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Abstract
This article argues that a culture of justpeace could be reached if the church as a hermeneutic community interprets all narratives in the light of promoting justpeace. Promoting good narratives will shape us to be peacemakers. By using the concept of Appreciative Inquiry (AI) as a method, this article aims to invite people to engage conflict in a constructive way. This article discovers the role of justice, truth, and ecumenical-interreligious dialogue which play in the vision of a culture of justpeace. It also shows how the use of imagination is important in dreaming of a culture of justpeace. It invites us to see how narratives drive our imagination and design our character to make peace or violence.

Introduction
The emergence of conflicts and violence between religions is due to different hermeneutics and claims of truth from one another. Different hermeneutics and truth claims have an impact on the violent conflicts that exist in the world. Thus, how to build a hermeneutic foundation for togetherness even though there are many variations in it. In this context, a culture of justpeace is needed and a culture of justpeace must be built on a good foundation. What is a good foundation for a culture of justpeace? This is one of an appreciative inquiry's (hereinafter, AI) sort of questions. As a call to study ‘root causes of success,” AI begin with the assumption that all human systems have something to value within them. AI is important because proposing a culture of justpeace means to behave ourselves vis-à-vis conflict and violence. Thomas Porter suggests that we should cultivate our awareness toward conflict


properly so that we can create a good attitude when it comes in the way. In other words, Porter suggests that the church (we) all need to engage conflict in a constructive way. To do that, the church must believe and do that role in the conflict, the work of God is to be done.

With the search for what is valued, AI works to change the system through dreaming about what might be the system if the system were based on this value, designing the system so it promotes the positive core, and living out this destiny through inspired action that fulfils the dream and design. Claudia Liebler and Cynthia Sampson believe that AI might be viewed as a journey, which “involves improvisation and a certain amount of risk.” In other words, to build a culture of justpeace on the foundation of the AI, one must consider herself as a pilgrim in her pilgrimage. Porter says, “The journey of conflict transformation involves a willingness to risk because relationship always entails vulnerability … reconciliation is a journey so we need to be committed to a journey of a lifetime.” In this article, I will walk with you as a pilgrim into the AI’s four steps (Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny) of the journey to create a culture of justpeace. As Porter says, “it is more constructive to build on what is known and appreciated in the system than trying to imagine an abstract ideal of a better self or a better community.” Therefore, the question for this article is what kind of positive cores are needed to promote peace to cultivate a culture of justpeace?

To answer this question, I divide this article into four section: Discovery, Dream, Design, and Destiny. In the first two sections, I will discover the role of justice, truth, and ecumenical-interreligious dialogue which play in my vision of a culture of justpeace. Then I will show how the use of imagination is important in dreaming of a culture of justpeace. In the last two sections, by reflecting on a case study, I will invite us to see how a narrative drives our imagination and designs our character to make violence or peace. Hence, as a Christian, I argue that a culture of justpeace as our destiny could be reached if the church as a hermeneutic community interprets all narratives in the light of promoting justpeace. In other words, we need to promote those kinds of narratives that will nourish love and shape us to be peacemakers.
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3 Claudia Liebler and Cynthia Sampson, “Appreciative Inquiry,” 56.

Justice

It might be useful to remember the statement of Vatican Council II in *Gaudium et Spes* in 1965:

“Peace is not merely the absence of war; nor can it be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies; nor is it brought about by dictatorship. Instead, it is rightly and appropriately called an enterprise of justice (Is. 32:7).”

In Indonesia, during the New Order regime (rejim Orde Baru), there was too much peace and harmony rhetoric, and it was considered to ask/call for justice. But the reality was conflictual and violent. There have always been victims. Witnessing to peace means standing on the side of the victims. *Vox victimarum vox Dei*, God stands on the side of the victims, hears their voices. As Porter said, in conflict “the victims have the moral agency or authority; that they should be empowered to confront and to hold accountable the one who has done harm.”

Unless justice persuaded, peace and harmony are not more than false and fragile harmony, since it contains violence that only a matter of time to explode. To witness peace is to struggle for justice. Unfortunately, as Howard Zehr said, “victims, offenders, and community members often feel that justice does not adequately meet their needs.”

