THE CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT OF RELIGION
IN POST-INDEPENDENCE, PANCASILA INDONESIA

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of
The School of Continuing Studies
and of
The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of
Master of Arts
in Liberal Studies

By

Michael S. Densmoor

Georgetown University
Washington, DC
April 13, 2013
THE CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT OF RELIGION
IN POST-INDEPENDENCE, PANCASILA INDONESIA

Michael Densmoor

Thesis Advisor: John Voll, PhD.

ABSTRACT

Pancasila, the political ideology of the nation state of Indonesia, is an inventive construct which gave form to the Republic of Indonesia. Upon their Declaration of Independence, Indonesia adopted Pancasila as the unifying narrative for their country. Yet Pancasila's simplistic statements needed to be given meaning. Social movement theory looks at how politics uses frames as a means of creating their narrative. Over the past 60 years, three governing periods have framed the first principle (sila) -- belief in One Supreme God -- in ways that have furthered their political agendas. The first period was under Sukarno, a radical nationalist who viewed Pancasila as a means of ensuring territorial integrity by including Christians in the fabric of the newly founded nation. The second period was under Suharto, an uncompromising autocrat who saw Pancasila as a way of establishing a stable state through eliminating the armed Islamic rebellion of Darul Islam and violent Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia – PKI). Suharto utilized Pancasila as a means of rejecting both the Islamic and the Atheistic state. The final period is under fluid democratic rulers. Under this period, religion is being globalized and is no longer confined to territorial entities. As religions are freed from territory and culture, Pancasila has taken on the role of creating a national community between religions groups.
This thesis will analyze how the three modern eras of Indonesian government – Sukarno, Suharto and various Democratic leaders – have redefined Pancasila to facilitate their vision of the state which allowed them to control and manage religion in support of their vision and agenda.
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CHAPTER ONE

PANCASILA’S MULTICONFESSIONAL MONOTHEISTIC STATE

Modern trends in globalization have resulted in an increasing exposure to and mixing of religious groups. This phenomena has accelerated the discourse between religious communities and has posed challenges to religious claims of absolute truth. Religious majorities in many cases have suppressed the rights of religious minorities on the basis that the religious minority did not follow the true religion. These majorities have used the state as one means of enforcing religious purity within a religion as well as restricting religious expression for minorities. But ascertaining the truth of one religion over another is problematic. For many, religion is about knowing God truly. And knowing God involves seeking God through purity of heart. The Gospel of Matthew records Jesus as saying, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God” (Matt. 5:6 [New International Version]). Sören Kierkegaard also drew attention to this in his book, *Purity of Heart Is to Will One Thing*. Singularity of heart has a particularly individual quality. It cannot be coerced nor regulated externally by a state. It assumes that people should be free to follow the dictates of their conscience when seeking God. Yet throughout history, both governments and religious bodies have determined which beliefs are orthodox and which are heterodox. The result has been the punishment of heretics and apostates. But if belief is an individual right of conscience, can or should orthodoxy and heterodoxy be arbitrated by governments and religious bodies?

This question has been at the heart of many discourses as it pertains to the relationship between religion and the modern nation-state. Various models have developed to define this role. One such model is Pancasila, the political ideology of the
nation-state of Indonesia. As Indonesia was preparing for Independence in 1945, Dr. Radjiman Wediodiningrat, the Chairman of the Investigating Committee for the Preparation of Indonesian Independence, raised the foundational question which would impact the future form of the Republic of Indonesia. Dr. Wediodiningrat asked, “What is the foundation of the Indonesian state which will be formed?” (Pranowo 2010, 2). This teleological question addresses the philosophical underpinnings of the role of religion and the state. The subsequent drafting of Pancasila as the basis of the state was part of a movement coming out of the pre-colonial and colonial periods of globalization. The colonial period of globalization for Indonesia ended with World War II when Indonesia along with other colonial states was recognized by the United Nations as an independent nation. This initiated a period of decolonialization based on building global community in response to western hegemony. It was in this context that Indonesia constructed a unique model of the post-colonial nation-state which emphasized nationhood over religion. Five monotheistic religions were sanctioned – Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, and Buddhism. Later under President Abdurrahman Wahid, Confucianism was added as a sixth state-sanctioned religion. Each religion had an historical precedent in Indonesia’s pre-colonial and colonial history. Now in the decolonialization phase of its history, a multiconfessional state was developed.

The Indonesia model based on Pancasila was intentionally vague. Pancasila and the Indonesian Constitution were drafted and finalized over a short period of time as the end of Japanese occupation of Indonesia drew near. Fearing that the Netherlands would attempt to reclaim their former colony, Indonesia’s founding fathers drew up the
documents of statehood. “The 1945 Constitution is a short document not only because of the exigencies of the situation in which it was completed, but also by design” (Ellis 2002, 117). Negotiating between the various national constituencies was a difficult task. Due to the great historical, cultural and religious differences across the archipelago, the founders eventually settled on the inherently equivocal state construct of Pancasila. The founders concluded that only in this way could they craft a nation. “The principles are too vague, it is true, but the vagueness is not the weakness of Pancasila. On the contrary, the vagueness is exactly the key to its strength and effectiveness in dealing with the diversity in Indonesia” (Darmaputra 1988, 178). The five principles (sila) were high in symbolism satisfying various constituencies but lacking in prescriptions. This allowed room for dialogue and discourse to shape the implementation of these principles.

Pancasila’s relationship between church and state left open the question of who would arbitrate matters of faith. The first sila required belief in the One Supreme God thereby establishing a general religious state in which all citizens must be monotheists. Yet within this category much room existed for interpretation. The vagueness of the relationship between religion and state created space for the state to control and manipulate religion. Also, the possibility existed that the majority religion would use the state to control the minority’s freedom of religious expression. In a state which granted full religious freedom to its citizens, the individual’s conscience would be the arbiter of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Pancasila’s limiting of religious freedom meant that this would not be the case. The founders determined that the individual would not be the arbiter. Discussions on the drafting of the Indonesian Constitution curtailed individual
rights. “Both Soekarno¹ and Soepomo specifically rejected proposals to include human rights provisions in the Constitution. Soekarno had said that such individual rights detracted from the freedom of the sovereign state, while Soepomo believed that the individual was nothing more than an organic part of the state” (Ellis 2002, 133). Without the guarantee of human rights, the state openly exercised its hegemony over religious matters. The state defined orthodox religions as those that believed in One Supreme God, have a Holy Book, gained international recognition, and taught a comprehensive religious law system. But not only would the individual not be the arbiter in matters pertaining to religion, neither would the state.

Faced with its own situation of religious pluralism, it [Indonesia] decisively rejects the option of state neutrality or indifference in regard to religion, in favor of state promotion of religion in general and existing religion in particular…In short, the Indonesian State insists on having a say with regard to religion, while at the same time, insisting that say is never against any legitimate religion but in the interest of all of them. What has to be seen is how this formula works out in practice. (Dhont 2010, 248)

Pancasila did not choose a particular religion but instead used legal means to encourage adherence to one of the sanctioned monotheistic faiths. The state determined the boundaries differentiating between orthodoxy and heterodoxy and then gave its citizens the freedom to exercise their religion within those boundaries.

The resulting relationship between the establishment of the general monotheistic religious state and the freedom of worship formulates a unique solution for the Indonesian historical context. One cannot sufficiently understand Pancasila without stepping back and viewing Indonesia from the longer perspective of historical

¹ Old Indonesian spelling used ‘oe’ instead of ‘u’. Soekarno in modern spelling becomes Sukarno, etc.
globalization starting much before the Sukarno regime. The pre-colonial and colonial histories of Indonesia significantly affected the post-colonial state that was established. Indonesia’s geographic location exposed the archipelago to the influences of globalization. Its pre-colonial history is one of Buddhist and Hindu kingdoms flourishing throughout various parts of the archipelago as it interacted with other kingdoms up and down as well as on both sides of the Indochina peninsula. Eventually this interaction gave way to the archipelago’s integration into the global Islamic trading system. Muslim traders from Gujarat expanded the Muslim world system to Southeast Asia. “Gujarat merchants were a permanent sight in the ports of the Malay peninsula and Indonesian archipelago… From Malacca, the Gujarati merchants went to Sumatra, Java, Timor, Borneo, the Moluccas, and even China” (Abu-Lughod 1989, 302). As ships passed through the Malacca Straits, the Indonesia archipelago was increasingly exposed to different cultures and religions. Consequently the archipelago’s pre-colonial religious history is one of transitions from animistic beliefs to Buddhist kingdoms to Hindu kingdoms and finally to Muslims kingdoms. Eka Darmaputera describes the effects of these transitions on the weltanschauungen of the populace. They experienced a layering of Indigenous, Indic, and Islamic religious beliefs. The layering produced an Indonesian version of Islam that did not resemble the Islam practiced in the Middle East.

Indonesia’s colonial history was in many ways a continuation of what was established under the Islamic world system. Using existing trading networks, the

---

Portuguese had supplanted the Muslim traders. The Portuguese and then the Dutch were able to expand their reach into Indonesia because of the networks already established by the Muslim world system. “Pathways and routes developed by the thirteenth century were later ‘conquered’ and adapted by a succession of European powers. Europe did not need to invent the system, since the basic groundwork was already in place” (Abu-Lughod 1989, 361). The colonial powers were able to utilize the existing structure to exert its own hegemony over the Indonesian archipelago. Now Indonesia found itself interfacing with yet again another culture, language, history and religion. Establishing a colonial rule in the archipelago meant that the Dutch had to bridge a tremendous religio-cultural gap. The Dutch continued the practice that had been established under the Muslim kingdoms of differentiating religion from culture. “For Muslim Indonesians the most consistent way of discussing the relationship between religion and local culture lay in the contrast between divinely revealed religion (agama or din) and humanly generated custom or tradition (adat). As this difference suggests, for orthodox Muslims there can never be absolute equality between religion on the one hand and mere ethnolocal custom on the other” (Emmerson 1999, 212-3). This Islamic distinction between adat and agama was further developed by Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje, a Dutch expert on Islam and Aceh at the end of the 19th century. Snouck used this distinction in crafting colonial law around the principle that things not explicitly mentioned in the written law would be ruled on by the local adat. This policy was essentially reaffirmed in the establishment of the Indonesian nation-state. Pancasila continued the Dutch policy of separating Islamic law and adat. The external, colonial power was replaced by an internal, national arbiter (i.e. the State).
Successive post-colonial era governments continued to rely on the inventive construct of Pancasila as the unifying narrative for their country. In the past 70 years, Pancasila has proved to be a crucial political concept as it was reframed with each new political era. Different political eras interpreted and framed the first *sila* in ways that furthered their political agendas. When the varying interpretations of Pancasila were viewed through the lens of the social movement’s framing narrative, it became clear that each political era found utility in the Pancasila construct to control and manage religion. The first period was under Sukarno, a radical nationalist who viewed Pancasila as a means of ensuring territorial integrity by including Christians in the fabric of the newly founded nation. The second period was under Suharto, an uncompromising autocrat who saw Pancasila as a way of establishing a stable state through eliminating the armed Islamic rebellion of *Darul Islam* and the violent Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia – PKI). Suharto utilized Pancasila as a means of rejecting both the Islamic and the Atheistic state. The final period was under fluid democratic leaders. In this period, religion was undergoing intense globalization and was no longer confined to territorial entities. As religions were freed from territory and culture, Pancasila once again was framed to be the basis of creating a national community between religious groupings. These three modern eras of Indonesian government reframed Pancasila to facilitate their vision of the state, which in turn allowed them to control and manage religion in support of their vision.
CHAPTER TWO
THE SUKARNO ERA – RADICAL NATIONALISM

The first of three political eras that defined Pancasila’s role in managing religion was the post-independence presidency of Sukarno from 1945-1965. As with other countries emerging from colonialism, Indonesia struggled to accommodate its historical context with a future vision for the state. Two main blocs arose with competing visions for the future form of the state. One was Masyumi which desired to see the new republic founded upon Islam as basis of the state. Masyumi, an acronym derived from the phrase Madjlis Sjuro Muslimin Indonesia (Consultative Council of Indonesian Muslims), was a Japanese-sponsored Islamic organization formed in 1943 during the brief Japanese occupation of Indonesia. At the end of World War II, Indonesia declared its Independence from the Dutch and Masyumi subsequently transformed itself into an Islamic party. Masyumi worked towards the establishment of an Islamic state until it was finally banned by President Sukarno in 1960. The competing vision was put forward by the socialists/nationalists who wanted to establish a European-like secular state. They did not consider religion as a proper basis for a modern nation-state. “In the post war period, the dominant political discourse in most Muslim countries was socialist and secular nationalist, not Islamist. Politics was visualized through the shapes and colors of the nation-state, and the nation to which the state was supposed to conform had, if any, an only vaguely Islamic hue” (Hefner 2001, 494-495). The nationalists, led by Sukarno, engaged the various stakeholders of society to craft a unified nation.

