

Chapter 3

Building Unity: Fundamental Principles

Elwin Tobing

Dec 29, 2005

If you want to be free, there is but one way; it is to guarantee and equally full measure of liberty to all your neighbors. There is no other. **Carl Schurz.**

DARK REALITIES

On 19 January 1999, on the Moslem holy day Idul Fitri, an argument in Ambon City between a Christian public transport driver and at least one Moslem passenger deteriorated into a wide-ranging brawl. Within hours of the incident, Christian and Moslem fighters were attacking neighborhoods all over the city with both sides taking heavy losses in lives and property. The fighting spread almost immediately to the nearby islands of Haruku, Seram, Saparua and Manipa, partly because natives of those islands fled the Ambon fighting, carrying with them rumors about the plans of one 'side' (Christians or Moslems) to evict all of the other group from the province.¹

By August 1999, the fighting had spread to the North Moluccas, where government's plan to divide the province into two had resulted in competition between the Muslim Makian and Christian Kao groups. Communication between islands and the flow of refugees served to spread the conflict throughout the region. Since the bus incident, the

Chapter 3. Building Unity: Fundamental Principles—2

violence had escalated into almost all Moluccas regions, killing more than 5,000 people.²

Lesson: While the roots of the conflict are too complex to be reduced to one source, it shows that one group of people cannot live in a peaceful co-existence with others, and vice versa.

On January 19, 1999—an interesting coincidence with the bus incident in Ambon, a young man of Madura origin was detained due to accusations that he stole from the house of a Dayak in the Parit Setia, Sambas. Soon the news spread from mouth to mouth, and in the process the story was embellished to include the torture of the young man. This angered the Madurese who lived in Sambas. On that same afternoon, arriving on three minibuses and motorcycles, around 200 Madurese attacked the Parit Setia villagers. Three residents of the Parit Setia village were fatally wounded in the 20-minute attack.³

The conflict quickly broke out in the Sambas Regency on February 22, 1999 and spread to the neighboring regencies, including the provincial capital of Pontianak. For more than three months the clashes between the Dayaks and the Madurese escalated and continued to diffuse throughout the region. As of March 26, 1999 as many as 489 people were killed, where many were beheaded, about 4000 houses burned or destroyed, and nearly 30,000 Madurese people were displaced and had to seek refuge.⁴

The atrocities—regardless their root causes and their initiators—simply tell us that: Two groups of people, living under one nation, cannot live in a peaceful co-existence with one another. They cannot live in a peaceful coexistent with their neighbors.

Lesson: That one party or a group of people cannot live in a peaceful coexistent with others is not exclusive to the cases in Moluccas and Sambas. It can happen in any circumstances and any places. A worker cannot work peacefully and productively with his co-workers. The riches cannot live peacefully with the poor and vice versa. Such attitude is largely due to people's failure to respect for others who are different from them. Thus, in building a united nation of ours, the first

fundamental principle to be embraced is to respect differences. Differences must be respected and, above all, they must be cherished.

RESPECTING DIFFERENCES

In a speech during the commemoration of the birth of Prophet Muhammad on May 14, 2003, former President Megawati Soekarnoputri told the nation to consider it an obligation to acknowledge and respect differences. “That seems to reflect our nationhood. Without needing to boast about our huge differences or cover them up, there needs to give and take,” she said.⁵

Respect for differences is mandated by the fact that every human being is unique. Indeed, difference is a fact. We are diverse. Everyone has her own way of being herself—and this is what makes the world diverse. No one is exactly like his or her best friend, neighbor, spouse, or even one of his or her parental units. No two people in the world are exactly alike. Differences, whether due genetic inheritance, environment or culture, do exist and they are natural. If there were no differences, one becomes undistinguishable from others. All is the same. Most likely, there would be no progress because progress in most cases is driven by the desire to be different from and better than others. When all is uniform, there is a huge disincentive to compete and to be different from others. One of the principal incentives to learning is the imitation of other people’s achievements. Improvement usually starts by imitation. In fact, the success story of Japanese electronic industry in 70s was due to their ability to imitate the US’s products and improve their design and quality. If all were the same, there would be no incentive to imitate others. So differences are positive for improvement.

