



Final Report

Pax Romana ICMICA International Conference:

Toward a New Paradigm Sustainable Human Development: What Perspectives?

Yogyakarta, Indonesia
20 – 22 July, 2009



ICMICA – Pax Romana – MIIC

International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs
Mouvement International des Intellectuels Catholiques
Movimiento Internacional de Intelectuales Católicos

www.icmica-miic.org

Introduction

From July 20th to July 22nd, the International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs (ICMICA-Pax Romana) organized its International Conference on the theme of Towards a New paradigm: Sustainable Human Development: What Perspective? This event was coorganised with ISKA – The Association of the Catholic Graduates of Indonesia, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Atmajaya University Yogyakarta and PUSDEP – The Center of History and Political Ethics. This event was attended by leaders of Pax Romana from around the world with other intellectuals, professionals, civil society leaders and experts to reflect on global crisis today, and the new paradigm on the reflection of the development. The debate was focused on the proposals to look at the development through human perspective in a sustainable way.. The Conference, which took place at the Sanata Dharma University, which a Jesuit University in Yogyakarta Indonesia was a rich dialogue and exchange among the academics, practioners on development, leaders of the religious groups, the grassroots activists, as well as students.

The main questions addressed during the Conference include:

- Public policies and measures to combat poverty and the ownership of person based on the useful work, promoting justice and human rights.
- The value of work and measures to protect persons, who are mostly exposed to risk and job crisis such as rampant unemployment in most developing countries, accessing needs in adequate training especially vulnerable groups such as women, youth, informal and precarious and migrants workers.
- Towards a new and alternative paradigm, what semantic, intellectual, philosophical and practical efforts and initiatives needed not just to return where we came from after the crisis but to engage in a fundamental change?
- How to ensure that social progress is not undermined in the current crisis, and draw attention on the usefulness of a work as written in the Catholic Social Teaching to be used to evaluate the real contribution of every economic activity, which is potentially containing the *non-earned* income component.
- The economy in the developing countries should be based on the principle: a *decent work for each and for all, the transformation from less human conditions to more human conditions*. And this should be equally valid for the advanced countries, where the social and economic exclusion is growing phenomena.
- Financial crisis hamper the achievement of MDG, disturbing the sustainability of the development efforts, hence a search for an alternative paradigm that could eliminate current crisis will be contributing to its success of MDG and the goal for a sustainable human development.
- The globalization process should be handled with care, because it could have negative impacts besides its beneficial consequences. As such globalization needs a correcting instrument conducted by good willing people and good practices.
- Deepening ICMICA work on all aspects of Sustainable Human Development and responses to promote an alternative paradigm to respond to the global and social consequences of crisis.

The outcomes of the debate and discussion can be found in the *Final Declaration*.

Prior to this International Conference which took place at Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, the Conference also included several activities, including:

- Formation Session for Asian Youth Leaders which took place in Wisma Samadi, Jakarta, from 10 – 16 July 2009. This session was attended by participants from India, Pakistan and Indonesia, with the accompaniment by trainers coming from South Korea, France, and Switzerland.

I. Objectives of the Conference

In looking at the theme of "Toward A New Paradigm, Sustainable Development: What Perspective?" ICMICA-Pax Romana, in partnership with experts and other actors in civil society and government, sought to address a number of key objectives in hopes of contributing to the current debates on the development within intergovernmental institutions, civil society, the Church, and Pax Romana membership. These objectives included:

1. Developing a critical analysis on the concept of sustainable human development, based on the failures of the today's development paradigm and ways to promote a new paradigm.
2. Sharpening understanding and engagement in the participatory democracy which should be compatible with the sustainable human development, with a comparative study on the quality of current democracy models developed in different continents
3. Deepening our reflection on the role of faith based organizations & religious organizations in promoting the new paradigm & concept of sustainable human development, especially focusing on the ethical inputs of religion on the development paradigm

II. Exposure Programme

As the programme is held in Yogyakarta, the participants who were present prior to the Conference were invited to join the exposure programme. The city of Yogyakarta has often been considered as the cultural center of Java, and center of excellence due to the presence of various education institutions, both private and public. Yogyakarta is also known for their tolerance toward people coming from different cultural and religious backgrounds. It's a melting pot of the Indonesian society. These facts provide Yogyakarta with the unique opportunity where people can have intellectual, academic and cultural debates on various contemporary issues of the society as well as a place where people can live relatively in harmony. The objective of this exposure was to have exchange of views and dialogue on their activities civil of the society organization and understanding their involvement and initiative in facing the crises. The participant met with different organizations and civil society's initiatives on education, developments and empowerment. Below is the programme of the exposure:

EXPOSURE PROGRAMME

TIME	HOUR	GROUP I	GROUP II
Saturday, 18th July 2009	08.30-11.00	Madrasah Mu'alimin Islamic Boarding School of Muhammadiyah Jl. Letjen S Parman 65 Yogyakarta. Yayasan Pondok Rakyat Jl. Nagan Lor, Ngasem	Sunan Pandanaran Islamic Boarding School Jl. Kaliurang Km. 12.5 Pakem Yogyakarta
	12.00- 13.00	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>
	13.30-16.30	Secretariat in Service of The World Food Day Farmers' and Fisherman Movement of Indonesia (WFDFM)	NGO Cinde Laras, Depok, Sleman
Sunday, 19th July 2009	08.30-11.00	The Alliance of Workers of Yogyakarta (Aliansi Buruh Yogyakarta) Sawitsari, Yogyakarta	Visit to Urban Settlement at River Code Bank
	12.00-13.00	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>

14.30-15.00	<i>Afternoon Break</i>	<i>Afternoon break</i>
15.00-16.30	Going to Ganjuran Bantul	Going to Ganjuran Bantul
17.00-19.00	Holy Mass in Ganjuran Catholic Church	Holy Mass in Ganjuran Catholic Church
19.00-20.00	Dinner with Ganjuran Church Community	Dinner with Ganjuran Church Community
20.00-21.30	Return to Accommodation	Return to Accommodation

III. Participants

Apart from the resource persons and experts invited to address the Conference, this event was attended by network and members of ICMICA coming from different countries. The Indonesian participants came from different parts of Indonesia, which gathers the academia, members of political parties, practioners in development, civil society representatives, students and labor union members. These representatives came to the Conference from the following countries:

Australia, Basque-Spain, China, Rep. of Congo, DR Congo, Dominican Republic, France, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, the Philippines, Peru, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uganda, Uruguay, Zimbabwe.



IV. Conference Programme

	Time	Program
19 July 2009	04.00 pm – 06.00 pm	Opening of Holy Mass: at Ganjuran Church
20 July 2009	08.30 am – 10.00 am	Performance : Javanese Dance Welcome Speeches : Mr. Javier Iguñiz, President of ICMICA Pax Romana Dr. Paul Wiryono, Rector of Sanata Dharma University Yogya Mr. Paulus Harli, President of ISKA Indonesia Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X, Governor of Yogyakarta Special Territory (presented by Prof. Dr. Suwarsih Madya) Moderator : Laurence KWARK, SG of ICMICA Pax Romana
	10.00 am – 10.30 am	Break
	10.30 am – 01.00 pm	Topic: Crisis, Poverty: What scenarios and perspectives toward a New Globalisation? Keynote Speakers : -H.E. Mari Pangestu, The Minister of Trade of Indonesia -Fr. Hugues Puel, O.P, Professor of Economics, University of Lyon, France; Former President of Economy and Humanism, "Change of Paradigm to face Crises: New relevance of Fr. Lebret's Intuition and E & H, What Perspectives?" Moderator : Dr. Djamester Simarmata, University of Indonesia
	01.00 pm – 02.00 pm	Lunch
	02.00 pm – 04.30 pm	Topic: Crisis, Poverty: What scenarios and perspectives for a new paradigm? Panel of Regional Speakers: America: Dr Enrique Valencia, Economist from Mexico, "Public Policies and Programs to fight against Poverty in LA; What perspectives?" Africa : Dr. Odomaro Mubangizi, SJ., Prof of Economy and political science at Arupe College, Harare, Zimbabwe, "What scenarios and perspectives toward a new paradigm in Africa? Lessons learnt and future perspectives" Asia : Mr. Ivan A. Hadar, National Coordinator of the Target MDG Program, UNDP / BAPPENAS Moderator : Mr. Philippe Ledouble, European Vice President of Pax Romana ICMICA
	04.30 pm – 05.00 pm	Break
	05.00 pm – 06.30 pm	Final Keynote Speaker: Prof. Javier Iguñiz, President of ICMICA Pax Romana Professor in Economics, Pontifical University of Lima, Peru Moderator : Mr. Egide Rwamatwara, African Vice President of ICMICA Pax Romana ICMICA.

21 July 2009	08.30 am – 10.00 am	<p>Topic: Quality of Democracy: citizen’s participation in democratic governance?</p> <p>Asian Perspective : Dr. Helen Ting, Research Fellow at IKMAS, the National University of Malaysia, “Political Participation of Civil Society in Democratic Governance, lessons learnt and future perspectives” in Malaysia</p> <p>European Perspective : Fr. Antoine Sondag, Director of International Study & Research at Caritas France (Secours Catholiques), “Political Participation of Civil Society in Democratic Governance, lessons learnt in Europe and future perspectives”, towards an Alternative political economy in Europe</p> <p>Moderator : Dr. Vincent J. Jolasa, University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia,</p>
	10.00 am – 10.30 am	Break
	10.30 am – 01.00 pm	<p>Latin American Perspective: by Mercedes Vega Sahdala, Lawyer, Dominican Republic and Ana Claudia de los Heros, Central Bank of Uruguay on “Political Participation of Civil Society in Democratic Governance in LA & Caribbean Region, lessons learnt and future perspectives”,</p> <p>African Perspective : Mr. Mike Roussos, Former Member of Gauteng Government, South Africa on “Political Participation of Civil Society in Democratic Governance, lessons learnt and future perspectives”, towards an Alternative political economy & Energy sources in Africa</p> <p>Moderator : Dr. Radja Oloan Tumanggor, Sekolah Tinggi Theologi Jakarta, Indonesia</p>
	01.00pm – 02.00 pm	Lunch
	02.00 pm – 04.00 pm	<p>Indonesian Perspective:</p> <p>Mr. Nikolas Simanjuntak, Professional Practical lawyer, Lecturer at Jakarta Catholic University on Human Rights, Indonesia “Ten Years Democracy Stages in Indonesia (1999-2009).</p> <p>Moderator : Dr. Lucas S, Activist in Human Rights and Democracy from Atmajaya University Yogyakarta</p>
	04.00 pm – 04.30 pm	Break
	04.30 pm – 06.30 pm	<p>Topic: Democracy, Truth and Reconciliation in Indonesia:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dr. Baskara T. Wardaya, SJ, Historian and Director of PUSdEP (Center for History and Political Ethics), Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. 2. Mr. Tri Subagya, MA Lecturer and researcher at PUSdEP (Center for History and Political Ethics), Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia <p>Moderator: Dr. Martino Sardi, OFM, Lecturer and President of Human Rights Study and Democracy, Atmajaya University Yogyakarta, Indonesia.</p>
22 July 2009	08.30 am – 10.00 am	<p>Ethical / Religious Inputs: The Contribution from different faith-based communities – How to build logic of compassion and peace for the change of paradigm?</p> <p>Reflection from Muslim Perspective, Dr. Rumadi, Wahid</p>