The discourse to bridge these two visions of the state was not going well. Debate over the foundation of their future state had gone on for years between the nationalists
and Islamists. “This theme was repeatedly brought up whenever the foundation of the state was discussed… Soekarno\(^1\) once debated Moh. Natsir in the 1930s in his writing “Islam Sontoloyo\(^2\)” and Agus Salim also debated him in several published correspondence” (Wahid 1998, 4). The end of World War II added new impetus to reaching a resolution. The Dutch, who had fled their colonial territory of Indonesia thereby ceding it to the Japanese during World War II, were anxious to regain their rule over the archipelago.

Negotiations on the Indonesian Constitution needed to be brought to a conclusion before the Dutch were able to re-exert themselves. Sukarno appointed two committees to write the draft constitution (known as the Jakarta Charter\(^3\)). One of the leading Muslim clerics on the committee was Wahid Hasyim, the leader of Nahdlatul Ulama (NU). Hasyim made two proposals to the committee concerning the role of religion in the state:

> The first one was that the Article on the President should run as follows: ‘The President shall be a native-born Indonesian, an adherent of Islam.’ He argued that for any Islamic community the relationship between the government and the society is a very important one. If the President is a Muslim, the regulation will bear the mark of Islam and that will have a great influence. Secondly, the Article of Religion should, according to him, read: ‘The Religion of the State is Islam, which guarantees the freedom for adherents of other religions to profess their own religions.’ He argued that this matter was very important with regard to the defense of state. ‘Generally, defense based upon faith is a very given for religious society.’ (Anshari 1979, 21)

Muslim leaders in the independence movement wanted to formalize the position of Islam in the new nation. They felt that Islam would knit together hundreds of different

---

\(^1\) The Indonesia has an old and new way of spelling. In the new way, ‘oe’ was substituted with ‘u’. Therefore the name ‘Soekarno’ became ‘Sukarno’ and ‘Soeharto’ became ‘Suharto’.

\(^2\) The term is Indonesian slang which is loosely translated as irresponsible Islam.

\(^3\) Jakarta Charter is from the Indonesian Piagam Jakarta.
languages, tribes and islands into a single nation. “It was mainly Islam… that created in them consciousness of belonging to the same group. Islam was their rallying point of identity. It was through Islam that different ethnic groups were united into a large comprehensive community. Islam was able to break the power of local nationalism” (Nasution 1965, 180). Non-Muslim and Muslim secular leaders, however, did not concur with this assessment.

The drafting committee found itself deadlocked over the role religion would play in the state. On May 31, 1945, Supomo remarked, “On the one hand is the opinion of the religious experts (ahli agam) who are proposing to establish Indonesia as an Islamic state, and on the other hand is another proposal, as has just been proposed by Mr. Mohammad Hatta, that is, a national unitary state which will separate the state from religious affairs” (Yamin 1959, 17). Pancasila was proposed to the Jakarta Charter group as a compromise solution for the basis of the state by Muhammad Yamin. But even this proposal was not acceptable to all the stakeholders. The debate continued for the ensuing months with neither side willing to cede their position.

Finally Sukarno inserted himself into the debate by including seven words into the first sila to indicate a special relationship between Muslims and the state. These seven Indonesian words were “dengan kewajiban menjalankan syariat Islam bagi pemeluk-pemeluknya”. Translated it meant “with the obligation to carry out Shari’a Islam for its adherents.” Sukarno declared on July 10:

…national independence is hereby expressed in a Constitution of the Indonesian state which is molded in the form of the Republic of Indonesia, resting upon the people's sovereignty and founded on (the following principles): The Belief in God, with the obligation to carry out Shari’a Islam for its adherents in accordance with the principle of
righteous and moral humanitarianism; the unity of Indonesia, and a democracy led by wise policy of mutual deliberation of a representative body and ensuring social justice for the whole Indonesian people. (Yamin 1959, 154)

With the compromise in hand, Sukarno urged the committee to finalize the draft constitution. “Allah the Most-high has blessed us. Actually, at first, there were difficulties between so-called nationalistic group (golongan nasional) and so-called Islamic group (golongan Islam)...in seeking agreement between both of them, especially in regard to the question of religion and state. However, as I told you, Allah the Most-high has blessed us, for there is now agreement” (Yamin 1959, 153). Sukarno’s declaration of agreement was premature. The Christian-dominated eastern part of the archipelago still would not accept the inclusion of Shari’a. The Islamic group had not defined what they meant by the term Shari’a and this lack of clarity was threatening to the Christians in light of their status as a minority.

On August 17, one day after the Japanese surrendered Indonesia to the allied forces, Sukarno declared independence. The opening meeting of the Preparatory Committee for Indonesian Independence was scheduled for that morning. However its start was delayed by two hours because no agreement had been reached in regards to the inclusion of the seven words in the Jakarta Charter. These two hours were crucial for determining the relationship between religion and state. Hatta recalls the events of that day:

Since it seemed to be very serious, the next morning, on August 18, 1945, before the meeting of the Preparatory Committee began, I invited Ki Bagus Hadikusumo, Wahid Hasjim, Kasman Singodimedjo and Teuku Hasan from Sumatra to attend an introductory meeting to discuss the above-mentioned problem, we agreed to omit the part of the sentence
which hurt the feelings of the Christians and substituted for it Belief in the One, Supreme God.\textsuperscript{4} (Hatta 1969, 58)

Finally, the meeting was opened and the Preamble of the Jakarta Charter was amended to remove the stipulation that Muslims must adhere to Shari’a and that the president must be a Muslim.

Pancasila was proposed as a uniquely Indonesia solution to this issue of religion’s relationship to the state. Sukarno framed the first \textit{sila} as the preferable alternative to either a purely secular state or an Islamic state. In doing so, Sukarno chose the multiconfessional state over the nationalist’s nonconfessional state and the Islamic faction’s monoconfessional state. Sukarno ultimately eliminated the seven words from the Preamble in order to achieve his goal of territorial integrity. Sukarno challenged the delegates writing the constitution, “This is the way we all must proceed: establishing the \textit{Nationale Staat}, on the unity of Indonesia soil from the tip of Sumatra to Irian. I am sure that there is not one faction among you gentlemen that does not concur, both Islam and the faction called the ‘national faction’. This is where we all need to proceed” (Haq 2011, 148). Masyumi, however, would continue its fight for an Islamic state throughout the Sukarno years from its seat in Parliament. Political Islam was increasingly viewed as the source of sectarian strife and rebellion. “The \textit{Masyumi} party was under pressure from the power of the Guided Democracy government led by Sukarno, and the party finally was dissolved by its own leadership; the dissolution occurred in 1960” (Hidayat and Gaus, 2006, 51). The government was giving a clear message that the pursuit of an Islamic state was over.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Ke-Tuhanan Yang Maha Esa} is translated ‘Belief in the One, Supreme God.’ There are several ways to translate this phrase.
Role and Character of the State

The state as defined during the Sukarno era emphasized consensus building and egalitarian collectivism. Due to the diverse ethnic makeup of the country, Sukarno relied on the Javanese paradigm of rukun (living together in harmonious relationships) to negotiate Pancasila and the relationships between members of the society. In his speech before the Dokuritsu Zyunbi Tyosakai on June 1, 1945 Sukarno put forward his initial draft of Pancasila consisting of the five principles: nationalism (kebangsaan), internationalism (internationalisme), democracy, (mufakat), welfare (kesejahteraan), and belief in God (ketuhanan). Originally Sukarno had put the sila about belief in one God as fifth in the list of Pancasila. But he acceded to the request to move it to first in the list of Pancasila and added the adjectival phrase, ‘One Supreme’ to describe God. “The first sila expressed by me regards this feeling: God in the sense of: religieusiteit. But the brothers on the Muslim side (saudara-saudara pihak Islam) proposed the addition of the words: One Supreme. And that we have received gladly. So because of that the first sila now reads: Belief in One Supreme God” (Soekarno 2005, 35). Sukarno’s negotiation of this sila illustrated that religion was not the priority in Sukarno’s nation-state. It would appear that Sukarno had included this sila as a way to create unity by assuaging the Islamic stakeholders. Islam would never be able to peacefully establish hegemony over the archipelago because of the pre-colonial and colonial globalization of Indonesia. Therefore, Pancasila became the only way of escape from the dilemma of the basis of the state. As a compromise, Sukarno included the principle of belief in the One Supreme God to satisfy the demands of the predominately Muslim majority through affirming religion’s place in the state.
Sukarno proceeded in his speech to combine these five into three principles and then finally distilled them into a single phrase:

So the original five had become three… If the gentleman is pleased with the symbolic three, then take the three. But perhaps not all you gentlemen are pleased with three principles (Trisila), and ask for one, only one basic right? Well, I made one, I collected them again into one. What is that one?

As I have said before: we establish a state of Indonesia, which we all should support. All for all! Not Christians for Indonesia, not Muslims for Indonesia… but Indonesians for Indonesia, - all for all! If I squeeze the five to three, and the three become one, I get a combined original Indonesian word, the word ‘Mutual-cooperation’ (gotong-royong). The state of Indonesia which we establish must be a state of mutual cooperation! That would be great! The state of Mutual Cooperation (Negara Gotong Royong)! (Haq 2011, 157)

Mutual cooperation (gotong royong) became the national duty for all. It carried with it the connotation of working together as one large family to achieve a common purpose. Sukarno stressed egalitarian collectivism in saying that all Indonesians had the obligation to work for the betterment of all. Mutual cooperation was spirit of Sukarno’s Indonesia. Sukarno’s original ordering of Pancasila with nationalism first and religion last along with his summary of Pancasila as being mutual cooperation gives a clearer picture into Sukarno’s mindset. Many strong religious adherents might object to either God not being placed above nationalism or in having God distilled into the tenet of mutual cooperation. Sukarno was of the persuasion that the Indonesian people and not God were the strength and basis of the Indonesia nation-state.

The resulting state united the territory of the archipelago by highlighting its diversity. Indonesia was established beneath the motto of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika which is translated ‘Unity in Diversity’. The unity of Sukarno’s Indonesia was shallow in the
sense that it focused primarily on territorial integrity rather than achieving a deeper sense of oneness as a nation. Diversity, however, was allowed to flourish. The post-colonial state celebrated the diverse cultures of the peoples of Indonesia. The motto Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, derived from a 14th century Javanese poem written during the Majapahit Empire, spoke of tolerance between Hindus and Buddhists. Sukarno desired to have a state in which different religions would show tolerance to one another because of the higher value of adherence to the civil religion of Pancasila. Consequently, the state needed to safeguard Pancasila by marginalizing or even crushing any movement that threatened the weltanschauungen of ‘Unity in Diversity’. “The 1945 Constitution created ‘a state based on law’ and government based on the constitution as against absolutism.’ However, the document was consciously designed to be flexible” (Ellis 2002, 117). This flexibility, as expressed through tolerance, was the cornerstone of the state.

The state responded to intolerant, absolutist movements with a heavy hand. Once the state secured its independence, the overarching and unifying goal was achieved and Islamic factions once again raised issues important to them. “The Muslim leaders were basically unable to accept that in a country where Muslims are in the majority there can be anything other than Islam as the basis of unity. Ahmad Hassan, for instance questioned why the 90 per cent Muslim majority must be overlooked because of the 10 per cent non-Muslim minority” (Hosen, 2007, 64). Muslim political leaders throughout the 1950s would try to renegotiate the Jakarta Charter to overturn the general religious basis for the state thereby making Islam the official religion. The Muslims felt betrayed by Sukarno and his push for Pancasila. “Pancasila had been increasingly utilized as an
ideological tool for delegitimizing Islamic demands for state recognition of Islam” (Ramage 1995, 17). Masyumi, as a political party, continued to lead the political charge for the establishment of the monoconfessional state. Their efforts led to years of bickering with the nationalists over a question that was already decided in Sukarno’s mind. Finally Sukarno banned Masyumi in 1960.

