said that they would not attend higher education for lack of financial resources. 16% responded that they had to help their parents earn a daily living. Hence, almost 86% from the cohort are not able to get a higher degree for economic reasons. Only 8% argue that they had already chosen their own career as entrepreneurs and 1% of the cohort cannot enter university due to disability.⁹²

The implications of this changing sociological background are threefold:

1. Students will be very unlikely to get involved with activities which do not have a direct relation to their future investment, which is to secure a job. Why would a student sacrifice her/his parents' high expenditure on tuition to join an alliance with a workers' strike or farmers' movement?
2. With stable economic growth, there is adequate opportunity for fresh graduates in the job market. Stable economic growth will radically limit student angst due to shortages in the job market as happened during the 1998 economic crisis.
3. As shown in table 1.2, between 1990-2005, post-Suharto Indonesia experienced the massification of student enrollment from 8% in 1990 to 17% in 2005, double in more than 15 years. But, it is an irony that massification of higher education does not correspond to the level of involvement in social movements. This phenomenon also happened in Japan (post-1960s movements), Thailand (post-1973s movements), and Korea (post-1980s). Aspinall argues that proliferation of Asian higher education focuses narrowly on providing technical and professional training, while at the same time encouraging less the study of liberal arts and critical social sciences.⁹³

⁹² Wicaksono and Friawan "Recent Development in Higher Education in Indonesia: Issues and Challenges," 198.

⁹³ Weiss and Aspinall, eds., *Student Activism in Asia*, 16.

The following data show the trend of proliferation of Indonesian education in technical and professional training.⁹⁴

*Table 1.5. Higher Education Institutions in Indonesia by type (2009/10)*⁹⁵

	Ministry of Education & Culture			Ministry of Religious Affairs		
	Public	Private	Total	Public	Private	Total
University	48	412	460	6	87	93
Institute	6	47	53	14	26	40
Advanced School	2	1,314	1,316	32	409	441
Academy	0	1,015	1,015	0	0	0
Polytechnic	27	140	167	0	0	0
Total	83	2,928	3,011	52	522	574

Since it is only universities that have liberal art and social studies (i.e., sociology, anthropology, political sciences, gender studies, development studies, and philosophy), and many of them were already overshadowed by business and natural sciences majors, we can conclude that only 15% (460 of 3,011) of higher education institutions in the post-Suharto era have resources and give room for student interaction with critical reflection of Indonesian society through lectures, group discussions, etc. When students have limited access to critical reflections on their society, how can we expect a vibrant political activism on university campus?

4.2. Lack of Vision in Education

Massification and commodification of higher education in the post-Suharto era does not correspond to the vibrant life of civic involvement of the students. While the skyrocketing of tuition and the mushrooming of professional training can be blamed as the main reason for the

⁹⁴ In Indonesia's Education System, there are two ministries that supervise educational programs: the ministry of education and culture and the ministry of religious affairs. The ministry of religious affairs supervises all *madrassa* and Islamic higher education institutions, while the ministry of education and culture supervises all public and private educational institutions (even if some of the private institutions are also affiliated with religious institutions).

⁹⁵ Unpublished data from Directorate General of Higher Education, Ministry of Education and Culture, July 2011, cited in Hal Hill and Thee Kian Wie, "Indonesian Universities: Rapid Growth, Major Challenges," Daniel Suryadarma and Gavin W. Jones, eds., *Education in Indonesia* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2013), 165.

decrease in student involvement in non-academic activities, especially in politics, it is just a symptom of a hidden and untouched conundrum of the philosophy of education itself.

H.A.R. Tilaar—a leading expert in Indonesian education—analyzed the complexity of the Suharto educational system, its anomalies, and the results of this failed system in the subsequent years.⁹⁶

Development Indicators of <i>Sisdiknas</i> (System of National Education)	Paradigm	The New Order Era: The Results Achieved	Anomalies
1. Popularization of education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing education is a way to end the vicious circle of poverty 2. Hastening the effort to provide basic education 3. Initiating nine years compulsory education to improve the quality of people 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The improvement of people's education did not respond to reducing the index of absolute poverty 2. The increase of economic growth was not followed by enhancing investments in education, and as a result, it is difficult to increase the quality of education 3. The participants at the primary, elementary, and higher education levels increased 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The improvement of education did not correspond to a qualitative increase of productivity 2. The level of unemployment among university graduates increased 3. Popularization of education was not followed by increased investments in education and the government budget on education 4. Popularization of education did not correspond to increased quality of education
2. Systematization of education	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With the fixed system of education, it can produce: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. an efficient means of planning and management b. greater ease of supervision c. increasing the quality of education 2. Uniformity of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The birth of Law no.2/1989 about <i>sisdiknas</i> [national education law] with its regulations and other decisions that made uniform the system, content, and curriculum in various types and channels of 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Centralization of management, curriculum, recruitment, distribution of elementary school teachers 2. Standardization of curriculum in all levels of education 3. Centralization of the

⁹⁶ H.A.R. Tilaar, "Paradigma Baru Pendidikan Nasional," cited in Muhammad Agus Nuryatno, *Education and Social Transformation: Investigating the Influence and Reception of Paulo Freire in Indonesia* (PhD Dissertation, McGill University, 2006), 42-43.

Development Indicators of <i>Sisdiknas</i> (System of National Education)	Paradigm	The New Order Era: The Results Achieved	Anomalies
	<p>education can generate unity of a nation</p> <p>3. <i>Étatism</i> in education can maintain the quality of national education</p>	<p>education</p> <p>2. The oneness of national system has closed the door for innovation and experimentation</p> <p>3. Private schools, that had become pillars of national education since the struggle for independence, had been subordinated to the system established by the state</p>	<p>system of evaluation, e.g. through EBTANAS (national learning evaluation) and UMPN (selection exam for state university)</p> <p>4. Establishing bureaucratic institutions (such as KOPERTIS and BAN) to strengthen the state power and to prevent the innovation of education</p> <p>5. The sphere of education institutions established by the community (private) were limited.</p>
3. Proliferation of education	<p>1. Parents, community, and state are responsible for education</p> <p>2. Economic growth must be followed by preparing skilled human resources produced by the national education system</p>	<p>1. Over time, the responsibility of parents is decreased, while the state's is increased, either in budget or management of school</p> <p>2. The national education system could not meet the need to provide skilled human resources</p>	<p>1. Education was narrowed to mean only schooling</p> <p>2. Education was perceived as a state business that is non-profit, while the state itself lacked funds</p>
4. Politicization of education	<p>1. Education is perceived as a tool to maintain state ideology</p> <p>2. Management of education was handled by central bureaucracy in order to achieve the same vision</p>	<p>1. Although indoctrination was employed by the New Order regime in all levels of education, particularly through P4, students overthrew the regime</p>	<p>1. Making national ideology a sacred entity is against the goal of education, i.e., developing critical thinking</p> <p>2. Education is burdened with sacred goals, but it is not supported by sufficient budget</p>

Development Indicators of <i>Sisdiknas</i> (System of National Education)	Paradigm	The New Order Era: The Results Achieved	Anomalies
		2. Politicization of education did not kill the power of conscience	and qualified teachers 3. Politics can manipulate the ethical goals of education

If we refer back to the concept of a floating mass proposed by the army, Tilaar showed the direct link between up-rooting people's consciousness due to a highly centralized educational system and the quality of service deliverance in education. Good quality of education, especially in higher education, happens only when government guarantees academic freedom. When higher education is used to propagate knowledge serving the regime, the quality of education will slowly decrease.

With the high level of politics in education during the Suharto era, an Indonesian vision of education was neglected or even worse was used to support the predatory Suharto regime. The legacy of this failed education system continues into the post-Suharto era. In numerous international standard comparative tests, for example PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment), Indonesia is at the bottom of the international chart.⁹⁷ Suryadarma argues that this highly corrupt national education system influenced its inefficiency to deliver good service in education.⁹⁸ In remote areas of Java and the outer islands, teacher absenteeism is high, on an average of 27% of school days. Only in those schools where the community tightly controls teacher performance (which happens mostly in urban schools in Java) teacher absenteeism is

⁹⁷ PISA 2012 Results in Focus: What 15-year-olds know and what they can do with what they know, accessed July 21, 2014. <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/keyfindings/pisa-2012-results-overview.pdf>

⁹⁸ Daniel Suryadarma, "How Corruption Diminishes the Effectiveness of Public Spending on Education in Indonesia," *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 48, no. 1 (2012): 85-100.

below the national average (around 17%). At the same time, teacher salaries increase steadily over time.

In the context of higher education, the lack of resources also influences the quality and performance toward a better quality of education. The World Bank's survey in 2012 showed that only 7% of Indonesian higher education staff (both in public and private universities) hold a PhD. 40% of academics had masters degrees. The majority of academic staffs (roughly 53%) held only bachelor degrees. According to Indonesian Educational Law, in the year 2015, every academic staff member with only a bachelor's degree will not be able to teach in a higher education institution. However, in reality, numerous universities (mostly private) still find it hard to fulfill such requirements. With this background, it is understandable that in the *Times Higher Education* there is no Indonesian university among the top 400 world-class universities. In terms of the quality of higher learning, Indonesian is still far behind Singapore (ranked 40), and Thailand (351).

The massification of Indonesian higher education with its high cost but low quality only produces uncritical students. These uncritical students then easily fall back into the trap of "missing Suharto" (*Rindu Suharto*) as I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Instead of finding the root of the Indonesian problem and building collaboration to pursue social justice for all Indonesians, the floating mass misses the old authoritarian figure and tries to rebuild the nostalgia of an unreal glorious past.

With such a background, Aspinall claimed that in the post-Suharto era, the robust support for authoritarian figures sadly comes from the Indonesian middle class with a higher education

degree.⁹⁹ The national survey of the 2014 Indonesian presidential election was worth noting as an illustration of the link between post-Suharto quality of education and sensitivity toward social justice issues. There were two candidates running for the presidency (Prabowo and Joko Widodo). As Suharto's son-in-law and the disgraced commander of an army special force in which he was accused of kidnapping and killing students in 1998, Prabowo's bid for the presidency was highly criticized by numerous former 1998 activists as "Putin in the making."¹⁰⁰ Even during his campaign, he spoke openly using terms like "to shut down democracy"¹⁰¹ or "democracy is not part of Indonesian culture."¹⁰² Nevertheless, in the campaign full of smear and racial language directed against the populist Joko Widodo, national surveys prior to the election showed that the majority of Prabowo's supporters comes from the youth (17-23 years old): the educated sector of Indonesian society.¹⁰³

This national survey shook most Indonesians' awareness that Indonesia needs a stronger vision of education which would, on the one hand, train students critical thinking and, on the other hand, sustain the spirit of solidarity for the common good.

⁹⁹ Edward Aspinall, "Demokrasi Indonesia dalam Bahaya [Indonesian Democracy in Danger]," *New Mandala*, accessed July 31, 2014. <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/06/21/demokrasi-indonesia-dalam-bahaya/>

¹⁰⁰ David Bouchier, "Return to Autocracy in Indonesia?," *New Mandala*, accessed July 31, 2014. <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/06/25/return-to-autocracy-in-indonesia/>

¹⁰¹ Elizabeth Pisani, "Indonesians are not Idiots," *New Mandala*, accessed July 31, 2014. <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/07/02/indonesians-are-not-idiotics/>

¹⁰² Edward Aspinall and Marcus Mietzner, "Prabowo Subianto: vote for me, but just the once," *New Mandala*, accessed July 31, 2014. <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/newmandala/2014/06/30/prabowo-subianto-vote-for-me-but-just-the-once/>

¹⁰³ Poltracking, *Laporan Survey Nasional* [National Survey Report], accessed July 31, 2014, http://www.poltracking.com/images/content/pdf/Laporan_SurNas_Mei_2014.pdf.

4.3. Conclusion

Shapiro argued that the challenge for today's higher education institutions is to promote a pedagogy that will animate students toward a shared journey of meaning and hope.¹⁰⁴ Unfortunately, massification of higher education institutions that favored only technical abilities is continuously decreasing student ability to see that shared journey of meaning and hope. As also argued by Nussbaum,¹⁰⁵ the lack of humanistic vision in higher education institutions creates a generation that has not been equipped with a critical mind and a compassionate heart. The discussion about government support toward humanistic education is a wake-up call that unless such "social capital" is sustained, in the end, the willingness to live together as a community starts to vanish.

Indonesian post-Suharto higher education institutions confirm the critiques of Shapiro and Nussbaum. In the Suharto era it was understandable that making a low quality education was part of a political strategy to uproot student political consciousness. Sadly, this intransigence continues even in a more open post-Suharto era. The decrease of student activism is just one symptom of a possible further collapse of a vibrant civil society, which has the ability to promote a social justice agenda and challenge the rise of predatory elites and oligarchs.

5. Summaries and Reflection for Reading Catholic Social Teaching

In this chapter, I analyzed the problem of the decentered character of Indonesian society and the possibility of education to stimulate critical thought and nurture the spirit of collaboration. Three factors influence the ongoing conflict in Indonesia:

¹⁰⁴ H. Svi Shapiro, "Global Pedagogies and Communities of Meaning and Hope: Education in a Time of Global Fragmentation," Joseph Zajda, ed., *Global Pedagogies: Schooling for the Future* (New York: Springer, 2010), 3-21.

¹⁰⁵ Martha C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).

- a. The influence of internal pluralism in Islam. Understanding the breadth of features of Islam in Java is necessary in order to understand the history of power contestation between various segments in Islam and also the possibility for an alliance to build a more stable democracy in Indonesia.
- b. The role of the military in creating a surveillance state and uprooting democratic life. With its dual functions, the armed forces took power to its center and created paramilitary groups as covert operations in securing their political ends.
- c. As the IMF forced Indonesia to apply the neoliberal vision of state management as terms of the Structural Adjustment Programs, the contesting power embedded deeply in the Suharto regime transformed itself into a new democratic player. Instead of promoting the social justice agenda for the Indonesia people, the predatory elites hijacked the democratic transition.

During the time of crisis in regime transitions (1966 and 1998), students became the moral voice of Indonesian society. They are the heirs of the charisma of *pemuda* (the youth) from the independence era. In the Suharto regime, students have been trying to build alliances with democratic movements, locally and internationally, as shown in the Kedung Ombo and Reformasi cases. Nevertheless, massification of higher education, skyrocketing educational expenses, and decreasing government subsidies for higher education—all contribute to the decline of student involvement in political activism. The lack of civic education programs made the problem worse.

Some reflections can be made from the previous social analysis of Indonesian society and can be used as stepping-stones in reading Catholic Social Teaching on solidarity for the common good in the following chapter:

1. Conflict and Cooperation in the Idea of Solidarity

Indonesian history has always been shaped by the tension of conflict and cooperation. *Aliran* politics emerged from contestation of different group aspirations and needs. Solidarity should not be understood as neglecting the potentiality of conflict but as a genuine common understanding of the possible sense of connections between parties. Solidarity only happens when one can see amid different aspirations a sense of common purpose. What could Catholic Social Teaching (CST) provide to foster a sense of common purpose among groups in a pluralistic society like Indonesia? With the massification and commodification of higher education in post authoritarian Indonesia, how could CST contribute to envisioning an education that promotes solidarity among unequals?

2. Urgency of the Idea of Subsidiarity

Some political theorists argued that the rise of predatory actors has “hijacked” the process of democratic transition through decentralization. However, they also do not propose that Indonesia should return to the highly centralized government of Suharto. Democracy works when local communities can decide the best way to attain their ideal life, and at the same time, look at the larger context of civil society. What would the principle of subsidiarity from CST say to strike a right balance between giving authority to the local level and maintaining the spirit of solidarity?

3. Envisioning the Common Good through education

In social theory, there are on-going discussions about, on the one hand, the role of actors’ choices for social transformation and, on the other hand, political structures that could support or hinder these political choices. Our analysis of the post-Suharto era showed how these two approaches (actors and structures) have intersected and shaped the ebbs and flows

of democratic movements in Indonesia. Student movements, as the expression of students' choice in responding to political situations, were influenced or limited by structural arrangements during the Suharto powerhouse state and the massification plus commodification of higher education institutions thereafter. Then, how does the vision of solidarity that is part of promoting the common good in CST contribute to this debate by, on the one hand, educating the social character of the students so that they can envision the good for all people and, on the other hand, showing the basic structural requirements so that such an education could be possible in a pluralistic society?

We will answer these questions by looking closely at two CST documents: *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (John Paul II, 1987) and *Caritas in Veritate* (Benedict XVI, 2009).

Chapter II

An Ethic of Collaboration for the Common Good in Post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching

In this chapter, I will outline the contribution of post-Vatican II social encyclicals, especially John Paul II's *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (SRS) and Benedict XVI's *Caritas in Veritate* (CV), in proposing an ethic of collaboration in a post-authoritarian society. Influenced by the ecclesiological stance of Vatican II, which saw the church journeying together with other communities in the world (*Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes*), post-Vatican II social encyclicals consistently provide three constitutive themes that can be used as the foundation in proposing an ethic of collaboration in post-authoritarian society, namely: solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good. These three themes always appear in post-Vatican II social encyclicals as the ethical basis for building joint action among people of goodwill to build the kingdom of God. I argue that the ethic of collaboration should be based on the interlocking of these three themes. With the common good, collaboration finds the goal of its existence. With solidarity, collaboration finds the driving force that makes joint action possible. With subsidiarity, collaboration finds its proper limit in respecting the diversity of local actions that contribute to the common good.

The ethic of collaboration based on post-Vatican II documents can help a post-authoritarian society in two foundational ways: a) giving a deep communitarian awareness of being a people in a decentralized society; b) recognizing the active yet unique role of non-state actors in pursuing the common good. Nevertheless, this ethic of collaboration must face two

challenges: a) the reality of structural sins that demands a change of heart sustained through just structures; b) the need to make cross-fertilizing dialogue with the local cultures.

1. The Legacy of Vatican II in Preparing the Space for Collaboration within the Catholic Church

In a recent urgent search of global collaboration, religious communities have been challenged to reinterpret their tradition: what they could bring from their tradition to sustain the spirit of collaboration in this interdependent world. One foundational moment for making the discourse of collaboration possible in the Catholic Church is Vatican II. While Benedict XVI strongly challenged the argument of a “hermeneutic of rupture” between pre- and post-Vatican II social encyclicals and highlighted the “hermeneutic of reform,”¹ we cannot ignore the influence of Vatican II in preparing the church to engage more with the world. *Lumen Gentium* and *Gaudium et Spes* argue that the church is *in via* with other religious communities toward the full realization of the promised salvation. This renewed ecclesiological stance creates a new enthusiasm for dialogue and collaboration with other communities. In this openness to the world, Richard McBrien argued that Vatican II marked a “Copernican revolution” which changed the centralized and institutionalized church from the past. Karl Rahner suggested that Vatican II is “the beginning of a tentative approach by the Church to the discovery and official realization of itself as *world-Church*.”²

Before Vatican II, Catholic ecclesiology principally focused on institutional features of the Church in responding to critiques from Reformation movements. Robert Bellarmine saw the

¹ Benedict XVI, “A Proper Hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council,” Matthew L. Lamb & Matthew Levering, eds., *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), ix-xv.

² Karl Rahner, “Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council,” in *Concern for the Church: Theological Investigations*, Vol. XX (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 77-89.

church as a *societas perfecta* because the church is always self-sufficient in completing her mission in the world. Seeing the church as a *societas perfecta* implied that this self-fulfilled institution did not need other groups as partners in building the kingdom of God.³

Anti-clericalism brought by the French revolution and strong critiques of church doctrine from the Enlightenment have brought a confident and self-fulfilled church as *societas perfecta* into a defensive mode which created a “siege mentality.” The language of Catholic social teaching in this era inclined to suspicion and even rejection of worldly affairs. This “siege mentality” was then manifested theologically as paternalism toward social concerns. As argued by Michael Schuck, the language that the church used in describing herself before *Rerum Novarum* was as a pastor, a good shepherd. Therefore, “unlike the Enlightenment’s heady optimism over a machine-like, controllable world, the popes’ pastoral image imparts a cautionary worldview. Though the pasture provides nourishment and rest for the flock, it also contains ‘trackless places,’ ‘ravening wolves,’ and evil men ‘in the clothing of sheep.’”⁴ In this defensive stance, assurance of harmony happens if the laity obediently follows the direction of the hierarchy who have power and wisdom to distinguish the sheep and the wolf, separating the wheat from the chaff.

With this background, John XXIII’s opening remarks at Vatican II truly brought fresh air into the church. In *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, he wrote:

Illuminated by the light of this Council, the Church, we trust, will grow in heavenly riches and, drawing from it the strength of new energies, will look to the future without fear. For by means of appropriate improvements and wise

³ Richard R. Gaillardetz, “The Ecclesiological Foundation of Modern Catholic Teaching,” in Kenneth R. Himes, OFM., et al., eds., *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 72.

⁴ Michael J. Schuck, *That They Be One: The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals 1740-1989* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991), 20.

provisions for *mutual cooperation*, the Church will bring individuals, families and nations to turn their minds to the things that are above.⁵

John XXIII explicitly said that the siege mentality from the past was over. “The church will look to the future without fear.” This optimism was manifested in recognition of “mutual cooperation” between the church with all the people of good will.

This optimism of *aggiornamento* radiated to the council fathers.⁶ On October 20, 1962, following John XXIII’s opening allocution, the council fathers sent a brief message on the fundamental mission of the Catholic church which is in solidarity with the modern world:

We turn our attention continually toward the anguish that afflicts people today, and our concern goes first of all to the most humble, poorest, the weakest. Following Christ’s example, we feel compassion for the crowds that suffer from hunger, misery, and ignorance; we turn constantly to those who, deprived of the necessary help, have still not attained the kind of life that they deserve. For these reasons, as we carry out our work we will keep in serious consideration everything that is conducive to the dignity of the human person, and that contributes to the true fraternity of peoples.⁷

This brief message from the council fathers as a response to John XXIII’s opening allocution provides a renewed understanding of the church which no longer sees herself as a self-sufficient yet perfect society, but a church within the world which struggles with suffering and hunger, a church in relationship with other communities. Placing the church within the human community

⁵ John XXIII, *Gaudet Mater Ecclesia*, no. 6, translated by Joseph A. Komonchak, accessed January 31, 2015. <https://jakomonchak.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/john-xxiii-opening-speech.pdf>. Emphasis is mine.

⁶ It is also important to note that when John XXIII summoned the first session of Vatican II, there were also moments of uncertainty about the direction of the council. World crisis (e.g., the Korean War in 1950, the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961, and the Cuban nuclear missile crisis in 1962) influenced this atmosphere of uncertainty. However, there was a strong desire for renewal by the great number of the council fathers, even though the form for such renewal had not been materialized yet. Giuseppe Alberigo, *A Brief History of Vatican II* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006), 3.

⁷ *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Vaticani II* cited in Giuseppe Alberigo, *A Brief History of Vatican II*, 25. Andrea Riccardi reports that the text was drafted by Marie-Dominique Chenu with the help of Yves Congar. This draft was brought to the council fathers by four French Bishops and received approval from the majority, although the optimistic and pastoral stance of the text was challenged by a more traditionalist group (e.g., Marcel Lefebvre and Msgr. Parente of the Holy Office). Lefebvre for example complained that this message was too focused on earthly affairs and less about supernatural being or Catholic truth. Andrea Riccardi, “The Tumultuous Opening Days of the Council,” in Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds., *History of Vatican II*, Vol II (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 50-51.

imposes ethical demands on the church to make serious considerations during the council in order to find anything that will be a conducive factor to “the dignity of the human person” and “contributes to the true fraternity of peoples.”

With this new ecclesiology, it is understandable that, when the preparatory committee presented the first draft of the constitution on the Church as “the militant church,” echoing the juridical and institutional characteristics of Vatican I and Pius XII, the majority of the council fathers rejected it.⁸ The council fathers urged the council to return to the foundations: to more biblical, patristic, and liturgical images of the church.⁹ Finally, the bishops divided the *De Ecclesia* draft into two separate documents, namely: a) *ecclesia ad intra*, approved on November 21, 1964 and named *Lumen Gentium* (LG); b) *ecclesia ad extra*, approved on December 7, 1965 and named *Gaudium et Spes* (GS). While both documents were approved during the papacy of Paul VI, nevertheless he continued the vision of John XXIII of a church which was no longer in fear but in dialogue with the world. Because “Christ is the light of the nations,” (LG 1) the Holy Spirit enables the church to respond to Christ’s call to proclaim and share the light to radiate “[t]he joys and the hopes, the griefs and the anxieties of the men of this age, especially those who are poor or in any way afflicted.” (GS 1)

Following McBrien, we can find at least six images of the church in LG and GS: the church as mystery or sacrament, the church as people of God, the servant church, the church as communion, the church as ecumenical community, the church as eschatological community. Related to our topic of finding the ethical base of collaboration in a post authoritarian society, the

⁸ Richard R. Gaillardetz and Catherine E. Clifford, *Keys to the Council: Unlocking the Teaching of Vatican II* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 51.

⁹ The movement of *ressourcement* to more biblical and patristic images of the church was already present before the council through the writings of Henry de Lubac and others.

image of the church as people of God provides a solid ecclesiological reason for post-Vatican II support for collaboration with people of good will.

As summarized by Comblin, LG portrays several features of the biblical concept of the people of God as follows:

Christ instituted this new covenant, the new covenant in his blood (1 Cor 11:25); he called a people together made up of Jews and Gentiles which would be one, not according to the flesh, but in the spirit, and it would be the new people of God (LG 9).

The holy people of God shares also in Christ's prophetic office: it spread abroad a living witness to him (LG 12).

All women and men are called to belong to the new people of God. This people therefore, whilst remaining one and unique, is to be spread throughout the whole world and to all ages in order that the design of God's will may be fulfilled (LG 13).

All are called to this catholic unity of the people of God, which prefigures and promotes universal peace (LG 13).

[T]hose who have not yet accepted the Gospel are related to the people of God in various ways (LG 16).¹⁰

The biblical image of the people of God highlights Israel's faith that it is God who called Israel. Therefore "the law, worship, its placement in the midst of the peoples, politics, economics—everything comes from being people of God."¹¹ The New Testament, especially Paul, continues this vision with renewed understanding that God in Christ summons the new Israel and acts within the people, which began from the first community of Christ's disciples. The formation of the new people of God closely relates to Christ mission. "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light."¹² Participating in Christ's mission is the *raison d'être* of the people of God.

¹⁰ José Comblin, *People of God* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004), 2-3.

¹¹ Ibid., 7.

¹² 1 Pet 2:9-10.

GS captures this spirit by saying “[t]he people of God believes that it is led by the spirit of the Lord who fills the whole world. Impelled by that faith, they try to discern the true signs of God’s presence and purpose in the events, the needs and the desires which it shares with rest of humanity today.”¹³ Because it is Christ who sends the people of God “to proclaim the mighty acts of God” to all people, the awareness of being the people of God is not limited to the Christian community but also expands toward all people who “travel the same journey as all of humanity and share the same earthly lot with the world.”¹⁴ A deep acknowledgement that we share “the same earthly lot” binds our human relationships and our responsibility toward each other.

In Chapter 2, GS explains lengthily this communitarian nature of Christian faith by underlining that “God...has willed that all men should constitute one family and treat one another in a spirit of brotherhood.”¹⁵ Chapter 2 of GS begins with the acknowledgement of new human interdependence in the world. While this new interdependence could bring disturbance and social disorder because of humans’ pride and selfishness, socialization consolidates and increases “the qualities of the human person and safeguard[s] his right.”¹⁶ Being a member of one family will foster the vision of the common good because each member should respect “the needs and legitimate aspirations of other groups, and even of the general welfare of the entire human family.”¹⁷

Paragraph 30 provides a very interesting reflection: this interdependent global society requires more than an individualistic ethic. GS was written during the great human rights

¹³ *Gaudium et Spes*, no. 11.

¹⁴ GS, no. 40 and Comblin, *People of God*, 9

¹⁵ GS, no. 24.

¹⁶ GS, no. 25.

¹⁷ GS, no. 26.

movements in the 50s and 60s.¹⁸ Chapter 1 of GS affirms and supports this aspiration by reflecting the theological notion of human dignity. However, safeguarding human dignity is possible only by participating to build a human community. Moreover, the challenges of the modern world cannot be met unless society promotes and cultivates “social virtue.” This social virtue, as portrayed by GS, is anchored and refers back to the tradition of the notion of People of God that the Church inherited from Judaism. The history of salvation is not only a history of individual/personal salvation, but also, most importantly, a history of communal salvation because “God called these chosen ones ‘His people’ (Exod. 3:7-12), and, furthermore, made a covenant with them on Sinai. This communitarian character is developed and consummated in the work of Jesus Christ.”¹⁹ Through his work, death and resurrection, Jesus Christ is “the firstborn” for “a new brotherly community.” Therefore, in GS’s view, “this solidarity must be constantly increased until that day on which it will be brought to perfection.”²⁰

GS’s emphasis on the communitarian nature of human dignity then gives a theological framework to the following part of the document: human participation throughout the world (chapter 3), the role of the church in the modern world (chapter 4), and how the church should address some problems emerging from interdependence (Part 2 of GS).

In LG and GS’s communitarian view, enacting Christ’s mission to proclaim the good news to everyone, especially those who live on the margins of today’s world, should start from building the community of love within the community of Christ’s disciples who have been facing the reality of disintegration. Collaboration between all people of good will should start from cooperation among the believers of Christ. How could we invite people of other religions to

¹⁸ David Hollenbach, “Commentary on *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World),” in Himes, et al., eds., *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*, 267-268.

¹⁹ GS, no. 32.

²⁰ Ibid.

bring light to the world if the followers of Christ cannot work together with each other for the common good? It is in the Decree on Ecumenism we find a renewed commitment to work together, starting from *communio christiana*.

In these days when *cooperation* in social matters is so widespread, all men without exception are called *to work together*, with much greater reason all those who believe in God, but most of all, all Christians in that they bear the name of Christ. *Cooperation* among Christians vividly expresses the relationship which in fact already unites them, and it sets in clearer relief the features of Christ the Servant. This *cooperation*, which has already begun in many countries, should be developed more and more, particularly in regions where a social and technical evolution is taking place be it in a just evaluation of the dignity of the human person, the establishment of the blessings of peace, the application of Gospel principles to social life, the advancement of the arts and sciences in a truly Christian spirit, or also in the use of various remedies to relieve the afflictions of our times such as famine and natural disasters, illiteracy and poverty, housing shortage and the unequal distribution of wealth. All believers in Christ can, through this *cooperation*, be led to acquire a better knowledge and appreciation of one another, and so pave the way to Christian unity.²¹

It is also important to mention “cautionary notes” from Joseph Ratzinger/Benedict XVI on overemphasizing the notion of “people of God” at the expense of other rich ecclesiological notions in Christian tradition (e.g., the Body of Christ). Ratzinger (and also, von Balthasar) proposed “communion ecclesiology” as another ecclesiological contribution of Vatican II. In communion ecclesiology, the Eucharist becomes an entry point for *koinonia* not only within the community in which the Eucharist is celebrated, but also within the universal church.²²

Nevertheless, Walter Kasper was right to say that communion ecclesiology should be understood within the historicity of the Christian community as “people of God” so that the *koinonia* is not separated from *diakonia* as shown by the events of Pentecost, a first foundational

²¹ *Unitatis Redintegratio*, no. 12. Italics mine.

²² Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Letter on Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion*, no. 2-6. Accessed Jan 29, 2015.

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_28051992_communionis-notio_en.html

moment of being a church and being sent by Christ himself.²³ As shown by Lennan, Hahnenberg, and Watkins, giving too much space to *koinonia* without enough attention to *diakonia* will put Christian communion to “cuddle in the corner” and being “disincarnate.”²⁴ As envisioned by the opening paragraph of GS, the Christian community should be incarnated in the world with its problems and challenges, with its hopes and despairs.

Vatican II with its vision reclaims that the biblical language of people of God has opened the door to foster engagement with the human communities in the world. This vision influenced subsequent Catholic Social Thought to see the importance of working together with all people of good will as a manifestation of participation in Christ’s mission to proclaim the good news. The first community of Christ’s disciples continues Israel’s faith of being chosen to build a special relationship with God as God’s people. In this faith, everything in this world becomes a manifestation of God’s presence. If God through Christ has called the Christian community to build a human family with all people in this world, can we say no?

2. Three Themes of Collaboration in Post-Vatican II Catholic Social Teaching

In the previous section, we traced the role of Vatican II in preparing the space for the church to engage with the world and no longer see herself as a self-sufficient community in this interconnected and interdependent world. This section will ask: what then *is* collaboration according to the Catholic tradition? What are the key components so that people of good will can

²³ Kilian McDonnell, “The Ratzinger/Kasper Debate: The Universal and Local Churches,” *Theological Studies*, no. 63 (2002): 227-250.

²⁴ Richard Lennan, “Communion Ecclesiology: Foundations, Critiques, and Affirmations,” *Pacifica*, no. 20 (February, 2007): 24-39; Edward P. Hahnenberg, “The Mystical Body of Christ and Communion Ecclesiology: Historical Parallels,” *Irish Theological Quarterly*, no. 70 (2005): 3-30; Clare Watkins, “Objecting to *Koinonia*: The Question of Christian Discipleship Today – And Why Communion Is Not the Answer,” *Louvain Studies*, no. 28 (2003): 326-343.

collaborate with others? What are the parameters for collaboration among different people with different goals?

In answering those questions, I offer three important and interlocking themes for understanding an ethic of collaboration in post-authoritarian society, based on the post-Vatican II social encyclicals, especially John Paul II and Benedict XVI. I argue that collaboration always entails three interlocking components: solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good. Solidarity is the heart of any collaborative action. The spirit of solidarity has brought people from different backgrounds to work together. Subsidiarity imposes a limit on any collaborative act so that local inspiration will not be drowned in the bigger movement of solidarity. Subsidiarity also aims at assuring that all parties have adequate resources to pursue their ideal life so that they can join in the shared project of the larger community. The common good is the goal of any collaborative action that members of a pluralistic society will pursue.

2.1. Solidarity as Praxis of Collaboration

One major contribution of John Paul II's social encyclicals is recovering the language of solidarity in magisterial teaching. In his first social encyclical, *Laborem Exercens* (LE), the word "solidarity" appears 11 times. In *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (SRS), it appears 29 times, and 15 times in *Centesimus Annus* (CA).²⁵ Shaped by his experience of the Polish *Solidarność* movement, John Paul II envisioned solidarity to be at the heart of CST.²⁶ The question is: how does John Paul II define solidarity? In this section, I rely on studies of Bilgrien, Njoku and Vieira to

²⁵ Uzochukwu Jude Njoku, *Examining the Foundations of Solidarity in the Social Encyclicals of John Paul II* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2006), 275.

²⁶ Domingos Lourenço Vieira, *La solidarité au cœur de l'éthique sociale: la notion de solidarité dans l'enseignement social de l'Église catholique* (Paris: Mare & Martin, 2006).

understand the multilayered notion of solidarity used by John Paul II and how it will contribute to our search for an ethic of collaboration in the context of post-authoritarian society.

2.1.1. Multilayered Notion of Solidarity

2.1.1.1. Solidarity as a Social Attitude

The Oxford Dictionary defines attitude as a “settled way of thinking or feeling about someone or something, typically one that is reflected in a person’s behavior.”²⁷ This definition gives three important components of “attitude.” First, there is a fact or person which provoked our response. Second, this response was processed by our reason and emotion and is more or less settled or consistent. Third, such a response leads to certain actions which embody the whole internal dynamic (rational and emotional) behind our response.

These three components of human attitude are important to understand the rationale of SRS’s assessment of solidarity as “a social attitude.” In 1987, one year before the publication of SRS, John Paul II delivered a message for the World Day of Peace. He said,

We need to adopt *a basic attitude towards humanity and the relationships we have with every person and every group in the world*. Here we can begin to see how the commitment to the solidarity of the whole human family is a key to peace. Projects that foster the good of humanity or good will among peoples are one step in the realization of solidarity. The bond of sympathy and charity that compels us to help those who suffer brings our oneness to the fore in another way. But, the underlying challenge to all of us is to adopt *an attitude of social solidarity* with the whole human family and to face all social and political situations with this attitude.²⁸

²⁷ Oxford Dictionary, “Attitude,” accessed Dec 5, 2014.

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/attitude?searchDictCode=all.

²⁸ John Paul II, “Message for the World Day of Peace 1987,” cited in Marie Vianney Bilgrien, SSND, *Solidarity: A Principle, an Attitude, a Duty? Or the Virtue for an Interdependent World?* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 49. Emphasis added.

This brief message gave us three components of solidarity as a social attitude. First, solidarity comes from our response to the relationship that we have with every person and every group in the world. Second, from our awareness of being members of the human family, we are compelled to help those who suffer and bring our oneness to the fore in other ways. Third, through the bond of sympathy and charity, we join the projects that foster the good of humanity. These projects are one step toward the realization of solidarity.

These three components of solidarity (fact, rational and emotional processing, and collective action) as social attitude also appear consistently in SRS. In chapter III of SRS, John Paul II gave a survey of the world which not only showed some signs of fragmentation but also the “growing awareness of interdependence among individuals and nations.”²⁹ The challenge is “to take up interdependence and transfer it to a moral plane.”³⁰ When we fail to transfer interdependence to a moral plane or separate it from moral consideration, the world faces a serious problem of underdevelopment. Since “interdependence must be transformed into solidarity,” we can say that solidarity is a moral response to interdependence, based on the Christian principle that “the goods of creation are meant for all,” not only for a selected few.³¹

SRS gave three examples to indicate when interdependence was separated from moral consideration. The first is “the lack of housing” which “is being experienced universally.” The problem of housing leaves numerous families from the developed to the developing world “struggling to survive, without a *roof* over their heads or with a roof so *inadequate* as to constitute no roof at all.”³² The second example is unemployment and underemployment, “with its series of negative consequences for individuals and for society, ranging from humiliation to

²⁹ SRS, no. 18.

³⁰ SRS, no. 26.

³¹ SRS, no. 39.

³² SRS, no. 17.

the loss of that self-respect which every man and woman should have.”³³ Earlier in his pontificate, John Paul II’s *Laborem Exercens* had argued that “human work is a key, probably the essential key, to the whole social question.”³⁴ The third example is international debt. In John Paul II’s analysis, international debt is a manifestation of “interdependence” which neglects its ethical consideration. Debt “has turned into a counterproductive mechanism” which “has even aggravated underdevelopment.”³⁵

A moral search for interdependence was getting more urgent during the time of imminent global fragmentation when SRS was published. John Paul II put together two interconnecting features of fragmentation at that time. The first is the cold war between two opposing blocs: East and West. Each bloc has its own vision of the person and society. Each has its own forms of propaganda and indoctrination. This strong opposition has created “wars by proxy” that “kept people’s minds in suspense and anguish by the threat of an *open and total war*.”³⁶ In this open and total war, the opposing blocs stockpiled atomic weapons that “destined us more quickly toward death.”³⁷

Then, John Paul II added one more category of opposition: North and South, the more developed and less developed regions. While the north acts as the center and does not always take as a priority the problems of the south, the less developed nations fail to be “autonomous nations” but become “parts of a machine, cogs on a gigantic wheel.”³⁸

These are the manifestations of complicated problems of underdevelopment, which in SRS’s analysis have pointed toward two roots of social sins, namely: “the all-consuming desire

³³ SRS, no. 18.

³⁴ LE, no. 3.

³⁵ SRS, no. 19.

³⁶ SRS, no. 19.

³⁷ SRS, no. 24.

³⁸ SRS, no. 22.

for profit” and “the thirst for power.”³⁹ Solidarity as social attitude is the antidote for such fragmentation, because solidarity will nurture one’s commitment to the common good, the good of all people. In his address to the workers in Malta, John Paul II said, “The outstanding virtue of the working men and women of Malta should be solidarity: a commitment to the common good; a rejection of selfishness and irresponsibility. We must be responsible for one another.”⁴⁰

The importance of a rational and emotional dynamic within our social attitude helps us to respond to a critique directed at SRS affirming that this document, while giving a prime space to interdependence, still lingers at the abstract level of what constitutes human relationship and did not go deeper into the affective and experiential side of human relationship. As Donald Dorr argued, solidarity “could be enriched significantly by some account of the *experience* of solidarity and the strong *feelings* that are part of it.”⁴¹ Through the shared experience in the community and our feelings that emerge from it (i.e., joy, hope, fear, anxiety), we realize that we are bound with each other more closely. How could interdependence drive us to a social attitude of solidarity with those who live on the margins, if human emotions (e.g., compassion) do not play an important role in such a process? If we read SRS carefully, John Paul II answered Dorr’s critique by showing the importance of shared experience and human emotions in the very definition of solidarity as a social attitude.

Through this exploration, we can conclude that solidarity as a social attitude has three important features. First, it emerges from human interdependence. Second, cognitive and emotional processing is important in the face of human interdependence because members of the

³⁹ SRS, no. 37.

⁴⁰ John Paul II, “Address to Workers, Malta, 26/5/1990,” cited in Kevin P. Doran, *Solidarity: A Synthesis of Personalism and Communalism in the Thought of Karol Wojtyla/Pope John Paul II* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 186.

⁴¹ Donald Dorr, “Solidarity and Integral Human Development,” in Gregory Baum and Robert Ellsberg, eds., *The Logic of Solidarity: Commentaries on Pope John Paul II’s Encyclical on Social Concern* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989), 153.

human family will initiate responsibility, especially toward those who suffer the most from the problem of underdevelopment, particularly in the Global South. Third, our responsibility to others is manifested in the praxis of collaborative social justice projects.

2.1.1.2. Solidarity as a Virtue

In SRS 40, John Paul II wrote, “solidarity is undoubtedly a *Christian virtue*. In what has been said so far it has been possible to identify many points of contact between solidarity and charity, which is the distinguishing mark of Christ’s disciples.”⁴² When John Paul II defines solidarity as *virtus Christiana*, three levels of explanation are needed. First, solidarity is a virtue. Second, solidarity is a Christian virtue, which involves charity and justice. Third, John Paul II’s claim that solidarity as “a Christian virtue” should be understood in its specific Christian context needs further clarification, especially if we want to transpose it into an interreligious context.

First, by saying that solidarity is a virtue, John Paul II followed the Thomistic tradition on the role of virtue in moral action. Aquinas argues that “human virtue is a habit perfecting man in view of his doing good deeds.”⁴³ Since virtue is a perfecting habit, it is not predetermined by nature. A human has freedom to “choose the right means” with his rational and appetitive capacity. Through habit, this rational and appetitive capacity is “perfected” continuously so that it becomes a stable disposition for good deeds.⁴⁴ With our modern understanding about habit, we must retain that what Aquinas had in mind about habit is not just “any routine performance, however trivial or mechanical ... A *hexis* or *habitus*, in contrast, is a durable characteristic of the

⁴² SRS, no. 40.

⁴³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 58, art. 3, accessed Jan 28, 2015. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa/FS/FS058.html#FSQ58A3THEP1>.

⁴⁴ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 58, art. 5.

agent inclining to certain kinds of actions and emotional reactions, not the actions and reactions themselves. Acquired over time, habits grow to be ‘second nature’ for the individual.”⁴⁵

When John Paul II saw solidarity as a virtue, he probably had in mind this Thomistic understanding of the stable disposition to do good before the fact of human interdependence.

With this stable and innate disposition to do good, solidarity is not

a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people, both near and far. On the contrary, it is *a firm and persevering determination* to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are *all* really responsible *for all*.⁴⁶

We can have “a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good” if we are perfected rationally and emotionally through good habits.

Second, moreover, John Paul II added that solidarity is distinctively a *virtus christiana*. According to Aquinas, virtue is differentiated as natural virtue, acquired by human beings through habits, and supernatural virtue, given by God. The supernatural or theological virtues are faith, hope, and charity. Bilgrien argues that while John Paul II acknowledged the traditional differences between natural and supernatural virtues, he wanted to show more how these two different realms of virtue interact with each other.⁴⁷

In relating solidarity as a social virtue and a theological virtue, SRS wrote:

In the light of faith, solidarity seeks to go beyond itself, to take on the *specifically Christian* dimension of total gratuity, forgiveness and reconciliation. One’s neighbor is then not only a human being with his or her own rights and fundamental equality with everyone else, but becomes the *living image* of God the Father, redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ and placed under the permanent action of the Holy Spirit.... [A]wareness of the common fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of all in Christ – “children in the Son” – and of the presence and

⁴⁵ Bonnie Kent, “Habits and Virtues (Ia. IIae, qq. 49–70),” in Stephen J. Pope, ed., *The Ethics of Aquinas* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2002), 116.

⁴⁶ SRS, no. 38.

⁴⁷ Bilgrien, *Solidarity*, 100.

life giving action of the Holy Spirit will bring to our vision of the world a *new criterion* for interpreting it.⁴⁸

In solidarity as a social attitude, we are embedded in the immense experience of human interdependence. Solidarity is a moral response toward this human experience. From this fact, John Paul II proposed a Christian point of view by seeing human interdependence in the light of “common fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of all in Christ...and of the presence and life-giving action of the Holy Spirit.” If we see human interdependence through this theological lens, we find what is *specifically* Christian in human solidarity: seeing others as the living images of God, redeemed by Christ, empowered by the Holy Spirit.

As analyzed by Vieira, the term “*solidarietas*” came to the body of social teaching through secular—even atheistic—discussions in Europe (especially France) during the 18th-19th centuries, through the work of the socialist utopist Pierre Leroux (1797-1871), the philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857), the moral psychologist Henri Marion (1846-1896), the sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), the politician Léon Bourgeois (1851-1925), and the lawyer Léon Duguit (1859-1928).⁴⁹

If SRS said that solidarity is undoubtedly a Christian virtue, it confirms a new articulation of the traditional theological vision of the human community that is formed beyond natural bonds. John Paul II is continuing the traditional Christian anthropological vision of personhood by basing solidarity on human dignity. Solidarity in the Christian view highlights one pillar of the Catholic social vision, namely every human being is “the living image of God.” However, the dignity of a human being is not found in an individualistic quest but in relation with others in the community. With this notion of socialization—previously proposed by John XXIII and Paul VI—one realizes that one’s existence is always in relation with others, and this awareness of human

⁴⁸ SRS, no. 40.

⁴⁹ Vieira, *La solidarité au cœur de l'éthique sociale*, 25.

reciprocity will engender the emergence of solidarity in a community. Thus, through solidarity, Christian community responds to its vocation, namely to be a “sacrament” of God to the world. One implication of this vocation is to play our part in God’s divine plan, “both on the level of individuals and on the level of national and international society.”⁵⁰

Some may argue that by focusing on charity, SRS neglects the previous positive assessment on the role of justice in solidarity especially in *Populorum Progressio* (PP) and *Iustitia in Mundo* (JM). In this matter, we can find a mixed reception on how John Paul II utilized solidarity as a basis for a more robust understanding of justice. From a more critical point of view, Mary Hobgood, for example, argues that by focusing on charity, SRS fails to continue the legacy of PP’s strong criticism of capitalism and the process of social change to reverse it. One major reason for such failure is because SRS ignores “structural criticism concerning the causes of poverty and by disregarding radical prescriptions of what might be done about poverty.”⁵¹

Be that as it may, Paul Lakeland has a more constructive point of view by saying that topics of social justice that are consistently brought by liberation theologians have gained canonical appreciation in the document. The language of “structural sins, option for/with the poor, and liberation” are vividly present in the document.⁵² Although it is true that John Paul II has a different opinion from Latin American liberationists on strategies to respond to the problem of structural injustice, the fact that the language of “structural sins” emerged in a magisterial

⁵⁰ SRS, no. 40.

⁵¹ Charles E. Curran, Kenneth R. Himes, OFM., and Thomas A. Shannon, “Commentary on *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (On Social Concern),” in Himes, et al., eds., *Modern Catholic Social Teaching*, 433.

⁵² Paul Lakeland, “Development and Catholic Social Teaching: Pope John Paul’s New Encyclical,” *The Month*, no. 21 (June 1988): 708.

document has “touch[ed] a special nerve”⁵³ for the people in the global south. Francisco Claver, bishop and theologian who specialized in doing a contextual theology, gave a nod to Antoncich’s assessment that “the encyclical is right on target as far as we in the Philippines are concerned.”⁵⁴

Therefore, when SRS argues that solidarity is a Christian virtue, it wants to show the close connection between charity and justice. As argued by Lisa Cahill, charity as a form of love of God also manifests itself in our love toward God’s creation. Justice helps to structure the concrete expression of love so that, on the one hand, it is experienced universally but, on the other hand, it recognizes diversity and individual situations.⁵⁵ From the point of view of charity, solidarity is an expression of love toward others by recognizing the others as always in relationship with ourselves. There will be no solidarity without charity. But, this expression of love should be structured so that it will be experienced universally yet diversely by its recipients, a true creation of God who lives in the real world with real and contextual struggle, especially with the ones who live on the margins of society. When one’s uniqueness is respected, one can start to see the interdependence with the others through their uniqueness. This is the manifestation of solidarity as being transformed and directed by a virtue of justice.

Third, when John Paul II claimed that solidarity is a Christian virtue, this should be understood within its specific historical context, especially his discussion with secular Europe. As argued by Vieira, by claiming that solidarity is a Christian virtue, the Church brought this secular terminology into a theological reflection and showed how the tradition of the Church supported and sustained such a transposal. By the same logic, we can also “transpose” solidarity

⁵³ Ricardo Antoncich, “*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: A Latin American Perspective,” in Baum and Ellsberg, *Logic of Solidarity*, 211.

⁵⁴ Francisco Claver, “*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: A View from the Philippines,” in Baum and Ellsberg, *Logic of Solidarity*, 202.

