Alexander Hendra Dwi Asmara

Ph.D. Candidate in Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education, Fordham University

REA Annual Meeting 2019, 1–3 November, Toronto, Ontario

**Educating for Peaceful Pro-Existence through a Model of "Live-in" Education in Indonesia**

This paper proposes "live-in" as a model of interreligious education. Live-in education underlines the importance of two movements – "crossings over" into other traditions and "returning back" to the home tradition – that transform one's beliefs and practices. In the context of "everyday religious conflict" in Indonesia, live-in as exposure to others through living and learning together provides such natural and effortless forms of learning together (*belajar bersama),* which is a first step in the process of working together *(aksi bersama*) for the greater good of the whole community. Here, I will explore why "live-in" as a model of interreligious education is to be preferred than multireligious learning known as "Religious Quest". There are three important points from live-in. First, it provides a model of transformative learning for students. Second, it nurtures "dialog of life" as a model of "everyday interreligious education." Third, it encourages the student to venture into cross-ritual participation.

Recently, in a message for the 2019 World Day of Migrants and Refugees, released May 27, 2019, Pope Francis articulated his concern toward the growth of what he referred as the "globalization of indifference." He said,

> The most economically advanced societies are witnessing a growing trend towards extreme individualism which, combined with a utilitarian mentality and reinforced by the media, is producing a 'globalization of indifference. The problem of the globalization of indifference is not that we have doubts and fears, but that the indifference attitude can make people grow in intolerance, perhaps even to the point of hatred and animosity.[1]

Pope Francis precisely articulates the real challenge of our globalizing-multicultural world that is not so much how to recognize and appreciate the difference, but rather how to find ways of living together with all these differences. Learning to live together with others in peaceful pro-existence becomes an urgent task as people from different groups have been thrown together into common space and compelled to find ways to work together. A theologian Anselm Kyongsuk Min rightly says, "we are indeed living in an age of difference, but what the age calls for, paradoxically is not reification or absolutization of difference, but its sublation – in Hegelian sense of negation, transcendence, and preservation – into solidarity."[2] It is true that "the insistence of difference can produce an indifference (or even worse) towards Others."[3]

Following Pope Francis' concern, this paper aims to develop a pedagogy of religious education that can resist the expansion of the globalization of indifference in today's world. My strategy will be focused on fostering a model of religious education that concerns toward

---

[1] Francis, *Message for the 105th World Day of Migrants and Refugees 2019*, http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/messages/migration/documents/papa-francesco_20190527_world-migrants-day-2019.html

[2] Anselm K. Min, *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism* (NY: T&T Clark International, A Continuum imprint), 65.

[3] Ibid. 139.

nurturing not coexistence but peaceful pro-existence with other communities. As a context of this study, I will draw from my own experience as a religious educator in Indonesia, particularly by focusing on the model of "live-in" education that has been practiced by Jesuit education in Indonesia. More than merely learning other religions through encountering and dialogue, live-in education underlines the importance of two movements – "crossings over" into other traditions and "returning back" to the home tradition – that transform one's beliefs and practices. I will begin this discussion by elaborating the key term in this paper, "pro-existence."

**Searching for A Model of Community: From Co-Existence to Pro-Existence**

The crisis of globalization of indifference, Francis argues, takes two forms: First, the indifference of those who "are vaguely aware of the tragedies afflicting humanity, but they have no sense of involvement or compassion. Theirs is the attitude of those who know, but keep their gaze, their thoughts and their actions focused on themselves." And second, there is the indifference where "some people prefer not to ask questions or seek answers; [but] lead lives of comfort, deaf to the cry of those who suffer. The first case demands more attention since it articulates the "structural" indifference that turns out to be the dominant model in society. This structural indifference articulates a model of a multicultural society in the contemporary world where several different cultures exist as a result of migration and colonization. In this model of community, the dominant or majority group is at the center of society. Meanwhile, the minority groups are at the margin, competing with each other in order to engage dialogue with the dominant group. This model, as Boyung Lee argues, has been criticized because the concept of 'multicultural' society tends to lead to the construction of ghettos which cannot be the ideal model for living together and tends to ghetto, which cannot develop. She said:

> [In a multicultural society] small [minority] groups are only talking with the center, so they are not in conversation with any other small groups in their neighborhood. The result is that small circles compete with each other to be the privileged dialogue partner of the dominant culture's center. The concept of 'multicultural' society is helplessly facing the situation of living in parallel (in ghettos, for example) and cannot develop a model for living together.[4]

In this model of society, communities live and co-exist together, without open conflict. Nevertheless, coexistence is inadequate because its main foundation is economical and social stabilization, not a real awareness of people to engage others as human beings; coexistence is a passive mode of relationship which is not strong enough to build a community.[5] At a deeper level, this mode of engagement helps the dominant group keep the status quo while putting other groups at odds with one another. Thus, the dominant group continues the imperialistic matrix that has been brought and planted by colonialism. Walter Mignolo, an Argentinian post-colonialist scholar, argues that the unequal relationship between the dominant groups and the minority groups is part of the impacts of colonialism that have distorted, damaged, and in certain

---

[4] Boyung Lee, *Transforming Congregations through Community: Faith Formation From the Seminary to the Church* (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 123.