Movements that were deemed in opposition to Pancasila were crushed. During Sukarno’s presidency he was faced with absolutist movements from Communism as well as Darul Islam\(^5\) which continued in the struggle to redefine the basis of the state. From 1948-1962, Darul Islam fought an armed insurrection with the goal of establishing the Muslim state. Their rebellion flourished in the mountainous areas of West Java. A peer of Sukarno, Kartosuwirjo could not accept that the newly founded country was not an Islamic state. Although not having much in the way of formal Islamic training, Kartosurwirjo appointed himself as Imam of the Negara Islam Indonesia (The Islamic Nation of Indonesia). “Kartosuwirjo had propagated the message that he had received an order from God to become the Imam of the World Caliphate” (Horikoshi 1975, 73-74). In Kartosurwirjo’s opinion only Islam could restrain the momentum of communism in the archipelago. “His letters also suggested to President Soekarno that in order to block communism the Government should adopt Islamism, rather than Nationalism. The Indonesian Government never responded to these confidential letters” (Soebardi 1983, 129). But what began as a political movement of the weltanschauungen of the nation, devolved into a terrorist movement which viewed the Indonesia government as its arch-enemy. Eventually the military gained the upper hand over the Darul Islam movement

\(^5\) ‘Darul Islam’ means of the House of Peace. Kartosoewirjo named his movement Darul Islam to distinguish it from Sukarno’s state which he later openly regarded as the Darul Harb, the House of War.
leading to the capture and execution of Kartosurwirjo. The struggle against absolutism would consume much of the energy of the Sukarno government.

**Pluralism**

The impact of Indonesia’s pluralism was evident in the surrounding discourse and eventual construct of Pancasila. The focus of the discourse was on the creating a national identity out of diverse religious and cultural groups. The new nation state was to be established upon the foundation of the archipelago’s history. To achieve their goal of a united Indonesia, they needed to disarm the divisive issue of religion. Therefore Sukarno was “interested in a non-Islamic or pre-Islamic identity for Indonesia” (Dhont 2010, 112). Unless the religious identity of Indonesia was neutral and tolerance was extended on the basis of the historical pluralism, eastern Indonesia would seek the Netherland’s protection and split the archipelago apart:

It was probably due to the extraordinary influence of the popular Minahasa politician Sam Ratulangi that integration into the Republic eventually became widely accepted, and the Minahasa was spared the fate of going to war as the Republik Maluku Selatan (RMS, South Moluccas Republic) did. Ratulangi, who in colonial times had been a stout proponent of a distinct Minahasan nationalism, eventually sided with the republican cause and served as Governor of Sulawesi in 1945. He is generally believed to have strongly influenced the decision by the Indonesian founding fathers not to include the so-called Jakarta Charter (Piagam Jakarta) into the preamble of the Indonesian constitution. (Schröter 2010, 294)

The rescinding of the seven words provided the Christians with space within the civil religion to become Indonesians in the fullest sense of the word. “Pancasila is really ‘a smart choice’ taken by the Indonesian leaders before Indonesian independence. For a society so fragmented like Indonesia, Pancasila surely meets the need. The principles of
broad enough and general enough to be able to include as many groups as possible within the embrace” (Darmaputera 1988, 178). Particular religions, then, were to function in support of the Pancasila’s civil religion.

A cultural and territorial unity was to be woven out of the diverse strands of ethnicities throughout the islands. Although the worldwide Islamic trading network had brought Islam to Indonesia, other forces of globalization had also brought other religious systems to the archipelago. Upon their introduction to Indonesia, each of these religions underwent a process contextualization resulting in an ‘Indonesianized’ version of these monotheistic religions. For instance, “Since Islamization was not accompanied by either Arabization or imperial unification, the religious change kept most of the archipelago’s ethnic diversity intact. This insured that from early on most, though not all, Muslim Indonesians were accustomed to seeing Islam professed in ways that varied by region, ethnicity, and state” (Friend 2006, 40). Islam and the other religions took on particular characteristics based on their interaction with the local culture. This process made it problematic to form a monoconfessional state. If the Indonesian state was to be founded upon Islam, who would decide which version of Islam was orthodox? The plethora of ethnic and religious variations added to the challenge of forming a state. This diversity challenged all to compromise in order to construct both a national cultural identity and a territorial integrity.

Historical religious adaptations necessitated Sukarno’s construct of the multiconfessional Pancasila state. Therefore Wahid Hasyim’s proposals that the adherence to Islam be one of the qualifications for President and the enshrinement of Islam as the official state religion were both rejected. Hasyim himself would come
around to embracing the Pancasila state ideology and defend this grand bargain. Wahid Hasyim served as first Minister of Religious Affairs in the government of President Sukarno of Indonesia from 1949 to 1952. Speaking to the Ministers of Religion and Directors of the Non-Political Muslim Organization in Jakarta on Nov 4, 1951, Hasyim explained:

…in Indonesia, different from other countries, most of the people have strong desires to implement the Shari’ah of their religion, although they do not yet know the perfect way of how to implement it. That was evident with the inclusion of Belief in God Almighty as one of our Pancasila. Instead democracy (popular sovereignty), also accepted as one of the Pancasila, provides a foundation for our nation to maintain freedom and independence, both in general and specifically for a group against other groups. The meeting had two principles, the belief in One God and popular sovereignty, resulted in the compromise that we have now. The desire of the Muslims as the largest group of our nation is to implement the Shari’ah of their religion in a good manner. But on the other hand, the principle of democracy is maintained, so that that desire would not coerce and disadvantage other groups. If here it is explained as a compromise with democracy, does that not mean that if there was no compromise certainly there will arise things that coerce and disadvantage minority religious groups. (Ahmad 2010, 81)

The acknowledgement by Wahid Hasyim that the nation’s relationship between the belief in God and popular sovereignty needed to be negotiated will again be echoed again by his son Abdurrahman Wahid in the waning years of the Suharto government. Moderate Muslims have concurred that the pluralistic make-up of Indonesian society meant that the negotiated statement of the Jakarta Charter was indeed the only way forward for Indonesia.

The agreement that was reached resulted in unifying the entire archipelago in the newly created state of Indonesia. The Muslim majority had mixed feelings about the compromise but they were willing to embrace it to achieve the larger goal of territorial
integrity. “The sacrifice was so great that not even the word ‘Islam’ and ‘Muslim’ or ‘syari’at’ were mentioned in the constitution. Later in 1978, Alamsjah Ratu Perwiranegara (Minister of Religious Affairs) interpreted that moment as ‘the greatest gift and sacrifice of the humble Indonesian Muslims as a majority population for the sake of Indonesian national unity and integrity’ (Hosen 2007, 63). Territorial integrity was secured for future generations. Sukarno noted that had such a compromise not been made by the Islamic faction the country would have split into several states. “The country that we desire is a national country that includes all of Indonesia. If we found the country on the basis of Islam, some of the non-Muslim areas such as Maluku, Bali, Flores, Timor, Kai Islands, and Sulawesi will break off from us. And West Irian, which is not yet part of Indonesia, will never join the Republic” (Al-Chaidar 1999, 100-101). Yet many Muslim leaders did not agree with Sukarno. They did not consider maintaining territorial integrity a valid reason for selling out the Islamic ummat. Consequently their discontent continued to fester as they awaited the next opportunity to reassert themselves onto the political scene.

Arbitration of Religion

The founding of the general monotheistic Pancasila state raised the issue as to how religions would be ordered and managed. Announcing the birth of the new state was relatively simple. Formulating and nurturing a functioning state was significantly more challenging. The 1945 Indonesian Constitution gave scant formulation to the article dealing with religious freedom. Article 29 deals with the role of religion in the Republic of Indonesia. To quote it in its entirety: “1. The State shall be based upon the belief in the One Supreme God. 2. The State guarantees all persons the freedom of
worship, each according to his/her own religion or belief.” For a state integrated with religion, the 1945 Constitution left much to be decided. It did not prescribe the relationship between religion and state. Article 29 lacked a description of which religious freedoms were granted to citizens. No mention was made as to which monotheistic religions were permissible or what process would be used to determine the orthopraxy of approved religions. The founding of a new nation state had resulted in a need for state sanctioned religion yet without a mechanism to order such religions.

Sukarno, the dynamic personality that held the nation together, ultimately fulfilled the role of the arbiter of religions in the new state. He was a leader of great charisma and exemplary oratorical skills. “Soekarno was a believer in the power of ideas, properly mobilized, to transform society and culture. Instead of preserving or justifying Indonesia’s ‘feudal’ social structure and attendant philosophies, Soekarno dreamed, as he put it in his famous 1933 tract ‘to reach a Free Indonesia’, of ‘a total transformation of the character of society’” (Bourchier 1996, 83). Not only could he inspire people with his speeches, but he held his life up as a symbol of the state that was to be formed. Out of the chaos accompanying the creation of a unified state consisting of broad diversity, Sukarno embodied the melding of a new nation and state. “I am a follower of Karl Marx,” Sukarno proclaimed in one of his speeches. “I am also a religious man…I have made myself the meeting place of all trends and ideologies. I have blended, blended and blended them until finally they became the present Sukarno” (Geertz 1968, 85). The new state of Indonesia would indeed be a blending of peoples, philosophies of life, languages and histories. Pancasila was the crystallization of
Sukarno’s blending. Sjafruddin, a member of Masyumi and cabinet minister from (1946-48), noted:

…if we look for further information on the Pancasila in the 1945 Constitution, either in its body or in the explanatory commentary, we do not even once encounter the word ‘Pancasila’ let alone an elucidation of it. Yet what is actually binding on us as citizens… is the Constitution and all laws and ordinances based on this Constitution. So where can we find an elucidation of this Pancasila, which is said to be the basis of the 1945 Constitution? As we all know, elucidations of the Pancasila can be found only in the speeches that preceded the establishment of the 1945 Constitution, specifically in the speech of Bung Karno closing a session of the ‘Body to Investigate Efforts for Preparing [Indonesian] Independence’ the BPUPKI (in Japanese, the ‘Dokuritsu Zyunbi Tyoosakai’) on June 1, 1945, which subsequently has usually been referred to as ‘The Birth of Pancasila Address.’ (Prawiranegara 1984, 75-6)

The archipelago’s historical pluralism had shaped Sukarno and his thoughts on nationalism and the kind of state that was to be created. It was the power of his personality that both led to the adoption of Pancasila as well as allowed him to serve as the arbiter and implementer of its civil religion.

Sukarno arbitrated Pancasila and religious matters via a government that granted him as executive almost unlimited powers. The 1945 Constitution had been drawn up in haste and from its adoption it was decided that the constitution would be revisited and amended. The Konstituante⁶ met from 1956-1959 to make amendments. Three groups (Islamists, Communists, and Nationalists) each endeavored to amend the religious nature of the state so as to bring it in line with their philosophy of statehood. After three years of meeting, the Konstituante was deadlocked with no settlement in sight. Sukarno

---

⁶ The Konstituante was an Indonesian government body tasked with rewriting the 1945 Constitution.
suggested that the Konstituante return to the 1945 Constitution. The matter was put to a vote. Although the majority was in favor of returning to the 1945 Constitution, they could not muster the votes of a 2/3 majority needed to pass it. Three times Sukarno’s proposal was put to a vote and each time it did not meet with success. “The uncertain development caused some members of the Konstituante to feel as though they were on the verge of failure, the increasingly precarious situation threatening national unity. Observing the precarious development, President Soekarno took steps to salvage the state ideology Pancasila and for the unity of the nation, he issued a Presidential Decree dated July 5, 1959” (Haq 2011, 50-51). Sukarno rejected both the nonconfessional secular state proposed by the Communist faction as well as the monoconfessional Islamic state as proposed by the Islamic faction. Sukarno declared, “We believe that the Jakarta Charter, dated June 22, 1945 inspires the Constitution of 1945 and is an integral part of that Constitution” (Haq 2011, 51). As the source of Pancasila and the embodiment of the state, Sukarno settled the dispute by simply reinstating Pancasila as the non-negotiable basis of the state and subsequently dismissed the Konstituante.

