

CARLO MARTINI'S NEW WORLD ORDER IN INDONESIAN CONTEXT

Rafael Mathando Hinganaday | Graduate Student
Faculty of Theology
Sanata Dharma University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract:

Diversity has been an unavoidable reality. People live with other people of different religions, tribes, or races. The falling of old ideological and political structures in the world has played a great role in making this happen. To replace the old ideological and political structures, populism tends to be widely accepted by people who want to erect great wall in order to avoid immigrants. In Indonesia, populism manifests in the ideas and attitudes that alienate others based on religions and ethnic groups. The author introduces the views of Carlo Maria Martini, who, as a Catholic bishop, has promoted the idea of creating a society that supports diversity to be a new world order. Martini based his ideas on a biblical analysis, mainly on the Old Testament books such as Genesis, Exodus, and Deuteronomy. In order to find inspiration of Martini's views for the context of Indonesia, the author relates them to Anthony Giddens and Raimon Panikkar, and finds how Martini's ideas can be practised not only by inclusivists and pluralists, but also by exclusivists.

Keywords:

new world order • diversity • populism • peace • interreligious dialogue

Introduction

Once upon a time during a Christmas, Carlo Maria Martini (1927–2012), a Catholic bishop, came to a Coptic liturgy in Milan, Italy (Martini, 1995:79). The Coptics accepted him joyfully, honoured him, and even

prayed for him during the liturgy. From the experience, besides promoting an interreligious harmony, Martini saw as well that diversity has flourished in Europe, including in Milan, either in the terms of racial diversity or religious diversity. In 1990's, for example, when Martini shared the Christmas experience, there were about 50,000 immigrants from Egypt in Milan, who were also practising Coptic rites. That was actually just a small part of a greater wave of migration, since the phenomenon had been common in many European countries. Many of the migrants came from poor countries in Africa and Asia. They landed in Europe as refugees or poor migrant workers (Martini, 1995:79-80, 85-89).

The number of migrants in Europe has increased in many years until today, and most of them are refugees. About two years ago, in January 2017, György Bakondi, the Chief Advisor on internal security issues to the Prime Minister of Hungary, has warned Europe by stating that only in 2016, there were about 361,000 migrants already, especially those who came illegally (Express, 2017). Italy, Martini's country of origin, and Greece, were the main gates.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) gives a comprehensive picture on the diversity in the world created by the migration of refugees nowadays. Based on the data, which was updated on 28 June 2018, the dangerous conflict in Syria, for example, has forced about 5,624,813 people to flee toward other countries (UNHCR, 2018). The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and other conflicts between the government's soldiers and the opposition have been the causes of that big number of refugees—about half of them are children. The number is a small figure compared to the total number of refugees, that reaches more or less 68,5 million people in the whole world.

The data above shows that the phenomena of migration and migrants have existed since almost 30 years ago and has increased in today's world. After almost three decades, the wave of migrants has become the main cause of diversity in the modern society. The concept of "multiracial society" from Carlo Martini will be explored below as an alternative to the idea of building great walls, which sadly becomes very popular lately in our society.

New Walls and Populism

The phenomenon of migration cannot be separated from the context of our world particularly when it happened. During the 7th International Forum for Peace “Peoples and Religions”—about 25 years ago—Martini depicted the world like this: “old ideological and political structures have fallen away, we are confusedly seeking new checks and balances and are aware of the necessity for a different international composition” (Martini, 1995:31). This statement shows that Martini was trying to formulate the situation of the era: a clash between the USA and the USSR, which was ended by the downfall of the USSR in 1991, Berlin wall in Germany was demolished in 1990-1991, frictions in Bosnia-Herzegovina during 1992-1995, the long and endless conflict between Israel and Palestine, and Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait which led to the Persian Gulf War in 1990-1991. When observing the situation from Martini’s perspective, we might see that they are linked to each other: when the USSR and Berlin’s wall collapsed, at the same time there were some nations, ethnic and religious groups emerged and showed themselves as new forces by invading other countries or groups. The conflicts and clashes appeared as a result of the process of looking for new orders and structures in the world.