[5] Hans Harmakaputra, "Radical Love and Forgiveness as Foundation of Reconciliation: A Theological Imagination for GKI Yasmin Case in Indonesia." In *Violence, Religion, Peacemaking: Contributions of Interreligious Dialogue*. ed. By Douglas Irvin-Erickson and Peter C. Phan (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 101.

instances destroyed cultures and their communicative forms in the post-colonial society. Following the work of Peruvian Sociologist Aníbal Quijano, Mignolo argues of the still-operative matrix of colonialism that influences the post-colonial society. He argues:

> After liberation movements in America, Asia, and Africa, Western imperialism transmuted into "an association of social interests between the dominant groups ('social classes' and/or ethnic groups) of countries with unequally articulated power." In the aftermath of the widespread demise of Eurocentric colonialism, coloniality, remains operative through exploitation, domination, and discrimination, not from the outside as it was during the age of colonialist control, but through interactions among unequally-powered races, ethnic groups, and nations.[6]

This imperialistic matrix has resulted in "a subordination of cultures", accompanied by the distortion of people's imaginations, psyches, and bodies, namely, the epistemology of human beings: one's ways of understanding one's self, others, and the necessary conditions for thinking and acting. Over time, this imperialistic matrix creates ghettos where people are segregated based on their religion, ethnic, and race.

Mignolo suggests a pedagogy of unlearning coloniality. This pedagogy confronts destructive patterns of thought, feeling, decision-making, and acting that leave their marks on the psyche and the body. To accomplish this requires epistemological disobedience—that is, challenging the colonial matrix of knowledge and power.[7] From critical education perspective, Giroux proposes a model of "border crossing" pedagogy that presupposes not merely an acknowledgment of the shifting borders that both undermine and reterritorialize dominant configurations of power and knowledge, but also links the notion of pedagogy with the creation of a society in which there is available a multiplicity of democratic practices, values, and social relations.[8] Similarly, to address the indifference among communities in a multicultural society, Boyung Lee suggests a model of a community called "liberative interdependence" to describe and to underline the interconnectedness of different histories, economic structures, and political structures as well as the relatedness of cultural texts, races, classes, and genders within specific and global contexts.[9] Quoting Musa Dube, an African New Testament scholar, Lee argues that "the term *liberating interdependence* is therefore used here to define the interconnectedness of relationships that recognize and affirm the dignity of all things and people involved."[10] Pope Francis, looking from the Catholic tradition, also proposes an ecclesiological model of the community by employing the image of the "polyhedron." He argues:

---

[6] Bradford Hinze, "Decolonizing Everyday Practices: Sites of Struggle in Church and Society" *CTSA Proceedings 71 / 2016,* 47.

[7] Ibid., 49

[8] Henry Giroux, 2005. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education* (NY: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2005), 107.

[9] To achieve liberating education, Lee suggests that religious educators and ministers should: (1) be aware of and ask if their pedagogy bring liberation of those who are the most marginalized among community; (2) include different voices and interpretations in order to create a multiplicity of meanings; and (3) be that of dialogue based on equality between two or more different communities who have equal standing and rights. See Boyung Lee, *Transforming Congregations Through Community: Faith Formation From the Seminary to the Church* (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 130-132.

[10] Boyung Lee, *Transforming Congregations Through Community: Faith Formation From the Seminary to the Church* (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2013), 130.

Here our model is not the sphere, which is no greater than its parts, where every point is equidistant from the center, and there are no differences between them. Instead, it is the polyhedron, which reflects the convergence of all its parts, each of which preserves its distinctiveness….There is a place for the poor and their culture, their aspirations, and their potential. Even people who can be considered dubious on account of their errors have something to offer which must not be overlooked. It is the convergence of peoples who, within the universal order, maintain their own individuality; it is the sum total of persons within a society which pursues the common good, which truly has a place for everyone. (EG 236)

Francis' polyhedron is the union of all the different subparts that overcomes the centralistic understanding of the relations between the center and the peripheries and the sectarian mentality among the communities in the periphery. In conclusion, drawing insights from these scholars, the globalized world requires a new model of living together where people can mutually interact and have meaningful relationships; and at the same time, it is fostering the dialectic of both otherness and togetherness in the context of a pluralistic world.