Howard Zehr argues that criminal justice does not adequately meet our need because our legal system has been asking fallacious questions. Zehr encourages us to practice a restorative justice by asking different questions from the questions that criminal justice asks. Only by asking different questions can we focus on different needs. Hence, the right questions are also needed for restorative justice restorative. For Zehr, the true (restorative) justice requires that we ask the question “who has been hurt?” (stand on the side of victims) rather than “what laws have been broken?” because this will shift our focus onto people as subjects, rather than people as objects of justice. By understanding people as subjects, we can properly ask “what do they need? And who has a stake in this situation?” rather than, “Who did it?” because we will shift our focus to all parties rather than focusing only on the offenders. Hence, after shifting our focus
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9The term coined by our second Indonesian President Suharto to characterize his regime as he came to a dictatorship power in 1966 through 1998. Due to my limitation on this article, I will not explain the history of the New Order regime. For more information, see: Michael R. J. Vatikiotis, *Indonesian Politics Under Suharto: The Rise and Fall of the New Order* (New York: Routledge, 2018).


to all parties, we can no longer ask, “What do the offenders deserve?” as we search for proper punishment for the offenders. Instead, we ask, “What is the process that can involve the stakeholders in finding a solution?” This is important because, often, we will never know for sure who has been the victim and the offender, or who has been the oppressors and the oppressed. According to Miroslav Volf, a thought that the oppressors are the sinners must be reiterated. People often find themselves sucked into a long story of wrongdoing in which yesterday’s victims are today’s perpetrators and today’s perpetrators tomorrow’s victims. Sometime the role of perpetrators and victims are overlapping, even we often will never know until then when in a circle! Therefore, we should invite all parties to peace by asking a different question. By doing this, we shape ourselves deliberately to cultivate a culture of justpeace.

Truth

As I have shown above, the New Order regime used the rhetoric of peace and harmony to cover their violent regime in Indonesia. Hence, here we could recognize that violence usually goes hand in hand with lies. Narrating lies is a mechanism to cover violence. Without truth, there is only false harmony where structural violence is going on. Narrating truth implies uncovering violence and lies. How do we really uncover the violence and lies? Porter answers, “justice requires the naming. Truth requires the naming. Transformation requires the naming. What is unnamed lies just beneath the surface. It often develops dis-ease. ... You must name it to heal it.” As Jesus started his last dinner with his disciples by naming the conflict that is “the elephant in the room,” also naming the structural and systemic problem of his society, we should also begin our work, by naming the conflicts, violence and lies to uncover them. Therefore, the way to begin the process of transforming any conflict, according to Porter, is the naming, speaking the truth. Speaking the truth can create, while speaking lies can destroy. To build a culture of justpeace, this action is an important beginning because through speaking the truth, the victim can address the harm which happened to them while giving the offender the chance to take personal responsibility for the actions that harmed the victims. This is the way to uncover the lie which has covered the violence and conflict.
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15Howard Zehr, The Little Book of Restorative Justice, 50-52.
18Thomas Porter, Spirit and Art of Conflict Transformation. This idiom was used by Thomas Porter to show a major controversial issue that is the betrayal of Judas and the denial and abandonment of Peter and other disciples Jesus will experience.
Ecumenical-Interreligious Dialogue

Hans Kün is a Catholic priest and theologian who has devoted his life to the questions about the place of religions in the quest for world peace. He explores the possibilities for both ecumenical dialogue (between Christian denominations) and interreligious dialogue (between Christianity and other religions). Through this work, Kün believes that world peace is dependent upon peace among religions. Furthermore, he says:

“No peace among the nations
Without peace among the religions.
No peace among the religions
Without dialogue between the religions.
No dialogue between the religions
Without investigation of the foundation of the religions.”

Therefore, for Kün, it is important for inter-religious dialogue to investigate the foundation of each religion. It is why, quoting Jonathan Sacks, Porter believes that “the greatest single antidote to violence is conversation.” Only in a dialogue can each side learn from the other, and naturally gradually learn more about our partners. Only in a dialogue can we encounter other people. Only in a dialogue do we have a chance of conflict transformation. Only in a dialogue can we learn about ourselves from our dialogue partner more than we could. Importantly, “our dialogue partner likewise becomes for us something of a mirror in which we perceive ourselves in ways we otherwise could not.” Therefore, it is important to bring our faith tradition to the table and be clear with how our faith tradition frames our orientation towards a culture of justpeace.

Dream: No Peace Without Imagination

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in his speech said, “I say to you today, my friends, though, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream.” Dream in the appreciative inquiry is powerful. Often, people in conflict are too focused on the problem and jump to a conclusion that they have reached their dead end. As King believed, even though in a difficult situation, to dream and to share the dream means to keep hope alive. Porter says, “sharing dreams and hopes together can reveal strong preferences, deep values, and desires.