The situation was slightly different in Indonesia. The fall of Soeharto’s New Order in 1998 signified the end of a very strong ideological and political structure, which had been very dominant in Indonesia for 32 years. For a very long time many people and groups have considered the New Order as a public enemy. After Soeharto fell, people brought out worldviews in order to fill the vacant political room left by the New Order. Pancasila was still there as the only ideology where all Indonesians were supposed to base their actions, especially in terms of living together, as a nation. The people, however, did not want to use the interpretation promoted by Soeharto’s government anymore. Thus, people attempted to interpret Pancasila according to the points of view they have brought. Other reaction was also to reject Pancasila and try to promote a new order according to the view they have lived up quietly under the suppression of the New Order. The clashes have happened until today among those who promote particular way of interpreting Pancasila and those who accept or reject Pancasila.

In today's world we learn that our search for new orders and balances has not ended yet. Israel and Palestine are still fighting in order to possess certain areas. ISIS has been born and brings impacts on people through terrors. Nations and groups are trying to become new orders that affect every aspect of human's life. They not only want to replace—in Martini's words—"the fallen-away ideological and political structures," but also want to unsettle the existing ideological and political structures. At the same time, the existing structures defend themselves so that they do not experience the same fate as with the previously fallen structures. Each person, group, system, or structure wants to be a winner, since nobody wants to be a loser, while every age creates its own new winners and losers (Held et al., 1999:495).

Unfortunately, the many attempts used to defend old structures and to search and build new structures have also become the cause of migration and modern problems. We can mention the economics system built by the scholars from capitalist countries as an example. Instead of spreading common good, capitalism has created poverty in many places. Not all people, and only very few, can enjoy the wealth of the world. In the past, capitalism spread throughout the world with the help of the capitalist countries, but today this system strikes back at its creators and spreaders, for it eventually generates a big wave of poor migrant workers. The workers also desire to taste a bit of sweetness of capitalism in the capitalist countries, which they cannot taste in their own countries.

The US is one of the evidences related to the case. It is assumed that at early 2018 there were more than 86,4 millions of migrants in the superpower country. The number has included the non-US citizens who are born there. In the past, most migrants came from Mexico, but now more and more people came to the US from India and China. In 2016, there were about 175,100 people coming to the US from India, and at the same time about 160,200 migrants coming from China (Zong, 2018). It is even more pathetic that some of the capitalist countries try to erect great walls in order to avoid immigrants. We know that President Donald Trump forces the Congress to accept his great-wall-plan at the US-Mexico borders. The Australian government has sent back refugees to Indonesia or to Nauru and Papua New Guinea; this policy is a sort of 'invisible'

wall for those poor people. The concepts of racism and xenophobia also lie behind the policies of the governments and other countries to avoid migrants.

The situation is different in Indonesia. Here the wall is more ideological than physical. This wall is often expressed stealthy and not straightforwardly, since this country wants to build an image of a country that upholds tolerant values within its society. The main actors behind the wall might not be the officials of the government, but some extremists and fundamentalists, either inside or outside of the government. The aim of building walls, however, can be slightly the same with that of the US and Australia, that is, to protect some people's opportunity from other people or groups in order to gain power and influence in social, cultural, and economic aspects. The effect is also the same, i.e. the birth of dichotomies within the society: indigenous people-strangers, majority-minority, and ally-alien (enemy).

Whatever the reasons and forms, the walls have emphasized unwillingness to live together in diversity, just as Martini says, "If the wall dividing Europe is down, there can on the other hand be felt the urge to erect so many new walls, higher ones sometimes, in the name of security" (Martini, 1995:31-32). Martini would respond to the danger by urging and supporting acceptance of each other within the societies, regardless the origins and the backgrounds.

Martini's Ideas and Biblical Interpretation

Discussing Carlo Martini's ideas would entail exploring the methods he has used to communicate his ideas, for he is not only a bishop of Milan, but also as an exeget. His expertise in interpreting verses from the Bible has helped him deliver his ideas about a new world order. A new world order in Martini's concept is different from that in conspiracy theory. Far from the idea of building a totalitarian world government, Martini's new world order is very much based on the Bible. There are at least two ways that are used to absorb inspirations from the Bible and in turn to offer different approaches for the new world order.