		<p>Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia and Prof Dr. Ahmad Syafii Maarif, M.A., Former President of Muhammadiyah and Senior Professor in history from Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia</p> <p>Reflection from Protestant Perspective, Ms. Etty, Expert in Peace and Justice from Duta Wacana Christian University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.</p> <p>Reflection from Civil Society Perspective, Mr. Timotius Apriliyanto, Forum for Interfaith Dialogue, Yogyakarta, Indonesia</p> <p>Moderator : Dr.Andre Ata Ujan, Atma Jaya University Jakarta, Indonesia,</p>
	10.00 am – 10.30 am	Break
	10.30 am – 01.00 pm	<p>Reflection from Buddhist-Catholic Comparative Perspective, Mr. Paul Hwang, Coordinator of Centre for Asian Theology and Solidarity, UCAN Journalist, South Korea</p> <p>Reflection from Catholic Perspective, Dr. Ir. Wiryono Priyatamtama SJ, President of Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia</p> <p>Reflection from Balinese Hindu Perspective: Dr. Anak Agung Suryahadi, M.Ed, Indonesia</p> <p>Reflection from Great Tao Maitreya Yogyakarta Perspective: Ms. Drg. Chindy Tanjung (Nun), Yogyakarta, Indonesia</p> <p>Moderator : Ms. Bridget Mary Prema, Council member of ICMICA Pax Romana, India</p>
	01.00pm – 02.00 pm	Lunch
	02.30 pm – 05.30 pm	<p>Final Panel on Reflection and Conclusion :</p> <p>Fr. Mike Deeb, O.P. : Director of the JPC of RSA, Economic and Ecological Justice, humanising humanity – Role of Catholic Action Movements”, South Africa</p> <p>Mr. Young Jin Nam, from Individual Social Responsibility to a Collective Social Responsibility, the role of alternative mass-media, South Korea</p> <p>Ms. Lawrencia Kwark, Secretary General of ICMICA Pax Romana, Towards a new solidarity for an equitable and sustainable world, role of faith-based Professional movement</p> <p>Moderator : Dr.Baskara T. Wardaya SJ, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia</p>
	06.00 pm	Closing Mass at Sanata Dharma University Chapel presided by Dr. Ag. Purnomo, MSF.
	08.00 pm	Closing Gathering hosted by PUSDeP Sanata Dharma





The global financial crisis: an unprecedented crisis and a positive international response

**By Dr. Mary Elga Pangestu
Indonesian Minister of Trade**

The global financial crisis caught everybody by surprise. Developed and developing countries saw a dramatic downturn in international trade, production, and cross-border capital flows. This is the most serious fall in confidence since the Great Depression. Developed countries growth slowed dramatically and this spilled over into lower growth in many developing countries.

Governments around the world have taken initiatives to address the global financial crisis with a comprehensive and well coordinated response to support economic growth. The G20 has provided a framework for responding to the crisis with the G20 Leaders Global Plan for Recovery and Reform.

This Plan has had the desired effect by building confidence in the financial sector and is now bringing stabilization to the global economy. But the world cannot be complacent, a continuation of the recovery will call for continuing to build on the positive momentum generated to date including with the G20 initiatives.

Asia has weathered the Storm Well

Asia has generally weathered the storm well as compared to developed countries. This reflects the strength of Asian economies at the start of the global financial crisis.

Asian economies have improved their policy framework as a result of reform efforts. Reforms include improving monetary management, fiscal reforms, debt reduction, more resilient financial systems and ensuring comfortable levels of foreign exchange reserves. Many of these reforms commenced in response to the Asian financial crisis in 1997 and have been ongoing since 1997.

Asian economies have responded to the spillovers decisively with prompt implementation of countercyclical monetary and, in some cases, fiscal measures to support growth. Given these strong fundamentals and policy track record, the severity of the slowdown in the Asian region means that Asia was *generally* less affected than other countries by the global financial crisis.

What are the effects on poverty?

The global financial crisis is likely to increase poverty.

While developed countries are experiencing some of the sharpest contractions, poor people in developing countries are much more vulnerable and likely to experience negative consequences. Lower economic growth rates combined with high levels of initial poverty leave many households in developing countries highly exposed to the crisis.

Slower levels of economic growth will see those that are the most vulnerable in society having fewer employment opportunities. Slowing economic growth has seen layoffs and a fall in the demand for firms to employ new staff.

The poor may also be vulnerable from reduced social protection. Some governments may lack the funds to expand their social safety nets to protect the poor. Aid budgets from mainly developed to developing countries may reduce the assistance that supports pro-poor policies and provides direct financing for the poor.

¹ If you need other papers, please contact us.

Indonesia's response to the global financial crisis has lessened the effects

Indonesia's macroeconomic performance is relatively healthy and the government is fully aware of all of the challenges faced by Indonesia and has taken actions to deal with these challenges.

The resilience of Indonesia's economy is affirmed by international ratings agencies assessing Indonesia as having a stable outlook. International ratings agencies note Indonesia's fiscal prudence and comfortable level of foreign reserves.

The government is fully aware of how the global credit crisis has and will affect Indonesia. The government has taken a series of targeted actions to address the challenges of the crisis and move Indonesia quickly back to average levels of economic growth.

The Government of Indonesia's response to the global financial crisis

Many of the policy responses to the crisis by the Government of Indonesia focus on ensuring the stability of the financial system. The Government of Indonesia recognizes that the financial system plays a major role for high levels of economic growth.

To restore and to now maintain liquidity in the financial system, the Government has placed funds with state-owned banks and raised the deposit guarantee amount. A crisis protocol has also been designed and regulations have been refined to deal with changes in the financial markets.

To curb speculative derivative transactions that could destabilize the value of the Indonesian Rupiah, the government is more actively managing state-owned enterprises' foreign exchange transactions. Greater disclosure is required for large-sized transactions of foreign currency against the Indonesian Rupiah. The Government has also maintained a sufficient level of foreign exchange reserves through trade financing facilities and the prevention on illegal imports.

The Government will continue to actively support the economy through monetary tools. Following the easing of inflationary pressures, Bank Indonesia has responded swiftly to the slide in economic growth by lowering the policy rate. Large Indonesian banks have also cut their lending rates in response.

The Government has also implemented policies to stimulate real sector growth. These include an accelerated program of loan disbursement for government and state owned enterprises projects as well as government guarantees for trade financing. To reduce operational costs for the manufacturing sector, the government reduced premium gasoline and diesel prices.

The Government continues to improve competitiveness and governance. The Government remains committed with its economic reform agenda. The Government is improving its economic competitiveness maintaining its relatively open international trade policy stance and simplifying regulations, for example, regulations for the implementation of the National Single Window program.

The fiscal stimulus initiatives include expanding infrastructure programs. The Government will provide tax incentives for selected sectors and regions, and allocate additional non-energy tax subsidies. In terms of tax revenue, Indonesia will continue to reform the tax structure and implement the Income Tax Law.

Many of these measures are also in the context of the Government's commitment to fully participate in the joint global efforts to do whatever is necessary to return to the path of average levels of economic growth.

What is a likely growth scenario for the future?

2009 so far has been characterized by returning stability. Most economists think that this trend is likely to continue for the rest of 2009 with some positive signs of returning to economic growth emerging in 2010. A return to average levels of economic growth is expected in the medium term to long term.

In the short term, different countries are likely to fair differently from the effects of the global financial crisis for the rest of 2009 and 2010.

The scenario for developed countries and developing countries will clearly be different.

For many developed economies, their level of economic growth will continue to find it challenging in returning to average levels of economic growth. They have been the worst affected from the global financial crisis especially with the difficulties in their financial systems.

For developing economies, their level of economic growth is likely to return to average levels of economic growth in reasonably good time. They have been less affected by the crisis as compared to other economies.

While this is the case, it should be noted that developing countries would be affected by the lower economic growth in developed countries. Some clear linkages are between international trade and investment. In the short-term, there is likely to be lower demand from developing countries for imports from developed countries. Investment, which is a major driver of economic growth, from developed countries to developing countries is also expected to be lower.

Some perspectives on a way forward

Within the context of this scenario on economic growth a policy framework for the future is to:

- Continue to strengthen the financial systems – a major conduit for economic growth;
- Maintain accommodative monetary policy. Financial systems will need to ensure that they maintain a quantitative easing as long as is possible to ensure credit continues to flow; and
- Maintain a fiscal stimulus to boost domestic demand.

What should be the focus governments' response to reduce the impact on poverty?

A part of governments' response is to mitigate the poverty impacts of falling growth. Several measures that can be taken by governments include:

- Step up efforts to strengthen social safety nets for the poor;
- Focus stimulus packages on employment generation. Critical to helping the poor in the long term will be the ability of governments to cope with the fallout and fiscal programs that create jobs; and
- Commitments from donors to increase aid to developing countries with a focus support for poverty alleviation.

SUSTAINABILTY: OF WHAT DEVELOPMENT?

By Javier M. Iguíñiz Echeverría *

Introduction

The problem with "sustainable development" lies not in its impossibility or in the difficulties of sustaining but in the nature of the development that is to be sustained. Hence, the most recent preoccupation for the meaning of development. There are many diagnoses concerning the defects of economic development resulting from this preoccupation and they vary in how radically they question such development. There are, for instance, those that are "anti-

*Full Professor of the Economics Department of the *Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú*, Lima, Peru. Since this is not a definitive version, please suggestions to: jiguini@pucp.edu.pe Presented in Conference TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: WHAT PERSPECTIVE? Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta July 20th, 2009.

development” even though they lack an audience. Most of the concepts of development relate to very widely accepted goals and human aspirations. However, when we introduce environmental issues the criticism to most of the more common views of development acquire new impetus.