⁵⁵ Lisa Sowle Cahill, “Charity and Truth as Justice, and Hope,” in Uzochukwu Jude Njoku and Simon O. Anyanwu, eds., *In the Service of Charity and Truth: Essays in Honour of Lucius Ogorji* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2012), 253.

into an interreligious context as advocated by this dissertation. Solidarity is not only a Christian virtue because it also could bear Islamic, Buddhist, and Hindu ways of expressing it. Asian religious traditions may see solidarity as either a natural or a supernatural virtue, with its unique theological arguments and be expressed in its own terms. For example, in the context of dialogue with Islam, the closest equivalent of the term “solidarity” is the concept of ‘*asabiyya* (social cohesion), first advocated by Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406) in the 14th-century Middle East.⁵⁶

Khaldun argued that ‘*asabiyya* transformed a tribal-based pre-Islamic community into a cross-cultural community of faith (*umma*) before God. Therefore, Abdulazis Sachedina argues that in Islamic tradition there is a strong commitment that “community strengthens a sense of solidarity that demands individual acts of worship to translate into new meanings to provide motivations for men and women for the development of an ideal social order reflecting this-worldly and other-worldly prosperity.”⁵⁷ Khaldun and Sachedina’s proposal on highlighting the prominent role of ‘*assabiya* and *umma* could be the equivalent of the concept of solidarity as a natural and supernatural virtue, as advocated by John Paul II.

2.1.1.3. Solidarity as a Moral Duty

The third meaning of solidarity in SRS is moral duty. This concept was first proposed by Paul VI in *Populorum Progressio*. He wrote,

Each man is also a member of society; hence he belongs to the community of man. It is not just certain individuals but all men who are called to further the development of human society as a whole. Civilizations spring up, flourish and die... We are the heirs of earlier generations, and we reap benefits from the efforts of our contemporaries; *we are under obligation to all men*. Therefore we cannot disregard the welfare of those who will come after us to increase the

⁵⁶ Linda T. Darling, “Social Cohesion (‘*Asabiyya*) and Justice in the Late Medieval Middle East,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49, no. 2 (2007): 329-357.

⁵⁷ Abdulazis Sachedina, *Islam and the Challenge of Human Rights* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 154.

human family. The reality of human solidarity brings us not only benefits but also obligations.⁵⁸

Solidarity as a social attitude depends on the awareness of the interdependence of human life. We belong to the human community. But, the community that we live in is part of a long history. “We are the heirs of earlier generations, and we reap benefits from the efforts of our contemporaries.” Since we have received from others who make us “spring up and flourish,” we have a moral obligation to do the same for all human beings, even to generations who will come after us.

John Paul II took Paul VI’s vision of solidarity as a moral duty in his writings and social encyclicals. SRS paragraph 23 acknowledges the originality of Paul VI’s vision in seeing solidarity as a moral duty. Each Christian has a moral duty to respond to the social problems “according to the degree of each one’s responsibility.”⁵⁹ By saying that solidarity is a moral duty, John Paul II affirms the universality of solidarity. Being in solidarity with others, especially with the ones who suffer from underdevelopment, is not a matter of free choice or option. Especially for a Christian, we have a moral obligation to respond to it. In the face of the suffering other, SRS echoes what has been envisioned by Emmanuel Levinas: moral duty comes from the face of the others, especially the suffering others. The *epiphany* of the face of suffering others “sanctioned” our entire moral capability so that we have to answer “Here I Am” [*Me voici*].⁶⁰ In this line of thought, SRS writes that the church is “obliged by her vocation...to relieve the misery of the suffering, both far and near. This is part of her teaching and her practice.”⁶¹

⁵⁸ PP, no. 17. Emphasis mine.

⁵⁹ SRS, no. 9.

⁶⁰ Michael L. Morgan, *The Cambridge Introduction to Emmanuel Levinas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 40.

⁶¹ SRS, no. 31.

Let us also not forget that Karol Wojtyla had mentioned solidarity as a moral duty in *Toward a Philosophy of Praxis*. He wrote,

The attitude of solidarity is a “natural” consequence of the fact that a human being exists and acts together with others. Solidarity is also the foundation of a community in which the common good conditions and liberates participation, and participation serves the common good, supports it and implements it. Solidarity means the continuous readiness to accept and perform that part of a task, which is imposed due to the participation as member of a specific community.⁶²

There are two important points that we can draw from that quotation. *First*, in solidarity as a social attitude, we learn the fact of our embeddedness into the vastness of global interdependence. However, the fact of interdependence also imposes a moral duty to “serve the common good, support it and implement it.” The problem of underdevelopment, as outlined in SRS, emerges when one neglects to take this moral obligation into account.

Second, one may criticize SRS by saying that imposing solidarity as a moral duty, it will be at the expense of one’s freedom. Nevertheless, the tradition of CST understands freedom not only as “negative freedom” (freedom from) but most importantly also “positive freedom” (freedom for), which is participation in the dynamic of communal life. By accepting and responding to the *epiphany* of the faces of the suffering others in the community, one is participating in recreating a true community. Participation for John Paul II is a form of freedom in the context of our relationship with others. Taking on the duty of solidarity is a manifestation of this positive freedom.

Third, in seeing solidarity as a moral duty, members of a pluralistic society with its diverse backgrounds (sex, class, religion) could find a common ground based on the universality

⁶² Karol Wojtyla, “Toward a Philosophy of Praxis,” cited in Meghan J. Clark, *The Vision of Catholic Social Thought: The Virtue of Solidarity and The Praxis of Human Rights* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014), no. 26.

of calling to which all of them should respond. The problem of underdevelopment is not only a problem of a specific community or country, but it is a universal problem of all. This recognition will initiate a strong bond to engage in a collaborative project.

2.1.2. Collaboration: The Praxis of Solidarity

After explaining three possible meanings of solidarity in SRS, we can ask: how do these three meanings relate to our project of proposing an ethic of collaboration? I propose three possible connections.

First, collaboration is the praxis of solidarity. SRS argues that human interdependence should not be seen as a mere fact of today's world. It demands our moral response. SRS shows that when interdependence was seen merely as a sociological fact, the problem of underdevelopment (housing, etc.) emerged. Interdependence is then understood merely as how globalization shaped global communication. By addressing problems influenced by the new human interaction through solidarity, solidarity becomes a moral response to human interdependence. In solidarity with others, collaboration becomes the manifestation of this moral response.

Second, the praxis of collaboration is sustained through virtues of charity and justice. By placing collaboration in relation with virtue, we find a solid basis to build the disposition to join a shared action in the community. Charity becomes the heartbeat of the praxis of collaboration. Justice is the goal for such an action. In this relationship between collaboration-charity-justice, we can understand why SRS mentioned that solidarity is not just feeling good about one's neighbor. Collaboration can be sustainable if it becomes a habitual praxis in community.

While some forms of collaboration happen only in a specific time and for a specific cause, the community in which the collaboration happens needs "communal virtues" that will

enable the emergence of local-level collaboration. Collaboration happens in the virtuous community. From the point of view of charity, collaboration is an expression of love toward other beings. From the point of view of justice, collaboration should be structured so that others with their unique experiences can join the shared project of all.

Third, as Aquinas said, the human being has a natural capacity to do a virtuous act and it should be cultivated through training. The very foundational step in the formation of a virtuous person is by restraining human vices.⁶³ In this logic, cultivating the virtue of solidarity should start from facing the two forms of social sins, namely: “the all-consuming desire for profit” and “the thirst for power.”⁶⁴ These two roots of social sins influence our ability to respond to the problem of underdevelopment. In this context of underdevelopment and growing tension between opposing blocs (West-East and North-South), John Paul II argued that integral development happens only if we sustain “the impulse toward united cooperation by all for the common good of the human race.”⁶⁵ Solidarity will lead to cooperation because solidarity is “a diametrically opposed attitude” from the growing fragmented world. To make cooperation happen, solidarity requires “a commitment to the good of one’s neighbor with the readiness, in the Gospel sense, to ‘lose oneself’ for the sake of the other instead of exploiting him and to ‘serve him’ instead of oppressing him for one’s own advantage.”⁶⁶ In *Centesimus Annus*, John Paul II provides some examples of “loosing oneself” for the good of one’s neighbor by “helping entire peoples which are presently excluded or marginalized to enter into the sphere of economic and human development.”⁶⁷ He also wrote “stronger nations must offer weaker ones opportunities for taking their place in international life, and the latter must learn how to use these

⁶³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 95, art. 1.

⁶⁴ SRS, no. 37.

⁶⁵ SRS, no. 22.

⁶⁶ SRS, no. 38.

⁶⁷ CA, no. 276.

opportunities by making the necessary efforts and sacrifices and by ensuring political and economic stability.”⁶⁸

Fourth, through solidarity, collaboration is more than working together for the same goal.

As mentioned in SRS,

[s]olidarity helps us to see the “other”—whether a person, people, or nation—not just as some kind of instrument with a work capacity and physical strength to be exploited at low cost and then discarded when no longer useful, but as our “neighbor,” a “helper” (see Gn 2:18-20), to be made a sharer, on a par with ourselves, in the banquet of life to which all are equally invited by God.⁶⁹

Solidarity brings cooperation into a deeper level, which is facilitating an authentic and compassionate relationship. In solidarity, we treat the other as brother or sister. Marciano Vidal proposes some best practices in order to grow and let flourish our ability to see the other not merely as an instrument for our purpose but as “a sharer...in the banquet of life”:

- to have and to feel the conviction of the unity and interdependence of all human beings which eventually leads to total integration with the whole universe...
- whenever, wherever possible to keep stretching the idea of “us” until truly we are working for “our world”...
- to integrate without confusion the public and private spheres connecting them whenever, wherever it is possible...
- to always include, respectfully, the dispossessed...
- to give priority to the other, in that way discovering who I really am...
- to opt for a sense of equality with all, in all human relationships, and a movement of all working together for the good of all..
- to associate solidarity with the sentiments of compassion, generosity, fidelity, forgiveness toward the friend, understanding of the mistreated, support of the persecuted, to approve unpopular just causes, not as a must for justice, but for solidarity...⁷⁰

As argued by Sobrino, the basis of Christian solidarity is friendship in the face of justice.

Each one gives and receives from others, and justice is a prerequisite so that no one will be

⁶⁸ CA, no. 35.

⁶⁹ SRS, no. 39.

⁷⁰ Marciano Vidal, “*Ética de la Solidaridad*,” cited in Bilgrien, *Solidarity*, 72-73.

excluded from this process of “giving-receiving.”⁷¹ By collaboration, development will be experienced by all members of society, and not only by a small and powerful minority. This “collaboration in the development of the whole person and of every human being is in fact a duty of all towards all and must be shared by the four points of the world: east and west, north and south.”⁷²

2.2. Localizing Collaboration through Subsidiarity

2.2.1. Development of the Concept of Subsidiarity

If in solidarity we find strong arguments for human reciprocity, it is in the principle of subsidiarity that we find strong arguments for respecting the person as him/herself and not merely a tool for a shared project. It is interesting that John Paul II did not provide many reflections in his social encyclicals about the notion of subsidiarity. In SRS, we cannot find the word “subsidiarity” even once. In LE and CA, the word appears one or two times. It is in Benedict XVI that we find more space given to subsidiarity. There are 12 references to the word subsidiarity in CV. One can gauge that the different social locations of these two popes have had an impact on their approach to subsidiarity. John Paul II came from Poland, amidst the solidarity movement, while Benedict XVI came from Europe amid the process of unification of the European Union with all its discussion on making a super-structured state and the authority that localities and particular countries should have in it.

The notion of subsidiarity was first incorporated in *Quadragesimo Anno* (QA). Pius XI wrote as follows:

⁷¹ Jon Sobrino, “Bearing with One Another in Faith,” in Jon Sobrino and Juan Hernández Pico, *Theology of Christian Solidarity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985), 1-41.

⁷² SRS, no. 32.

Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater and higher association what lesser and subordinate organizations can do. For every social activity ought of its very nature to furnish help [subsidium] to the members of the body social, and never destroy and absorb them.

The supreme authority of the State ought, therefore, to let subordinate groups handle matters and concerns of lesser importance, which would otherwise dissipate its efforts greatly... Therefore, those in power should be sure that the more perfectly a graduated order is kept among the various associations, in observance of the principle of “subsidiary function,” the stronger social authority and effectiveness will be the happier and more prosperous the condition of the State.⁷³

QA was issued to commemorate *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII. Leo XIII and Pius XI strongly opposed socialism and liberalism. Socialism has a tendency to magnify state intervention, especially in the economy, while liberalism relies on giving individuals or associations more freedom to pursue their ideal life. *Rerum Novarum* seems to leave more room for state intervention. But then, questions arose: if state intervention contradicted the principle that would justify its intervention, what is the ethical principle to respond to such intervention?⁷⁴ According to Nell-Breuning—the drafter of *Quadragesimo Anno*—that question came to Pius XI in the context of Mussolini’s fascism.⁷⁵

QA argues that state intervention is necessary for the common good and protection of the rights of society’s members. What QA wants to address is finding more precise conditions and its limits for such intervention through the principle of subsidiarity. Negatively, the lower-level

⁷³ QA, no. 79-80.

⁷⁴ Jean-Yves Calves, S.J. and Jacques Perrin, S.J., *The Church and Social Justice: Social Teaching of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII* (Chicago: Henry Regnery), 329.

⁷⁵ Oswald von Nell-Breuning, S.J., “The Drafting of *Quadragesimo Anno*,” in Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, S.J., eds., *Official Catholic Social Teachings: Readings in Moral Theology No. 5* (New York: Paulist Press), 1986, 63. In that article, Nell-Breuning responded to the criticism of QA, even with its proposal of subsidiarity, that it still has too much flavor of ‘state corporatism’ and did not provide a strong critique to it. Nell-Breuning argued that the church “did not want to awaken sleeping bears needlessly...and provoke the wrath of Mussolini.” (67).

community should not be interfered by the upper-level community when the former makes decisions base on their aspirations. Positively, the upper-level community should provide adequate support (*subsidium*) for the lower-level community so that the latter will have adequate resources to participate in the process of decision-making. In his address to Italian farmers in 1946, Pius XI summed up the two conditions of subsidiarity with the following words: “[a]n economic policy which accords with reason and a sound juridical framework ought to give you aid... but your main help must come from yourselves, from your co-operative unity.”⁷⁶

Thirty years later, John XIII in *Mater et Magistra* (1961) continued the positive interpretation of subsidiarity of Pius XI by saying that the state “supports, awakens, organizes, supplements and complements” social groups “based on the subsidiarity principle.”⁷⁷ State intervention in the name of subsidiarity is manifested in many concrete areas by supporting individual/small group initiatives in economic sectors, for example: obtaining property, granting credit facilities, social security, and price regulation. By enhancing local initiatives, the overall community will benefit from gradual, simultaneous, and balanced development.⁷⁸

In Verstraeten’s reading of John Paul II, we find a greater tendency to highlight negative aspects of subsidiarity. In his earlier writing, Wojtyla wrote, “whenever a person is the object of your activity, remember that you may not treat that person as only the means to an end, as an instrument, but also allow for the fact that he or she too has or at least should have distinct personal ends. This principle, thus formulated, lies at the basis of all human freedoms.”⁷⁹ With this Kantian notion we can find a solid background for understanding subsidiarity. First, each

⁷⁶ Pius XI, “Speech to Italian farmers,” 15 Nov 1946, cited in Calves and Perrin, *The Church and Social Justice*, 337.

⁷⁷ MM, no. 53, in J. Verstraeten “Solidarity and Subsidiarity,” in David A. Boileau, ed., *Principles of Catholic Social Teaching* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1994),

⁷⁸ MM, no. 151.

⁷⁹ Karol Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981), 28.

person has his or her own distinct personal ends, which should be respected. Second, from this notion of freedom then we can talk about participation for the greater good of the community.

It is in Benedict XVI that we find a full-fledged reflection on subsidiarity. He developed the notion of subsidiarity within the context of globalization by putting it in the theology of charity.⁸⁰ Subsidiarity is “a guiding criterion for fraternal cooperation between believers and non-believers...an expression of inalienable human freedom.”⁸¹ For believers, God has plans for the world. The world comes “neither from blind chance nor strict necessity.”⁸² Charity is the response of the vocation to engage in God’s divine plan: “living as a family under the Creator’s watchful eye.”⁸³ The role of subsidiarity according to Benedict XVI is to make charity more effective.

Benedict XVI gave three reasons to argue for the effectiveness of charity through subsidiarity. *First*, continuing the positive notion of subsidiarity proposed by Pius XI, subsidiarity “is first and foremost a form of assistance to the human person via the autonomy of intermediate bodies. Such assistance is offered when individuals or groups are unable to accomplish something on their own, and it is always designed to achieve their emancipation, because it fosters freedom and participation through assumption of responsibility.”⁸⁴ It is very interesting that Benedict XVI puts the positive notion of subsidiarity as “the first and foremost.” By placing the positive aspect of subsidiarity first, Benedict XVI returns to the tradition of

⁸⁰ Before the publication of *Caritas in Veritate*, the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences held a thorough study on the topic “solidarity and subsidiarity” on May 2-6, 2008 in Casina Pio IV. The papers from this conference were published under the title “Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together.” We can see that some major arguments from *Caritas in Veritate*—especially on the relationship between solidarity and subsidiarity—have similarities with the arguments presented during the 14th plenary session.

⁸¹ CV, no. 57.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ CV, no. 57.

Quadragesimo Anno and *Mater et Magistra*. It seems to me that Benedict XVI realizes that we should not overemphasize negative interpretations of subsidiarity—for example, some proposals in the United States Catholic circles arguing for the legitimation of “small government” through the argument of subsidiarity. While the autonomy of intermediate bodies is acknowledged, the most important thing in subsidiarity is the intervention to help, *subsidium*. For this very reason, Benedict XVI argues persistently that “*the principle of subsidiarity must remain closely linked to the principle of solidarity and vice versa.*”⁸⁵

Second, subsidiarity makes solidarity become more effective. Benedict XVI echoes criticism from political discourse on the problem of the bureaucratization of social assistance. By giving more initiative to the local community, social assistance will be delivered more effectively and generate more benefits for the whole community in the long term. “A more devolved and organic system of social solidarity, less bureaucratic but no less coordinated, would make it possible to harness much dormant energy, for the benefit of solidarity between peoples.”⁸⁶ The larger community should question “the actual effectiveness of their bureaucratic and administrative machinery, which is often excessively costly.”⁸⁷ Benedict XVI gives an example of “fiscal subsidiarity,” where the local community interacts actively on how to spend a proportion of taxes to initiate better social assistance to the community. This approach will generate “solidarity from below” (rather than “solidarity from above”).

Third, in the context of globalization, subsidiarity is a manifestation of respect toward human dignity “by recognizing in the person a subject who is always capable of giving something to others.” Reciprocity is the heart of being human. One positive aspect of globalization is furthering international cooperation for human development. However,

⁸⁵ CV, no. 58. Italics in the original.

⁸⁶ CV, no. 60.

⁸⁷ CV, no. 47.

international cooperation should not be seen as a one-way movement (from the rich to the poor) but in a reciprocal way. Benedict XVI's focus on charity is manifested in lengthy reflections on "gratuitousness" and "economy of communion." It is certain from Benedict's point of view that charity is not limited to the "haves," but also to the "have-nots." The poor have their unique contribution to make to the process of international cooperation. They are active actors in the integral development. The role of the international community is to "take up the duty of helping them to be 'artisans of their own destiny,' that is, to take up duties of their own."⁸⁸ Subsidiarity assures that such recognition continues. Integral human development deploys two features at the same time. First, there is a recognition of many layers of planning to implement what it means by "human development" due to the unique understanding of each group about it. Second, there is a need to coordinate each concept of development so that they will not compete with each other, but support one another for the benefit of all.

In the context of state-family relationship, in the following table Pierpaolo Donati gives an example of how to relate solidarity and subsidiarity as suggested by CV.⁸⁹

Fig. 1 - Four possible combinations of subsidiarity and solidarity towards the family		SUBSIDIARITY (towards the family)	
		Absent	Present
SOLIDARITY (from the social state)	Absent	A The family depends on external supports which are not up to public institutions (therefore the family depends on private resources, in particular it receives <i>private charity</i>)	B The family is held to be able to perform its own responsibilities with no or little public support (therefore families are left to <i>mutual help and self help</i>)
	Present	C The family is entitled to public benefits, but is treated as a passive actor (therefore the family is not <i>empowered</i> , but substituted in its own tasks and social functions)	D The family can rely upon a combination of public support and private networks which are autonomous and entitled to supplementary rights (therefore the family can enjoy an <i>active citizenship as a family</i>)

⁸⁸ CV, no. 43.

⁸⁹ Pierpaolo Donati, "State and The Family in a Subsidiary Society," in Margaret S. Archer and Pierpaolo Donati, eds., *Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together* (Vatican City: Pontificia Academia Scientiarum Socialium, 2008), 271.

If we transpose the table above into the realm of relationship between individual/small communities within the large community, Donati gives four possible relationships between solidarity and subsidiarity. The first combination is private charity, when both solidarity and subsidiarity absent. The second combination is a where the local community has its own freedom through subsidiarity but there is no structure of support from the larger community through solidarity. The third combination is when the network of support does not empower a small community because the local community is treated as a passive actor, merely the recipient of the benefits. The ideal condition is in the fourth combination where participation of the small and local community is generated through basic rights that are guaranteed by political structures of the state or the larger community.

2.2.2. Subsidiarity and Collaboration

What would the principle of subsidiarity bring to enhance an ethic of collaboration in the context of a post-authoritarian state? I propose three answers.

First, by considering the history of the notion, subsidiarity has always a two-sided interpretation: positive (upper level community gives *subsidia* toward local and lower level community) and negative (a guarantee of freedom of intermediate bodies in pursuing the best for their flourishing). It must be noted that each papacy has its own style about how to articulate both sides of the interpretation. But, we notice the ongoing confirmation of the importance of intermediate bodies. While the state has a unique and very important responsibility to ensure the basic structures of social justice, nevertheless it is not the only locus for this project. As shown by Benedict XVI, we cannot neglect that the state sometimes is not efficient in bringing about development due to its bureaucratic structure. By acknowledging initiative and the logic of reciprocity, intermediary bodies will play an important role in promoting solidarity, especially in

places where the state is unable to respond effectively due to its limits. Moreover, as shown by Benedict XVI and articulated by Donati, such recognition is possible only if there is a structural guarantee from the larger community.

Second, with its two features (negative and positive), subsidiarity will bring the project of collaboration closer to the unique contexts and struggles of individuals, small groups and communities. We cannot deny that solidarity brings people together for a shared project. But, there are a lot of problems that a community should respond to. Without the principle of subsidiarity, collaboration can fall into a forced, top-down project from the upper-level community (international/regional collaboration) toward a local community. Local communities know best their unique aspirations, but at the same time this uniqueness should be seen in the context of interdependence, as highlighted by solidarity.

Third, some commentators resisted Benedict XVI's idea on urgency to highlight the effectiveness of subsidiarity in the context of a globalized world. Bernard Laurent lamented that, even though Benedict still subscribes to earlier social encyclicals, he merely describes the problems that globalization brought to development without going deeper into the neoliberal ideas that sustain them.⁹⁰ By giving too much space to personal initiative and less to structural arrangements, Laurent even argues that this neoliberal vision was left untreated by Benedict XVI.

I think Laurent gave a fair treatment to CV's approach on this issue. As argued by Verstraeten, neoliberal ideology has sneaked smoothly into the body of CST starting from

⁹⁰ Bernard Laurent, "Caritas in Veritate as a Social Encyclical: A Modest Challenge to Economic, Social, and Political Institutions," *Theological Studies* no. 71 (2010), 515-544.

Centesimus Annus.⁹¹ But, we should not forget that in CV, Benedict XVI also spoke eight times about redistribution of basic goods.⁹² The idea of redistribution is very important in Benedict XVI's vision of subsidiarity and how it makes the work of charity become more effective. Two important points can be included here. First, redistribution of basic goods is hardly neoliberal. Second, redistribution also enhances creativity and initiatives so that everyone can participate in the heartbeat of a communal dynamic. Redistribution demands structural arrangement, and this structural arrangement should initiate personal creativity and initiatives in responding to the shared project of community to attain the common good for all. If redistribution is a form of solidarity, it should be accompanied by communal support for its unique contribution as a form of subsidiarity.

Fourth, in relating solidarity and subsidiarity to any collaborative action as proposed by CV, Minnerath also reminds us about the limit of such correlation. He argues:

Subsidiarity is not located at the same level of social architecture as solidarity. The latter is one of the conditions *sine qua non* of the existence of a human society. Subsidiarity belongs to the 'bene esse' of a society, whereas solidarity belongs to its 'esse'. Without subsidiarity, society can work but it works badly, on the verge of collapse. An extremely centralized organisation of powers can meet temporary needs, without losing sight of the common good. But under normal conditions, all societies must let subsidiarity play its full role.⁹³

Without solidarity, there is no community. Solidarity is a *conditio sine qua non* that makes subsidiarity possible. Without solidarity, subsidiarity is unworthy of the pluralistic society.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Johan Verstraeten, "A Ringing Endorsement of Capitalism? The Influence of the Neo-liberal Agenda on Official Catholic Social Teaching," in Linda Hogan, ed., *Applied Ethics in a World Church: The Padua Conference* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2008), 54-64.

⁹² CV, no. 32, 36, 37, 39, 42.

⁹³ Roland Minnerath, "The Fundamental Principles of Social Doctrine: The Issue of Their Interpretation," in Archer and Donati, eds., *Pursuing the Common Good*, 51.

⁹⁴ Kenneth R. Himes, OFM., *Christianity and the Political Order: Conflict, Cooptation, and Cooperation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014), 214.

2.3. The Common Good as the Goal of Collaboration

2.3.1. Two Approaches to the Notion of the Common Good

The Western tradition is very familiar with the concept of the common good as the normative vision of a good life in the community. However, it is not easy to find a comprehensive definition of this concept in Greek classical moral philosophy, Christian theology, or early modern Christian spirituality.

Modern interpreters tried to unearth this classic notion of the common good for a modern liberal audience by equating it with more modern terms. There are at least two examples of modernizing the notion of the common good. The first example is equating the common good with public good or public service. In order for certain goods and services to be considered as common and public, they should have two characteristics. First, they should be non-rivalrous in consumption. We do not need to conflict when we use them.⁹⁵ For example: a beautiful beach is a public good. When someone enjoys this beach, other people have the same right to use it. The other characteristic of a public good is that it can be enjoyed by everyone without exception (non-excludable). For example: clean air is a public good because everyone can enjoy it. However, clean air in gas cylinders is excludable, because only those who buy the cylinders can legitimately enjoy them. Since public goods should be available to everyone, the benefits of public goods should not be reserved to individuals/groups only.

The second example that attempts to modernize the notion of common good focuses on the internal conditions of society that make every member of the community participate and contribute to a shared public good. This second approach places the notion of the common good within the heartbeat of community life itself. According to this line of thought, the quality of

⁹⁵ Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg and Marc A. Sterns “Defining Global Public Goods,” in Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern, *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 2-19.

human relationship is more important than the public good itself. Society can provide the public good only if their members commit themselves to make those goods open to the public and not just for private consumption. Consequently, being a member of a community (*commune*) itself is a form of goodness (*bonum*). Members of the community are “non-rivalrous” and “non-excludable” in sharing the public good because there are connections characterized by mutual respect. The CST tradition sees the second approach as more fundamental than the first approach.

In current studies on the development of the idea of the common good, we find two different yet interconnecting traditions in understanding common good, namely the Augustinian and Thomistic traditions.⁹⁶ In *The City of God*, Book II, Augustine challenged accusations that the Christian community was the main reason for the decline of Rome. Echoing Cicero, the fall of Rome was not in the hands of Christianity, but because Romans had lived under a corrupt and unjust government, where “every man be able to increase his wealth so as to supply his daily prodigalities, and so that the powerful may subject the weak for their own purposes.”⁹⁷ According to Augustine, Rome was never a republic in the first place, because as Scipio said a “republic cannot be governed without the most absolute justice.”⁹⁸

Augustine then asked: what are the conditions for a republic to exist? He returned to Cicero.

Res publica, res populi, populus autem non omnis hominum coetus quoquo modo congregatus, sed coetus multitudinis iuris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatus.

⁹⁶ David Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Christopher Vogt, “Fostering a Catholic Commitment to the Common Good: An Approach Rooted in Virtue Ethics,” *Theological Studies* no. 68 (2007): 394-417.

⁹⁷ Augustine, *The City of God*, Book II. No. 20 (New York: Modern Library, 2000), 59

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, Book II, No. 21, 61.

A commonwealth is a thing of the people. But a people is not any collection [*coetus*] of human beings brought together [*congregatus*] in any sort of way, but an assemblage [*coetus*] of people in large numbers associated [*sociatus*] in agreement [*consensu*] with respect to justice [right, *juris*] and a partnership for the common good [*utilitatis communione*].⁹⁹

For Cicero and Augustine, the republic can exist only in a true social union or community. The bond of social union emerges through respect for justice and partnership for the common good.

Without respect for justice, Augustine said, “the people is no longer a people” but a “mob.”¹⁰⁰

The absence of virtuous citizens and the failure to educate in the way of justice and putting it into practice in public affairs are the sources of Rome’s fall.

Augustine, influenced by Neoplatonism, sees the created world deeply impacted by sin, where the human ability to perceive reality is easily fooled by disordered human lust. Therefore, contrary to Cicero, Rome will never become a true republic and it will never be achieved in this world. The true community idealized by Augustine is tied by the faith to Christ, with its love of God and obedience to the moral demands of the Gospel. The true republic is the city of God, Jerusalem.¹⁰¹ This earthly city, Babylon, will always yield to our human condition of *amor sui* and *libido dominandi*.

However, while the fullness of true community will not be achieved in this world marked by sin, we are still able to find elements of the city of God everywhere in this earthly life, in the family, in the neighborhood, and in political community. Augustine is not proposing an otherworldly hope that can be interpreted as a legitimation for a pessimistic view of human

⁹⁹ Cicero, *De Re Publica I, XVI*, 39 and Augustine, *The City of God II*. 21, cited and translated by David Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*, 65.

¹⁰⁰ Augustine, *The City of God*, Book II. No. 21, 62.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., Book XIX, no. 23, 701-706.

history. Augustine acknowledges the limits of politics and, at the same time, the possibility of interpenetration of these two cities within human life.¹⁰²

The limits of politics and the interpenetration of the two cities mark the Augustinian interpretation of the common good. While no basic human goods should be absolutized, Augustine prepares the field for respecting diverse forms of human relations and their contributions to our journey toward the fullness of good. Augustine gave a theological basis for affirming that the political domain will lead to a partial realization of the fuller common good. By doing that, Augustine also prepared the future discussion on the plurality of goods which will be discussed heavily in the 20th century by John Rawls, Alasdair MacIntyre, etc.

A second approach to the common good depends on Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas starts from an Aristotelian conviction that the world of senses provides a wide opportunity to develop human goodness in various ways. Human beings have rationality to discern the ultimate truth because the world is a *locus revelationis* of truth. Aquinas does not neglect the reality of sin, but he believes in the human capability to grow in the journey of knowing the good. On this very point, he lays out his teleological vision of good.¹⁰³ Aquinas uses the Aristotelian hierarchical pattern of existence to show the interconnectedness of the good. Since God is the ultimate good, this hierarchical pattern will show that everything, from the most simple to the most complex entities, participates in God's goodness to its own degree. Hence, "participation" is very important in Aquinas' metaphysical thinking. Aquinas describes participation as *partem capere* (taking part in something) and *partem habere* (having a part of something). Aquinas says that "to

¹⁰² Dominique Greiner, "Le bien commun à l'épreuve des éthiques procédurales: pour une réinterprétation des sources théologiques," *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* no. 241 (2006), 129.

¹⁰³ Susanne M. DeCrane. *Aquinas, Feminism and the Common Good* (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2004), 43-44.

participate is like taking a part; thus when something receives a part of what belongs to another fully, it is said to participate in it.”¹⁰⁴

Aquinas echoes Aristotle in the *Nichomachean Ethics*, who argues that morality is a continuous pursuit toward the good end. Since everyone is part of the *polis*, the end of the polis is the common good. The purpose of the law in the polis is to ensure that the members of the polis can achieve the good life. Aquinas borrowed this notion when he defined that “every law is ordained by reason for the common good.”¹⁰⁵ It is the intention of the lawgiver to make humans good. If the foundation of any law is to achieve good in society, the common good is “‘a substantive notion’; it is not merely the conglomeration of private interests or preferences, but an objective set of conditions which advances human flourishing.”¹⁰⁶

For that fundamental reason, Aquinas claims that the human being is not just an *animal rationale* but also an *animal sociale*. Jacques Maritain, a modern Thomist philosopher, gives three explanations for understanding the human being as *animal sociale*. First, humans have an ability to love and communicate with each other. This internal drive urges them to find and relate with other humans. Second, because of their material inadequacy, human beings interact with each other to gain their basic needs. Stepping aside from society means cutting away the resource for their needs. Third, in order to develop their ability and to fulfill their vocation to perfection, human beings need to learn from society, especially through education.¹⁰⁷

Maritain then proposes “an analogical scale” for comprehending the analogical nature of

¹⁰⁴ Thomas Aquinas, *Expositio Libri De Hebdomadibus* I.2, cited in John Rziha, *Perfecting Human Actions: St. Thomas Aquinas on Human Participation in Eternal Law* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009), 8.

¹⁰⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 90, art. 2.

¹⁰⁶ Thomas Massaro, *Catholic Social Teaching and United States Welfare Reform* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 11.

¹⁰⁷ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* IIa-IIae, q. 47, art. 10; cited by Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, trans. John J. Fitzgerald (1946; reprint., Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006), 47-49.

the common good. In this scale, the highest level is the Trinity, the most perfect community. The lowest level is characterized by the non-human animals where their capacity for communion is very low.¹⁰⁸ The common good in human society will be experienced within the spectrum of scale.

We can conclude that, on the one hand, the Thomistic vision of the common good continues the Augustinian understanding of the limits of politics. In the Thomistic analogical scale, the true common good is the Trinity. But, on the other hand, the Thomistic tradition uniquely sees how the idea of the common good will pull us to go beyond our limitedness of the human condition, to go closer and closer toward the perfect community.

With this conviction that our human relationships are forged toward perfection, Maritain proposes four important categories for the common good in society.¹⁰⁹ First, since a human by nature is a social being and not a monad, the common good has a redistributive dimension. Second, since the common good exists in relationships between persons, the distribution of goods should be oriented toward the person. Therefore, third, the redistribution of goods is dedicated to the flourishing of the person. Fourth, the most needy, the poor, and those whose lives are on the margins should have the priority in receiving this redistribution of goods.

We will see how these two approaches shaped the papal understanding of the common good in the post-Vatican II social encyclicals, especially in SRS and CV.

2.3.2. The Legacy of these Two Approaches in the Post-Vatican II Social Encyclicals

As one of the basic themes in CST, the common good appears repeatedly in the body of CST from *Rerum Novarum* to CV. During the 1960s, there was intense discussion that facilitated

¹⁰⁸ Modern biologists would strongly reject this idea.

¹⁰⁹ Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, 49-50; Greiner, “Le bien commun à l’épreuve des éthiques procédurals,” 133.

the development of this doctrine, as we can see in *Mater et Magistra* (1961), *Pacem in Terris* (1963), and *Gaudium et Spes* (1965).¹¹⁰ The first attempt to give a working definition of the common good appeared in MM, where the common good is “the sum total of those conditions of social living, whereby men are enabled more fully and more readily to achieve their own perfection.”¹¹¹ John XXIII puts this notion of the common good under the section of “socialization.” Socialization is a defining character of our times. It relates to a multiplication of relations and diverse forms of communal life, that is relations of social actors that animate history and the progress of the human community. Through socialization, states and various forms of civil associations correlate with each other so that the whole society will achieve common goals which are beyond those that can be achieved by limited individuals/groups. Socialization is manifest in healthcare, education, labor, information, entertainment, skills training, and housing.¹¹² The idea of socialization challenges the liberal ideology of the state as the night watchman, because the state urges to intervene in setting up the laws that assist, regulate and foster the multiplication of human relationships without sacrificing basic human freedom.¹¹³

The common good is achieved through interaction and cooperation between individual social actors and institutional arrangements. The common good is not created by the state. The state safeguards the process so that “overall condition to attain their own perfection” is available and attainable for all individuals and social groups. In the context of this idea of socialization, John XXIII defined the common good. Situating the common good in the realm of socialization is very important so that we do not mistakenly interpret the common good as if it is merely

¹¹⁰ Guy Jobin, “Justice et identité: la reconnaissance comme enjeu de la question sociale dans l’enseignement moral de l’église catholique,” *Laval théologique et philosophique* 63.3 (2013): 499-519.

¹¹¹ MM, no. 65.

¹¹² MM, no. 61.

¹¹³ MM, no. 65.

setting up conditions for personal human flourishing without acknowledging the importance of human interdependence in such a process. This “overall condition to attain one’s perfection” can exist only through socialization. The common good fosters participation for perfection in society. A person must relate and participate with other persons to attain their fullness of life. People cannot live alone in society, and society will help them by setting up “those conditions of social living” so they can acquire their basic needs to flourish. Hence, in *Mater et Magistra* we see a Thomistic approach to the common good.

This Thomistic approach of John XXIII also influenced *Pacem in Terris*’s argument that “the common good is best safeguarded when personal rights and duties are guaranteed.”¹¹⁴ For Maritain, the common good is tied with the good of the person because “the common good implies and requires the recognition of fundamental rights of the person.”¹¹⁵ The common good is not limited to social economic rights but is a recognition of the person *qua* person. Without recognizing the human person, Maritain argues that the common good will become totalitarian. In this idea of recognition as “an essential element of common good,” *Pacem in Terris* discusses women’s rights in political life,¹¹⁶ as well as the protection of ethnic minorities and indigenous people.¹¹⁷ In the 1960s, these hot and debated topics centered on recognition enlarged CST’s approach to what should be considered as social questions, from the traditional socio-economic problems to cultural issues. This shift contributed to the development of CST’s understanding of the common good.

¹¹⁴ PT, no. 60.

¹¹⁵ Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, 51.

¹¹⁶ PT, no. 41.

¹¹⁷ PT, no. 94-96.

When Vatican II released *Gaudium et Spes*, one drafter of this document (some say Bernard Häring) picked up MM's and PT's definition of the common good almost word for word, by saying that the common good is

the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment. [T]oday [the common good] takes on an increasingly universal complexion and consequently involves rights and duties with respect to the whole human race. Every social group must take account of the needs and legitimate aspirations of other groups, and even of the general welfare of the entire human family.¹¹⁸

In explaining this quotation, *The Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* provides in detail what constitutes the social condition of the common good:

the commitment to peace, the organization of the State's powers, a sound juridical system, the protection of the environment, and the provision of essential services to all, some of which are at the same time human rights: food, housing, work, education and access to culture, transportation, basic health care, the freedom of communication and expression, and the protection of religious freedom.¹¹⁹

SRS continues the Thomistic tradition of interpreting the common good. It is the duty of the state to secure these basic social arrangements (i.e., providing adequate work, good education, protection of human rights, especially for the poor and minority groups, promotion of world peace and international cooperation) for the whole community.¹²⁰ But, SRS also argues that this duty is limited not only to the state. As we mentioned in the section 2.1, the common good is tied closely with solidarity. Solidarity “is a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good; that is to say to the good of all and of each individual, because we are *all* really responsible *for all*.”¹²¹ By relating the common good to solidarity, John

¹¹⁸ GS, no. 26; MM no. 53.

¹¹⁹ Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Washington, DC: USCCB Communications, 2005), no. 166.

¹²⁰ SRS, no. 40: “It is the task of the state to provide for the defense and preservation of common goods such as the natural and human environments, which cannot be safeguarded simply by market force.”

¹²¹ SRS, no. 38. Emphasis in original.

Paul II is consistent with his vision that structural transformation should be accompanied by moral reform. The ability of a community to pursue the common good is curtailed by two roots of social evils, namely exclusive desire for profit and the thirst for power. The culture of solidarity as presented by SRS will overcome these social evils and help all members of the community to surpass their self-interest and envision the good of all.¹²² On this point, SRS gives a big contribution by relating the structural aspect of the common good (just law) with its cultural aspect (culture of solidarity). A just law will emerge from the culture of love and solidarity. Or, to put it negatively, the ability to scrutinize an unjust law happens only when the culture of solidarity is present in such a community.

Finally, the Augustinian vision of the common good reemerges strongly in *Caritas in Veritate*. In his previous encyclical *Deus Caritas Est*, Benedict seems to separate strongly charity as the mission of the church from justice as the task of the state. The state secures the just ordering of society through practical reason. Nevertheless, as envisioned by Augustine, reason also needs to undergo constant purification from the tendency to *libido dominandi*. The Church helps the state in this process of purification so that practical reason could perform its function and see its object (securing a just order) more clearly. Through forming the conscience of public authority (especially Catholic politicians), the church is helping the state to pursue the common good for all. Thus, if the work of the common good relates to charity, it is still the domain of the church, but if the work of the common good relates to justice, it is the work of the state.¹²³

In CV, we witness a different nuance in Benedict XVI's assessment of the work of charity and justice toward the common good. In the opening paragraph of CV, Benedict argues

¹²² John Paul II, "Address to Participants in a Convention on the Encyclical Letter *Rerum Novarum*, 15/5/1991," cited in Doran, *Solidarity*, 222.

¹²³ Charles E. Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching of Pope Benedict XVI* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014), location 71, Kindle.

for an essential connection between charity and justice because “justice is a primary way to charity” and “the minimum measure of charity” (CV 6). The political path of charity will help society to pursue the common good in this increasingly globalized society (CV 7). In chapter 5 of CV, Benedict XVI reflected at length on the task of cooperation by all members of the human family as an important feature in pursuing integral development. In the spirit of cooperation for the common good, Benedict XVI proposes the principle of gratuitousness. Because “the human being is made for gift,” the principle of gratuitousness is “an expression of fraternity” because it “fosters and disseminates solidarity and responsibility for justice and the common good” among different people (CV 38). In the following part, Benedict shows the possibilities of applying the principle of gratuitousness in the realm of political economy, especially in the context of the collapse of world finance in 2008. Profit is not an end in itself. It must be directed toward the greater good of society. The logic of gift must be at the heart of economy activities, not only the logic of exchange which leads economic activities to “make use of contracts to regulate their relations as they exchange goods and services of equivalent value between them, in order to satisfy their needs and desires.”¹²⁴

Nevertheless, Benedict XVI still maintains his footing in Augustine by saying that it is civil society, not the state, which is the place to nurture the principle of gratuitousness. He strongly argues that “attitudes of gratuitousness cannot be established by law.”¹²⁵ It is duty of civil society with its diverse forms (i.e., social organizations, fraternal groups, businesses, schools, and especially the church) to form the financiers and politicians so that their “consciences are finely attuned to the requirements of the common good.”¹²⁶

¹²⁴ CV, no. 35.

¹²⁵ CV, no. 36.

¹²⁶ CV, no. 71.

While Benedict XVI's suspicion about the possibility of structures and institutions in bringing about substantive social change should be placed in proper perspective, this Augustinian view of the common good provides a possibility for a vibrant civil society. As argued by Hollenbach in the previous section, the Augustinian vision of the common good provides a very strong rationale that in a globalized society the bearer of the common good is not only the state, but also non-state actors. In this train of thought, we can see also the possible contribution of educational institutions in searching for the common good.

2.3.3. The Common Good and Collaboration

How does this assessment of the notion of the common good help us to reflect on the ethic of collaboration? There are three possible insights.

First, even with their differences, the Augustinian and Thomistic approaches agree that the idea of the common good rests on the fundamental acknowledgement of being a member of a community, being “a people.” This communal bond—as Augustine said—is more than the fact of living together in the same lot, but subsists in the deep acknowledgment of justice and the common good. It is the vision of the common good that unites people and forges a community. While Augustine argues that the true and ideal community will not be attained in this world, yet the journey toward the fullness of true community should start here and now, in this pluralistic society.

Second, since the journey should start here and now, an understanding of being a member of a community will foster participation in the dynamic of strengthening or remaking the community. The idea of participation as proposed by Aquinas lies in the affirmation that we are relational people; and because of this awareness, we can choose the good of all and not only our own limited self-interest. However, the Augustinian critique of the human tendency for

domination should not be set aside. Nevertheless, as argued by Aquinas, a human being also has a drive to pursue what is good for others. While we are sometimes blinded by our own greed, we are still capable of working together with other people/groups toward a shared goal, for a common good. A commitment to serve the good of all is the basic drive for collaboration. We collaborate because we have seen that there is something good that should be achieved, not only by me, but by all the members of the community.

In doing so, all community members should be able to participate in this process. Any structural arrangement in the community aims at the same end: enabling every member of the community to participate in the dynamic of community. For this very reason, we then understand why post-Vatican II CST defined the common good as “the sum of total conditions that allows everyone to attain their ideal life.” Structural arrangement of society (i.e., education, security, adequate housing, recognition and protection of minority/native groups) guarantees the minimal condition for one’s participation in a community in order to attain their unique vision of the ideal life. As argued by Maritain, the vision of the common good should empower every person, especially those who live on the margins of society, to be able to participate in the dynamic of community and not be left aside.

Third, SRS and CV provide a strong footing for looking at the unique contribution of non-state actors in pursuing the common good. While the classic understanding of the state as the guarantor of the common good through laws must still be maintained, SRS and CV also argue for the possible role of civil society in creating “the culture of solidarity” (SRS) and committing to “the principle of gratuitousness.” Nevertheless, it is also noticeable that SRS and CV have different views on how the state and the non-state actors (especially the church) will relate in accomplishing the duty of the common good. While SRS shows the close connection of just laws

and the culture of solidarity, CV is very strong in arguing for a separation by affirming that the principle of gratuitousness can never be achieved by law. By separating the structural and cultural components of the common good too strongly, as has been criticized by commentators, CV runs the risk of undermining the possibility of structural change to promote the common good—a legacy of Augustinian pessimism on the failure of this earthly city to control *amor sui* and *libido dominandi*.

3. Contributions and Challenges of an Ethic of Collaboration Based on CST in a Post-Authoritarian Society

In this section, I will show the contribution of an ethic of collaboration based on CST in the context of a post-authoritarian society. I also want to show some possible challenges that could emerge in seeing the ethic of collaboration based on CST from a post-authoritarian context.

3.1. Contribution of an Ethic of Collaboration to a Post-Authoritarian Society

3.1.1. Collaboration and the Deep Sense of “Being a People” in a Decentered Society

One major contribution of Vatican II is the ecclesiological notion of “the people of God” which shares the same lot with all creatures of the world. The recognition of being “a people chosen by God” initiates a deep awareness that everything in this world—i.e., law, state, society—is anchored in the dynamic of relationship with fellow human beings, with other creatures, and especially with God. As Comblin said, the theological notion of “people of God” initiates our awareness that “we are the people.”

Chapter 2 of GS explicates this communitarian vision by highlighting the urgency to nurture more than an individualistic ethic in the globalized world. Today’s problems can be met

only by cultivating social virtues within our society. Safeguarding human dignity is possible only in the community. For GS, Christian discipleship is manifested in ongoing participation in building human community, in promoting solidarity for social justice, in and envisioning the common good. A call to holiness from God can be responded to only by immersing oneself in the dynamic to build human community. Three ethical moments proposed by CST (i.e., solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good) explicate this foundational communitarian vision as proposed by LG and GS.

The urge to reclaim the sense of connection of being “a people” is very important in a post-authoritarian society that faces ongoing tensions and conflicts, even deadly conflicts. As shown in my first chapter, the first thing to do in order to rebuild a society after the fall of authoritarian regimes is to reclaim this deep awareness of being “a people.” CST’s vision of solidarity and subsidiarity will help a decentered society to bind once more its fragile sense of connection. Solidarity initiates and promotes a sense of interdependence. Subsidiarity will enable a smaller community to participate in the wider shared project of communal flourishing. Pursuing the common good helps us to navigate the right balance between solidarity and subsidiarity.

Moreover, the theological notion of “people of God” in LG and GS’s emphasis on human community are more than a generic invitation to feeling good while living in a community. The *raison d’être* of “the people of God” is responding to God’s mission—*diakonia*. The *diakonia* of the people of God in a post-authoritarian society is to pursue the common good for the whole community and not merely to serve the greedy political elites. As argued by chapter 2 of GS, a collaborative project for social justice is initiated because all of us see the good that we

envisioned and which binds us together in a common effort to pursue it. The pursuit of the common good becomes a *locus* for building a truly human community.

As I showed in the first chapter, the only resource civil society has in the context of a post-authoritarian society is “being a people.” The ruling elites may control the state apparatus, and try to disintegrate the cohesiveness of being a people by sparking deadly conflict. Disintegration will never benefit civil society but drag it to the brink of its collapse.

Nevertheless, the principle of subsidiarity helps us to see the diversity in the process of forging alliances in civil society. Envisioning the common good should not trap us into another form of totalitarianism. The Indonesian experience with Suharto’s powerhouse state confirms the necessity to give the local community the means to participate in deciding what is best for the lives of their people.