Sukarno’s philosophy of religious arbitration was one of laissez-faire. His laissez-faire approach to religion meant that religions should be self-governing. In his speech known as ‘The Birth of Pancasila,’ Sukarno elucidates the sila of belief in the One Supreme God:

Not only are the Indonesian people god-fearing, but each Indonesian should believe in their own God. Those who are Christians worship God according to the instructions of Jesus Christ, those who are Muslim believe in God according to the instructions of the Prophet Muhammad A.S., those who are Buddhist carry out your worship according to the books that are available to him. But let us all believe in God. May the state of Indonesia be a state where every person can
worship God in a way that is unimpeded…. Let us practice, carry out religion, whether Islam or Christianity, in a civilized manner. What is a civilized manner? It is with respect for one another. (Haq 2011, 155)

Sukarno’s principle of *laissez-faire* established respect, tolerance and harmony as the priority for inter-religious relationships. The government would not bother those who lived by these principles. “The official religious policy of the government was just a repetition of the Constitution: religious freedom was guaranteed and people should be tolerant of followers of different religions and respect other religions” (Kim 1998, 360).

The paucity of content in Article 29 of the Constitution sowed the seeds for future religious conflicts. When arbitration was required, Sukarno filtered the issue through his Javanese *weltanschauungen*. “In this framework, an individual or a given religious community was considered fully responsible for maintaining harmonious relations with followers of different religions” (Kim 1998, 369). Sukarno would interfere as little as necessary leaving religious matters to be worked out by dialogue between religious communities.

Although *laissez-faire* was Sukarno’s approach to managing religions, he did establish the Ministry of Religion to determine orthodoxy and heterodoxy on behalf of the nation. Previously while under Japanese occupation, an Office of Religious Affairs was established by the Japanese as a means of courting the support of Muslims during World War II. This office grew to a full fledge cabinet post after independence. “The establishment of the Ministry, then unique in the Muslim world, made possible the consolidation of the entire Islamic administration under a single authority and ensured that Islamic institutions would be under the control of Islamic groups, rather than that of more secular minded nationalists who dominated the Ministry of Justice and the rest of
the state bureaucracy” (Cammack 1997, 147). Throughout the Sukarno Era the Ministry of Religion would be lead by members of Nahdlatul Ulama. “At the beginning the Ministry was on the defensive, but soon it became aware of it power and began to develop a propaganda far beyond the possibilities foreseen in Sjahrir’s compromise. When later on the Nationalists Party became permanently entrenched behind the Ministry of Information, the propaganda service of the Ministry of Religion became as powerful as that of the state” (Bakker 1956, 215). The Ministry of Religion became a power tool for controlling religion throughout the country. This platform gave Nahdlatul Ulama a voice in shaping the expressions of Islam supported by the government.

The Ministry of Religion was dominated by Muslims who consider it to be an effective vehicle for influencing the discourse about orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Wahid Hasjim, as the first Secretary of Religion, issued regulations concerning orthodoxy and orthopraxy with the following goals: “To assist, support, protect and promote all sound religious movements. To provide for, give guidance to and to supervise religious instruction in state schools” (Boland 1971, 108-9). This promotion included the development of religious education in elementary and secondary schools. Starting in 1947, Mahmud Yunus in his capacity as the head of an Islamic section in the new Department of Religion for Sumatra added religion to the school curriculum (Furchan 2002, 216-217). Eventually this was adopted for the entire nation. “Thus, in the primary school curriculum published in 1964, religion was elevated to the position of a basic subject. It was aimed at ‘the development of religious sentiment and the feeling of devotion to God Almighty as well as of respect towards other religions.’ So too, in the curriculum for junior and senior high schools published in 1964, religion was made a
basic subject” (Kelabora 1976, 246-7). Although the Ministry of Religion promoted or stimulated religion, Sukarno’s philosophy of laissez-faire kept the state from involving itself in the internal affairs of religions that were deemed orthodox.

Sukarno viewed the state as an instrument for establishing discourse and constructing a common, unified identity of Indonesia. Withdrawal of the seven words from the Jakarta Charter and the acceptance of Pancasila were achieved through the process of consensus building. Speaking of the changes to the Jakarta Charter:

Muhammad Hatta, the chairman of the meeting, justified these modifications by emphasizing the superiority of national integration over the conflicting interests of different groups: ‘[with these revisions] all the contents of the Constitution can be accepted by certain parts of Indonesia where Islam is not the major religion’ and ‘these are the most important changes to unite all citizens.’ (Kim 1998, 359)

The founders of Indonesia rejected the Netherland’s vision of a federal Indonesia consisting of autonomous regions in favor of a united archipelago (Van Der Kroef 1958, 242). Instead a unified multiconfessional state was established which honored the historical and cultural pluralism of the archipelago. The process of unifying these islands and peoples was a shepherded process led by Sukarno. Sukarno led a discourse which resulted in each stakeholder owning the outcome of the process.
CHAPTER THREE
THE SUHARTO ERA – UNCOMPROMISING AUTOCRACY

The Suharto Era came about on the heels of an abortive Communist coup led by the Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia, PKI) in 1965. Escaping the coup that killed six of Indonesia’s top generals, Gen. Suharto restored order and eventually outmaneuvered Sukarno to take over the presidency in 1968. The Communist Coup attempt was the second time that Suharto experienced a violent, homegrown attempt to commandeer the Indonesian state. In the 1950s, while already an officer in the army, Suharto witnessed the powerful rise of the Darul Islam rebellion with their accompanying demand for an Islamic state. Now, a decade later, Suharto was again involved in putting down another violent rebellion led by the Communists fighting for a secular state. These two violent, anti-state rebel movements form the frame of Suharto’s construct of Pancasila. He rejected changes to the state, particularly those brought about by violent means. The military under Suharto was constantly concerned about the threat that radical or extreme groups posed. Communism was crushed with a heavy hand. Once decimated, Suharto’s government was vigilant in ensuring that it would not reappear. They mobilized their state resources against what they deemed to be their greatest threat. Pancasila’s multiconfessional monotheistic state was reconstructed to function as a safeguard against communism. Religion became a means of suppressing communism. “Atheism, inseparable in officials' minds from Communism, was declared anti-Pancasila and outlawed” (Liddle 1996, 621). In constructing his frame for Pancasila, Suharto used the events of the abortive Communist Coup as defining
moment. Indonesia declared the date of the coup, October 1 as ‘Hari Kesaktian Pancasila’ or ‘Sanctity of Pancasila Day’.

Islamic parties and nationalist groups came to the support of the government in putting down the Communist coup. After the Communist Party was destroyed, Muslim political leaders expected to be rewarded with positions of influence in the Suharto regime. But if Communism was deemed the greatest threat to the nation state, political Islam was number two on that list. “Sukarno’s deep suspicion of political Islam was shared by Suharto’s New Order government, which was dominated by the abangan army. Distrust of political Islam was strong among officers who had fought against the Darul Islam and other Muslim regional rebellions” (Intan 2006, 52). With the world’s third largest communist party disbanded and the military firmly in control, Suharto set his sights on marginalizing political Islam. Suharto’s strategy for stemming the growing influence of political Islam was to construct a new meaning of Pancasila which placed the stability of the state at its core. In his containment of Islamic factions, Pancasila was the anvil to the military hammer that Suharto wielded.

Suharto controlled Islam’s agenda and room for movement in the political arena. Following a strategy designed by Snouck Hurgronje in the 1920s, Suharto allowed Islam to function as a cultural and spiritual entity but denied them the right to become a political force (Ramage 1995, 191-2). Although he permitted Masyumi to reappear as a

---

1 Clifford Geertz, in this book, Abangan, santri, priyayi : dalam masyarakat Jawa, describes three dominant strands of Javanese Islam that were congruous with the class divisions found among the Javanese people. The majority abangan were nominal Muslims who practiced a syncretistic blend of Javanese mysticism, Hindu, Buddhist and Islamic elements. The santri one the other hand were the devout Muslims who practiced a more orthodox, Middle Eastern version of Islam. Finally the priyayi were nominal Muslims from the Javanese ruling class.
new political party in 1971, *Partai Muslimin Indonesia (Pamusi)*, Masyumi’s previous party leaders were barred from holding leadership positions in Pamusi. Suharto outmaneuvered the older Masyumi leadership of the independence generation by co-opting their power and installing younger leaders that were willing to follow his agenda. Pamusi and three other Muslim political parties were next required to form a single party. “When, in 1973, Suharto forced the creation of a new, unified Muslim political party (*Partai Persatuan Pembangunan* – PPP or Unity and Development Party), so cosseted that it did not have a reference to Islam in its title, the most senior Reformists were excluded as well” (Pringle 2010, 90). Islamic political aspiration were undermined and co-opted by the Suharto government. By stressing a new narrative, he suppressed religion as secondary to the need for stability and security. Islam would be secondary to Pancasila.

Not only did Suharto enjoy success in neutralizing political Islam, he also contained the threat from Islamist groups that wanted to wage war in order to establish an Islamic state. Until present, Islamist groups believe that they were systematically oppressed, claiming that the Suharto government slaughtered their followers and imprisoned their *ulama* (Al-Chaidar 1999, XIII). The Suharto regime tried to remain in control by suppressing all opposition, including those who desired the return to the Caliphate:

In 1977, the Indonesian government arrested some 185 Islamists who were not formally members of DI, but who shared Kartosuwirjo’s ideals. The future founders of al-Jama’a al-Islamiyya, Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Ba’asyir, were among those arrested. Both were deeply involved in da’wa activities, were known for making statements urging

---

2 Translated, “Indonesian Muslim Party”
disobedience to secular authority, and refused to acknowledge the validity of the Indonesian constitution. (Helfstein 2009, 19)

It was assumed that the Darul Islam movement was no longer a threat to the Republic of Indonesia and the remaining handful of adherents could easily be dealt with. But even a decade after this move against Islamist leadership, Islamists still posed a significant challenge to the nation state.

Suharto enjoyed unmitigated success in this task of silencing the clamor for an Islamic state on both the military as well as political fronts. There was no major figure from the mid-1980’s until Suharto’s downfall who advocated for an Islamic state. Pancasila was held up as the alternative to the dangers of not only Communist but also Islamic extremism. “To oppose the social and political impact of the Pancasila state is to become identified with the twin bugaboos of ‘extremism of the left’ (communism) and ‘extremism of the right’ (radical Islam), and in the government’s mind the two are linked” (Weatherbee 1985, 189). Extremism was to be neutralized by stability. Pancasila’s multiconfessionalism was seen as the social means of expanding the government’s influence and ensuring the longevity of the Suharto regime. This framing of Pancasila would impact both the way that the state dealt with dissent, pluralism and how it controlled religion.

**Role and Character of the State**

The state under Suharto was all-subsuming and was to be served by the citizens. “In describing the nature of the state, the New Order regime rarely touched upon the question of citizenship…The New Order tended to see the state not simply as being the institutionalization of social values and norms with its legitimate apparatus of violence, but also – and more importantly – as the manifestation of the inherited ‘identity of the
nation,”” (Abdullah 2009, 395). The state was more important than the rights of individual citizens. The Suharto Era arose during the bipolar world conflict between communism and the West. Suharto steered the country towards authoritarianism as also was the case with regimes in countries such as South Korea, South Africa, etc. Although Indonesia under Sukarno had founded the non-aligned movement, Suharto was much more in the West's camp rather with the non-aligned nations.

To ensure the continuity of the state, Suharto prioritized stability which was underpinned by the continuation of his leadership. Suharto was a master of diverting the legitimate concerns of various diverse groups away from himself and his regime. “Again and again he pitted ethnoreligious groups against one another in a high-stakes game of divide and conquer. The repoliticization of religion and ethnicity and the systematic drain on Indonesia’s social capital of tolerance and civility was to be the most tragic of Soeharto’s legacies” (Hefner 2000, 72). Suharto’s regime created a façade of toleration through perfunctory statements but in actuality was all the while fomenting religious and ethnic strife. Not only was such strife a release valve of pent up frustration towards Suharto’s government, but it reminded the rest of the country of the crucial role that only Suharto’s government could play in keeping that strife from spreading to other parts of the country.

In light of the growing dominance of the state, Suharto shifted the character of the state away from the rich diversity found in the state to an emphasis on unity. Although Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity) continued to exist as a state slogan, increasingly the regime used the slogan Persatuan dan Kesatuan. Both of these terms have the word satu or ‘one’ as their root. If one was to literally translate this slogan, it
would be ‘Unity and Unity’. *Persatuan* speaks more of unity in an emotive sense of feeling as one. Other translations of this term might be ‘Association’ or ‘Union’. *Kesatuan* is unity in the sense of a group that is gathered together. It might also be translated ‘Unit’. But of note is that whereas Sukarno celebrated the diversity of Indonesia and thrived in the chaos that often resulted, Suharto strived to create a stable state through increased uniformity. The move toward a narrative of unity strengthened the hand of Suharto and the military, which was all pervasive in the state.