What is worth sustaining? Sustainability of what development? Is then our question. The answer, following Amartya Sen’s approach to development and human development in general, will be that we have to view different things (real freedoms), and through different means (public deliberation). In this text, after a general framework about the difficult relationship between economic development and environment, and in order to establish their respective sustainability we will review, following Sen, the following four conceptions of development: increase in productivity, greater income equality, basic needs satisfaction, and capability expansion. Our own effort, aside from selecting some quotes, will be to suggest the need for a reflection on the diversity of connections between each approach to development and environmental concerns. To move further we would have to consider more complex issues related to the view of development as the expansion of freedoms. The question about the meaning of development is even more difficult to answer if we accept Sen’s suggestion that the precise meaning of development has to be created in the midst of the public and democratic debate in the diverse societies of the world. In the last instance, the importance of the sustainment of development lies in the fact that human development is, although not only, an end in itself.

I. Sustainability and Development: Some Approximations to a Tension

In this first part we shall begin with the relatively thorough vision of Denis Goulet, who rejects that vision of development as wholly irreconcilable with the protection of nature and still provides a sharp criticism against current economic development. We shall then move on to the attempt made by Anand and Sen to conciliate environmental preoccupations with the universalist view of rights today and in the future, with the care of specific groups, particularly the poor. We hope this is a good enough starting point to elaborate on some of the important issues involved.

A. *Economic development vs. the environment*

Denis Goulet presents the problem as follows²

“...the categorical imperative is clear and cruel. We must save nature or we humans shall die. The biggest threat to nature - with the danger of the irreversible destruction of its capacity for regeneration - comes from “development”. This same development is also the biggest culprit of the “underdevelopment” of hundred of millions of people”. (Goulet 1999: 121)³

Despite the importance of this common origin of the problem of poverty and environmental risks, the struggle against poverty and the struggle against the destruction of the environment do not always converge and correspond to two ethical currents. As a matter of fact, the author states:

“...the task of following the two ethical currents at the same time faces great difficulties; fundamental problems of language and of meaning, disagreements over diagnostics, discordant political preferences and contrary appreciations of values”. (Goulet 1999: 121)

Around ten years later Crocker puts it in this way:

² Quotations from Goulet’s book are translations from the Spanish version.

³ In a similar direction: “Yet, all too often in the process of development it is the poor who shoulder the heaviest burden. It is development itself that interferes with human development.” (Streeten 1994, 13)

"Those committed to 'ecodevelopment' or 'sustainable development' often fail to agree on what should be sustained as an *end in itself* and what should be maintained as an indispensable or merely *helpful means*. Nor do they agree on how to surmount conflicts among environmental and other competing values." (2008: 48)

Confronting these difficulties for a dialogue, Goulet's proposal is thorough because his way of facing that imperative consists in relativizing the three perspectives which he considers are at stake.

"What is needed is an ample framework of dynamic synthesis, a philosophical vision that reconciles the passionate opposition between human freedom and the integrity of nature. To propose these themes with their due distinction, we have to articulate a conceptual scheme in which all the demands of the three different ethical values are relativized: justice, freedom and the respect of nature. None of these values are absolute; and most important, each one can only be defined according to its own limits in relation with the other two. (Goulet 1999: 121)

The need for an all encompassing vision of these diverse conventional approximations is a well known demand.

"When the picture as a whole is not contemplated, insoluble difficulties arise that are both theoretical and practical. It is necessary to look at the whole picture in order to transcend numerous apparent antinomies. The main one is the supposed contradiction between anthropocentric and cosmocentric conceptions of the universe". (Goulet 1999: 122)

From an also ethical analysis, but closer to the debate from an economic approach, Anand and Sen reach a similar conclusion.

B. Universality and particularity, present and future in development

As Anand and Sen remind us, the sensibility for environmental sustainability has a universalist accent. It is the right to life of "the whole human gender" that is at stake and in question.⁴ The dominant concern is the viability of future generations. Actually, many times the struggle against some environmental damages is a question of today's life and death of very specific groups, as peasants, and urban dwellers. That is why if it is the whole population, and future dangers that matter most some warnings are needed:

"The language and rhetoric as well as the reality of rights in the contemporary world are often characterized by the neglect of particular sections of the populations –less privileged ethnic groups, exploited classes, sequestered women." (Anand and Sen 2000: 2029)

Sustainability is a concern that almost always stresses the relation between present and future. Poverty, however, stresses the sustainability of the present.

"A newborn child may be doomed to a life of extreme brevity or intense misery if that child happens to be borne in a 'wrong class,' in a 'wrong country,' or to be of the 'wrong sex.'" (Anand y Sen 2000: 2030)

We should then consider a more complex framework where universal and particular impacts are relevant for today and for tomorrow. The present is not merely a platform that is

⁴ We should distinguish these from the interest in, for instance, global warming.

of interest because of the future that it prepares. It includes, though not only, that which is sought to be sustained.

“The moral value of *sustaining* what we now have depends on the *quality* of what we have, and the entire approach of sustainable development directs us as much toward the present as toward the future. There is, in principle, no basic difficulty in broadening the concept of human development to accommodate the claims of the future generations and the urgency of environmental protection.” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2030)

But this view is the beginning of another road. Goulet's opinion pushes us towards a wider conceptual framework in order to incorporate all of these concerns into the discussion.

“... it is particularly important to place the concern about equity in the contemporary world and equity in the future in a generally integrated framework.” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2040)

These authors recognize that “what is to be sustained is not always straightforward” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2029) but aim to clarify the point by starting their critique of economic development from a human development approach. Let us deal with four views of development, and relate them in a preliminary way to poverty and environmental concerns.

II. Conceptions of development

The sustaining of human life in the planet constitutes a concern that can be associated with the criticism of a conception of development that has opulence as its success criteria, and productivity as the key to achieve it.

A. *The increase of productivity*

The most important and classic approach to economic development is the one that defines it as an increase in productivity. We will spend more space dealing with this particular approach than with the next two. The question being asked by this approach is: *how many goods are produced by labor?* More technically: How many things are produced by a person per unit of time, let us say an hour, or a day or a year? Goods are the result of an activity. The criticism of economic development from environmentalist perspectives has this concept of development as its privileged target. The growing use of natural resources and the disposing of residue that threaten the reproduction and the healthy use of such resources are the result of a conception of development that has based its legitimacy in the increase of productivity. Things are the outcome of the human activity we call labor. *The poor person is a producer; one that produces too little goods in spite of working hard.* He or she, then, suffers of, and from, low productivity. The particular aspect of the productivity increase that is under attack is, more obviously, the material or physical component of production and consumption. Industrial development is, with good reasons, viewed as the most dangerous aspect for environment. Let us reflect on this.

Actually, it is not that such an increase is in itself negative for the reproduction of the environmental conditions of human life or a danger to life as a whole, but the way in which it is being carried out as of late that has been questioned. For example, a rise in productivity, even of the actual type in technological terms, would not be necessarily harmful to nature and dangerous for life in the planet if it were to be used to radically shorten working hours. Or also in the case that such society would be conformed to a lower production and consumption magnitude in the most destructive of these components of productive activity. The environmental problem resides in the increases of productivity and productive diversity that are achieved by quickly raising the volume of material production and the consequent use of natural resources. The problem would seem to be in the type of goods and services produced, and that a change towards non material commodities would protect nature. But the problem is deeper, and more related to values and institutions. The massive exploitation of natural resources is stimulated by the combination of an

unlimited objective, such as profit, and competition for profit and, in consequence, for the necessary resources to attain such ends. The solution is therefore, not merely to move toward less destructive forms of activity; changing therefore the industrial composition of the Gross Domestic Product of the countries. A variant, complementary, is the change in the input composition (fertilizers and energy for instance).

Viewing this problem from the consumption side, it can also be said that such a way of increasing profits is aided by the cultivation of and "insatiability" for goods of high environmental impact such as the enlargement of family motor vehicles. This type of analysis would lead us to very *vogue* matters concerning lifestyles, but it is not the course that we shall privilege in this essay.⁵

We consider that Sen's work over the last few years has targeted the same objective from another angle. In this section we shall look at his way of doing so, and the links that are made with environmental concerns. From an ethical perspective, the criticism consists in reminding that the interest for the maximization of material wealth does not take sufficiently into account people or the differences between them. It is the opulence of the whole of society, the GDP per capita, which weighs more heavily in the utilitarian perspective.

"...the fundamental difficulty with the approach of wealth maximization and with the tradition of judging success by overall opulence of a society is a deep-seated failure to come to terms with the universalist unbiasedness needed for an adequate understanding of social justice and human development." (Anand and Sen 2000: 2031)

This criticism is, partly, similar to that of environmentalist ones which do not take into account the direst situations of inequality today, and also to the ones which we have alluded above. It is however, different to the criticism that comes from the exhaustion or destruction of natural resources. In this sense, Sen could be situated in Goulet's categorization among those who privilege the matter of development-underdevelopment, and see it as a mainly social phenomenon. For example, hunger is a problem that has little to do with food production. As Sen points out:

"Widespread hunger in the world is primarily related to poverty. It is not principally connected with food production at all. Indeed, over the course of the last quarter of a century, the prices of the principal staple food (such as rice, wheat, etc.) have fallen by much more than half in 'real' terms. If there is more demand for food, in the present state of world technology and availability of resources, the production will correspondingly increase.

The demand for food is restrained mainly by lack of income. And the same factor explains the large number of people who are hungry across the world." (Sen 2002)

Indeed, if one looks at reality and accepts as a given all social, political and economic restrictions; if one looks at a producer and his/her family isolated from society or as members of a society composed of those who are just as hungry as them, one can say that if nature were richer, less depleted, that family could avoid hunger thanks to their own efforts. Sometimes in literature, one has the impression that the conception of the relation between nature and people is isolated from the social context in which both are found. That is true especially when we move from the provision of fish, to the teaching how to fish, and finally, to the environmental care needed for the fish to be there.

In any case, and in more general terms, the angle of entrance in his criticism to opulence is clear, and paradigmatic.