3.1.2. The Recognition of Non-State Actors in the Praxis of Collaboration in a Post-Authoritarian Society

The second contribution of an ethic of collaboration based on CST to post-authoritarian societies is a deep acknowledgment of the non-state actor’s contribution. The traditional CST vision still focuses too much on the role of government as the sole bearer of the common good. As criticized by Lisa Cahill, “the Catholic concept of common good depends on a theory of society as a system of distinct, hierarchically arranged groups, whose relations are structured by ascending and more comprehensive levels of government, with ultimate authority residing at the top.”¹²⁷ This hierarchical view of the common good has an impact on seeing the nation-state as

¹²⁷ Lisa Sowle Cahill, “Globalization and the Common Good,” in John Coleman and William Ryan, eds., *Globalization and Catholic Social Thought: Present Crisis Future Hope* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005), 43-44.

the sole bearer of the common good. With this hierarchical view, globalization is interpreted as a form of global governance with a power to supervise local community.

Nevertheless, the study of post-authoritarian societies has shown the failure—or at least the ineffectiveness—of the state in performing this very important task. Cahill’s question challenges Catholic theological ethics to find the resources that give space to non-governmental actors as one of the key players in collaboration. Take the example of the key role of Non-Governmental Organizations in global society. The number of NGOs has risen significantly, a 90 percent increase since 1970. In 2001, there were 50,000 active NGOs across the world. John Keane argues about the normative roles of NGOs: “[t]hese non-governmental institutions and actors tend to pluralise power and to problematise violence; consequently, their peaceful or ‘civil’ effects are felt everywhere, here and there, far and wide, to and from local areas, through wider regions, to the planetary level itself.”¹²⁸

The idea of civil society indicates that while there is a close relationship between state and society, society is bigger and larger than the state. In this relationship, non-state actors can make their unique contribution for joint action by addressing the world’s problems and helping the community to envision the common good.

With this acknowledgment of the contribution of non-state actors, we can also extend the possible contributions of educational institutions for the project of social justice. In the first chapter, I showed the contribution of Indonesian universities during the Suharto powerhouse state powered by military. Student movements across the country in collaboration with democratic activists joined their hands in tearing down the authoritarian regime in May 1998.

¹²⁸ As cited in R. Scott Appleby, “Global Civil Society and the Catholic Social Tradition,” in Coleman and Ryan, eds., *Globalization and Catholic Social Thought*, 134.

From a more regional (Southeast Asia) perspective, we also notice the promising project called “Education on the margins”: a collaborative project between US Jesuit universities and the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS) in Thailand. This collaborative project responds to the urgent need to provide one of the basic rights of human beings: education. Thailand and Myanmar could not handle the demand for providing education to the refugees due to the lack of resources in those countries or the lack of attention to such issues. In the face of the failure of the state to provide the basic right to education, non-state actors (NGOs and universities) work together to deliver the service.

We will reflect at length on this topic in chapter 5 of this dissertation, especially in responding to the decline of student social involvement in post-authoritarian Indonesia.

3.2. Some Challenges for an Ethic of Collaboration Based on CST in a Post-Authoritarian Context

3.2.1. Collaboration and the Reality of Social Sin

One major contribution of *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* is bringing the language of social sin into the magisterium of the Church. While Vatican II provides a more positive view of human nature, the language of sin in its societal context gains more and more attention, especially through the experience of unjust suffering by the global south. SRS argues that structural sin is “rooted in personal sin, and thus always linked to the *concrete acts* of individuals who introduce these structures, consolidate them and make them difficult to remove. And thus they grow stronger, spread, and become the source of other sins, and so influence people’s behavior.”¹²⁹

Explaining the meaning of social sin, John Paul II refers back to his previous apostolic exhortation *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia* (RP). He wrote:

¹²⁹ SRS, no. 36

[Social sins] are the result of the accumulation and concentration of many *personal sins*. It is a case of the very personal sins of those who cause and support social evil or who exploit it, of those who are in a position to avoid, eliminate, or at least limit certain social evils but who fail to do so out of laziness, fear, or the conspiracy of silence, through secret complicity or indifference, of those who take refuge in the supposed impossibility of changing the world, and also of those who sidestep the effort and sacrifice required, producing specious reasons of a higher order.¹³⁰

Since structural sin is an accumulation of personal sins, therefore “a situation—or likewise an institution, a structure, society itself—is not in itself the subject of moral acts. Hence a situation cannot in itself be good or bad.”¹³¹

In RP, John Paul II offers three conditions for defining social sin. First, every sin is a social sin due to its social effects. Every sinful act will affect directly or indirectly other persons. “There is no sin, not even the most intimate and secret one, the most strictly individual one, that exclusively concerns the person committing it. With greater or lesser violence, with greater or lesser harm, every sin has repercussions on the entire ecclesial body and the whole human family.”¹³²

Second, social sin refers to a direct attack on one’s neighbor. Social sin is an act against the commandment “Love your neighbor as yourself.” Defiance against this commandment is manifest in

sins of commission or omission—on the part of political, economic or trade union leaders, who though in a position to do so, do not work diligently and wisely for the improvement and transformation of society according to the requirements and potential of the given historic moment; as also on the part of workers who through absenteeism or non-cooperation fail to ensure that their industries can continue to advance the well-being of the workers themselves, of their families and of the whole of society.¹³³

¹³⁰ SRS, footnote 65.

¹³¹ RP, no. 16.

¹³² RP, no. 16.

¹³³ RP, no. 16.

A third meaning of social sin is seen in the context of various relationships within human communities. It is interesting that in this third meaning of social sin, class struggle is defined as a form of social sin. In RP's rationale, since God envisions justice and peace between people or communities, any confrontation, even with the justification of achieving a just order, is a social sin. On this point, John Paul II and Benedict XVI take different positions from classical Marxism. While the classical Marxist focus is on class struggle as the leitmotiv of any joint action for social transformation, John Paul II and Benedict XVI focus on solidarity between social classes as the antidote for structural sin. Through collaboration as the praxis of solidarity, the different social classes work together for the betterment of all members in the society.

From these three meanings of social sin, we see that SRS and CV, while acknowledging the contribution of liberation theologians, still incline to a more traditional vision of sin: every sin—even if it is a structural sin—is rooted in personal action. Thus, conversion should begin from personal conversion. Building solidarity is the entry point for such personal conversion which in the long term will affect how we live in our society, as written in *Redemptoris Hominis*:

The principle of solidarity, in a wide sense, must inspire the effective search for appropriate institutions and mechanisms . . . in order that the economically developing peoples may be able not only to satisfy their essential needs but also to advance gradually and effectively. This difficult road of the indispensable transformation of the structures of economic life is one on which it will not be easy to go forward without the intervention of a true conversion of mind, will and heart. The task requires resolute commitment by individuals and peoples that are free and linked in solidarity.¹³⁴

Nevertheless, in responding to the reality of structural sin, some commentators see a paradox that Benedict XVI—and John Paul II in several parts of SRS—leans too heavily on personal conversion and not enough on structural change. John Paul II with his philosophical

¹³⁴ RH, nos.16, 55-56.

background in personalism and Benedict XVI's focus on charity influenced the respective papal positions.

In order to make the ethic of collaboration applicable, it should be based on a more stable structural support through various public policies and laws. In the previous chapter, I dealt with the impact of structural adjustment programs of the IMF in the decentralization of Indonesian society and its effect on educational policy. Focusing only on the renewed commitment to collaboration without addressing such issues will not solve the problem at its root.

Another reason why we cannot give too much attention to personal conversion without thinking about the structural support for such conversion concerns the issue of power.

Any collaborative action should address the reality of different levels of power which could hinder one's capability to participate in joint action, especially on behalf of the least, the poor and the minority in the society. In her critique of SRS, Mary E. Hobgood argues: how could the oppressor easily cooperate with the oppressed with an expectation that such cooperation will benefit all and not only the oppressor?¹³⁵ If the reality of human sinfulness is present at the same time as our deepest desire to build the kingdom of God through collaboration with all people of goodwill, then how will the reality of sins affect the project of collaboration itself? If we take structural sin seriously, one can ask whether the liberative approach of SRS and CV (i.e., solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good) is liberative enough to challenge the deep roots of structural sins.¹³⁶

In answering those questions, it is important to highlight another big contribution from SRS in the development of CST: namely the principle of "the preferential option for/with the

¹³⁵ Mary E. Hobgood, "Conflicting Paradigms in Social Analysis," in Baum and Ellsberg, eds., *The Logic of Solidarity*, 180.

¹³⁶ William K. Tabb, "John Paul II and Fidel Castro: Two Views of Development," in Baum and Ellsberg, eds., *The Logic of Solidarity*, 155.

poor.” While some argued that Benedict XVI’s conflicts with liberation theologians have influenced the omission of the phrase “the preferential option for/with the poor” in CV, both John Paul II and Benedict XVI agree that collaboration should be carried out for the benefit of the poor. Collaboration is more than social harmony; it is a condition whereby everyone is enabled to engage in the common project. Any unjust social structure should be challenged so that participation of all members of the community, especially the poor, is possible.

In the collaboration aimed at attaining the common good, in many cases we have to shake and challenge a common perception which legitimizes oppression and excludes a certain group in the community from the dynamics of the community. In order to make the preferential option for/with the poor operational, as argued by David Hollenbach, collaboration for the common good amidst the reality of social sins should be guided by the following three principles:¹³⁷

- The needs of the poor take priority over the wants of the rich.
- The freedom of the dominated takes priority over the liberty of the powerful.
- The participation of marginalized groups takes priority over the preservation of an order that excludes them.

These three principles are normative ethical standards to assure that structural arrangements in society will benefit all members of the community, especially those who live on the margins. Collaboration is more than just the preservation of order. Collaboration should address injustice and unmask it in front of the entire community. Collaboration should not be a justification for concealing injustice, but a motive to struggle for making it possible for everyone to have a right to participate in the community. With these three ethical standards, we can see the

¹³⁷ David Hollenbach, *Claims in Conflict: Retrieving and Renewing the Catholic Human Rights Tradition* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 204.

operationality of the preferential option for/with the poor in the dynamic of collaboration in a pluralistic society.

3.2.2. Constructing a Cross-fertilizing Approach on Collaboration

Another critique of John Paul II/Benedict XVI's approaches to CST is their deductive style in proposing a social ethical reflection. Deductive reasoning argues that there is a valid universal principle—e.g., solidarity—which will fit nicely in any given context. The context is seen merely as an application of a universalized principle. It is true that, as in recent discussions concerning global ethics, we do not need to fall into post-modern pessimism about our possibility to find what Rahner and Fuchs called the *humanum* which we share with all human beings.¹³⁸ However, it is important to highlight Aquinas' insistence on the role of practical reason in understanding natural law. The first precept of natural law (do good and avoid evil) is purely formal and self-evident. While this precept guides our moral orientation, it tells us nothing about what to do to address a specific moral question. It is the role of practical reason to make a normative judgment based on our observation of how people in many different contexts make moral considerations.¹³⁹ Practical reason both appreciates the goodness in many different contexts and unique practices in carrying out that goodness in communal life.

Roland Minnerath argues that “a principle is not an abstraction but the expression of a real relationship, subject to various practical definitions, among the members of society and between them and the whole of society.”¹⁴⁰ Because a principle is not an abstraction, we agree with Orobator who said, “[w]e may not ignore the possibility that the appeal to the notion of

¹³⁸ Josef Fuchs, S.J., *Personal Responsibility and Christian Morality*, translated by William Cleves and others (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1983), 53-68.

¹³⁹ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 94, art.2.

¹⁴⁰ Roland Minnerath, “The Fundamental Principles of Social Doctrine: The Issue of Their Interpretation,” in Archer and Donati, eds., *Pursuing the Common Good*, 45

solidarity can assume specific nuances depending on the particular cultural context, the outcome of which may be ethically problematic.”¹⁴¹ Orobator gave an example of how the concept of gratuity and gift applauded by *Caritas in Veritate* has a completely different nuance in Africa due to corruption and favoritism. In a continent with very close kinship relations, economy of communion then “prizes personal relationships over efficiency, rule of law and public accountability.”¹⁴² From the context of Southeast Asia, Agnes M. Brazal also shows some difficulties in merely applying a Western understanding of common good to the Asian context. In an Asian tradition, the common good is not only limited to the arrangement of society (state and non state actors’ relationship) but also to a deep awareness of being part of a harmonious cosmos, in our relationship with mother earth. The common good in the Asian tradition, according to Brazal, goes beyond the Western dichotomy of mind-body, active-passive, and action-contemplation.¹⁴³

In responding to Orobator’s and Brazal’s remarks, I will propose a model of practical reason on the topic of collaboration by discussing at length an Indonesian example of local wisdom, called *gotong-royong* (mutual help or working together) as the sparring partner when we talk about an ethic of collaboration in the Indonesian context. Putting collaboration side by side with *gotong royong* is a form of cross-fertilizing process where each party will “give and receive” from the other.

¹⁴¹ Agbonkhianmeghe E. Orobator, S.J., “*Caritas in Veritate* and Africa’s Burden of (Under)Development,” *Theological Studies* no. 71 (2010), 327.

¹⁴² Orobator, “*Caritas in Veritate* and Africa’s Burden of (Under)Development,” 327.

¹⁴³ Agnes M. Brazal, “East Asian Discourses on Harmony: A Meditation for Catholic Social Teaching,” Daniel McDonald, S.J., ed., *Catholic Social Teaching in Global Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2010), 118-146.

4. Conclusion

In his reflection on the characteristics of collaboration in a pluralistic society, Pat Jones wrote this interesting assessment:

Collaboration is a dynamic activity. It is always a becoming, a journey rather than a destination, something always changing or developing. It involves taking risks. It requires a strong belief in the action of the Spirit and a commitment to listening to the Spirit through discernment, both communally and individually.¹⁴⁴

In this chapter, we traced how the Catholic Church after Vatican II is trying to listen to the spirit in the context of a more pluralistic and interdependent world. There is a deep sense of optimism as a people of God who respond to God's mission to bring light and justice to the world. But painful experiences from the global south become a wake-up call concerning the pervasiveness of the reality of structural sin. This deep optimism and acknowledgment of structural sin influenced the post-Vatican II Catholic Church to propose an ethic of collaboration based on solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good.

In the following chapter, we will see how the spirit of God also works in Indonesian society which faces the problem of decentralization. Through the assessment of the virtue of *gotong royong* (mutual help or working together), we will trace how the Indonesian people can also find the ethical source within their tradition in order to nurture the spirit of solidarity for the common good.

¹⁴⁴ Pat Jones, "Collaborative Ministry," in Bilgrien, *Solidarity*, 236.

Chapter III

The Didactic of *Gotong Royong* in the Changing Indonesian Society

In this chapter, I will show the cross-fertilizing dialogue between an ethic of collaboration based on the post-Vatican II social encyclicals and an Indonesian worldview on social cooperation named *gotong royong*. This cross-fertilizing dialogue is perceived from the educational point of view by asking: how could education help society in nurturing the spirit of collaboration? How does the specific context of Indonesian society pose a challenge in developing a pedagogy of solidarity for the common good? What are the resources to bring it about? How does the Indonesian approach to *gotong royong* shape our understanding of Catholic Social Teaching (CST), and *vice versa*?

There are three pedagogues selected as representatives of Indonesian national pedagogy: Ki Hajar Dewantara (1889-1959), Nicolaus Driyarkara (1913-1967) and Mochtar Buchori (1926-2011). They will be presented subsequently in their respective eras, with their unique challenges and hopes. While Dewantara and Buchori were Muslim pedagogues, their philosophies of education were not based exclusively on Islamic thought. Their international experiences (Dewantara lived in the Netherlands for nine years and Buchori attained his PhD in Education Planning from Harvard) have shaped their approaches in proposing the limit and possibility of education as a source of transformation in Indonesian society. As argued by Abdulah and Nizar, the traditional Islamic educational system has made a great contribution to the development of

Indonesian society, which would take another dissertation to explore.¹ In this dissertation, we will limit the discussion to the pedagogy of public education in Indonesia.

This chapter consists of three sections. In the first section, I show the definition of *gotong royong* as an invented tradition, its political and cultural appropriations from the pre-independence era until the authoritarian Suharto regime, and the growing interest in such ideas in post-authoritarian Indonesia. In the second section, I expound the idea of *gotong royong* as sociality in Indonesian society and the role of education in sustaining it. In the third section, I facilitate a cross-fertilizing dialogue between the three Indonesian pedagogues with their concept of *gotong royong* and the notion of collaboration in CST. This cross-fertilizing approach pinpoints three important insights. First, *gotong royong* as social collaboration emerges from a network of solidarity between active yet equal agents. Second, education based on the daily experience of people's struggles could help bring about such collaborative action for the common good. Third, in uprooting social sins, education should pay attention to the practices that hinder any liberative yet collaborative projects.

1. Preliminary Remarks for Understanding *Gotong Royong* in Its Socio-Political and Cultural Settings

In his speech during the preparatory committee for Indonesian independence, Sukarno—the first Indonesian president—proposed Pancasila (five principles) as the foundational ideology for Indonesian society. These five principles are belief in God, just and civilized humanity, the unity of Indonesia, democracy guided by inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of

¹ Taufik Abdulah, *Schools and Politics: The Kaum Muda Movement in West Sumatra 1927-1933* (Singapore: Equinox, 2009); H. Samsul Nizar, et al., *Sejarah Sosial & Dinamika Intelektual Pendidikan Islam di Nusantara* [The Social History and Intellectual Dynamic of Islamic Education in Nusantara] (Jakarta: Kencana, 2013).

deliberation among representatives, and social justice for all of the people in Indonesia. Sukarno claimed that these five principles could be summarized into a single notion, namely *gotong royong*, which can be translated as mutual assistance or mutual cooperation/collaboration. He said

If I compress what was five [principles] into three, and what was three into one, then I have a genuine Indonesian term, *gotong royong*, mutual cooperation. The State of Indonesia which we are to establish must be a *gotong-royong* state. How wonderful that is: a *Gotong-Royong* state... *Gotong royong* is a dynamic concept, more dynamic than the family principle, [my dear] friends! The family principle is a static concept, but *gotong royong* portrays one endeavor, one act of service, one task... *Gotong royong* means toiling hard together, sweating hard together, a joint struggle to help one another. Acts of service by all for the interest of all...²

From then on, *gotong royong* was transformed into national jargon in understanding the nature of Indonesian society. Together with two other important terms, namely *koperasi* (cooperation in the economic sphere), *musyawarah untuk mufakat* (reaching consensus for agreement in the legislative body or communal decision making), *gotong royong* embodies the ideal conception of a person seeing one's self in the community, one's rights and responsibilities, and the ideal arrangement of political power from the local to the national level. *Gotong royong* is positioned as "the key cultural operator" in which each member of Indonesian society in some way or another relates her/his self to its symbol.³ Sukarno has made *gotong royong* reach its status as "the national value."

Nevertheless, experience with Suharto's authoritarian regime posed a serious question about the authenticity of this "national value." In studies of the history of the concept, we can find at least two different approaches on *gotong royong*. The first one is a cultural approach, focusing on how the praxis of *gotong royong* gives meaning to ordinary Indonesians, how they

² Sukarno, "Pancasila: The Basis of the State," cited in Eka Darmaputera, *Pancasila and the Search for Identity and Modernity in Indonesian Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 181.

³ John R. Bowen, "On the Political Construction of Tradition: *Gotong Royong* in Indonesia," *Journal of Asian Studies* 15, no. 3 (May 1986): 545.

interpret and interact with the world. The second one is a more socio-political approach. This approach focuses on how the notion of *gotong royong* is shaped by power relations within Indonesian society. In this approach, *gotong royong* is seen as an “invented tradition” for a state’s developmental and political agenda. *Gotong royong* as a “national culture” was used as a state intervention in the dynamic of rural Indonesian community especially in mobilizing the labor force.

This chapter will argue that these two approaches can be complementary in seeking a renewed understanding of cooperation, especially after the highly abused and top-down treatment of *gotong royong* during the Suharto era. A socio-political approach could help Indonesian society to detect the possibility of a hidden ideological agenda during the promotion of such values. However, a cultural approach will help to see that a citizen is not merely a passive recipient of the political agenda. In this chapter I will show that education proves to be very helpful in the process of navigating the balance between the political and cultural approaches of *gotong royong*.

1.1. *Gotong Royong*: An Invented Tradition

The term *gotong royong* is associated with Javanese culture, the biggest and the dominant ethnic culture in Indonesia. However, J. Zoetmulder, SJ, a Jesuit expert on ancient Java, argues that this term is relatively new, even in the Javanese dictionary. This term has never been used in the entire literature of ancient and middle Javanese literature.⁴ In the modern Javanese dictionary, the word “gotong” means a group of people carrying a heavy object together.

⁴ Koentjaraningrat, *Some Social-Anthropological Observations of Gotong Royong Practices in Two Villages of Central Java* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Asia Project, 1961); “The System and The Spirit of *Gotong Royong*,” *Prisma* 6 (1977): 20-28.; “The Indonesian Mentality and Development,” *Sojourn* 3, no. 2 (August 1988): 107-133.

“Royong” is a rhythmic addition, a style in Javanese grammar to intensify the meaning of “gotong” and also make it more pleasant to hear.

With no reference to the middle and ancient Javanese literature, Sullivan concludes that *gotong royong* is an invented tradition.⁵ Borrowing the concept from Eric Hobsbawm, an invented tradition is

a set of practices, normally governed by overtly or tacitly accepted rules and of a ritual or symbolic nature, which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behavior by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past.⁶

Hobsbawm’s definition provides two important insights for understanding *gotong royong* as an invented tradition. First, an invention of *gotong royong* implies a sense of continuity with an ideal historical past. As an invented tradition, *gotong royong* serves as an idealization of the communitarian life especially in rural areas. It is invented through varying degrees of deliberation. The social imagination conveyed by *gotong royong* is “a society that is harmonious, free of conflict, and part of the personal experience; it is anchored in execution of duty, and consciousness of place. The individual is defined by place and duties; subjected to the welfare—harmony—of the whole.”⁷

Second, this local idealization of the Javanese worldview then was generalized toward a highly diverse Indonesia. *Gotong royong* then was ordained as the indigenous cooperativeness in Indonesian society, as shown in the following remark:

Gotong royong in the strict sense can be rendered as collective social activities. But the deepest meaning of *gotong royong* can be explained as a philosophy of

⁵ John Sullivan, *Inventing and Imagining Community: Two Modern Indonesian Ideologies* (Clayton: Monash Asia Institute, 1991), 11.

⁶ Eric Hobsbawm, “Introduction: Inventing Traditions,” in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1.

⁷ Niels Mulder, *Mysticism in Java: Ideology in Indonesia* (Amsterdam: The Pepin Press, 1998), 122.

life that takes the collective life as the most important. The philosophy of *gotong royong* is now a part of Indonesian culture because *gotong royong* is not the property of a particular ethnic group.⁸

The sense of continuity between the past and present in the tradition of *gotong royong* is the priority of community over individual in the daily life of Indonesians. *Gotong royong* is a manifestation of a collective identity: one understands oneself through one's participation within the dynamic of a community. Everyone is part of a network of social relations. Even though this term comes from a specific tradition (Java), it is used to represent the basic value which the highly diverse Indonesian society shared among its members.

Gotong royong as an invented tradition then manifests itself in the individual and communal daily praxis. Repetition of daily practices of *gotong royong* helps in materializing a community's ideal vision of the harmonious society. Society then creates rules and norms in order to sustain the consistency of the respective practices. In this regard, we can ask: how successful is the praxis of *gotong royong* as the medium between the ideal of harmonious society and its realization in daily life? In answering this question, Koentjaraningrat, a leading Indonesian anthropologist, examined the praxis of *gotong royong* in real daily life and categorized it into three different forms. Nowadays most Indonesian people define *gotong royong* in these three forms.

First, *gotong royong* is a form of mobilizing labor in rural society. Due to the need of extra labor during the busy periods of preparing the wet rice fields, a farmer or a group of farmers will ask help from several other farmers either from the same village or from other villages to help him/them. The one who calls a *gotong royong* system usually provides only lunch during working days, without paying compensation. The reciprocity principle emerges

⁸ Bowen, "*Gotong Royong* in Indonesia," 546.

when a farmer who requested *gotong royong* must respond to the same request from the farmers who previously helped him/her.

In Koentjaraningrat's analysis, this type of *gotong royong* system is suitable for a small yet face-to-face rural community because of its flexibility (easily called and dispersed). When the work becomes larger and more complex, farmers prefer to hire and pay the additional workers for the sake of practicality. Another concern with this *gotong royong* system in rural contexts is the problem of compensation: a free lunch for the worker is far from enough to meet the daily needs of a farmer's family. Modernization also contributes to the diminishing of this type of *gotong royong* practice. In an urban context, collective work is available only for tasks that do not require specialized expertise. When an organization becomes broader with its specialization and complexity, mobilizing manpower through *gotong royong* is no longer effective or hardly possible. Therefore, when modernization influences the life of a rural community, this type of *gotong royong* also declines.⁹

Second, *gotong royong* also refers to generalized reciprocity and the mutual-aid activities in a village community. Mutual aid relates to the daily needs of family and relatives, e.g., cleaning and renovating the house, digging a well. The term used for these activities is *sambatan* (from the word *sambat*, meaning "asking for help"). Mutual aid is also initiated when a community member wants to make traditional communal ceremonies, e.g., for one's important life cycle moments from birth (seventh month of pregnancy, celebration after safely delivering a baby, giving names), circumcision, marriage and death of a community member. Ideally, these mutual-aid activities are spontaneous, although to different degrees. Cleaning or renovating the

⁹ Hyung-Jun Kim, "Agrarian and Social Change in a Javanese Village," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 32, no. 4 (2002), 440.

house is considered as the least spontaneous, while helping others during the death or disaster is considered the most spontaneous.

The *third* meaning of *gotong royong* emerged during the Suharto powerhouse state: a collective work to support state developmental projects. This *gotong royong* activity used a mostly top-down approach rather than bottom-up or coming from the community's aspirations. As in *gotong royong* as mutual aid, a community will easily be supportive of a developmental project if this project will directly influence their life. For example, villagers will wholeheartedly support a project to build a water irrigation system for a paddy field or for a village's water supply. But, if the developmental project is less related to the dynamic of everyday life in the village, communal participation in *gotong royong* is based on obligation, even sometimes with lack of enthusiasm.

Koentjaraningrat then argues that while there are three forms of *gotong royong* (mobilization of labor, mutual assistance, developmental project) each with its own degree of enthusiasm and spontaneity, there is an underlying *pathos* that makes such a practice possible: "a spirit of working together." It is true that modernization and specialization of labor have challenged the previous forms of *gotong royong*. However, for many Indonesian, *gotong royong* is still "a system of values which is the basis of our culture."¹⁰

Koentjaraningrat provides four reasons for this.¹¹ First, an individual is a part of community, a small element of the macrocosm whereby an individual lives. Therefore, second, one is essentially dependent on others in all aspects of life. Third, this dependency makes one try as much as possible to maintain a harmonious relationship with one's neighbor. Lastly, fourth, in the spirit of equality, one must seek to conform and to do the same to others.

¹⁰ Koentjaraningrat, "The System and Spirit of *Gotong Royong*," 25.

¹¹ Koentjaraningrat, "The Indonesian Mentality and Development," 113.

Koentjaraningrat's arguments on the underlying values of changing tradition help us to understand Hobsbawm's idea on adaptation of an invented tradition. When the old tradition is on the wane, adaptation happens. Some elements from older traditions are reconstructed and reinvented in a new form and for a new propose. A new ritual then is formed in line with the new reinvented tradition.¹² New symbols are created to convey the new customs. A process of reinvention of the *gotong royong* tradition happened during the Suharto powerhouse state.

1.2. *Gotong Royong* and Re-invention of Pancasila Personhood through Education during the Authoritarian Suharto Regime

A process of re-invention of *gotong royong* traditions continued during the Suharto powerhouse state. As I explained in Chapter 1, in order to secure its grip on power, the Suharto regime, staffed by military and backed by the oligarchs, propagated the ideal of the "pancasila person" as the ideological basis to support his developmental project. During the 1980s, Indonesia was showered by abundant developmental projects from the international community. *Gotong royong* turned out to be a very useful ideology for mobilizing a cheap labor force in the community to support the implementation of such projects.

In a larger view, the spirit of *gotong royong* is an important feature for an idealized Pancasila person, the so-called "complete Indonesian man." During this era, the state sponsored publications and seminars on the philosophy and morality of Pancasila, especially in education. A massive program called P4 (*Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengalaman Pancasila* or the Directive for Full Understanding and Practice of Pancasila) was initiated in 1985. All Indonesian students from elementary level until higher education had to take this short program before the new academic year began. It was even given throughout the year as civic education, a mandatory

¹² Hobsbawm, "Introduction: Inventing Traditions," 8.

subject for all students regardless of their academic level and concentration, called PMP (*Penghayatan Moral Pancasila* or Directive for Pancasila Morality).¹³

Using the Hobsbawm analysis, local wisdom is reinterpreted and reinvented for the sake of the state's concern. Take a look at this beautiful portrayal of the subject "obedience" in PMP's textbook for elementary school pupils as paraphrased by Niels Mulder.

Faithful obedience to and worship of God is reflected in the three dimensions of religious practice, namely the relationship with God, with fellow men, and with the environment. People praise the Lord, follow God's command, and refrain from sin. The relationship with people, society, nation and state, is shaped by respect for parents and elders, the drive for justice and truth, honoring one's teachers, and obedience to the state. People take good care of the natural environment and use it for their common welfare. The social-cultural environment that fosters the worship of God must be safeguarded.¹⁴

Pancasila ideology is beautifully written. We can find a communitarian concern, respecting the drive for justice and truth. The program even helps the pupil to understand that our care for the environment is a manifestation of our relationship with God. For the modern ear, the text of Pancasila philosophy is not a blatant ideology idolizing violence or domination. During the mandatory P4 program, Javanese proverbs continuously spread: *sepi ing pamrih, rame ing gawe, memayu hayuning bawono*. Mulder translated this proverb as "always guided by the common interest, one's ego-drives effaced, one is active for the benefit of all, and making the world a better and more beautiful place." This harmonious imagination can be possible only when we are in solidarity with others. Mutual aid and cooperation is a form of such solidarity.

The Pancasila person will also respect social and political human rights, which are (1) private rights, freedom of religion, freedom of association and expression, (2) economic rights, (3) equality before the law and government, (4) political rights, founding political parties,

¹³ A personal note: I was obliged to take and complete this annual compulsory course from my childhood in grade 1 until the first year of my philosophy studies as a Jesuit.

¹⁴ Mulder, *Mysticism in Java*, 95.

proposing petitions, (5) the right to education and cultural development. The Pancasila person then will live out the Pancasila democracy based on *musyawarah untuk mufakat*, a mutual consultation to reach unanimous agreement. How beautiful is the image of “the complete Indonesian person.”¹⁵

Nevertheless, the text should be read within the context that produced it. As I showed at length in chapter one, the Suharto powerhouse state used this beautifully written Pancasila philosophy for legitimation of its *libido dominandi*. Take an example from Kusujiarti Tickamyer’s studies on women’s roles in the Indonesian state-sponsored developmental program. The operability of *gotong royong* during the indoctrination period of the complete Pancasila person made the already separated gender roles in Javanese society become more apparent.

[S]ocial welfare provision was a function of centralized bureaucratic authority using existing communal social structures and relations, patriarchal gender ideology, and appeals to Indonesian norms and values to solicit local support for state programs. These strategies provided firm, centralized control over social welfare activities and both their agents and their participants, while creating the impression that the activities represented grassroots efforts that were fully supported by local populations or even originated in communal efforts and local value system.¹⁶

In a society where community becomes a priority and the birth of an individual is considered as a threat to harmonious social relations, spontaneous mutual assistance is hardly possible. *Gotong royong* as a spontaneous reciprocal praxis in a community is then perceived as a social obligation. There is even a “reward and punishment mechanism” to make this *gotong royong* work. The community alienated those who did not participate in these “*gotong royong*” programs or at worst, they were stigmatized as selfish and having no social responsibilities for the good of

¹⁵ Ibid., 94 and 103.

¹⁶ Siti Kusujiarti and Ann R. Tickamyer, *Power, Change, and Gender Relations in Rural Java: A Tale of Two Villages* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2012), 172.

the society. Through this “reward and punishment” method, the Suharto powerhouse state gained tremendous support from the local community in performing its developmental project through *gotong royong*.¹⁷

Sullivan even argues that the history of abusing *gotong royong* is not limited to Suharto’s regime. It starts from the conception of the term by Sukarno, that *gotong royong* is conceived through the mind of Javanese middle class and it is less about social solidarity for the poor (*wong cilik*).

It must be remembered that when Sukarno first invoked *gotong royong* as a national symbol and for some time thereafter, it was not widely and intimately associated with the *wong cilik* (the poor); middle and upper-class groupings of the time could associate it with an imagined Indonesian community made up of people like themselves, all pulling together abstractly in the national struggle, a kind of figurative *ho lopis kuntul baris* [let’s move together] as Bung Karno depicted it. As it became more overtly linked to literal pulling and pushing and the communities of the little people, it lost some of its early appeal.¹⁸

1.3. Re-emergence of *Gotong Royong* in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia

In the eyes of Western critics, the future of the complete Pancasila person with its philosophical elements—as *gotong royong*—is finished with the fall of Suharto. With the burning desire for a more democratic institution, Pancasila indoctrination seemed not to fit with the whole project to bring democracy closer to the dynamic of civil society.

Nevertheless, as I showed in Chapter 1, the problem of fragmentation and bloody ethnic conflicts in the early years of the post-Suharto era make the appeal of Pancasila, *gotong royong*, *koperasi* (economic cooperation) look steadily stronger. In the 2000s, there were numerous provincial laws issued based on a more rigid interpretation of Islamic Sharia Law, which sadly focus heavily on personal piety (*hijab* for women, anti-pornography law, regulation of alcohol)

¹⁷ Ibid., 173.

¹⁸ John Sullivan, *Local Government and Community in Java: An Urban Case-Study* (Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1992), 192.

instead of unearthing the social justice vision from the Quran, in order to deal with a chronic problem of corruption and human rights violations. Human rights NGOs also gave an alarm on the rise of religious intolerance and violence toward minority groups.¹⁹ When the old doctrine was uprooted, there was a vacuum which many new ideologies were competing to occupy. The battles of ideologies have cost thousands of Indonesian lives.

In these ideological battles to fill the vacuum after the fall of the Pancasila ideology, there is a growing desire to reinvent Pancasila, with its related doctrine of *gotong royong*, as a form of overlapping consensus (in the Rawlsian understanding) for this very diverse nation. With the history of abuse and failure of the complete Pancasila person during the Suharto era, *gotong royong* is no longer seen as a panacea for all social problems, but as a stepping-stone for ongoing discussion so that each community with its differences can come together on how to live together as a community. It is true that *gotong royong* was reinvented for the sake of the authoritarian regime. The history of misuse of *gotong royong* should be accepted as a fact, for there is a fragility in the idea of *gotong royong* that could go against all good intentions of social collaboration. However, simply rejecting this idea due to its history of abused interpretation will not help the Indonesian society either.

What we need is a renewed interpretation of *gotong royong* that, on the one hand, gives an orientation toward social cooperation for a social justice agenda, especially for the ones who live on the margins of Indonesian society. On the other hand, a renewed reinvention of *gotong royong* should respect plurality of interpretation, acknowledging its limitations and the possibility for abuse, and respecting many local approaches to the common good without

¹⁹ Human Rights Watch, *In Religion's Name: Abuses against Religious Minorities in Indonesia*, accessed March 26, 2015. http://www.hrw.org/print/reports/2013/02/28/religion-s-name#_ftn2.

sacrificing the strong bond with others. With these interpretative remarks, I believe *gotong royong* could be a powerful source in envisioning a social justice agenda for Indonesian society.

2. Re-appropriation of *Gotong Royong* through Education: Three Indonesian Pedagogues in the Spirit of their Times

In this section, we will see three different approaches to understanding *gotong royong* in three different Indonesian eras: pre-independence (1940s), during the years of national building of the Sukarno era (1960-1980s), and during the Suharto era and its aftermath. In these approaches, we will see the possibility of a re-interpretation of *gotong royong* that both provides a strong rationale for social cooperation yet respects the diversity and uniqueness of human agency. In doing so, we will focus on how education could nurture such a spirit of free social collaboration. I select the three most important Indonesian pedagogues: Ki Hajar Dewantara (Soewardi Soerjaningrat), Nicolaus Driyarkara, and Mochtar Buchori.

2.1. Soewardi Soerjaningrat/Ki Hajar Dewantara: National Education Embedded in The Life Stories of the People

Soewardi Soerjaningrat was born on May 2, 1889 from a family of the Javanese aristocracy in Yogyakarta, named Paku Alam. Together with Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo and Douwes Dekker, Soewardi Soerjaningrat established the first political party in colonial Indonesia, named *Indische Partij* (Indonesian Party) in 1913. In the same year, Soewardi published the most important writing that marked the beginning of Indonesian resistance toward the Dutch colonizers. It was a newspaper feature article, entitled “*Als ik een Nederlander wa*” (If I were a Dutchman). In 1913, the Dutch were commemorating the anniversary of their 100 years

of freedom from Spain. The Dutch central government gave orders to its colonies to contribute money for this celebration. Through this article, Soewardi challenged the very foundation of such a celebration: how could a country celebrate its independence while at the same time they colonize other countries? Through his satirical tone, Soewardi pointed out the basic problem of colonization, and opened discussion for Indonesian youth to realize that the commemoration of Dutch independence from Spain could initiate the spark of the same aspiration: independence from the Dutch. Soewardi, a Javanese, purposely wrote his article in a very sophisticated Dutch, a language that was limited to the elite colonizer of that times. Tsuchiya interprets Soewardi's use of language as an "ability to manipulate the language and make it a weapon."²⁰

When the article was translated into Indonesian, Dutch Colonials were afraid of the impact of such an article on the Indonesian public. Therefore, Soewardi was exiled to the Netherlands in 1913. There he met with others activists and joined the *Indische Vereeniging*, launched a vigorous campaign for Indonesian independence and made contact with members of the Dutch Social Democratic Party, who had sympathy for Indonesian independence.

However, with the guarantee of freedom of speech in Holland, Soewardi changed his style by becoming less confrontational toward the Dutch government. This change of political strategy stirred unanswered questions in the circle of independence movements who had high expectations of Soewardi. Scherer gives one explanation for this change of tone. She argues that during his exile in Holland, Soewardi started to see that the root of the problem of Indonesian society is more a cultural crisis.²¹ Soewardi still believed that Indonesian independence is a

²⁰ Kenji Tsuchiya, *Democracy and Leadership: The Rise of Taman Siswa Movement in Indonesia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988).

²¹ Savitri Scherer, *Keselarasan dan Kejanggalan: Pemikiran-Pemikiran Priyayi Nasionalis Jawa Awal Abad XX* [Harmony and Dissonance: Early Nationalist Thought in Java] (Depok: Komunitas Bambu, 2012).

conditio sine qua non. However, he saw that the cultural problem of a “slave mentality” due to colonization was a deeper problem, less acknowledged by the independence movements.

When he returned to Indonesia, Soewardi changed his name to Ki Hajar Dewantara, which means “man among the gods.”²² Then in 1922, he open the first national and secular school network in Indonesia, namely Taman Siswa (Garden of the pupils). It must be acknowledged that Taman Siswa was not the first educational network in Indonesia. Fr. Van Lith, a Dutch Jesuit, opened a teacher training school for native Javanese in Muntilan, Central Java, in 1900. Ahmad Dahlan started the Muhammadiyah movement in 1920 and imitated the Christian social charities network, through education and social associations.

2.1.1 Sociality as a Natural Social Praxis in Pre-Independence Indonesia

Dewantara’s background as a Javanese aristocrat greatly influences his educational philosophy and his ideas on collaboration. In his collected works, he rarely used the word *gotong royong*. Nevertheless, in his vision of Indonesian society, he always put the fact of human sociality as the basis of his educational philosophy. He argues that sociality was always a part of pre-independence Indonesian society. He enlists several daily practices in village life as manifestations of the culture of sociality by saying

Our customs throughout Indonesia, which have been followed since the ancient generation and in dialog with other civilizations, are always expressed with sufficient evidence of the existence of the refined social practices, both based on Hinduism or Buddhism, as well as those based on traditional belief; we notice an attitude toward other human beings which is always welcoming and peaceful, for example in the case of mutual assistance, protecting public safety, assisting others in their needs (death, marriage and so on; until now we still know its form in *sinoman* [mutual help during marriage], *gugur gunung* [working together on a village project], giving donations to the needy and so on); we always appreciate others by honoring others’ rights; we always like to sacrifice ourselves for the

²² Changing one’s birth name after marriage was a common practice for Javanese men in that era.

general welfare, such as charity, *slametan* [a traditional Javano-Islamic communal prayer], maintaining *waqf* [endowments] for public charity, and so on.²³

Dewantara articulated that this local expression of working together for the good of all has been present from the ancient history of Indonesian society. He showed many forms of cooperation in pre-independence Indonesian society. One of his main concerns in showing these practices of *gotong royong* is to dismantle racial prejudice. During his exile in Holland, Dewantara encountered a common misconception within Dutch society about the life of the people in the colony. They presumptively categorized the people in the colony as “backward and barbaric.” Although average Dutch people loved to portray the colony as *mooi Indie* (the beautiful East India) or “Indonesia is an emerald necklace,” they doubted that civilization or culture existed in this colony.²⁴ By pointing out the “sufficient evidence” of traditional social actions and collaboration among Indonesian people, Dewantara wanted to challenge those average misconceptions and racial prejudice. He vigorously challenged this prejudice starting from his exile in Holland, by setting up *Hindia Poetra* [The sons of Hindia], a newspaper whose mission was to inform the Dutch public about the current situations of the colony. In order to put the colony on an equal footing with Dutch society, Dewantara also wrote about the tradition of women leaders in some Javanese kingdoms. He criticized “the civilized Dutch” that they were left far behind the colony in terms of gender equality, an emerging issue for Dutch society at that time.²⁵

²³ Ki Hajar Dewantara, “Kultur atau Kebudayaan [On Culture],” in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara* [The Collected Works of Ki Hajar Dewantara], vol. 2 (Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Persatuan Taman Siswa, 1967), 28-29.

²⁴ Tsuchiya, *Democracy and Leadership*, 33.

²⁵ Scherer, *Keselarasan dan Kejanggalan*, 65. Scherer also shows Dewantara’s inconsistency in terms of gender equality. When he wrote for a Dutch audience, Dewantara wanted to show vigorously the fact of gender equality in the ancient tradition of the Javanese kingdom. But in many other articles, he supported arranged marriage in Javanese society which for many is seen as limiting women’s freedom in choosing the best for their lives.

One of Dewantara's aides described colonial racial prejudice as follows

When I learnt Dutch at school, the teacher would point at a picture of an Indonesian and say "*Dat is een man*" [This is a man], then at a picture of a Dutchman and say "*Dat is een heer*" [That is a gentleman]. He would show the distinction between *dame* [lady] and *vrouw* [woman] with the same kind of pictures. When we came to "*Dat is een dief*" [That is a thief], the thief in the picture was portrayed as [an Indonesian] peasant."²⁶

The problem that Dewantara saw is not the absence of a civilization or that the colony is a "backward and barbaric" culture. His concern is more about the crisis of the culture. This is the main reason why Dewantara shifted his struggle from political campaign to cultural renewal. He portrayed the crisis of Indonesian society as a person who lost the sense of belonging to a community, as a person who stayed in a hotel.

We live like people who stay in a hotel that belongs to someone else. We do not have the desire to repair or decorate the house we live in, because there is no feeling that the house was our home. Our life is like at the hotel: as long as we can eat, either good or bad, and can have a time of leisure; it is sufficient. That is the bourgeois life.²⁷

For Dewantara, the ideal of society is not like living in a hotel. Similar to Jonathan Sacks' critique of the crisis of British multiculturalism, society should be "a home that we build together."²⁸ Without a sense of connection toward fellow members in the society, society is no more than a group of person "entrapped" in the same hotel. They have the freedom to eat, freedom to do anything in their own "rooms" as long as they don't bother other people's "rooms."

Dewantara's critique of pre-independence Indonesian society as a hotel echoes the same concern as Augustine with the decline of Rome as we have discussed in the first chapter. What counts as a community is not the fact of "any collection of human beings brought together in any

²⁶ Tsuchiya, *Democracy and Leadership*, 131.

²⁷ Dewantara, "Asosiasi antara Timur dan Barat" [Association between East and West] in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 2, 4.

²⁸ Jonathan Sacks, *The Home We Build Together: Recreating Society* (New York: Continuum, 2007).

sort of way.” According to Augustine, it is the agreement, a sense of connection to respect “justice and the common good.”²⁹ If we read Dewantara’s critique through this Augustinian lens, we can see how perennial is the problem of being together for the sake of the common good in society, a problem that lingers from Ancient Rome to Indonesia.

Then, Dewantara asks a question: what causes the loss of being a people in a true community? He answers: it is the product of the colonial educational system. Education in the Dutch system fails to initiate awareness of the sociality of Indonesian society. In Paulo Freire’s terminology, the colonial system fails to initiate “conscientization” for Indonesian people.³⁰ Education is used to legitimize colonization and is crafted for the benefit of the colonizer, or in Dewantara’s term, for the sake of “others than the Indonesian position.”

It was true that in 1901 there was a movement in Dutch, called *Ethische Politiek* (ethical policy), whose intention was to give an opportunity for education to the pre-independence Indonesians. Nevertheless, this kind of education is very basic and was operated within the colonial system. So, the result of this colonial education was a person who lacked social awareness, the bourgeois, staying comfortably in an “Indonesian hotel.”

Therefore, in the magna carta of Taman Siswa, Dewantara placed freedom as a basic value in his national educational paradigm. Dewantara defines national education as follows:

National education is an education that is based on *the life-story of its people*. It is directed toward the common good of the nation, so that it will elevate the dignity of the nation and its people. Therefore, with equal status, we can *work together* with other nations for the glory of humanity in the whole world.³¹

²⁹ Augustine, *The City of God*, Book II, No. 21 (New York: Modern Library, 2000), 61.

³⁰ Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. 30th Anniversary Edition (New York: Continuum, 2005).

³¹ Dewantara, “Hal Pendidikan” [On Education], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1 (Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Taman Siswa, 1962), 15. Emphasis is mine.

Education should be based on the life story of its people. Therefore, education should start from “below,” from immersing oneself in the story of the community where the pupils live. Education from below starts by asking what happens within my community; “what are the shortcomings and the disappointments” of my people?³² Especially in the pluralistic context of Indonesian society, national education should acknowledge the plurality of the stories in Indonesian society, shaped by differences based on ethnicities and religions. By embracing the plurality of life stories of Indonesian society, education can help the students to envision unity and harmony. While Dewantara himself was a prominent Javanese aristocrat and his philosophy was shaped by Javanese philosophy, his educational system was never intended only for the Javanese and Islamic majority.³³ In his address on school holidays, Dewantara gave instruction that every student should have an equal opportunity for observing their religious obligations (Islam, Christian, Buddhist, and Hindu). A school in the Taman Siswa network should respect and accommodate them in its academic calendar.³⁴

Unity becomes the key point for moving toward freedom and liberation. For Dewantara, freedom is not only limited to physical freedom, but more importantly “inner freedom.” With inner freedom, one can strive to join the movement of the people. For Dewantara, freedom is not directed toward oneself. Freedom is an engine toward greater unity with all people, with all nations. The basic problem of colonization is hindering one’s freedom to participate in their community, and because of this exclusion, people fail to participate in creating a unity with other nations to build a more harmonious world.

³² Dewantara, “Pendidikan dan Pengajaran Nasional” [National Education and Instruction], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 3.

³³ Dewantara, “Pengajaran Nasional” [National Education], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 11.

³⁴ On the arrangement of school holidays, it is interesting that the only holidays which the Taman Siswa network will not observe are Dutch national holidays, e.g.: Dutch independence day, the birthday of the Queen. From Dewantara’s nationalistic point of view, observing Dutch national holidays is “inappropriate.” Dewantara, “Hal Pendidikan” [On Education], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 19.

It is very interesting to note how Dewantara combined nationalism with cosmopolitanism in his educational philosophy. His strong message of freedom and independence emerged in his stubbornness for *zelfbedruipingssysteem* (self-financed system) of Taman Siswa. In order to freely arrange his educational system, Taman Siswa refused any subsidies from the Dutch. Taman Siswa was afraid that any subsidy would influence its independence and especially its critical stance toward the colonial government. In order to meet the needs of the school, Taman Siswa relied on donations from teachers, students and their supporters.

But, at the same time, we also find elsewhere that the struggle for freedom should not hinder one's participation to create a better world. Freedom should be directed toward a freedom to cooperate with others for humanity, for the common good.

Making "order and tranquility" our highest objective while still attaching great importance to the spirit of independence means that central unity (*central eenheid*) must not be forgotten when decentralization is carried out. In other words, democracy must not be allowed to violate the common good. Soetatmo, the first chairman of *Taman Siswa*, said "democracy without wisdom is a catastrophe for us all." In other words, there can be no tranquility when *wiraga* [order of conduct] is not accompanied by *wirama* [self-control, order of spirit]. However well the *saron* or *gender* or other instruments of the gamelan orchestra might be played, the *gending* music will surely be unbearable to the ear if they are not in unison with the melody and the overall *wirama*.