The state was defined not by the perimeter but by the center. This was a reflection of the Javanese concept of *mandala*, the power of the center. Co-centric circles of power were focused around the spiritual power of the center. In Javanese culture, the philosophy of *mandala* was taught through wayang stories. In the wayang stories, the peripheries of the kingdom were in constant danger of being lost. “The territorial extension of the state is always in flux; it varies according to the amount of Power concentrated at the center…the concept of the frontier assumes very limited importance: The traditional state is defined by its center, not by its perimeter” (Anderson 1990, 41-2). The farther one was removed from the center, the less power was granted to the periphery to act on their own behalf. The boundary areas still depended on the center for instructions. Suharto expanded the influence of the state throughout his rule by forcing a Javanese-ness on the peripheries with the goal of conforming them to the center. The result of increased conformity with the center was greater unity. For example, the eastern most periphery of Indonesia was known as Dutch New Guinea during the colonial period. In 1961, the name *Papua Barat* or ‘West Papua’ was chosen by the people of the island. However under the Suharto government, the
island was annexed and the name was changed to Irian Jaya. Jaya is a Sanskrit word meaning glorious or victorious. The term was used by Javanese kingdoms in naming places and people. The indigenous Papuans considered the name Irian Jaya for their island as a symbol of Javanese imperialism. The name was kept until the end of the Suharto regime after which it was changed to West Papua.

Javanization under Suharto was also seen in imposing Javanese social structure on non-Javanese people. Throughout the islands the local terms for ‘village’ were replaced with a uniform Javanese word, desa. In the western most periphery of Aceh, the change of terms from keuchik (village head) to the Javanese kepala desa brought along an accompanied shift in communal power. “These democratic checks-and-balances in Acehnese village organization was eroded by the penetration (for lack of a better term) of the national bureaucracy which re-constructed Acehnese villages (gampong) to fit the model of Javanese ‘desa’, re-fashioning the role of the keuchik upon the Javanese model of ‘kepala desa’” (Siapno 2002, 169). The Javanization of Indonesia caused great resentment in the outlying islands. Language and symbols were several of the ways that Suharto minimized diversity thereby strengthening the control of the state over the boundary areas of the Republic of Indonesia.

The state responded with a heavy hand and much manipulation to anything deemed a threat to the unity of the nation. Pancasila was understood to have created a unified state. Suharto understood the upheavals and rebellions during the Sukarno Era to be a direct result of not adhering to Pancasila. He articulated this in his autobiography, claiming, “The chain of events which occurred prior to 1965, were linked to a common cause, which was a deviation from Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution, both in spirit
and practice” (Soeharto 1991, 198). Although the heavy handedness of Suharto did indeed restore and maintain stability, it also curtailed many human liberties including religious freedoms. “For the government, the internalization of Pancasila values is the necessary mental and spiritual prerequisite for citizens to discharge their duties in the state. For critics of the regime, however, it is an effort to buttress authority: for ‘liberals,’ a conservative defense of the social and political status quo; for increasing numbers of Moslems, a denial of the proper role of the religion” (Weatherbee 1985, 188-9). Tension continued to simmer throughout the Suharto era as the government continued to control or isolate religious groups.

The Suharto regime found itself competing throughout the 1970s and 1980s with Islam. Consequently they enacted policies to stem the resurgence of Islam which began in the 1970s. Mosque attendance was increasing and more people were donning Arabic dress as opposed to Indonesian dress. “The resurgence represented an assertion of religious society against the state. It also spelled trouble for the Suharto government’s policies on nation and religion” (Friend 2006, 42). Suharto’s actions during the 1970s were aimed at weakening the Islamic movement. He merged the four main Islamic political parties into a single political party, the United Development Party (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan). This party struggled to overcome their internal differences and was sidelined. The 1974 Marriage Law was also passed as part of an effort to mitigate the increasing Islamic influences in the public square. The government proposed curtailing the influence of Islam under the rationale of protecting the unity of the state. In proposing this bill before the House of Representatives, the government declared that “the proposal had two objectives: to reduce the frequency of polygamy,
divorce and child marriage; and to ‘unify’ Indonesian marriage law as part of the programme of national unification under the state ideology of Pancasila” (RUU Perkawinan, Aksi dan Reaksi 1973). Under the previous Marriage Law, Muslims marriages were legal if they were registered in the Islamic courts while all others religions were required to register their marriages in civil courts. The new Marriage Law changed this. The government set a uniform standard of laws concerning marriage for citizens regardless of their religion. Polygamy and divorce were significantly restricted. But more importantly, the government now required that all Muslim marriages be registered at civil courts rather than Islamic courts. The government was given final say over Islamic courts. Suharto managed to successfully curtail further the already limited power of the Islamic legal system.

But the coup de grâce was the enshrinement of Pancasila in all non-governmental organizations. In 1985, Suharto implemented a policy stating that Pancasila must be the sole ideological basis for all religious, social and political organizations. The goal of this policy was to minimize any threat of violent overthrow of the government. Nurcholish Madjid wrote of this strategy, “What is clear is that after Pancasila was decreed in 1985 as the one and only basis for political organizations and community organizations, every national judicial-constitutional problem was finished” (Madjid 1997, XIII). No longer were religious or ideological organizations allowed to challenge the government’s position, power or legitimacy. Islamist groups particularly resented these ‘anti-Islamic’ policies. “Some Muslims even considered such policies to be part of a systematic ‘de-politicization’ of Indonesian Islam. In spite of the objection of many Muslims, the government succeeded in putting all these policies into effect”
(Azra 2006, 181-2). The strategy of placing Pancasila as the sole basis of all organizations provided the Suharto regime with the upper hand in its competition with Islam. It allowed the state to have final say in the internal matters of religious groupings.

But Suharto did not want to go too far in alienating the Muslim majority in the country. In the mid-1980s Suharto took steps to appease Muslim groups. The government cancelled missionary visas for those working in Christian parts of the country, allowed veiling in public schools, funded mosque construction, and established an Islamic Court. These policies were implemented with the expectation that the groups benefiting from the policies would become loyal clients of the patron state. But when groups such as Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) under Abdurrahman Wahid’s[^3] leadership were critical and did not support Suharto’s government, they found themselves isolated. “Because of the NU’s critical stance toward the state, the pesantren[^4] have been excluded from the state’s major development projects. With this politics of exclusion, Suharto showed that those who defied his demands could expect to be barred from government patronage” (Sirry 2010, 65). Those who tried to create a civil society separate from the government’s center of power were curtailed and marginalized. Not only were extremist groups not allowed to oppose the government, but civil society was to be subsumed by the state as well.

**Pluralism**

Society trends during the Suharto era were to be harnessed in order to enhance the state. Building upon the Hegelian concept of the integrated totality of the state,

[^3]: Abdurrahman Wahid is also commonly known as Gus Dur

[^4]: A *pesantren* is an Islamic boarding school found predominantly among the Javanese
Suharto’s Indonesia was described as a big family. Suharto himself took on the title of *Bapak* or Father. The state would be unified under the head of the family, Suharto. During this period there was little separation between state and civil society. The state overwhelmed and subsumed civil society. Civil society existed to support the state and do the state’s bidding. “So, under the New Order Government, Pancasila was developed in a way that strengthened the theory of the good (teleology), with less of even no attention paid to the theory of the right (deontology)” (Dhont 2010, 87). The state’s focus was not on the individual and protecting/enhancing the richness of ethnic plurality but was instead concerned with the unitary society. The state was the uniting force of Indonesia’s diversity, like a grandparent would be the uniting personality of a family network. The state was to be above all.

In such a paradigm, religion’s role was to support the state by teaching its adherents that loyalty to the state was a high religious duty. Each week congregants in churches, mosques, and temples throughout the archipelago offered up prayers for Suharto. Civic, religious and cultural pluralism was managed by the state. That religions acquiesced to the government’s demand that Pancasila be the only basis of their organization (*asas yayasan*) meant that religious diversity was permitted as long as it allowed itself to be controlled by the state. “For twenty years of his thirty-two year rule, the President promoted a culturally conservative and politically authoritarian variant of multiconfessional nationalism” (Friend 2006, 41). Increasingly the government was usurping religion’s internal right to manage itself. Legal means and patronage were used to keep religious organizations loyal to the government. While Suharto’s construct of
Pancasila made it illegal to not believe in God, it also made it illegal to believe in God in a manner that threatened the power of the center.

Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah, the two major religious bodies with a membership of roughly 30-35% of the Indonesian population, accommodated the role of Islam in society that Suharto propagated. Instead of disagreeing with the narrative that religion in the public square must be managed by the government, these groups focused on non-political activities. Muhammadiyah was greatly influenced by Nurcholish Madjid, who famously declared, “Islam yes, Islamic Political Party no.” The call to de-link political parties from religion was founded upon Madjid’s belief that no one party could represent all the aspirations of all the Muslims. Therefore Madjid concluded that a non-religious based democracy was the best alternative. Madjid wrote, “In carrying out the mission to develop the world, the rights and obligations of all people are the same which demands the formation of a democratic order…So this formal state order for Muslims can vary in form, as long as this order gives room for the fundamental aspirations of Islam” (Madjid 1997, 29). Since accepting Pancasila in the 1985 as the basis for their organizations, Islamic groups discovered that Pancasila can accommodate their interests. The benefit to Islam was that it was no longer needed to expend a great amount of energy to promote the agenda of the Islamic state but could instead improve the quality of Islamic faith practiced by Indonesians. This aided in producing the subsequent generation of Muslims who enjoy high education and economic prosperity.

Instead of a fossilized political Islamic group, Madjid’s vision was to embrace Indonesia’s pluralism by promoting the inclusive brand of Islam modeled after Muhammad’s Madinah Constitution and advocated by Sukarno as a means of building a
nation out of Indonesia’s diversity. Madjid went back to Madinah, the first political
entity established by Muhammad, as the example of how Islam must deal with various
constituents. In Madinah, Muhammad crafted an agreement between all those residing
in the city. This agreement, *Mitsaq al-Madinah* or Madinah Constitution, created a
covenant in which Muslims and non-Muslims were given space in the social fabric to
develop the city of Madinah. The Madinah Constitution, Madjid wrote:

…contains thoughts which are great even in the context of modern
thinking. It is in this constitution that ideas which have now become the
mainstay of the modern way of life, such as religious freedom, the right
of a group to maintain its own sets of beliefs and freedom, the right of a
group to relations, were first formulated. But it is also important to
emphasize that there is a collective obligation to participate in defending
[the country] against enemies from outside. (Madjid 1999, 57)

Muhammad set up a single political entity in Madinah that consisted of citizens who
were Muslims, Jews, Christians and even idolaters. Yet the Medina Constitution did not
explicitly mention Islam, the Hadith or the Qur’an as the basis for the political entity or
state. Therefore Madjid concluded that there was no requirement for a theocratic nation
to be founded. The appeal to Madinah as his example of a pluralistic society was
intended to show that those working to establish an Islamic state were not being faithful
to the model put forward by Muhammad himself in Madinah:

Indonesian Muslims’ acceptance of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution
can be compared to Muslims’ recognition of the Constitution of Medina
under the leadership of the Prophet Muhammad, where the values of
these constitutions to develop a political society are legitimized by the
teaching of Islam. Although there are Indonesian Muslims who do not
view Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as an alternative for Islam,
there has never appeared in the minds of the Prophet and his followers a
concept of the Constitution of Medina as an alternative to their new
religion. (Madjid 1999, 11)
Islamic leaders, concluded Madjid, had a moral obligation to accept and active support Pancasila.

Although he did agree that the state must be de-sacralized and based upon the principle of respect and tolerance towards others and their religious beliefs, Madjid acknowledged that Islam had a special role in the public square. “Building a civil society is what the Prophet did for 10 years in Madinah. He built a society that was just, open and democratic, with a foundation of God-consciousness (taqwa) and obedience to His teaching” (Madjid 1996, 52). While supporting the multiconfessional, monotheistic state as the most appropriate form of governance for Indonesia, Madjid desired to see a virtual Muslim state established based on Islamic practices and values since he considered Islam as the best ethical basis for a state (Madjid 1997, 74). Madjid desired to see a dynamic form of Islam color and influence all aspects of Indonesia’s political and cultural life. For Madjid, this meant focusing on the reformation of Islamic values within the individual rather than expending energy on establishing a political form of Islam.