⁵ See, for instance, Segal (1999), Lane (1991), Goodwin, Ackerman and Kiron (1997). More recently, Crocker (2008: chapter 7,

"The most basic problem with the opulence view is its comprehensive failure to take note of the need for impartial concern in looking at the real opportunities individuals have. The exclusive concentration only on incomes at the aggregate or individual levels ignores the plurality of influences that differentiate the opportunities of people, and implicitly assumes away the variations –related to personal characteristics as well as the social and physical environment- in the possibility of converting the means of income into the ends of good and livable lives which people have reason to value." (Anand and Sen 2000: 2031)

But, following these authors, the vision of development from opulence does not have to be the one that makes it an end. One can recognize, as the majorities of world will, that things, though not always, are a necessary medium for personal and social development in a more ample sense than the economic. However, the record of efficiency of per capita economic growth, which we can consider for our purposes as the equivalent of the increase of productivity, in achieving an adequate level of human development is not as impeccable as would have been desired by those we can call "productivists". Poverty survives in an excessive magnitude where even high growth has been achieved, and continues to be a serious enough problem even in some of the richest countries. Hence the concern for distribution, and the struggle against poverty that inspires "distributionists", and those that look for the satisfaction of basic needs. No doubt that the effect of per capita economic growth over the purchasing power to the wide majorities of the people in a country depends on how income is distributed and on what it is spent.

Its efficacy is conditioned by the magnitude of those involved in the increase of productivity; that is, of the more or less "wide social base" of growth, and of how effectively the national income is spent on education, health services, and the feeding of the non-involved, particularly children.⁶ Let us look at these two elements now.

B. The reduction of inequality

Growing equality has been the answer to the critique of the productivity approach that raises the issue of the inequality of the income distribution that is generally associated with the reduced and slow dissemination of productivity increases to other activities and to other countries. The question being asked here is: *How equally are the goods being distributed among consumers?* Obviously, it depends mainly on the distribution of income, of purchasing power. Most, by far, will consider that this is a valuable goal. The poor, in this approach will be somebody that receives a very small proportion of the whole product while a few receive the lion's share or, at least, the possibility to have access to it. The poor person is an income recipient, and through the purchasing power, a consumer. If he or she is not a consumer, then one way or the other, through their non-participation in the market, they do not exist for the economy. Famines have been explained by Sen considering this entitlement problem. The assumption is that consumers are basically alike in terms of the right to receive some income from society, and not merely as owners of capital and labourers.

However, from an environmentalist perspective, the reduction of income inequality can also be seen as a danger to present and future generations. The dominant interest after the proposals of redistribution, or of a less inequitable growth is the homogenization of consumption, and the growth of the size of the market. In this respect it is obvious that an increase in consumption of the current poor can turn into greater pollution, depredation, etc. Not all improvements in income distribution are acceptable from environmentalist's sensitivity. It is when consumption diversifies and grows adopting the currently dominant guidelines coming from the higher income strata that the effect on nature is relatively greater. It is usual to remind us that the equalizing "upward" of consumption in countries as China and India, could put in danger the sustainability of human life on the planet. In that way, neither the success in the growth of

⁶ The awareness concerning insufficiency of economic growth that predominates in Latin America and the Caribbean has led to repeated reminders that the quality of growth matters. (ECLAC 2007).

production, nor in the redistribution that has that cultural guideline is convenient for those who put forward environmental arguments. It is therefore no surprising that there is a tension between the followers of economic development and environmentalists.

But in more general terms, the criticism of progress understood from an opulence approach within the world of economists is the permanence of goods and services, and the "having" of them as an evaluative space of such progress. But, what if instead, efforts were focused in the attainment of growth in consumption but without pretending to adopt the guidelines of the highest income sectors; would there be problems for sustainability? We have not seen studies dealing with such question. However, one way of searching in that direction is concentrating in the 'sufficient to survive' consumption of the poor. This approach is the one that we shall look at next.

B. Human poverty as a concrete problem: basic needs

Another question should be added to the two previous ones. Let us assume that the size of production is increasing, and that inequality of income and consumption is declining. Things are, no doubt, at least from an economic viewpoint improving. But one thing is to improve, and another quite different is to be well. You can reduce the fever and still have enough of it to still be unhealthy. The "basic needs" approach to development asks about when you are not healthier but healthy. The question being asked is: *Are production and distribution of goods enough to keep you well?*

An important point here is that the approach makes explicit something that was not in the productivity and distributive perspectives. The answer to the question has to be looked for in the human being. For instance, how much protein is enough? The answer cannot come from the economy; that is from the world of goods and services. It is in the biological and social nature of human beings that lies the answer. The economy explicitly confront criteria that are outside its realm. In an exclusively economic view it was enough to produce goods more productively and to distribute them better to say that society was progressing. The human being was in the background, but not in a very concrete way. For instance, there was not a person, needy of specific goods and services. Most of the times, it was the whole society that mattered, the aggregation of individual desires, and searches for happiness. Furthermore, development was understood more as a process than as an outcome; more in terms of efficiency than of effectiveness. In the development perspective behind this new question the poor is, evidently, the one that is not nourished, healthy, minimally educated, etc.

This most direct concern for poverty results in a more explicitly anthropocentric vision of priorities. Concretely, intermediations of an economic nature are left aside and the effort against poverty is partially freed from the list of intermediate objectives that distract policies against poverty, such as the increase of the average per capita product of the country, or further still, profit. The basic needs approach constitutes an advance in respect to previous conceptions, for it places the welfare of the person, and in particularly the poor person, as criteria of progress. It does so in a direct way by establishing goals such as nutrition, basic education, etc., that depend, as mentioned before, on human, that is biological and social criteria. It is against them that economics finds itself, and it is in relation to them that economic growth, the property regime and other aspects of the economic social relations acquire legitimacy. We are not before an approach that as in the case of the increase of productivity and the reduction of inequalities are approximations that are aggregative, and in which the individual ends up benefiting from macroeconomic measures that are generally impersonal, and most of the time, as a sub-product of the search for other objectives like the power of the national economy in the world market.

The tension between the basic needs approach and the concern for sustainability is a well-known one. It can be seen by looking at some expressions by Paul Streeten, the co-founder of the basic needs approach. His distance with respect to environmentalists is explicit. According to Streeten, when it comes to sustainability, he's not sure whether one has to⁷:

⁷ This is a translation to English from a previous translation to Spanish of the original text. Next version will correct this.

"be worried in maintaining the constitutive elements of welfare or its determinants, the ends or the means. More clearly, what should worry us are the constitutive elements: the health, welfare and prosperity of the people and not how many tons of minerals, how many trees or animal species. Truly, some writings on the matter confuse both. If in the process of curing ovarian or other type of cancer, one has to reduce the number of (*yew trees*) in the Pacific (or even the owls that inhabit them) in order to produce the medicine *taxol*, priority will have to be given to people over trees. Logically, some would like to attribute to "nature" the value of an end. This perspective can be called ethical environmentalism in contrast to prudent environmentalism." (Taken from Goulet 1999: 126)

This does not mean that the author does not incorporate the environmental vision. For example, in another publication he will point out that: "The resources freed from military expenditures can be devoted to development, environmental protection, and poverty reduction." (Streeten 1994: 111) For him, the conciliation of approaches is an agreement between different interest groups.

"Are there conflicts between full employment, sustainable environment and development? There is a need to bring together the interests of workers, environment activists and those concerned with development and poverty eradication. We have to avoid peace groups alienating the labor movement by asking for the shutting down of factories." (Streeten 1994: 111)

Again we are before an "exit" sign allowing us to escape from narrow approximations to the problem, such as in Goulet, and Anand and Sen; in this case, in the widening of interests to take into account. But the contradiction is not always necessary and the struggle for the environment can be favorable to the poor.

"In other cases, however, the interests of local elites coincide with those of the poor, and decentralization then will lead to reform. In India, communities have joined forces to protect themselves against invasion by outsiders who wanted to denude their forests and pollute their rivers. Their defense cut across class lines and decentralization worked for the benefit of the poor." (Streeten 1994: 99-100)

Even more so, the environment is one of the pillars that serve as a support for:

"People-friendly markets"[, which] are "efficient, labour-intensive, environmentally benign technologies." (Streeten 1994: 62)

But the search for conciliation is not a matter of pragmatism, integration of several interests, and efficiency in the struggle against poverty. New development perspectives, with which authors such as Streeten coincide to a large degree, are more ambitious.

D. From Needs to Freedom

Humans are humans because aspire to a lot more than satisfying basic needs. Animals fight to conquer some very basic needs satisfaction. Need satisfaction is required to achieve many properly human objectives. Amartya Sen has advanced the definition of development as the "expansion of capabilities". Even though capabilities are of a specific kind of freedom, we can make for the present purposes, synonymous.

The basic idea, following Aristotle, is that development should be seen in terms of what a person "is" and "does", not in terms of what they "have". This is in clear contrast with the economy that concentrates in the production, distribution and consumption of goods. To repeat, "being" and "doing" is what matters.⁸

⁸ In an article on Sen and Gutierrez we have shown how coincident is this view of development with the one coming from the French School that was so important to Paul VI while writing *Populorum Progressio*.

In order to make more clear the contrast between this approach a dialogue with the economy we described and criticized above the question this approach asks to development let us simplify things. Let us assume that the most important activity is labor, and that the results of such activity are goods. This need not be the case since human activities are wider than the economic ones, and the results of those activities are not most of the time goods for the market, or even goods. For instance, care provided, friends cultivated, etc. are many times far from the economic realm. But let us stick to the narrowness suggested to facilitate the contrast between this approach and the previous ones, particularly the first one. With these simplifying assumptions in mind we can formulate the question this approach asks. *How much activity (labor) can be done with the help of the goods available to the individual?* Here, the goods are not the result but the input, while in the productivist approach they were the result of an activity, and the criterion to evaluate how good those results were. In that approach the activity was an input, the human input; here is the result. We can formulate the point asking about how much "doing" has been achieved with the "having". In the productivist perspective, the opposite was the case.

Obviously, the effective "doing", what people really do, that Sen calls "functioning", following again to Aristotle, depends on how capable is the individual of doing things. The "capability" of a person refers to the real freedom an individual or group have which depends on many factors internal and external to the person or group as the abilities and endowments, the relevant institutional enabling context, and the existence or not of discrimination in such society, which imply some sort of values that are predominant.

What we usually refer to as "environment" can be seen as related to the freedom we have and will have. We cannot go deeper in this respect but there are no reasons to think that the expansion of freedom will be stopped by an improved environment. Clean rivers will allow not only fishing but many other amenities that will not be possible with polluted ones.

