

Research Article

Interpreting Solidarity of Arek Surabaya on Surabaya Bombing Incident

Agustinus Ryadi¹, Agustinus Ngadiman², Aloysius Widyawan Louis³

^{1,3}Faculty of Philosophy, Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.

²Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.

I N F O

Corresponding Author:

Agustinus Ryadi, Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.

E-mail Id:

ryadi@ukwms.ac.id

How to cite this article:

Ryadi A, Ngadiman A, Louis AW. Interpreting Solidarity of Arek Surabaya on Surabaya Bombing Incident. *J Adv Res Humani Social Sci* 2019; 6(3): 8-13.

Date of Submission: 2019-11-05

Date of Acceptance: 2019-11-30

A B S T R A C T

The bombing accident in Surabaya makes the people of Surabaya sympathy of the terrorist accident that happen in Santa Maria church. This makes all of the victim's family get Traumatize them at that time and make a solidarity action, many people of Surabaya and the entire Indonesia civilization make a support solidarity action. This research is dealing with suicide bombing incident which occurred on May 13, 2018, in Surabaya, Indonesia. Specifically, the incident happened at Santa Maria Tak Bercela church in Ngagel Street. This incident has triggered the solidarity of Arek Surabaya (popular term for Surabaya people). This solidarity is not merely emotional but also rational. The rationality is seen from various cultural actions for the sake of humanity to fight against terrorism which hurts many people in Surabaya. Further more, the solidarity of Arek Surabaya moves from the will of each individual to carry out a social movement for the common good.

Keywords: Surabaya bombing, Arek Surabaya, Solidarity, Humanity

Introduction

TEMPO (May 21-27, 2018) exclusively revealed the number of terrorist victims in some countries (the ten most severe terrors in 21st century) after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 against World Trade Center. In the report, TEMPO stated that Indonesia has experienced the attacks for 75 times figure 1, indicated the recap on the period of 1999-2018. Recently Indonesia has been startled by a week continuous terrorist attack (May 13-20, 2018): commencing from hostage taking in a detention house in the headquarter at Kelapa Dua, Depok, West Java, killing five policemen, to assaults occurring in Surabaya, Sidoarjo and police headquarters in Riau, Pekanbaru. As a consequence of the attacks, police and civilians became the victims.

This research is aimed at perceiving the process of solidarity actions in the culture of Arek Surabaya after the bombing incident taking at Santa Maria Tak Bercela Catholic church, Ngagel Madya Number 1, Surabaya on May 13, 2018.

The discussion on the meaning of solidarity action in the culture of Arek Surabaya is essential as Surabaya possesses distinctiveness in responding to terrorism compared to other cities in Indonesia such as Jakarta, Yogyakarta, Solo and some other cities in the world the ones experiencing similar terrorist attack.

The research is presented by firstly telling the bombing incident happening at St. Maria Tak Bercela Catholic church based on several sources which associate directly to the incident. Afterwards, it is tried to reveal the solidarity action for humanity, unity and true friendship carried out by Arek Surabaya as a reaction to the bombing incident occurring in Surabaya. The survey result about solidarity action for Surabaya bombing and the meaning of solidarity in the context of Arek Surabaya were also being discussed.

Materials and Methods

Between June 23 and 29, 2018, researchers have conducted a survey to understand the meaning of solidarity action

against the Surabaya bomb blast. Respondents from this survey were members of cross-community namely Banser Ansor, GMKI (Indonesian Christian Student Movement), Gusdurian Sidoarjo, Sanggar Merah Merdeka, Catholic Youth Commission, Nera Academia and Roemah Bhineka. These communities had social activities such as mentoring young people, providing interfaith dialogues, mentoring children from marginal groups and holding open discussions on various themes. The respondent's age ranged between 23 - 33 years who were currently living the community culture of Arek Surabaya.

This survey was combined with qualitative analysis of the text through the hermeneutic method. Hermeneutics comes from Greek word, *Hermēneueien* which is one of the meaning is "to explain". On this context, hermeneutics emphasizes the discursive aspect of word or statement.³ On hermeneutic circle or inherent circularity of all interpreting, meaning can be achieved through tacit knowledge to the salient features of the text.²

Discussion

Surabaya's Bombing

On Sunday, May 13, 2018, at 07.15, a suicide bombing happened at Santa Maria Tak Bercela (henceforth, SMTB) Catholic Church. The incident killed about six church members and caused some others wounded. At the same time, the similar incident took place at the other two churches: Gereja Kristen Indonesia in Diponegoro Street, Surabaya and Pentekosta Center Church Surabaya Sawahan, in Arjuno Street, Surabaya.