First, Martini makes use of the symbolic language style in the Bible and assumes that his audiences could understand the idea behind the

symbol. For example, when giving a speech during the 7th International Forum for Peace “Peoples and Religions” in Milan, he used the phrase “the dove at rest”, which refers to the story of Noah’s dove in the Book of Genesis. “Today Noah’s dove finds rest on our fragile olive branch,” he says (Martini, 1995:40). By using the phrase “the dove at rest”, Martini wants to describe the peace every people long and strive for. Many people can easily accept the symbol, even if they do not know the story of Noah at all. The reason is, for years, a dove has been recognised as a symbol of peace. It is, however, relatively unusual to use the phrase “the dove at rest”. If the aim of mentioning a dove was simply to symbolize ‘peace’, why would Martini have to say “the dove at rest”? Was it not enough to say simply “the dove”? One interpretation is, by reviewing other sources, Martini wants to communicate his idea as precise as possible by saying the complete phrase “the dove at rest”.

In the story of Noah’s ark, the flood of waters became God’s instrument for punishing the crimes human beings have committed. God wants to create a new and better world through Noah (Gen 6,11-8,22). Noah then sends his dove out so that he might know whether the earth has dried or not (Gen 8,8-12). Later on, the dove came back and held an olive branch on its beak; that image then became very popular as a symbol of peace. According to the ancient Greek tradition, an olive branch (but not a dove) is a symbol of peace. One of the ancient Greek figures who loves to hold an olive branch is Irene, the goddess of peace. In the story of Noah’s Ark, which is a product of Jewish tradition, the purpose of the dove’s olive branch is not to symbolize ‘peace’, but to build a nest (Gevaryahu, 2015:173). In this case, building a nest is a form and symbol of building a new world order, parallel to the idea behind the story of Noah (Gen 6,18-20; 7,1-3; 8,16-17). In other words, by using the phrase “today Noah’s dove finds rest on our fragile olive branch”, Martini might refer to the idea of building a new and better world order, which has been very fragile through ages. Thus, like the dove in the symbol, we are also supposed to find rest on the fragile world order, so that we will not stop developing it until it gets better and steady. In addition, the new world order must be based on peace.

Second, Martini compares the terms used in the Bible. For instance, when giving a presentation to Sant’Egidio community in Italy

in 1986 (Martini, 1995:79-97), he talked about immigrants who have been “strangers” in Europe for many years. In this way, he may explain some terms in Old Testament books, which were used to call ‘a stranger’. Here Martini interpretes Ex 22,21 and De 10,19.

Martini explains that in both verses, the Hebrew word רג (*ger*) was used to describe ‘strangers’. The actual meaning of the word is ‘to live’. We can attach the word to בשות (*toshav*) so that it becomes רג בשות (*ger toshav*), which means ‘resident’ or ‘inhabitant’. ‘*Toshav*’ itself means ‘resident’ or ‘population’. We can also find the use of the same word in Gen 15,13 to call the descendants of Abram, that is, the word of God to Abram, saying that his descendants would be strangers in other people’s land. Compared to that verse, ‘*ger toshav*’ in the context of Ex 22,21 and De 10,19 can mean “strangers who have been living in Israel for such a long time” so that they also bear and grow their heirs there. For Martini, this is the reason why the Israelites have to treat those *ger* well, just like treating their own community. Thus, both verses become a kind of legal basis and at once a reminder for the people, that they have to respect *ger* because in the past, they were also *ger* in other people’s land.