Respecting differences means acknowledge and cherish other people existence and right to live. We may not always like others who are different from us, but it does not make bad people. We are bad when we are not tolerant toward others by preventing and disrespecting them from being different. Embodied in diversity is the freedom to be different—liberty and to have our unique identity. By repressing diversity, we take away the freedoms and the individuality. So, can we make everyone becomes the same? Clearly, it is virtually impossible.

Humanity is in great jeopardy if people disrespect differences and believe in the notion that uniformity is the golden rule. In that case, people will tend to develop intolerant attitude toward others who are different from them either by race, color, religion or ideology.

The attitude to respect difference is an integral part of people's character. People are capable of doing good and bad things. When people develop negative mindset such as prejudice, hatred, racism and the kind, they will tend to commit bad things. When people develop compassion and tolerance toward others, they will likely commit good deeds to others. And just as people can choose to commit a good or bad practice, our attitude toward differences is about choice. It is not difficult to find when people disrespect differences. It presents whenever room is not made for another person's viewpoint, situation, or life experience. It grows quickly when people develop a closed mindset which prevents people to have interest in knowing and respecting others. A closed mindset is reflected in an attitude: *My ways, never yours—a domination attitude*. Or, *I am always better than you—a supremacy attitude*. Lack of respect for differences also cultivates rapidly when people are trapped, out of ignorant, in a narrow knowledge of others and the world. As a result, others are always viewed less important. A narrow knowledge is usually reflected in an attitude: *My world, it is not yours—an egocentric attitude*. When people develop such attitude, it is impossible for respect for differences to exist.

A common misconception about respecting differences is to deny it as if does not exist. Differences do not disappear by denying it. Rather, respect for differences is about accepting people for *who* they are, not about accepting *whatever* their behavior is. Respecting others for *who* they *are* and respecting others for *whatever* they *do* are two different things. We respect others because they are also human beings. While we tolerate people, our tolerance should not extend to whatever people's behavior or conduct is. The guideline for respecting others is just the simple golden rule, "*Do unto your neighbors what they want them to do for you.*" And the guideline for not respecting other people's conduct is, "*Do not do what you do not want others to do for you.*"

Once John Cook, a retired FBI agent who lived in Georgia was confronted with a situation that no father would ever imagine. On the evening of December 1996, Randy Upton, the Georgia Bureau of

Investigation who was working on a double homicide occurred in the Monroe County had called him, asking Mr. Cook to ask his son, Andy Cook, about the murder. Two college students, Michelle Cartagena and Grant Hendrickson were murdered brutally. After being asked by his father, the son admitted that he had killed his classmate and his girlfriend due to the classic reason: Jealousy. Shocking, outrageous, miserable and despite his well aware that his son would be on a death row for the crime he committed, the father decided to report his son confession to the authority. When asked how he felt about his son, the father said that he still loves his son, he accepts for who he is, but he did not tolerate for what he had done. In the word of Mr. Cook, “Andy’s crime was done with a malignant heart, but I don’t believe his heart is totally malignant. I believe there is a kernel value of somewhere in him...”⁶

While Mr. Cook accepts his son for *who* he is, he did not tolerate *what* he had done. In the eyes of his father, Andy’s act was a murder and must be punished accordingly. But in the eyes of his father, Andy is also his son. A blood association did not hinder Mr. Cook to judge malicious conduct from normal one.

Many of the problems in the world today are often caused by a simple reason: People have difficulties in distinguishing between accepting people and condoning *whatever* they do. Our association with others, either by blood, race, ethnicity or religion, often blinds us to judge their conducts objectively.

Accepting and respecting difference may not be easy. Rooted in all human beings is a basic “inclusive instinct”. We are always inclined to reduce the unknown to the known or the unfamiliar to the familiar, which consciously or not, could distort the image of the other. But if we are to build a better Indonesia, there is no other way, respect for differences is a must.