The three perpetual bomb blasts occurring at the three churches were fatally shocking. Surabaya city had previously well-identified as a safe and tolerant city. The incident has brought about sympathy from numerous community elements in Indonesia even in the whole world.

Solidarity Action for Humanity, Unity and True Friendship

It cannot be denied that all elements of society were influential in the process of restoring the Church. The incident on May 13, 2018 was felt not only as the grief of SMTB Church, but the grief of the community, especially the people of Surabaya. Many elements of the community conveyed their official statements. Many also emotionally condemned these acts of terrorism. There were also those who directly came to SMTB Church or the families of victims to express their feelings of grief and sympathy.

Not only did the various elements together with the church try to restore the situation, the youth groups or communities across faiths were also available. They came from various elements, such as Gusdurian, Catholic Youth, GKJW Youth and Hindu youths from Segara-Kenjeran Temple. They were

a group of young people who were concerned about the incident on May 13, 2018. The group wanted to participate in the recovery process after the blast. Gradually, they organized themselves so that they were involved in the process of reviving and living the event of May 13, 2018 for the people of Surabaya and Indonesia.

On Sunday night, the community of young people held an act of sympathy and solidarity. 1000 candles were around Hero Monument (Tugu Pahlawan). This action denounced acts of terrorism which damaged true brotherhood. This action also echoed the call for Surabaya Wani or Brave Surabaya. This action was also followed on social media networks and continued with the installation of various forms of banners or billboards in almost every corner of the city of Surabaya. It read Surabaya Wani or Terorisme Jancuk. Most of these banners were used banners where statements were manually written and sprayed with paint. These banners could be found on several highways including Governor Suryo Street, Panglima Jenderal Sudirman Street and Ir. Soekarno Street. One of Surabaya Bonek leaders stated that after the suicide bombing there was an appeal through the Arek Bonek Whatsapp group in 1927 to install the banners. They agreed on two hash tags namely #SurabayaWani and #KamiTidakTakut (translation: We are not afraid). In the field implementation, there were various expressions of anger from the Bonek members indicating solidarity to the bombing incident. One of them



Figure 1. Banner in Jalan Kalisari, Surabaya after Surabaya Bomb Blast

was #TerorisJancuk (translation: Fucking Terrorist).

On Friday, May 18, 2018, several young people who crossed faith from the first day of the movement, invited hundreds of people across faiths to hold a joint prayer at the Indonesian Christian Church in Diponegoro Street, Surabaya. This church was one of three churches that were bombed on May 13, 2018. The GKI officials realized that the presence of interfaith and faithful people gave great support to their congregations to return into their activities and worship in the church as usual. In addition, the joint prayer forum also expressed hope for Indonesia's unity.

This solidarity action continued. On May 19, 2018, SMTB Catholic Church held a commemoration on the seventh day after May 13, 2018 incident. The youth groups volunteered to be ushers for those who wished to worship. They dressed according to their respective faith identities. They wanted to send messages to Church people that they were brothers and friends. They wanted to give support to the people so that Catholics were not afraid to worship. In fact, at the Bayu funeral mass, on May 23, 2018 at SMTB Catholic Church, the church building was filled with thousands of people from various religions and faith. They even escorted Bayu's body to Keputih Public Cemetery.

On the 40th commemoration of the May 13, 2018 bombing incident, groups of young people across faiths were more creative in holding activities. After the mass commemorating the 40th day at the SMTB Church led by the Bishop Mgr. Vincentius Sutikno Wisaksono, they invited the people who were present to hold a Javanese tradition event "selamatan" or "kenduri". Some interfaith leaders and community leaders around were invited. In fact, there were also representatives from some caring countries, namely from the consulates of the United States, Australia and France. Besides the display of art from several groups of young people, the event was also closed with the signing of a petition and interfaith prayer. In the petition, the figure present agreed to sign the call "Respecting Allah means respecting human dignity". This appeal was the result of joint reflection on the May 13, 2018 Bombing Incident. Strictly speaking, the effort to respect God by respecting human dignity is done by reviving three basic values together, namely the equality of dignity, solidarity and true brotherhood.