**The Globalization of Indifference and Everyday Religious Conflict in Indonesia**
In the Indonesian context, globalization of indifference has taken religious tone, which creates the rise of religious intolerance in the present time. Based on the Setara Institute for Democracy and Peace, an Indonesian non-government organization (NGO), there has been a steady growth of religious intolerance in Indonesia since 2007 (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Acts violating religious freedom in Indonesia

| Years | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acts violating religious freedom | 185 | 367 | 291 | 286 | 299 | 371 | 292 | 134 | 236 | 270 |

Sourced from: Setara Institute reports, "Where is Our Place of Worship?"[11]

This report is in accordance with Sandra Hamid's research published by Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam, and Society (CILIS), another Indonesian non-government organization, which concerns with the rise of religious intolerance across Indonesia. In this publication in June 2018 entitled *Normalizing Intolerance: Elections, Religion and Everyday Life in Indonesia*, the study portrays the phenomenon known as "everyday religious conflict" that shows the strengthening role of sectarian religion, particularly Islam, in the public sphere. A primary characteristic of sectarian religious discourse is that it uses the language of a specific religious group or sect with little or no regard for whether or not this language is understood by those in other religious groups, such as, the application of Sariah law or Islamic law in the public sphere and the rise of radical Islamic groups such as the FPI (*Front Pembela Islam Indonesia*, The Islamic Defender Front) and the Hisbut Tahrir Indonesia (Table 1.2).[12]

---

[11] Setara Institute, *Where is Our Place of Worship? A Thematic Review of the Violation of the Freedom of Religion/Belief Regarding Places of Worship and the Right to Worship*, January-July 2010 (Jakarta: Setara Institute, 2010).

[12] The report lists several violent incidents by the FPI, such as, the attack of Ahmadi's community in West Java on February 2011, the burning down of Hindu Center on November 2011 in West Java, the forced closure of 11

Table 1.2 FPI's Collective Actions from 1998 to 2010

| Type of Actions | Frequency | Percent |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Violence | 64 | 27.5 |
| Nonviolence with physical threat | 33 | 14.2 |
| Nonviolence with verbal threat | 18 | 7.7 |
| Nonviolence | 118 | 50.6 |
| Total | 233 | 100 |

Thus, as a result, there is "daily religious segregation" where every dimension of public life, such as, the workplace, restaurant, public housing, schools, hospitals, and even public cemetery are segregated between those who are Muslims and non-Muslims.[13] Recent research from the Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam and Society (CILIS) in 2018 has documented the reality of daily religious segregation which allows for the normalization of intolerance in everyday life, such as in daily gatherings and prayer (and such stories rarely make it into civil society reports on intolerance):

> The first comes from a mixed neighborhood in a suburb of Jakarta, where a group of neighbors meets every month, rotating from house to another, in a gathering. A non-Muslim resident decided to leave the group because neighbors were no longer willing to visit her house for the monthly gathering, over concerns that her house was not *halal*. Indonesia has also witnessed shifting practices in how Muslims conduct business. Following the "marketization of Indonesian Islam," many Muslims have stories of being encouraged by family members to only buy products from Muslim owned businesses. One Jakarta-based member of a co-op, for example, decided to leave after being a member for a decade, because she believed that co-op practice was not in line with the requirements of a sharia-based economy.[14]

This narrative is one among many other narratives that can be found easily across the country. The stories contained in such narratives are testimonies by witnesses to growing intolerance in society. They show how intolerance has become normal and accepted and how it has affected the everyday experiences of people throughout Indonesia (Table 1.3).

---

Churches in Aceh in 2012, the bomb attack in 2013, the blasphemy case of a Christian Governor in Jakarta, and other narratives of intolerance in everyday life.

[13] Unfortunately, while these reports documents are irrefutable facts, the Indonesian government dismisses these narratives, arguing that they are merely local incidents which do not represent the country's condition. On the contrary, the government always projects Indonesia in a harmonious image as a model of a successful multi-religious state by presenting the pictures of dialogue among religious communities and the national symbol of unity in diversity.[13] With this strategy, the Indonesian president was eventually acknowledged by the international community for this achievement and received the World Statesman Award for religious freedom and human rights, from the Appeal of Conscience Foundation in New York on May 30, 2013. See. Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW). 2014. *Indonesia: Pluralism in Peril. The rise of religious intolerance across the archipelago*. Downloaded from www.csw.org.uk/2014-indonesia-report. (Accessed November 1, 2018).