---

20Thomas Porter, Spirit and Art of Conflict Transformation, 4.
People in conflict often find points of connection when sharing dreams of a preferred future that builds on their stories. This is why, in a circle process, Porter suggests that the first question is not “what are the problems that have brought you here?”, a question which invites all parties in conflict to start with a problem, rather “what are your hopes for our time together?” a kind of question which invites all parties in conflict to start with the imagination of hope in the future. Dream, hope, and future are imaginative words. Hence, to create a culture of justpeace, we need what John Paul Lederach called the moral imagination, the “capacity to imagine something rooted in the challenges of the real world yet capable of giving birth to that which does not yet exist.” Hence, hope for peace starts from the imagination. As Mary Elizabeth Moore says, “people will never be able to make peace until they can imagine it. They can never even long for peace if they cannot imagine it.” Sometimes, to imagine peace, we need help from others. In a Sunday school conflict mediation, even a photograph of Sunday school children from their last Christmas event as a talking piece could remind all parties of how important the event was at stake when they were in conflict.

Hence, when we hope for a culture of justpeace, we should use our imagination to dream about it. Yet, we also need some narratives to guide our imagination to make peace since as Moore says, “imagination, however, has the power to make war as well as peace.” How do we know that our imagination would lead us to make peace? After discovering the positive cores and dreaming about the culture of justpeace, in the next section, I will walk with you through a case as my landing point to design a culture of justpeace by promoting an importance of narratives.

Design: No Peace Without Narratives

On November 4, 2016, more than 100,000 protesters, mostly from various Muslim groups, swarmed onto Jakarta's street demanding the immediate arrest of Jakarta Governor Basuki ‘Ahok’ Tjahaja Purnama on blasphemy allegations. Ahok is accused of insulting Islam during election campaigning. In his campaign speech, Ahok said that Islamic groups who were using a Koranic verse to discourage support for him were deceiving voters. The Islamic groups, the Front
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26 Mary Elizabeth Moore, “Imagine Peace: Knowing the Real, Imagining the Impossible,” in Jay McDaniel and Donna Bowman (Eds.), *Handbook of Process Theology* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2016), 13.
27 Mary Elizabeth Moore, “Imagine Peace: Knowing the Real, Imagining the Impossible,” 13.
Pembela Islam (FPI - Islam Defenders Front) and the Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI - Indonesian Ulema Council), said that he had criticized the Koran and lodged complaints with the police. Some days later, Ahok apologized but denied committing blasphemy, which carries a maximum five-year jail sentence. Today, some media reported that there will be another rally in this week. “The former rally, which took a violent turn in the evening, leaving one man dead and dozens of police and demonstrators injured, was dubbed ‘peaceful,’ the organizers have been promoting the upcoming one as ‘super peaceful’”.

The story shows how we are as Indonesian so embedded in our religion that many of us can hardly separate religion from the other dimensions of our life. For Widjaja, this becomes a problem in Indonesia as a multi-faith context society because “religion is not simply used as an instrument to get economic or political interests, but it has been knitted and constructed into the societal web of meaning.” Quoting Hasenclever and Rittberger, Widjaja shows that religious conflict never just happens. A mass mobilization can take place when the relations between religious groups are tainted with mistrust against each other, Widjaja writes, “when the conflict is about values.”

Widjaja shows that conflict about value is prone to violence for three reasons.

First, one always identifies with the value of their community. Therefore, any threat to the value of their community will be seen as an existential threat to themselves. Secondly, the use of violence will be justified since it will be seen as an act to defend what the “community regards as just or unjust, and what makes up the identity of the community and its members.”

Lastly, violence is reinforced in a conflict about values, “the defeat will become a total reversal of one’s beliefs. It is a zero-sum game.”

I believe that conflict, as well as justice and peace, is socially constructed. Moore writes, “This reveals the nature of Peace as an ideal or vision that invokes a sense of wideness or cosmic
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vision. It enables individuals and commun an important rol ities to transcend themselves."³³ Here I argue that religion is a social institution which plays e to construct those terms. If religion can be a source of conflict, therefore Porter argues that our task is “to discover the resources of peace in our religions and make them our practices.”³⁴ Based on this understanding, I believe that narratives shape our character and will determine the kinds of attitudes and behavior that we have towards people who are different from us, especially in a multi-faith context. Widjaja argues that “our actions are intelligible only within the narrative context because human knowledge is necessarily narrative-shaped.”³⁵ I may give some money to a beggar whom I meet at a street junction, but that would not be a meaningful action unless I know personally who she/he is. I need to know the person’s life narratives. It is not a meaningful action when I give the money simply because I happen to have some coins in my pocket. Such an action can only become meaningful when I do the action for a particular reason that I derive from the narratives within which I live.