One of the biggest challenges with a very diverse nation such as Indonesia is to increase the percentage of her people who are aware and appreciative of diversity, and who view diversity as something to be cherished, not to be transformed into uniformity. Any intention and movement that tend to impose uniformity will only result in chaos. And any rules that indirectly or directly destroy diversity cannot be called as noble rules. When it destroys diversity, it essentially annihilates humanity; when it annihilates humanity, it only brings misery and

suffering. No prosperity in such circumstances exists at all.

RESPECT FOR HISTORY AND HERITAGE

Just as people cannot choose their parents, people cannot choose their country-birth by themselves without outside intervention.⁷ And just as people can have adopting parents, people can also have an adopting country. Nevertheless, one thing remains unchanged, their birthplace. This often-overlooked fact suggests that our country birth is not a random process. Rather, it is inherently embodied in our life purpose: To be valuable to our selves, our family, our nation, and our world.

Whether someone is Indonesian by birth or adoption, his neighbors are all Indonesians, from those who live in Sabang, Aceh to those in Merauke, Irian Jaya. All who call themselves Indonesians and all who have aspiration for a better Indonesia: Prosperous, democratic and united. About 75 years ago, young Indonesians understood this principle well. On October 28, 1928, delegates to the second Indonesian Youth Congress in Jakarta pledged allegiance to “one country, one nation and one language: Indonesia.” Thus, the second fundamental principle in building a united Indonesia is to have a respect for our history and appreciation for our heritage.

It is easy to take something for granted when everything seems working well in our favor. It is easy to get upset and frustrated when all things went wrong. And it is easy to get confused when all things seemed unclear. Most Indonesians are either upset, frustrated, confused or taking for granted of the current developments in their country. Nevertheless, as Carl Schurz, a German-born US general and politician, once said, “*Our country, right or wrong. When right to be kept right. When wrong, to be put right,*” Indonesians’ duty is to put their country right. The young Indonesians in the 1920s realized that the first step to put their country right (to be independent) was to be united.

About 17 years later, a founding father, the first Indonesian president, Soekarno stated this eloquently in his speech at the session of *Badan Penyelidik Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia—BPUPKI* (a committee for the preparation of Indonesia’s independence) in June 1, 1945,

Chapter 3. Building Unity: Fundamental Principles—7

“My fellow Indonesians, we have been meeting for three days. Many ideas have been proposed. We are all searching for a united philosophy that we all agree upon....Essentially, we all are searching for one mode.... we are all searching for one thing that we all agree. What is that? First of all, my fellows, I am asking you: Are we going to establish an independent Indonesia for one person or for one particular group of people?”

“We are going to establish a country not for a single individual, not for a particular group, but for all.....For more than 25 years, this thought have filled my soul that is...the first fundament of Indonesia is nationality.”⁸

Soekarno then went on to explain what nationality means to which he referred to as a strong bond among people who have the same aspirations and a strong bond between people and the place they dwell.⁹ It is a unity among people, and the unity between people and the place they dwell.

During the preparation for an independent Indonesia, the founding fathers debated seriously and intensely about the kinds of basic principles upon which the future state would be founded. The sharp differences were mainly on the basis and the territory of the future nation. One group proposed Islam as the basis, while other groups favored a secular state. Making appeals to the history and territorial claims of Majapahit, Muhammad Yamin proposed that the new nation should include Sarawak, Sabah, Malaya and Portuguese Timor, as well as all the territories of the Netherlands Indies.

The following brief chronology summarizes the debates. On 1 June 1945, President Sukarno delivered a famous speech proposing a compromise that the future country would be neither an Islamic nor a secular state but a *Pancasila* state.¹⁰ On June 22, 1945, Sukarno headed a special commission to resolve the disputes over the role of Islam in the future Republic and settled on compromise language known later as the *Piagam Jakarta* or Jakarta Charter. The compromise language simply states that Muslims are obligated to follow Islamic law. On the territorial issue, during the second BPUPKI session held from July 10 to 17, 1945, Hatta criticized Yamin’s nationalistic statements. He suggested that West Irian might be left out of the new Indonesia. Agus Salim broke the deadlock by suggesting that people in the British and