Madjid felt that in order for Islam to be a force for social reformation, its high standards must be carried into government and underpin national institutions. Islamic life would exercise influence in the political realm only to the extent that Islam was alive and influencing the adherent’s ethics (Madjid 1997, 77). Improving Islamic practice through education would bring improvement in the Islamic-ness of the government without needing to use the term “Islamic state.” The impact of Madjid’s vision was evident in an interview given by Adi Sasono (a former government minister) on March 3, 1993: “Because the majority of Indonesians profess Islam as their faith, and
because the proportion of Muslims in the MPR is higher than before, Islamic politics is Indonesian politics” (Ramage 1995, 106). Madjid’s legacy was that he influenced the highest levels of government with Islamic ethics while keeping Islam free from the static notions of an Islamic state.

The other organization, Nahdlatul Ulama, was greatly influenced by Abdurrahman Wahid. Wahid valued the “indigenization of Indonesian Islam”. He resisted both the Arabization and the Westernization of Islam in Indonesia. Indonesian Islam was both tolerant and inclusive. Wahid believed that these values needed to be reflected in all areas of society including the political realm. Wahid stated that, “State ideology and worldview of the people, in this case the Pancasila, are derived from noble values found in religion” (Udang-Udang 1998, 130). Islam’s role was to provide the inspirational values to the state. Wahid calls this the principle approach:

From the teachings and sources of Islamic thought, one can discern a number of universal principles, the need for the rule of law to be upheld, equality of treatment for all citizens before the law, decision-making based on the will of the majority in society, and so on, that are a series of benchmarks allowing Islam to be the engine of the nation… Islam does not serve as an operative hypothesis, but as an inspirational source for the life of the nation. (Udang-Udang 1998, 114)

Religion and state therefore must remain distinct yet work in concord with one another to create the societal and political life of Indonesia. By keeping Islam and the state distinct from one another, Islam will retain its dynamic and transformational influence on the state and culture.

Wahid realized that religion alone is unable to create a vibrant and healthy state. A sense of nationhood is required to overcome the parochial nature of Indonesia’s diverse ethnic and linguistic groups. People needed to realize that they are part of
something grander than just their own group. A state without a sense of being a united community of nations would not provide its citizens with dignity. Social bonds must be created that supersede the cultural worldview of the local ethnic group. “Establishment of a country, in addition to religious ideas, also needs a sense of *ashabiyah* (feeling of attachment)... This is the understanding of nationhood that was first described by Ibn Khaldun. According to Ibn Khaldun, the reason for the establishment of a state is because of the feeling of nationhood” (Wahid, Kacung and Ma’mun 1999, 87-88).

Ignoring cultural values in order to implement a religious agenda would not create a sense of nationhood. Wahid’s emphasis on the particulars of Indonesian Islam highlighted the process of bonding that has taken place over centuries. Pancasila was viewed by Wahid as the synthesis between religious and cultural values found throughout the archipelago. Islam and Pancasila then were to work together to shape the entire Indonesian person and national identity. They strengthened one another so that the challenges facing Indonesia could be resolved in a spirit of justice and respect for humanity. Islamic values, as referred to by Wahid, were not based a particular interpretation of Islam derived from a narrow reading of Shari’a. Instead Wahid used Islam in the universal sense of ‘humanity in submission to God’. “Religion as the spirit of the state is religion as human nature (*fitra*), a religion of true humanity which is defined in a personal context as ‘the submission to One God’ and in a social context as a transcendent commitment to collective moral values like justice, fraternity, freedom and equality before laws and other values which are honored by human communities universally” (Wahid 1991, xv). These values are spelled out in the five principles of Pancasila.
Pancasila, then, was the framework of a nationalistic ideology instead of a one-sided majority-dominated Islamic ideology. The Pancasila state according to Wahid recognized that, “in a country with such diverse citizens and geography, Islam is not the only religion. In other words, the state must provide equitable services to all recognized religions. This meant that the state must ensure a harmonious and balanced social interaction among fellow religious groups (ummah)” (Udang-Udang 1998, 131). Wahid rejected replacing Pancasila with a state based on Shari’a since such a state would violate the very nature of Indonesian society and the tenets of Islam. Yet Islam would continue to impact state and society through discourse. Discourse (musyawarah in Indonesian) was viewed by Wahid to be what keeps the state and religion from being in conflict with one another. Wahid wrote, “Thus, it becomes clear, that Pancasila and Islam do not have a polaristic relationship but instead a healthy dialogic relationship pattern, which continuously interacts in a dynamic way” (Udang-Udang 1998, 131). Wahid did not believe that it is necessary to pit Islam against the state or visa versa. After all, he believed that healthy level of discourse has historically shaped the relationship between Islam and the state:

The continuous dialogue between Islam as a system of religious teachings, and nationalism – dialogue which is deeply rooted in the experience of the Indonesian people – strengthened our founders’ awareness that a nation state which accepts and protects the diverse beliefs, cultures and traditions of Indonesia represents the best foundation upon which to build the life of our nation and people. (Wahid 2009, 15-17)

Wahid was clearly in agreement with Suharto’s efforts to reject the formal Islamic state and throughout the Suharto era mobilized NU to support Pancasila.
Wahid addressed Muslim concerns regarding Suharto’s requirement that all organizations must change their basis to Pancasila. In Wahid’s opinion, since organizations should support the state and visa versa, therefore there was no conflict in replacing Islam with Pancasila as their group’s foundation. “If humans follow the rules of Pancasila in their life, it means they are upholding the state ideology and the people’s worldview. If they do the same thing by basing their organizations on Pancasila, the organizational life will uphold the state ideology and people’s worldview as well” (Udang-Udang 1998, 132). A strong state will only be created when individuals, political parties and all non-governmental organizations actively participate in the same ideological framework. Under Abdurrahman Wahid’s leadership, NU trailblazed this path for Muslim organizations, becoming the first Muslim organization to accept Pancasila as a part of their bylaws. In NU’s national meeting held in Situbondo in 1983, the issue of NU amending its bylaws to switch the organization’s basis from Islam to Pancasila was discussed. KH. Achmad Siddiq, the Rais Aam of NU from 1984-1991, had an important voice in bringing about this change. He stated, “In the Pancasila, the state has the role in the development of the religious sector and religion has the very important role in developing the people (bangsa) and state (negara)” (Wahid 1998, 17). As an organization, NU realized the strength of the Pancasila consensus. Wahid and Siddiq understood that Pancasila was not a religion nor could it replace religion. Instead, Pancasila was seen as the embodiment of Indonesia and the efforts of Muslims to carry out their religious duties under Shari’a.

In the waning years of his regime Suharto moved away from his construct of multiconfessional nationalism and closer to Islam in an attempt to co-opt it. The 1990s
started with Suharto increasingly using Islamic symbols to legitimatize his reign. In 1991, Suharto performed the hajj pilgrimage to Mecca and established a bank using Shari’a law (Bank Muamalat Indonesia). Four years later he donated funds to build the H.M. Suharto Mosque in Bosnia. The construction of the mosque was viewed as an attempt to brandish Suharto’s Islamic credentials at a time that radical Muslim groups were departing to Bosnia to fight as jihadi warriors (Perwita 2007, 148). Another part of Suharto’s turn towards Islam was the enactment of the Religious Judicature Act in 1989 and the Compilation of Islamic Law in 1991. The Religious Judicature Act regulated Islamic courts. It strengthened the standing of the Islamic courts by granting them additional powers. Now the courts dealt with matters of inheritance and banking in addition to marriage and divorce. In light of the enhancement of the Islamic courts, new guidelines would be necessary to assist the courts in adjudicating in accordance with state policy. This necessarily led the government to influence Islamic law through the Compilation (known as Kompilasi). The Compilation of Islamic laws was “the product of extensive consideration of thirty-eight fiqh texts, interviews with 166 ulama and comparative studies of the Islamic law applied in Egypt, Tunisia, and Morocco” (Butt 2010, 289). Additionally, the Compilation drew from rulings of Indonesian Islamic organizations and previous rulings made by Indonesian Islamic courts. “The ostensible purpose of the project was to provide certainty and uniformity in the application of Islamic law. It has also been the means by which the government has attempted to promote an understanding of Islamic law consistent with its aims” (Cammack 1997, 165). Suharto’s wanted to appear to elevate the Islamic courts to the same level as the civil courts. Be doing so he would be seen as no longer competing against Islam but
instead restoring Islam to its proper place. But since it was the state that granted equal status to the Islamic courts and created the Compilation, the reality was that Suharto was positioning the state as the sole arbiter of religions and religious tradition.

Another major initiative by the Suharto regime was the establishment of the Indonesian Association of Muslim Intellectuals (*Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Indonesia*, ICMI). Notably, the leadership of ICMI consisted of political elite who previously opposed Islamic political movements:

In December 1995, the Association of Indonesian Muslim Intellectuals, ICMI (*Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim se-Indonesia*), held its second national congress in Jakarta….Twelve hundred delegates, representing 42,000 members from all Indonesian provinces and from many Indonesian Islamic communities abroad, participated. Minister of Research and Technology B. J. Habibie, generally considered President Suharto’s favorite cabinet member, was chosen for a second five-year term as national chair. Sixteen ministers, nearly half the cabinet, were elected to leadership positions, and the president himself was designated ICMI’s “Protector” (Pelindung). (Liddle 1996, 613)

Since the leadership was made up of Suharto’s cadre of faithful men with Suharto himself sitting at the top of the leadership structure, there was no opening for Islamic parties to leverage this association. ICMI was not a truly free association whereby intellectuals could discuss and debate as they wished. “Most of the members of the organization are also officials, and its funding comes directly and indirectly from the state” (Liddle 1996, 615). Christians, Hindus and Buddhists felt threatened by the establishment of a politically-connected Islamic group (Emmerson 1999, 231) and Islamic leaders also raised their concerns:

Muslims outside the new body criticized it as a tool of the regime’s desire to co-opt Muslims and deflect demands for democratizing change. This argument was voiced with particular consistency by Abdurrahman
Wahid, the head of NU and a leading figure in the growing pro-democracy movement. Other democratist Muslims joined him, decrying what they saw as the sacrifice of democratic ideals in the name of a government controlled Islam. (Emmerson 1999, 229-30)

The establishment of ICMI, combined with numerous other symbolically Islamic acts by Suharto, helped him brandish his Islamic credentials to the populace in an attempt to garner their unwavering support. “While the Suharto government is clearly presenting a more Islamic demeanor, it has not abandoned its historic policy of controlling Islamic law and politics” (Cammack 1997, 144). Until the 1990s, Suharto had kept the state mostly secular with a balance between Muslim and non-Muslim factions in state organizations. The even-handed control of religion was changing as Suharto struggled to maintain legitimacy.

Arbitration of Religion

Due to the all-subsuming nature of the state, religious arbitration was a matter for the state and the military behind the state. The state transitioned religious freedom through a “gradual shift in the perception of religious duties from something that is the responsibility of an individual or a given religious community to something that should be handled by the family, the schools, the community and the government” (Kim 1998, 357). The state was not neutral in regard to religious issues but instead continuingly interfered with individual religious beliefs as well as internal affairs of religious groups. “One of the regime’s first actions was to ban hundreds of mystical (kebatinan) sects regarded as left-wing, or offensive to mainstream Muslims. The government prohibited public expressions of Chinese religion, as well as the import of literature written in Chinese characters. Chinese Indonesians were encouraged to convert to Buddhism or
Christianity” (Friend 2006, 41). The overarching philosophy of the state’s arbitration was to decide and act according to the greatest good for all groups rather than for the individual. Suharto clearly articulated it, saying, “The attitude and character of the manusia Pancasila [translated ‘someone who embodies Pancasila’] is reflected in their true devotion to God Almighty, their willingness to work together, their readiness to sacrifice for the common good” (Soeharto 1991, 331). The common good, meaning stability and service to Suharto’s state, guided decisions concerning religious freedom.

This arbitration of religion was backed up or controlled by the military. The nation had relied on the military to end violent religious rebellions under the banners of Islam and Communism. They had then witnessed the chaos of the Sukarno laissez-faire policy. “The lesson they learned from these experiences was the importance of establishing and maintaining, first, unity among themselves and, second, tight control over others, including most especially Muslims, regionalists, andCommunists” (Liddle 1992, 446-447). The military asserted itself into the arbitration of religion as a necessary part of maintaining stability and national integrity. The state’s guidelines on Pancasila justified this under the guise of security (Morfit 1981, 846). The military’s mission in the Suharto era was to preserve the existing socio-political order.