[14] Sandra Hamid, "Normalizing Intolerance: Elections, Religion and Everyday Life in Indonesia," in the *CILIS (Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam, and Society) Policy Paper Series*, eds. by Professor Tim Lindsey and Dr Helen Pausacker. 2018. From http://law.unimelb.edu.au/centres/cilis/ research/publications/cilis-policy-papers

Table 1.3 Acts violating religious freedom in Indonesia in everyday life

| Acts against | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All religions (Events) | 185 (135) | 367 (265) | 291 (200) | 286 (216) | 299 (244) | 371 (264) | 292 (222) | 134 (117) |
| Christians (Events) | 28 | 15 | 18 (12) | * (75) | * (54) | * (50) | * (48) | * (25) |
| Christian % of total | 15% | 4% | 6% (6%) | (35%) | (22%) | (19%) | (22%) | (21%) |
| Other Minority | 21 | 238 (193) | * (33) | * (50) | * (144) | * (31) | * (59) | * (11) |
| Other Minority % of total | 11% | 65% (73%) | (17%) | (23%) | (47%) | (8%) | (27%) | (9%) |

Sourced from: Setara Institute reports such as "Where is Our Place of Worship?"[15]   *Unavailable

## Teaching Religion in Indonesia: The Model of Religious Quest

The growth of religious intolerance in Indonesia turns out to be very close and personal for me as I realize its disturbing impact on some of my students. When I was in Indonesia, back in 2016, I taught religious education subject called "Religious Quest" for undergraduate level in one of the Jesuit Universities in Indonesia. Religious Quest as a curriculum of religious education adopts the model of "comparative religious education" where the student can "learn about" various religious traditions. This model aims to achieve "a possibly objective survey of the contents and forms of expression of the religions."[16] I found that the curriculum of Religious Quest shares a similar vision with the model of multi-religious education developed in the context of a pluralistic society with its single purpose: to introduce pupils to the plurality of religions so that they acquire knowledge of, and insight into, different religions.[17] This approach seeks to cultivate interreligious literacy among students which will support them in building mutual understanding among religious believers. Minimal religious literacy is a necessary condition for people to live in the pluralistic society so that people do not make all sorts of bland, simplistic, and even disparaging judgment toward other religion.[18] Thus, in its core, this approach follows the coexistence paradigm as students learn the knowledge of different religions cognitively, and understand the uniqueness of other traditions affectively.

However, the Religious Quest approach does not support my students to have an inclusive and tolerant view. I observed that some of my students do not only have little knowledge, but the little knowledge they do have is often filled with bias, stereotypes, and generalizations, which they take from family, their religious leaders, their friends, and media. I remember one of my students openly said in the classroom during the discussion, arguing that

---

[15] Setara Institute, *Where is Our Place of Worship? A Thematic Review of the Violation of the Freedom of Religion/Belief Regarding Places of Worship and the Right to Worship*, January-July 2010 (Jakarta: Setara Institute, 2010).

[16] Ziebertz, H.-G. "Religious Education and Pluralism." In Marianne Moyaert. On the Role of Ritual in the Interfaith Education. *Religious Education* Volume 113, Number 1, January-February 2018, 50.

[17] C.A.M. Hermans, *Participatory Learning: Religious Education in a Globalizing Society* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 342.

[18] Marianne Moyaert, "On the Role of Ritual in the Interfaith Education." *Religious Education* Volume 113, Number 1, January-February 2018, 52.

"Islam is a violent religion which is responsible for the terrorist attack and the suicide bomb in Indonesia." I was shocked by his hatred statement for it was hurting other Muslim students in my class. Yet, I also realized that it was not completely his fault, but the influence of media and perhaps his religious communities. At a deeper level, this narrow and judgmental perspective signified the depth of religious intolerance in the Indonesian context.

Religious Quest as a model of multi-religious education is inadequate, especially in the context of religious intolerance in Indonesia. Even though this model informs student with knowledge of various religions, however, it lacks depth and personal involvement, creating religious indifference precisely because it is disconnected from real-life experiences.


**Live-in Education: A Model of Religious Education for Peaceful Pro-Existence**

Realizing this crisis, I changed my approach and did some experiment with a model of live-in education. In Indonesia, the term live-in refers to a "life experience" program where students or participants stay (live) in a religious community for several days to participate in the daily affair of community life, such as, attending the religious activities, joining daily schedule and many others. Florian Pohl in his study entitled *Religious Education and Secularization: Indonesia's Pesantren Tradition and Civil Society* (2007) points out that live-in as exposure to others through living and learning together provides "such natural and effortless forms of learning together *(belajar bersama)*, which is a first step in the process of working together (*aksi bersama*) for the greater good of the whole community."[19] Furthermore, the live-in program can accommodate the efforts effectively for peacebuilding and trauma healing, particularly in some parts of Indonesia, which have been deeply affected by conflict.[20] At its core, live-in perceives religion as "lived religion," a term that refers to "how religion and spirituality are practiced, experienced, and expressed by ordinary people in the context of their everyday lives."[21] Thus, live-in invites the student to see the "human face of religion" where religion is practiced in concrete contexts and intertwined with the lives of their adherents.[22] Through live-in program, student will understand religion not only cognitively, but also affectively, reflectively, and bodily through the actual experience of living in other religious community.