Portuguese possessions could vote on whether to join Indonesia. On August 18, 1945, *Piagam Jakarta* mentioning Islam among the Pancasila principles was dropped from the preamble to the new constitution. At the same day, the New Republic emerged which consisted of 8 provinces: Sumatra, Borneo, West Java, Central Java, East Java, Sulawesi, Maluku, and Sunda Kecil.¹¹

About sixty years ago, when Indonesia was still struggling to reclaim its independence, people were united, sharing their common noble vision. Folks in the farming fields cooperated with the guerilla fighters. Women prepared coffee and food for them. The founding fathers put aside their differences and worked cooperatively for a common vision. But now, people are so divided with different conflicting visions. In 1999 for instance, there were about 120 political parties in the country, exploding like molecules from only 3 political parties a year before. In 2004, the number of competing political parties is 24.

After the downfall of Soeharto in 1998, Indonesia had experienced one of the worst periods of its history. The archipelago confronts various intricate and interrelated problems from regional, political, ethnic, religion tensions to economic crisis. All these factors interact in complex ways and have threatened national unity. During the last five years, most news and reports on Indonesia are crowded with the images of political, regional, ethnic and religious strife. On June 3, 1999, BBC News carried a headline article: "Who own Indonesia?" Donald K. Emmerson, a noted scholar on Indonesia, wrote in *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2000, "Will Indonesia Survive?" Still in 2001, Edward Aspinall and Mark T Berger wrote an article in *Third World Quarterly* titled "The break-up of Indonesia?..." and Jusuf Wanandi in *The Washington Quarterly*, Summer 2002 wrote, "Indonesia: A Failed State?"¹²

There was even a domino effect theory. Right after East Timor won its independence, there were predictions that other Indonesian provinces would aspire to follow and the country would disintegrate. Suddenly, something that Indonesians have never imagined could become a real possibility: The prospect of the "Balkanization" of their own country in which Indonesia would dissolve into regional chaos and civil war along religious and ethnic lines just as in the former Yugoslavia.

Notwithstanding the nation's motto "Unity in diversity", the country is still being confronted with continuous challenge of both unity and diversity. Progress toward mutual respect and unity has been painfully slow and marked with setbacks, especially after the 1997 crisis. The resurgence of divisive attitudes, particularly on the religious basis, as well as the deepening of majorities vis a vis minorities have created a greater uncertainty of the nation's future unity. In college campuses, which are supposed to be a vibrant source of diversity, students tend to convene themselves on the basis of religions. In the government sector, it is a general knowledge that the recruitment process of public officials has been heavily biased on religious background of the candidates. In politics, religion has been the basis for separating one from another. To ignore the problem is to expose the country to physical, moral and spiritual danger.

In a State of the Nation delivered ahead of the Independence Day celebration on August 16, 2000, former President Abdurrahman Wahid stated, "*The founding fathers of this state had from the very beginning come to an agreement that the democratic Indonesian nation state does not belong to a group of people, not even the majority—either in terms of ethnicity, religion, social class or social stratum.*" He added, "*This republic belongs to all Indonesian people.*"¹³

Six decades ago, the founding fathers had adopted unity versus disunity. They put aside their differences for a greater cause. They all understood the nature of Indonesia: A very diverse nation. With 17,670 islands (6,000 inhabited), Indonesia is the world's largest archipelago, stretching from the west to the east for nearly 5,000 km, a distant equivalent to that from San Francisco to Bermuda. It is a home to a diversity of cultures and indigenous beliefs with about 500 tribes, and about 500 languages and dialects.¹⁴ The total and sea area is nearly 12 million square kilometers, 3 million square kilometers more than the land area of the United States.