The Survey Result on Solidarity Action for Surabaya Incident

Based on the survey conducted, there were at least two types of action namely symbolic action and direct action as a manifestation of solidarity over the Surabaya bomb blast. Symbolic actions were in the forms of, for instance 1.000 candles, group praying, open statement of attitude and candy and ribbon sharing. This symbolic action was picked as the first step in the effort to respect the victims, a symbol of concern and sympathy, condemning acts of terror and showing that this incident was not due to religious interests but radicalism. On the other hand, direct action was manifested in trauma healing, to mention a few. Almost all actions were carried out in the community. Most of the people who involved in the solidarity movement claimed they did not know the victims or families of the victims (81.8%). They decided to be involved in the movement because they saw victims as family, friends or others. There were also respondents who said there were three large groups called "victims", namely the wounded or

dead, the people and the perpetrators. In this context, the perpetrators were also classified as victims because they were victims of radical doctrine.

The dominant feeling that emerged associated with Surabaya bombing was sympathy and heartache (72.7%), then sadness and anger (45.5%). Feeling happy amounted to 18.2%, much smaller percentage. Heartache and sympathy appeared because the bombing actions hurt humanity, tolerance and brotherhood. Anger was aroused because the right to worship was harassed by the bombing. Meanwhile, a small proportion of respondents expressed happy feeling because the hypothesis that Surabaya had been contaminated with terrorism was proven and this incident made Surabaya residents unite and go against terrorism.

Half of the total respondents said they did not hate any parties (54.5%). Meanwhile, the rest stated that those who deserved to be hated were the terrorists, the people or groups who spread radical ideas and the organizations that were against Unitary Republic of Indonesia. With regards to the bombers, the respondents saw that the perpetrators were also victims (from radical teaching and irrationality). They had to be punished according to the law and they had to be radicalized.

Associated with living together after the Surabaya blast incident, the respondents stated that what needed doing after the incident were interfaith dialogues, victim assistance, the building of social solidarity through critical education and Pancasila values and diversity-based community.

Genealogy of Solidarity Concept

The word "solidarity" is etymologically derived from one of the laws of obligation in Ancient Rome. In that law, every family member or community has an obligation to pay "common debt" which is called an obligatio in solidum.³ Since the 18th century, the principle of shared responsibility as rooted in the law is imposed on every individual who is a member of his community. In this case, solidarity is seen as a bond of ignorance between individuals. This relation is manifested on the background of the relationship between individuals who embed the obligation to help one another and at a normative level, this relation contains the obligation to help one another as fellow human beings.

Throughout the course of the history of Western philosophy, the idea of Solidarity basically continues to develop. At least, this idea of solidarity is known in Aristotle's idea of friendship. This friendship is manifested in the will to live together which naturally encourages humans to act with others. However, this should not be understood as an individual's free decision to live together but as an expression of human social nature. In this case, Aristotle understands that naturally, humans will always be compelled to live together with the fabric of relationships with each

other in an increasingly broad scope ranging from families to city states (Polis). This is the relationship of friendship that leads to the formation of a city state as the most important and highest form of common life. In this common life in the city state, everyone will be able to live respectfully with an environment that supports their fullness and perfection.³ Therefore, for Aristotle, solidarity is seen as a natural urge to relate to others in order to achieve personal virtue and when the shared life is no longer based on the city state, Aristotle's idea of solidarity changes.

In Roman times, especially when Christianity was used as the main basis of Roman society's life, the pressure for social nature was no longer directed towards the bond between a person and his city state. At this time, the idea of bonding based on humanity or natural similarity among all humans started. Inspired by Christian ideas, humans are seen as "children of God" fellows and on the basis of this natural similarity, solidarity is progressively characterized as universal: all human beings are brothers.

Since the time of Christianity, the idea of solidarity in relation to universal ethics continued to be developed in the aftermath. This idea climaxed in the Modern era, especially when European life developed into an industrial society. This change was based on the concept of individuals who were known as subjects by Modern thinkers. For thinkers today, it is important to recognize that most people who live together in Modern society are strangers. Therefore, the idea of friendship as conveyed by Aristotle cannot be maintained. The problem is that Aristotle interpreted all types of friendship as personal relationships.³ How is it possible that encounters with such a large number of people in that community will result in personal friendships characterized in both local and universal contexts?