The difference between Western democracy and Eastern democracy lies in just this point. Western democracy attaches greatest importance to the freedom of the individual, and the individual dislikes being subject to overall order, namely, to regulations. Eastern democracy, on the other hand, attaches greatest importance to establishing a unity of all individuals. While this diminishes the independence of the individual, it means that he considers himself one with the whole and devotes himself wholeheartedly to the good of the whole. *In other words, the unity of servants and lord* [Manunggaling kawula lan Gusti].³⁵

For Dewantara, wisdom plays important roles in navigating between respecting one's freedom and the need to build strong communal relationships. Without wisdom, living together

³⁵ Ki Hajar Dewantara, "Pertalian Lahir dan Batin dalam Taman Siswa," *Pusara 1*, no. 6-7 (Dec 1931): 43-44, translated and cited in Tsuchiya, *Democracy and Leadership*, 140-141. Emphasis is in original.

can be catastrophic. He gave an illustration of living together as playing a musical instrument of a Javanese orchestra, called *gendhing*. There are many instruments in this orchestra (e.g., saron, gender, cymbal, etc). Each instrument has its own uniqueness. A player should play it the best she or he can. Nevertheless, without tuning oneself to the other players, the orchestra is just a collection of people playing music at their own will. The role of wisdom is in directing one's expertise to "tune in" with the others. In doing so, they will play beautiful music. For Dewantara, democracy is the art of living together, directed by wisdom.

Thus, the role of education is to introduce youth to wisdom. Dewantara's ideal types of education are the traditional Hindu ashram and the Muslim madrasa. In these traditional systems, students live together and share the same meals with the teacher. Living together with the mentor is the most effective way to form one's wisdom. In Dewantara's mind, school is a laboratory for living together with others. By doing daily communal tasks in an ashram/madrasa, students learn to be attentive to communal needs and work together with others to perform common tasks. The experience of living together and working together will form a student's capability to tune her/himself toward the other, as a Javanese orchestra player, guided with wisdom, plays harmoniously in full freedom in order to perform a beautiful composition.

2.1.2 The Tri-Con Principles and Three Spheres of Education

While Dewantara valued freedom and people's unity as the *conditio sine qua non* for education that empowers people, he also acknowledged the importance of dialogue and exchange of culture. As early as his writing before Indonesian independence (1945), Dewantara battled with the question of the possibility of cross-cultural dialogue. Therefore, he proposed the principle of "tri-con" in guiding, on the one hand, finding resources in one's own tradition and,

on the other hand, learning about goodness from other cultures. Tri-con stands for continuity, convergence, and concentric. Every process of dialogue always in one way or another relate to these three principles. Another important concept of Dewantara is the three spheres that influence education, namely: family, educational institution and society.

I think these two triads--tri-con and triple sphere of education—are very important contributions from Dewantara in reflecting how education could foster one’s ability to cooperate with others for the common good.

Tri-Con Principles

According to Dewantara, every culture in this world has a universal character. Thus it makes dialogue possible. Dewantara argued that this universal character in human culture was “a gift from the most graceful God to human beings in order to bring their life and way of life to a higher form.”³⁶ Dewantara defined this universal character as *kodrat alam* (nature). The role of education then is a refinement of this nature. The pedagogical theory of *tabula rasa* was well-known during the end of the 19th century: a child comes to the world as a blank paper and the role of education is to write a good character upon it. Influenced by Maria Montessori, an Italian educator, education is a process of cultivating the innate human nature, or in Dewantara’s words: “from nature to culture.” Within nature, there is a movement of progress and growth, as “a seed that grows into a big tree and bears fruit. After creating and spreading new seeds, the tree ends its life with a firm conviction that its *dharma* (destiny, vocation) has been fulfilled and it will continue to grow in other seeds.”³⁷

³⁶ Ki Hajar Dewantara, *Pidato Sambutan Ki Hajar Dewantara atas Pemberian gelar Doctor Honoris Causa oleh Universitas Gadjahmada* (Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Taman Siswa, 1956), 32.

³⁷ Ki Hajar Dewantara, *Azas-Azas dan Dasar-Dasar Taman Siswa* (Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Taman Siswa, 1952), 7.

The universality of *kodrat* (nature) makes the dialogue of cultures possible. The tri-con principle is a guideline for one to make an authentic dialogue with others. The first principle is continuity. In every cultural dialogue, one must find how she or he understands and relates with their own culture. Dialogue without finding the basis of one's life is a form of annexation. Continuity is important to make sure that there is a sense of connection between one's self and one's own culture. How can someone make a dialogue for something that she or he does not yet know or that is so alien to one's life? Finding the sense of connection with one's own culture is also important so one will not feel lost in confronting the new yet diverse cultural experience.

The second principle is convergence. After affirming that one is already firmly rooted in one's own tradition, the process of dialogue begins. One learns new things from other people. If necessary, one should revise one's old conception because of the opened-eye encounter with others. While Dewantara was influenced by his background as a Javanese aristocrat, he strongly opposed the Javanese tendency to feudalism. He argued that this feudalism was the biggest challenge to national education in reviving the spirit of freedom and solidarity across social classes.

The third principle is concentric. After one finds continuity with one's tradition and makes a fruitful convergence with others through dialogue, Dewantara believes that cross cultural dialogue will lead to a new concentric community. Dialogue is about making connections and learning from others. This open gesture will lead to a communal transformation, not only for the individual but for the one whom we engage in serious dialogue. The process of going out from ourselves finally will lead us to our new selves, with a more open mind and greater willingness to work with others. This is the deeper meaning of concentric that Dewantara proposed. In this concentric movement, the community of dialogue will grow bigger and bigger each day because,

as Paul Knitter said, “I know better my self because of my encounter with you.”³⁸ Dialogue of culture also accentuates Dewantara’s belief that culture is dynamic. There is a potency for growth in every culture.

During the process of dialogue of culture, education needs to be arranged on the principle of “*Tut Wuri Handayani*,” which means: following the student from behind but at the same time giving guidance and influence. As students are treading the path of their lives, the teacher should not drag or force the course of the path according to the teacher’s idea. Education should give freedom to the students on the path that they choose. The role of educator is to be with them along the way and give advice at the crossroads.

Three Spheres of Education

As I explored in the previous part, the main crisis of the pre-independence Indonesian society for Dewantara was a cultural crisis, which is the lack of social awareness due to the colonial educational system. In responding to this dire problem, Dewantara then asked: what kind of method, within and beyond today’s school could inflame, add, and encourage social awareness for Indonesian youth?³⁹ In answering these questions, Dewantara proposed a pedagogy which focuses on three interrelated spheres: family, school/campus, society.

*The first and main sphere is the family.*⁴⁰ Education is not limited only to the school or university campus. Dewantara challenged the prominent view of that time—even of today—that education is always placed in the context of an educational institution. Nature (*kodrat alam*) which we share with all human beings is first nurtured in the family. The parents are the first *gurus* for their children. The way a parent lives in society is the first didactic experience that a

³⁸ Paul F. Knitter, *Without Buddha I Could not Be a Christian* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2009).

³⁹ Dewantara, “Sistem Trisentra” [Three Sphere Systems], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 70.

⁴⁰ Ki Hajar Dewantara, “Keluarga sebagai Pusat Pendidikan” [Family as Center in Education], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 374-378.

child will learn. Dewantara also saw the impact of the family's size on children's sociality, especially among themselves. While parents become the prime gurus, siblings also have influence on the process of psychological and social development. Living together in the family is a practice for living together with others in society. Dewantara again and again stressed the importance of "example" (*tuladha*) of the practice of sociality in the family as the foundation of human society. By giving children a sense of responsibility through performing the family's daily tasks, parents made family become a center of "social education."⁴¹ In one of the Taman Siswa's codes of conduct, Dewantara strictly forbade any activities during weekends either for students or for the teacher. He supported the right of families to have adequate quality time. He said, "Give back Sunday to the family so that it can be used for giving good effect for the family! Bring back the children to the life of the family! Don't seize the children from their family."⁴² In his pedagogical vision, ethical obligations of love, compassion, responsibility, or care start from the family. If one couldn't care less about their closest family members, how could someone be expected to care or even sacrifice for a more abstract entity, such as for the common good?

Dewantara steadfastly believed that all parents have a pedagogical instinct for their children. This is true of the possibility of a psychological disorder that will lead to trauma or criminal acts. Nevertheless, he believed that it is in our human nature (*kodrat manusia*) due to the gift from God that parents are always in search for the good of their offspring. Even criminals, Dewantara said, want to provide the best education for their children.

The second sphere is the educational institution. If family is the foundation of social life, then the role of an educational institution is to find a way to help and to cultivate this first and basic pedagogical experience within the family. While parents have a strong bonding of

⁴¹ Ibid., 378.

⁴² Dewantara, "Pendidikan Keluarga" [Family Education], in *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 383.

responsibility with the children, the unique contribution from the educational institution is their professional expertise in helping children to understand the complex reality of the world. But, the process of understanding the world should not be limited to rational or intellectual development. Again and again, Dewantara insisted that a teacher should become a living example as does a parent in the family. Being a teacher is a vocation, and it is not only about a decent job to earn money.⁴³ Understanding the teacher's profession as a vocation will help teachers to be role models for the students.

As we saw in the previous part, Taman Siswa focused on the principle of *tut wuri handayani*: giving support from behind while at the same time giving advice and guidance. This principle does not pose a limit to the teacher as merely “a facilitator” of the educational process. The teacher in Dewantara's vision is an active agent of change, especially through giving a living example to their students.

The third sphere of education is society. For Dewantara, unity as a people (*kerakyatan*) was the broadest context of his educational vision. The Taman Siswa movement emerged from the concerns that Dutch colonial education had separated students from their society. Therefore, Taman Siswa wanted to bring the students back to the society, even when they were sitting in the class room.

Our time on duty is not just the time we are standing in the classroom. As long as we have life, we are on duty. Our supervisor is not an inspector, a school superintendent or other official but the People themselves.

The better we understand that we are supervised by the People, the better we shall understand our value in society and the better we shall realize the importance of

⁴³ In the pre-independent Indonesia, teaching was a prestigious job, especially for Dutch schools because they automatically became state employees. In his article entitled “The benefit of boarding school,” Dewantara strongly criticized big state expenditures in Dutch schools but with dissatisfying results. He complained that the expense for this incompetence of state employees in Dutch schools could be used for five more progressive low cost Taman Siswa schools. Dewantara, “Faedah Sistem Pondok” [The Benefits of Boarding School], *Karya Ki Hajar Dewantara*, vol. 1, 369.

our duty toward the People and the fatherland. The more we realize this, the greater our strength will grow and the more complete our education will become. Happily, the People are beginning to realize the significance of national education.⁴⁴

We must resolve to eat what the People eat, to wear what the People wear, to live where the People live. Thereby, the feeling will grow that we share the lot of the People.⁴⁵

Education finds its energy and vitality in society, as being a part of the people and shares the same lot with all the people. Education is not an ivory tower nor does it yield its integrity to the *libido dominandi* of the colonizer. Dewantara always criticized the colonial government for cutting back the quality and quantity of education in the East Indies, making “no attempt whatsoever to return to the People’s hands the taxes squeezed from them.”⁴⁶ By putting the life story of society as the sphere of education, education will help the student to listen “to the voice speaking from the bottom of the heart” of the nation.⁴⁷ Only through this process is national education able to sustain the spirit of solidarity for the common good.

2.1.3 Conclusion: National Education Embedded in the Life Stories of the People

There are two important points we can draw from Dewantara in our search for a renewed understanding of collaboration in the context of Indonesian society and the role of education in sustaining it.

First, Dewantara’s vision of national education pinpoints the need of embedding education in the life stories of the people. The cultural crisis in pre-independence Indonesia has severely curtailed Indonesian society from joining the common struggle for freedom. Living in

⁴⁴ Gadjah Mada, “Didiklah Kamu Sendiri!! [Educate Yourself!],” 21, in Tsuchiya, *Democracy and Leadership*, 133.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 134.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 143.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 137.

the society is no more than “staying in a hotel.” By embedding itself in the life stories of the people, education will reclaim the sense of connection among members of society. From there, they can envision and channel the sources of working together for the common good as happened in the various collaborative practices in the villages during the pre-independence era. Dewantara challenged the racial prejudice in Dutch society by showing the long tradition of *gotong royong* in pre-independence Indonesian society as a form of solidarity with the ones in need in community. It is then the unique role of education to reclaim such a traditional praxis of working together by first bringing education closer to the people, by listening to the life-stories of the people. Only then will the nation understand independence not only as *freedom from* the colonizer but as *freedom to* “work together with other nations for the glory of humanity in the whole world.”⁴⁸

Second, Dewantara also acknowledges the potency of every culture to grow and make a cross-fertilizing dialogue with other cultures. A fruitful encounter with another culture will help one to see one’s cultural potentialities and shortcomings. Two triads shown by Dewantara (Tri-Con Principles and Three Spheres of Education) will navigate one’s journey in making a fruitful dialogue with another culture. So, on the one hand, people will not lose their roots in their own culture and, on the other hand, they will learn and receive the constructive values from the other culture. The role of education is to train one’s ability to create dialogue and work together with others from different social and cultural groups. This social ability, as vigorously argued by Dewantara, is first nurtured within the family, the first and fundamental didactic moment of one’s social ability. The role of educational institutions is to cultivate the student’s foundational didactic moment in the family and to help the students to see the bigger picture of their own life in society.

⁴⁸ Dewantara, “Hal Pendidikan,” 15.

2.2. Nicolaus Driyarkara: The Possibility and the Limits of Our Human Sociality

Nicolaus Driyarkara was an Indonesian Jesuit philosopher and Rector of Sanata Dharma University from 1955 until his death in 1967. He received his doctorate in philosophy from the Gregorian University in 1952 with his dissertation *Participationis cognitio in exsistentia Dei percipienda secundum Malebranche utrum partem habeat*. Besides being a professor of philosophy at the Jesuit house of formation and University of Indonesia, he was a prolific writer on culture and education. He was the editor of a Jesuit journal of culture, *Basis*, where he wrote most of his thinking on Indonesian social, political, and cultural issues. Driyarkara was also very involved in politics, as a member of the Indonesian People's Consultative Assembly, 1962-1967.⁴⁹ Because of his close relationship with Sukarno, Driyarkara was selected as a member of the council of President's advisors.

Driyarkara was an existentialist philosopher who was able to dialogue between European existentialism—especially Martin Heidegger and Maurice Merleau-Ponty—and Javanese philosophy. Influenced by Heidegger, he explored the limits of Indonesian languages by creating many new terms to unlock new meanings. This section will focus on Driyarkara's ideas on *gotong royong* as the Indonesian understanding of human sociality and how education can be helpful in sustaining such a spirit.

2.2.1 Driyarkara on *Gotong Royong* as the *Grundform* of Sociality

In his collected works, Driyarkara used the word *gotong royong* only a few times. However, in his famous article "Sociality as existentiality," he purposefully used the word

⁴⁹ The People's Consultative Assembly is the highest state institution in Indonesia. Before the system of direct presidential election was applied in Indonesia in 2004, the People's consultative assembly had the ultimate power to elect the president. Now, this consultative assembly's power is limited to constitutional amendments.

“sociality” to catch the deeper meaning of *gotong royong*. For Driyarkara, *gotong royong* was a manifestation of humanity’s *Grundform* (basic form), namely sociality, in the mind of the Indonesian people.

He began his analysis of sociality by citing Sukarno’s speech on *gotong royong* as the quintessence of Pancasila.⁵⁰ *Gotong royong* as a form of Indonesian socialism is a movement of liberation that has two aspects: *terminus a quo* (the point of origin) and *terminus ad quem* (the goal for a course of action). Driyarkara then took Sukarno’s idea of “Marhaenism” as the *terminus a quo* of *gotong royong*. Marhaenism was Sukarno’s interpretation of socialism. The word “marhaen” came from the name of a poor peasant whom Sukarno met during his tour of duty as president of the newly independent nation. For Sukarno, Marhaen was not a person, but the representation of all Indonesian people. As quoted by Driyarkara, Sukarno said “I call Marhaens any Indonesian people who are destitute, or more precisely, who have been victimized by the system of capitalism, imperialism, colonialism.”⁵¹

Driyarkara then correlated the concept of Marhaen with Heideggerian terms of inauthenticity (*Uneigentlichkeit*) and alienation (*Entfremdung*). Capitalism and neocolonialism have alienated the marhaens from themselves. Instead of becoming a subject, Marhaen was the object of the political, cultural, and economic structures. This is the *terminus a quo* of *gotong royong*, a point of departure that will move toward the fullness of being a human.

The *terminus ad quem* of *gotong royong* is liberation from mental and physical suffering and attaining the fullness of being a human. For Driyarkara, fullness of being a human was

⁵⁰ Nicolaus Driyarkara, “Sosialitas sebagai Eksistensial” [Sociality as existentiality], in *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara* [The Collected Works of Driyarkara], edited by A. Sudiarja, S.J. et al. (Jakarta: Gramedia, 2006), 654.

⁵¹ Ibid., 655-656.

attained if one was able to “work-together-freely-and-actively” in the community so that everyone can participate in making a more just and prosperous society.⁵²

Because *gotong royong* is the *Grundform* of the sociality of our humaneness, *gotong royong* should not be limited only to building an Indonesian society. Here we meet Driyarkara’s cosmopolitan view. The *terminus ad quem* of *gotong royong* is also manifested in building “a good friendship between Indonesians and all nations in the world, which is based on the principle of respect.”⁵³ Driyarkara strongly argued that sociality is part of our nature as humans, no matter the differences of race, sex, and nation. In the context of the cold war of the 1960s and as an advisor of Sukarno whose political strategy was more inclined toward China and the USSR (even though Indonesia declared itself a member of the Non-Aligned Movement), Driyarkara’s ideas on cosmopolitanism of *gotong royong* are interesting.

In order to attain liberation to be a human in community, Driyarkara used Gabriel Marcel’s idea of “subject as con-subject.” According to Marcel, affirmation of an individual is manifested in the order of love (*l’ordre de l’amour*) which is constituted by *engagement*, *disponibilité*, *fidélité*, and *amour*. He quoted Marcel,

The real personality defines and constitutes itself essentially in love...For love, I leave the apathy of me. Transcending the opposition of the empirical self (objectified) and the transcendental self (objectifying), I would be gushing out of me when I freely engage in love. I do not pretend to be in the presence a “You” for whom I myself am a “You”. We are together through participation in our “We”-ness.”⁵⁴

Love, according to Marcel, is a prototype of sociality, because in love, one detaches oneself from egocentrism and creates unlimited space for one’s self and others. Furthermore, Driyarkara claimed that only in love we could understand conflict. Because conflict emerges

⁵² Ibid., 657.

⁵³ Ibid., 658.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 664-665.

only when one has failed to fulfill one's obligation to love. How could the conflict happen if there is no desire to engage with others? Human relationship is a prior reality before conflict.

Phenomenologically, as argued by Heidegger, the structure of our ontology is always *in-der-Welt-sein*. Even though *Dasein* is different from the world, *Dasein* could not exist outside the world. So, for *Dasein*, *Welt* is always *Mitwelt* (being-in-the-World), and *sein* is always *Mitsein* (being-together). Because *Mitsein* is the ontological structure of *Dasein*, *Dasein* dynamically performs two important actions toward others: *besorgen* and *fürsorgen*. The content of *besorgen* and *fürsorgen* is the totality of care, protecting, making it beautiful. The difference between them is the direction or recipients for those actions. *Besorgen* is care toward the world; *fürsorgen* is care toward other human beings.

Driyarkara then showed that the Heideggerian phenomenology was not foreign to Indonesian philosophy. In Javanese philosophy, there is a proverb “*memayu hayuning bawono*” or “protecting the beauty of the earth.” According to Driyarkara, this Javanese philosophy was equivalent to *besorgen*. Then, *gotong royong* is a form of *fürsorgen*, because *gotong royong* is possible if we care (*tepa slira*) for others as equals (*sapadha-padha*).⁵⁵ In the political realm, Driyarakara gives an example of *bersorgen/fürsorgen* in the Land Reform Law proposed by Sukarno. The new land-reform law proposed by Sukarno considered that land, water, and air in Indonesian territory should be kept and used for the common good. Sukarno did not neglect private property. However, private property has a social function. Therefore, property ownership should be managed so that the *marhaen* (the poor) will not be excluded from participating in

⁵⁵ The word “*sapadha-padha*” comes from “*padha*” which means “equal.” By saying that the other is *sapadha-padha*, Javanese philosophy believes that human beings are equal, especially in front of God. The concept of *sapadha-padha* can be used as an entry point for understanding human dignity in Javanese philosophy.

attaining the common good because they do not have adequate material (land).⁵⁶ The spirit of the new agrarian law is the dynamic of *besorgen* and *fürsorgen*. Because we care for the world (*besorgen*), we manage and protect the world, not for satisfying our greed, but for the common good. In attaining the common good, no one will be left behind. In that very situation, the caring human community emerges (*fürsorgen*).

Still in the category of *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem*, *gotong royong* as Indonesian sociality is always in tension between two forms of human relationship: *homo homini lupus* and *homo homini socius*. Driyarkara was not naïve by merely stating the fact of Indonesian sociality, but he also showed the fact of conflict, or theologically, human sinfulness. As experienced by *marhaen*, alienation happens because one objectifies others, using others as objects to satisfy one's needs. Driyarkara found the Hobbesian *homo homini lupus* as a rationale for the destruction of human sociality. In Driyarkara's reading, Hobbesian society based on a social contract had a loose grounding in finding a strong bond of society because society emerged out of fear toward others. No society can survive for the long term if the presupposition for reciprocity is avoiding conflict with the *lupus* by means of the state's intervention. Moreover, even the wolf, as Driyarkara argued, could work together at a certain level for survival. *Bellum omnium contra omnes* is not the only story of human relationship with others.

For Driyarkara, society should be based on the idea of the possibility of friendship or *homo homini socius*. Friendship (*socius*) is the core of any human relationship. It is very interesting how Driyarkara put friendship as the category in interpreting human sociality. Some Western scholars easily criticized Indonesia's lack of acknowledgment of individuality because it put the community and duty as members before individuality and its rights. Pancasila moral education during the Suharto regime was the vivid evidence for the collapse of individuality, the

⁵⁶ Nevertheless, the agrarian reform proposed by Sukarno was revoked after his fall.

priority of duty over right. From this Western (and liberal) point of view, becoming an autonomous individual is the first criterion for being fully human.

On the other hand, Driyarkara argued that it was in friendship that one found one's identity. Driyarkara was aware of the negative aspect of strong communalism which could curtail individuality. However, he could not neglect the communitarian tradition of Indonesian philosophy. Friendship is a middle way for such a tension. True friendship happens between two equal agents. There is no friendship if one's individuality is neglected or is not protected. But, it is also through friendship that one finds his understanding of being-in-the-world. As Marcel said, one makes an engagement through friendship, and from friendship, one experiences *disponibilité* and *amour*.

Because friendship is a category of human sociality, *gotong royong* will lead the *marhaen* toward *communio* through *communicatio*. Communication for Driyarkara is not only about the exchange of verbal or non-verbal action. It is also a mode of being, like *Mitsein*, being-with-others. For Driyarakara, it is through *communicatio* that one immerses in *communio*. Therefore, community is not a static entity. There is a dynamic within community because of the dialectic of communication. Through this dialectic, a person is not just *nunut* in this world. This special Javanese term, *nunut*, can be translated as “only a guest with no responsibility, no sense of belonging.” By saying that we are not *nunut* in this world, Driyarkara once again reinforced his Heideggerian ethic of care as the foundation of human communication, and from this, one builds community.

In the spirit of *communio* and *communicatio*, Driyarkara sees the importance of criticism in our sociality. Criticism is a foundation of democracy. The underlying principle of democratic institution is accepting others as equals (*sapadha-padha*). Because others are treated as equal,

every citizen is involved in the process of decision-making. A citizen is not a “water buffalo,” only following orders from the owner.⁵⁷ Dialogue between community members and dialogue between the state and its citizens make democracy move toward the common good. A free press is a manifestation of the spirit of dialogue where everyone could assess the government’s policy and give an alternative idea. If the government silences freedom of expression, then government kills the life of democracy.⁵⁸

Because criticism is an essential part of communication, human life is always *vivere pericoloso* (living dangerously). The expression *vivere pericoloso* was popularized by Sukarno for an Indonesian audience in his state address on the 19th anniversary of Indonesian independence in 1964, one year before the purge of Communists and Sukarno’s supporters. In his state address, Sukarno re-inflamed the spirit of revolution after the periods of opposition toward his presidency that made him ban two political parties and disband the house of representatives in 1959.

Driyarkara interpreted Sukarno’s *vivere pericoloso* in a more philosophical way and less about vivid political oppositions. For Driyarkara, any struggle toward liberation always has risk, either external or internal.⁵⁹ Being in the world is always risky. Opening oneself to friendship could tear us apart. But, it is through living the *vivere pericoloso* that one shows one’s perseverance on the journey to be a *homo homini socius*.

⁵⁷ Most Indonesian farmers have water buffalos to assist their farming activities. In Javanese culture, the water buffalo is used as a symbol of “total obedience without thinking” or stupidity.

⁵⁸ Driyarkara, “Demonstrasi, Mogok, Demokrasi” [Demonstration, Strikes, Democracy], in *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 648.

⁵⁹ Driyarkara, “Arti Kota dalam Kehidupan Manusia” [The Meaning of the City in Human Life], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 603-604; See also Driyarkara, “Filsafat Kehidupan Negara” [The Philosophy of Nationhood], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 611.

2.2.2 *Serat Wedhatama*: Education as Humanization

In the previous section we traced Driyarkara's argument on sociality as existentiality as the key to interpret *gotong royong*. *Gotong royong* is possible because of the *Grundform* of our existence, which is *socius*, friendship. This philosophical vision influenced Driyarkara's ideas on education. Education is the practice of humanization: a process of becoming a human, which is embedded in dialectical relationships with others through friendship.

In education, Driyarkara has three concerns. First, amid the socio-political change in Indonesian society, education should redefine its strategy to accommodate the change without losing the deeper sense of value that educational institutions try to communicate.⁶⁰ Second, there is an urgency to provide the nation with good teachers, not only in term of transferring knowledge but also as *gurus*, role models.⁶¹ Third, embedded in his social philosophy of friendship, education should encourage the students to grow in friendship with others. Education should focus not only on the process of becoming "I"-ness (*ke-aku-an*) but most importantly educating the "We"-ness (*ke-kita-an*). Educating the we-ness should not be placed on the shoulders of the formal educational institution alone, but also on the family.

One of his articles which captured the best of his thinking about these three concerns was his interpretation of a classical Javanese song, *Serat Wedhatama*. *Serat Wedhatama* is a classic didactical song, composed by Prince Mangkunegara VI in the early 19th century. When Driyarkara referred to *Serat Wedhatama*, it was not his intention to copy-and-paste a 19th-century ideal Javanese personality on post-independence Indonesian society. He made a strong argument that feudalism in Javanese culture is a hindrance to the process of humanization.

⁶⁰ Driyarkara, "Perubahan Zaman dan Pendidikan," [Education and Changing Times], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 298-313.

⁶¹ Driyarkara, "Kepentingan Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Menengah," [The Urgency of Educating Secondary School Teachers], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 314-321.

Using the category of *terminus a quo* in his social philosophy, he begins by portraying the antithesis for the vision of education, which is a person who is “empty.” The whole didactic of Wedhatama begins with this vision:

*Mingkar-mingkur ing angkara
akarana karenan mardi siwi
sinawung resmining kudung
sinuba sinukarto*⁶²

Turning away from selfish motives
As one is pleased to give instruction to sons,
It is cast in the form of a delightful song
Finely finished and well turned

*Jinejer neng Wedhatama
Mrih tan kembera kembeganing pambudi*

It is set out in the *Wedhatama*
So that they should not weary of turning it over in
their mind

*Mangka nadyan tuwa pikun
Yen tan mikani rasa
Yeti sepi asepa lir sepa samun*

Whereas though a man be old and bent
If he has not grasped the essence
Truly he is as empty and insipid as an abandoned
quid⁶³

The goal of Wedhatama is initiating a *consideratio status* on how one sees one’s state of journey toward the fullness of life. The opening canto portrays the fact of “emptiness.” This emptiness is not related to one’s age, because even an old and bent person could still be unable to grasp the essence of true knowledge. The first sentence lays out the whole program of Wedhatama: turning away from selfish motives (*mingkar-mingkur ing angkara*). But this didactic should be communicated with style, through the form of a delightful song. The good and beautiful method will help one to immerse in ongoing formation of the self throughout one’s whole life. Javanese pedagogical style is full of symbol (*pasemon*). As Ricœur said, “symbol gives rise to thought.”⁶⁴ Education without style has lost its inner energy.

What is the cause of this emptiness?

*Nora kaya si Pungung anggung
gumungung*

Not like the Fool, always eager for praise

⁶² Driyarkara, “Kepribadian Nasional Dipandang dari Segi Pendidikan” [National Identity from the Education Point of View], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 330.

⁶³ For the English translation, I used Stuart Robson, *The Wedhatama: An English Translation* (Leiden: KITLV Press, 1990), 21

⁶⁴ Paul Ricœur, *Symbolism of Evil*. Translated by Emerson Buchanan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), 347.

ugungan sadina-dina
Uripe sapisan rusak
Nora mulur nalare ting saluwir

And demanding attention all day long
Once his life is in confusion
He does not think things through but is a
scatterbrain

Kadi ta guwa kang sirung
Sinerang in maruta
Gumarenggeng, anggereng anggung
*gumrunggung.*⁶⁶

He is like a dark cave
Blown upon by the wind
Sighing and sougning, rushing and roaring⁶⁵

The fool happens to love being applauded by friends, making himself become the center of relationship all the time. In a very Platonic way, the fool is like a cave man who lives in a dark place and mistakenly thinks that the roaring and rushing sound is the truth. Driyarkara makes a strong claim: such a person does not have a democratic attitude. He referred to another classical Javanese hymn *Serat Wulang Reh*, to explain the attitude of the fool. In this hymn, there are three attitudes that disintegrate community: *adigang adigung adiguna*. *Adigang* means one is bragging of one's strength. *Adigung* is an attitude of showing off one's power. *Adiguna* is boasting of one's cleverness. If one wants to attain the "fullness" of life, one must start to restrain this destructive power of *adigang, adigung, adiguna*. That is the purpose of education:

Ngèlmu iku kalakoné kanthi laku
Lekasé lawan kas
Tegesé kas nyantosani
Setya budya pangekesé dur angkara.

Knowledge goes together with practice
It is effected with firmness
the meaning of firmness is steeling oneself
that is, with determination striving to master the evil
urges of egotism⁶⁷

Robson's translation of *laku* as practice curtailed the deep and rich meaning of Javanese mysticism. In Javanese mysticism, when someone is searching for true knowledge, one will perform *laku*. *Laku* is not just any practice, or performing a good habit, but an act of self-purifying. *Laku* or *tirakat* means "a serious and focused period of spiritual cultivation aided by

⁶⁵ Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 23.

⁶⁶ Driyarkara, "Kepribadian Nasional," *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 330-331.

⁶⁷ *Wedhatama*, Canto III:1, in Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 35.

intensive spiritual and ascetic practices (*Tapa*).”⁶⁸ The great leaders and princes of the past gained their spiritual knowledge through this self-purification of egocentrism and evil. In Wedhatama, *laku*, as a self purifying act, begins by building up firmness (*kas*) toward two goals: striving toward the good and wellbeing of others (*nyantosani*) and mastering the urge of evil. Here we meet the Javanese version of the first precept of Thomistic natural law. One is experiencing *eudaimonia* (*santosa*) through two formal forms of basic human action: doing good to achieve wellbeing and avoiding evil.

The world in Javanese mysticism is divided into two realms: macro-cosmos (*jagad gedhe*) and micro-cosmos (*jagad cilik*). The goal of *laku* or *tirakat* as a mystical endeavor is tuning these two worlds into one’s personality. Failure to do so will create chaos or “crazy time” (*zaman edan*), threatening harmonious society.

Driyarkara then quoted Mangkunegara’s four types of *laku*, namely disciplining the body (*sembah raga*), disciplining the mind (*sembah cipta*), disciplining the soul (*sembah jiwa*), and disciplining the emotion to grasp the mystery of life (*sembah rasa*). *Sembah raga* means disciplining one’s body (*raga*) so that one can glorify (*sembah*) the Lord. In line with neo-Platonism, Javanese mysticism sees the body (*raga*) as the challenge to be conquered. Therefore, one hardly finds a positive assessment of the human body. Nevertheless, Driyarkara shows that it is through the good and health of the body that one can cultivate spiritual richness. Wedhatama wrote:

*Wong seger badanipun
Otot daging kulit balung sungsum
Tumrah ing rah mamarah antening ati
Antenging ati nunungku
Angruwat ruweding batos.*

For when the body is refreshed,
Muscles, flesh, skin, bones and marrow,
This passes on the blood, causing peace of mind
The peace of mind becomes focused
And banishes inner confusion.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ Albertus Bagus Laksana, *Muslim and Catholic Pilgrimage: An Exploration through Java* (Burlington, MA: Ashgate, 2014), 90.

⁶⁹ *Wedhatama*, Canto IV:8, in Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 41.

Driyarkara even goes beyond Wedhatama's positive assessment of bodily experiences by arguing that the body is "a blessing" (*berkat*, from Arabic *baraka*) for a person, a *conditio sine qua non* for our being-in-the world and being-with-others. Through the body, the spirit becomes incarnate. Respecting the bodily dynamic could be an important path for a journey to find the Lord. I think Driyarakara's experience with Western philosophy and also his background in Ignatian spirituality is very influential in his understanding of the importance and the positive aspect of the body.

Sembah kalbu means orienting the heart. The key word in *Wedhatama* on *sembah kalbu* as a mystical endeavor is mindfulness (*waspada*). Educating the heart will bring one to the higher realm because mindfulness will lead to an encounter with the mystery (*meruhi marang kang momong*).⁷⁰ The expressions of mindfulness are watchfulness and carefulness (*tata titi ngati-ati*), steadfastness and perseverance, un-weariness and excitement, striving and being guided by the clear vision of life.⁷¹

Because one needs to be guided by a clear vision of life, the third *laku* is very important, *sembah sukma* or orienting the soul. In his interpretation, Driyarakara refers back to the programmatic of Wedhatama which is purifying oneself against all kinds of self-centeredness. Without the act of purification, one cannot understand one's place in this world. Self-centeredness only sinks one into darkness, portrayed as "barely conscious [and] swept [away] into the universe" (*kalamatan jroning alam kanyot*). In confronting the drive of self-centeredness, humans can encounter "the light" (*urup*):

*Kono ana sajatining urup
Yeku urup pagarep uriping budi*

Semirat sirat narawang

Yonder there is a true flame/light
which is the flame that leads to the life of the spirit
onward
It shines brightly roundabout,

⁷⁰ *Wedhatama*, Canto IV:11, in Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 42.

⁷¹ *Wedhatama*, Canto IV:14, in Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 42.

Encountering the light is manifested in the last form of *laku*, which is *sembah rasa*. *Rasa* can be translated as emotion, but also mystery.

About the ideal portrayal of a person in the Wedhatama, then, we can ask: why does Driyarkara put the portrayal of a perfect person in Wedhatama as the ideal portrayal of his educational vision? Does he ignore the importance of education as preparing professionals in their own field?

Driyarkara agreed that the modern world created more complex human relationships. It requires a new way to communicate, a new understanding and most importantly a new set of expertise. For such expertise, the youth need training so that they will not be left behind. However, education should not be limited only to preparing the youth to be “an operator” during this fast cultural transformation.

Education should aim at a higher point: education of character, namely educating the noble and perfect person (*manusia susila dan sempurna*). Driyarkara claims “*Without a noble person there is no democracy, no well-ordered society, no healthy economy; there will be no mechanism for the common good.*”⁷⁴ “‘Cleverness’ [*pinter*] without nobility will turn out to be ‘cunningness’ [*minteri*].” The portrait of a perfect person in Wedhatama, for Driyarakara, is the higher aim of education, the character of an educated person which will be the heart of democracy, the spirit of a just economy, and the vibrant yet creative idea for the common good. This whole humanistic vision should not be separated from professional training. It is already embedded in the higher vision of preparing not only an operator of this gigantic world, but in

⁷² Driyarkara, “Kepribadian Nasional,” *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 342.

⁷³ Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 45.

⁷⁴ Driyarkara, “Kedudukan dan Tujuan Ilmu Mendidik Teoretis” [The Role and Goal of Theoretical Pedagogy], *Karya Lengkap Driyarakara*, 351. Italic in original.

educating a person, who is already being-in-the-world-with-others (*Mitsein*).⁷⁵

Education for Driyarkara is manifest in an inter-correlated process of hominization (*hominisasi*) and humanization (*humanisasi*).⁷⁶ In the Hobbesian social contract, humans strive to go beyond the state of nature. Different from John Locke, the Hobbesian state of nature is conflictive and combative, an ongoing life or death fight to claim power. The social contract transforms and transcends this humane state of nature to avoid total chaos that in the end will only destroy the whole community. While Driyarkara rejects the individualistic argument of the Hobbesian state of nature, he agrees with Hobbes that the human being should transcend its state of nature as an existential project of one's life. This life-long process of transcending oneself is what Driyarakara called "hominization." Since the beginning of human life, humans have endeavored to go beyond their limitations. A child learns to rise with its own legs and starts to walk. Then the child will learn to communicate with others, grow up, fall in love, and be in relationship with a significant other. This process of always overcoming oneself finally reaches its culminative point in death.

Inherent in the process of hominization is what Driyarakara called "humanization." While both concepts are interrelated, there is a difference between hominization and humanization. If hominization is a "natural instinct" of a human being, humanization takes it to a higher level. In humanization, a human interacts with culture, with arts, with fine ideas about life, and the most important process of humanization is the encounter with the true light, God. For Driyarkara, humanization is a second-level process of refining (Dutch: *beschaving*) of the innate natural process of hominization. Through humanization, the human immerses in and dynamizes civilization.

⁷⁵ Driyarkara, "Pendidikan adalah Problem Eksistensi" [Education is an Existential Problem], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 278.

⁷⁶ Driyarkara, "Fenomena Pendidikan" [The Phenomena of Education], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 366.

Education is both hominization and humanization. Through education, a youth transcends the self as a human being, and refines it. For this reason, education is not just any “human actions” (e.g., sleep, eat) but it is truly a fundamental act because through education one is experiencing a moment of change, a determining and shaping moment.⁷⁷ Education as humanization means to help the youth enter the dynamic of refinement (*beschaving*).

Driyarkara wrote his philosophical writings during his time as rector of the teachers college of Sanata Dharma (PTPG, *Perguruan Tinggi Pendidikan Guru*). After Indonesian independence, Indonesian Jesuits chose to build a teachers college rather than a university because in their communal discernment, it was more urgent for this newly independent country to have good teachers for the majority of pupils who had no access to elementary schools during colonial time. Providing a good education through training good teachers is a manifestation of an option to enter the dynamic of refinement of this newly independent country.

Grounded in his social philosophy of *gotong royong* as communion and communication, Driyarakara argues that the role of a teacher in the process of education is to be a communicator and *socius* for the student in the process of becoming part of a communion. By educating a good teacher, Driyarkara was sure that the process of making *homo homini socius* in the changing Indonesian society, which was experiencing years of living dangerously due to political upheavals, would become possible.

2.2.3 Conclusion: Education to be Friend for and with Others

Driyarkara’s re-interpretation of Heideggerian ethic of care in the context of Javanese philosophy helps us to see the importance of *gotong royong* as the *Grundform* of human

⁷⁷ Driyarkara, “Pendidikan sebagai Aktivitas Fundamental” [Education as a Fundamental Action], *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*, 358.

sociality. Three points can be drawn from Driyarkara's assessment of the didactic of human sociality in Indonesia during the years of living dangerously.

First, he differs from Hobbes by seeking cooperation among "*socius*," not conflict among "*lupus*," as the necessary condition for an emerging society. The ethic of care, which means care for other persons (*besorgen*) or care for the earth (*fürsorgen*), becomes a framework for determining the meaning of friendship in this complex and pluralistic world. By framing interrelations among members of a community in term of civic friendship, Driyarkara goes further than the idea of citizenship as a basic formal category of belonging to a given political community. Membership is a necessary condition but society is about more than membership. Following the Aristotelian tradition, he highlights the importance of reclaiming the deep sense of friendliness as material for moving toward an ideal community. On this very point, Driyarkara's retrieval of the Heideggerian ethic of care is in play. *Gotong royong* is that very manifestation of civic friendship. And, influenced also by Marcel, *gotong royong* is possible only through friendship, when one finds one's identity in the vast network of relationship within one's community. The "I"-ness emerges in a constant relationship with the "We"-ness. Therefore, one's journey in seeking one's ideal life can never be separated from the rich and long tradition of goodness of the community.

Second, in the process of reclaiming the rich tradition from one's community, Driyarkara then turns to *Wedhatama*. In *Wedhatama*, *laku*, as a Javanese appropriation of praxis, is understood as a lifelong commitment to steel oneself for the good of the others and restrain the urge of egotism. Driyarkara's retrieval of *Wedhatama* is very important in helping us to reclaim the neglected aspect of the modern educational vision which focuses solely on enhancing one's professional expertise. *Wedhatama* provides a framework for an integral yet humanistic vision of

the person that will shape the course of human flourishing. *Wedhatama* portrays a model of civic virtue which will help members of society determine how to live together in a community. In a world which becomes more and more interconnected, society needs to develop some civic virtues so that this interconnectedness will bring people closer and help them to envision the good for all, and not the endless war of all against all. Education in *Wedhatama* as retrieved by Driyarkara could help the society in nurturing such virtues of living and working together for the common good.

Third, Driyarkara understands education both as hominization and humanization. Education is a form of hominization, a natural growth and a process of refinement as a human being. Acquiring one's expertise for living is part of this category. But, education is most importantly a process of humanization, a long-life process of becoming more and more human. Becoming human, as tirelessly argued by Driyarkara, is always becoming *homo homini socius*. Education will not and should not neglect training one's expertise for living, but such expertise is understood in the whole project of being friends for and with others.

2.3. Mochtar Buchori: Collaboration for Transformation of Indonesian Society

While Dewantara influenced the educational reform in pre-independence Indonesia, and Driyarkara wrote during the years of living dangerously in the 1960s, it was Mochtar Buchori who wrote extensively in the period of modern Indonesia. Buchori was the son of the Muhammadiyah leader. Muhammadiyah is one of biggest Islamic religious groups in Indonesia (even in the world) which focus on *dakwah* (mission) through charities: schools, hospitals. With his Muhammadiyah background, Buchori saw education as the fundamental element for this changing nation. He got his PhD in Educational Instruction from Harvard University in 1960.

During the 1980s, Buchori was elected as the head of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI). Under his leadership, LIPI conducted several important researches, especially on the rise of extremism and the need for intercultural and interreligious dialogue. These researches were considered as revolutionary and prepared the future discussion on interreligious dialogue in Indonesia, especially when Indonesia experienced the bloody religious conflict and terrorism in 2000s. After the fall of Suharto's regime, Buchori often gave a gloomy analysis of the course of the country. However, he consistently believed that the integral transformation of Indonesian society can be possible only through a more humanistic vision of education.

2.3.1 Technocratic Development and its Effects on Indonesian Society

The keyword for Buchori's pedagogy is "transformation." During Suharto's powerhouse state, development became a mantra for every aspect of Indonesian society. However, the new order regime had viewed development merely through a technocratic and economic lens. The criteria of development were based solely on government performance in obtaining higher GDPs. There was no question about how the GDP was distributed equally to its members. Buchori picked the untreated aspect of human development, namely a more humanistic point of view. His focus on integral development of the person related to his passion for building a more dialogic yet collaborative society through education. As I showed in the beginning of this chapter, in order to secure the technocratic approach of development, the Suharto powerhouse state interpreted the notion of social collaboration (*gotong royong*) as supporting top-down developmental projects without questions. There were no dialogues with local communities.

This one-way communication is a manifestation that the Suharto government neglected the traditional cultural praxis of living together in a community. One of its manifestations is a social practice called "*rembug desa*" [village dialogue]. *Rembug desa* is

a forum where common problems faced by the village were discussed and solutions formulated. In this forum coercion and violence were never used. Instead, arguments, debates and discussions constituted the main instruments for defining and analyzing problems, and for formulating solutions. Thus *rembug desa* was a democratic institution developed on the basis of our own cultural force.⁷⁸

Buchori lamented the effect of technocratic approaches to development that have eroded this cultural genius, and transformed the vibrant communal lives of village dialogue into passive recipients of any government projects. In Buchori's analysis, the most dangerous effects of losing this traditionally social ability were the rise of violence in dealing with communal problems. If there was no dialogue, Buchori asked "how do you persuade people to become more open-minded, to become less defensive in confronting new situations?"⁷⁹

During the early 1980s, before the hype of multicultural education, Buchori, as the head of the Indonesian Institute of Science, conducted a series of fieldwork researches on tracing the local source of social cooperation in multicultural Indonesia. In his report on the typology of socio-cultural interaction in nine big cultural groups in Indonesia, Buchori challenged the prevailing prejudice between Indonesian cultural groups (e.g., the Indo-Chinese are hard workers and money-oriented, while the Batak—people living in Sumatra—are more collectivist, love partying) in the era of fast socio-economic and cultural changes. The effect of socio-cultural prejudice is less willingness to build strong social relations across cultural groups. Buchori named this tendency as an "enclave" mentality, feeling comfortable within the boundaries of one's social ties because the diverse outside worlds seem threatening.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Mochtar Buchori, "Violence, Coercion and Democracy," in *Sketches of Indonesian Society: A View from Within* (Jakarta: The Jakarta Post & IKIP Muhammadiyah-Jakarta Press, 1994), 34.

⁷⁹ Buchori, "Promoting Democracy in Transitional Society," in *Sketches of Indonesian Society*, 99.

⁸⁰ Mochtar Buchori and Wiladi Budiharga, *Tipe-Tipe Orientasi Sosial-Budaya di Sembilan Daerah Penelitian di Indonesia* [Typologies of Socio-Cultural Orientation in Nine Research Areas in Indonesia] (Jakarta: Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia, 1983), 40.

Because relations with outside clans are risky, the enclave mentality then transformed itself into clientelism with the patron within social groups. Buchori gave an example of a client-patron relationship between a diamond miner and the head of a village (*kepala luang*). The miners are totally dependent on the head of the village to get upfront credit for conducting mining activities. In return, the head of the village has the total right to buy the diamonds, always at lower price than the market. The head of the village will try to push the price as low as possible to get the most benefit from the miners. This client-patron relationship is possible because the miner is willing to risk living in the enclave rather than building economical ties with those outside the miners' cultural group, even if the outside group could give more benefits or equal shares.⁸¹

Buchori concluded that the enclave mentality and patronage eroded the spirit of social cooperativeness and solidarity in the Indonesian traditional community. It reflected the milieu of the nation which was also developing the same patron-client tendency. The Suharto powerhouse state as patron started a lot of developmental projects—with all their corruptions—and local communities were totally dependent on them, even though they knew that this unequal relationship gave benefits only to the state and not to the community.

Top-down approaches of social transformation and one-way communication to secure total support for developmental projects were also manifested in education. Buchori called this type of education “dumb obedience” (*kepatuhan yang dungu*). In another article, he described it as “circumcision of the brain,” which was “the practice of demanding total conformity in thought and expression which considers any heterodox idea or view as automatically ‘wrong’ and

⁸¹ Ibid., 41-43.

‘disloyal’ or even ‘subversive.’”⁸² Democratic institutions (e.g., House of Representatives, Judiciary) instead of representing the people turned out to be “rubber stamp institutions,” which upheld any political decisions from the Suharto regimes.⁸³

In order to reverse such “dumb obedience” or “circumcision of the brain,” Buchori proposed a form of education that can motivate creativity.

What is badly needed is critical and creative obedience. That is the ability to participate in the maintenance and promotion of social order. This ability must be accompanied by another ability, i.e., the ability to identify shortcomings that exist in one’s environment and also the ability to generate new ideas concerning how to improve the existing reality in one’s environment.⁸⁴

Creativity can flourish only in an educational setting that guarantees freedom of expression, appreciating every student’s aspirations. Creativity will never emerge in a “dumb obedience” culture, where one-way communication dominates and eliminates the plurality of voices.

The end result of “fear culture” is an aggressive attitude toward others. In 1988, Buchori conducted field research on the growing religious intolerance in Indonesia in comparison with the same radical religious movement in other Islamic countries (Malaysia, Iran, and India).⁸⁵

Buchori differentiated between radicalism and intolerance/extremism. Radicalism is acceptable if we understand it as a total commitment to fight evil and injustice within society. He gave as example the liberation theology movement in Latin America. It is a form of radicalism amid the problems of poverty and economical inequality. Moreover, the problem with intolerance, which

⁸² Mochtar Buchori, “The Unseen and the Unseeable in Indonesian Society,” in *Culture and Politics in Indonesia: Personal Reflections* (Jakarta: CSIS & IKIP Muhammadiyah-Jakarta Press, 1996), 129.

⁸³ Mochtar Buchori, *Evolusi Pendidikan di Indonesia: Dari Kweekschool sampai ke IKIP 1852-1998* [Evolution of Education in Indonesia: From Kweekschool to IKIP 1852-1998] (Yogyakarta: INSIST Press, 2007), 112.

⁸⁴ Buchori, “Education for Obedience and Education for Creativity,” in *Sketches of Indonesian Society*, 103

⁸⁵ Mochtar Buchori, *Radikalisme dalam Gerakan-Gerakan Keagamaan* [Radicalism in Religious Movements] (Jakarta: Lembaga Pertahanan Nasional, 1988).

breeds extremism, is its inability to accept the plurality and heterogeneity of ideas. People feel threatened by plurality, and violence becomes the acceptable language to deal with it.

Buchori also argued that radicalism and intolerance might be interrelated. Some religious extremism arises from inequality and injustice. People see themselves as fighters (the *jihad*) to totally revise a broken society, and build a utopian community free from injustice and suffering. In some cases, religious extremism adopted populist language because it took the plea of the common people as its cause, gaining wide support from members of society. Analyzing religious extremism from the point of view of injustice, Buchori then gave a strong critique: it is the corrupt and unjust political structure that breeds religious extremism, not *vice versa*.