Live-in education involves two basic elements, namely, visiting the religious communities by participating actively in their community life and followed by returning to the home tradition. This process involves not only studying in the presence of the other, but also to "get inside" the religious tradition of another and "return" to the home religious tradition. John S. Dunne describes it as a "passing over" and "coming back" educational technique:

> What one does in passing over is trying to enter sympathetically into the feelings of another person, become receptive to those images and then come back enriched by this insight to an understanding of one's life which can guide one into the future.[23]

---

[19] Florian Pohl, "Religious Education and Secularization: Indonesia's Pesantren Tradition and Civil Society," *Ph.D. Dissertation*, Temple University, 2007, 188.

[20] Joyce Ann Mercer, "We Teach Our Children to See a Human Being": Women Transforming Religious Conflict in Indonesia". *International Journal of Pastoral Theology* 20(2), 2016, 276.

[21] Ibid., 268.

[22] Moyaert, "On the Role of Ritual in the Interfaith Education." 51.

[23] Kieran Scott, "Three Traditions of Religious Education," Religious Education, Vol. 79, (3) 1984, 325.

Michael Barnes, in his *Interreligious Learning: Dialogue, Spirituality, and the Christian Imagination* (2012) argues the importance of interreligious hospitality in this process. Barnes describes three shifts or "movements" that occur in relationship with others. The first movement, "meeting," attempts to situate interreligious encounter within the context of theology and history. Here he offers the image of religious traditions as "school of faith" where teachers and learners can meet and ask questions about beliefs, actions, prayers, and ritual. The second movement, "crossings," emphasizes the need for people to be translated across cultural boundaries if they are to learn the skills necessary for dialogue. The third movement, "imaginings" concerns the return back across the threshold of engagement to reflect on the ways that faith is enhanced through interreligious learning and the need to imagine an alternative future.[24] In a more detail step, Leonard Swidler, as pointed out by Kujawa-Holbrook, develops the basic idea of "passing over" and "coming back" educational technique in his concept of "Stages in the Process of Interreligious Engagement" (2008). There are six stages, namely,

> 1. Stage One – Radical Encountering of Difference: Encounters with other religious traditions challenge me to face my own worldview. I am tempted to withdraw.
> 2. Stage Two – Crossing Over – Letting Go and Entering the World of the Other: I decide to engage the world of the other, and I find I need to reassess my own assumptions, stereotypes, and prejudices.
> 3. Stage Three – Inhabiting and Experiencing the World of the Other: Practicing compassion opens me to learning new things. I feel the excitement and a deeper relationship with humanity.
> 4. Stage Four – Crossing Back with Expanded Vision: My sense of identity has deepened and changed. I am able to hold multiple truths, and I now hold the other in a relationship.
> 5. Stage Five – The Dialogic Awakening – A Radical Paradigm Shift: I experience a radical shift in my consciousness and am no longer able to go back to my former worldview. I sense interconnectedness between myself, the other, and all creatures.
> 6. Stage Six – Personal and Global Transforming of Life and Behavior: I experience communion with all – myself, others, and all creatures. My moral consciousness has been expanded, as has my concern for all life. I experience deeper meaning in all relationships.

Swidler's work is critical because it emphasizes the need to view learning as part of a process which contributes to spiritual growth. The end result is an experience of "perspective transformation," or new insights as one becomes "vulnerable" to the force and beauty of the religious other, becoming more open in giving more profound and more inclusive meaning to religious ideals and practices.[25] This vulnerability is transformative since this process challenges our unconscious assumptions about other traditions and provides an opportunity to reflect critically on the experience.

 Live-in also represents a model of spiritual education deeply embedded in St. Ignatius Loyola's spirituality and Ignatian pedagogy. In fact, in Indonesian Jesuit Schools, live-in education has been one of the traditions that uniquely characterize Jesuit education. Ignatian

---

[24] Sherly A. Kujawa-Holbrook, 2014. *God Beyond Borders: Interreligious Learning Among Faith Communities* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 13

[25] Bagus Laksana, "Back-and-Forth Riting: The Dynamics of Christian-Muslim Encounters in Shrine Rituals." in *Ritual Participation and Interreligious Dialogue: Boundaries, Transgressions, and Innovations*. eds. Marianne Moyaert and Joris Geldhof (NY: Bloomsbury Publ, 2015), 80.

pedagogy consists of five movements, namely, contexts, experience, reflection, action, and evaluation. Through these movements, students are expected to transform their competency (head), conscience (heart), and compassionate commitment (hand):

> Conscience, because in addition to knowing themselves, thanks to developing their ability to internalize and cultivate a spiritual life, they have a consistent knowledge and experience of society and its imbalances. Competent, professionally speaking, because they have an academic background that exposes them to advances in science and technology. Compassionate, because they are able to open their hearts to be in solidarity with and assume the suffering of others. Committed, because, being compassionate, they honestly strive toward faith, and through peaceful means, work for the social and political transformation of their countries and social structures to achieve justice.[26]

Live-in education consists of three sets of programs. The first program occurs in the classroom where students follow religious education based on their religions, taught by an educator from a similar religious tradition.[27] This dynamic is followed by the live-in, which takes place more or less at the end of the first half of the semester, particularly when the discussion touches the topic of interreligious dialogue. The student will be sent to several religious communities, namely, pondok pesantren, the Hindu community, and Buddhist ashram to stay and be actively involved in their community life for three days. Then, they will be brought back to school. The third program called reflection and action occurs after live-in. Student accompanied by their teacher is asked to reflect on their live-in experience personally and communally. Sometimes, the live-in committee also invites one or two speakers or motivators to help students in their process of reflection and in their plan for constructing transformative action.