The expansion of capabilities understood in this ample sense makes goods in general, and among them the most ecologically dangerous goods, more clearly instruments of more important objectives than the goods themselves. Ecological problems may be seen as limiting human freedom, in spite of the fact that ecological care can be seen a limiting factor in some cases, and in the short run. We have the strong impression that this change in hierarchy helps reducing the ecological tensions we mentioned at the beginning of the presentation.

Anand and Sen point out that as opposed to the material content of development, human development can be considered as a very concrete mean for the caring of the environment to the degree in which the promoting of intellectual abilities and health constitutes a progress that not only respects nature but also makes possible new and less harmful options for material development in the future. (Anand and Sen 2000: 2039-40). More so, the encouragement of education and health services has a benefit that exceeds that which can result from the mere distribution of income in a given moment. Those authors remind us that human development is an end in itself and that it also constitutes a future demand for more human development which will remain being environmentally adequate.

"There is hardly any example in the world of the expansion of education and health being anything other than monotone: good education and good health seem to generate powerful demand for these opportunities (and more) for our children. This is a relation that goes well beyond the redistribution of income to the poor at a given point of time-important though that is." (Anand and Sen 2000: 2038)

The instrumental value of "human capital" is not insignificant neither for the material vision of progress nor for that especially concerned with the environment. But the approach to the environmental problem from the perspective of human development as extension of freedom is more radical in the sense that the instrumentality of such capital, to the degree in which "capital" has an economic significance, is too restrictive for it is instrumental to the service of an economic goal such as in the increase of production.

Extensions as a way of concluding

We may conclude that the views of development that focus on “basic need satisfaction” and especially on “capability expansion” are less potentially conflictive with environmental concerns. By looking at what people “are” and “do” and not so much at what they “have”, the meaning of development becomes more compatible with the concern for the destruction of nature. (Sen 2000; Goulet 1999: 129-30)

Everything points out that this way of looking at development converges with the definition of sustainable foundational development that saw it as

“a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the orientation of technological evolution and the modification of institutions are in accordance and increase the current and future potential to satisfy human aspirations and needs.” (Commission 1988: 70)

One very important aspiration is precisely, freedom. Freedom of the poor is particularly urgent. It is useful to remember in this respect that needs was understood as “in particular the needs of the poor to which outstanding priority should be given” (Commission 1988: 67).

Future generations do not “demand” from us only one given level of welfare which we ought to take care starting from now. What Sen and others are bringing to the debate is not so much the problem of the means to achieve welfare but the meaning of human progress itself. The deeper discussion should not be about the means to reduce welfare deterioration now and in the future. The new search goes in at least two directions that very probably have radical consequences. One is that leading us more clearly to ends, alerting us not to take means as ends.

“The basic rationale of the human development approach ... lies in the fact that the constitutive elements of human development are closer to the shared human ends than are some of the more commonly-used criteria of progress, such as the growth of GNP per person.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2039)

The second is that which alerts us about the richness and complexity of those human ends and goals. Sen insists in several works in that demands cannot be encapsulated in the criteria of the welfare economy, and that non self-interested behaviors have a place in the life of individuals and groups. It is not therefore adequate, at least it is not sufficient, to have a discussion about environmental concerns focused only on the present and the future in terms of the present and future self-interest and welfare of individuals and groups. People want more than being better in welfare terms. Many may want to embrace objectives that do not improve their material well-being. That’s the case of what Sen calls “commitment”. In other perspectives could be called “gratuitousness”.

“There is, thus, a nonwelfarist issue underlying the claims of future generations, which a welfarist conceptualization of sustainable development cannot fully capture.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2037)

This refers us then to the limitation of the economy to include a significant part of the considerations that have to do with the relation between people and groups and that which both have with future generations and with their social and natural environment. For instance, family dedication cannot be seriously understood in welfare terms. Life projects of individuals and groups are guided by a complex set of motivations that, as Sen insists, cannot be captured by calculations about the costs and benefits of particular alternatives.

To finish, we can talk of a change in development paradigm because the basic question has been radically altered; indeed, inverted; but also widely expanded in reach, something that reduces the concentration on goods as evaluative sphere of development.

**Religion: Is it for God or Human Being?
Shifting the Paradigm to Build a Logic of Compassion and Peace**

(by R u m a d i)⁹

Peace be upon You and Peace be to You.

I would like to thank you for this noble opportunity and am so pleased and joyful to be involved in such an honorable forum to share my experiences and perspectives on Islamic issues as an effort to setting up a new "brighter" religious paradigm of action to respect, to protect, and to fulfill religious freedom and peaceful Islam in Indonesia. Unfortunately, while writing last week, I was shocked by the suicide bomb blasts in Kuningan, which struck the Marriot and Ritz-Carlton hotels. Official reports say that at least nine people died and fifty others were wounded. Whatever the reasons, still this is an intolerable terror action and it definitely has a traumatic impact on Indonesian society.

Moreover, what I am disturbed by is that the bombing action was carried out as if it was on behalf of Islam. As soon as something like this happens, "conspiracy theories" and "speculations" about the actors immediately come up and raise a heated debate in the media. The "terrorist networks" are those who are suspected, despite the fact that the "police department" did not announce publicly the real actors of the bombing terror yet.

Given this traumatic happening, it is unavoidable for me to question some fundamental issues, such as: for whom is the religion actually being defended? Is it for God or for the human-being *itself*? Why do those groups of people keep ignoring and disregarding the peaceful and non-violent teachings of Islam as its essence? Why do those people tend to violate human life and take advantage of that traumatic situation?

Concerning this complicated situation, I found an interesting book written by Charles Kimball, Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies in Wake Forest University, United States, entitled "*When Religion Becomes Evil*." He critically portrayed religious practices as a phenomenon of paradoxes, simply illustrated by the terror of Black September 11, 2001. According to Kimball, we must ask a fundamental question: how come a certain belief or creed, which were admitted as the "holy"-revealed-dogmas and doctrines, are historically and practically used for terrorizing and frightening? Consequently, instead of being a blessing for all, religious belief becomes a tragedy of dramatic terror for human beings.

Kimball argued that there are at least five conditions where religion leads to tragedy for human beings. *First is* "the absolute-truth-claim." This means that there are no "interpretative-spaces" left to argue and discuss with, particularly to other religious proponents. Religious dogmas and doctrines then replace the ultimate-authority of God *himself*. Consequently, religious proponents are no longer worshiping and internalizing God *himself*, but deviating extremely and excluding *its essence*. This is a serious dilemma, since the "truth-claim" is a fundamental tenet that underpins any sacraments and rites, particularly for "missionary" religions, including Islam, Catholics, Protestant, and Jews.

Secondly, the "blind-obedience" (*taqlid al-a'ma*) toward leaders who have legitimately been noticed as the "religious authority." As far as I am concerned, this phenomenon is not merely embedded inherently within rural communities in which all members still believe "religious charisma" of their leader, but within urban communities with distinctive characteristics like the "deficiency of spirituality" as well. In the past three decades, we witnessed rise of deviant religious sects such as "people temple movement" in Guyana in the midst seventies (1970s), "Aum Shinrikyu" led by Shoko Asahara in Japan in the late nineties (1990s), or "David Koresh Movement" in Texas in the mid-nineties (1990s). And recently, in Bandung, Indonesia, we are also surprised by the rise of a new religious sect called as the "House of Prophet," which aims to socialize that judgment day (*yaum al-qiyamah*) is close to happening. Regrettably, those mentioned sects end their rites with a massive suicide.

Thirdly, it is argued that some religious groups aim to recreate the experience of "past glories" by imitating blindly all behaviors of their "religious ancestors." This mission then finally to be admitted through the "aprioristic-presumption" that today they live in an "un-ideal world": for them, the world now is very hopeless. In the political level, this vision is represented by the demand for Islamic state establishment.

⁹ Researcher of The Wahid Institute, Jakarta.

Fourthly, having evidence that some religious groups tend to disobey and ignore legal procedures as a “social contract” to attain their objectives, it can be expected that tensions and conflict among them are likely to happen. Sadly, on behalf of his beliefs, a man or women commits terror and violence like a suicide bombing, which contradicts the substantive teachings of each religion. By tracing the history of religion back, we have found many evidence regarding terror and conflict among religious adherents.

There are motifs that trigger tensions and conflicts among religions, such as the motif to occupy or to defend certain “holy sites,” to strengthen the identity of a certain group over others, and to protect religious institutions from external threats and danger.

In order to overcome this situation, Kimball reminds us to learn and to reflect on Gandhi’s teachings. Gandhi has a wise vision of a human being or religious believer. In attaining his pursuit of happiness, Gandhi has never underestimated or even denied other people regardless their race, religion, and ethnicity. Instead of spreading the sense of hatred among religious proponents, Gandhi invites them to collaboratively join and work to attain such happiness and peaceful society together.

Fifthly, Kimball worried about when religious proponents perceived tensions and conflict among them as a “holy” struggle. It is not difficult to look for evidences in our history as we called it the “holy war,” among internal religious sects or among inter-religious loyalists. Kimball suggested that one way to overcome this problem is through rethinking religion as belief system by seeding plural and peaceful society. Rethinking religion means authentically look for its essence based on local wisdom and its diversity. So, it is pivotal for us to keep “dreadful-elements” away from our religion.

Those arguments presented here are not immediately rising up from the empty space, but reflect sociological and theological processes within the religious groups and communities. Sociologically, prejudice and ignorance are mainly triggered by “unjust social structures,” “political interests,” “poverty,” and “lack of education.” Meanwhile, theologically, those attitudes are reproduced through indoctrination and dogmatization, which religious proponents believe as the “ultimate truth-claim.”

Accordingly, I hope to convince you all that we have to radically reformulate our “religious orientation.” So far, we have been merely mainstreaming our religious worldview and perspective to serve and even to protect the divinity of God *itself*, whereas the sanctity of human life to which people interact with in the real world is perceived as something that does not matter. Such groups easily get angry and cruel when others argue against what they theologically believe, whereas there is no reaction for human rights violations and discrimination. Hence, the religious orientation must be mainstreamed toward the supremacy of human rights *itself*. In line with this fundamental tenet, K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid said that “God is not to be defended for”; “God is the almighty by himself, and his ultimate supremacy does not need others.” Human beings are relatively powerless and the situation demands that their rights be protected, respected, and fulfilled.