In handling the problem of religious extremism, Buchori proposed a political and cultural approach. Society and the state should listen to the basic demand from this movement, which commonly relates to the experience of exclusion. Excluding these religious movements will only lead to alienation, and alienation is a breeding ground for a more radicalized and intolerant action. It is only dialogue that will pull them out from the enclave mentality.

2.3.2 Democratic Education: Preparing the Space for Working Together in a Pluralistic Society

As an expert on education, Buchori did not neglect the fact that the Suharto regime was successful in providing access to education through nine years of compulsory enrollment toward basic education. This expansive access to basic education dramatically cut the higher percentage of illiteracy during the previous regime. Enrollment in higher education also grew 50% more than in the era before 1965. Moreover, the technocratic government opened doors to academicians to join in managing the booming economy, even though it was under the

supervision of the military.⁸⁶ However, in terms of quality of education, this expansive open access proved to be very weak, and strongly political.

Therefore, if Indonesian society is striving to navigate into the era of great transformation, education should be based on the very principles of democracy itself. He wrote:

I think that the only sure path toward a more democratic future is education which is truly democratic, and not merely nominally democratic. It is only if and when each younger generation is educated in a way that is more democratic than the one provided to the preceding generation that this nation will become increasingly more democratic.⁸⁷

During the technocratic approaches to development, education was seen merely in terms of employability: how the alumni successfully enter the job market and have adequate skills to meet the demand from the economic sector. For Buchori, the goal of education first and foremost is to “improve creativity, work ethics and greater understanding of and commitment towards democracy...[A]t some point in the future, we can expect [our educational institutions] to produce a generation able to restore civility and rid our society of oppression.”⁸⁸

In doing so, education should be oriented toward a threefold academic culture: “a continuous search for truth, an ongoing acquisition of new knowledge, and a defense of knowledge against falsification.”⁸⁹ Living the basic principles of democracy starts from giving academic freedom to search the truth, and resisting the falsification due to propaganda to support blindly developmental projects. University and educational institutions at any level should take their position as critical elements within society. If educational institutions lose this basic

⁸⁶ Mochtar Buchori and Abdul Malik, “Higher Education in Indonesia,” in Philip G. Altbach and Toru Umakoshi, eds., *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 259-260.

⁸⁷ Buchori, “Between Feudalism and Democracy,” in *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, 34.

⁸⁸ Mochtar Buchori, “Demystifying, Reinvigorating Today’s Education System,” in *Notes on Education in Indonesia* (Jakarta: The Jakarta Post, 2001), 27.

⁸⁹ Buchori and Malik, “Higher Education in Indonesia,” 273.

condition for “a continuous search for truth,” as Buchori lamented before, they will only produce “dumb obedience” generations.

2.3.3 Conclusion: Abrading the Enclave Mentality through Education

Buchori’s idea of education as an engine for social transformation leads us to three important points. First, transformation in the fast and competitive modern world should not be limited solely to the technocratic and economic aspects. Especially in the context of the Suharto powerhouse state, neglecting the humanistic aspect of transformation and limiting students’ creativity for the sake of obedience to the state propaganda/project will only create a dumb generation. One of the resources for such a humanistic vision of transformation is found in the traditional communal practices which encourage solidarity and social collaboration, as in “village conversation” (*rembug desa*). Only through a genuine conversation will transformation bring benefit for all members of the community, and not solely for the small limited elites.

Second, Buchori’s concern about the persistence of an enclave mentality within certain Indonesian societies helps us to see that exclusive communal ties could go against the aspiration of human flourishing. Buchori’s fieldwork research during the 1980s is a reminder of the negative potency of defining identity so narrowly. I think Buchori will agree with Amartya Sen’s assessment that the “solitarist approach to human identity, which sees human beings as members of exactly one group” is the hatchery for the social and religious violence.⁹⁰ The importance of dialogue for Buchori is not only for the preventive steps for such social and religious violence but also for understanding the *raison d’être* of such actions and how to respond properly to their basic demands, which usually relate to the problem of injustice.

⁹⁰ Amartya Sen, *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (New York: Norton, 2006), xii.

Third, if education is properly designed and not being used as a “rubber stamp” of the regime’s desire to dominate society, education can help to abrade such an enclave mentality. Education could help the students to find “the way to fly out of the bottle” and engage with others for a shared project of social justice. Democratic education is a necessary condition for sustainability of a pluralistic society, because democratic education guarantees that everyone can engage in a wide and ongoing conversation within society. Such a conversation will find the suitable yet creative knowledge to respond to the ongoing changes in a pluralistic society and will also find the best way to share it with future generations.

3. Cross-fertilization Approach between *Gotong Royong* and Catholic Social Teaching

In the previous chapter, I outlined the three interrelating themes of collaboration in the post-Vatican II CST, namely solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good. Influenced by Vatican II’s ecclesiological stance of the people of God, the church interprets herself as a member of global society who closely works together in solidarity with people of goodwill to pursue the common good. In doing so, the principle of subsidiarity helps in respecting the aspirations embedded within local communities. By respecting their own uniqueness, they can participate in making an alliance for a shared project.

In this chapter, I propose the notion of *gotong royong* as an idealization of Indonesian sociality starting from pre-independence, through the dangerous years of 1960s, until the fall of the Suharto regime. How could these two visions of collaboration be put into dialogue?

3.1. *Gotong Royong*: A Network of Solidarity between Active Yet Equal Agents

As argued in different ways by Dewantara, Driyarkara, and Buchori, sociality is a *Grundform* of the Indonesian people. *Gotong royong* is a manifestation of this sociality in a

specific context: a rural and agrarian community. Koentjaraningrat showed that *gotong royong* as working together in preparing a rice paddy might not be vividly present anymore in a changing agrarian community, where modern modes of farming have been deploying. Nevertheless, *gotong royong* as a spirit of reciprocity and collaboration continues to live in many different forms. This chapter has shown the many different forms of social collaboration in every phase of the changing Indonesian society.

Acknowledging different yet unique expressions of social cooperation in Indonesian society, starting from pre-independence to the post-authoritarian era, is a stepping-stone for making a cross-cultural dialogue between *gotong royong* and the CST vision of collaboration. Both principles—CST and *gotong royong*—are based on the acknowledgment that one's action is oriented toward something outside oneself. While the fact of the human condition—because of sin—could limit one's capability to orient oneself toward the good, each culture has a conviction that a human being could never be constrained to serve one's own interest. Dewantara named this basic orientation as *kodrat* (nature), present in every culture. From this social orientation, Driyarkara built ethical reasoning, using the Heideggerian terms *fürsorge* (care toward fellow human beings) and *besorgen* (care toward creation). The ethic of care is built on the innate human tendency to go beyond oneself, not only in one's social relations with others, but also in one's awareness that one is an integral part of the *macro cosmos*. This innate movement toward others is an equal footing for CST's notion of solidarity and the common good.

Using Driyarkara, we can see that in Indonesian society—and I believe mostly in the Asian community—it is the “we” that comes first, that precedes the “I.” The “We-ness” becomes a source of one's identity. *Gotong royong* and any other forms of social cooperation are manifestations of the “We-ness.” In the priority of “We-ness” over “I-ness,” community is not a

space of negotiation between many different interests that “I” have, but an arena of seeing “the I” through “the We.” The other is the inherent part of the “I.” In Java, the term for the other is *sapadha*. Literally, it can be translated as “equal.” By saying that the other is *sapadha-padha*, Javanese philosophy believes that human beings are equal, especially in front of God. The concept of *sapadha-padha* can be an entry point for understanding human dignity in Javanese philosophy.

However, in making the “We” as prior in face of the “I,” CST could speak to Indonesia’s appropriation of *gotong royong* on the importance of subsidiarity. In the first chapter, we see the importance of pairing solidarity with subsidiarity. Solidarity without subsidiarity will cost the society its diverse yet unique forms of expression, a top-down approach for collaboration that costs freedom. Dewantara, Driyarkara, and Buchori have shown the importance of guaranteeing one’s freedom because freedom is a necessary condition to participate in the life of the community.

Solidarity without subsidiarity has a tendency to be “top-down.” This type of “top-down” approach to solidarity is hardly unique to Indonesia. Asian communities that place among their cultural values the importance of familial-communal relationships have a tendency to fall into the same trap. Rhetoric during the 1980s on the incompatibility between so-called (Western) democracy and “Asian values” was a cultural disguise for authoritarian regime’s *libido dominandi*. How can a community experience a genuine sociality and reciprocity when there is no guarantee for the multi-layered meaning of sociality itself? As argued by Koentjaraningrat, the loss of the early expression of *gotong royong* was due to political powers that have an omnipotent control in defining what *gotong royong* means and what it is not. Solidarity without subsidiarity will only create a “dumb generation”—as Buchori said.

Collaboration for the common good, as reflected by Hollenbach, “comes into existence in a community of solidarity among active, equal agents.”⁹¹ There are two important points from this assessment. First, *gotong royong* as a form of collaboration for the common good is inherent in any communal relationship that exists within community. *Gotong royong* will not last if it is something “added,” “forced” or “alien” from a community. *Gotong royong* as a network of solidarity in a changing Indonesian society comes into existence through the reciprocal praxis of community, especially in helping those who are in need. Second, these reciprocal relationships happen among equal yet active agents. A *gotong royong* truly oriented toward the common good can be initiated only by respecting human agency, because it is the agent which can form solidarity with others. On this very point, Driyarkara’s insistence on friendship as the basis of being-in-the-world-with-others becomes undeniably important. Friendship is possible only through acknowledging the others in their individuality. There is no friendship between two unequal persons. But, it is also because of friendship—especially civic friendship—that one finds the other as an inherent partner for one’s journey to attain the ideal life.

Understanding *gotong royong* as a network of solidarity among active yet equal agents is what post-authoritarian Indonesia needs, particularly in pursuing the social justice agenda for all. It is no longer a “top-down” social mobilization which neglects diverse local aspirations. *Gotong royong* as the *Grundform* of Indonesian sociality emerges from the daily experiences of civic friendship which give birth to the network of solidarity for the common good.

3.2. Education for the Common Good: Immersion into the Life Stories of the People

Collaboration in civil society becomes possible by nurturing an innate human tendency for sociality or *gotong royong*. This is the unique contribution of education. *Sollicitudo Rei*

⁹¹ Hollenbach, *Common Good and Christian Ethics*, 189.

Socialis defines solidarity as “a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good.”⁹² Education helps youth nurture such commitment and determination to orient oneself, not only for their own good, but for the good of all people.

The three pedagogues whom we discussed in this chapter can contribute to deepen the pedagogical aspect in CST. As pointed out by Bergman, there is an imbalance in the body of CST because “in approximately 600 pages of the standard collection of documents that represent the canon of CST, only one and one-half pages are devoted explicitly to Catholic social learning or pedagogy.”⁹³ In *Justitia in Mundo*, we find a strong message on the need for “educating to justice.” The bishops believe that a just act is not self-given. It is learnt through family and the community where the youth live. Education for justice demands a renewal of heart, so that “it will also inculcate a truly and entirely human way of life in justice, love and simplicity. It will likewise awaken a critical sense, which will lead us to reflect on the society in which we live and on its values; it will make people ready to renounce these values when they cease to promote justice for all people.”⁹⁴

In this matter, Dewantara-Driyarkara-Buchori’s vision of education can help in righting the balance in the body of CST. From Dewantara, we learn that social action emerges from three interrelated spheres of education: family, educational institutions, and society. In other words, education should be based on the reality of students, their experience, their daily lives, first in family and then in educational institutions and in society.

⁹² *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, No. 38.

⁹³ Roger Bergman, *Catholic Social Learning: Educating the Faith that Does Justice* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), vii.

⁹⁴ *Justitia in Mundo*, No. 51.

Borrowing a term from Ada María Isasi-Díaz, the daily lives of the people (*lo cotidiano*) is the source of collaboration for the common good.⁹⁵ It is in our daily lives that we encounter structural injustice and the collaborative practices for liberation. The jargon on the importance of transforming the structures of our society is ubiquitous. However, the transformation of the structural arrangement of society will not last if it does not transform the daily life of the people. People's everyday life—with its narratives, fears, and hopes—are the final criteria in determining how close or far we are in working together toward the common good. In the words of Dewantara, “We must resolve to eat what the People eat, to wear what the People wear, to live where the People live. Thereby, the feeling will grow that we share the lot of the People.”⁹⁶

In the first chapter, I argued for the urgent need for the post-authoritarian Indonesia to seek the strong bond of “being a people.” Education which is anchored in the daily struggles of the people will help members of the community—especially the youth—to sustain the deep connection of being a people (or in Dewantara's term “*kerakyatan*”). In front of the greedy elites, being a people is the only resource that civil society has. It is then understandable that the greedy elites try to influence educational policy with its limited concern toward technical expertise. In this neoliberalistic vision of education, the sole goal of educational policy is preparing the youth to enter the brutal competition of the job market. No more no less.

When Dewantara argues for the national educational system to get closer to the people, “to hear the cries of the people,” he puts the daily lives of the people as the foundation for initiating a liberative education. The failure of post-authoritarian Indonesian education mirrors the long problem of pre-independence Indonesia. The failure of the pre-independence Indonesian educational system was in separating education from the life story of the student. Education is

⁹⁵ Ada María Isasi-Díaz, *La Lucha Continues: Mujerista Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004), 92-106.

⁹⁶ Cited in Tsuchiya, *Democracy and Leadership*, 133.

seen merely as the tool for upright movement. As Paulo Freire persistently argues, when education is seen merely as a transfer of knowledge—or in Freirian term: banking education⁹⁷—it will fail to conscientize the people from the root of their suffering and to see the possibility to work together to bring about justice and peace.

3.3. The Didactical Aspects of the Common Project in Uprooting Social Sin

The experience of our daily lives is a *locus liberationis*. However, as Buchori argues, when education is immersed into the daily lives of the people, the youth will also find daily practices which are utterly against the trajectory of pursuing the good for all people. The salvific and liberative aspects of our daily lives are not found in the actions *per se*, but in how close those daily practices move and bring the community's members to the common good. Buchori's study showed that an enclave mentality which breeds clientelism and extremism is also a part of the daily lives of the Indonesian people. This enclave mentality abrades social solidarity, and hinders one's capability to work together across social, cultural, racial, and religious diversity. A liberative and collaborative education should make the youth aware of such practices and continue to uproot them.

CST can contribute in naming such anti-liberative and anti-cooperative practices as a form of structural sin. Structural sins, as rooted in personal sin, “grow stronger, spread, and become the source of other sins, and so influence people's behavior.”⁹⁸ CST argues that we can never comprehend the completeness of reality if we fail to name “the roots of the evils that afflict us.”

⁹⁷ Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 72-86.

⁹⁸ *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, No. 36.

In the process of naming the structure of sins, education can play two important roles. First, because the daily struggles of our people become the basis for a liberative education, education should also open the heart and mind of the student to people's hopes and despairs. Education with its resources can help the student to see the pattern of structural sins, the roots of the problem and our intransigence that make injustice widespread.

Second, as a form of *consideratio status*, education should also acknowledge its fragility. It is important to be clear that Ki Hajar Dewantara, Nicolaus Driyarkara, Mochtar Buchori, and the majority of students in higher education are not the poor. In the first chapter, I have shown that higher education in Indonesia is a highly expensive investment. If the status of being a student in higher education is a part of the privileged, the big challenge for education based on the lives of the people is finding a way to transform this privilege into a liberative action. The danger of neglecting the fact of being a member of the privileged can make our view about our fellow human beings, especially the ones who live on the margins, shortsighted.⁹⁹

Marxist critique on how the acquisition of capital (as the base structure) influences human values (as the superstructure) should be noted. Dewantara already argues about the impossibility of *tabula rasa* in education. Each student brings his or her cultural and class values to the classroom. However, if *gotong royong* is truly the nature of each human being, then the possibility to make a genuine social collaboration for the common good is also wide open. Education should help the youth, as Greek philosophers said, "to know ourselves": our privileges. But knowing ourselves is the first step of the long journey toward building a social relationship with others for peace and justice. More importantly, the process of knowing ourselves is not a solitary mental activity, apart from the network of relations with others, apart

⁹⁹ Rebecca Todd Peters, *Solidarity Ethics: Transformation in a Globalized World* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014), 69.

from the real struggle of daily lives. The process of knowing is inherent in our constant relation with the community.

When education embraces the liberative aspect of our daily lives and makes us aware of the common practices which hinder the same liberative trajectory, education then, in the words of Driyarkara, can be interpreted as a form of *laku* (mystical practices). As shown by Driyarkara's interpretation of classic didactical Javanese text of the *Wedhatama*, education is a praxis of "steeling oneself with determination to master the evil urges of egotism" and "the wellbeing of others."¹⁰⁰ In this dual project—nurturing the good and uprooting the evil—education finds its unique contribution. It is the didactical aspect of uprooting the structures of sin. In the Javanese world view, a didactic is broader than a schooling system or curriculum management. A didactic first and foremost is a mystical endeavor, an ongoing pursuit to go deeper in embracing one's place in relationship with the world.

4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I showed the possibility of making a cross-cultural dialogue between collaboration based on post-Vatican II social encyclicals with *gotong royong* in Indonesian society, especially through the lens of three Indonesian pedagogues. This chapter consisted of three parts. In the first part, I outlined the changing meaning of *gotong royong* as it has been interpreted in respect to the socio-cultural milieu. I concluded that *gotong royong* is a form of social collaboration in the face of personal and communal needs. In the second part, I discussed the reflections of three Indonesian pedagogues on social collaboration and the role of education to bring it about. The three pedagogues are Ki Hajar Dewantara, Nicholas Driyarkara, and Mochtar Buchori. In the third part, I showed three points of cross-cultural fertilizing based on

¹⁰⁰ *Wedhatama*, Canto III:1, in Robson, *The Wedhatama*, 35.

CST and the Indonesian praxis of *gotong royong*. The first point is the acknowledgment of *gotong royong* as a form of network of solidarity among active yet equal agents within a community. The second point is pinpointing the life stories of the daily struggles of the ordinary people as sources for a liberative and collaborative education for the common good. The third point is highlighting the didactical aspect of any collective action in uprooting the structures of sin and building structures of grace.

In the following chapter, with the help of Ellacuría, we will see at length the possibility of the university as a member of the people of God journeying and working together with people of good will to build the promised kingdom.

Chapter IV

Bearing Together the Weight of Reality: The Mission of a Jesuit University in a Post-Authoritarian Society

In this chapter, we come to the central argument for this dissertation: what is the role of a Jesuit university in sustaining the spirit of solidarity for the common good in the context of post-authoritarian Indonesia? In order to answer this fundamental question, we must first understand the mission of higher education in a pluralistic society. I argue that Ignacio Ellacuría's approach to university studies is helpful in answering this question. Ignacio Ellacuría, through his life and his thought on the historical mission of a Jesuit university, is one of the best examples and articulators of bringing about such a mission of creating a just structure so that everyone, especially the marginalized, can speak and enter into the conversation. In the context of post-authoritarian society, with its long history of one-way communication, the Ellacurían vision of higher education is timely, important and relevant. But in reading Ellacuría, we will use insights that we have found in the previous chapter. Critical engagement with Ellacuría will bring us to see a possible generalization of his contribution to the theology of the mission of Jesuit higher education while at the same time remaining respectful to his unique social context.

This chapter consists of two sections. The first section is an overview of Ellacuría's idea of the historical mission of a Jesuit university and its call to be faithful and immersed in the reality of the people. In the second section we create a critical dialogue between Ellacuría and our previous chapter, which concerns the socio-political analysis of post-authoritarian Indonesian society, an ethic of collaboration based on Catholic Social Teaching (CST), and the didactic of

gotong royong. Then we come to a conclusion that collaboration for a shared agenda of social justice is an urgent task of any Jesuit university in being faithful to the reality of a post-authoritarian society. Amid the facts of disintegration and decentralization on the one hand and the richness of religious and cultural diversity on the other, collaboration is both propheticism and utopia. Therefore, it is in the continuous commitment to bear together the weight of reality, that a Jesuit university in a post-authoritarian society finds the heart of its mission.

1. Ellacurían Framework: Proposing a Different Kind of University

1.1. Three Approaches to University

There are lively and broad discussions on the mission of higher education in responding to the ongoing changes of (post-)modern society. In this public debate, we can find at least three approaches.

The first approach has been argued, for example, by Stanley Fish, that the fundamental missions of college and university are to:

(1) introduce students to bodies of knowledge and traditions of inquiry that had not previously been part of their experience; and (2) equip those same students with analytical skills—of argument, statistical modeling, laboratory procedure—that will enable them to move confidently within those traditions and to engage in independent research after a course is over.¹

According to Fish, the main mission of a university is not to train students to strive for moral or political purposes, but it is strictly academic. Even if the subject matter of studies relates to public policy or law, it is not the job of the department of political science, for example, to marshal the students for “partisan purposes.” A university should devote and limit itself to “a certain kind of interrogation.” Political, social and economical issues “should be discussed in academic terms; that is, they should be the objects of analysis, comparison, historical placement

¹ Stanley Fish, *Save the World on Your Own Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 8.

etc.”² Fish argues that a university should understand the limits of its existence. A university is not and should not act like a political party. He proposes the term “to academicize” as the right way for a university to embrace current issues in society. He writes: “[t]o academicize a topic is to detach it from the context of its real world urgency, where there is a vote to be taken or an agenda to be embraced, and insert it into a context of academic urgency, where there is an account to be offered or an analysis to be performed.”³

Fish’s treatment of a university’s mission is strictly “Cartesian.” Beneath his arguments, there is a conviction that we can approach the body of knowledge in its *clara et distincta* form. The role of a university is to detach knowledge from its social context. Then, like a doctor doing an operation on a patient, the university will analyze the issues as objectively as possible.

There are two problems with this Cartesian approach to university. First, is such a process of detaching knowledge from its context of world urgency possible in the first place? For the Cartesian tradition, a pursuit of knowledge should be a soliloquy, detached from mundane and passing experiences. However, after Descartes, the philosophical tradition has come to realize the impossibility of this task. Knowledge itself is formed and shaped by its context. Social location influences our retrieval of knowledge; a thesis with which the Cartesian tradition strongly disagrees.

Second, even if a university strictly performs the “academicizing task,” at some point we will come to a certain conclusion on that issue. Suppose we discuss the issue of apartheid in South Africa. As researchers, we can rigorously analyze the historical, cultural, and social background of that racial policy. But by the end of our analysis, we cannot ignore the question: can we justify the policy of apartheid? In answering this question, closeness to or remoteness

² Ibid., 25.

³ Ibid., 27. Italics in original.

from the problem has a huge impact on the inquirer. Maybe a student in an American university can refuse to treat this question for the sake of “objectivity.” But what is the point of this Cartesian objectivity for a South African student who suffered from such a policy? Social location indeed shapes our knowledge.

The second way to reflect on the mission of a university is a dedication to train professionals. According to this kind of thought, the role of a university is to generate knowledge and train professionals capable of doing their jobs in a rapidly developing society.⁴ It is the main business of a university to prepare youth to be good lawyers, doctors, social workers, and engineers. The success or failure of a university is seen from the point of view of how well they can prepare the youth to march into the job markets.

Therefore, the market also has influence in determining the content of knowledge that a student should learn. A university should “link and match” with day-to-day capabilities of the respective profession. Associations of professionals determine the standard of competence and the university will refer and adjust its curriculum in preparing the young professionals in the field. In this framework, the student is an apprentice who learns under the guidance of “master teachers” in the university to become proficient at certain competences in order to be worthy to assume the same role within society after finishing the apprenticeship. In the era of globalization, mission for professionalism is more and more getting a favored status. The heart of competition among modern higher educational institutions is precisely in this area: how well they can prepare their students to easily enter the job market.

While we cannot neglect the importance of preparing professionals in our society, focusing the university’s mission solely on this aspect is inadequate. First, if the body of

⁴ Derek Bok, *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 62.

knowledge is shaped and under the control of an association of professionals or on how well the acquired knowledge will “link and match” with the needs of industrial society, other kinds of knowledge which are not considered closely related to the profession will slowly be abandoned. The trend to downsize the study of the humanities, for example, is a direct consequence of such a policy. Reading the *Republic* of Plato or the great Greek tragedies will not give an immediate and direct benefit for training a competent accountant or computer technician. Humanities are even considered as an additional burden.

Second, training a competent professional is directed to preservation of a society so that the dynamic of a society will run as it should. Therefore, it is more a question of the division of labor. Each section (e.g., education, healthcare, finance, and defense) performs its task at its best. However, this approach lacks a critical hermeneutics of reality by not asking: why does a certain section of society attain much and others less. The division of labor cannot answer the problem of inequality. At worst, it legitimizes it. In order to promote a just social structure, it needs an ability to go beyond its limited sector of labor. We need a bird’s eye view of the dynamic of society, a capability that is not easily available to higher education which limits its scope only to training professionals. As Herbert Marcuse argued in the 1960s, these two critiques show that, if a body of knowledge is considered merely from the point of view of economization and materialization, then the university is totally under the control of a technocratic rationality which produces only “one dimensional man” and neglects the multidimensionality of human life.⁵

The third approach is a more humanistic vision of education. The basic argument of this approach is that a university is inherently part of the dynamic of the society where it operates. Following the Aristotelian tradition, every human action has political ends. Therefore, university

⁵ Herbert Marcuse, *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

activities in teaching, research, and preparing competent professionals inherit the same political dimension. Of course, there is a wide range of ways in which a university understands the term “political”: from a very active engagement in influencing policy-making to generating a critical knowledge for a betterment of living together. But this approach argues that from its conception a university is not and will never be an “ivory tower.” Here we find the place of Ellacuría, which will be discussed at length in the following section.

1.2. Return to Reality: The Historical Mission of a University

Ellacuría’s humanistic vision finds its foundation in his experience as a Jesuit in El Salvador. This experience then shaped and molded his philosophy/theology of liberation which helped him to articulate a normative vision of the university amid the struggle for liberation in his country. El Salvador, and Latin America at large, was torn apart by poverty, civil war, and exploitation by North American capitalism. Civil war killed at least forty thousand Salvadorans between 1980 and 1984. Popular movements for peace and justice suffered from the ruling military regime with its brutal death squads.⁶ The political, economical and social instability of El Salvador left its people in chronic poverty and unemployment with no structural mechanisms available to palliate their effects. Only five percent of the work force was able to receive social security support. Many families, especially in the rural areas, were unable to access minimum schooling and good education.⁷

In the face of this reality of oppression and injustice, Ellacuría wrote about the mission of the university, as follow:

⁶ Ignacio Ellacuría, “Violence and Non-Violence in the Struggle for Peace and Liberation,” in Hans Küng and Jürgen Moltmann, eds., *A Council for Peace* (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1988), 71.

⁷ Ignacio Ellacuría, “The Kingdom of God and Unemployment in the Third World,” in Jacques Pohier and Dietmar Mieth, eds., *Unemployment and The Right to Work* (New York: Seabury, 1982), 92.

[T]he historical mission of the university should be shaped in accordance with the situation of the human rights of the poor majorities and in accordance with the state or phase in which those poor majorities find themselves and out of which they are advancing... Of course there is no single response to these claims, but the university must find a way to respond to them creatively. Its response must reflect a genuine love for the poor majorities, a passion for social justice, and a courage to meet the attacks, the misunderstandings, and the persecutions that will ensue because of its stand on behalf of the poor.⁸

The historical mission of the university is not something *added* from outside, or merely lipstick on a university mission statement. The historicity of mission is already inherent in the life of the university itself, especially because the very existence of the university is related to the production of knowledge. Ellacuría's historical vision of the university directly challenged a Cartesian mode of knowledge underneath the "academicizing tasks" forcefully proposed by Fish. Ellacuría was influenced by his mentor, Xavier Zubiri, who proposed the term *sentient intelligence*. Zubiri radically challenged the reductionist Western idealism. For such idealists, knowledge is separate from sensing because "intellection is posterior to sensation, and this posteriority results in opposition."⁹ This separation divides "knowing" from reality. For Zubiri, the human being is already embedded in reality during the whole process of knowing. Because beings are already embedded in reality, the senses help human beings not only to grasp the *materia* of reality, but also its *forma*. In the unity between sensing and intellection in the realm of reality, Zubiri and Ellacuría went further than the idea of *return to subject* as proposed by modernism. For Zubiri and Ellacuría, we must *return to reality*. The ultimate criterion of philosophy and theology then is how faithful they are to reality. Human intelligence does not

⁸ Ignacio Ellacuría, "The University, Human Rights, and The Poor Majority," in John Hassett and Hugh Lacey, eds., *Towards a Society that Serves its People: The Intellectual Contribution of El Salvador's Murdered Jesuits* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991), 219. Also cited in David L. Gandolfo, "A Role for the Privileged? Solidarity and the University in the Work of Ignacio Ellacuría and Paulo Freire," *Journal for Peace and Justice Studies* 17, no. 1 (2008): 14.

⁹ Kevin F. Burke, S.J., *The Ground Beneath the Cross: The Theology of Ignacio Ellacuría* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000), 45.

create reality, but it emerges in an ongoing relation with reality. Often, it is even challenged and confronted by reality.¹⁰

Intramundane reality, as differentiated from extramundane reality which is God, has four characteristics. *First*, there is the complex unity of intramundane reality. A thing exists in inherent relationship with and by others. By highlighting the intraconnectedness of reality, Ellacuría rejected total opposition between atomization on one side and total monism on the other. A complex unity does not go against difference, and difference itself will not nullify the complex unity. Within complex unity, there are multiplicities of differences, contradictions, oppositions and even negations. Sentient intelligence is seeking to maintain the balance between identity and multiplicity. For example, macroeconomic theory emerges from multiple microeconomic realities. There is a noticeable difference between microeconomic realities, but at the same time it is possible to look amid this multiplicity with a bird's eye view on the macro level.

Second, this intramundane reality is intrinsically dynamic. Because of the multiplicities of contradictions and differences within the complex unity of reality, reality is always intrinsically dynamic. This intrinsic dynamic "interrupts identity and non-identity [and] actualizes dynamism."¹¹ The dynamic of reality helps Ellacuría to analyze history and human society, especially in his critical encounter with Marxism.

Third, the dynamic of reality is manifest not only in dialectic but also as an ascending process. While Ellacuría agreed with Marx on seeing the dialectic of reality and its usefulness for analysis of society, he also saw the inherent process of affirmation. He argued that this type

¹⁰ Michael Lee, *Bearing The Weight of Salvation: The Soteriology of Ignacio Ellacuría* (New York: Crossroad, 2009), 45.

¹¹ Ellacuría wrote "Reality is dynamic from itself [*de por sí*], it is dynamic of itself [*de suyo*], and its moment of dynamism consists initially in a giving-of-its own [*dar de sí*]." Ignacio Ellacuría, *Filosofía de la realidad histórica*, 591, cited in Burke, *The Ground Beneath the Cross*, 56.

of dynamic is a “Christian dynamic.” In the Christian vision of dynamism, it is true that there is the fact of cross and death. But also there is the fact of resurrection that follows. While negativity is a necessary condition within the dynamic of reality, this negativity does not end in itself. It also leads toward positivity, in “going beyond the sphere of the negated.”¹² Ellacuría’s concern with Marxist dialectic was that it runs the risk of not going beyond the sphere of what is negated. This Christian vision of the dynamic of reality becomes the foundation of Ellacuría’s idea of two important tasks of being a disciple of Christ amid the historicity of suffering: *propheticism* and *utopia*. Propheticism shows the negativity of reality. But it will lead to the possible positivity, which is utopia.

Four, the dynamic of reality reaches its highest qualitative form in “historical reality.” It is historical because it refers both to the field or sphere of reality and the contents of that realization. In relation to the unitary character of reality, when reality becomes historical, it will not nullify the previous levels of reality, which are material, biological, personal, and social. Historical reality fundamentally integrates the whole journey (i.e., material, biological, personal, and social) into a “new” form, adding something “more,” and open to what is “beyond.”¹³ This openness to something “more and beyond” is also the entry point for the theological category of reality. Every historical reality is a site for the theological dimension¹⁴ because we encounter the One that is “beyond” or “more,” not outside historical reality, but precisely in its internal dynamics. Intrarelatedness between historical reality and its theological dimension becomes Ellacuría’s foundation for interpreting salvation, by his famous statement that “salvation history

¹² Ibid., 57.

¹³ Ibid., 59.

¹⁴ Ellacuría, following Zubiri, specifically used the term “theological” instead of “theological.” Theological refers to the study or formulation of the divine. Theological refers to “the implicit God’s dimension of reality.” Burke, *The Ground Beneath the Cross*, ff.48, 40.

is a salvation in history.”¹⁵ Christian tradition believes in the history of salvation; therefore salvation should influence history, because God acts in and through the historical actions of God’s people.

Our short inquiry into Ellacuría/Zubiri’s metaphysics helps us to see the very foundation of the university’s mission as *a return to reality*. Ellacuría will agree with Fish on the importance of the production of knowledge through research and teaching. It is the heart of the university. However, “academicizing” is very reductionist. Imagining a pursuit of knowledge in the Cartesian mode is impossible. We, the beings, are already rooted and grounded in reality. We are part of reality, as *materia* and *forma*. The university’s mission to be faithful to reality is a manifestation of this ontological character of our being, immersed in reality.

In the journey to return to reality, the role of the university is to highlight the internal dynamics of the intrarelatedness of beings. This dynamic of intrarelatedness underlines the political character of the university. Following the Aristotelian tradition, every human institution, including the university, has a political character. The university is political, not only in terms of the consequences of its activities within society, but from its very existence as one among many political communities. What makes the difference between the university and other political forms is its *modus operandi*. The university understands *politeia*, the art of living together, as a place of learning. Ellacuría wrote:

A university works out its political nature in a manner appropriate to a university when, from among its various functions—teaching, research and social projection—it gives priority to social projection such that the latter determines the others although it is, in turn also determined by them...

¹⁵ Ignacio Ellacuría, *Freedom Made Flesh: The Mission of Christ and His Church* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), 15. See also his article “The Historicity of Christian Salvation,” in Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J. and Jon Sobrino, S.J., eds., *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993), 260.

This social projection...is not something apart from the other two fundamental functions of the university. It presupposes teaching as its basis of support; likewise, it presupposes research as the fundamental illuminator of its task. But it becomes the regulator of these.¹⁶

The university as political community is manifested differently than state, or political parties. The latter see politics as a tactic to reorganize power. For Ellacuría, the politics of the university lies in analyzing how well the intrarelatedness of reality is manifest in day-to-day experiences, in unmasking the lies perpetuated by the dominant class in order to control reality for their own sakes, in making the *polis* aware of the sinful structures that oppress, and in proposing creatively the possibility of a more just world.

How does a return to reality shape the course of the university's mission? Here we find the famous Ellacurían triple dimension of engaging reality:

Engaging real things in their reality has a three-fold dimension: *becoming aware of the weight of reality* [*el hacerse cargo de la realidad*], which entails being present in the reality of things (and not merely being present before the idea of things or being in touch with their meaning), being "real" in the reality of things, which in its active character of being is exactly the opposite of being thing-like and inert and implies being among them through their material and active mediations; *shouldering the weight of reality* [*el cargar con la realidad*], an expression that points to the fundamentally ethical character of intelligence, which has not been given to us so that we could evade our real commitments, but rather to take upon ourselves what things really are and what they really demand; *taking charge of the weight of reality* [*el encargarse de la realidad*], an expression that points to the praxical character of intelligence, which only fulfills its function, including its character of knowing reality and comprehending its meaning, when it assumes as its burden doing something real.¹⁷

This dense reflection on engaging reality is foundational in our normative quest of the historical mission of a university. Ellacuría helps us to see three integral moments of engaging reality.

¹⁶ Ignacio Ellacuría, "Universidad y Política," 186 & 189, translated and cited in Gandolfo, "A Different Kind of University Within the University: Ellacuría's Model in the Context of the United States," in J. Matthew Ashley, Kevin F. Burke, S.J and Rodolfo Cardenal, S.J., eds., *A Grammar of Justice: The Legacy of Ignacio Ellacuría* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014), 164.

¹⁷ Ignacio Ellacuría, "Laying the Philosophical Foundations of Latin American Theological Method," in *Ignacio Ellacuría: Essays on History, Liberation, and Salvation*, edited by Michael E. Lee (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014), 80.

First, the university is present within the historical reality of the people that it serves. It is the noetic level that provides solid foundation in determining the orientation of the university. Engaging reality should start from being “present” in reality. Here we see a strong Ignatian influence in Ellacuría. For Ignatius, the core of the Spiritual Exercises is not in acquiring more religious insights but in *experiencing* an intimate relationship with God. Ignatius even highlights the importance of using one’s human senses, becoming aware of one’s surrounding, and managing the composition of darkness and light or enjoying heat and cold. First-hand contact with reality through the senses will help one to know the “weight” of such experiences, because senses help reason to uncover what is hidden beneath the fragments of reality. Analysis at all levels of reality (material, biological, personal, social) helps us measure the complexity and relation between experiences. In this train of thought, teaching and research are an integral part of the process of becoming aware of the weight of reality. From the reverse angle, reality also challenges and directs human desire to know the truth, placing history as the formal approach for attaining the content of the truth.

In the context of El Salvador for example, Ellacuría brought Universidad Centroamericana to engage in the reality of poverty, unemployment, and bloody civil war. In engaging with reality, it is easy to fall into the trap of partisan politics. But, for Ellacuría, the sole orientation in becoming aware of the reality is to be closer to the subject of historical reality, which is the poor majority. The university is a place where one can make a critical judgment about the cause of the problem and creatively find solutions for such a problem. Critical and creative analysis are the heart of the task to “de-ideologize” historical reality.¹⁸

¹⁸ Robert Lassalle-Klein, “Ignacio Ellacuría’s Debt to Xavier Zubiri: Critical Principles for a Latin American Philosophy and Theology of Liberation,” in Kevin F. Burke and Robert Lassalle-Klein, eds., *Love That Produces Hope: The Thought of Ignacio Ellacuría* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), 110.

Second, sensing and analyzing reality will bring us to the second moment, which is bearing the weight of reality. Ellacuría called it an ethical moment. When one is facing the weight of reality, one realizes that one is “being-together-with-reality.” This togetherness-with-reality brings one to an ethical opening. Ellacuría was struggling with the same question as Emmanuel Levinas.¹⁹ In the face of the epiphany of reality, can we evade its ethical demands? Like Levinas, the only answer to the ethical demands of becoming aware of the weight of reality is “Here, I am!” For Ellacuría, intelligence is a gift to humanity so that “it might shoulder upon itself the weight of what things really are, and what they really demand.”²⁰ Solidarity with the marginalized is a core manifestation of shouldering the weight of reality.

Third, an ethical response to the burden of reality brings one to praxis. For Ellacuría, praxis is not something *added* to the intelligence, because in its core, intelligence always entails its praxis-oriented nature. If intelligence is shaped and challenged by reality, then in the face of the plea of reality, intelligence will direct one’s will to move into the decision-making of liberating praxis, especially in the form of the preferential option for and with the marginalized. However, one must determine “what kind” of liberation praxis, the “where to” of liberation and the mode of liberation, especially in the context of the university.²¹ When the university engages in “taking charge of reality,” the praxis of liberation that it chooses should manifest its uniqueness as a university. It manifests that by unmasking the sinful structure that hinders human flourishing, in proposing a creative answer that empowers the marginalized to join communal deliberation in policy making. It is a liberative praxis of university *qua* university.

¹⁹ Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis (Hingham, MA: Kluwer, 1979). Especially Section III: Exteriority and the Face, 187-247.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 114.

²¹ Ellacuría, “The Liberating Function of Philosophy,” in *Essays on History*, 107.

While this threefold moment of engaging reality has resemblance to the pastoral circle proposed by Joe Holland and Peter Henriot,²² Ellacuría considers these threefold moments are more about a metaphysical reflection of our being when we are confronted and challenged by reality, and less about so-called “pastoral method.” Ellacuría’s philosophy of historical reality is the foundation that makes the pastoral circle possible in the first place. It is the projection that orients our existence as human beings, as part of the complex unity of reality. But it is also our projection as the disciples of Christ in today’s historical reality.

1.3. The Mystique of Service of a University Toward the Reign of God

Ellacuría was a Jesuit and president of a Jesuit university. His approach to the historical mission of a university was shaped not only by his mentor, Zubiri, but more importantly by Ignatius of Loyola. As for Ignatius, all activities within the Society of Jesus should be directed solely to the one and only purpose: *Ad maiorem Dei gloriam inque hominum salutem*, the greater glory of God and the salvation of humankind. In the Jesuit tradition, the university is one of the classical apostolates dedicated to that vision. The university is a form of Jesuit response to the Call of Christ the King, to live under the banner of the Eternal King as Ignatius contemplated in the second week of the Spiritual Exercises. In this logic, the university is at the service of Christ’s mission, that is in anticipating some aspects of the earthly dimension of the Reign of God and its coming in fullness.

Ellacuría’s understanding of the Reign of God then leads to two interrelated theological propositions: *utopia* and *propheticism*. In orienting its self-understanding toward the Reign of God, the university is also performing these two foundational missions. Ellacuría understood the

²² Joe Holland and Peter Henriot, S.J., *Social Analysis: Linking Faith and Justice* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006), 7.

Christian utopia to have the following features: “(a) there is a general and undefined Christian utopia; (b) this general utopia must be concretized in historico-social terms; (c) this utopia is in relationship with the Reign of God; (d) the Reign of God must be historicized; and (e) the Reign of God is rendered operational through the setting in motion of concrete utopia.”²³ Ellacuría rejected arguments which held that, instead of proposing utopia, today’s world needed only a calculable verification of pragmatism. Utopia is more than “to give hope” [*esperanzar*] but “to give the future of the project [*proyecto*] and the struggle.”²⁴ One main function of Christian utopia is to historicize the Reign of God. Utopia is born from God’s revelation, traditions of faith, and also the magisterium. But for Ellacuría the biggest challenge for utopia is how creatively to retrieve the same spirit that animated the traditional and previous form of utopia and to keep that foundational dynamics alive so that a new dynamism is possible. This dynamism of a living utopia is not only burning in the human heart but also “in the structures without which that heart cannot live.”²⁵ It is then the role of propheticism to grasp that living spirit.

Ellacuría defined propheticism as “the critical proclamation of the fullness of the Reign of God with a specific historical situation.”²⁶ Through propheticism, the living tradition experiences once again “the radical newness of the Spirit.”²⁷ If tradition proclaims the God of Life but historical reality shows the immense horror of terror and death, propheticism will show both the limitation (complicity of personal and social sin that caused death) and the necessary dialectic to overcome (*superación*) it. Christian propheticism lives by Christian utopia and *vice*

²³ Ellacuría, “Utopia and Propheticism from Latin America,” in *A Grammar of Justice*, 10.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 11.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

versa. Propheticism and utopia nourish each other. “Both are historical and both are transcendent, but neither becomes what it is meant to become except in relation to the others.”²⁸

The question is: what is the role of the university in the dialectic of propheticism and utopia? Ellacuría provided four points to answer that question. First, the university should understand itself as “one of the social forces through which the Reign is or is not being built up...It demands that the university seek its center outside itself...in order that [universities] place themselves at the service of the Reign and not of themselves.”²⁹ Ellacuría differentiated social from political action. Political action operates on “the suprastructural level, while social action moves on the level of human subjects as well as on the structural level.”³⁰ If the university is categorized as a *social force*, its mission in historical reality focuses both on the formation of the human subject and on proposing the necessary structural arrangements that make such formation possible. In order to fulfill that ideal, the university as a whole should “decenter” itself: focusing all its resources and activities not only on self-preservation but on proposing projects that are “signs and structures of the Reign, and that this projection be not merely something drawn from the facts of research and teaching...but something explicitly sought, cultivated and verified.”³¹ Orienting the university to the Reign of God will encourage the investigation of reality, communicate its resemblance or dissemblance from the Reign through teaching and formation of the students, and initiate projects involving other members of society.

Second, orienting the university toward the Reign will generate a mystique of service within the university. The call to turn to reality will lead the university to experience “the joys

²⁸ Ibid., 15.

²⁹ Jon Sobrino, “The University’s Christian Inspiration”, in Jon Sobrino, et al., *Companions of Jesus: The Jesuit Martyrs of El Salvador* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990), 159.

³⁰ Ellacuría, “Liberation Theology and Socio-historical Change in Latin America,” in *Towards a Society*, 32.

³¹ Sobrino, “The University’s Christian Inspiration,” 160.

and sorrows” of humanity. Experience of being close to reality will cultivate solidarity and reconciliation with fellow human beings, a joyful dedication of being members of the people of God *qua* university. In the context of a pluralistic society, the mystique of service could be the engine in promoting solidarity and joining in advancing shared project for fostering the common good. The university as one social force for building the Reign will join hands with other social forces in the world to realize the utopia which the Reign already manifests in history. The mystique of service will nurture the spirit of social collaboration. While our constrained timeline as human beings will limit the possibility of experiencing the fullness of the promise, every step toward the Reign is a source of immanent joy for all the members of the people of God.

Third, however, we also must realize that the university operates in “a world fraught with anti-Reign.”³² The powers of anti-Reign will work tirelessly with abundant resources to make the university kneel at their feet. They will react strongly when their demand for unconditional loyalty is challenged. “For wide is the gate and broad is the road that leads to destruction” and narrow is the gate for the Reign.³³ Commitment to the Reign will lead to martyrdom, as shown by the life of Ellacuría and his fellow martyrs of the UCA. As Ignatius repeatedly said, “Love ought to manifest itself in deeds rather than in words.”³⁴

Fourth, orienting the university to the Reign of God gives Christian meaning to the university. In the current debate about finding the Christian identity of our university, it is regretful that the criteria to define the “Christianness” of university are merely seen from how the university will adhere to Christian doctrine and obedience to the hierarchy or the explicit teaching of religious topics. For Ellacuría, a Christian university is modeled on the living example of Christ himself, who “seeks to serve rather than to be served,” who “asserts the

³² Ibid., 160.

³³ Matthew 7:13.

³⁴ Spiritual Exercises, no. 230.

transcendent value of human life and the value of the person from the standpoint of [God]...and hence...upholds solidarity and kinship between all human beings.”³⁵ In modeling itself on Christ, a Christian university should “make us aware of the need for an ever greater future and thus unleash the active hope of those who want to make a more just world, in which God can thereby become more fully manifested.”³⁶

1.4. Transforming Our Privileges: Building Solidarity for the Common Good in an Unequal World

One of the favorite meditations from the *Spiritual Exercises* that captivates Ellacuría, Sobrino, and other Jesuit liberation theologians is the meditation before the crucified Christ during the first week of the Spiritual Exercises.³⁷ Before encountering the proclamation of the Reign in the second week, the retreatant makes a *consideratio status* in front of the crucified Christ by asking: “what have I done for Christ? What am I doing for Christ? What ought I do for Christ?”³⁸ The meditation before the cross is to evaluate anything that could make our vision shortsighted. However, the *consideratio status* is also a form of promise that, after knowing our selves and the unconditional grace that we have received, we will respond to the call of the King in today’s world.

Ellacuría and Sobrino proposed the importance of a mystique of service in the university context. In order for such a mystique to be nourished, it is important to start with a *consideratio status* of our background that could limit our sight of the Reign. Ellacuría wrote

³⁵ Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?” in *Towards a Society*, 206

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ellacuría, “Las iglesias latinoamericanas interpelan a la Iglesia de España,” cited in Lee, *Bearing the Weight of Salvation*, 73-74.

³⁸ Spiritual Exercises no. 53.

If students are coming to the university campus in order to secure a dominant and profitable place in an unjustly structured society, we find ourselves with a serious constraint on the ideal of the university's mission. Even worse, if teachers come to the university with the same attitudes and concerns of the other professionals who enter the labor market, very little indeed will be possible.³⁹

Ellacuría, Sobrino, and Martín-Baró realized that those who came to the university were not the ones who lived on the margins of society. They were members of the privileged class. It is true that there was a small percentage in the university who truly were members of the marginalized. Ellacuría himself realistically argued that the university would not survive institutionally if it did not have adequate resources to meet the needs of any thorough research and qualified teachers. The historical mission of the university also should not be limited to the problem of inclusion: opening the door of the university as much as possible for the poor to enter the university. Ellacuría wrote “[a]ny university student here is privileged and should be held accountable as a privileged person.”⁴⁰

Acknowledging our background as members of a privileged class should first be initiated in order to open our senses widely to grasp the historical reality of our people. George Orwell famously said that “to see what is in front of one’s nose needs a constant struggle.”⁴¹ Privilege could hinder one’s ability to see “what is in front of one’s nose,” reflecting the world from one’s affluent background. The new epidemic disorder called “affluenza,” which includes “buying, having and wasting too much,” is one example of how accumulation of capital shapes the way one sees the world and one’s place in it.⁴² While the traditional Catholic vision acknowledges the universal destination of goods, in the affluenza world the only criterion is an excessive anxiety to

³⁹ Ellacuría, “The University, Human Rights and the Poor Majority,” in *Towards a Society*, 217; Gandolfo, “A Role for the Privileged?,” 17.

⁴⁰ Ellacuría, “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?” in *Towards a Society*, 198

⁴¹ George Orwell, *In Front of Your Nose*. Accessed Sept 26, 2015.

http://orwell.ru/library/articles/nose/english/e_nose.

⁴² John de Graaf, David Wann and Thomas H. Naylor, *Affluenza: The All-Consuming Epidemic*. 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2005).

pursue more and more for oneself. How could we talk about solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good when one's inner movement is always going "inward" and never "outward"? In this social illness of affluenza, Orwell's criticism is a strike at the heart of today's imagination.