Based on my survey data of live-in education in Indonesia, I found several themes that show how this program fosters a more inclusive perspective among the students. [28]

*First of all,* several students point out the transformative effect of live-in education as this experience has changed their prejudice and bias towards other religions, particularly Islam.[29] In other words, live-in education entails a commitment for *self-criticism*, a competence one gradually acquires in open conversation with other. Self-criticism leads to "reflexive spirituality", a willingness to "step back mentally from one's own perspective and recognize it as

---

[26] Adolfo Nicolas, Jesuit Alumni and their Social Responsibility: The Quest for a Better Future for Humanity. What Does it Mean to be a Believer Today? Medellin, 2013.

[27] This program follows the Indonesian Education Law which regulates that "Every student in an educational unit deserves to receive religious education following his or her religion, imparted by an educator from a similar religious tradition" (Article 12.1). "Religious education has the function to prepare students to become community members who understand and practice religious values and/or acquire expertise in his or her religion" (Article 30.2).

[28] I received the 2017-2018's survey data of live-in from de Britto Jesuit High School. I have asked their permission to use this data for my presentation in this conference. In this open-ended survey, students are asked five questions: (1) what is your disposition before you join the live-in program, (2) do you find that your live-in community help you to nurture tolerance, (3) what is your most insightful experience during live-in, (4) do you think that one week of live-in is enough, (5) Do you find that through your involvement in their community life you can know them better, (6) if any, what are your recommendations for next year live-in program.

[29] Some students says that "[before live-in] I have a very negative image about Islam which I got from the mass media that Islam is a radical religion which cannot accept religious differences and tries to Islamize other believers. However, after live-in, I realize that there are actors behind this [Islam radical]. During live-in, I met a very open *santri* (the Muslim student who stay in *pesantren*/Islamic boarding school) who our differences."

situated in an array of other possible perspectives."[30] An authentic self-criticism will eventually help to develop "hermeneutical openness" which refers to an attitude of attending to the other so as to overcome general claims, platitudes, and stereotype.[31] Moran points it out as an "open conversation" among religious believers, understood as a humble acknowledgment that each religion has its own incompleteness[32] It can be concluded that live-in can be categorized as a model of transformative learning, a model which involves "the process by which we transform our taken-for-granted frames of reference to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, emotionally capable of change, and reflective so that they may generate beliefs and opinions that will prove more true or justified to guide action."[33] At a deeper level, transformative learning seeks for "conscientization," understood as a process of cultural action in which people are awakened to their sociocultural reality, move beyond the constraints and alienations to which they are subjected, and affirm themselves as conscious subjects and co-creators of their historical future.

*Secondly*, many students also point out that one of the most memorable and meaningful experience during live-in is a dialogue which is not limited to conversation, but also venture into the many patterns of human relationship. They point out how in the daily routine during live-in, such as, cleaning the dishes, working in the rice field, and preparing the meal can be the site for dialogue.[34] These findings confirm the importance of "dialog of life" which is "the pattern of interreligious encounter found through interactions with neighbors, families, schools, and workplaces."[35] The dialog of life is often overlooked in favor of more structured programs; yet, the capacity to form a friendship in this model of dialogue is often more effective and fruitful. Borrowing from the work of an Indonesian anthropologist, Stella Hutagalung, live-in might rebuild what she calls the "everyday forms of civic engagement", namely, "a simple, routine interactions of life, such as mutual visits, mutual co-operation and participation in important events, as well as daily interaction among the people, including youth, women, and children" that eventually can be a place of negotiation and dialogue among religious believers.[36]

*Thirdly*, students also found out that live-in help them to understand other religions deeply through religious participation in other religious ritual. They were invited not only to have a religious conversation but also to join religious ritual by observing others doing a

---

[30] Nancy T. Ammerman, *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 171.

[31] Moyaert, "On the Role of Ritual in Interfaith Education," 52.

[32] Gabriel Moran, *Religious Education as a Second Language* (Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1989), 232.

[33] Jack Mezirow, "Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory," In J. Mezirow & Associates, *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2000), 8.