In fact, in Modern society, networks of social relations that generally occur are indirect, anonymous and plural. Here, what is possible to happen is no longer a personal bond but a bond of mutual interests. People are bound one another by a relationship of mutual needs and fulfil needs without fully knowing who is personally related to anyone. This relationship forms an abstract network that places anyone not as a competitor but as a free individual who helps each other fulfil common interests. Here, personal ties understood as friendships change into interpersonal agreements that are free and equal for the common good. It is these agreements in everyday life that are made voluntarily by each individual to achieve this common good. It underlies the rights and obligations embedded in the idea of solidarity of Modern thinkers.

Solidarity for the common good carried out by a group of free individuals is also formed through the process of division of labour in modern industrial life. According to Bayertz, this idea is revealed at least by Emile Durkheim

when interpreting the idea of Auguste Comte (3). The life of a modern industry gathering many individuals from various places into an industrial environment with a specific division of labour places everyone in a particular social class. This condition forces each individual to be identified as part of a particular social group and outside other social groups. Solidarity in this social group grows in such a way and results in various political movements characterized by politics.

This notion of political solidarity is inspired by various ideas about the ideals of freedom that are highly developed in the labour movement around the 19th and 20th centuries. This idea basically gains conceptual support in communitarian thoughts. In European history, the labor movement in Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries are a clear example of this type of solidarity. In this case, the instrument that fosters emotional bonds in political solidarity is the similarity of the position of the working class. The similarity of this class gives more or less the same direction about the conditions of liberation as expected.

In the course of world history, political solidarity has contributed greatly to the process of legalizing various life aspects. One example is the role of humanitarian solidarity in the process of formulating the human rights declaration. In its development, this notion of solidarity also plays a role in the context of the anti-discrimination struggle: skin colour, gender, ethnicity, race, etc. In general, the idea of political solidarity becomes very important when the institutionalized mechanism in a formal political organization is unable to realize its aspirations and does not lead to justice for the whole community.³

In everyday life in this contemporary era, solidarity in a political context is related to the community organization known as a country. Here, solidarity contains the ethical obligations of every member of society to help their fellow human beings on the basis of similarities in history, language, culture, etc. One of the historical sources of this idea appears in the concept of fraternity whose ideas emerged during the French revolution and formally appeared in the declaration of human rights in 1793 as a sacred duty to support disadvantaged members of society.³ The problem is that solidarity is then vulnerable to various forms of politicization. This occurs because solidarity is generally fostered based on common goals, but is often not critical of methods to achieve these goals. Under these conditions, it is very possible that the solidarity built by each group member is directed by some group members for certain interests that only benefit a few parties.

Therefore, the concept of solidarity in the contemporary era basically contains several main features. First, solidarity involves free will of each individual involved in efforts to achieve a mutually agreed goal. Second, solidarity contains certain ethical obligations for anyone who is bound to

attitudes based on solidarity. Third, as a feeling that gives encouragement to perform certain ethical obligations, solidarity is characterized by politics because it can produce social change. Regarding this political characteristic, solidarity is prone to be politicized for certain purposes with discourse modification that can be done through various mass communication media.

The Meaning of Solidarity on the Culture of Arek Surabaya

Behind the Surabaya bombing incident, researchers found a number of important values typical in the way Arek Surabaya interpreted solidarity after the bombing incident. For Arek Surabaya, solidarity always contained an attitude of compassion, street warriors, fight, anti-feudal, no straightforwardness and concern.

Solidarity in the context of Arek Surabaya community is actually not an entity that is always fixed but dynamic and still in the process of formation. Arek Surabaya, in previous studies, are often identified as people who are “emotional and easily ignited”, “rebels and troublemakers”, “terrorist gangs” even their behavior is considered “uncivilized”. Such research is assessed by Frank Palmos as a Western lens in seeing Arek Surabaya culture.³ This is understandable given that in its history, Arek Surabaya solidarity was found in the Heroic Resistance of Surabaya people who had been famous since the 15th century. In 1615, they took up arms against Mataram. Surabaya’s history as a place of exile political prisoners of the Mataram Kingdom in the 17th century fostered an attitude of resistance, anti-feudalism and “straightforwardness” of the people of East Java. This attitude was also considered to arouse anti-colonial and anti-Japanese militancy throughout the War of Independence.³