During the session, Martini also discussed two other terms in the Old Testament books, which were also used to call ‘strangers’. Besides *ger*, there are also רז (*zar*) and ירִכְנִי (*nokri*), which, in Martini’s opinion, have been used differently. ‘*Zar*’ means ‘gentile’, a non-Israelite who lives outside the border of Israel. Martini described the thought behind the term as follows. Every nation basically has its own god; therefore, without permission a stranger cannot enter Israel, which belongs to God whom a stranger does not worship. If anyone breaks the rule, a great misfortune will come to Israel. The construction of the Temple in Jerusalem during the time of Christ depicts the idea of *zar* clearly, since it places the gentiles at the outermost area. The Book of Exodus also gives a good understanding of this term, because it shows the experience of all Israelites as *zar* after escaping from Egypt. The other term, ‘*nokri*’, defines the strangers who stay in Israel for a while without any legal status as residents or inhabitants. They might stay among the Israelites as passing merchants or casual labourers. An example for *nokri* is the Ishmaelites merchantmen, to whom Joseph’s brothers sold him (Gen 37,25-28).

By elaborating those three terms and giving a special place for ‘*ger*’, Martini presents his vision on the new world order. One concrete manifestation of his vision is therefore a multiracial society which respects immigrants. He has shown that the texts from a religious tradition, which has a deep root among European nations, can inspire people in order to create a better world order. And, for Martini, it is plausible, and not merely a pious idea.

Let Us Create A New and Better World Order!

Concretising the concept of a new world order has been important for Martini. He suggests that a social order must also be a hospitable home for a multiracial society and a support system for developing solidarity among the people. In such a social order, every person respects each other—regardless his or her race, religion, and background. The social order promotes human dignity and common good, by integrating immigrants to the society which accepts them and regards their rights. This response is more urgent when the immigrants bring their families and old people (cf. Martini, 1995:105-106, 112-126).

In actualising the idea, ‘involvement’ dan ‘prayer’ are Martini’s two keywords. “There is no one who cannot do much for peace. ... There is no power stronger than the weakness of prayer,” Martini gave his remarks at the end of the 7th International Forum for Peace “Peoples and Religions” (Martini, 1995:47). On the one hand, for Martini, the new, peaceful, and harmonious world order has to be our common quest. Therefore, we also have to pray so that there are many people getting involved in this quest. On the other hand, ‘to pray’ can also be our way of involvement in constructing a peaceful world order. A prayer becomes—in Martini’s word—“the weak weapon” when other people fight their fellows and discriminate them by using great weapons and violence, which bring out death (Martini, 1995:38).

“I wish simply to remind you that the conditions necessary for peace are not merely social and political, but also moral and spiritual,” said Martini in front of the delegations for the negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians in Assisi, Italy (Martini, 1995:51). Martini shows that cultivating moral and spiritual aspects could help generate peaceful words and expressions, rather than anger and hatred. Thus, the conditions would

be fulfilled well in many kind of expressions, such as “reverence for the ‘other’, capacity for listening, willingness to be called in question, to take the other’s point of view, the sincere desire to talk and discuss” (Martini, 1995:51).

Martini realises that it would never be easy to create a harmony in a multiracial society. It can even be more difficult for the people who get used to live in a monocultural society. There are people who always express hostility by identifying some immigrants as terrorists, thinking of them as threats to local people, and underestimating them (cf. Martini, 1995:99-100, 109). Many of those immigrants are indeed strangers in Martini’s perspective. Therefore, for this new order, Martini hopes that every person in a society would be adaptive to new settlers, ready to sacrifice, open-minded, and helpful to them during the process of integration.

For Martini, our society has to promote the encounter among people of different religions and races as a way to encourage anti-racism and anti-xenophobia. It is very important for the faithful in the world, including the Catholic Church, to get involved in it, in order to create and to develop the more harmonious and humanist new order. In particular, Martini urges everyone to initiate interreligious and ecumenical movements in order to be able to keep the vision alive. With great optimism, he says that religions would make our earth “a place to live in” and to “give hope and strength to look upward to those whose faces are drawn with anguish, fear and strife” (Martini, 1995:43).

Is It Better to be Inclusive or Pluralist?

Martini’s ideas are relevant to the Indonesian context, because Indonesia has been a fertile soil for diversity and plurality, particularly when people talk about races, tribes, and religions. Of course Indonesians are living in a different context, compared to Martini’s Europe, for even without migrants or refugees like in the European context, historically Indonesian nation has been formed by diverse races, cultures, and religions from the beginning. Here, Martini’s vision can come along with “Bhinneka Tunggal Ika”, the motto Indonesians have struggled to realise. “Bhinneka Tunggal Ika” is cultivated when we are working hard in building a social order, namely, a harmonious multiracial and multireligious society in Indonesia.