It is interesting that, after knowing the privileged circumstances of the university, Ellacuría strongly believed that the historical mission of the university is not a question of "where the students and faculty come from" but "where they are going." In orientating the university, the Reign of God should be the guiding principle to strengthen the self-awareness of the university. I think here we face again a high dose of "Ignatian optimism" in understanding power and privilege. From Augustinian perspectives, we can argue that dealing with privilege (which leads to the affluenza epidemic) is like a walk on a thin line that could entrap someone and turn him/her away from the highest good. However, Ignatian optimism (some would say naïveté) sees that all worldly things (even power) are means to the first and principal foundation: *ad maiorem Dei gloriam inque hominum salutem*. I think this Ignatian vision of the importance (even the sanctity) of the means is behind Ellacuría's assessment that the question of the university is about orienting "where they are going."

Then we will meet the fundamental question: in a university that is embedded in the middle and elite classes, what kind of arrangement should be made so that its structure could be transformed into a social force for promoting the common good? In answering this question, Martín-Baró proposed *the structural mechanism* in transforming privileges and developing a critical consciousness. It is structural because it specifies the essential mission of the university. He differentiated the *structural* from *the complementary mechanism* which is common in academia today. The most common features of the complementary mechanism in today's academia consist in adding more specific programs in the university to fill its lack of "social

concerns.” This could mean adding more courses, or obligatory service learning programs. While these *complementary* programs could be beneficial for the university, they also have drawbacks. Because it is seen as *complementary*, the university will see it merely as an addition or an added value, but not the core value itself. In many cases, the university chooses to postpone employing not only the structural but even the complementary mechanism because administrators argue that university resources are not sufficient to handle such radical options.

Martin-Baró argues that the common practices of the complementary mechanism should be directed toward the structural mechanism, which consists of three realms: planning, politics of the leadership in the university, and pedagogical methodology.⁴³

First, planning refers to the whole projection of the university, how it will define its role in the specific historical reality of the people it serves. There are two types of planning: academic and budgetary. In academic planning, the university should ask what kind of programs/degrees best serve the ideal of the liberation of the people. Are the choices of the program merely based on economic opportunities? Who benefit most from the university’s strategic plans: the ruling elites or the majority of the marginalized? In terms of budgetary planning, university resources should be used and directed to the historical mission of the university. Martin-Baró also noted a recent alarming trend in the rise of administrators in academia to boost university aggressiveness in recruiting new (and mostly rich) students. Does the university’s need of financial support justify its decision to blindly receive endowments from corporations which are guilty of human rights violations or environmental abuse?

Second, leadership in the university. In order for the university planning to work as designed, leadership plays a crucial role. Who makes the highest strategic decisions in the

⁴³ Ignacio Martín-Baró, “Developing A Critical Consciousness through the University Curriculum,” in *Towards a Society*, 224.

university? Is the process of decision-making coherent with the strategic vision? Leadership in the daily activities of the university is also manifest in the living example of the professors. They are the forerunners whom students meet in daily university activities. They can be a stumbling block for initiating critical awareness and solidarity or, ideally, living examples of the mystique of service.

Therefore, the criteria for the selection of leadership in a university inspired by the historical mission should be attentive to the historical reality itself. Martín-Baró and Ellacuría were highly aware of the importance of leadership within the university. This type of leadership goes beyond the discussion of collaboration between the Jesuits and the lay professors in a Jesuit university. It is about leadership that could bring the university closer to its ideal: to be faithful to the reality.

Third, pedagogical methodology. The purpose of pedagogy is to link the available resources and the desired objectives. There are many types of pedagogical methods and the university should apply them as diversely as possible so that the *civitas academica* could find the best method in their respective contexts. However, following Paulo Freire, Martín-Baró argued that “banking knowledge” methodology is a *contradictio in terminis* to the strategic plan of developing a critical consciousness. Banking knowledge happens when “prefabricated subject matters are gulped down and the ideal learning process is reduced to the ability to memorize in order to retain and accumulate more and more data.”⁴⁴ The banking-knowledge model makes the student a passive recipient of knowledge, more an object of indoctrination than a subject who is “active, critical, community-oriented and dialectical.”⁴⁵ Liberative pedagogy, as Freire, Ellacuría and Martín Baró proposed, takes student to the heart of reality, engaging them critically

⁴⁴ Ibid., 237.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

to find the root causes of oppression, and letting the historical reality influence their vision about the world.

With these three structural mechanisms within the university (strategic planning, leadership, pedagogical methodology), in Ellacuría, Martín-Baró, and other El Salvador liberation pedagogues there is a strong optimism about the possibility to convert a “privileged imagination” into a profound social force for the common good.

1.5. Conclusion: A University at the Service of the Human Dignity of the People

What would be the normative vision of a Jesuit university in the context of the struggles of the people whom it serves? In this section, we drew from Ellacuría on the notion of a call for the university to return to reality. Although Ellacuría’s formal approach to reality was metaphysical, influenced by Zubiri, we can also argue that reality for Ellacuría has a concrete dimension with its concrete ethical demand and response. By engaging with reality, a university will embrace the very heart of the struggle of the people, which is to attain their wellbeing. A university at the service of the Reign of God, through the option for and with the oppressed, will no longer see “reality” as a general and abstract term, but in its concrete praxis to respond, challenge, and correct any situation which could become impediment for the members of society in their journey to attain the fullness of their ideal life. To state it in a more positive fashion, by realizing the weight of reality, bearing the weight of reality, and finally taking charge of the weight of reality, Ellacuría called a Christian/Jesuit university to engage in any collaborative movement that both raises critical awareness of the problem of dehumanization of life in all its integral aspects and joins with other social forces to find creative and possible solutions.

Therefore, the structural and complementary arrangements of a university should be directed toward those goals. The university's strategic planning, leadership, and pedagogy should help the whole university to use all its resources to help society in developing the wellbeing of its people. A university with such resources should not perceive itself as an "ivory tower" but should contribute to the common project that will benefit society. This radical conversion from "inward looking" toward "outward looking" will help a university to grow in the mystique of service toward the Reign of God. A university will unite in the deep sense of interconnection with other social forces within a pluralistic society that have similar concerns, apart from their ethnic and religious differences, as fellow wayfarers to the Reign.

The Christian tradition believes that in the Reign of God every creature attains the fullness of its dignity as God's creation. Therefore, in the context of the human community, every personal and communal praxis to help everyone achieve the fullness of their wellbeing or to limit the lack thereof is one step closer toward the full realization of the Reign of God. In this precise sense, the university's commitment to struggle with other members of the people of God to promote the wellbeing of the people, especially for and with the ones who are neglected and excluded, bears its theological dimension.

Seeing Ellacuría's normative vision of a university as a commitment to struggle with all members of the people of God in advancing the wellbeing of society could be a point for dialogue toward a larger audience and with people of different traditions. A university is "a place for critical exploration of the ways diverse religious communities envision our shared life with one another...[and] a major venue where ideas about the meaning of justice and their relevance

to our life together must be explored.”⁴⁶ Ellacuría tirelessly argued that the way a university engaged in the struggle to advance human dignity is manifested not as a political party, but as a university, as a center of learning, as an incubator of creative ideas, as a venue for thoughtful conversations.

In the following section, we will examine the possibility of retrieving this Ellacurían humanistic vision of university in the context of a pluralistic Asian society.

2. Bearing Together the Weight of Reality: The University in a Post-Authoritarian Society

In the previous section, Ellacuría helped us to see the historical mission of a Jesuit university to return to reality. This call to return to reality then enables a Jesuit university to engage in the struggle to promote the wellbeing and dignity of the people. But in order to make this vision possible, a university should first transform its privileged imagination: from an inward-looking human institution into a social force in collaboration with people of good will across the ethnic and religious differences. This looking outward will develop the mystique of service within the university which is manifested through its strategic planning, leadership, and pedagogical method.

Then, we come to this question: how could this vision help us in summarizing our search for nurturing an ethic of collaboration in a post-authoritarian Jesuit university?

⁴⁶ David Hollenbach, S.J., “The Catholic Intellectual Tradition, Social Justice and the University,” in *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 36 (2010): 21. Accessed Oct 9, 2015. <http://epublications.marquette.edu/conversations/vol36/iss1/10/>.

2.1. Return to the Reality of Post-Authoritarian Society

Ellacuría's vision of "a different kind of university" resonates deeply with the heart of the post-authoritarian Indonesian society. The first chapter of this dissertation provided a lengthy analysis of the Indonesian reality. On the one hand, the fall of the Suharto regime marked the beginning of the reform era, with the aspiration to bring politics and democracy closer to its people. But on the other hand, it also unleashed the predatory elites that previously were under Suharto's control. They transformed their image from a regime's loyal apparatchiks into new players of democracy but with a different agenda: pursuing their greedy desire, especially in controlling Indonesia's rich national resources.

The decentralization proposed by the IMF with its Structural Adjustment Program after the 1998 economic collapse only made the battle to rob the country's natural resources become more open. IMF's strong belief in the "one fits all" approach to handle the crisis only made the neoliberal greed from the previous regime more vivid. The IMF agenda for liberalization, decentralization, and deregulation can be attributed to a neoliberal agenda operative within the body of the IMF. The direct effect of decentralization and deregulation in a country which was still struggling to build a more democratic system only enhanced the corruptive attitude of *bagi-bagi* or "the obligatory sharing of oligarchic spoils,"⁴⁷ as analyzed by Winters in the first chapter.

After the fall of Suharto regime, there was an ideological gap that needed to be filled. Suharto's authoritarian regime failed to build a strong and lasting legacy of democratic institutions to handle such a gap. Therefore, this gap opened the space for many competing ideologies to enter into the public discourse and compete with each other to reclaim Suharto's seat. These ideological battles were then used by the military to resurrect their waning image by stirring conflict in this newly democratic nation. Ideological differences then turned into bloody

⁴⁷ Winters, *Oligarchy*, 143.

conflicts that cost thousands of innocent Indonesians' lives and a deep drawback to the Indonesia capability to live together as a people.

In this urgent search to find a shared commitment for the common good, Indonesian universities were entangled in the open battle of the greedy. Universities that historically claimed to be the moral voice of the society operated no differently than the enemy that they used to fight. Massification of higher education has transformed the ability of the university as a critical voice into overt support of neoliberalism.

The first chapter of this dissertation brings two important points for understanding the role of the university in a post-authoritarian context. *First*, Ellacuría's vision of the historical mission of a university is a wakeup call to remind universities that they need to find once again their true place in the society that they serve. Amid the growing massification of higher education, the university has become just an ordinary business, an investment to gain maximum profit. Ellacuría's idea of engaging the weight of reality demands from the university a radical conversion.

In the context of a post-authoritarian society, the university should be active in promoting the necessary conditions for everyone to flourish as persons and as members of a community. As a center of learning, a university has plenty of resources that could generate creative ideas, by building various networks to disseminate knowledge that will respond to the needs of society. The university has a unique role to help society to retrieve and reconstruct the understanding of the human good and of social justice in the context of a post-authoritarian society.

However, *second*, as argued by several critic of liberationist theology, the context of the 1970s is highly different from our new global context. In Ellacuría, we can find a clear

juxtaposition of liberationist movements with authoritarian regimes.⁴⁸ This was the case with Indonesian civil society during the Suharto regime. When we find a “single enemy” (e.g., Suharto regime), it is easier to organize social movements to challenge that enemy. The level of solidarity was also higher in that “black and white” context. However, globalization has created a high level of new fluidity and it also operates within the context of post-authoritarian society. During the 1998 Asian financial crisis, neoliberalism carried by globalization and endorsed by the Structural Adjustment Program demanded a high level of “short-termism”⁴⁹ in terms of interpersonal relationships. In economy, short-termism is manifested in the refusal to give long term contracts. Manual labor is outsourced for the sake of flexibility and efficiency. It leaves the youth graduating from the university in an ongoing limbo for their long term plans for their own lives. Even more, short-termism also operates in the way society understands itself, in seeing its own history. Collective memories erode fast. Following the financial crash in 1998, there were tragic racial riots in Jakarta. Hundreds of Chinese-Indonesian women were gang-raped and killed. Tragically, in the very place of such tragedy, in Jakarta’s Glodok Shopping Center, the post-authoritarian Indonesian government immediately rebuilt the burned shopping center just a few months after the tragedy without any acknowledgement that in that very place the lives of hundreds of women were torn apart. No trial, no justice for the victims. In the eyes of

⁴⁸ One of the strong critics of liberationist movement is Alistair Kee in his book *Marx and the Failure of Liberation Theology* (Philadelphia, PA: SCM, 1990), and his article “The Conservatism of Liberation Theology: Four Questions for Jon Sobrino,” *Political Theology* 3 (2000): 30-43. Kee criticized liberation theology for falling into the same trap which Marx criticized before, which is to become a new ideology. Liberation theology failed to recognize the changing pattern of reality which in turn would need a new framework to see rapid changes. While I do not completely agree with Kee’s assessment of Sobrino, his honest criticism—which comes from his admiration of liberationist movement—should be noted. Liberation theology provides a helpful method that always needs to dialogue with any new reality, not a one-size-fits-all project.

⁴⁹ I borrowed the term “short-termism” from Loïc Lainé, “La compassion comme outil critique de la mondialisation néo-libérale: Éléments pour une théologie contextuelle” *Revue d’éthique et de théologie morale*, no. 273 (Mars 2013): 77-109.

neoliberalism, there is no time for grief and remembrance. There is no trauma and horror in visiting the site of a tragedy. In the short-termism ideology, there is no added economic value for collective memory. Capitalism must go on!⁵⁰

This complexity of post-authoritarian society challenges the university to find the way to be faithful to reality in this short-term memory. In the beginning of the first chapter, I portrayed the image of the “missing Suharto,” a psychological social disorder that happened after the fall of the regime, a longing for a “strong leader” in a messy post-authoritarian Indonesia. It is striking that this authoritarian tendency is strongly present in youth with college and university degrees. Missing Suharto is a vivid manifestation of the short-termism of collective memory during the times of labor market flexibility. During the times of no assurance of the future, the figure of the “great leader” is an escape mechanism which yields to predatory elites.

As Ellacuría said, the university can play an important role in eroding this psychological disorder by returning to reality. The university should arrange its educational planning, its leadership, its pedagogical method, so that it can bring the students to be faithful to the changing and fluid reality, and not escape from promoting the common good into a destructive melancholia of “the great leader.”

2.2. Collaboration as Propheticism and Utopia: Nurturing a Different Kind of University

In relation to the previous point, acknowledging the fluidity of post-authoritarian reality, I suggest that collaboration can be a contextual manifestation of propheticism and utopia in post-authoritarian Indonesia. Ellacuría argued that utopia was nurtured within the tradition. Catholic Social Teaching (CST) is a fertile ground for nurturing the utopia of a different kind of

⁵⁰ Abidin Kusno, *The Appearance of Memory: Mnemonic Practices of Architecture and Urban Form in Indonesia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 108.

university. The vision of an ethic of collaboration in the two Catholic social documents that we read carefully in chapter II (*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* and *Caritas in Veritate*) highlights the possibility of collaboration in response to the fluidity of reality in a post-authoritarian context.

Collaboration as propheticism and utopia relates to the impact of the trend of commodification in post-authoritarian higher education. When higher education focuses only on economical and political gain, the university is distancing itself as one major social force within civil society. In the end, we witness the decentralization of a shared agenda of social justice.

While the problem of financing higher education can be an excuse for not embracing the historical mission of the university toward its people, I think the problem of ignoring the weight of reality runs deep to the very foundation of the university itself. The university is a human institution, created by humans and it operates in the wide web of human relationships. Due to the humanness of the university, as Augustine said, its ongoing battle is to turn away from the highest good. Any human institution is entrapped in this *civitas terrena*, this winding worldly journey. As the famous Augustinian image of a child who wants to capture the whole ocean into her small pail on the seashore, no human institution can contain the immense reality of grace.⁵¹

But, as argued by Hollenbach⁵² and Gregory,⁵³ Augustine also leaves an optimism for the possibility of politics, of living together in regard to justice and the common good. In this ongoing battle to control one's *libido dominandi*, there is a glowing spark of hope to orient human institutions toward the fullness of the *Civitas Dei*. Augustine shows not only the difference but also the possibility of an interpenetration of the two cities. The fullness that humankind will experience in the true city should start with every small step of the long journey

⁵¹ Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend Vol V*. Accessed Nov 29, 2015.

<https://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/goldenlegend/GoldenLegend-Volume5.asp#Augustine>.

⁵² Hollenbach, *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*, 127-128.

⁵³ Eric Gregory, *Politics and the Order of Love: An Augustinian Ethic of Democratic Citizenship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

toward the highest good. Aquinas continues this optimism by showing the possibility of participation to the highest degree of perfection. Our human community is always in the circuitous movement between the community of the beast or the ideal of pure community of the Trinity. However, the back and forth movement in the ladder of being has always a religious dimension due to our participation in the Supreme Good.⁵⁴

In SRS and CV, solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good strongly depend on Aquinas' conception of ordering society without neglecting the Augustinian sense of realism. Solidarity is formed by the conviction that one can go beyond one's limited self-interest and self-preservation. Subsidiarity is anchored in the Thomistic principle that the bigger and larger part of the community should respect the diversity of approaches aimed at achieving the good life. For Aquinas, any human law should be directed toward the common good. Thus any law that contradicts the basic orientation to the common good is not a law *in se*.⁵⁵

These foundational Augustinian and Thomistic visions of human institutions run deep in the tradition of CST. Ellacuría is also part of this tradition. Propheticism and utopia are two sides of the same coin. Through propheticism, Ellacuría showed an Augustinian critique of how human institutions—university, and even the church—operate in the realm of sin. Ellacuría went even further by saying that sin was not only committed by the person in an institution, but most importantly it operated in the structure that cut off human beings from participating in building a just community. This structural sin is corporeal and real. It sacrifices millions of victims and throws them into the ditch of dire poverty and bloody conflicts. The university imbued with propheticism has an urgent duty to denounce such structural sin, by showing the reality of the people who suffer on the way to Jericho.

⁵⁴ Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, 59.

⁵⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* Ia-IIae, q. 90, art. 2.

Certainly, the university, like other human institution, has power. Sadly, history proves that it can serve evil purposes. But amid the hardship of slavery in Egypt, the biblical faith of Israel was rooted in the strong belief that God creates everything that is good.⁵⁶ This recognition of the goodness of creation leads humankind to the possibility of redemption. As Walter Wink famously said, “the powers are good, the powers are fallen, the powers must be redeemed.”⁵⁷ A strong belief in the possibility to redeem the power of an institution to serve the human community is at the heart of CST’s utopia. Collaboration in the spirit of solidarity, subsidiarity and the common good is a manifestation of the possibility for such utopia.

By performing the act of collaboration, the university uses power to perform propheticism to address the decentralization of the post-authoritarian community. But, at the same time, the university’s acts of propheticism point to the utopia that the university’s power can be redeemed and can be directed to materialize the biblical vision that all of God’s creation is good. The university’s fidelity to use its power only for performing propheticism and nurturing utopia will transform the post-authoritarian society’s decentered power into empowerment.

Collaboration is a form of empowerment. The university should not presume itself to be the one and only institution that can face and address the problems of a post-authoritarian society. The university should understand itself as one of many social forces. The role of the university in the decentralized post-authoritarian society is in networking with other important social forces (e.g., NGOs, social democratic actors), but more importantly with those who live on the margins. They are the center of any collaborative movement. According to Ellacuría, one central moment of engaging reality is the ethical moment, that is bearing the weight of reality (*el cargar con la realidad*). However, the task of bearing the weight of reality is not a solitary

⁵⁶ Genesis 1:1-31.

⁵⁷ Walter Wink, *The Powers That Be: Theology for a New Millennium* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 31.

project. The university is part of social forces that work shoulder to shoulder in bearing together the weight of reality through a collaborative project to promote the common good. The tradition of CST, as we discussed in the second chapter, provides ample support for this crucial ethical moment of collaboration in bearing the weight of reality.

2.3. Plurality of Asian Cultures and How that Shapes Our Understanding of Being an Asian Jesuit University

In the previous section, we saw that tradition nurtures utopia and sharpens propheticism. However, for Asians, tradition is not limited to the Christian heritage. The Catholic tradition is part of a bigger tradition, a tradition of humanity. Here the third chapter of this dissertation is very important. Peter Phan is right in affirming that, with the great contribution of Ellacuría in understanding the historical mission of the university, there is a difference in ecclesiology between Latin America and Asia.⁵⁸ In Latin America, the Catholic churches have a central position and a very strong presence in the social fabric. While Asia is the first home of Christianity, nonetheless in this continent the number of Christian communities is less than 12% (with the exception of the Philippines and East Timor) in a population of 4.4 billion (2014). In terms of history, Christianity is also considered to be a “young religion” compared to some major Asian religions: Confucianism, Shintoism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. In this context, the Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conference (FABC) continuously sees Christianity as a part of “the great Asian traditions.” Because of this, a self-understanding of being a part of larger religious and spiritual traditions influences FABC to see dialogue as a way of being “the church.”

⁵⁸ Peter C. Phan, “Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J. in Dialogue with Asian Theologians: What Can They Learn From Each Other?” *Horizon* 32, no. 1 (2005): 53-71.

Self-awareness of this historical and contextual location suggests three important points in our appropriation of the Ellacurian historical mission of a different kind of university.

First, in Asia, we witness cultural and religious diversity within our Jesuit/Catholic universities. Even in some institutions, we are serving students mostly from other religions. Diversity shapes a different approach toward reality. A university is actually a “multiversity,” not only in that it is constituted by different departments or centers, but also because it represents the multitudes of a pluralistic society. Therefore, the Ellacurian call to return to reality should not be manifested in a single plan, but through diverse plans.

As I showed in the previous section, tradition shapes one’s understanding of propheticism and utopia. When we deal with many traditions, then we should be ready to embrace a plurality of utopias that will lead to a plurality of manifestations of propheticism. For example: the Islamic understanding of the common good has a different nuance than in Christianity. In the Islamic understanding of the common good (*maslaha ‘amma*, or public interest), we find more source-texts about rituals, morals and social legislation through Islamic jurisprudence (*usul al-fih*). We also see the important role of *ulama* (the cleric/jurist) in exegeting a renewed interpretation (*ijtihad*) of Islamic jurisprudence using three categories: *darura* (necessity), *hajiyyat* (needs), and *tahsiniyyat* (edificatory interests).⁵⁹ While in CST, the natural law tradition that emphasizes using reason and experience plays a prominent role in discerning any concrete applications of the common good.

⁵⁹ Anver M. Emon, “On Islam and Islamic Natural Law: A Response to the International Theological Commission’s *In Search of a Universal Ethic: A New Look at the Natural Law*,” in *Searching for a Universal Ethic: Multidisciplinary, Ecumenical, and Interfaith Responses to the Catholic Natural Law Tradition*, edited by John Berkman and William C. Mattison III (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 125-135. Emon argues that the historical debate between the Ash’arites and Mu’tazilites is not over and still continues today. Therefore, the International Theological Commission’s preference for Mu’tazilite is either “politically naïve” or “imperialistic.”

Second, amid their noticeable differences, Asian theologians have debated about finding an agreeable common ground. Ellacuría could help us in the process of retrieving a normative vision of a Christian/Jesuit university. Ellacuría's threefold engagement with reality (being present in the reality, bearing the weight, and taking charge of the reality) show the humanistic dimension of our historical reality. The point of convergence of our differences is that we are human, and all of us are called to promote any necessary conditions that could help us to grow as human beings. Of course, each tradition has a unique vision of what being human means. The Islamic vision of human being has a different approach and nuance than Christianity. However, at the same time, we share the same conviction that human beings have dignity and that dignity should be promoted and protected, especially in the case of negligence and exclusion. The humanistic dimension of the historical reality which Ellacuría showed could lead us to find a possible common ground amid differences. If that is to be the case, then it is the task of a university to work together with all social forces in a pluralistic society to promote any personal and structural arrangement so that the members of that pluralistic society could be ready to achieve their fullness of being human, personally and collectively.

The third assembly of the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences (1982) named this commitment to work together for the good of our humanity a "dialogue of life" and a "dialogue of action."⁶⁰ We encounter the uniqueness of each other in our day-to-day interaction with our neighbors. Through this encounter, we learn about each other's hopes and despairs. In this encounter, we find connections, we learn about our common problems which impede our aspiration for integral flourishing as human beings. The dialogue of life then could initiate a dialogue of action, when we, as a multi-religious community, respond creatively to the root

⁶⁰ "The Church—A Community of Faith in Asia: Resolutions of the Assembly," in G. B. Rosales and C.G. Arévalo, eds., *For All The Peoples of Asia: Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences Documents from 1970-1991, Vol. 1* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1992), 62-65.

cause of social problems and promote the necessary conditions for the dignity of human life.

Through these dialogues of life and action then we can continue the journey toward a “dialogue of theological exchange” and a “dialogue of religious experience/spirituality.”⁶¹

John Paul II’s apostolic constitution on higher education, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, also highlights the same trajectory by pointing toward the mission of Catholic universities to firmly commit to dialogue with cultures by developing a sense of responsibility toward the integral growth of human beings, especially the ones who live on the margins.⁶²

Third, in the university in order to prepare the space for dialogue of life and action for the advancement of human dignity, we must start by renewing ourselves. The Asian Bishops are aware of the “minority complex” which is pervasive in the Asian Catholic community. This minority complex then breeds fear of going out of its comfort zone, “afraid to step on the toes of government and powerful personalities...fear of losing certain privileges to respect for authority in a foreign land.”⁶³ This minority complex will block any initiative to work together for the Reign of God. But, as FABC V stated, “our minority status should not deter us from patiently working out, in collaboration with Christians of other churches and peoples of other religions and persuasions, the steps needed to liberate our people from the bondage of sin and its societal manifestations, and to inscribe the values of the Reign in Asian society.”⁶⁴

⁶¹ Edmund Kee-Fook Chia, “Interfaith Dialogue and Christian Theology in Asia,” in Peniel Jesudason and Rufus Rajkumar, eds., *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context* (London: SPCK, 2012), 21.

⁶² John Paul II, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, no. 35. Accessed Sept 20, 2015. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_ex-corde-ecclesiae.html

⁶³ “The Prophetic Path to the New Millennium Through Social Advocacy: Summary Report of the Consultation on Advocacy for Justice and Peace in the 21st Century,” in Franz-Josef Eilers, SVD., ed., *For All the Peoples in Asia: Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conference Documents from 1997-2001, Vol. 3* (Quezon City: Claretian Publication, 2002), 51.

⁶⁴ FABC V, art. 4.6 “Journeying Together toward the Third Millennium,” in *For All the Peoples in Asia Vol. 1.*, 282.

If this minority complex is left untreated, it will bring the university in the opposite direction from the vision of a university that uses its social forces to promote propheticism and utopia. History shows the complacency between Asian Catholic institutions and powerful regimes for the sake of survival. Catholic educational institutions have excelled in many more areas than public educational institutions or educational institutions affiliated with other religions. Numerous prominent leaders graduated from Catholic educational institutions. But we cannot deny the fact that many of those leaders are part of the oppressive regimes, of the greedy elites.

Therefore, we cannot set aside a very fundamental question that Pedro Arrupe asked in front of notable Jesuit alumni in Valencia, Spain.

Have we Jesuits educated you for justice? You and I know what many of your Jesuit teachers will answer to that question. They will answer, in all sincerity and humility: No, we have not. If the terms “justice” and “education for justice” carry all the depth of meaning which the Church gives them today, we have not educated you for justice.⁶⁵

Arrupe’s questions invite us to go beyond our minority complex that make us afraid to challenge the dominant majority, or beyond selling our prophetic stance for institutional survival. Arrupe’s question is therapy for our minority complex disorder so that our universities can cooperate with other social forces in the pluralistic society to attain greater dignity of the people.

2.4. The Didactic of *Gotong Royong* as a Habit of the Heart for a Structural Reform

One of the strengths of Ellacuría’s theology of the university is its focus on structural arrangements to be faithful to reality and its orientation toward the promise of the Reign. This structural approach to the university operates in the same way on the necessity for structural

⁶⁵ Pedro Arrupe, S.J., *Men for Others*. Accessed Sept 9, 2015.
<http://onlineministries.creighton.edu/CollaborativeMinistry/men-for-others.html>

arrangements for solidarity toward the common good in CST. The Marxist class analysis has influenced the Latin American reading of the weight of reality by seeing that the problem within reality is not only limited to the “personal level” but goes more deeply to the “structural level.” Structures help people to find a relatively stable ground for participation within their respective communities. Martín-Baró’s take on the difference between complementary mechanism and structural mechanism in making a-different-kind-of-university—where he privileges the structural approach over the complementary one—shows the same tendency as liberationist theologians and CST in identifying the tremendous impact of structural changes on human institutions.

However, the Asian tradition can speak also to this Latin American reading of the university by recalling that the university is also a house of formation. In the university, students are formed to be better persons. Integral development of the person is not limited only to the struggle to provide a structural warranty for growth, but it embraces the real experience of personal growth itself. On this point, the didactic of *gotong royong*, as we discussed at length in chapter three, can complement the dimension that was left untreated by liberationist theologians.

From the point of view of the Indonesian virtue of *gotong royong*, a continuous yet unending struggle to make a-different-kind-of-university needs a constant disposition within a person. One cannot just jump on the train of struggle for liberation if one does not have the ability to jump in the first place. The didactic of *gotong royong* is the core of such ability. It focuses on finding the right place for oneself within the vast network of *macro cosmos* and *micro cosmos*. It helps a person to have a clear vision of her or his personal goals so that his or her energy will not circulate “inward” but will go “outward” for the benefit of others.

From Dewantara, a-different-kind-of-university will learn that propheticism also needs a high level of ability to listen to others, to make a fruitful encounter with the other. Marked by the high diversity of cultures and religions, Stephen Bevans and Roger Schroeder are right when they affirm that propheticism in Asia is manifested in *prophetic dialogue*, which is “based on the beautiful but complex rhythm of dialogue and prophecy, boldness and humility, learning and teaching, letting go and speaking out.”⁶⁶ A prophet has the boldness to denounce the unjust situation and humility to listen to others in order to grasp clearly the weight of reality. These abilities are not magically present when one enters the gate of the university, but as Dewantara argued, they are nurtured from family, from networks of *gotong royong* (mutual help) within society. In many cases, the university just harvests the results of hard work from many previous *gurus* who taught the students to fly out of their tiny worlds.

Dewantara’s triadic relationship of education (family-educational institutions-society) shows that a-different-kind-of-university is inherently related to a-different-kind-of-family and a-different-kind-of-society. In order to be one of the strong moral voices in society, the university can never act alone. It needs other supporting systems: family and society. The role of a-different-kind-of-university is to continue and enhance the already present network of solidarity for the common good that exists in society, to shape such natural communal praxis into a more elaborate praxis—whether in research, teaching, and social projects.

Driyarkara’s retrieval of *Wedhatama* highlights the humanistic vision of education as an ongoing tension between “going against the urge of egoism” and “striving for the good of others.” Experience in a-different-kind-of-university is an experience of both hominization (a natural process of growth) and humanization (a continuous journey to become more human). The

⁶⁶ Stephen B. Bevans and Roger P. Schroeder. *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011), 156.

goal of the process of humanization is developing a civic friendship, to be *homo homini socius*. The duty of solidarity can be abstract. Friendship brings this abstract ethical demand closer to one's daily life. If we can respond to the plea of our close neighbor (i.e., bounded solidarity), then we can extend this bounded solidarity into a more cosmopolitan demand.⁶⁷ Education then for Driyarkara is a rehearsal of making broader friendships, enlarging our close in-group solidarity toward an open solidarity, even solidarity with the unknown, those we just met in the ditch of the Jericho road.

Buchori continues Driyarkara's humanistic education by highlighting the necessity to cultivate the environment of creativity within the university. In the era of high control of the Suharto regime, the university was transformed into an obedient servant for technocratic development which was less concerned about integral development of the people. Creativity requires a guarantee of freedom, not only in the negative sense (freedom from) but also in the positive orientation (freedom for). Failing to guarantee creativity and freedom will breed extremism, which favors violence as a response to the fragility of the world.

Living propheticism and utopia is not easy. They demand a mystique of service and, in extreme cases, they could demand the spirituality of martyrdom. In its more ordinary form, one's spirituality is anchored in *los cotidianos*, in the daily praxis of our life. The didactic of *gotong royong* is helpful in nurturing such spirituality and mystique. For Dewantara, Driyarkara, and Buchori, to be a-different-kind-of-university needs a "habit of the heart" of its members. A willingness to dialogue and an orientation to sustain civic friendship are the daily rehearsals for building such a habit. In the word of *wedhatama*, collaboration is a *laku* (mystical practice) that

⁶⁷ Ron Pagnucco and Peter Gichure, "Solidarity: A Catholic Perspective," in Susan Crawford Sullivan and Ron Pagnucco, eds., *A Vision of Justice: Engaging Catholic Social Teaching on the College Campus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014), 161-181.

converts the youth's imagination toward a broader project of living justly and harmoniously with others.

2.5. Excursus: Academic Freedom in the Challenge of Historical Reality

One striking idea from Ellacuría is the question of leadership in the university, especially the selection of university professors to serve the historical mission of the university. A professor who serves the dominant elite class has no place in “a different kind of university.” This bold statement will challenge the basic norms about academic freedom within the university. How does Ellacuría understand academic freedom within the university that serves its people? Will Ellacuría's proposal degrade the university into a closed-minded attitude, contrary to the pursuit of “*la realidad*” which in most cases is not self-evident?

Ex Corde Ecclesiae focuses on the same problem when it places academic freedom in the larger context of the common good by saying that the university “possesses that institutional autonomy necessary to perform its functions effectively and guarantees its members academic freedom, so long as the rights of the individual person and of the community are preserved within the confines of the truth and the common good.”⁶⁸ It seems that Ellacuría and *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* are on the same page in framing the concept of academic freedom. Academic freedom is placed not as a distinct entity but in its inherent relation to the common good.

My question is not about the simple juxtaposition between freedom and the common good, but how do we understand properly the common good in the first place. From this

⁶⁸ John Paul II, *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, no. 12. Following the promulgation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, there were lively discussions about the role of a *mandatum* from the hierarchy to theologians, which could create tensions when theological teaching or theologian's inquiry collided with ecclesial authority or even simply questioned certain traditional teachings.

understanding, then we can approach the problem of academic freedom in the university that faithfully serves its people.

In the second chapter, we discussed at length the common good. Plurality in the university is just a mirror of plurality in the world. Negating such plurality is not only unrealistic, but can also easily slip into authoritarianism. As I indicated at the end of chapter two of this dissertation, by using Hollenbach's approach to the common good, at least three necessary conditions should be pursued so that the question of academic freedom is still in line with the call to return to reality.

First, the university should guarantee a dialogical environment so that it will better serve society. A dialogical environment could lead many different and conflicting parties to see the possible grounding of their arguments in their unique proposals. If the university is striving toward creating a more open and vibrant civic society, such a process should start from the university itself by making university life vibrant. As James Keenan argues, however, the university is more concerned with the ethical life of other institutions but less concerned for creating and sustaining its own.⁶⁹

But a genuine dialogue requires honesty. Honesty is manifested, for example, by questioning who gives a research grant that leads to a certain policy. Does the donor gain any benefit from the concluded policy? If a research conclusion is tied to a political or economic agenda of the donor, the credibility of such a conclusion receives a bright red mark. Hence, ethically this approach contradicts the very notion of "academic freedom." The question of honesty is also applicable to the leadership of the university. Is the leadership honest enough to the *civitas academica* in its operation? How do the university administrators undertake financial

⁶⁹ James F. Keenan, *University Ethics: How Colleges Can Build and Benefit from a Culture of Ethics* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015).

investments? Who gives money to the university endowment? A crisis of leadership is happening mostly because the university leadership is operated in secret with insufficient transparency and with the risk of leading to an unethical decision in face of the historical mission of the university because there is no mechanism of checks and balances.⁷⁰

Second, the wellbeing of the poor and the marginalized is the fundamental criterion for determining the orientation of academic freedom. This is the ethical criterion that Ellacuría advocates. The life of the marginalized is the fundamental benchmark for determining which proposals should be rejected or accepted. This preferential option is so fundamental in a Jesuit university mission that, if a Jesuit university fails to hold this preferential option as the final criterion, there is no fundamental reason why the university should continue to exist. By paraphrasing Ignatius' Principle and Foundation, the university is a means, not an end. If self-preservation of the institution takes control over the final criterion of *para ayudar las animas*, it is time for the Jesuit institution to reconsider its existence.

After the groundbreaking vision of General Congregation 32 which seeks a “faith that does justice,” Jesuits in Latin America decided to seriously reconsider some of their famous educational institutions because they were considered no longer serving the ideal of Jesuit education, merely serving the elites and becoming more and more distanced from the poor. This decision inflamed big debates on whether such a radical decision was necessary or whether it could be applied in other continents. However, this prophetic boldness of Latin American Jesuits is an inspiring living example of holding the preferential option with and for the marginalized as the fundamental criterion for the very existence of the university. This bold propheticism underlines the tradition of utopia of the daughters and sons of Ignatius. For them, *Ad maiorem*

⁷⁰ See John G. Simon, Charles W. Powers and Jon P. Gunnemann, *The Ethical Investor: Universities and Corporate Responsibility* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972).

Dei gloriam inque hominum salutem is not just a slogan above the university entry door, but “our way of proceeding.”

Third, it is true that a modern university operates in a very complex reality. The complexity of reality in many cases requires a certain flexibility or even compromise. Even the basic principle of the preferential option for the poor and the marginalized sometimes can be translated in numerous different ways. The university relates with more complex entities than in the time of Ellacuría and Ignatius. If a more radical and affirmative stance toward the option for the poor and the marginalized becomes so hard or almost impossible to achieve, the final workable criterion is that in any case the university should seek a diminution of possible injuries. If the university’s ability to engage in “saving the world” is limited, at least universities should avoid getting involved in any action that will “destroy the world.” The application of this “moral minimum” or the least possible harm is certainly less radical than the Ellacurían vision of the university that serves its people. As Simon, Powers and Gunneman wrote, “to be sure, [the principle of moral minimum] will not rebuild cities or make deserts bloom, but it can limit or halt the destruction of life, of opportunity and of beauty. This may not be enough, but it is a great deal.”⁷¹

Academic freedom in the face of the last ethical demand to contain and reduce any possible harm then will both seek a limitation of any proposals that will severely injure the marginalized and a realistic approach to the ideal different-kind-of-university.⁷²

⁷¹ Simon, Powers and Gunnemann, *The Ethical Investor*, 14.

⁷² Sobrino also argued that “[the] option for the poor does not negate pluralism and its positive values, but it does place limits on pluralism...[The option for the poor] has the capacity to bring together objectively the diversity of academic fields and religious stances. The minimum that the option for the poor imposes on the university is that, in the name of pluralism, notorious aberrations not be tolerated; and the maximum is that the university as a whole, respecting legitimate pluralisms, pursue this option.” Sobrino, “The University’s Christian Inspiration,” 165.

3. Conclusion

The 35th General Congregation of the Society of Jesus wrote an important document entitled “Collaboration at the heart of the mission.” This document focused on the urgent call for collaboration and partnership between Jesuits and laypersons working in Jesuit institutions. I believe that the title of this document went beyond its limited topic. Collaboration between Jesuits and laypersons is only one part of a larger view of collaboration with all people of good will, beyond ethnicities and religions. Collaboration is indeed at the heart of mission because our humane collaboration for a shared agenda of the common good is a manifestation of a deeper theological vision of mission: a collaboration between God and humanity. If God is willing to be present in the history of humankind in Jesus Christ, who always goes beyond the boundaries of identity to reach out the marginalized and excluded, we should do the same.

In this chapter, I retrieved Ellacuría’s historical mission of the university in serving its people and society at large. This chapter consisted of two sections. In the first section, I showed a possible retrieval of the Ellacurían vision of a university with a focus on three foundational moments: realize the weight of reality, shoulder the weight of reality, and take charge of the weight of reality. In the second section, I dialogued between the insights that we gathered from the previous chapters and Ellacuría’s idea of a-different-kind-of-university. I concluded that collaboration is indeed a bold manifestation of propheticism, which also points toward a utopia rooted in CST and in the plurality of Asian religious traditions.

In chapter five, we will see the possible operationality of an ethic of collaboration for the common good, with ebbs and flows, in one Jesuit institution of higher education in post-authoritarian Indonesia, Sanata Dharma University.

Chapter V

Best Practices of Collaboration for the Common Good at Sanata Dharma University

In this fifth chapter, I will show the best practices of collaboration for the common good initiated by Sanata Dharma University (SDU). SDU is one of the four institutions of higher education owned by the Indonesian Province of the Society of Jesus together with ATMI Polytechnic Engineering in Solo and Jakarta, and PIKA Wood-Science Institute in Semarang. In this chapter, I argue that through its numerous practices, SDU is trying to be a place of rehearsal for collaboration for the common good in the context of post-authoritarian Indonesia, with its success and failures.

This chapter consists of three sections. In the first section, I reexamine the general scholarship on the changing patterns of student movement in post-authoritarian Indonesia. In the literature, there is a consensus that the post-authoritarian student movement is operating at a more local level and responding to a wide range of issues. This new pattern gives an opportunity to build a more localized approach but also poses a challenge for a university in bringing this local movement toward wider audiences across their noticeable differences. The second section discusses the praxis of collaboration performed by SDU. Using Martín-Baró's approach, the best practices of collaboration in SDU are analyzed by distinguishing two categories: structural and complementary mechanisms. The structural mechanism focuses on the changing vision of SDU within ten years of post-Suharto era, the complexities faced by leadership in grounding these visions, the promotion of Ignatian pedagogy as an alternative approach to highly statist

Indonesian higher education, and the contribution of two important research centers as the response of SDU *qua* university to the problems of a post-authoritarian society. The complementary approach brings the SDU vision into various practices. Two are presented here, namely the *Berbeda itu Biasa!* [Being different is ordinary!] campaign and the annual *Pekan Nasional Kreativitas Mahasiswa* [National Student Research Competition]. In the third section, I propose three points of reflection for understanding the importance of these practices for Indonesian society. I also make six recommendations for better praxis in the future.

1. A Preliminary Consideration: A Local Entrance into National and Global Solidarity

In the first chapter of this dissertation, we analyzed the ebbs and flows of student movements during the Suharto regime and the post-1998 era. The post-authoritarian era marks the decline of organized civil movements, as is shown by the decline of an organized student movements. Several analyses have been proposed. Edward Aspinall argued that the decline of the student movements was due to the dynamic of democratic society itself.¹ A democratic society opens a proliferation of issues which make it hard to find a single unifying issue as we have seen during the struggle of the authoritarian regimes. Hamayotsu went further by analyzing the proliferation of Islamic student movements and how careerism through Islamic political parties has shaped interrelations, even conflicts, between various student organizations. When political parties start to influence and recruit student activists, the emergence of an organized student movement becomes barely possible.² Student movements were no longer seen as the moral voice of the people, but political statements from political parties which backed such movements. There was also a shift from national issues toward more local problems. Current

¹ Aspinall, "Moral Force Politics," 175.

² Hamayotsu, "Beyond faith and identity," 225-247.

student movements relate closely to the problems which are closer to their locations. Other analysis also shows the shift from “street activism” to “hashtag activism,” where millennials are very active in using social media for social justice campaigns.

These previous analyses are helpful in seeing *la realidad* of the post-Suharto era. Imagining a massive organized student movement, as happened during Suharto’s era, is hard to achieve (if not impossible). That historical epoch uniquely shaped a momentum which cannot be repeated. A new era needs a new form of engagement. From the insights of CST in the second chapter, a new form of solidarity should be experienced through the emerging vibrant context of civil society, which is operating at a more local level. Collaboration emerges from small scale communities; and from there, communities join broader and bigger collaborative networks.

When student movements joined the local advocacy groups, in many cases they no longer kept their distinct identity as university students but identified themselves as parts of the larger civil society movements. In 2004, Demos, a research NGO, documented and analyzed the plethora of such initiatives.³ Some notable local initiatives documented in that research were: the collaborations among urban poor communities (e.g., street vendors, beggars, prostitutes, pedicab drivers, scavengers, and victims of forced evictions), local NGOs (e.g. Urban Poor Consortium, Institut Sosial Jakarta, and Sanggar Ciliwung⁴), and university students in Jakarta.⁵ They brought up issues related to the urban poor communities in post-authoritarian Indonesia, such as demanding just treatment and restitution for the victims of forced evictions in Jakarta, and

³ Stanley Adi Prasetyo, et al., *Indonesia’s Post-Soeharto Democracy Movement* (Jakarta: Demos, 2004).

⁴ Institut Sosial Jakarta [ISJ-The Jakarta Social Institute] and Sanggar Ciliwung were NGOs affiliated and staffed by the Indonesian Jesuits. After operating for more than three decades, sadly ISJ was closed in 2005 due to heavy financial problems. Shortly after that, Sanggar Ciliwung was transformed into an independent NGO with numerous university students (among them the Jesuit scholastics) who work as volunteers until today.

⁵ Donni Edwin, “UPC, ISJ and Sanggar Ciliwung: Experiment Towards a New Social Movement” in Prasetyo, et al., *Indonesia’s Post-Soeharto Democracy Movement*, 221-240.

exposing the corruption of Jakarta's social safety network funds. They even brought their causes to the court to challenge and to amend regional regulations which were considered unjust to the urban poor, such as Jakarta's Regional Regulation No.11/1988 which forbade the operation of pedicab drivers in Jakarta and provided legal standing for forced eviction of the Jakarta urban poor who lived in various slums. Instead of forcing the poor out, UPC, ISJ and Sanggar Ciliwung advocated more integral action plans for the urban poor communities by improving the basic structure of health services, and providing educational and economic opportunities so that the urban poor communities could live their lives with dignity. Academics with backgrounds in architecture or urban planning joined this campaign by helping to design a more integral and community-based proposal. After the anti-Chinese riot in Jakarta in 1998, ISJ organized university students from various campuses in Jakarta as volunteers in Team Relawan Kemanusiaan [The Volunteers Team for Humanity] to launch fact-finding investigations of this tragedy. This volunteer team brought the human right issues during the chaotic transitional era (May 1998), not only to the national arena but also to the United Nations.⁶

The same pattern of collaboration between university students, NGOs, and local communities also happened in Aceh during the conflict between the Indonesian military and Aceh opposition movements.⁷ They proposed peaceful negotiations between the Indonesian military and opposition groups, and demanded that the Indonesian government stop extra-judicial violence toward civilians in Aceh that killed nearly 2,511 people from August 1998 to April 2002. These peaceful advocacies led up to the peace agreement in August 2005.

⁶ The Team Relawan Kemanusiaan's full report of the May 98 anti-Chinese tragedy can be found at: <http://www.usachinese.com/Indo/atrocities.html>.

⁷ A.E. Priyono, "Post-DOM Aceh: The Escalation of State Terror and Resistance of Civil Society Movements" in Prasetyo, et al., *Indonesia's Post-Soeharto Democracy Movement*, 513-541.

These emerging social movements in Jakarta and Aceh show the resilience of local democratic actors (i.e., urban poor communities, NGOs, university students) in promoting a more local social justice agenda by demanding a stop to the human rights abuses committed by the state and by challenging the unjust regional regulations which benefitted only the greedy elites.

By saying that a new form of collaboration for the common good should be started from local movements, two points should be considered. First, a new form of localized solidarity should not lose a larger view of “structural injustice,” which not only operates at the national level but also in the global arena: the untamed greed of neoliberalism. However, second, this so-called social evil has been manifested and transformed differently in various part of the world, even in the same nations. Focusing on the local level of struggles will help both the emergence of a plethora of local expressions of solidarity and the possibility to reconnect these local struggles into a broader audience with broader issues. In the first chapter, I also showed that the collaborative movement of 1998 civil society was not a sudden event, but it emerged through various movements that had preceded it. These various local movements prepared the space and made possible a national struggle to trample down the regime.

In doing so, this dissertation argues that higher education can play an important role in sustaining the spirit of localized solidarity for the common good. Higher education could be a venue for a rehearsal, formation of habits for students’ capacity to work with others for social justice. In doing so, higher education should be oriented in that direction. I follow Aspinall’s analysis by highlighting the importance of preparing the space for students’ involvement in various social issues through institutions of higher education. Especially in the era of massification and commodification due to a silent penetration of a neoliberal vision into

education, higher education should look back to its mission in a pluralistic society, and from there, embrace once again the spirit that once animated its existence as a social force for transformation. More importantly, the tradition of Jesuit higher education institution is rooted in the Catholic social tradition and the great Asian traditions. Hence, for such an institution there is no other choice than responding positively to such a call.

2. Striving to Combine Academic Excellence and Humanistic Values

Following Martín-Baró's proposal of a structural change for a different kind of university, we will assess the best practices and also the shortcomings of SDU in employing a vision of university that does justice by working together for the common good. Material for analysis is the university president's reports from 1998 to 2014. I choose this timeline to show how the dynamic of the post-Suharto regime influenced SDU and *vice versa*.

In assessing the best practices and the practices that go against the Jesuits' commitment to social justice, we will use the lenses that we have learnt in the second chapter of this dissertation by asking: how can such practices bring the SDU community to nurture the spirit of solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good? How do these practices make the SDU community embody its historical mission to engage with people's struggle to attain their wellbeing in the pluralistic Asian society? These questions will highlight the theme of collaboration for the common good as the framework for assessing, reflecting, and drawing recommendations for better practices in the future.