Accordingly, we need to reformulate a theology in more humanistic way (*humanistic-theology*). This term is quite unfamiliar actually, since the term theology is commonly linked to the divine God. However, in this sense, human being is positioned as a mere “object” despite the fact that theological discourse *itself* resulted from human thinking activities. The term theology (*an-sich*) by means “the Discourse of the Divine God” (Theos: God, Logos: Science); so debating on God means presenting His Divinity and His Magnificent Power. In contrast, despite of the term *humanistic-theology* contains a *contradictio-in-terminis*. The essence of such new theology focuses more on how to fully respect, protect, and fulfill human rights. So, there is no God-Debate in humanistic theology, but the human rights and human needs are.

Such *contradictio-in-terminis* is also embedded inherently in the term *liberation theology*, which was initially introduced by Farid Esack, the African-Muslim Scholar. Terminologically, he find himself in the clouds since the term “theology” means a compulsory order that Muslims have to fully obey what God mandates, while the term “liberation” means that no structural and cultural boundaries values dominate absolutely. He then elaborates a new paradigm in approaching Islam, of course, in more humanistic way. His beliefs are presented in his famous book entitled *Qur’an, Liberation and Pluralism* (Oxford: Oneworld, 1997), stating that Muslims should appreciate and internalize messages of liberation in the Qur’anic verses instead of just rules, norms, mandates, or

other religious orders. Additionally, he elaborates that when a human beings tries to internalize a certain belief system or religion, at the same time, he should liberate *himself* of being trapped in his belief and then to pass over his belief to reach a better understanding of his presence in this world.

By the way, we are not debating terminological validation. What I want to emphasize, in this honorable forum, is how to reformulate our theology into more humanistic way, and not "God-Oriented" anymore. I fully realize that this kind of effort is not popular and even unfamiliar in our theological studies, but such an effort is pivotal for our future understanding. Such an effort aims to transform our theological matter into human sensitivity, although such effort is not easy, as expected, particularly in Islamic tradition. In contrast, it is quite different for our brothers in Christianity. They have the courage to criticize and to find fault with their theological tradition and then transform it into more a humanistic point of view and real action.

In spite of these facts, transforming our theology into social and human sensitivity is necessary, because Muslim scholars in the past unthinkably left this duty behind. Therefore, it is easy to answer the question why for Muslims it is difficult to find theological formulas that comprehensively combine the idea of the sanctity of the human life. Consequently, theological beliefs and the real human life are distinguished and there is no correlation at all. If we follow this later perception then there is no hope for theological transformation into social action. Instead of just imitating blindly, we have to "humanizing our theology" and "theologize our humanity." The former one means formulating and transforming our theology into humanistic values and actions, while the second one implies conditioning human beings as fundamental basis of the future theology.

In this regard, Fulton J. Sheen, in his provocative book entitled "*Religion Without God*," introduces a new idea of religion by interestingly stating: "*What is this new idea of religion? It is briefly a religion without God, that is, God as traditionally understood. Religion centers not about God but man. It is man first, not God*".

Actually, this shifting of paradigm is widely noticed and has its root in Islamic theological studies. Normatively, Islam introduces *sufistic-hadis* that can be a reference to how to define a human as has been clearly stated by the Prophet that "*man 'arafa nafsahu faqad 'arafa rabbahu*" (Man who knows himself truly knows his God). This *hadis* perfectly positions human beings (man or woman) as both "subject" and "object" in the journey toward God, the Almighty. Therefore, when a man or woman fully respects, protects, and fulfills the values of humanity, then he automatically honors God himself. In contrast, when a man or women behaves violently toward others, in spite the fact that he or she seems to be a religious loyalist, then this person practically dishonors God Himself.

As a "subject," man or woman should address real life and its complexities in a wise way, of course, based on his or her strengths and weaknesses, by keeping away any external "negative" influences come in. That *hadis* mentioned above indicates the unity of God's spirit within human entities, or ultimately there will be "internalized-God" and then "humanized-God." Hence, when one thinks of himself or others, he is truly thinks of God and His honor. One who respects, protect, and fulfill rights of others means he perfectly honors and respects God himself. From this point of view, it is relevant to quote a Quranic verse stating: "I (God) am perfectly closer to a man (or women) rather than a man (or women) is to himself" (*Q.S. 50: 16*). To sum up, this wisdom leads a Sufi to reach the level of unity toward his God (*istighraq fi bahr al-wihdah*).

VII. Final Declaration

Final Declaration

Pax Romana ICMICA International Conference - July 2009 Toward a New Paradigm, Sustainable Human Development: What Perspectives?

1. **Annual Conference.** Over 170 participants from 13 countries (Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominican Republic, France, Korea, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, South Africa, Uganda, U.S.A., Uruguay) came together in Yogyakarta, Indonesia from the 20th to the 22nd of July, 2009 around the theme of "Towards a New Paradigm, Sustainable Human Development: What Perspectives" in the framework of the Annual International Conference organized by Pax Romana ICMICA MIIC.
2. **Exposure Program.** On July 18th and 19th, some participants visited civil society organizations in Yogyakarta, including two Muslim boarding schools (or madrassas), a worker advocacy group, an organic rice farmer's cooperative, a group working to improve the lives of slum dwellers, and the Ganjuran Church, an important religious center that reflects Indonesian Catholicism and local Javanese culture and spirituality.
3. **Our Host Country: Indonesia.** All of us were honored by the hospitality, hard work, commitment and openness of our hosts, the Indonesian Movement of Catholic Professionals, Ikatan Sarjana Katolik Indonesia (ISKA) movement, Sanata Dharma University, the Atma Jaya University, and the Center for History and Political Ethics (PUSdEP). Our sincere go thanks to the volunteers who made this event possible.
4. **Past and Future in Indonesia.** Indonesia has experienced colonialism, dictatorship, and now, democracy. Foreigners were honored to learn about Indonesian history, and Indonesians were invited to reinterpret their own history through emotionally intense and scholarly work that seeks to represent the perspectives of victims, who have the right to know. At the present moment, fears persist that a process with incomplete participation would result in additional violence or in a politically manipulated outcome, and today the need for silence still overwhelms the need for truth. Our desire for peace and truth requires us to work for justice. We hope that a commitment to opening dialog spaces and facilitating dialogical attitudes will someday help reconcile Indonesia's collective memory of its past with the national principles of Pancasila ("Five Pillars") and the country's commitment to move forward into democracy, religious plurality and cultural diversity, and a prosperous future for its youth.
5. **Our Search for a New Paradigm.** Faced with the impact of global food, energy, financial, economical, social and ecological crises, Pax Romana ICMICA MIIC has set itself the task of moving towards a new paradigm, while remaining humble about the possibility of making a sudden discovery in three days of work. Taking as our horizon the concept of sustainable human development, we are guided by the ideas of *Caritas in Veritas* – Charity in Truth. Our consistent observation, our principled analysis, and our active commitment, can gradually help build the better world we know is possible. We balance the urgency of the crisis with the deliberation needed to do our job well. Despite the crisis, we find many reasons to be hopeful.
6. The paradigm of sustainable human development requires our work in four channels:
7. **Economy:** Our economic policies, structures and institutions must decrease inequality and suffering and ensure the basic provision of public goods (i.e., health, education), while growing sustainability in ways that increase human well-being. Currently, our national economies are organized to foster economic development, but economic development alone increases inequality. We call for a rehabilitation of the role and a reorganization of the structures of the nation state around the goal of sustainable human development, aimed at

decreasing inequality. We highlight the shared responsibility of all members of the family of nations.

8. **Democracy:** As Catholic professionals who labor in the “middle layer” of society, we are conscious that we must engage in a permanent dialog between deciders and the base, fostering the genuine participation of and solidarity with our communities. As members of civil society, we must find a way to effectively engage people with guns (the military and police), people with money (the rich), and people with political power (the politicians), in order to effectively reach make our voices heard. We must use our talents and networks to take an active role on a local, national, regional and international level to strengthen and deepen democracy, which, despite its many imperfections, is the best principled solution that we have to ensure good governance, uphold universal human rights and deliver sustainable human development. In this respect, we also acknowledge the examples of international regional institutions, such as the European Union and the regional human rights commissions and courts, as structures that help us move closer towards these goals.
9. **Religion:** We affirm that it is important that the practice of religion have a social dimension, committed to upholding human dignity. As lay people of the Catholic church, we are committed to assuming a dialogical attitude towards the major world religions and human faith traditions. There is a lot we don't know about each other, and this can lead to terrible mistrust, community violence, and abuses at all levels of society. To be religious is not the same as to have religion. We must support each other in a challenging and changing global context, to actively live the principles of our faiths in the defense of human dignity. To this effect, we must use and expand existing safe spaces for dialog, constantly asking ourselves if we have excluded anyone. A dialog requires a speaker and a listener. To engage honestly in a dialog, we must listen, and we must admit the possibility that we will be changed by what we hear. We can argue intellectually and never change our minds, but when our hearts are moved by compassion and love, our perspective shifts.
10. **Environment:** The environmental dimension of sustainable human development, despite our many social problems, requires our urgent action. As the 5-year follow-up to the Kyoto Agreement approaches, countries who are developed need to acknowledge responsibility, and both sides developed and developing need to be part of the solution. Science and technology offer signs of hope.
11. **Conclusions:** We are still searching for a new paradigm, but these are important components of what we believe it includes.
12. Even if it was never presented as a “new paradigm”, the wording of sustainable human development could be the best summary of the ideas, concepts, convictions... we shared during these three days. Some participants noticed that this is not at all a “new paradigm”, but could be put under the umbrella of some already existing alternative models of development, such as human development (see UNPD), or integral human development (Benedict XVI in his recent encyclical, and before him LJ Lebert, the author of *Populorum Progressio*), or sustainable development (see the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg 2002). What would be new is the situation of the planet if one of these models would be implemented as they should have been. The newness would be to take seriously into account the commitments made by the community of states in international world meetings.
13. It was easier to come to an agreement by denouncing the current situation of the world, its finances, the situation of its economics, the threat of the climate change, the greed of the elites, etc... It was more difficult to come to an agreement in proposing workable alternatives. We nevertheless agreed on the point that there is a need for a new paradigm. But times have not yet come to identify how it could be or should be shaped.