It might be true that in Indonesia unwillingness to accept others of different backgrounds is historically inherent. One can mention the polemic of the Jakarta Charter, the handling of separatists movements, and religious-based violence during the early years of Indonesian independence. Today we can see that some similar tendencies occur. Some religion-based groups, for instance, attempt to spread their opinions by unwelcoming leaders who do not belong to their groups. They might use different ways, particularly economics and cultural channels, in order to become one of the influential groups in Indonesia. We are still facing the same challenges if we want to build a harmonious multiracial and multireligious society.

Some surveys show that the challenge is real. The following data is from the survey made by Centre for Islamic and Societal Studies (Pusat Pengkajian Islam dan Masyarakat / PPIM) Syarif Hidayatullah Islamic State University, Jakarta. From September 1 to October 7, 2017, PPIM surveyed 264 teachers and 58 lecturers of Islamic studies. In addition, the institution also surveyed 1,522 high school students and 337 university students. The respondents were Moslems spread out through Indonesia. The aim of this survey was to observe levels of radicalism and intolerance within Islamic academic environment (PPIM, 2018). From the survey, on the one hand, there are 83.85% teachers and lecturers, but also 79.07% high school and university students who say that Christians are not the enemies of Moslems. Then, 64.60% teachers and lecturers, as well as 70.36% students, do not mind if people of other religions donate something to the Islamic institutions. On the other hand, however, the same survey informs that there are 54.35% teachers and lecturers, as well as 48.04% students, who think that non-Moslems are more benefited economically than Moslems. Further, there are 40.06% teachers and lecturers, as well as 36.79% students, who say that non-Moslems have to take responsibility for the social-economic inequality in Indonesia (PPIM, 2018:12). Two conclusions can be taken from the survey. *First*, diversity might not be the main reason to why many people in our society reject it. *Second*, the cause of many conflicts in our society, which are usually considered as interreligious conflicts, could be related to social welfare and politics.

Another survey made by Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) also shows a similar tendency in our society. This survey, which was carried out on August 23-30, 2017, to 1,000 respondents, informs that 52.7% respondents do not agree if other people want to change Pancasila into other ideology. It is in line with the data from PPIM, saying that 90.16% students and 93.17% teachers and lecturers agree if to practise the Constitution (UUD 1945) and Pancasila is considered parallel with practising Islamic teachings (CSIS, 2017). In other words, there were more than half of the respondents who support the unity of Indonesia with all the consequences, including the acceptance of diversity and plurality within the society. It is also interesting to note that only 39.1% respondents of the CSIS survey can let people of other religions lead them.

These surveys do not inquire about how a foreigner or a '*ger*' become a leader in Indonesia, in the terms of politics or economics, but rather about Indonesians who face the reality of diversity in their society. One might notice the slightly different case experienced in Indonesia compared to Martini's situation above. When Martini talks about accepting strangers, he might have imagined the Church and the European society welcoming refugees and immigrants, who are not from Europe and probably not of Christian background as well. Therefore, he borrows the experience of the Israelites written in the Old Testament, since both Europe at that time and Israel in the past have similar situation in dealing with strangers.

In the case of Indonesia, most people are basically indigenous people. The fact that we, Indonesians, live in different places and islands in that same country, which was once occupied by foreigners of different religious backgrounds, makes us different. Thus, because we are the same Indonesians, it is not really the place of origin that makes us alien to each other; it might be us who alienate our fellow Indonesians based on something that we do not originally own (i.e., religion), know, or practise (i.e., cultural habits, customs). Therefore, as an example, people of the same island, tribe, and race can be strangers to each other because of their different religions. At the same time, the faithful of the same church can also see other people as strangers because they come from other islands, tribes, or races. In other words, while all Indonesians are not supposed to alienate others, alienation still happens. In light of Martini's views, the

Church in Indonesia has an important role in diminishing alienation in the society. The Church can be a 'host' for the 'strangers', that is, a place where they can seek for help and advocacy as victims of alienation, and particularly because of religious diversity.