An important tool for maintaining the existing socio-political order was the Guidelines for Instillation and Implementation of Pancasila (Pedoman Penghayatan Dan Pengamalan Pancasila, P4). This curriculum drilled students in the narrative of working together to further the prosperity of all. In Suharto’s eyes, movements such as the Communist and Darul Islam rebellions had, “erased the opportunity for the Indonesian people to develop and proceed towards the realization of the society that
they aspired to” (Katuuk and Muchji 1996, 35). Suharto used the P4 curriculum to indoctrinate Indonesians into the concept that the state had their best interests in mind and therefore should be obeyed with complete allegiance. The solution to Indonesia’s problems was a stable state founded upon Suharto’s construct of Pancasila. “The interpretation of Pancasila according to one’s own taste and interests is the same as making Pancasila unclear. In such an instance, Pancasila remains in name only and without meaning” (Katuuk and Muchji 1996, 36). Gaining control of the Pancasila narrative and instilling that narrative in the lives of the citizens became the focus of the P4 curriculum. The state was obligated to protect the sanctity of the nation by ensuring the purity of Pancasila and its application.

The P4 curriculum’s instruction on religion was built upon the premise of Article 29 of the Indonesian Constitution, which it interpreted to mean that the state had asserted that all Indonesian citizens were to have a relationship with the One Supreme God. “And if the state recognized the existence of belief and devotion to the One Supreme God, the people must believe and be devoted to that One Supreme God” (Saleh 1996, 104). Therefore the P4 curriculum forbade Communism because of its denial of the divine. The curriculum reads, “Everyone who is reasonable and sensible, certainly believes completely in the oneness of God” (Saleh 1996, 102). Faith in the One Supreme God was mandated to protect the reasonableness and sensibleness of the citizens. Theocracy was also rejected since all citizens were given the right to choose which of the approved monotheistic faiths they wanted adhere to (Saleh 1996, 105). Pancasila became the basis and goal of state thereby preventing reoccurrences of illegitimate political and violent movements.
The consequence of Article 29 was that it justified the state’s intrusion into internal religious affairs. “The government is obligated to give the opportunity and protect each citizen and encourage the growth of their healthy religious life in our country” (Saleh 1996, 106). Suharto’s government interpreted Article 29 to give them vast rights in determining and molding the religious life of the citizens. Because the government declared that all must believe in God, it therefore involved itself in all aspects of private and communal religious affairs as well as mandate religious observance in all aspects of daily life. The P4 curriculum also described the government’s right to define orthopraxy. Because Pancasila required tolerance among religious communities, therefore the government was to ensure that no intolerant teachings or practices were to arise. This meant forbidding overly fanatically attitudes as well the combining of one’s religious beliefs with beliefs from other religions (Saleh 1996, 108). The onus then was on the government to keep the purity of a religion’s teachings.

An example of the state’s intrusion into individual religious freedoms can be seen in P4’s teaching about the propagation of religious views. The 1978 law on P4 listed 45 ways to implement Pancasila. The seventh point under the section of ‘Belief in the One Supreme God’ teaches that one “cannot force another religion or belief about the Only Supreme God on someone else” (Tap MPR No. II/MPR/1978). Only the proselytizing of animists was permitted since they resided on the outside of the state’s defined borders of orthodoxy. According to Suharto, Article 29, Sect. 2 in the Constitution about religious freedom, “prescribed that people could not force their religious convictions upon others and that proselytizing activities (penyebaran agama)
of a certain religion should not be carried out either to increase its followers or by employing methods which could give an impression that these activities were directed at followers of different religions” (Kim 1998, 365-6). Proselytizing adherents of sanctioned orthodox faiths would not be permitted. According to P4, religion was to be personal, approved by the state and respectful of others. Religious freedom was permissible only in so far as it supported stability and obeyed the center of power.

The state meddled in internal religious affairs even though these affairs fell within the boundaries of state sanctioned orthodoxy. Suharto’s government established the National Council of ‘Ulama (Majelis Ulama Indonesia, MUI):

At its opening, Suharto delivered a speech in which he stated that MUI should play four roles: it should (1) serve as the ‘translator of the concepts and activities of national or local development for the people’; (2) be a form of advisory council that ‘gives advice and opinions to the government concerning religious life’; (3) be the ‘mediator between the government and ulama’; and (4) function as a place where the ulama discuss ‘the problems related to the duties of ulama.’ Although its foundation was engineered by Suharto, and it continues to be funded by the government, MUI is not a statutory body anchored in law, but an independent non-governmental institution. (Ichwan 2005, 49)

Although the MUI was granted much freedom to discuss religion, it must be noted what authority was not granted to the MUI. They could not issue fatwas regarding political and state matters. Their sphere of influence was regulated to only matters of inter-ulama religious dialogue and representing the state to the people. The MUI was to be a continuation of the Dutch model of dealing with Islam in Indonesia. Matters of cultural Islam (adat) would be the purview of the MUI and religious organs but political Islam would be controlled by the state. The establishment of the MUI was another of
Suharto’s effort to manage religion via the controlling of the nation’s ulama. “Suharto, who was certainly aware of the important place of the ‘ulama’ in Indonesian society, had become increasingly interested in bringing them into line with his own political agenda” (Ichwan 2005, 47). Suharto also involved the Ministry of Religion into the internal affairs of religious bodies. In 1992, the Ministry of Religion fueled a church split in the Batak Christian Protestant Church (*Huria Kristen Batak Protestan, HKBP*), Indonesia’s third largest religious body after NU and Muhammadiyah. The ministry also banned groups such as Jehovah Witnesses, Mormons and Ahmadiyah that were labeled as heterodox. Folk religions referred to as *kebatinan* were also forbidden (Hefner 2000, 82-85).

In the government’s mind, the government needed to involve itself in the management and control of orthoproxy of the approved monotheistic religions because these religions could pose a threat to the continuation of the state and the Suharto regime. The government claimed that their goal was to preserve religious harmony by uniting religious communities. “If there was not harmony between religions and faiths of the One Supreme God (toleration) then there will be hostility, conflict, strife, and division” (Saleh 1996, 110). The fear was that ethno-religious conflicts would tear the country apart. Under this guise, the government interfered with internal religious matters. The state’s arbitration of religion was based on the principle of the greatest good for all groups. The sanctioned monotheistic faiths were to cooperate with the government’s development policies and be loyal adherents to the Pancasila civil religion. Although P4 repeatedly stated that religion was a personal matter, in reality it was not. “Full responsibility is no longer given to an individual or a religious
community since harmonious relations between people and groups having different religions, a prerequisite for religious freedom, cannot be attained without due attention and regulation” (Kim 1998, 369). The state managed orthodoxy and heterodoxy as well as inter-religious relations under the banner of Pancasila. Plurality of faith existed as long as it followed the prescribed model.

The Department of Religion, the P4 curriculum and other such instruments became the means of manipulating religions to preserve the political order. Madjid criticized such systemic interferences by stating, “Various failures made by the regime of the New Order and most of their policies were against the values of Pancasila. This is why I never agreed at their idea of Panataran P4 (indoctrination of Pancasila) because it was a mere tactic of feudalism” (Soeprapto 2007, xvii). Suharto found it advantageous to his regime to use religions as a tool for controlling the masses, silencing dissent, and increasing the citizenry’s unquestioning loyalty to the state. Although Suharto would later turn towards Islam in an attempt to preserve his power, religions were mostly treated as an important resource for the development of Indonesia and were consequently managed as such by Suharto’s regime. Tensions, however, would continue to exist throughout Suharto’s regime between the homogeneous, state-imposed multiconfessionalism and individual religious freedoms.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE DEMOCRATIC ERA – FLUID POPULISM

With the fall of the Suharto government in 1998, Indonesia entered into a third post-independence era based on the premise of democracy. Once again, the state was challenged with constructing, or in this case salvaging, Pancasila so that Pancasila might retain its relevancy as the basis of the state. Due to Pancasila’s manipulation by the Suharto regime, many Indonesians felt little empathy towards keeping Pancasila and believed it was time for Pancasila to move to the annuls of history. However, the opposite would occur. Instead of discarding Pancasila, a series of democratically elected leaders reframed Pancasila thereby enabling it to become the foundation for a new political era. Pancasila gave “surety that in implementing the principles there should be no interference by the state and every member of society should also be free in possessing his/her own personal ideology and identity in addition to that of Pancasila” (Soeprapto 2007, 67). After a period of rejection, especially among the youth, that brought about the downfall of the Suharto regime, Pancasila found its footing again as it was reconstructed in its new frame.

The new frame was one defined by human rights. Habibie replaced the toppled Suharto as President and immediately embraced the human rights agenda. Three months into his presidency, Habibie told Parliament, “We are determined to make human rights principles the yardstick in our life as a nation and country. We will promote and safeguard human rights in accordance with our democratic and welfare-based approach” (Hosen 2007, 203). Increased human rights were evident early in the Democratic Era. Vibrant democracy arose as people were granted freedom of speech. This resulted in the
founding of new political organizations as well as free and fair elections. As Indonesians grew in their awareness of human rights and the abuse of such rights under previous eras, they demanded changes to the Constitution. A free and open debate once again ensued among the stakeholders of the Indonesian nation. “During the period of constitutional reform from 1999 to 2002, all political parties, Members of Parliament and the government examined the issue; no presidential decrees to unilaterally stop the discussion were issued, and no military force was used to influence the process” (Hosen 2005, 419). In light of the open and vibrant debate over revisions to the 1945 Constitution, Islamists once again had the opportunity to address whether or not the nation would keep the multiconfessionalism of Pancasila or discard it for the monocoffessionalism of an Islamic state. Not surprisingly, the Islamic factions once again proposed the inclusion of the seven words that were stricken from the Preamble of the Jakarta Charter as part of Sukarno’s grand bargain with the non-Muslims of the archipelago.

Christian groups argued against the inclusion of the seven words into the Constitution. Minutes of the Constitutional debate recorded the views of Christian political groups that, “the amendment of the preamble, and amendment of Articles {to make them} inconsistent with the preamble, are a breach of the social contract of the birth of the Republic of Indonesia, and consequently, would end the Unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia” (Indrayana 2005, 183). Clearly the Christians did not want to re-open the the deal negotiated in 1945. Their position was also reinforced by the national government. “The Department of Religious Affairs argued that the original Article 29 should be preserved for three reasons: first, because it was the result of a
national consensus among the founders; second, because it serves as a unifying factor for the country and if it were changed, the country might disintegrate; third, because it acts as the compromise among all the religions in the country” (Indrayana 2005, 238). Significant numbers wanted to preserve the status quo that had worked to protect religious freedom in the country since its founding. But the Christian faction did not have enough electoral strength and the Department of Religion did not have enough legitimacy to prevent the debate over the inclusion of the seven words from proceeding.

Without Sukarno’s charismatic personality or Suharto’s powerful state to make the determination, the confessional basis of the state this time would be made through the democratic process and discourse. Many were rightly concerned that constitutional amendments would lead to an Islamic takeover of Indonesia. However, analysis of the debate shows that the opening position of the Islamist parties fell well short of Islamist demands from previous eras. “During the constitutional debate none of the Islamic political parties proposed the adoption of a caliphate system, thus acknowledging the nation-state, nor did they propose the establishment of an Islamic state like those in Iran, Egypt or Saudi Arabia” (Hosen 2005, 420). Islamists were no longer advocating for a pan-Islamic nation or a theocracy. These parties had moved away from the demands of the Darul Islam movement and were content with the representative nature of government that existed in the country. The debates also showed that Islamists developed a strong tendency towards pragmatism by showing flexibility in regards to the basis of the state (Platzdasch 2009, 325-6). They ceded the right to establish laws to the state rather than looking to Shari’a as the source of laws:

Accommodation and compromise were central characteristics of Islamist politics in democratic Indonesia despite the large amount of anti-
Christian and anti-Semitic rhetoric in PK and the doctrinaire sections of PBB and the keluarga. The pragmatic imperative has prevailed regardless of the inner resistance individual Islamists might preserve to parts of the state’s legislation. (Platzdasch 2009, 295)

Desiring to appear pluralistic and pro-reform, Islamist political parties did not make the inclusion of Shari’a a deal-breaker during the amending of the Constitution. They were willing to deal away their Islamic state in order to gain greater human rights protections in an amended Constitution.