The Dutch Jesuit province opened SDU first as a teacher college in 1955. In this newly independent country, there was an immense need to provide good quality education. In the 1900s, the Dutch Jesuits left the already fruitful mission in Flores, East Nusa Tenggara, and

started a new mission in Java, the most populous land in the East Indies and a predominantly Muslim island. The first educational mission in this island was a *Kweekschool*⁸ for native Javanese founded in 1900 in Muntilan Central Java with Frans van Lith, SJ as its headmaster. This teacher training school marked the beginning of the Jesuit educational mission in Java and opened the door of encounter between native Javanese and Christianity. In 1905, Frans van Lith also opened six additional elementary schools and sent the students from the Muntilan *Kweekschool* to be tutors for them.⁹ On July 18, 1911, this school then was transformed into *Xaverius College* and received recognition from the Dutch for their diplomas. Alumni from this college worked in various Catholic and Dutch/state elementary schools and earned great confidence among the public.¹⁰ Several of its alumni also became notable in the pro-independence movement and established the Catholic Party in 1923.

When Indonesia attained its independence on August 17, 1945 and the first generation of Catholic teachers and independence activists had established their important impact on this newly independent country, there was an urgent need to open a higher education institution and also a need for a place of formation for the Catholic laity. The Jesuits responded to this need by opening various post-secondary level crash programs in pedagogy, history, and the English language. During 1954-1955, the Minister of Education urged the Jesuits to institutionalize their

⁸ *Kweekschool* is a teacher training school for the primary school teacher with Dutch language as medium of instruction. However, in Muntilan, Van Lith persistently advocated using the Javanese language. He strongly believed that education should use students' native language, a language they used in everyday life, and not a foreign language [especially the language of the colonizer].

⁹ Floribertus Hasto Rosariyanto, S.J. "Father Franciscus Van Lith, S.J.: Turning Point of the Catholic Church's Approach in the Pluralistic Indonesian Society" (Doctoral diss., Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997), 256.

¹⁰ The following numbers show the urgent need of lay Catholic teachers in the Yogyakarta area. In 1924/1925, there were 90 lay Catholic teachers, serving approximately 2,900 students in Yogyakarta. In ten years, the number surged to 280 lay Catholic teachers, serving approximately 10,300 students. Anton Haryono, *Awal Mulanya Adalah Muntilan* [In the beginning is Muntilan] (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2009), 146.

various short courses into a teacher college. Therefore, in October 20, 1955, the Superior of the mission in Indonesia combined these short courses into Sanata Dharma Teachers College. The Indonesian government then gave its approval and ratified this teacher college on December 17, 1955.

The name Sanata Dharma means “the true service” or “the real service”; it relates closely to the idealism that inflamed Catholic activists during the Indonesian independent movement. It was through educating good teachers that this newborn higher education, which also represented the Catholic Church in the predominantly Muslim society, aspired to contribute to the common good of society. After it received government approval for its operation, the Jesuit Superior missioned Nicolaus Drijarkara as its first president.

Entering the second millennium, there was a continuous discernment between Jesuits and lay professors at Sanata Dharma Teacher College about how to better respond to the changing modern Indonesian society. While education was still the core mission, the modern Indonesian society also faced the complex problems of technology and science. A teacher college was considered as limited in responding to the fast pace of technological development. Therefore, in April 20, 1993, after years of deliberations, Sanata Dharma transformed itself from a teacher college into a university with six additional departments beyond its traditional teacher training: humanities, pharmacy, psychology, natural sciences, engineering, and theology. In April, 1999, SDU started graduate programs in English Literature, Religion and Culture and a Licentiate in Theology.¹¹

¹¹ Universitas Sanata Dharma, *Rencana Strategis Universitas Sanata Dharma 2003-2007* [The Strategic Plan of SDU 2003-2007] (Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University, 2003), 5-8.

Today, SDU serves 10,910 students with 351 administrators and 331 professors, 8 departments, with various research centers, with its slogan of “combining academic excellence with humanistic values” or shortened to “excel and [become] humanist.”

2.1 Structural Mechanisms for Collaboration in Civil Society

2.1.1 Strategic Planning

During the opening ceremony of SDU’s new campus on July 10, 1999, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., the Jesuit Superior General at that time, wrote on the plaque for the new building as follows: “Let learning and research be instrumental to Truth, Faith and Justice.” This sentence is a summary of his address during that event, when he said

In a university with a Catholic and Jesuit tradition, the search and communication of truth cannot be separated from service to society. Knowledge is not an end in itself, but it is directed to the service of the development of the people in society. Only in this view, a search and communication of truth, which is the fundamental reason for a university’s existence, will we bring the university to its goal in its fullness.¹²

The SDU’s 2003-2007 strategic plan envisioned three goals. First, SDU would strive for the ongoing search for truth in freedom. Second, SDU was called to contribute to the national common work of cultivating the integral development of youth through teaching, research and service. Therefore, future Indonesian generations will be actively yet creatively involved in building a just and democratic pluralistic society. Third, this collaborative endeavor for the common good of Indonesian society is based on both the tradition of Indonesian society itself and the tradition of the Jesuit order, especially as advocated by Pedro Arrupe: to be men and women for others, in respecting the uniqueness of the human person (*cura personalis*), and in its

¹² Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J.’s address to Sanata Dharma University, July 10, 1999, as cited in Universitas Sanata Dharma, *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Tahun 1999* [The 1999 Annual Report of the President of University] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 1999), 6.

option for and with the poor. This idealism was carried out in the spirit of dialogue and in the endeavor to be “more” (*magis*).

This vision then was materialized in five strategic plans, namely a) capacity-building for professors and administrators, b) improving the effectivity and efficiency of organization and management, c) improving the quality of teaching for qualified alumni, d) improving the quality of student accompaniment and e) improving the resources of the university. From these five strategic plans, it was clear that the focus during this era was to improve organizational capabilities within SDU.¹³

Though there was a strong vision of joining in the collaborative vision of social justice, we cannot find explicit mention of such a vision in its strategic plans. There were two important reasons for this more internal focus during this period. First, SDU had just recently transformed itself from a teachers college into a full university with six additional departments. This transition demanded a more internal focus to provide institutional support for this newly established university, e.g., building new classrooms, and providing a better ratio of professors and students in the new departments.

Second, this focus on more internal management factors seemed to capture the national situation, especially within Indonesian academia, shortly after Suharto’s fall. In 2004 SDU annual anniversary celebration and its featured lecture [*Dies Natalis Studium Generale*], St. Sunardi eloquently reflected the deep sense of angst after the fall of Suharto’s regime.¹⁴ Within five years after Suharto’s fall, there were numerous bloody ethnic and religious conflicts that killed thousands. “Religious war” between Christians and Muslims in the Moluccas was still on

¹³ Paulus Suparno, S.J., SDU President 2000-2004, interview by author, Yogyakarta, April 27, 2015.

¹⁴ St. Sunardi, *Tahta Berkaki Tiga: Kepemimpinan Universitas dan Moral Perguruan Tinggi* [A Chair with Three Legs: University Leadership and the Morality of Higher Education] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2004).

the national stage. Ethnic cleansing of Madurese by the Dayak group had just finished in 2001 and Indonesian society was still trying to understand how such tragedies could have happened. But, in 2004, Indonesia was just finishing its “first free” direct presidential election that happened through a relatively peaceful and accountable process. These two contrasting experiences (bloody ethnic/religious conflicts and a peaceful democratic transition) made civil society—and of course academia—struggle to understand the new experience of democracy, the dream that had been desired for so long. But they also had to face the fact that such democratic institutions were not able to stop the vivid horror of ethnic/religious conflicts.

In his reflection, Sunardi argued that these unspeakable atrocities and the inability of civil society to respond to them should pull academia to focus on its mission as a center of learning by developing a certain kind of leadership, which he called “a chair with three legs.” The three legs of this kind of leadership are: intellectuality, morality, and fortitude. The deep crisis of post-authoritarian Indonesia was due to the lack of such leadership. Therefore, the role of higher education is to prepare students so that they can be future leaders from the local to the national level. The university should prepare students to be public intellectuals with a sense of history and a sensitivity toward the marginalization of the public good. In a growing unhealthy focus on personal pietism and consumerism, the university was expected to prepare leaders who would be able to cultivate public morality through a commitment to protect and respect the diverse forms of living together in society. The future leaders also need the virtue of fortitude: a willingness to take risks in engaging in any struggle for the common good, to be a voice against any dictatorial threat.¹⁵ Sunardi then concluded his reflection by highlighting the sense of process. Educating a leader is a long and a back-and-forth process. This ongoing formation does not lead to a sudden

¹⁵ Sunardi, *Tahta Berkaki Tiga*, 66-75.

result. The image of the chair with three legs captures the idea of a leader who is always willing to learn, and not just to sit comfortably on an ordinary chair (with four legs), to be aware of the dynamic within society, to have the fortitude to stand behind the minority, the poor and those whose rights are neglected by the majority. A chair with three legs manifests a commitment to never stop learning. When a leader starts to sit comfortably in his or her four-legged chair, the process of human flourishing is over. His or her energy as a leader will be used solely to preserve power, and not for the common good. Then leadership starts to decay.

In the 2013-2017 SDU strategic plans, we encounter a different spirit. If the 2003-2007 strategic plan was more careful to grasp the newly post-authoritarian era, the strategic plan of 2013-2017 is more optimistic. The SDU mission statement for this current term is educating to be “a digger for truth who is excellent and a humanist for the realization of the dignity of society.”¹⁶ This vision is then manifested in three missions: a) developing a holistic educational system which combines academic excellence and humanistic values through a dialogic, pluralistic, *cura personalis*, and transformative approach; b) creating an academic community that respects the academic freedom and the autonomy of each discipline while fostering the ability for interdisciplinary collaboration, and promoting the depth of knowledge—instead of its broadness—through teaching, research and community service; c) enlightening society through publication and community services, collaboration with various partners who have the same vision, and empowerment of alumni in their participation in a pluralistic society. From these three mission statements, SDU is striving to develop four core values: a) depth and holism, b) reflective ability, c) transformative collaboration, d) the Ignatian spirit of *magis*. If we review the transition of mission statements between the 2003-2007 strategic plans and the 2013-2017

¹⁶ Universitas Sanata Dharma, *Rencana Strategis 2013-2017* [The Strategic Plans of 2013-2017] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2013),

strategic plans, within ten years SDU has transformed itself from a more inward-looking Jesuit higher educational institution to a more outward and collaborative vision.

It must be noted that the current Jesuit Superior General Adolfo Nicolás's remarks during the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities meeting in Mexico City in 2010 deeply influenced the formulation of this mission statement.¹⁷ In an age of globalized and abundant information, the world is entrapped in a "globalization of superficiality" which in the end curtails human ability to respond to the needs of others. Nicolás pushed Jesuit higher education institutions to pursue both the depth of knowledge as centers of learned ministry, and to cultivate a new commitment to collaboration, first among Jesuit higher education institutions and then with all social forces in this globalized world.

Asian Jesuit universities received a special task to dialogue in the context of religious pluralism and poverty. In his address to Sogang University in Korea, Nicolás said that searching for wisdom is the tradition of learning in Asia.¹⁸ In the face of "unbridled competition, greed [and] the hunger for power and position,"¹⁹ it is a challenge for an Asian university to be a community of wisdom and service. Transmission of wisdom is not the same as giving abundant information in the classroom. "Wisdom comes through practice, particularly, the practice of compassion and service."²⁰

¹⁷ Adolfo Nicolás, S.J., *Depth, Universality, and Learned Ministry: Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education Today*. Accessed Oct 5, 2015.

http://www.sjweb.info/documents/ansj/100423_Mexico%20City_Higher%20Education%20Today_ENG.pdf.

¹⁸ Adolfo Nicolás, S.J., *The University as A Community of Wisdom and Service: Address to the Sogang University Community*. Accessed Oct 5, 2015.

http://www.sjweb.info/documents/ansj/140116_Korea_Sogang_University_Community.pdf.

¹⁹ Ibid., 4.

²⁰ Ibid., 4.

With this ethos as a background, Paulus Wiryono Priyotamtama, S.J. highlighted the Ellacurian mission of a Jesuit university by seeing SDU as a *proyecto social* in his concluding *memoriale* at the end of his term as SDU president.²¹ This vision was carried out through various programs during his two terms as president of SDU, such as supporting community education especially through the teachers college; health care services to rural communities in Yogyakarta through the department of Pharmacy, getting involved in the local and national debate on conflict and reconciliation; supporting various campaigns on sustainable living by the department of biological education. Due to its location near Mount Merapi, SDU was also very active in the emergency responses during the big eruption in October 2010. The department of Economics and Management actively engages in introducing social entrepreneurship through microfinance for low-income families as an empowering response to the problem of poverty. In order to implement SDU's vision and missions, SDU should be ready to engage in creating broader networks with various social forces. However, in networking with various partners which often have different visions, SDU should always make a prudent discernment and exercise the virtue of humility so that it might learn from the ebbs and flows during the daily struggles to bring about its vision and mission.²²

2.1.2 Leadership

The leadership of SDU is in the hands of the president, under the auspices of the board of trustees and the Provincial of the Indonesian Jesuit Province. During the years 1998-2014, there

²¹ Paulus Priyono Priyotamtama, S.J., *Menjadi Universitas Yesuit yang Berkontribusi Nyata Bagi Pembangunan Kemartabatan Bangsa: Catatan-Catatan Refleksi Akhir Jabatan* [Becoming a Jesuit University which Contributes to the Development of the Nation's Dignity: Reflections on Concluding My Term] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2014), 3.

²² Ibid., 8.

were 3 Jesuit presidents and the current layperson. It was during the leadership of Paulus Wiryono Priyotamtama, S.J., that SDU embodied a strong vision of collaboration for social justice. At the same time, he was willing to make a controversial decision, especially by collaborating with the government and corporations. In my interview with Priyotamtama, he argued that the university should be open to cooperate with everyone, through trial and error in implementing what it means to be a *proyecto social* in the Indonesian context. He initiated several collaborative efforts with the government, NGOs or in helping corporations to implement their corporate social responsibility programs.²³

One debate that emerged during his tenure as SDU president was the decision made by the leadership of the university (the board of trustees and the president of SDU) to accept a soft loan in the form of 2.2 % shares in a gold mining industry operated in East Nusa Tenggara. This mining industry was operated by Newmont Cooperation, the Indonesian Government and Indonesian business entities. In light of the first chapter of this dissertation, this mining industry is one example of extractive capitalism, led by transnational cooperation, in order to plunder Indonesian national resources. Some local NGOs had already raised concerns about the threat to local biodiversity because of the mine's submarine tailing disposal system to funnel its mining waste to Senunu Bay.²⁴ It is ironic that the same tailing system was considered illegal in United States, Newmont Corp's headquarters, due to its environmental impact. In their arguments, the leadership of SDU took the soft loan because they wanted to influence the decision-making

²³ Interview by author, Yogyakarta, April 27, 2015.

²⁴ Newmont disposes nearly 140,000 tons/day of its mining waste in the Senunu Bay or nearly 51 million tons/year. Benny Juliawan, S.J., The Coordinator of Social Apostolate of the Jesuit Conference in Asia-Pacific. E-mail message to Indonesian Jesuits, January 1, 2014. However, Newmont Nusa Tenggara claimed safety for such practices on their website. Newmont Nusa Tenggara, *Mengenal Tailing Langsung ke Sumbernya* [Understanding the Tailing Practice from Its Source], Accessed Oct 21, 2015. <http://www.ptnnt.co.id/id/2015/bootcamp/mining/mengenal-tailing-langsung-ke-sumbernya-di-konsentrator-dan-teluk-senunu.aspx>.

among the shareholders so that this extraction could bring more benefit to Indonesian society and not to the greedy business elite.

This decision inflamed a big debate among the Jesuits. Supporters of the investment argued that this decision was a reflection of Jesuit willingness to reach a new form of “frontier” in service to society. However, the opposing camp argued that the leadership was naïve to think that with such a small share (2.2%) they could influence the orientation of stockholders. It turned out that, in 2012, the local government in East Nusa Tenggara received less than 1% of the total annual profit.²⁵ This finding also showed the inability on the leadership’s part to apprehend the complexity of post-authoritarian Indonesian politics. Moreover, from the environmental and social point of view, this investment can be interpreted as an approval of using any means—even an evil one—as long as it is directed toward the good. It is clearly contradictory to the basic rule of ethics that the end should not justify the means. After years of debate, the Jesuit Provincial finally decided that the leadership should divest the stock entirely in 2015.

Sadly, such a big investment decision was made only within the Jesuits’ circle. Because this debate was limited *ad intra*, there were no public discussions for the SDU community to be able to voice their perspectives. This attitude is also a reflection of the reality of an institution in the post-authoritarian era. Hybridity between “secrecy” and the desire to be more “open and transparent” effects every institution in Indonesian society. The state, the (Jesuit) university, and even the Church, in many cases, work with no different degree of transparency.

From the point of view of collaboration for the common good, SDU’s decision to invest in the gold mining industry went against the Jesuits’ commitment to social justice and integrity

²⁵ Kompas, “Emas Dikeruk Newmont, Sumbawa Barat Hanya Raih Royalti 20 Milyar.” Accessed Oct 1, 2015.
<http://bisniskeuangan.kompas.com/read/2013/12/26/1653035/Emas.Dikeruk.Newmont.Sumbawa.Barat.Hanya.Raih.Royalti.Rp.20.Miliar>

of creation. As I advocate in this dissertation, an ethic of collaboration based on the tradition of CST involves three important components: solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good. From the point of view of solidarity and the common good, there were no justified arguments that such an investment will bring more benefit to local communities or that such an investment will make SDU respond better to the needs of local communities or other marginalized communities in Indonesia. The wellbeing of the local community was totally absent in the overall debate about this investment. Sadly, SDU was just being used as a whitewash for this untamed extractive capitalism which preys on any natural resources for its own profits. SDU's naïve assumption trapped them in the battle of the greedy elites without the ability to have any influence at all. The lack of transparency and the refusal to engage with a wide range of dialogue partners, not only within the SDU community but more importantly with the local communities who had to take the environmental impact from the mining waste, is a contradiction to the principle of subsidiarity.

2.1.3 Pedagogy

As I discussed in the first chapter, the Suharto regime put strong controls on educational policy from elementary to tertiary education. During the height of Suharto's powerhouse state in the late 1980s, any political activities on campus were forbidden. This high level of control created a system of statism that persists even after the reform era. Higher education has less freedom in developing and tailoring a distinctive curriculum that serves its mission.

In its limited space for creativity, SDU tries to implement Ignatian pedagogy in its curriculum, especially in the core courses. SDU believes that Ignatian pedagogy will bring the subject of learning closer to the experience of the Indonesian people. Ignatian pedagogy consists

of five important parts: acknowledging the context, embracing student experiences, conducting reflective analysis, proposing planned actions, and final reflection on praxis. SDU provides trainings, seminars, and funding each year for professors to implement Ignatian pedagogy in their courses. However, there are mixed responses from faculty on relying to Ignatian pedagogy.²⁶ Some argue that Ignatian pedagogy is not practical, especially for natural science majors. There is also the fact that some professors are reluctant to revise their syllabi and lesson plans, especially when they are already burdened with heavy loads of teaching.²⁷

Nevertheless, for the professors and students who engaged in Ignatian pedagogy, their class experience was more than acquiring new information. Ignatian pedagogy is experienced as an invitation to an integral vision of life which could lead to an integral transformation. Ignatian pedagogy starts from one's context, and it helps to situate the classroom in the professor-students' daily experience. Education is no longer located in a vacuum.

Rosa shared her experience in using Ignatian pedagogy for her class on "Introduction to Information Technology."²⁸ She invited her students from the beginning of the course to bring in their contexts and propose a final project at the end of the semester on how information technology could help them better respond to their concerns in society. By always referring to the societal context, Rosa acknowledged that students were more engaged and critical during the course. She was amazed by her students' creative projects, e.g. using information technology to provide better data about water conditions, helping street vendors to advertise their products through websites, using message gateways to mobilize a blood drive. In the context of a

²⁶ Tarsisius Sarkim, the provost of SDU 2014-2017, interview by author. April 20, 2015.

²⁷ Universitas Sanata Dharma, *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Tahun 2009* [The 2009 Annual Report of The President of University] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2009), 10.

²⁸ P.H. Prima Rosa, "Belajar Menjadi Pendidik: Dari Hati dengan Cinta," [Learning to Be an Educator: From Heart with Love] *Jurnal Spiritualitas Ignasian* 12, no 1 (2010), 10-18.

corrupted government, one of her students proposed a system to track government decisions to grant remission to convicts so that the public could know if such a remission was legitimate or not.

Rosa also shared her experience that, by using Ignatian pedagogy, she became closer with her students. Some even shared their experience on dealing with personal challenges in their studies, the relationships with their families, their fears and hopes. So, she invited her students to write essays about “who am I” and she was amazed by their stories. Ignatian pedagogy indeed demands more time and energy than the classical approach to teaching. It is also true that this pedagogy is not practical. But, she concluded that Ignatian pedagogy gave her and her students the joy of learning. This genuine joy is the source of the integral transformation that she witnessed in her life and in the lives of her students.

Another best practice of SDU in tweaking their limited space of freedom in the strong statism of Indonesian higher education is in designing the mandatory core class so that it can help to raise both critical awareness about social problems in Indonesian society and generate ideas for finding possible solutions for such problems. One element of the core curriculum is “Introduction to Philosophy.”

In 2011, several SDU professors conducted research to assess the influence of the core curriculum in the process of integral formation of the students. This research found that the core curriculum helped students to be more critical of the problems in society and raised awareness of the importance of dialogue in a pluralistic society. The core curriculum also helped them to be more engaged in their local community, or active through various social campaigns in social

media (Facebook, Twitter), and writing in blogs.²⁹ Knowing various philosophical traditions also made the students more aware not only about the positive side of technology in human society but also about its possible negative impact on human relationships, especially in the context of Javanese society in Yogyakarta, where there is an ongoing process of transformation from a closed-rural community to a more open and multicultural one. Activism through student associations is pumped up through students' encounter with various critical thinkers whom they learn about in class.

However, in this research it is interesting that students were more familiar with western philosophers (Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Husserl, Karl Marx). Karl Marx was the most famous philosopher among the students. This is understandable because until today Marxism and Communism are still forbidden in Indonesia due to the history of the failed Communist coup in 1965 that marked the beginning of the Suharto regime. This prohibition only makes students more curious to read and study Marx's work. But, there is no record in the research to show any student interest in Driyarkara, Ki Hajar Dewantara, Mangunwijaya or other Indonesian philosophers. This is quite ironic because almost at the same time as this research, a team of SDU professors had just finished editing and publishing the collected works of Driyarkara.³⁰

2.1.4 Research Center

One additional feature that we should add to the structural arrangement of the return to reality is the importance of a research center. A university in today's world operates as a multiversity, with various departments and centers. That is also the case with SDU. There are

²⁹ Budi Susanto et al., *Filsafat Keterbukaan: Pluralitas Indonesia* [The Philosophy of Openness: Indonesian Plurality] (Yogyakarta: Fakultas Teologi Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2011), 22-23.

³⁰ Budi Subanar, S.J., one of the editors of Driyarkara's collected works, told me in an interview that SDU's interest in Driyarkara was a recent phenomenon, after being neglected for quite a long time.

several research centers which are directed to respond to the vision of a *proyecto social*. Two research centers that embody the vision of the university as a *proyecto social* in a post-authoritarian society are PUSDEP and PSL.

PUSDEP stands for *Pusat Sejarah Dan Etika Politik* [Center for History and Political Ethics]. As its name indicates, this research center focuses on conducting various research, publications, lectures, mentoring student theses on the subject of Indonesian history and political ethics. Of course, the director of the center has influence on selecting the angle and theme from the wide area of Indonesian history. Under Baskara Tulus Wardaya, S.J., PUSDEP was more focused on research on the human rights tragedy at the beginning of Suharto's regime, especially around the year 1965. As I showed in the first chapter, the rise of the Suharto regime killed nearly 600,000 lives of his political opponents, especially ex-members of the Communist Party and Soekarno's own loyalists. Thousands of people were exiled to Buru island. "This year of living dangerously" marked a deep wound in Indonesian history. History became the battleground when Suharto created his own version of the event with the justification that such massive human rights abuse was justifiable in order "to save the nation." Every October 1, every student from elementary to high school was marshaled to a local movie theater to watch the propaganda movie created by Suharto's apparatchiks.

PUSDEP enters this battleground of memory by reversing the point of view, not from the point of view of the victor, Suharto's regime, but from that of the survivors. PUSDEP has conducted various research on this national tragedy and then published books or articles, e.g., *Cold War Shadow: United States Policy Toward Indonesia 1953-1963* (2007),³¹ *Suara di Balik Prahara: Berbagai Narasi tentang Tragedi '65* [The Voice Behind Disaster: Various Narratives

³¹ Baskara Tulus Wardaya, S.J., *Cold War Shadow: United States Policy Toward Indonesia, 1953-1963* (Yogyakarta: PUSDEP and Galang Press, 2007).

of the '65 Tragedy] (2011),³² *Truth Will Out: Indonesian Accounts of the 1965 Mass Violence* (2013).³³ In 2004-2005, PUSDEP worked together with the Department of Theology to conduct a seminar on the Theology of Reconciliation. During this course, members of the seminar listened and learned from the survivors how they reflected on their traumatic experiences and their demand for justice and reconciliation, and how these narratives shaped the survivors' and the students' understanding about God. These various moving and powerful narratives were published in 2007 in a book entitled *Menyebrangi Sungai Air Mata: Kisah Tragis Tapol '65 dan Upaya Rekonsiliasi* [Crossing The River of Tears: Tragic Stories of '65 Political Prisoner and Reconciliation Efforts].³⁴

As a research center, PUSDEP works in a large collaborative advocacy for the installment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission for the survivors of the 1965 tragedy. But more importantly, PUSDEP works closely with the group of victims, namely *Sekretariat Bersama Korban 65* [Joint Secretariat for Survivors of 1965], shortened as *SekBer*.³⁵ During the Suharto regime, the survivors of the 1965 purge have been denied their basic rights and cast out from society. Even merely to obtain an identity card or a driving license was a constant and painful struggle for them. Survivors even had to report and obtain a special permit from the district office every time they planned to move to another place.³⁶ *SekBer* works with many groups in Indonesian society to push the post-authoritarian government to provide equal services to

³² Baskara Tulus Wardaya, S.J., *Suara di Balik Prahara: Berbagai Narasi tentang Tragedi '65* (Yogyakarta: Galang Press, 2011).

³³ Baskara Tulus Wardaya S.J. and Jeniffer Linsay, eds., *Truth Will Out: Indonesian Accounts of the 1965 Mass Violence* (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University Press, 2013).

³⁴ Antonius Sumarwan, S.J., *Menyebrangi Sungai Air Mata: Kisa Tragis Tapol '65 dan Upaya Rekonsiliasi* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2007).

³⁵ Baskara T. Wardaya, S.J., *Restoration Without Politics?* Accessed Oct 5, 2015.
<http://www.insideindonesia.org/reconciliation-without-politics-2>

³⁶ Adriaan Bedner, *Citizenship Restored*. Accessed Oct 5, 2015.
<http://www.insideindonesia.org/citizenship-restored-2>

survivors as rightful citizens. *SekBer* has met with several city majors to demand this equal treatment.

PUSDEP is currently inactive due to its internal process of reorganization and reorientation. Therefore, Baskara Tulus Wardaya, S.J.—the previous director of PUSDEP—continues to work on the issues of the 1965 tragedy through PUSDEMA, *Pusat Kajian Demokrasi dan Masyarakat* [Center for the Study of Democracy and Society].

PSL stands for *Pusat Studi Lingkungan* [Center of Environmental Studies]. PSL was affiliated with the Department of Education in Biology, with four missions: a) building awareness in society about the importance of the quality and sustainability of the environment so that it will insure a better quality of living for all, b) promoting the formation of civil societies able to conserve energy, c) introducing the application of sustainable living, d) engaging with the community to deal with environmental issues.³⁷

In pursuing its mission, PSL works closely in collaboration with the Indonesian branch of the United Nations Development Program (namely Global Environment Facility), NGOs working on environmental issues (e.g., Yayasan Nawakamal, Gerakan Masyarakat Agraris Indonesia, Yayasan Kanopi Indonesia), universities in the Yogyakarta area, the Archdiocese of Semarang, and corporations.

During the leadership of Priyotamtama, PSL was very active in conducting research, public discussion, community service, and sharing the benefits of sustainable living with the local community. In 2010, PSL worked with local communities along the Gunung Kidul coast in responding to their energy shortage—a persistent problem for community living in a coastal area—by building a wind-power plant. This renewable energy resource was not only addressing

³⁷ Pusat Studi Lingkungan. Accessed Oct 2, 2015.
<https://www.usd.ac.id/lembaga/lppm/pusat.php?kode=ket&noid=12>

the problems of the local community but also introducing clean and non-greenhouse-gas energy sources which could foster sustainable and green living.

However, the biggest challenge that PSL received was in helping corporations to fulfill their corporate social responsibility (CSR) projects. Critics showed the ambiguity of CSR in the face of the real demand for environmental protection, since most of the CSR projects usually are not related to the problem of their core business. In 2011, PSL was in charge of a collaborative work between SDU and Swakarsa Sinarsentosa Corporation by upgrading the pedagogical system in a local school near Swakarsa's operation, in Muara Wahau, East Kalimantan.³⁸ This local school was the only educational institution accessible to three indigenous tribes in Muara Wahau. There was a dilemma in accepting this offer: should PSL/SDU work with corporations which have a bad track record on environmental issues? If PSL/SDU refused the contract, then who will help the three indigenous tribes in Muara Wahau to get a better education?

Understanding this dilemma, before signing an agreement with Swakarsa corporation, PSL and the SDU leadership stated their core vision to the Swarkarsa management that PSL/SDU must have freedom in designing a pedagogy for these indigenous communities, and such a pedagogy in the long run could stimulate critical awareness from local community toward Swakarsa's operation.

2.2 Complementary Mechanism for Collaboration in Civil Society

In this section we will look at the complementary mechanism on various SDU projects in sustaining a spirit of collaboration in post-authoritarian Indonesia. Categorizing these activities as “complementary” does not mean to minimize their importance and possible impact—as the

³⁸ Universitas Sanata Dharma, *Laporan Tahunan Rektor 2011* [The 2011 Annual Report of the President of University] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2011), 2.

modern use of this word could suggest. We can even argue that these complementary mechanisms are at the forefront of the university's outreach to civil society. Precisely because these activities embody and ground the general SDU vision to "combine academic excellence and humanistic values," they are complementary in the true sense of that word, which is "to make complete" and "to bring to perfection."³⁹

Two current activities are carried out by SDU students with the accompaniment of the professors. While surely there are numerous undocumented collaborative activities in SDU, these two activities are unique in that both respond to problems of post-authoritarian Indonesia and show the characteristics of student movements in this era.

2.2.1 *Berbeda itu biasa!* (Being Different is Ordinary!)

Indonesian society experienced the year of 2014 as its most divisive time in the post-Suharto era. Presidential elections brought the majority of Indonesians into two opposing camps: a) Prabowo Subiyanto, a former military general, one of Suharto's sons-in-law and a part of the ruling oligarch, and b) a populist figure, Joko Widodo. The most disturbing experiences during the presidential campaigns were the instances of hate, the use of racial epithets, and the negative campaign directed especially to Widodo's camp. The words "Chinese," "Christian," or "Non-Natives" became part of cheap tactics to garner popular support for Subiyanto's side. While there was no record of actual violence, much less death, during the presidential campaigns, the prevalence of racial and religious language was troublesome. The rise of religious intolerance during Yudhoyono's presidency, and his inability to assure the rule of law especially toward the

³⁹ Collins Online English Dictionary, Accessed Oct 6, 2015.
<http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/complement>.

minorities, was the larger context that made this vivid discriminatory language possible. Two years before the elections, some Sunni extremists ruled out the Ahmadiyah muslim community as non-Islamic and forbade the exercise of its religious rights. In the same year, several churches were forced to close for the inconceivable reason of violating permits. A peaceful recognition of being different seems to be a rare gem in post-authoritarian Indonesia.

To respond to this problem, the SDU Campus Ministry launched a yearlong program, called “Being different is ordinary.” This collaborative program was conducted by three parties: SDU Campus Ministry, an NGO named Ketjil Bergerak [Small Moves], and a local community along Code River named Juminahan. The purpose of this program was to help both students and the local community to reflect on the current experience of intolerance toward diversity and to find possible resources to embrace differences in daily life.⁴⁰ Yogyakarta, the city where SDU is located, always claims to be “a city of tolerance.” The daunting question was how the city redefine itself in the face of intolerance during the 2014 presidential campaigns.

This campaign was undertaken in collaboration with Ketjil Bergerak, a local NGO that works with youth especially by using art as a medium to voice their concern.⁴¹ Juminahan is a small urban village in Yogyakarta, struggling with the problem of poverty and more lately in protecting its public space against the city’s aggressiveness in hotel construction. Yogyakarta is also known as a tourism hotspot. The collaboration among these three entities (SDU, Ketjil Bergerak, Juminahan) to bring the message to the people was then manifested in several forms. First, there were numerous public campaigns from street art, and social media to sound the topic of respecting difference. Street art itself is still illegal in Yogyakarta. Second, the main event was

⁴⁰ Antonious Febri Harsanto, The Coordinator of SDU’s Campus Ministry, interview by author, Yogyakarta, April 29, 2015.

⁴¹ Information on Ketjil Bergerak can be found on their website: <http://www.ketjilbergerak.org>.

a full day of public performances in Juminahan. SDU students, professors, Jesuits, and the leadership of the university blended with the Juminahan community. There were art performances, but also dialogue on their current experiences of responding to diversity. The



Figure 5.1. Campaign with street art. © Ketjil Bergerak.

dialogue between students and the local community broadened further. With the background of hip hop, jazz and Javanese music, the Juminahan community and students shared their concern about corruption, about their anxiety of losing public space due to the excess of

commercial constructions, radicalism, and the hope of being more caring toward others.⁴²

The event itself did not end that night. It was just the beginning of a new relationship. The people in Juminahan asked SDU to support their causes: a) to propose a moratorium on the city's excessive hotel construction that not only severely limits public space but also causes water crises to the people who live nearby, b) to find an alternative education for the youth in Juminahan who do not have any opportunity to go to college. Ketjil Bergerak is now helping SDU to connect with other universities in bringing the cause to a wider public.⁴³ One of them is Solo State University that has a department of architecture. This coalition is trying to propose a sustainable plan to the city especially in managing public spaces.

⁴² In Nugroho Budisantoso, *Dari Juminahan Melawan Pengingkaran Perbedaan* [A Challenge from Juminahan to Any Denials of Difference]. Accessed Oct 1, 2015. <http://www.ketjilbergerak.org/dari-juminahan-melawan-pengingkaran-perbedaan-oleh-rm-in-nugroho-budisantoso/>.

⁴³ Greg, the Leader of Ketjil Bergerak, interview by author. April 28, 2015.

2.2.2 *Pekan Kreativitas Mahasiswa Nasional* [National Student Research Competition]

Every year the Ministry of Education holds a student competition, called Student Creativity Competition. The purpose of this competition is to foster student creativity in proposing alternative projects to respond to certain important issues in society. With this competition, the Ministry is hoping to bring the university closer to society as a center of learning.

SDU takes this student competition very seriously, more than I have witnessed in other universities in Yogyakarta. This institutional support is manifested in the form of the faculty's accompaniment and providing financial assistance for the project. Every year, more than a dozen proposals from SDU students pass the regional selection and compete in the national presentations. Here are examples of their project titles:⁴⁴

- Enhancing Living Skills through the Montessori Method for Street Children in Pingit Community, Yogyakarta
- Influencing Inmates' Autonomy through Theatrical Activities in Yogyakarta Prison
- Understanding and Developing Multiculturalism for Students at Grade XII in Yogyakarta Public Schools
- Ongoing Training for HIV/AIDS Awareness to Street Children in "Anak Mandiri" Shelter, Yogyakarta.

From the titles above, we can see that most of the research titles are responses to social problems close to students' lives, which are in Yogyakarta. Through this local context, SDU's students study the complexity of problems in national settings. HIV/AIDS is a growing epidemic in

⁴⁴ Universitas Sanata Dharma, *Laporan Tahunan Rektor 2012* [The 2012 Annual Report of the President of University] (Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2012), 17.

Indonesia, although there are relatively few cases in Yogyakarta. The problem of multiculturalism is certainly in the daily imagination of Indonesian people.

For these various projects, SDU students spend months in participatory action research. Greta Paulina, a SDU student who won a national student competition on patient pharmacy counseling in 2014, and then won the second prize in the international competition in India in 2015, mentioned that she had to navigate prudently with her mentor during seven months of participatory action research, preparing presentations in English, and had to deal with the limited availability of drugs in both Indonesia and SDU.⁴⁵ This participatory action research helped her to grow in compassion with the suffering of the patients that she met during her research and encouraged her to work harder to help the patients finding the best treatments even with Indonesia's limited resources. Her mentor, a SDU faculty member in the department of pharmacy, guided and helped her during the process of making her proposal, conducting field research, and preparing her presentation.

3. The University as a Space of Rehearsal for Collaboration for the Common Good:

Concluding Reflections and Recommendations

From various stories on SDU's involvement in collaborating with diverse social forces in post-authoritarian Indonesia, I come to several points of reflection and some recommendations.

3.1 Points of Reflection

First, the university is a space of rehearsal for participation in collaborative action for the common good of society. The structural and complementary mechanisms of the university are

⁴⁵ Suara Merdeka, *Persiapan Tujuh Bulan Untuk Raih Prestasi*, Accessed Oct 19, 2015. <http://berita.suaramerdeka.com/smcetak/persiapan-tujuh-bulan-untuk-raih-prestasi/>

designed toward providing such a space for rehearsal. Without neglecting the importance of research, as Adolfo Nicolás remarked at Sogang University, the Asian Jesuit university should be a house of formation for students. Here the traditions of wisdom are handed down through practices of compassion and service.

In Sunardi's analogy of "a chair with three legs," the core mission in the university is preparing future leaders with tools: competence, having a good conscience, and compassion with/for those who live on the margins of our society. This type of leadership does not come from nowhere. It is not inherited from previous generations. It must be cultivated and sustained in the ups and downs of people's daily struggles. The Ignatian pedagogy, core curriculum, and SDU's various research centers are examples of praxes in making such spaces of rehearsal possible.

The rehearsal of compassion and service through many university activities will develop a sense of connection between academia and the local community. This is the backbone for the network of *gotong royong*—as we discussed in the third chapter. *Gotong royong* exists as a response to the real needs of the community. Through engaging in the practices of *gotong royong*, as Driyarkara said, students will find the true meaning of their sociality, to be *homo homini socius*. This network of *gotong royong* in the long run could be the reservoir for collaborative action on a larger scale for a wider issue.

This vision of education can happen only if a university situates itself within the narrative of the people that it serves. PSL's engagement with the poor living in coastal communities in Yogyakarta became the driving force to propose some creative works for obtaining affordable and sustainable energy. PUSDEP's collaborative works with survivors of the '65 purge are an example of placing the life story of the people in the horizon of learning and teaching. Their

story of exclusion, a long rejection of their basic rights as citizens, and the impunity of the perpetrators who are protected by the previous regimes challenge our commitment that a university should work together with various social actors in advocating their pleas.

As Ellacuría showed us with his own life, historical reality will confront us, challenge us, and invite us to embrace the struggle of the people in achieving the fullness of their wellbeing. Our response to such a calling will have its theological dimension. Through the university's commitment to provide a space of rehearsal for social collaboration for the common good of post-authoritarian society, the university is joining the entire people of God in their journey to walk one step closer to the fullness of the reign of God.

Second, collaborative action for the common good starts from local projects closer to the community. When the program starts to kick in, it gets bigger and grows like a snowball. This type of localized collaboration could be an entry point for reflecting on a new role of the university in creating solidarity for the common good in a post-authoritarian society. Starting from a local project does not mean to neglect the importance of larger scale movements. This web of civic participation can always be enlarged when there is momentum to shape it. Participation in a local community is a rehearsal and an entry point for a larger form of solidarity.

More importantly, collaboration is not always self-evident because the form of collaboration is determined and negotiated among many actors who are involved in it. Therefore, as Dewantara tirelessly argued, a capacity to dialogue, to listen to the needs of others while maintaining one's own tradition, is important. A pluralistic society urgently needs such a civic virtue. It would be a tremendous contribution from a university if the young generation could learn and develop such ability through exposure to a variety of ideas, creative projects,

community services, etc. Tailoring the core curriculum in order to develop civic virtues is one creative response from SDU.

However, the university is also a center of learning where we could help the students to see the bigger picture of reality, looking beyond the contextual small-scale movements that they initiate. There is also a danger of focusing on a very local issue without acknowledging the national, even global, context of the problem. Social analysis could be helpful for students in seeing the structure beneath the problems they encounter. In this, SDU should work hard to bring its students to have a more bird's eye view of the problem to which they want to respond. This critical thinking will help students, on the one hand, to see the patterns of exclusion which happen across regions and, on the other hand, to promote any urgent collaborative action to respond to them.

Third, the university's option to engage in a shared project for justice and the common good will direct the university in discerning its strategic planning. At this point, the choice presented to the university is not only between "good" and "evil," or between "the Reign" and the "Anti-Reign." In many cases, the choice is more complicated and subtle. Using the Spiritual Exercises terminology, it is a choice between "good" and "seems to be good" or between "evil" and "lesser evil." The case of SDU investment in a gold mining company in East Nusa Tenggara captures this struggle.

This investment started from a naïve assumption to convert "greedy elites" so that they will serve the wellbeing of the local community. However, this choice trapped SDU in internal and external debates on the ethical justification for their investment. SDU's naïve assumption of making changes to the local community turned out to be a big question mark for SDU's integrity on social justice and environmental issues. In the words of Simon, Powers, and Gunneman, if the

university's ability to engage in "saving the world" is limited, at least they must avoid getting involved in any action that will "destroy the world."⁴⁶ This option for finding the least possible injuries should guide the leadership of a university in discerning their strategic actions, especially when the options presented are between "good" and "seems to be good," or between "evil" and "less evil."

3.2 Recommendations

There are six recommendations to SDU for its better praxis of collaboration in the future. *First*, SDU should be more active in the national debate about national public policy in order to promote the necessary conditions for each member of post-authoritarian Indonesia to attain its ideal life. SDU has been active in various local-level engagements, but less so in the national setting. By saying that, the fact that some professors and students have been involved in some urgent national issues (e.g., the debate on the necessity for setting up the truth and reconciliation commission for survivors of 1965's communist/Soekarnoist purge) should not be ignored. More importantly, their work should be supported so that it is no longer seen as an individual initiative but as an institutional strategic choice.

Second, in relation to the first chapter of this dissertation, SDU should be active in national conversations about the growing concern of massification and commodification of Indonesian higher education. It is true that financing higher education is a complicated matter. Higher education needs a lot of resources to provide a good quality of education (e.g., access to very expensive academic journals and books, qualified professors) without neglecting its core values. In light of this dissertation, there should be a structural arrangement through national legislation so that a university will receive financial support from the state and which could be

⁴⁶ Simon, Powers and Gunnemann, *The Ethical Investor*, 14.

used to provide financial support for the poor. The Indonesian government's financial subsidies (called *hibah*) are mostly institution-oriented, especially to boost faculty member's publications. There are very few scholarship options available for students from low-income families and marginalized groups. It is getting more complicated for SDU as a private higher education institution—which are assumed to be self-financed—because state universities are priorities among financial subsidies from government.

SDU's Department of Economics and Management could play an active role in the national debate on proposing various financial options for students from low income families and marginalized groups. For example: a no-interest student loan scheme, various scholarships, tuition remissions, etc. Of course, learning from the Newmont case, in proposing these options to government, alumni, and donors, SDU should adhere to its core values so that any financial support should not come with special conditions or restrictions which are contrary to SDU's historical mission.

Third, SDU should be part of a thoughtful conversation on how to navigate our differences after the collapse of the regimes. This thoughtful conversation can be conducted at several levels. First, it must start from the local level. In the previous era, the more free conversations were limited to academia, due to Suharto's tactic of allowing a semi-open democracy operating only in academia. Therefore, the conversation in the local community was more top-down and one-way, from local leaders to members of the community. SDU's involvement with the local community should help that community to become more active in voicing their concern and participation. But, second, a local-level conversation should be brought to a broader audience. One benefit of a university is its broad network with other universities, NGOs, and public officials. As a Jesuit university, SDU has the unique characteristic of a more

global network with other Jesuit universities across the globe. By bringing local conversation and participation toward a broader, even global network, the university can find a right balance in promoting subsidiarity while still connecting with the networks of solidarity, both national and global. SDU can initiate a working group on certain social concerns, make this group work, and open a broader network.

Fourth, in bringing a local conversation toward a broader audience, SDU should use media as its close ally.⁴⁷ The number of SDU faculty who actively write their opinions in national, even local media, is limited. Op-ed articles could embrace an audience broader than very limited peer-review journals. In the context of Indonesian society, an op-ed in a newspaper is the only outlet to raise awareness of the common problems in society, invite a thoughtful conversation on how we should respond to them, and propose a possible praxis that members of society could join. In addition to writing for the mass media, SDU should view open-access depositories as an opportunity to bring numerous researches conducted by the faculty and students to society. Up to now, there are more than a dozen journals published by SDU. Sadly, none of them are available to the public, and most end up on library shelves. By making this research open to the public, not only will SDU generate a conversation in society on relevant topics but it will also promote various works of SDU to the public, which in the long term will help attract numerous prospective students.

Fifth, SDU should help its student associations to become more active in a broader student network. Post-authoritarian society brought collaborative student actions into a smaller scale movement. The millennials' characteristic of preferring to work in small yet close groups,

⁴⁷ B. Herry Priyono, S.J., *Sanata Dharma di Indonesia: Dimensi Sosio-Politik Universitas Jesuit* [Sanata Dharma in Indonesia: Socio-Political Dimension of a Jesuit University], unpublished presentation for SDU's Faculty Study Days in Tawangmangu, March 6-8, 2015.

rather than building a massive coalition, makes it harder to bring student associations out from their comfort zone.⁴⁸ SDU student associations should be more active in networking, starting from the local/provincial level and moving toward a national caucus. They can start from various associations to which SDU belongs, such as the Association of Catholic Higher Education (APTİK). This association could help the student associations in each member institution to connect with each other, and then enter into a broader network, for example with Muslim student associations, etc.

Sixth, the SDU leadership should be more open toward academia, not only to a small group of Jesuits, especially in dealing with the university's major decisions. The SDU investment case shows the lack of transparency from the leadership toward the *civitas academia*. Especially in the context of post-authoritarian society, the university should resist the temptation to operate on the same level as the government by lacking transparency in making major public policy. Inviting the broader SDU community will help to grasp the multilayered reality of post-authoritarian Indonesia.

4. Conclusion

The Graduate School of Religions and Cultures of SDU celebrated the memorial of the 100th birthday of Driyarkara with a month-long exhibition entitled “Rereading Driyarkara: Humanity, Education, Nationalism” from December 17, 2008 to January 17, 2009. This exhibition focused on major topics in Driyarkara's philosophy, especially on education. There was a painting that captured the heart of Driyarkara's philosophy of education, entitled “Intoxicated by Knowledge” by Budi yana. It was a painting of an obese Javanese student. He

⁴⁸ Patrisius Mutiara Andalas, S.J., The SDU Vice President of Student Affairs, interview by author, April 23, 2015.

tore apart, ripped up and finally ate books. His feet and legs were huge, and he sat comfortably in a semi lotus posture, a posture known in Javanese mysticism as a prayerful position. His drowning eyes implied that the activity to attain knowledge has intoxicated him, and made him escape from any contradictions of this passing world.



Figure 5.2. © Budi Yana, "Mendhem Ilmu," 2008.

With this painting, Budi Yana challenged visitors to reexamine the purpose of any pursuit of knowledge. Does pursuit of the truth entrap someone to sit down quietly and comfortably in one's tiny world? Is thirst and hunger for knowledge intended to intoxicate the student so that knowledge operates inwardly, by making the student obsessed with personal betterment? Meditating on this painting led me to Pope Francis' powerful critique of the professionals, opinion makers, and I believe also

academics, that we "live and reason from the comfortable position of a high level of development...beyond the reach of the majority of the worlds' population. This lack of physical contact and encounter...can lead to a numbing of conscience and to tendentious analyses which neglect parts of reality."⁴⁹

In the interview with the current president of SDU, Eka Priyatma, he mentioned that one of his main goals in embodying the Ignatian vision in the context of a post-authoritarian Indonesian Jesuit university is to help the *civitas academica* to have a deeper sense of concern

⁴⁹ Francis, *Laudato Si'*, no. 49. Accessed Oct 18, 2015.
http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html

(*cemas*) for the dynamic of Indonesian society.⁵⁰ Without a certain level of concern for the reality of the people, higher education will no longer be seen as one of the actors for social transformation. Having a concern for the dynamics in society will foster a deep sense of responsibility by highlighting how the university is part of the people's struggle. The university is not an ivory tower. If this dynamic of concern and responsibility is growing, it will guide faculty members, students, and administrators in finding creative ideas or projects that respond to the problems of society.

In this chapter, I showed how such a dynamic of concern is materialized and cultivated in SDU through its structural and complementary mechanisms. This dynamic of concern is the backbone for developing an ethic of collaboration in the university, as witnessed by various activities conducted by SDU as a center of learning, as a house of formation and most importantly as a space for collaboration to promote the common good in post-authoritarian Indonesia.

⁵⁰ J. Eka Priyatma, The 2014-2018 SDU's President, interview by author, April 20, 2015.