It sounds plausible when somebody asks: even though many people have worked hard for interreligious and intercultural dialogue and collaboration, why do some people still not able to live together harmoniously in midst of diversity? Martini realises this as well. Dialogue and collaboration presuppose trust and a sense of security among the participants. Dialogue and collaboration themselves are good practices to maintain trust and sense of security, which are called 'ontological security' and 'basic trust' in Anthony Giddens's terms. Thus, people who are not able to work together or to communicate from heart to heart with others could have problem in maintaining trust and sense of security. The phrase 'ontological security' wants to say that basically every person has a desire to have a secure and sustainable life (Giddens, 1991:37-41). Habits, routines, and attentions other people give continuously play a fundamental role in the process of forming this ontological security. In particular, they generate the 'basic trust', which means that a person believes that somebody protect and secure him or her, even though he or she cannot see the protector.

For Giddens, 'basic trust' does not cover up the fact that risk has been an inherent element in the sustaining of life, either physically or psychologically. When a person wants to meet others and share something with them, that can possibly create chaos. Psychologically, other people can raise anxieties because of their new habits and points of view. A person's anxiety comes from his or her failure, in certain levels, to give space for the process of forming the basic trust. In line with this, risk can erode a person's constructed ontological security. A person can build his or her basic trust. It, however, does not mean that the person can erase any risk in his or her life. The fact is one can never eliminate risk because, for Giddens, trust can also mean "to face the possibility of loss", which is to miss a person who can become a protector in someone's opinion. The point, then, is not to eliminate risk, but they who can form basic trust will also be able to deal with risk creatively. They will prepare themselves "to embrace novel experiences," or, in other words, "to leap into the unknown."

People tend to be more fragile psychologically in a constantly preserved unstable situation. It means that it will be more difficult for people to build basic trust and ontological security if, for instance, the economic and political situations are unstable; this is similar to the situation when people cannot control the traffic of thoughts, worldviews, and opinions. When the economic situation becomes harder, people try to find ways in order to survive. They might recognise others as 'threatening'. Religious, tribal, or similar sentiments, might be blown up so that people feel the urgency of preserving themselves or their groups.

It makes sense, therefore, to apprehend the result of one of the surveys above saying that some respondents blame people of other religions for getting more benefits in terms of economics. It is more understandable if there are more religious extremists or radicalists and xenophobes born in such a situation. It is also easier for certain people to abuse the people and get some benefits from the disruption. That is also the reason why Martini called our world order as a "fragile olive branch." Hence Martini was apt when he insisted that any people of good will, regardless their religious views, must work together as pioneers in accepting diversity among them. They also have to find way-outs so that self-interests will not disunite people in the society by using issue of diversity. Interreligious fraternity and dialogue need to be continuously practised without depriving differences among religions. Some people may feel if Martini urges them to be inclusivists or pluralists. The question is, in order to be able to accept diversity in the society, "Do we need to be firstly inclusivists, or pluralists?"

Raimon Panikkar's explanation on attitudes in a dialogue can help us understand the matter. We usually know three attitudes in a dialogue: exclusivism, inclusivism, and pluralism. Panikkar added two more attitudes: parallelism and interpenetration (Panikkar, 1999:5-11). We have recognized the difference among exclusivism, inclusivism, and pluralism. Exclusivism formulates a person who thinks that his or her religion is the truest religion; there is no other truth except in his or her religion. Inclusivism and pluralism show the opposite; it is possible for a person in order to know and find positive roles and values, or even truth, outside his or her religion. Pluralism is, of course, different from inclusivism. An inclusivist may assimilate certain teachings from other religions and adjust them with the teachings of his or her religion. A pluralist, however,

will not merely recognize positive values from other religious teachings, but also will not hesitate to embrace other religious teachings, while still practises his or her religious belief.