Ethnicity, religion, culture, and language, must not be allowed to become a source of divisiveness. These are historical facts and heritage we must preserve and cherish. The unique diversity of cultural heritage and backgrounds of this nation should be recognized as a valuable asset for the nation, one to be cherished and shared. The

richness and diversity of our national cultures constitute a real treasure for humanity as a whole. Cultural diversity is the heart and soul of Indonesia. Ethnicity, religion, culture, and language diversities are the soul of people and the very essence of nationhood. They reflect our history, our values, our dreams and our view of our nation and the world. Those are that make us different, but also that tie us together. This may be a paradox: It is the heterogeneity, not homogeneity, of our people that becomes a crucial asset in building a solid national unity. As quoted by Bogdanor,

*A society, therefore, which is rivet by a dozen oppositions along lines running in every direction may actually be in less danger of being torn with violence of failing to pieces than one split along just one line. For each cleavage contributes to narrow the cross clefts, so that one might say society is sewn together by its inner conflicts.*¹⁵

Table 1. Indonesia, Basic Facts

Total islands	17,670 (6,000 inhabited)
Area:	
- total	1,919,440 sq km
- land	1,826,440 sq km
- water	93,000 sq km
Sea	7,9 million sq km
Total population	231,328,092 (July 2002 est.)
- 0-14 years	30.26%
- 15-64 years	65.11%
- 65 years and over	4.63%
Number of Languages	500
Number of Ethnic Groups	500
Major ethnic groups ^{a)}	Javanese 45%, Sundanese 14%, Madurese 7.5%, coastal Malays 7.5%, other 26%
Religions ^{a)}	Muslim 88%, Protestant 5%, Catholic 3%, Hindu 2%, Buddhist 1%, other 1% (1998)

Source: *Indonesia Handbook 2000*, the Directorate of Foreign Information Services of Department of Information. See also, *About Indonesia*, Department of Foreign Affairs. <http://www.dfa-deplu.go.id/background>. a) = Source: CIA, *the World Factbook 2002*.

Our country geographical position, on a crossroads between two oceans (the Pacific and the Indian oceans) and a bridge for two continents (Asia and Australia) poses challenges as it makes vulnerable to the dynamics of international geopolitics. As evolving technologies continue to remove the constraints of national boundaries, distances and time zones, countries are faced with the fact that national identity is becoming harder to preserve. In this age of globalization, markets and economies are increasingly inter-connected, and societies themselves are feeling the pressure to become more homogeneous. But as Mahatma Gandhi once said, “I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the culture of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any.”

We want to be open to outside influences, while at the same time preserving a rich heritage and a society that is pluralistic in terms of ethnicity, religion, culture and language. We therefore want the cultures of every land to be “blown about” our houses as freely as possible. But we don’t want the customs, traditions, and histories that have made each of our societies unique, blown away in the process!

As a nation, we hope to build a prosperous country—a better Indonesia. Just as the young Indonesians in the 1920s realized that unity is the crucial step in achieving independence, unity is also the first step in building a better Indonesia. We must then take responsibility in educating and building the character of our young generations so that they arrive at an appreciation for themselves and learn to accept those who are different from them. We must teach them to appreciate their own differences and the differences of others. In other words, we must help them to enhance their mindset and enrich their understanding about others, about the varied and marvelous heritages that enrich our nation, and the world. Many of our ideas and beliefs about race, culture and the world we learned during our early age. Any effort to implant the minds of the young generations with a better understanding about others and the world will be a priceless investment.

Public figures, politicians and group leaders must embrace diversity. They must develop and implement their plans for diversity. Words and actions must be consistent since one of the biggest enemies of tolerance

and respect for differences is hypocrisy. Together with private sectors, the government must explore the plan of establishing community centers in cities across the country where people from all background can get together sharing their knowledge and experience, learning about necessary knowledge and holding, for instance, diversity festivals.

Our education should have a system that allows for recognition of and respect for existing cultural differences in our society. In order to truly recognize, accept and affirm cultural diversity and individual differences, it is essential that we adopt an overriding educational philosophy that respects the cultural and individual differences of all people, regardless of their racial, ethnic, cultural or religious backgrounds, or physical differences.

Diversity must be cherished and our schools must become a source of hope for tolerance for diversity not a source of inspiration for intolerance. In higher learning institutions, guidance needs to be given to college student leaders on how to handle religious differences. Recruitments of public officials must be based on capabilities rather than the belief of the candidates. We need reliable and solid political parties that have inclusive rather than exclusive platforms. A strong nation can only be built if all diverse elements in the nation—whether by religion, ethnicity or race, are willing to associate, assemble and cooperate with one another for the good of the country.

STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCES

Cultural, ethnic, and language diversity are assets that we must incorporate in building our nation's strength. The strength of a nation comes from the diversity of its people as much as from its unity. Therefore, understanding differences is just as important as preserving unity. However, in trying to understand diversity, we should be careful to distinguish between natural diversity and structural diversity. Natural diversity is the diversity induced by nature such as ethnicity, culture and language. Structural diversity is the diversity induced by economic, social and political development. A failure to do so could lead to a less appreciation of diversity or worse, it could repress diversity.

Natural diversity is often less problematic compared to structural diversity. The economic and social gaps among groups of people are salient characteristics of Indonesian society that could affect all racial, ethnic, cultural, and social-class groups. Some of these gaps are due to a fundamental misconception that occurred in our economic development strategy during the New Order regime. The central planners failed to recognize of the fact that strong regional economies are the key to successful national development, not the other way around. Not only did it create serious regional disparities, it had caused some regions far left behind compared to the nation as a whole.

According to data released by the Central Bureau of Statistics in 1998, the average per capita income of 19 provinces was 1.48 million rupiah, much lower compared to the national per capita income of 2.17 million rupiah. Per capita income in Jakarta was ten-fold that of Eastern Southeast Nusa and nine-fold that of Southeast Sulawesi.

During period of 1967-98, total approved domestic investment in five provinces was 12 trillion rupiah, much less compared to that of West Java that received 195 trillion rupiah. Foreign investment approvals in eight provinces were only \$2.6 billion while, at the same period, West Java secured \$64 billion.

The other problem is the imbalanced regional distribution of population. Although the government has implemented transmigration policy aggressively for decades, the percentage of population in Java only reduced by 1 %, from 60% of total population in 1980 to 59% in 2000.

Regional indicators of human basic needs such as access to health services, better education, clean water and sanitation are even more dismal. In eight provinces, ratio of student to teacher at elementary level was still much higher compared to the national average of 23 students per teacher. Population per public health center in eight provinces was 360, too high compared to the national average of 274.

Around 34 percent of households in 17 provinces do not have access to sanitation, while the national average is 24 percent. On average, 30 percent of households in 12 provinces do not have access to clean water, too high compared to the national average of 12 percent.

An interesting aspect is that, while some analysts suggest that growth and increasing income inequality usually go together, economic growth and income inequality in Indonesia behave differently.¹⁶

Nevertheless, the number is rather minuscule. For fifteen years, 1984-1999, the top 20% of Indonesian people enjoyed about 41% of national income, and only about 9% of the national income was enjoyed by the lowest 20% of population (Table 2).

These structural differences pose serious challenges in realizing unity. They can affect people attitudes and behaviors which then influence their view about racial, cultural and other types of diversity. They can create cultural, racial and other types of diversity biases. Because the effects of these biases significantly hinder the opportunities for true relationship between people of different races, cultures, and economic backgrounds, the minimization of these differences must be the main goal of economic, social and political policy. Equally important, all leaders of any groups in the society must be able to distinguish the structural differences from natural differences. Their goal must be how to convert the challenge of the natural diversity into a potential that could facilitate the effort in resolving structural differences, not the other way around.

Table 2. Distribution of Income, 1999

Income share held by	1984	1990	1995	1999
highest 10%			28.3	26.7
highest 20%	41.97	41.94	43.1	41.1
second 20%	37.28	36.75	21.0	12.5
third 20%			15.5	16.1
fourth 20%	20.75	21.31	12.0	21.3
lowest 20%			8.4	9
lowest 10%			3.6	4

Source: *World Development Indicator*, various years. The World Bank.

FROM UNITY TO DIVERSITY

The third fundamental principle in building a united Indonesia is to exercise the right paradigm. We often hear *unity in diversity* paradigm. While this paradigm acknowledges differences, the emphasis is on realizing unity. Unity, according to this paradigm, is what holds differences together. The main focus in *unity in diversity* paradigm is on unity, and promoting diversity often becomes as a secondary issue. And diversity often becomes a passive notion, less appreciated, feared, or much worse, has to be repressed.