With this idea in mind, we can see that the religious narratives within which people live are very crucial because they create the plausibility structure by and through which the reality of the world is comprehended and within which divine legitimation is given by juxtaposing the mundane and the sacred.³⁶ “Narrative history,” MacIntyre points out, is “the basic and essential genre for the characterization of human actions.”³⁷ In this sense, the human being is human becoming, I presume that in this becoming process, as human, we inherit a givenness also from the community to whom we are born. This givenness significantly determines who we are. Our character, whether it is peaceful or violent, is given even before we can shape it because the character of our community inevitably shapes our individual characters.³⁸ Each of us then adopts the convictions of our communities and make the community’s way of seeing become our own. In this sense, our convictions and ways of seeing determine our quest, and after that determine who we are. We are what we do. Hence we need to intentionally create and nurture certain kinds of narratives and allow them to shape our character and the character of the generations to come.

³³ Mary Elizabeth Moore, “Imagine Peace,” 7.
³⁴ Thomas Porter, Spirit and Art of Conflict Transformation, 2.
³⁵ Paulus Sugeng Widjaja, Character Formation and Social Transformation: An Appeal to The Indonesian Churches Amidst the So-called Chinese Problem (Saarbrucken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft & Co., 2010), 165.
In the context of the problem above, Widjaja argues that Christians must be critical of violent narratives such as what he called “cosmic war narrative”. He refers to a narrative which tells about the ongoing war in the world between two conflicting forces, the good and the evil ones. He added, “they also include the narratives of heaven and hell as well as of the end of time.” In this narrative, one has to choose whether she belongs to the good force or the bad one. War will determine the dignity of herself. For this reason, she is willing to die to win because winning become the ultimate sign that she is right.

The problem with this narrative is that it leads people to perceive themselves as belonging to the good force under God’s command. Widjaja says, “it is therefore just a matter of time before they point their fingers at people of other faiths as belonging to the evil force that they have to fight against and even abolish.” That is why with this violent narrative, violence naturally follows. This is the danger of violent cosmic war narrative that shaped the character of religious people in Indonesia.

To achieve our destiny to have a culture of justpeace, we should escape from this violent and destructive narrative. We can escape only when we develop non-violent integrity by being connected to a narrative that is sufficient to lead us to justice, truth, ecumenical-interreligious dialogue, and as many as other values and virtue possible that can form and shape our character. Only then we can create a culture of justpeace. Therefore, we have arrived at our last section, which is our destiny to participate in a culture of justpeace a hermeneutic community.

CONCLUSION

No Peace Without Hermeneutic Communities. The religious community is the hermeneutic community within which we are nourished and provided with interpretations of human experiences and of the transcendence. As a Christian, Christian narratives become the narrative of the community of which I am a part. Stanley Hauerwas clarifies this understanding. According to him, the differences between Christian ethics, Islamic ethics, and Confucian ethics and so on, are not primarily that each prescribes different precepts but each is based on different narratives. Hence as a Christian, the narratives of Jesus Christ are thus important for the task of interpreting all the other narratives that promote and justify violence, including the narratives that we find within the church itself. We should acknowledge our part in creating and
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nourishing enmity and hatred between people, especially between Christians and Moslems. By doing this, we create a good field of dialogue even before the dialogue happens. At the same time, we should promote those kinds of narratives such as hospitality, restorative justice, and non-violence through the life of Jesus Christ that will nourish love and shape us to be peace builders, and in turn enable us to participate in a culture of justpeace.

The religious community also provides us other fellow practitioners to learn what is due to whom, to be prepared to take whatever risk is demanded along the way even though it may endanger us, to listen to what others tell about our inadequacies and to reply with the same carefulness. As a Christian, it is within the Church that we as Christian could find a structure of mutual accountability by which we demonstrate that “we are each other’s keepers” because our character is determined by our vision of reality but no one is able to see all sides of reality. Only God can do that. That is why we need to engage ourselves in the community by which our vision is enhanced through seeing together the reality with others believers. We are always under the moral evaluation of others. In here, we can train deliberately the important practice of speaking the truth, listening to others, forgiving, learning, reflecting, and so on, as our tools to promote a culture of justpeace. So the Church is the place where we are as Christians hold each other accountable. It is a place where we not only experience togetherness but also importantly, learn to discipline our wants and needs in congruence with Christian narratives which give us the resources to lead truthful lives in peace.
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