We, nevertheless, generalise the acts of respecting other religions as inclusive or pluralistic. We still need to distinguish them from parallelism and interpenetration. In Panikkar's view, the one who embraces parallelism will treat religions as "means to lead people to the same Ultimate Reality." Meanwhile, interpenetration is practised by seeing the possibility of reciprocal influence among religions without eliminating the characteristics of each religion. By reading Martini through Panikkar's perspective, some people may incline to inclusivism, while others may become pluralists, as Panikkar himself was a pluralist. There is, nevertheless, an unbridgeable gap among religions. People can appear more as exclusivists than inclusivists when they talk about the matter. For instance, both *Tawhid* in Islam and Trinity in Christianity say differently about the same God they believe. Therefore, in an interreligious dialogue, it is hard for a Moslem to affirm what his or her Christian fellow believes.

A dialogue, then, is not firstly meant to defeat others or to agree on a certain religious truth. Panikkar says that a dialog becomes a way of communication in order to bridge the gap of ignorance and misunderstanding among cultures and religions in the world (cf. Panikkar, 1999:29). Thus, people who get involved in a dialogue may speak out their views according to their own beliefs and expressions. The process cannot stop on a mere theoretical or theological dialogue; it has to generate a desire to collaborate in order to build a better world order.

One may realise that Martini has promoted a new world order that surpasses beyond the unbridgeable gap among religions. This world order is based on human values. Therefore, in fighting for this new world order, a person does not need to be an inclusivist or pluralist, because even an exclusivist can play a role in creating peace in the society. A person may not agree with other's (theological) view, but he or she may still be willing to help his or her fellow. Although we are different, we do not mean to be indifferent. That is the ideal order Martini offers to our society.

Conclusion

Everyone cannot deny diversity in this modern society. It is not meant to be denied as well. It is indeed uneasy to create a more humane world order if people resist diversity and do not want to adapt. Martini hopes that religions can pioneer the progress towards a new world order, which supports peace and humanity. We do not need to start from zero, since we have practised interreligious collaboration in many different ways, especially in Indonesia. Religious views, in particular, promote supporting values for a peaceful society; hence, sharing the values becomes a great contribution from all religions for our common good. Martini also urges the faithful to keep praying for peace in the world.

At this point, “the heirs” of Martini’s ideas have to keep finding creative ways in exploring his ideas, so that many people can understand them better. Martini was a Catholic, who often used Catholic terms in sharing his ideas, for he might have meant it as a contribution of the Catholic Church for a new world order. There are risks that Martini’s ideas may be effective only when communicated to Catholics and that non-Catholics may misunderstand them. However, being creative in expressing good ideas can show one’s sincerity in a dialogue. All people can generate better collaborations so that, in Martini’s words, “Noah’s dove can be at rest in a strong and solid nest.”

References

Books

- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. 1991.
- Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia. *Alkitab Deuterokanonika*. Jakarta: Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia. 1974, 1976.
- Martini, Carlo M. *The Dove at Rest*. Kildare, Ireland: St. Pauls. 1995.
- Panikkar, Raimon. *The Intrareligious Dialogue*. New Jersey: Paulist Press. 1999.

Articles

- Gevaryahu, Gilad J. J. “What Did the Dove Bring to Noah?” *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 43, Nr. 3 (2015) 172-5.

Held, David, et. al. "Globalization". *Global Governance* 5, Nr. 4 (1999) 483-96.

PPIM UIN Jakarta-UNDP Indonesia. "Sikap dan Perilaku Keberagaman Guru dan Dosen Pendidikan Agama Islam". *Convey Report* 1, Nr. 9 (2018).

Presentation

Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). "3 Tahun Jokowi: Kenaikan Elektoral dan Kepuasan Publik, Laporan Survei." (presented 09.11.2017).

Internet Sources

Express, "Migrant Crisis Warning: Situation Will Get Worse in 2017, Says Refugee-Hit Hungary" (5 January 2017). <http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/750615/Hungary-migration-refugee-crisis-2017-EU-borders> (access 28.06.2018).

UNHCR. "Syria Regional Refugee Response." <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php> (access 29.06.2018).

UNHCR. "Figures At A Glance". <http://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html> (access 29.06.2018).

Zong, Jie, et. al. "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States" (8 February 2018). <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states> (access 28.06.2018).