14. A new paradigm is for the moment just a horizon, we are longing for it, we don't know how it will be.
15. **Final Recommendations:** Therefore, we recommend to Pax Romana, its national organisations and all its members:
1. To deepen the analyses and prolong the reflection of the Yogyakarta study session.
 2. to widen the spaces for discussion, sharing and debate, favouring the plurality of views, the stories rooted in various cultural and religious backgrounds ; to allow Pax Romana members to join in order to share, enrich themselves and come to common engagements, recommendations and actions ;
 3. to engage in an active dialogue with other CSOs, international and national institutions, in order to increase our participation in the interconnected universe
 4. to elaborate more on the theme "sustainable development" in order to see more clearly the changes needed in our lifestyle by an increased solidarity with future generations.
 5. to promote the interconnectedness through exchange of ideas, good practices, mutual visits of members, specially young people, intellectuals and professionals
 6. To engage in a true inter religious dialogue, stressing the conditions of possibilities of such a dialogue which has not to be a window show: dialogical attitude, respect for human rights, for minorities, readiness to change including in our personal faith, aiming at being more religious and not promoting the product of "our religion", focusing on the dialogue of everyday life and dialogue on spiritualities...

Yogyakarta, Indonesia, July 22nd, 2009

SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF RESOURCE PERSONS AND MODERATORS

Ms. Lawrence Kwark	MODERATOR
<p>Ms. Kwark is originally from Korea. She studied chemistry and sociology, and worked as a journalist as well as a development practitioner for the CCFD, a French development agency working for international solidarity. In 2008, Ms. Kwark was elected by the Plenary Assembly of ICMICA in Nairobi, Kenya as the Secretary General of Pax Romana.</p>	

Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X	PRESENTER
<p>His Majesty, Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono the Tenth is the Governor of Yogyakarta Special Territory. He studied law in Gadjah Mada State University. He was one of the public figures during the 'Reformasi' in 1998 when President Suharto was finally forced to resign. He is the reference person for the Javanese culture. His speech was presented by Prof. Dr.</p>	

Prof. Javier María Iguñiz Echeverría	PRESENTER
<p>Senior Professor and former Director of the Economics Department of the Pontifical Catholic University of Perú. Author of many books, including on topics that include foreign debt, agrarian reform. Prof. Iguñiz has a distinguished academic career, including visiting professor at University of Notre Dame, University of Oxford, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has been working as the president of the commission for a National Plan for the United Left in Perú. He is also a frequent contributor to the Peruvian national media on political and economic matters. He's been a member of Pax Romana since its early stages, and today is the President of ICMICA Pax Romana.</p>	

Dr. Ir. Paulus Wiryono Priyotamtama, SJ	PRESENTER
<p>Dr. Paul Wiryono is a Jesuit priest and the Rector of Sanata Dharma University. He has a doctorate in Agriculture from Oklahoma State University in the USA, and a bachelor's in philosophy and theology from Sanata Dharma University Teacher Training Institute in Yogyakarta. In addition to his duties as rector, he teaches courses in the Faculty of Pharmacy (on nutraceutical), food ethics, and the psychology of learning. Previously, he served as rector of East Timor University, in East Timor, and Soegijapranata Catholic University in Semarang. He was also the Provincial of the Indonesian Province of the Society of Jesus, and an instructor in the Society of Jesus in Sri Lanka and Indonesia.</p>	

Mr. Paulus Harli	PRESENTER
<p>Mr. Paulus Harli is a businessman and industrialist in the oil and gas sector. He studied engineering at the Bandung Institute of Technology. He is a former student activist, serving as the Vice-President of PMKRI Bandung and also the Vice-Chair of his university's student council. Mr. Harli is the current President of ISKA Indonesia from 2003 through November 2009. His vision is that the young catholic community be linked in a network all over the world and he has worked to support this goal by working on this conference.</p>	

Dr. Djamester Simarmata	MODERATOR
<p>Dr. Djamester Simarmata is a senior lecturer in Public Finance and Development Economics at the University of Indonesia, Jakarta for post-graduate students, and a consultant to several government offices. He studied at the Bandung Institute of Technology. He continued his studies in Aachen, Germany, and then went on to earn his PhD in Economics from the University of Lyon. He has worked as a consultant for the CPIS and his area of specialty is in public sector economics. Between 1995 and 1998, he traveled as a delegate and presenter on topics related to global trade to the OECD conference. He is a previous member of the Asia Pacific Council of ICMICA International.</p>	

Dr. Mari Pangestu	PRESENTER
<p>Ms. Mari Pangestu is the Minister of Trade of Indonesia. She is the first female Indonesian Chinese to hold a cabinet position in Indonesia. Born in Jakarta, Pangestu obtained her</p>	

Bachelor's and Master's degrees from the Australian National University, and her Doctorate in economics from the University of California at Davis, United States, in 1986. Prior to becoming the Minister of Trade, she was active for a long time in various trade forums such as PECC and has been one of the foremost economics experts in Indonesia. She was an instructor in the Faculty of Economics in the University of Indonesia. As an economist, she is widely published in the Indonesian and international media. She serves on the Board of External Editors of the Asian Journal of Business (University of Michigan) and Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies (Australian National University). She is also the co-coordinator of the Task Force on Poverty and Development for the United Nations Millennium Project. Mari Pangestu is married to Adi Harsono and has two children, Raymond and Arya.

Fr. Hugues Puel	PRESENTER
Fr. Hugues Puel is a Dominican father from France. He completed his studies at the Bordeaux and Aix en Provence. He is a now retired Professor of Economics from the University of Lyon. He was a researcher at CNRS, the National Center for Scientific Research in France. Fr. Hugues previously served as the President of Economy and Humanism, an important think tank on development issues, human development and public policy. His specialty areas are labor, development and urban economist and business ethics.	

Philippe Ledouble	MODERATOR
Mr. Ledouble is an engineer, retired from the SNCF – the French National Railways. He served previously as the president of MCC, and then as president of the national commission of projects for CCFD, a French NGO. Mr. Ledouble currently serves as Vice-President of ICMICA-Pax Romana for Europe.	

Enrique Valencia Lomelí	PRESENTER
Prof. Enrique Valencia Lomelí is a Mexican sociologist and economist. Currently he works as a researcher and Professor at the University of Guadalajara in Mexico, and he also is a lecturer at the Jesuit University of Guadalajara (ITESO). He also works with several civil society organizations in Mexico, including Oxfam-Mexico, and Observatorio Social de los Derechos Humanos y de la Política Social en México (Social Watch). He received his MS in Sociology at the Jesuit University of Mexico City, and his doctorate in economics at the University of Paris 7. Professor Valencia Lomelí's research is currently focusing on social policy and social rights, as well as a comparative study between South Korea and Mexico.	

Fr. Odomaro Mubangizi	PRESENTER
Professor Odomaro Mubangizi is a Jesuit priest from Uganda, and professor of Economy and Political Philosophy at Arrupe College, in Harare, Zimbabwe. He received his Masters in Philosophy from the University of Zimbabwe and his PhD in Social Ethics from Boston College in the United States. His research interests are in globalization and ethics, as well as in civil society and international relations.	

Ivan Hadar	PRESENTER
Mr. Ivan Hadar is the United Nations Development Program Coordinator for Indonesia's Target Millennium Development Goals (UNDP/BAPPENAS). He received a degree from the Technische Universität in Berlin, Germany.	

Mr. Edige Rwamatwara	MODERATOR
Mr. Edige Rwamatwara is a lawyer and a sociologist, and currently works for the World Health Organization in Brazzaville, Congo. He is conducting research on the evolution of the African Court for Human and People's Rights, and currently serves as ICMICA Pax Romana's Vice President for Africa.	

Prof. Javier María Iguñiz Echeverría	PRESENTER
Senior Professor and Director of the Economics Department of the Pontifical Catholic University of Perú. Author of many books, including on topics that include foreign debt, agrarian reform. Prof.	

Iguiñiz has a distinguished academic career, including visiting professor at University of Notre Dame, University of Oxford, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He has been working as the president of the commission for a National Plan for the United Left in Perú. He is also a frequent contributor to the Peruvian national media on political and economic matters. He's been a member of Pax Romana since its early stages, and today is the President of ICMICA Pax Romana.

Dr. André Ata Ujan

MODERATOR

Dr. André Ata Ujan is a Senior Lecturer on Philosophy, Public Policy, and Business and Ethics at Atma Jaya University, Jakarta, in Public Policy, Business and Ethics. He is the former Vice Dean for Student Affairs of the Faculty of Economics of Atma Jaya. Dr. Ata Ujan obtained his PhD in Philosophy from the Ateneo of Manila University in the Philippines. He is the author of many books and articles, including a new publication in 2009, *Multikulturalisme: Belajar Hidup Bersama dalam Perbedaan*, which means *Multiculturalism: Learning to Live Together in a Society with Different Cultural and Economic Backgrounds and Ways of Life*.

Dr. Helen Ting

PRESENTER

Dr. Helen Ting is a Malaysian political scientist. Her thesis was entitled [Identity of Malaysia], and she graduated from Institute de Etudes Politiques, in France. She also served as a member of the Asian Coordination Team and the International Team of IMCS. Currently, she serves as a Research Fellow at IKMAS, the National University of Malaysia.

Fr. Antoine Sondag

PRESENTER

Fr. Antoine Sondag is a diocesan priest from Metz, France. He studied History, Sociology and Political science, as well as theology and philosophy. He served as the international chaplain of the International Young Christian Students (IYCS), as the Secretary of the National Justice and Peace Commission of France, and member of the National Consultative Commission on human rights to the Prime Minister, and the International Chaplain of ICMICA Pax Romana. Currently he serves as the Director of International Study and Research at Caritas France (Secours Catholique).

Dr. Radja Oloan Tumanggor

MODERATOR

Dr. Radja Oloan Tumanggor is a professor at the Theological Institute of Jakarta (Sekolah Tinggi Theologi) Indonesia.

Dr. Mercedes Vega Saldala

PRESENTER

Dr. Mercedes Vega Saldala is a practicing lawyer in the Dominican Republic. Currently, she has her own practice, focused on corporate law with a specialty in the construction sector. She has been committed to the movement, she works as the legal volunteer for the Fundación Mujer Iglesia, an institution that arises as response to the EMIC for the formation and empowerment of women who are rural and marginalized in the Dominican Country. She is currently serving as the Vice President of ICMICA for the Latin American and Caribbean Region.

Ana Claudia de los Heros

PRESENTER

Ms. Ana Claudia de los Heros is an economist, currently working at the Central Bank of Uruguay. She is the president of the Catholic Professionals Movement in Uruguay. She is a member of the International Council of ICMICA Pax Romana.

Mr. Mike Roussos

PRESENTER

Mr. Mike Rousos is a graduate of the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, South Africa, and is currently working as a management consultant. He was the president of IMCS and a national leader in IYCS in South Africa. Between 2001 and 2004, he was the head of the government services department during the Gauteng government in South Africa. Previously, he worked for the COSATU trade union movement, and for MCW, a Catholic Workers movement in South Africa. He is currently focusing on ecological justice issues.