[34] Some students realize that they are able to nurture dialogue through simple things during their live-in program. For example, one student shares that "One of the most meaningful experiences for me is when we are having dinner together in *pondok pesantren* since we can talk anything openly and casually. In this simple occasion, I feel welcome by them; I am no longer a stranger in this community." Others also say that "It was on Thursday night, the third day of live-in in this *pondok pesantren*. I found out that that night was a recreation night for the *santri*, so they were allowed to watch TV, to do karaoke "ndangdutan" [the traditional song in rural area], and to play card. I joined them and I had a conversation with them. They shared to me their struggle as a *santri* and as a Muslim. I was surprised by their openness and honesty to me."

[35] Sherly A. Kujawa-Holbrook, 2014. *God Beyond Borders: Interreligious Learning Among Faith Communities* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 37.

[36] Stella Aleida Hutagalung, "Muslim–Christian Relations in Kupang: Negotiating Space and Maintaining Peace." *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 17:5 (2016), 441.

religious ritual or even by joining or participating in their community prayer and liturgy. Cross-ritual participation symbolizes "religious generosity" among religious believers; it embodies openness and hospitality that express mutual acceptance and mutual trust. However, cross-ritual participation might also not be productive for some rituals are strange, which eventually limit their participation. Thus, it also means accepting and respecting that not everything can be shared and understood.[37] This attitude can be called as "interreligious sensitivity" which is needed when dealing with religious issues, as they are strongly interwoven with personal and communal experiences, narratives, and loyalties. Interreligious sensitivity seeks to build an awareness of religious boundaries that should not be violated; therefore, people have to be sensitive to the symbols, rituals, and language of others.

In short, live-in program has brought positive things for nurturing sensitivity and openness towards other religious traditions. Nevertheless, this approach has some challenges. Live-in program presupposes students to have sufficient religious knowledge and religious sensitivity which will help them to engage with others in an authentic and fruitful dialogue. In fact, some religious communities are not as friendly and open as others which can be challenging for many students. Furthermore, implementing this program also means that school and students must be willing to spend more money.

## Conclusion

This paper does not suggest that live-in education is the panacea to cure and solve the rise of religious intolerance in Indonesia. Rather, it suggests that live-in is one of the "best practices" to inspire religious educators to actualize the transformative role of religious education. Religious education, in its most fundamental sense, is transformative aimed at "reshaping of life's form with end and without end in a lifelong and life-wide form" of forging, fashioning, nurturing, and exercising our faith by which "we nourish a commitment to active peaceful, nonviolent living."[38] Its curriculum is embedded in a "political activity" that seeks to inform, form, and transform people's lives that influences how they live their lives as social beings in history. Thus, as Groome argues, this political purpose of religious education invites people to a "lifelong journey of conversion toward holiness and fullness of life for themselves and for the life of the world" (John 6:51) and to "bring their lives to their Faith and their Faith to their lives."[39] The core vision of live-in that might be generally applicable in different contexts is the call to nurture the culture of encounter and of engagement. Through this call, we move from the "face-less" encounter to the "face-to-face" relation with others which implies solidarity and responsibility. Thus, as Emmanuel Levinas rightly says, "my relation to the other is not

---

[37] Students share how they compared Catholic liturgy with the Muslim prayer. Some of the students are also moved to join with *santris* during the prayer. One student says "During *shalawat* (the Islamic prayer), I saw many *santri* actively participate even though it lasted for more than two hours from 8-11 PM. This experience made me realize that I need to do the same thing as a Catholic. I want to participate more actively in the liturgy." Another also shares "During the live-in program, I joined all of the santri's activities. I attended Arabic class, learnt the history of Islam in Indonesia, and joined sholat (Islamic prayer) with them."

[38] Gabriel Moran, *Living Nonviolently: Language for Resisting Violence* (Maryland: Lexington Book, 2011), 167.

[39] Thomas H. Groome, *Will There Be Faith?: A New Vision for Educating and Growing Disciples* (NY: Harper Collins Publ, 2011), 13.

symmetrical, but 'asymmetrical': 'I am responsible for the other without waiting for reciprocity'"[40] We are responsible for everyone else, but I more than others.

**Bibliography**

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2007. *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bagir, Zainal Abidin. 2014. Advocacy for Religious Freedom in Democratizing Indonesia. *The Review of Faith and International Affairs* 12, No. 4: 27-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2014.976084.

Barnes, M. 202. *Interreligious Learning: Dialogue, Spirituality, and the Christian Imagination.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christian Solidarity Worldwide (CSW). 2014. *Indonesia: Pluralism in Peril. The rise of religious intolerance across the archipelago*. Downloaded from www.csw.org.uk/2014-indonesia-report. (Accessed November 1, 2018).

Francis. 2019. *Message for the 105th World Day of Migrants and Refugees 2019*, https://migrants-refugees.va/resource-center/world-day-of-migrants-refugees-2019/

_____. 2019. *Evengelii Gaudium: The Joy of the Gospel.* Vatican Website. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html.