The call for unity itself lies in the very nature of human beings. While a human being is an individual, he is also part of a living whole. He cannot evolve except in relation to his fellow human beings. Accordingly, building any unity is in fact building upon the relational aspects of its diversities. The emphasis is at the relational aspects. Thus building unity is not the same as building a *uniformity* wherein the latter tends to limit the characteristics of the diversities so that they appear the same. It is about promoting people's consciousness about their diversities so that they recognize their relational aspects in their inter-relationship, and hence bring them to unity. Therefore, building unity must be based on understanding of two fundamental aspects: Diversity and relational aspects that bind the diversity.

Imagine a family or a household of four members: A father, a mother, a son and a daughter. They are diverse in nature. Each has his or her own work, hobby and own view about life. Most of the times, they are doing different things. There are only a few of their hobbies intersected with each other. They are diverse, but bound by the same aspiration: A good and happy family. Without anyone of them, the family will lose some part of their emotion and 'body'. A family without a father or a mother or children is incomplete. And if all of them do the same thing exactly or have exactly the same role all the time, the family will be dysfunctional. *They are functional because they are diverse.*

The success of the family is realized when each of them can develop to her or his fullest. Together they form a family and the family makes them together. They are united by a special bond. *They are successful because they are united.* As we shall discover, this example can readily be extended to a larger family: a nation. That is when each group of people

Chapter 3. Building Unity: Fundamental Principles—16

in our society—whether by race, ethnicity, religion or tribe—is allowed to develop to each of their fullest. This is the subject of the next chapter.

¹ International Crisis Group, *Indonesia's Maluku Crisis: The Issues*, 19 July 2000.

² International Crisis Group, *Indonesia: Overcoming Murder and Chaos in Maluku*, 19 December 2000.

³ For more detail of the aftermath of the January 1999 incidence, see *Communal Violence in Indonesia: Lessons From Kalimantan*, International Crisis Group, Asia Report 27 June 2001.

⁴ Heri Akhmadi, a Member of Indonesian Parliament. “Ethnic Conflict And Nation Building In Indonesia”. Paper presented at a “Assembly of Austronesian Leaders”, December 9 – 10, 2002, Taipei, Taiwan.

⁵ The Jakarta Post, May 15, 2003: *Megawati tells nation to respect differences*.

⁶ Reader Digest December 2000, “I turned in my son.”

⁷ While newborn babies cannot choose their own birthplace, in some cases their parents can choose where to give birth to their children. Thousands of Mexican pregnant women cross the US-Mexico border to give birth in the US yearly. By the US law, any baby born in the US automatically becomes American and this guarantees a better welfare for the child.

⁸ *Lahirnya Pancasila* (The Birth of Pancasila), Second Edition, 1949. Guntur, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ From then on, 1 June has been celebrated as “the birth of *Pancasila*.” Literally, *Pancasila* means “five principles.”

¹¹ See for instances, Darmaputera, E. 1988. *Pancasila and the Search for Identity and Modernity in Indonesian Society*. New York: E.J. Brill; Ricklefs, M.C., 2002. *A History of Modern Indonesia Since C. 1200*, Stanford University Press; 3rd edition; Taylor, J. G., 2003. *Indonesia: Peoples and Histories*, Yale University Press.

¹² Edward Aspinall and Mark T Berger, 2001. “The break-up of Indonesia? Nationalisms after decolonization and the limits of the nation-state in post-cold war Southeast Asia” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 22, No 6, pp 1003–1024.

- ¹³ South China Morning Post, Thursday, August 17, 2000. “Wahid appeals for unity as force to steer recovery.”
- ¹⁴ Indonesia Handbook 2000, the Directorate of Foreign Information Services of Department of Information. See also, About Indonesia, Department of Foreign Affairs. <http://www.dfa-deplu.go.id/background>
- ¹⁵ Ross quoted in V. Bogdanor, 1988. “Federalism in Switzerland,” *Government and Opposition* 23(1), 71-72.
- ¹⁶ Sala-i-Martin, Xavier, 2002. “The World Distribution of Income (Estimated From Individual Country Distributions),” *Working Paper 8933*. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w8933>.