General Conclusion

Michael Garanzini, the International Secretary of Jesuit Higher Education, argued that one of the main trends of today's Jesuit higher education is the growing awareness and effort for collaboration *intra* and *extra* Jesuit higher education institutions.¹ Partnership among several U.S. Jesuit Universities and the Jesuit Refugee Service to deliver educational services to refugees in Africa is one example of this collaborative project. When the state fails to provide such service, partnership between university and NGOs emerges. This growing network of collaboration embodies the basic vision of the post-Vatican II social encyclicals, which highlight the classic ecclesiological understanding of the people of God, who work together with all other people of good will to build a more just and peaceful world. While the Thomistic tradition reminds us of the importance of the state as the bearer of the common good through the promulgation of just laws, globalization brings a new opportunity for the local community to find another road, especially when the classical state approach is no longer effective in delivering urgently needed services. Subsidiarity could bring the demand of solidarity closer to the community, build stronger local alliances for various communal projects while still envisioning the larger view of social justice. The common good helps the local advocacy groups see the larger vision and to network with each other.

Using Ellacurían terminology about engaging reality, the title of this dissertation is "Bearing Together the Weight of Reality." The historical mission of a Christian university is to return to reality so that it will bring a university closer to the struggles of the people by

¹ Michael J. Garanzini, S.J., "A New Turning Point," *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 48 (2015):10-11. Accessed Nov 1, 2015. <http://epublications.marquette.edu/conversations/vol48/iss1/5>.

establishing any necessary conditions to better achieve their wellbeing. The struggle to promote human dignity or to combat any lack thereof, is not a solitary action. The University is not the only actor in the process of liberation. We bear *together* the weight of reality, with many local and global actors, across religious and ethnic boundaries. *We bear together the weight of reality* as members of the people of God who journey together in this world.

This Christian vision is not foreign to the Indonesian world view. *Gotong royong* is a commitment, nurtured in Javanese tradition, to carry together the burden that one has. *Gotong royong* is a network of solidarity, immersed in the daily practices of working together, especially during the important moments in one's life. Dewantara, Driyarkara, and Buchori drew from this local virtue and used it as the vision for their pedagogy. Collaboration/*Gotong Royong* with its changing forms is the network of solidarity that sustains the existence of Indonesian society.

By highlighting the “togetherness” of working toward peace, justice and integrity of creation, this dissertation also prepares for possible challenges in bringing home such a vision to post-authoritarian Indonesia, especially in the Jesuit university. If globalization brings the need of recognition of the multiplicity and fluidity of one's ideal appropriation of the good, such a multiplicity of interpretation about the common good also emerges in the church, society, even within the Jesuit order. Our social outlook is shaped by the breadth of human stories and this breadth creates multiple possible interpretations of human life which in the end will generate the numerous and different proposals for actions. One Catholic university will focus on how to hand over the tradition of faith by highlighting a more traditional dimension of Christianity, in its communion with the hierarchy, while another Catholic university will be imbued with the diverse interreligious dialogue and social justice projects. Students from a Jesuit university will join the “March of life” and heavily focus on the divisive debate on sexual ethics, while others

will join the protest to demand divestment of the university's fossil fuel investments or push for a more active response toward cases of racial discrimination.

The questions that emerge then are: is the argument of this dissertation convincing enough to make these numerous groups of our society and our university come together? What would be the criteria to bring them together to the table?

I believe there will be no easy answer for such big questions. Numerous other proposals also have been advocated to approach the above questions. One of the proposals is to focus on finding our common response to the common problem of society, as advocated by Asian liberation theologians. In the fifth chapter of this dissertation, I also use such an approach by incorporating the FABC recommendations on the importance of the dialogue of life and action before one enters into the dialogue of theological exchange and spiritual experiences.

However, this dissertation proposes two starting points for an ongoing and local search of working together in pluralistic society. First, it is important to set up a genuine and respectful dialogue. Without such basic civility, we will see only a plethora of condemnation and exclusion toward others who are different. But such capability to dialogue is not inherited; it is nourished and cultivated. Then, it is precisely the mission of higher education to nurture such basic civility, which unfortunately is getting hard to notice, especially in a highly partisan culture. CST and the three Indonesian pedagogues provide plenty of resources for nurturing such basic civic virtue, starting from the family, and continuing and developing in higher education.

Second, a genuine and respectful dialogue also demands basic recognition for everyone to participate. Aristotle said that virtue needs a structural arrangement to make it possible to

flourish.² It is also then a question of arranging society so that every one has a voice to contribute to the ongoing search for a workable commitment toward the benefit of all, not only the individual. Ignacio Ellacuría, through his life and his thought on the historical mission of a Jesuit university, is one of the best examples and articulators of bringing about such a mission of creating a just structure so that everyone, especially the marginalized, can speak and enter into the conversation. In the context of post-authoritarian society, with its long history of one-way communication, the Ellacurían vision of higher education is timely, important and relevant.

With these two proposals, this dissertation tries to address the concern of Pope Francis in *Laudato Si'*. In the context of numerous and sometimes conflicting approaches toward environmental degradation, Pope Francis wrote:

There are certain environmental issues where it is not easy to achieve a broad consensus. Here I would state once more that the Church does not presume to settle scientific questions or to replace politics. But I am concerned to encourage an honest and open debate so that particular interests or ideologies will not prejudice the common good.³

It is through “an honest and open [conversation],” that the less clear concept of the common good in pluralistic society can be defined. This dissertation is an exploration to set up a necessary condition in the Jesuit university so that such “an honest, open and thoughtful conversation” to envision the common good in the context of post-authoritarian Indonesia will be possible.

² Aristotle, *Politics* 7.2 (1324a23-5), cited in Martha Nussbaum, “Nature, Function, and Capability: Aristotle on Political Distribution” in G. McCarthy, ed., *Marx and Aristotle: Nineteenth-century German Social Theory and Classical Antiquity* (Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1992), 176.

³ Francis, *Laudato Si'*, no. 188.

Bibliography

- Abdullah, Taufik. *Schools and Politics: The Kaum Muda Movement in West Sumatra (1927-1933)*. Jakarta: Equinox Publishing, 2009.
- Aidit, D.N. *Kaum Tani Mengganjang Setan-Setan Desa : Laporan Singkat Tentang Hasil Riset Mengenai Keadaan Kaum Tani Dan Gerakan Tani Djawa Barat*. Jakarta: Pembaruan, 1964.
- . *Kibarkan Tinggi Pandji Revolusi*. Jakarta: Pembaruan, 1964.
- Alberigo, Giuseppe. *A Brief History of Vatican II*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006.
- Alberigo, Giuseppe, and Joseph A. Komonchak. *History of Vatican II*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995.
- Altbach, Philip G., and Toru Umakoshi, eds. *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- Amaladoss, Michael. *Life in Freedom: Liberation Theologies from Asia*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997.
- Anderson, Benedict R. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 2006.
- . “The Idea of Power in Javanese Culture.” In *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, edited by Claire Holt, 1-69. Singapore: Equinox, 2007.
- Antoncich, Ricardo. “*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: A Latin American Perspective,” In *The Logic of Solidarity: Commentaries on Pope John Paul II's Encyclical on Social Concern*, edited by Gregory Baum and Robert Ellsberg, 211-226. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989.
- Appleby, R. Scott. *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
- . “Global Civil Society and the Catholic Social Tradition.” In *Globalization and Catholic Social Thought: Present Crisis Future Hope*, edited by John Coleman and William Ryan, 130-140. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005.
- Arrupe, S.J., Pedro. *Men for Others*. Accessed Sept 9, 2015.
<http://onlineministries.creighton.edu/CollaborativeMinistry/men-for-others.html>.
- Aquino, María Pilar, Kevin F. Burke, and Robert Lassalle-Klein, eds. *Love that Produces Hope: The Thought of Ignacio Ellacuría*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006.

- Ashley, J. Matthew. "A Contemplative under the Standard of Christ: Ignacio Ellacuría's Interpretation of Ignatius of Loyola's Spiritual Exercises." *Spiritus* 10, no. 2 (2010): 192-204.
- Aspinall, Edward. "Elections and the Normalization of Politics in Indonesia." *South East Asia Research* 13, no. 2 (2005): 117-156.
- . "A Nation in Fragments: Patronage and Neoliberalism in Contemporary Indonesia." *Critical Asian Studies* 45, no. 1 (2013): 27-154.
- . *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Astorga, Christina A. *Catholic Moral Theology & Social Ethics: A New Method*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014.
- Augustine. *The City of God*. New York: Modern Library, 2000.
- Baum, Gregory, and Robert Ellsberg, eds. *The Logic of Solidarity: Commentaries on Pope John Paul II's Encyclical on Social Concern*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989.
- Bedner, Adriaan. *Citizenship Restored*. Accessed Oct 5, 2015.
<http://www.insideindonesia.org/citizenship-restored-2>.
- Benedict XVI. "Caritas in Veritate: On Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth." In *Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage*. Expanded Edition, edited by David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, 524-586. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2010.
- . "A Proper Hermeneutic for the Second Vatican Council." In *Vatican II: Renewal within Tradition*, edited by Matthew L. Lamb and Matthew Levering, ix-xv. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Bergman, Roger. *Catholic Social Learning: Educating the Faith that does Justice*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.
- Beirne, S.J., Charles J. *Jesuit Education and Social Change in El Salvador*. New York: Garland, 1996.
- Bertrand, Jacques. *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia*. Cambridge: University Press, 2004.
- Bevans, Stephen B., and Roger Schroeder. *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011.
- Bilgrien, Marie Vianney. *Solidarity: A Principle, an Attitude, a Duty? Or the Virtue for an Interdependent World?* New York: P. Lang, 1999.

- Bok, Derek. *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Social Responsibilities of the Modern University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Bowen, John R. "On the Political Construction of Tradition: *Gotong Royong* in Indonesia." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45, no. 3 (1986): 545-561.
- Brazal, Agnes M. "East Asian Discourses on Harmony: A Meditation for Catholic Social Teaching." In *Catholic Social Teaching in Global Perspective*, edited by Daniel McDonald, 118-146. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2010.
- Bresnan, John. "Economy Recovery and Reform." In *Indonesia: The Great Transition*, edited by John Bresnan, 189-238. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
- Buchori, Mochtar. *Culture and Politics in Indonesia: Personal Reflections*. Jakarta: CSIS, Jakarta Post & IKIP Muhammadiyah Jakarta Press, 1996.
- . *Evolusi Pendidikan di Indonesia: Dari Kweekschool sampai ke IKIP 1852-1998*. Yogyakarta: INSIST Press, 2007.
- . *Notes on Education in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Jakarta Post & Asia Foundation, 2001.
- . *Sketches of Indonesian Society: A Look from within*. Jakarta: Jakarta Post & IKIP-Muhammadiyah Jakarta-Press, 1994.
- . *Radikalisme dalam Gerakan-Gerakan Keagamaan Kumpulan Catatan Dan Karangan*. Jakarta: Markas Besar Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia-Lembaga Pertahanan Nasional, 1988.
- . *Transformasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: IKIP Muhamadiyah Jakarta Press, 1995.
- Buchori, Mochtar, and Wiladi Budiharga. *Tipe-Tipe Orientasi Sosial-Budaya di Sembilan Daerah Penelitian di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia, 1983.
- Budi, Hartono. *Teologi, Pendidikan dan Pembebasan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2003.
- Budiman, Arief, and Olle Törnquist. *Aktor Demokrasi: Catatan Tentang Gerakan Perlawanan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Institut Studi Arus Informasi, 2001.
- Budisantoso, In Nugroho. *Dari Juminahan Melawan Peningkaran Perbedaan*. Accessed Oct 1, 2015. <http://www.ketjilbergerak.org/dari-juminahan-melawan-peningkaran-perbedaan-oleh-rm-in-nugroho-budisantoso/>.
- Burke, Kevin F. *The Ground Beneath the Cross: The Theology of Ignacio Ellacuría*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2000.

- . “Ignacio Ellacuría: The Love That Produces Hope.” *Budhi: A Journal of Ideas and Culture* 1, no. 3 (1997): 71-80.
- Cahill, Lisa Sowle. “*Caritas in Veritate*: Benedict’s Global Reorientation.” *Theological Studies* no. 71 (2010): 291-319.
- . “Charity and Truth as Justice, and Hope.” In *In the Service of Charity and Truth: Essay in Honour of Lucius Ogorji*, edited by Uzochukwu Jude Njoku and Simon O. Anyanwu, 253-272. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2012.
- . “Community Versus Universals: A Misplaced Debate in Christian Ethics.” *Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics* 18 (1998): 3-12.
- . “Globalization and the Common Good.” In Coleman and Ryan, *Globalization and Catholic Social Thought*, 42-54.
- . *Global Justice, Christology and Christian Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- . “The New Testament and Ethics: Communities of Social Change.” *Interpretation* 44, no. 4 (1990): 383-395.
- . “Toward Global Ethics.” *Theological Studies* no. 63 (2002): 324-344.
- Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of Network Society*. Malden, MA: Polity, 2000.
- Clark, Meghan J. *The Vision of Catholic Social Thought: The Virtue of Solidarity and the Praxis of Human Rights*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014.
- Claver, Fransisco. “*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*: A View from the Philippines.” In Baum and Ellsberg, *Logic of Solidarity*, 202-210.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. *Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion*. Accessed Nov 27, 2015.
http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_28051992_communionis-notio_en.html.
- Clifford, Catherine E., and Richard R. Gaillardetz. *Keys to the Council: Unlocking the Teaching of Vatican II*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Cohen, Dennis J. “The People Who Get in the Way: Poverty and Development in Jakarta.” *Politics* 9, no. 1 (1974): 1-9.
- Comblin, José. *The Holy Spirit and Liberation*. Eugene, OR: WIPF & Stock, 2004.
- . *People of God*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004.

- Combs, Mary Beth, and Patricia Ruggiano Schmidt, eds., *Transforming Ourselves, Transforming the World: Justice in Jesuit Higher Education*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.
- Crouch, Harold A. *The Army and Politics in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Equinox, 2007.
- Curran, Charles E. *Catholic Social Teaching and Pope Benedict XVI*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2014.
- Curran, Charles E., Kenneth R. Himes, and Thomas A. Shannon. "Commentary on *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (On Social Concern)." In *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*, edited by Kenneth R. Himes et al., 414-435. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005.
- Himes, et al., *Modern Catholic Social Teaching*, 414-435.
- Daniels, Timothy P. *Islamic Spectrum in Java*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
- Darling, Linda T. "Social Cohesion ('Asabiyya') and Justice in the Late Medieval Middle East." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49, no. 2 (2007): 329-357.
- Darmaputera, Eka. *Pancasila and the Search for Identity and Modernity in Indonesian Society: A Cultural and Ethical Analysis*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- De Graaf, John, David Wann and Thomas H. Naylor. *Affluenza: The All-Consuming Epidemic*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2005.
- DeCrane, Susanne M. *Aquinas, Feminism, and the Common Good*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2004.
- Dewantara, Ki Hadjar. *Azas-Azas dan Dasar-Dasar Taman-Siswa*. Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Taman Siswa, 1952.
- . "Peringatan 20 Mei di Zaman Pendudukan." In *Dari Kebangunan Nasional sampai Proklamasi Kemerdekaan: Kenang-kenangan Ki Hadjar Dewantara*, 58-60. Yogyakarta: Endang, 1952.
- . *Pidato Sambutan Ki Hajar Dewantara atas Pemberian Gelar Doctor Honoris Causa oleh Universitas Gajahmada*. Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Taman Siswa, 1956.
- . *Karya Ki Hadjar Dewantara, Vol I Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Persatuan Taman Siswa, 1967.
- . *Karya Ki Hadjar Dewantara, Vol II Kebudajaan*. Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Persatuan Taman Siswa, 1967.
- . *Pantjasila*. Yogyakarta: Usaha Penerbitan Indonesia, 1950.

- Doran, Kevin. *Solidarity: A Synthesis of Personalism and Communalism in the Thought of Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II*. New York: P. Lang, 1996.
- Donati, Pierpaolo. "State and The Family in a Subsidiary Society." In *Pursuing the Common Good: How Solidarity and Subsidiarity Can Work Together*, edited by Margaret S. Archer and Pierpaolo Donati, 265-309. Vatican City: Pontificia Academia Scientiarum Socialium, 2008.
- Dorr, Donal. *Option for the Poor and for the Earth: Catholic Social Teaching*. Rev. ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2012.
- . "Solidarity and Integral Human Development." In Baum and Ellsberg, *The Logic of Solidarity*, 143-154.
- Driyarkara, Nicolaus. *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara: Esai-Esai Filsafat Pemikir Yang Terlibat Penuh dalam Perjuangan Bangsaanya*. Edited by A. Sudiarja, S.J., et al. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2006.
- . *Kumpulan Surat Romo Drijarkara*. Edited by F. Danuwinata, S.J. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2013.
- . *Pendidikan ala Warung Pojok: Catatan-Catatan Prof. Dr. N. Driyarkara, S.J. tentang Masalah Sosial, Politik, dan Budaya*. Edited by G. Budi Subanar, S.J. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2006.
- . *Rerasan Owah Gingsiring Jaman*. Edited by G. Budi Subanar, S.J. Yogyakarta: Tembi & Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2007.
- Dwyer, Judith A. *Vision and Values: Ethical Viewpoints in the Catholic Tradition*. Washington, DC; Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1999.
- Eilers, Franz-Josef, ed. *For All the Peoples of Asia, Vol 2: FABC Documents from 1992 to 1996*. Quezon City: Claretian Publications, 1997.
- . *For All the Peoples of Asia, Vol 3: FABC Documents from 1997 to 2001*. Quezon City: Claretian Publications, 2002.
- Ellacuría, Ignacio. "Discurso de graduación en la Universidad de Santa Clara." In Ignacio Ellacuría. *Escritos universitarios*. 221-228. San Salvador: UCA Editores, 1999.
- . *Freedom made Flesh: The Mission of Christ and His Church*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976.
- . "The Historicity of Christian Salvation." In *Mysterium Liberationis: Fundamental Concepts of Liberation Theology*, edited by Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J. and Jon Sobrino, S.J., 251-289. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993.

- . “Human Rights in a Divided Society.” In *Human Rights in the Americas: The Struggle for Consensus*, edited by Alfred Hennelly, S.J. and John Langan, S.J., 52-65. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1982.
- . “Is a Different Kind of University Possible?” In *Towards a Society that Serves its People: The Intellectual Contribution of El Salvador’s Murdered Jesuits*, edited by John Hassett and Hugh Lacey, 177-219. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991.
- . “The Kingdom of God and Unemployment in the Third World,” In *Unemployment and The Right to Work*, edited by Jacques Pohier and Dietmar Mieth, 91-96. New York: Seabury, 1982.
- . “A Latin American Reading of the Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius.” *Spiritus* 10, no. 2 (2010): 205-242.
- . “Laying the Philosophical Foundations of Latin American Theological Method.” In *Ignacio Ellacuría: Essays on History, Liberation, and Salvation*, edited by Michael E. Lee, 63-91. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014.
- . “Liberation Theology and Socio-historical Change in Latin America.” In Hassett and Lacey, *Towards a Society that Serves its People*, 19-43.
- . “The Task of a Christian University.” In Jon Sobrino, et al. *Companions of Jesus: The Jesuit Martyrs of El Salvador*, 147-151. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1990.
- . “The University, Human Rights, and The Poor Majority,” in Hassett and Lacey, *Towards a Society that Serves its People*, 19-43.
- . “Utopia and Propheticism from Latin America: A Concrete Essay in Historical Soteriology.” In *A Grammar of Justice: The Legacy of Ignacio Ellacuría*, edited by Matthew Ashley, Kevin F. Burke, S.J. and Rodolfo Cardenal, S.J., 7-55. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014.
- . “What is the Point of Philosophy?” *Philosophy and Theology* 10, no. 1 (1997): 3-18.
- . “Violence and Non-Violence in the Struggle for Peace and Liberation.” In *A Council for Peace*, edited by Hans Küng and Jürgen Moltmann, 69-77. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1988.
- Emon, Anver M. “On Islam and Islamic Natural Law: A Response to the International Theological Commission’s *In Search of a Universal Ethic: A New Look at the Natural Law*.” In *Searching for a Universal Ethic: Multidisciplinary, Ecumenical, and Interfaith Responses to the Catholic Natural Law Tradition*, edited by John Berkman and William C. Mattison III, 125-135. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Fish, Stanley. *Save the World on Your Own Time*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

- Francis, *Laudato Si': On Care of Our Common Home*. Accessed Oct 18, 2015.
http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. 30th Anniversary Edition. New York: Continuum, 2005.
- Fuchs, S.J., Josef. *Personal Responsibility and Christian Morality*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1983.
- Jacques Maritain. *The Person and the Common Good*. Translated by John J. Fitzgerald. 1946. Reprint, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.
- Gaillardetz, Richard R. "The Ecclesiological Foundation of Modern Catholic Teaching." In Himes et al., *Modern Catholic Social Teaching*, 72-98.
- Gandolfo, David I. "A Different Kind of University Within the University: Ellacuría's Model in the Context of the United States." In Ashley, Burke, and Cardenal, *A Grammar of Justice*, 161-172.
- Gandolfo, David I. "A Role for the Privileged? Solidarity and the University in the Work of Ignacio Ellacuría and Paulo Freire." *Journal for Peace and Justice Studies* 17, no. 1 (2008): 9-33.
- Garanzini, Michael J. "A New Turning Point." *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 48, no. 1 (2015): 5.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Religion of Java*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- . *Peddlers and Princes; Social Change and Economic Modernization in Two Indonesian Towns*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Greiner, Dominique. "Le bien commun à l'épreuve des éthiques procédurales: pour une réinterprétation des sources théologiques." *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale*, no. 241 (2006): 119-44.
- Gregg, Samuel. *Challenging the Modern World: Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II and the Development of Catholic Social Teaching*. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 1999.
- Gregory, Eric. *Politics and the Order of Love: An Augustinian Ethic of Democratic Citizenship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Guinness, Patrick. *Harmony and Hierarchy in Javanese Kampung*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

- . *Kampung, Islam and State in Urban Java*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.
- Hadiz, Vedi R. *Localizing Power in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia: A Southeast Asia Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- . "Reorganizing Political Power in Indonesia: A Reconsideration of so-Called 'Democratic Transitions'." *The Pacific Review* 16, no. 4 (2003): 591-611.
- Hahnenberg, Edward P. "The Mystical Body of Christ and Communion Ecclesiology: Historical Parallels." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 70, no. 1 (2005): 3-30.
- Hamayotsu, Kikue. "Beyond Faith and Identity: Mobilizing Islamic Youth in a Democratic Indonesia." *The Pacific Review* 24, no. 2 (2011): 225-247.
- . "Bringing Clientelism and Institutions Back in: The Rise and Fall of Religious Parties in Indonesia's Electoral Democracy." In *Party Politics in Southeast Asia Clientelism and Electoral Competition in Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines*, edited by Dirk Tomsa and Andreas Ufen, 120-141. London: Routledge, 2013.
- . "Islam and Nation Building in Southeast Asia: Malaysia and Indonesia in Comparative Perspective." *Pacific Affairs*, no. 3 (2002): 353-375.
- Hatley, Barbara. "Theater as Cultural Resistance in Contemporary Indonesia." In *State and Civil Society in Indonesia*, edited by Arief Budiman, 321-348. Clayton: Center of Southeast Asian Studies—Monash University, 1994.
- Hari Susilo, Anggun Trisnanto. *The Indonesian National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM) Rural: Decentralization in the Context of Neoliberalism and World Bank Policies*. Thesis, Institute of Social Studies, 2012.
- Haryono, Anton. *Awal Mulanya Adalah Muntilan: Misi Jesuit di Yogyakarta, 1914-1940*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2009.
- Hasto Rosariyanto, Floribertus. "Father Franciscus Van Lith, S.J. (1863-1926): Turning Point of the Catholic Church's Approach in the Pluralistic Indonesian Society." Doctoral diss., Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997.
- Hawkins, Mary. "Is Rukun Dead? Ethnographic Interpretations of Social Change and Javanese Culture." *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 7, no. 1 (1996): 218-234.
- Häring, Bernard, and Valentino Salvoldi. *Tolerance: Towards an Ethic of Solidarity and Peace*. Translated by Edmund C. Lane, SPP. New York: Alba House, 1995.
- Hefner, Robert W. "Islamizing Java? Religion and Politics in Rural East Java." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46, no. 3 (1987): 533-554.

- . “Islam and Nation in the Post-Suharto Era.” In *The Politics of Post-Suharto Indonesia*, edited by Adam Schwarz and Jonathan Paris, 40-72. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1999.
- Heim, S. M. *Salvations: Truth and Difference in Religion*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995.
- Henley, David. “Custom and Koperasi: The Co-operative Ideal in Indonesia.” In *The Revival of Tradition in Indonesian Politics: The Deployment of Adat from Colonialism to Indigenism*, edited by Jamie S. Davidson and David Henly, 87-112. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Henriot, Peter J., and Joe Holland. *Social Analysis: Linking Faith and Justice*. 2nd ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis in collaboration with the Center of Concern, 1983.
- Herlambang, Wijaya. “Cultural Violence: Its Practice and Challenge in Indonesia.” PhD diss., The University of Queensland, 2011.
- Hernandez Pico, Juan. “Solidarity with the Poor and the Unity of the Church.” In Juan Hernandez Pico and Jon Sobrino. *Theology of Christian Solidarity*, 43-98. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1985.
- Heryanto, Ariel. “Where Communism Never Dies: Violence, Trauma and Narration in the Last Cold War Capitalist Authoritarian State.” *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 2, no. 2 (1999): 147-177.
- Heryanto, Ariel, and Vedi R. Hadiz. “Post-Authoritarian Indonesia: A Comparative Southeast Asian Perspective.” *Critical Asian Studies* 37, no. 2 (2005): 251-276.
- Hicks, Jacqueline. “The Missing Link: Explaining the Political Mobilisation of Islam in Indonesia.” *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 1 (2012): 39-66.
- Hill, Hal, and Thee Kian Wie. “Indonesian Universities: Rapid Growth, Major Challenges.” *Education in Indonesia*, edited by Daniel Suryadarma and Gavin W. Jones, 159-179. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2013.
- Himes, Kenneth R. *Christianity and the Political Order: Conflict, Cooptation, and Cooperation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2013.
- Hing, Lee Kam. “The Taman Siswa in Postwar Indonesia.” *Indonesia*, no. 25 (April 1978): 41-59.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Hobgood, Mary E. “Conflicting Paradigms in Social Analysis.” In Baum and Ellsberg, *The Logic of Solidarity*, 167-185.

- Hollenbach, David. "Caritas in Veritate: The Meaning of Love and Urgent Challenges of Justice." *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 8, no. 1 (2011): 171-182.
- . "The Catholic Intellectual Tradition, Social Justice, and the University." *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education* 36, no. 1 (2010): 20-22.
- . *Claims in Conflict: Retrieving and Renewing the Catholic Human Rights Tradition*. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- . "Commentary on *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World)." in Himes et al., *Modern Catholic Social Teaching*, 266-291.
- . *The Common Good and Christian Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . "Human Dignity in Catholic Thought." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Human Dignity: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Marcus Düwell, et al., 250-259. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- . "Human Rights in a Pluralist, Unequal Globe: Contributions of Jesuit Universities." *Journal of Catholic Education* 14, no. 3 (2011): 338-344.
- . "Humanitarian Crises, Refugees and the Trans-national Good: Global Challenges and Catholic Social Teaching." In *Scrutinizing the Signs of the Times in the Light of the Gospel*, edited by Johan Verstraeten, 221-245. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007.
- . "Sustaining Catholic Social Engagement: A Key Role for Movement in the Church Today," *Journal of Catholic Social Thought* 10, no. 2 (2013): 431-447.
- Human Rights Watch. *In Religion's Name: Abuses against Religious Minorities in Indonesia*. Accessed March 26, 2015. http://www.hrw.org/print/reports/2013/02/28/religion-s-name#_ftn2.
- Hunt-Hendrix, Leah. "The Ethics of Solidarity: Republican, Marxist and Anarchist Interpretations." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014.
- Isasi-Díaz, Ada María. *La Lucha Continues: Mujerista Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004.
- Jen, Gish. *Tiger Writing: Art, Culture, and the Interdependent Self*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Jobin, Guy. "Justice et identité: la reconnaissance comme enjeu de la question sociale dans l'enseignement moral de l'Église catholique." *Laval théologique et philosophique* 69, no. 3 (2013): 499-519.

- John Paul II. "Centesimus Annus: On the Hundredth Anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*." In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 471-523.
- . *Ex Corde Ecclesiae: Apostolic Constitution of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II on Catholic Universities*. Accessed Sept 20, 2015. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_jp-ii_apc_15081990_ex-corde-ecclesiae.html.
- . "Laborem Exercens: On Human Work." In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 378-421.
- . *Love and Responsibility*. Boston: Pauline, 2013.
- . "Sollicitudo Rei Socialis: On Social Concern." In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 424-468.
- . *Toward a Philosophy of Praxis: An Anthology*. Translated by Alfred Bloch and George T. Czuczka. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- Jones, Tod. *Culture, Power, and Authoritarianism in the Indonesian State Cultural Policy Across the Twentieth-Century to the Reform Era*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Juliawan, Benny Hari. "Street- Level Politics: Labour Protests in Post- Authoritarian Indonesia." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 41, no. 3 (2011): 349-370.
- Kaul, Inge, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern. *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Kawamura, Koichi. "Consensus and Democracy in Indonesia: *Musyawarah-Mufakat* Revisited." IDE Discussion Paper, no. 308. Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO, 2011.
- Kee, Alistair. "The Conservatism of Liberation Theology: Four Question for Jon Sobrino." *Political Theology*, no. 3 (2000): 30-43.
- . *Marx and the Failure of Liberation Theology*. Philadelphia: SCM Press, 1990.
- Keenan, James F. *University Ethics: How Colleges Can Build and Benefit from a Culture of Ethics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
- Kent, Bonnie. "Habits and Virtues (Ia-IIae, qq. 49–70)." In *The Ethics of Aquinas*, edited by Stephen J. Pope, 116-130. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2002.
- Kim, Hyung-Jun. "Agrarian and Social Change in a Javanese Village." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 32, no. 4 (2002): 435-455.
- Klinken, Gerry van. *Minorities, Modernity and the Emerging Nation: Christians in Indonesia—a Biographical Approach*. Leiden: KITLV Press, 2003.

- Knitter, Paul F. *Without Buddha I could Not be a Christian*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2009.
- Koentjaraningrat. "The Indonesian Mentality and Development." *Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 3, no. 2 (1988): 105-133.
- . *Javanese Culture*. Singapore-New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- . "The System and the Spirit of *Gotong Royong*." *Prisma* 6 (1977): 20-28.
- . *Some Social-Anthropological Observations of Gotong Rojong Practices in Two Villages of Central Java*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program-Cornell University, 1961.
- Kunkler, Mirjam. "Democratization, Islamic Thought and Social Movements: Coalitional Success and Failure in Indonesia and Iran." PhD diss., Columbia University, 2008.
- Kusno, Abidin. *The Appearances of Memory: Mnemonic Practices of Architecture and Urban Form in Indonesia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Kusujarti, Siti, and Ann R. Tickamyer. *Power, Change, and Gender Relations in Rural Java: A Tale of Two Villages*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2012.
- Lainé, Loic. "La Compassion Comme Outil Critique De La Mondialisation Néo-Libérale: Éléments pour une théologie contextuelle" *Revue d'Éthique Et De Théologie Morale*, no. 273 (Mars 2013): 77-109.
- Lakeland, Paul. "Development and Catholic Social Teaching: Pope John Paul's New Encyclical." *The Month*, no. 21 (1988): 708.
- Laksana, Albertus Bagus. *Manusia Tanpa Sekat: Inspirasi Driyarkara dan Pendidikan Universitas dalam Dunia Serba Cair*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2013.
- . *Muslim and Catholic Pilgrimage Practices: Explorations through Java*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014.
- Lane, Max. *Unfinished Nation: Indonesia Before and After Suharto*. London: Verso, 2008.
- Lassalle-Klein, Robert. *Blood and Ink: Ignacio Ellacuría, Jon Sobrino, and the Jesuit Martyrs of the University of Central America*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2014.
- . "Jesus of Galilee and the Crucified People: The Contextual Christology of Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría." *Theological Studies* no. 70 (2009): 347-376.
- . "The Christian University for a Globalized World: Ignacio Ellacuría's Vatican II Advance on Cardinal Newman's Classic Statement." In Ashley, Burke, and Cardenal, *A Grammar of Justice*, 173-188.

- Laurent, Bernard. "Caritas in Veritate as a Social Encyclical: A Modest Challenge to Economic, Social, and Political Institutions." *Theological Studies* 71, no. 3 (2010): 515-544.
- Lee, Doreen. "The Origins of Our Future: Nationalism and Youth in the Indonesian Student Movement." PhD Diss., Cornell University, 2008.
- Lee, Michael Edward. *Bearing the Weight of Salvation: The Soteriology of Ignacio Ellacuria*. New York: Crossroad Pub. Co, 2008.
- Lennan, Richard. "Communion Ecclesiology: Foundations, Critiques, and Affirmations." Vol. 20. Victoria : 2007.
- MacAndrews, Colin. *Central Government and Local Development in Indonesia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Mahmud, Simeen. "Why Do Garment Workers in Bangladesh Fail to Mobilize." In *Citizenship and Social Movement: Perspectives from the Global South*, edited by Lisa Thompson and Chris Tapscott, 60-86. London: Zed, 2010.
- Martín-Baró, Ignacio. "Developing A Critical Consciousness through the University Curriculum." In Hassett and Lacey, eds., *Towards a Society that Serves its People*, 220-242.
- Mangkunegara. *The Wedhatama: An English Translation*. Translated by S.O. Robson. Leiden: KITLV Press, 1990.
- Massaro, Thomas. *Catholic Social Teaching and United States Welfare Reform*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- . *Living Justice: Catholic Social Teaching in Action*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012.
- McDonnell, Kilian. "The Ratzinger/ Kasper Debate: The Universal Church and Local Churches." *Theological Studies* 63, no. 2 (2002): 227-250.
- McRae, Dave. *The 1998 Indonesian Student Movement*. Clayton: Monash Asia Institute—Monash University, 2001.
- Mietzner, Marcus. *The Politics of Military Reform in Post-Suharto Indonesia: Elite Conflict, Nationalism, and Institutional Resistance*. Washington, DC: East-West Center Washington, 2006.
- Min, Anselm. *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Minnerath, Roland. "The Fundamental Principles of Social Doctrine: The Issue of Their Interpretation." In Archer and Donati, eds., *Pursuing the Common Good*, 45-56.

Morgan, Michael L. *The Cambridge Introduction to Emmanuel Levinas*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Mujiburrahman. *Feeling Threatened Muslim-Christian Relations in Indonesia's New Order*. Leiden: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

Mulder, Niels. *Mysticism in Java: Ideology in Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2005.

———. *The Ideology of Javanese-Indonesian Leadership*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press Ltd, 1994.

Nell-Breuning, S.J., Oswald von. "The Drafting of *Quadragesimo Anno*." In *Official Catholic Social Teachings: Readings in Moral Theology No. 5*, edited by Charles E. Curran and Richard A. McCormick, 60-68. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.

Newberry, Janice C. *Back Door Java: State Formation and the Domestic in Working Class Java*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Nicolás, S.J., Adolfo. *Depth, Universality, and Learned Ministry: Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education Today*. Accessed Oct 5, 2015.
http://www.sjweb.info/documents/ansj/100423_Mexico%20City_Higher%20Education%20Today_ENG.pdf.

———. *The University as A Community of Wisdom and Service: Address to the Sogang University Community*. Accessed Oct 5, 2015.
http://www.sjweb.info/documents/ansj/140116_Korea_Sogang_University_Community.pdf.

Nizar, Samsul, et al. *Sejarah Sosial & Dinamika Intelektual Pendidikan Islam Di Nusantara*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2013.

Njoku, Uzochukwu Jude. "Africa and the Conflicting Paradigms of the Relationship between Person and Society in Catholic Social Ethics." In Njoku and Anyanwu, eds. *In the Service of Charity and Truth*, 139-155.

———. "Discourse on the Foundations of Solidarity in the Social Encyclicals of John Paul II." *Ethical Perspectives: Journal of the European Ethics Network* 14, no. 1 (2007): 79-97.

———. *Examining the Foundations of Solidarity in the Social Encyclicals of John Paul II*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006.

———. "Re-thinking Solidarity as a Principle of Catholic Social Teaching: Going Beyond *Gaudium et Spes* and the Social Encyclicals of John Paul II." *Political Theology* 9, no. 4 (2008) 525-544.

Nuryatno, Muhammad Agus. "Education and Social Transformation: Investigating the Influence and Reception of Paulo Freire in Indonesia." PhD diss., McGill University, 2006.

- Nussbaum, Martha. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- . “Nature, Function and Capability: Aristotle on Political Distribution.” In *Marx and Aristotle: Nineteenth-Century German Social Theory and Classical Antiquity*, edited by George E. McCarthy, 175-211. Savage, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1992.
- . *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Nyman, Mikaela. *Democratising Indonesia: The Challenge of Civil Society in the Era of Reformasi*. Copenhagen: Nias, 2006.
- Oldenski, Thomas. *Liberation Theology and Critical Pedagogy in Today's Catholic Schools*. New York: Garland, 1997.
- Olle, John. “The Majelis Ulama Indonesia Versus “Heresy”: The Resurgence of Authoritarian Islam.” In *State of Authority: The State in Society in Indonesia*, edited by Gerry van Klinken and Joshua Barker, 95-116. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Cornell University, 2009.
- Olssen, Mark. *Liberalism, Neoliberalism, Social Democracy: Thin Communitarian Perspectives on Political Philosophy and Education*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Orobator, Agbonkhianmeghe E. “*Caritas in Veritate* and Africa's Burden of (Under) Development.” *Theological Studies* 71, no. 2 (2010): 320-334.
- Orwell, George. *In Front of Your Nose*. Accessed Sept 26, 2015.
http://orwell.ru/library/articles/nose/english/e_nose.
- Pagnucco, Ron, and Peter Gichure. “Solidarity: A Catholic Perspective.” In *A Vision of Justice: Engaging Catholic Social Teaching on the College Campus*, edited by Susan Crawford Sullivan and Ron Pagnucco, 161-181. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014.
- Paul VI. “*Populorum Progressio*: On the Development of Peoples.” In O’Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 253-277.
- Pemberton, John. *On the Subject of “Java”*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Perrin, Jacques, and Jean-Yves Calvez. *The Church and Social Justice: The Social Teaching of the Popes from Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1958*. London: Burns & Oates, 1961.
- Peters, Rebecca Todd. *Solidarity Ethics: Transformation in a Globalized World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2014.
- Pieris, S.J., Aloysius. *An Asian Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1988.

- . “The Holy Spirit and Asia’s Religiousness.” *Spiritus* 7, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 124-141.
- Phan, Peter C. “Ignacio Ellacuría, S.J. in Dialogue with Asian Theologians: What can they Learn from each Other?” *Horizons* 32, no. 1 (2005): 53-71.
- . *In Our Own Tongue: Perspectives from Asia on Mission and Inculturation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003.
- Pius XI. “*Quadragesmo Anno*: After Forty Years.” In O’Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 43-82.
- Prasetyo, Stanley Adi, et al. *Indonesia's Post-Soeharto Democracy Movement*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Demos, 2003.
- Priyatma, Johanes Eka. *Merajut Masa Depan Universitas: Sambutan Rektor Universitas Sanata Dharma Periode 2014-2018*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2014.
- Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church*. Washington, DC: USCCB Communications, 2005.
- Priyotamtama, S.J., Paulus Priyono. *Menjadi Universitas Yesuit yang Berkontribusi Nyata Bagi Pembangunan Kemartabatan Bangsa: Catatan-Catatan Refleksi Akhir Jabatan*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2014.
- Powers, Charles W., Jon P. Gunnemann, and John G. Simon. *The Ethical Investor: Universities and Corporate Responsibility*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Pranowo, Bambang. “Islam and Party Politics in Rural Java.” *Studia Islamika: Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies* 1, no. 2 (1994): 1-19.
- Prawiranegara, Sjafruddin. “Pancasila as the Sole Foundation.” *Indonesia* (1984): 74-83.
- Rahmi, Dwita Hadi, Bambang Hari Wibisono, and Bakti Setiawan. “Rukun and Gotong Royong: Managing Public Places in an Indonesian Kampung.” In *Public Places in Asia Pacific Cities*, edited by Pu Miao, 119-134. Boston, MA: Kluwer, 2001.
- Rahner, Karl. “Basic Theological Interpretation of the Second Vatican Council.” In *Concern for the Church: Theological Investigations Vol. XX*, 77-89. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- Rajkumar, Peniel. *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*. London: SPCK, 2012.
- Regan, Ethna. *Theology and the Boundary Discourse of Human Rights*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2010.

- Resosudarmo, Ida Aju Pradnja. "Closer to People and Trees: Will Decentralisation Work for the People and the Forests of Indonesia?" *The European Journal of Development Research* 16, no. 1 (2004): 110-132.
- Ricœur, Paul. *Symbolism of Evil*. Translated by Emerson Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.
- Rosa, P.H. Prima. "Belajar Menjadi Pendidik: Dari Hati dengan Cinta." *Jurnal Spiritualitas Ignasian* 12, No 1 (2010), 10-18.
- Rosales, Gaudencio B., and C. G. Arevalo, eds. *For All the Peoples of Asia, Vol 1: FABC Documents from 1970 to 1991*. Quezon City: Claretian Publications, 1992.
- Rush, James. "Placing the Chinese in Java on the Eve of the Twentieth Century." *Indonesia*, Special Issue (1991): 13-24.
- Rziha, John. *Perfecting Human Actions: St. Thomas Aquinas on Human Participation in Eternal Law*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2009.
- Sachedina, Abdulaziz. *Islam and the Challenge of Human Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Sacks, Jonathan. *The Home we Build Together: Recreating Society*. New York: Continuum, 2007.
- Scherer, Savitri Prastiti. *Keselarasan dan Kejanggalan, Pemikiran-Pemikiran Priayi Nasionalis Jawa Awal Abad XX*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu, 2012.
- Schuck, Michael J. *That They Be One: The Social Teaching of the Papal Encyclicals, 1740-1989*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991.
- Scholtz, Sally J. *Political Solidarity*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.
- Scott, James C. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Sen, Amartya. *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. New York: Norton, 2006.
- Sennett, Richard. *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Sennett, Richard, and Jonathan Cobb. *The Hidden Injuries of Class*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.

- Shapiro, H. Svi. "Global Pedagogies and Communities of Meaning and Hope: Education in a Time of Global Fragmentation." In *Global Pedagogies: Schooling for the Future*, edited by Joseph Zajda, 3-21. New York: Springer, 2010.
- Sharkey, Stephen Richard. *Sociology and Catholic Social Teaching: Contemporary Theory and Research*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012.
- Shipler, David K. *The Working Poor: Invisible in America*. New York: Vintage, 2005.
- Shiraishi, Saya. *Young Heroes: The Indonesian Family in Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program—Cornell University, 1997.
- Sidel, John T. *Riots, Pogroms, Jihad: Religious Violence in Indonesia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Simpson, Bradley R. *Economists with Guns : Authoritarian Development and U.S.-Indonesian Relations, 1960-1968*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008.
- Skinner, G. William. "Creolized Chinese Societies in Southeast Asia." *Sojourners and Settlers: Histories of Southeast Asia and the Chinese*, edited by Anthony Reid, 51-93. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.
- Sobrinho, Jon. "Bearing with One Another in Faith." In Hernandez Pico and Sobrinho. *Theology of Christian Solidarity*, 1-41.
- . "The University's Christian Inspiration." In Jon Sobrinho, et al. *Companions of Jesus*, 152-173.
- Soekarno. "Setialah Kepada Sumbermu!." In Dewantara, *Dari Kebangunan Nasional sampai Proklamasi Kemerdekaan*, 36-53.
- Stange, Paul. "The Logic of Rasa in Java." *Indonesia* no. 38 (1984): 113-134.
- Sullivan, John. *Inventing and Imagining Community: Two Modern Indonesian Ideologies*. Clayton: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies—Monash University, 1991.
- . "Kampung and State: The Role of Government in the Development of Urban Community in Yogyakarta." *Indonesia* (1986): 63-88.
- . *Local Government and Community in Java: An Urban Case-Study*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Sunardi, St. *Tahta Berkaki Tiga: Kepemimpinan Intelektual dan Moral Perguruan Tinggi*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2004.

- Suryadarma, Daniel. "How Corruption Diminishes the Effectiveness of Public Spending on Education in Indonesia." *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 48, no. 1 (2012): 85-100.
- Surjomihardjo, Abdurrachman. *Taman Siswa di dalam Arsip-Arsip Hindia Belanda*. Jakarta: LIPI, 1971.
- Susanto, Budi, et al. *Filsafat Keterbukaan: Pluralitas Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Teologi Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2011.
- Tabb, William K. "John Paul II and Fidel Castro: Two Views of Development." In Baum and Ellsberg, *The Logic of Solidarity*, 155-166.
- Tadjoeddin, Mohammad Zulfan. *Explaining Collective Violence in Contemporary Indonesia: From Conflict to Cooperation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Touraine, Alain. *Can We Live Together? Unity and Difference*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Tsuchiya, Kenji. *Democracy and Leadership: The Rise of the Taman Siswa Movement in Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987.
- Tyson, Adam. "Vigilantism and Violence in Decentralized Indonesia: The Case of Lombok." *Critical Asian Studies* 45, no. 2 (2013): 201-230.
- Ufen, Andreas. "From 'Aliran' to Dealignment: Political Parties in Post-Suharto Indonesia." *South East Asia Research* 16, no. 1 (2008): 5-41.
- Universitas Sanata Dharma. *EduArt Exhibition: Rereading Driyarkara—Humanity, Education, Nationalism*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University & Indonesia Contemporary Art Network, 2009.
- . *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Pada Acara Peringatan Dies Natalis ke-44*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 1999.
- . *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Pada Acara Peringatan Hari Ulang Tahun ke-54 Universitas Sanata Dharma*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2009.
- . *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Pada Acara Peringatan Hari Ulang Tahun ke-56 Universitas Sanata Dharma*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2011.
- . *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Pada Acara Peringatan Hari Ulang Tahun ke-57 Universitas Sanata Dharma*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2012.
- . *Laporan Tahunan Rektor Pada Acara Peringatan Hari Ulang Tahun ke-59 Universitas Sanata Dharma*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2014.

- . *Rencana Strategis Universitas Sanata Dharma 2003-2007*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2003.
- . *Rencana Strategis Universitas Sanata Dharma 2008-2012*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2008.
- . *Rencana Strategis Universitas Sanata Dharma 2013-2017*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sanata Dharma, 2013.
- van Bruinessen, Martin. "Genealogies of Islamic Radicalism in Post- Suharto Indonesia." *South East Asia Research* 10, no. 2 (2002): 117-154.
- Vatican Council II. "*Gaudium et Spes: Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*." In O'Brien and Shannon, *Catholic Social Thought*, 174-250.
- . *Lumen Gentium: Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*. Accessed Nov 27, 2015. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html.
- Vatikiotis, Michael R.J. *Indonesian Politics Under Suharto: The Rise and Fall of the New Order*. London-New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Verstraeten, Johan. "A Ringing Endorsement of Capitalism? The Influence of the Neo-liberal Agenda on Official Catholic Social Teaching." In *Applied Ethics in a World Church: The Padua Conference*, edited by Linda Hogan, 54-64. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2008.
- . "Solidarity and Subsidiarity." In *Principles of Catholic Social Teaching*, edited by David A. Boileau, 133-147. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1998.
- Vieira, Domingos Lourenço. *La solidarité au coeur de l'éthique sociale: La notion de solidarité dans l'enseignement social de l'Église catholique*. Paris: Mare et Martin, 2006.
- Vogt, Christopher P. "Fostering a Catholic Commitment to the Common Good: An Approach Rooted in Virtue Ethics." *Theological Studies* 68, no. 2 (2007): 394-417.
- Wardaya, Baskara T., ed. *Truth Will Out: Indonesian Accounts of the 1965 Mass Violence*. Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2013.
- Watkins, Clare. "Objecting to *Koinonia*: The Question of Christian Discipleship Today - and Why Communion is Not the Answer." *Louvain Studies* 28, no. 4 (2003): 326-43.
- Weiss, Meredith L., and Edward Aspinall, eds. *Student Activism in Asia: Between Protest and Powerlessness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.
- Welch, A. "Blurred Vision?: Public and Private Higher Education in Indonesia." *Higher Education* 54, no. 5 (2007): 665-687.

- Whitfield, Teresa. *Paying The Price: Ignacio Ellacuría and the Murdered Jesuits of El Salvador*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1995.
- Wicaksono, Teguh Yudo, and Deni Friawan. "Recent Developments in Higher Education in Indonesia: Issues and Challenges." In *Financing Higher Education and Economic Development in East Asia*, edited by Shiro Armstrong and Bruce Chapman, 159-188. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 2011.
- Wink, Walter. *The Powers that Be: Theology for a New Millennium*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.
- Winters, Jeffrey A. *Oligarchy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Woodward, Mark R. *Islam in Java: Normative Piety and Mysticism in the Sultanate of Yogyakarta*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1989.
- . *Java, Indonesia and Islam*. New York: Springer, 2011.
- . *Resisting Wahhabi Colonialism in Yogyakarta*. Center for Strategic Communication. Accessed Nov 27, 2015. <http://csc.asu.edu/2008/11/06/resisting-wahhabi-colonialism-in-yogyakarta/>.