Dr. Lukas Suryanto Ispandriano	MODERATOR
Dr. Lucas Suryanto Ispandriano is a lecturer at the faculty of Social and Political Science of Atmajaya University in Yogyakarta. He received his BA from Gadjah Mada University, his MA from Ateneo de Manila University, in the Philippines, and his PhD from Ilmenau University, Germany.	
Mr. Nikolas Simanjuntak	PRESENTER
A practicing lawyer, a lecturer at Jakarta Catholic Atmajaya University on Human Rights, Legal Proceeding and Alternative Dispute Resolution. Since 2000, he is expert staff at the National Parliament on the function for legislation, government, policy controlling and budgeting.	
Dr. Martino Sardi	MODERATOR
Dr. Martino Sardi is a Franciscan father, and is currently a lecturer and President of the Human Rights and Democracy Study at Atmajaya University in Yogyakarta, Indonesia.	
Dr. Baskara T. Wardaya	PRESENTER
Dr. Baskara T. Wardaya is a Jesuit Priest and Historian, currently serving as the Director of the PUSdEP, Center for History and Political Ethics, Sanata Dharma University. He received his PhD in History from Marquette University, focusing on the relationship between Indonesia and the United States. Author of several books regarding Indonesian history, with a particular focus on the critical year of 1965.	
Mr. Tri Subagya	PRESENTER
Mr. Tri Subagya, M.A., is a Lecturer and Researcher at the PUSdEP, Center for History and Political Ethics, Sanata Dharma University. He is currently conducting research on the communal conflicts in Poso, Sulawesi, Indonesia.	
Dr. Vincent J. Jolasa	MODERATOR
Dr. Vincent Jolasa is the Chairman of the Philosophy Department of the University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia. He received his PhD from the University of Leuven in Belgium. He is an advocate of World Philosophy Day, which is being promoted by UNESCO and the Federation Internationale des Societes de Philosophie. His area of research interest includes the philosophy of Islamic thought and its impact on culture. This last year he has participated in a series of conferences on the topic of "Philosophy Emerging from Culture: Islamic Thought and Indonesian Culture, held in Yogyakarta, Indonesia.	
Dr. Rumadi	PRESENTER
Dr. Rumadi is a lecturer in at the State University of Islam, Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, in the faculty of law and sharia. He is a the President of the Wahid Institute, a research institute named after Indonesia's former President, Abdul Rahman Wahid Gus Dur. This institute strives for a just and peaceful world by espousing a moderate and tolerant view of Islam and working towards welfare for all. Dr. Rumadi's writings include his most recent book in 2008, Post-traditionalisme Islam: wacana intelektualism dalam komunitas NU – Post-traditional Islam: intellectual discourse in Nahdatul Ulama community.	
Prof. Dr. Ahmad Syafii Maarif	PRESENTER
Professor Doctor Ahmad Syafii Maarif was born in Sumpur Kudus, West Sumatra. He is a prominent Indonesian intellectual and from 1998 to 2005, was the leader of Muhammadiyah, one of the two biggest Muslim organizations in Indonesia. He is the founder of the Maarif Institute, which inspired and the Jaringan Intelektual Muda Muhammadiyah – the Muhammadiyah Youth Intellectual Network. Currently, Professor Maarif is a senior lecturer in IKIP Yogyakarta (the State Teacher Training College), as well as a Senior Professor in history at Yogyakarta State University. He is also active as a spokesperson and writer, writing about "madani" - civil society. Prof. Maarif relishes his role as an independent thinker and mentor to the young. We must learn to look beyond our individual nations, he says, and see the world from a global perspective-"from a human perspective and from a justice perspective." Indeed, justice is the key to "global	

wisdom." Without it, he says, "I think the world will go astray forever." For his work to build democracy and good governance in Indonesia, Professor Maarif received the 2008 Ramon Magsaysay Award for Peace and International Understanding.

Ms. Endah Setyowati, M.Sc., MA

PRESENTER

Ms. Endah Setyowati has ten years experience in conflict and development experience, conducting training and facilitating workshops relating to conflict and development issues. She is a lecturer at Duta Wacana Christian University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia and a researcher at the university's Center of for Study and Promotion of Peace. Ms. Setyowati has a MA in Coexistence and Conflict from Brandeis University and a MSc in Peace and Conflict Resolution, from Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. She received a International Fellowship from the Ford Foundation

Mr. Timotius Apriliyanto

PRESENTER

Director of the Forum for Interfaith Dialogue, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Dr. André Ata Ujan

MODERATOR

Dr. André Ata Ujan is a Senior Lecturer on Philosophy, Public Policy, and Business and Ethics at Atma Jaya University, Jakarta, in Public Policy, Business and Ethics. He is the former Vice Dean for Student Affairs of the Faculty of Economics of Atma Jaya. Dr. Ata Ujan obtained his PhD in Philosophy from the Ateneo of Manila University in the Philippines. He is the author of many books and articles, including a new publication in 2009, *Multikulturalisme: Belajar Hidup Bersama dalam Perbedaan*, which means *Multiculturalism: Learning to Live Together in a Society with Different Cultural and Economic Backgrounds and Ways of Life*.

Mr. Paul Hwang

PRESENTER

Mr. Paul Hwang is a theologian, journalist and researcher from Korea. He is Chief of the Center for Asian Theology and Solidarity, and a regular to the UCAN Catholic Action Network news service.

Dr. Ir. Paulus Wiryono Priyotamtama, SJ

PRESENTER

Dr. Paul Wiryono is a Jesuit priest and the Rector of Sanata Dharma University. He has a doctorate in Agriculture from Oklahoma State University in the USA, and a bachelor's in philosophy and theology from Sanata Dharma University Teacher Training Institute in Yogyakarta. In addition to his duties as rector, he teaches courses in the Faculty of Pharmacy (on nutraceutical), food ethics, and the psychology of learning. Previously, he served as rector of East Timor University, in East Timor, and Soegijapranata Catholic University in Semarang. He was also the Provincial of the Indonesian Province of the Society of Jesus, and an instructor in the Society of Jesus in Sri Lanka and Indonesia.

Dr. Anak Agung Suryahadi

PRESENTER

Dr. Anak Agung Suryahada M.Ed., is the winner of the prestigious Pratisara Affandi Adhi Karya award. In 1988, he was one of the founding members of the Komunitas Seni Rupa Lempuyang (Lempuyang Community of Fine Arts).

Ms. Drg. Chindy Tanjung

PRESENTER

Ms. Chindy Tanjung is a Taoist Nun working in Yogyakarta.

Dr. Baskara T. Wardaya

MODERATOR

Dr. Baskara T. Wardaya is a Jesuit Priest and Historian, currently serving as the Director of the PUSdEP, Center for History and Political Ethics, Sanata Dharma University. He received his PhD in History from Marquette University, focusing on the relationship between Indonesia and the United States. Author of several books regarding Indonesian history, with a particular focus on the critical year of 1965.

Fr. Mike Deeb	PRESENTER
<p>A Dominican from South Africa, Fr. Mike Deeb has a Masters Degree in Theology from the University of Natal at Pietermaritzburg. He is the former International Chaplain of the IMCS and spent eight years based in Paris, France working with international catholic youth movements linked with the IMCS and IYCS. He is currently working as Coordinator of the Justice and Peace Department of the Southern Africa Catholic Bishops Conference, serving South Africa, Swaziland and Botswana.</p>	

James Young Jin NAM	PRESENTER
<p>Mr. James Young Jin NAM is a Journalist and Activist for Alternative Media from Korea. He was graduated from Korea University and was a reporter for the HANKOOK daily. He was the president of the KOREA JOURNALISTS ASSOCIATION and has served as the Secretary General of the Korean Commission for the Press. Currently, he is the Chief Executive Officer of the Korean Civil Society Times.</p>	

Ms. Lawrencia Kwark	PRESENTER
<p>Ms. Kwark is originally from Korea. She studied chemistry and sociology, worked as a journalist as well as a development practitioner for CCFD, a French development agency working for international solidarity. In 2008, Ms. Kwark was elected by the Plenary Assembly of ICMICA in Nairobi, Kenya as the Secretary General of Pax Romana.</p>	

Fr. Dr. Ag. Purnomo	CLOSING MASS
<p>Fr. Purnomo is the chaplain of ISKA Yogyakarta and he is professor on the faculty of theology of Sanata Dharma University Yogyakarta.</p>	



Conference Partners



SANATA DHARMA UNIVERSITY
YOGYAKARTA, INDONESIA



ATMAJAYA UNIVERSITY
YOGYAKARTA, INDONESIA



Many thanks also to **H.E. Archbishop Dr. Suharyo**, Archbishop of Semarang, Indonesia, **Dr. Paulus Wiryono S.J.**, Rector of Sanata Dharma University, Rector of Atmajaya University, **Dr. Baskara T. Wardaya, S.J.**, the Director of PUSDeP, **Mr. Paulus Harli** and **Mr. Sihol Sihotang**, President and Secretary General of ISKA Indonesia, **Mr. Joko Widodo**, Coordinator of ISKA Yogyakarta, members of ISKA Yogyakarta, PMKRI/IMCS National Board and Yogyakarta branch and Students of Sanata Dharma University, the State University of Yogyakarta and all other volunteers, members, and friends of ICMICA-Pax Romana who made this event possible.

About Pax Romana ICMICA

The International Catholic Movement for Intellectual and Cultural Affairs (Pax Romana ICMICA) is a global network of national Catholic federations and movements of intellectuals and professionals from more than 80 countries around the world. Since 1947 when it was founded as the adult branch of the International Movement of Catholic Students (Pax Romana IMCS), ICMICA has been working to empower, support, and represent intellectuals and professionals concerned with integrating their faith into their lives. Together with IMCS, ICMICA is actively present in the work of the Intergovernmental Institutions with accreditation before the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Department of Public Information, UNESCO, the International Labor Organization and the Council of Europe. ICMICA is also recognized as an International Association of the Lay Faithful by the Pontifical Council for the Laity.



International Team - 2008-2012

President: Mr. Javier Iguñiz
Secretary General: Ms. Lawrence Kwark
Chaplain: Fr. Luis Maria Goicoechea

Pax Romana ICMICA/MIIC
3 rue de Varembe, 4th Floor
CP 161, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland
Tel: (41 22) 823 0707 **Fax:** (41 22) 823 0708

kwark@yahoo.com, kwark@paxromana.int.ch