The characteristics of this kind of Arek Surabaya solidarity appear for example during the anti-Japanese period. Solidarity action is based on the spirit of compassion among the street fighters who consist of “small people” or “wongcilik” who were often treated badly by the Japanese army.⁴ This spirit-based solidarity is also evident after Indonesia’s independence on August 17, 1945 when Surabaya people made Surabaya as one very persistent city in maintaining independence from allied attacks. This historic event is called the Battle of November 10, 1945 or the Battle of Surabaya. The battle of Surabaya is not merely the spontaneous resistance of Arek Surabaya, but an action that is carefully prepared in coordination with military units.⁴ Surabaya at that time is the city where the most aggressive nationalists live. Surabaya has become a friendly base for militant Arek Surabaya people who are passionate about maintaining the independence of their nation.⁴

The November 10, 1945 incident inspires the next generation

of Arek Surabaya to identify themselves as ‘courageous and persistent’. The manifestation of Arek Surabaya’s solidarity has been maintained for decades and now shows one of its faces in the love of Surabaya or Persebaya football team. The Persebaya Supporters called Bonek took the word wani (brave) as their main slogan.⁵

However, the idea of solidarity manifested by Arek Surabaya in the love of the football team is different from the idea of solidarity in the past (anti-colonial). The idea of modern solidarity is coloring Arek Surabaya solidarity more today. Solidarity is no longer based on personal ties but ties of mutual interest. Each conscious individual agrees to form a common bond, for example in Bonek (Persebaya Supporter). However, it is not infrequently that individual nature maintains life and raises competition. This is seen for example in Bonek’s internal rupture.

Arek Surabaya’s solidarity that manifested in the football club’s fanaticism is a bit different from Arek Surabaya’s post-bombing solidarity for May 13, 2018. In solidarity after Surabaya bombing, the underpinning of the action is not only a sense of love for the group but beyond that. There, the nature of humanity as a victim of bombs becomes more mainstream. Solidarity in these two phenomena still maintains the characteristics of modern solidarity that rests on the will of individuals. This can be seen for example in the Surabaya post-bomb action where each individual place himself in the victim’s position, fulfilling their respective social media accounts with various expressions of humanitarian sympathy to concrete steps such as peaceful action, installation of banners, assistance to victims and interfaith prayers.

In addition, Arek Surabaya’s solidarity after the bombing event is more politically oriented because it succeeds in fostering a massive fight against terrorism which is shown for example from criticism of acts of terrorism in various forms and invitations to being bold to fight terrors from various parties. When looking at conceptual genealogy as the researcher has previously stated, it appears that the act of solidarity in Arek Surabaya culture shows the political characteristics of contemporary solidarity. However, there is one thing that is very distinctive in this solidarity action. Because of this particularity, the social political movement caused by post-Surabaya bomb solidarity does not lead to various brutality actions but various cultural movements that empower the community.

Conclusion

The solidarity action taken by Arek Surabaya after Surabaya bombing incident is a manifestation of the strong social ties that have been continuously formed since the early Surabaya era. There are two important elements in interpreting the solidarity of Arek Surabaya after the Surabaya bombing incident.

Firstly, Arek Surabaya solidarity action is based on the nature of humanity that goes beyond personal relationships. This solidarity action is independent of the presence of personal relationships among the people involved. Human nature is more important than personal relationships, so it encourages members of Arek Surabaya community to take action. Secondly, Arek Surabaya solidarity moves from the will of each individual to carry out a social movement for the common good. Other individuals are not seen as competitors but partners to help one another realize mutual interests. These two elements of the meaning of Arek Surabaya's solidarity action after the incident exceed the meaning of solidarity in the past in the colonial period when there is still limited characteristics based on primordialism.

References

1. Palmer RE. Hermeneutics. Northwestern University Press, 1969.
2. Honderich T. The Oxford companion to philosophy. OUP Oxford, 2005.
3. Bayertz K. Four uses of "solidarity." In: Solidarity. Springer, 1999: 3-28.
4. Pamos F. Surabaya 1945: Sakral Tanahku. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2016.
5. Wirawan OA. Imagined Persebaya: Persebaya, Bonek, Dan Sepakbola Indonesia. Buku Litera, 2016.