Giroux, Henry A. 2005. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. NY: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Groome, Thomas H. 2011. *Will There Be Faith?: A New Vision for Educating and Growing Disciples.* NY: Harper Collins Publ.

Hamid, Sandra. 2018. "Normalizing Intolerance: Elections, Religion and Everyday Life in Indonesia," in the *CILIS (Centre for Indonesian Law, Islam, and Society) Policy Paper Series*, eds. by Professor Tim Lindsey and Dr Helen Pausacker. From http://law.unimelb.edu.au/centres/cilis/ research/publications/cilis-policy-papers

Harmakaputra, H.A., 2016. "Radical Love and Forgiveness as Foundation of Reconciliation: A Theological Imagination for GKI Yasmin Case in Indonesia." In *Violence, Religion, Peacemaking: Contributions of Interreligious Dialogue*. ed. By Douglas Irvin-Erickson and Peter C. Phan. NY: Palgrave Macmillan. 97-106.

---

[40] Anselm K. Min, *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*, 10.

Hermans, C. A. M. 2003. *Participatory Learning: Religious Education in a Globalizing Society*. Leiden: Brill.

Hefner, Robert W. 2008. A Conservative Turn in Indonesian Islam? Genesis and Future. *Annual Indonesia Lecture Series No. 28,* 33-50.

Hinze, Bradford. 2016. Decolonizing Everyday Practices: Sites of Struggle in Church and Society. *CTSA Proceedings 71*, 46-61.

Hutagalung, Stella Aleida. 2016. Muslim–Christian Relations in Kupang: Negotiating Space and Maintaining Peace. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 17:5, 439-459, DOI: 10.1080/14442213.2016.1226943.

Kujawa-Holbrook, Sherly A. 2014. *God Beyond Borders: Interreligious Learning Among Faith Communities*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Laksana, Bagus. 2015. "Back-and-Forth Riting: The Dynamics of Christian-Muslim Encounters in Shrine Rituals." in Ritual Participation and Interreligious Dialogue: Boundaries, Transgressions, and Innovations. eds. Marianne Moyaert and Joris Geldhof. NY: Bloomsbury Publ.

Lee, Boyung. 2010. Toward liberating interdependence: exploring an intercultural pedagogy. *Religious Education*, 105 no 3 May - Jun 2010: 283-298. DOI: 10.1080/00344081003772055.

_____. 2013. *Transforming Congregations through Community: Faith Formation From the Seminary to the Church*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press.

Mercer, Joyce Ann. 2016. "We Teach Our Children to See a Human Being": Women Transforming Religious Conflict in Indonesia". *International Journal of Pastoral Theology* 20(2): 261-281.

Mignolo, Walter D. "Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and De-Colonial Freedom," *Theory, Culture and Society,* 26 (2009), 1–23.

Merriam, Sharan B, Rosemary S. Caffarella and Lisa M. Baumgartner. 2007. *Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide. Third Edition.* San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Min, Anselm K. 2004b. *The Solidarity of Others in A Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*. NY: T & T Clark International.

Moran, Gabriel. 1989. *Religious Education as a Second Language*. Alabama: Religious Education Press.

_____. 2011. *Living Nonviolently: Language for Resisting Violence*. Maryland: Lexington Book.

Moyaert. Marianne. 2011. *Fragile Identities towards a Theology of Interreligious Hospitality*. NY: Rodopi.

_____. 2018. On the Role of Ritual in the Interfaith Education. *Religious Education* Volume 113, Number 1, January-February, 49-60.

Nicolas, Adolfo. 2013. "Jesuit Alumni and their Social Responsibility: The Quest for a Better Future for Humanity. What Does it Mean to be a Believer Today?" Medellin, Colombia. http://www.sjweb.info/documents/ansj/130815_Medellin_8_Congress_Alumni.pdf

Pohl, Florian. 2006. Religious education and secularization: Indonesia's Pesantren tradition and civil society. *Ph.D. Dissertation*, Temple University.

Setara Institute, "Where is Our Place of Worship? A Thematic Review of the Violation of the Freedom of Religion/Belief Regarding Places of Worship and the Right to Worship," January-July 2010. Jakarta: Setara Institute, 2010.

Sidel, John T. 2006. *Riots, Pogroms, Jihad: Religious Violence in Indonesia*. Ithaca: Cornell

Survey Data of "Live-in for Tolerance" from John de Britto High School, 2017-2018.

Swidler, Leonard. 2008. "Stages in the Process of Interreligious Engagement," in *Interfaith Dialogue at the Grass Roots*, ed. by Rebecca Kratz Mays. Philadelphia: Ecumenical.

Ziebertz, H.-G. Religious Education and Pluralism. In Marianne Moyaert. On the Role of Ritual in the Interfaith Education. *Religious Education* Volume 113, Number 1, January-February 2018, 49-60.