The Islamist political parties ultimately failed to change the Constitution mostly due to the leadership of the two largest Muslim non-political organizations in the country, Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah. These organizations had a combined membership of 80 million people when the amendments to the Constitution were debated. “Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) and Muhammadiyah, which (as part, then, of the Masyumi Party) pushed for an Islamic state in 1955, now no longer share the agenda of formally adopting the syariah into the Constitution” (Hosen 2005, 425-426). Nearly sixty years of independence had transformed these two civil Muslim organizations into supporters of the pluralistic state. Hasyim Muzadi, the chairman of the NU in 2002, warned against any amendments to Indonesia’s multi-confessionalism because they would lead to national disintegration. Muzadi argued, “We are not capable of stemming a fight that will certainly follow if [Article 29] is changed. It will almost certainly instigate a clash between the far right and the far left” (Indrayana 2005, 238). These comments echoed the words of his predecessor at NU, Abdurrahman Wahid, who said in 1995, “In a pluralistic state, disintegration is cause by sectarianism. A country like
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1 Islamic parties such as the Justice Party (Partai Keadilan, PK), the Crescent Star Party (Partai Bulan Bintang, PBB) and other Islamist political parties were known as the family (keluarga).
Indonesia could in no way implement values that are not acceptable to all its citizens, who come from different religions and worldviews” (Dhakiri 2010, 111). Reaffirming Pancasila’s multiconfessionalism as the basis of the state, then, was the only way to prevent sectarianism and protect the integrity of the state.

The debate in 2002 also differed from the discourse surrounding the initial formation of the state in 1945 in that a new argument was introduced by Abdurrahman Wahid, the son of Wahid Hasyim. Abdurrahman Wahid wanted to change the discourse from the shallow concern of territorial integrity to a deeper philosophical basis for multiconfessionalism—the basis of equality for all citizens. Commenting on the proposal to include the seven words, Abdurrahman Wahid said that, “The Preamble and original Article 29 put all citizens on the same footing. But by adopting this charter\(^2\), that will give the Moslems advantage over the others, the others will be second class. So we have to avoid that” (Indrayana 2005, 239). Abdurrahman Wahid believed that religion alone was not a sufficient basis for forming a country. Citizens needed a sense of equal ownership in the state. Instead of supporting the demand for an Islamic state, Abdurrahman Wahid chided Muslim leaders for not being inclusive of other faiths. He said:

…if you want to go down the path of integration, don’t think any more like a Muslim that is outside of the thoughts of others who have been born, speak and are together with other Indonesians. I have read, learned and applied the Qur’an, and Hadiths, and other books that are not specifically for Muslims. I am prepared to apply whatever that is true and in accordance with my conscience. I don’t care if it is a quote from the Gospel or the Bhagavad Gita as long as that verse is acceptable to us. (Wahid 1999, 201-202)

\(^2\) Here he means the original draft of the Piagam Jakarta (Jakarta Charter) that included the seven words.
Abdurrahman Wahid wanted Muslims to change their own perceptions of others and to begin to see others as their equals. Only then would true unity be created out of Indonesia’s diversity. The frame of human rights enabled Wahid to focus on the essence of humanity and the meaning of citizenship:

The struggle for human rights, democracy and the rule of law is a universal struggle. Proclaiming that is the people’s autonomous right against the state. This means that one cannot use the flag of Islam. Islam should make a contribution but not claim [it all for its own]. Now it is as if Islam is advancing the claim that the only true contribution is from Islam. (Wahid 1999, 196).

Wahid affirmed the fact that Islam was only one piece of the social fabric and history of Indonesia. All Indonesians were given the right to contribute to the dialogue. Not only were they given the right but they were being encouraged to use it. Wahid was not simply advocating peaceful coexistence brought about by tolerance but instead was encouraging an active effort to breakdown the prejudices in society which ultimately result in sectarianism and disintegration. This active discourse included respect, awareness, sincere dialogue and embrace of equal status for all citizens.

The reaffirmation of the multiconfessional through the constitutional amendment process provided Pancasila’s framing for the Democratic Era. The frame was established between the rejection of state control and dominance on the one hand and the rejection of radical Western individual rights on the other. The state would still recognize, encourage and participate in the religious life of its citizens. But now the state would act in accordance with protecting human rights. “Pancasila indicates Indonesia’s distinctiveness from rather than hostility to the Western world and above all can be seen as an embodiment of the nation’s commitment to pluralism and tolerance”
(Dhont 2010, 129). As is true in other countries, Indonesia had its own contextualized interpretation of human rights. These leaders maintained a middle road of respecting human rights as well as respecting the rights of groups and religions. Pancasila still defined what orthodoxy and heterodoxy were through determining which monotheistic faiths were allowable. Tolerance continued to be the theme that embodied Pancasila’s relevancy to Indonesia’s pluralism. Pancasila’s universal principles would be renewed in this frame to accommodate the new realities of the global wave of democracy and human rights.

**Role and Character of the State**

The state was no longer the promoter of egalitarian collectivism as it was under Sukarno neither was it the all-subsuming organ as it was under Suharto. Instead it became the partner of civil society and citizens. The state acted as the guardian of public civility working with citizens and civil religion rather than against them:

If in the past the people gave a respect to the Red and White\(^3\) because of fear, now it is the accountability of the government to educate people on how to respect the Flag based on their genuine appreciation of the state and nation. In that regard the values of Pancasila have to be reconstructed and socially transformed. Pancasila should not be simply regarded as a state ideology but it should be converted into a global paradigm on civilization. (Soeprapto, 2007, 59)

Under the new framing of Pancasila, the state maintained a role in promoting religion. But this role was now distanced from the coercive machinery of the state. A new relationship between religion and state was negotiated. Ahmad Hasyim Muzadi, who succeeded Abdurrahman Wahid as head of Nahdlatul Ulama, advocated that religion was an integral part of civil society. Muzadi said:

\[^3\] The Indonesian flag.
...religion should contribute values and principles to the state, so that the latter would be empowered to serve and protect the whole nation and create a pluralistic civil society in the country. Therefore, moderate Islam serves both state and religion. It promotes religious life of the people and ensures the sustainability of religions within the state. Moderate Islam ensures that there is no conflict between state and religion. Hence, there should be no need for separation between state and religion. (Potz 2010, 23)

The Democratic Era did not push religion outside of the public square neither did it monopolize religion. Instead religion was given the freedom to de-privatize according to the spirit of Pancasila.

Once Civil Muslim groups ceased in their demands to establish a Muslim nation, they were able to craft a role for Islam in the public square. “Rather than regulating Islam to the realm of the private, however, they insist that there is a middle path between liberalism’s privatization and conservative Islam’s bully state. The path passes by way of a public religion that makes itself heard through independent associations, spirited public dialogue, and the demonstrated decency of believers” (Hefner 2000, 218). Civil Muslims embraced Madjid’s vision of Islam in the public square as a dynamic, constructive voice in society rather than a fossilized institution. The human rights and democratization movements provided civil religions with the room to develop their own model independent from the state. Civil religions were granted broad autonomy to regulate themselves without government interference. The state became the champion of all Pancasila-approved religions but not an exclusive promoter of a single religion. Prof. Dr. H. Syafiq A. Mughni of Muhammadiyah University at Sidoarjo observed that, “After a long process of discourse and dialogue among intellectuals and ulama’ (religious scholars) it seems that they have come to agree that religion is the
basis of spirit, values, and culture of Indonesians. With regards to politics, religion provides an ethical foundation for a democratic state” (Potz 2010, 63). The consensus that was reached through discourse was that religion was an enhancement to the cultural and political fabric of the state. Therefore the monoconfessional state based on Islam was once again rejected in favor of the multiconfessional Pancasila state.

The state in the Democratic Era would not emphasize diversity as Sukarno did neither would it emphasize unity as Suharto did. Instead it strived to achieve unity in diversity. Only via the human rights paradigm as implemented through the Second Constitutional Amendments could this be achieved:

The Indonesian Constitution (the Undang-undang Dasar 1945 hereinafter UUD45) before its amendment was a symbol of national unity and integration and that it had little place for the recognition of minority rights. The Second Amendments to the UUD45 has led to another model for the Indonesian State, one that symbolically is prepared to recognize more diversity while still promoting unity. (Bell 2001, 791)

No longer was there an overarching slogan such as Bhinneka Tunggal Ika or Persatuan dan Kesatuan to be foisted on the people. Instead the slogan of Reformasi or Reformation became the rallying cry of the Democratic Era. True to the spirit of democracy and free speech, the slogan of Reformasi gave way to a myriad of slogans would be developed to communicate the vision of political and civil groups to the masses. The Indonesia of the Democratic Era was to be based on mutuality and inclusivity which meant respect for minority rights. This would be impossible to obtain without the active participation of civil society. Autonomous religious and civic organizations created a check on the coercive powers of the state thereby providing an environment for the rights of the minorities to be protected. The net result was the
establishment of a culture of inclusivity which recognized the inherent value of each minority grouping and fostered mutual respect.

The strengthening of civil society provided the state with a more robust manner to deal with religious threats. These threats no longer needed to be dealt with via violence and coercion. Instead the Democratic Era would neutralize threats by promoting the rule of law and active citizenship. Hefner saw that democratic Indonesia would need both of these working in tandem with each other. “What is apparent, however, is that democratic consolidation will require not just a civil society of independent associations (although these are important too) but a public culture of equality, justice, and universal citizenship” (Hefner 2000, 20). Would Indonesians and civil society be enough to maintain the order and the pluralistic nature state? The answer to this was born out in the post-Suharto elections. In the run up to the 2004 and 2009 elections, Islamist parties increasingly moved towards the political center and away from Islamic ideology. These parties established platforms focusing on issues of daily life that the average Indonesian struggled with:

The best example in this is Partai Keadilan Sejahtera (PKS or Prosperous and Justice Party), the most Islamically-oriented conservative party that was able to substantially increase its gains the last election from less than two percent in the 1999 election to seven percent. The party succeeded in getting more voters not because they campaigned for the implementation of shari’a or the transformation of Indonesia into an Islamic state, but rather for the fight against corruption and creation of good governance. (Azra 2006, 215-6)

Surveys continue to show that most Indonesians view themselves as non-Islamists. “Averaging the responses from a typical survey conducted in 2007, we classified 57% of the respondents as secular and 33% as Islamist….We also find declining support for
Islamist values” (Mujani and Liddle 2009, 589). This trend was seen in the falling support for Islamists in elections. “There is an intriguing discrepancy between support for Islamist values (33%) and the vote for Islamist parties (15%)” (Mujani and Liddle 2009, 589). The public discourse among Indonesian citizens proved strong enough to preserve the Pancasila basis for the state. No longer was there a need to crush opposition or isolate threats to the state. Elections showed that Islamist parties advocating a monoconfessional Islamic state did not enjoy the support of the majority.

Not only did Indonesians reject the Islamic state via the ballot box but they also voted to retain the multiconfessional monotheistic state. Civil Muslim groups such as NU and Muhammadiyah viewed religion as important to the makeup of the state. “A French- or American-style separation of religion and state has some support in Christian circles, but not among Muslims” (Friend 2006, 44). Religious teachings should influence the content of laws and religious sensitivities should guide the usage of individual freedoms. Pancasila’s new frame created an Indonesianized mechanism for human rights to be implemented. Shari’a would not dictate but instead influence what laws were to be implemented. Radical human rights squeeze religion out of the public square. The state would not overwhelm civil society. Minorities would be integrated as equal citizens. Indonesia negotiated its future path in light of its past to reframe Pancasila for the Democratic Era. Religion’s status was preserved and acknowledged as a partner to the democratic process. Democratic governments working in discourse with civil society proved to be an effective mechanism for maintaining the multiconfessional, monotheistic state.
Pluralism

Worldwide trends and ideas were spreading rapidly throughout the archipelago. International human rights and the deprivatization of religion in the West were of great interest to Indonesians. Indonesian society was increasingly focused on the individual rather than the ethnic group or the nation. The human rights banner became a major focus of the national discourse. In the Democratic Era, Indonesia added constitutional guarantees of human rights such as the Freedom of Religion, Freedom of Speech, etc. The human rights agenda enjoyed broad support. “Today Indonesia is a functioning democracy, where an almost complete Declaration of Human Rights from 1948 has been given constitutional guarantee, and the existence of non-Islamic religions as of the same dignity as Islam is fully accepted. It may be added that all post-Suharto governments had strong support by Islamic parties” (Potz 2010, 36). The state of Indonesia fully embraced human rights and moved away from stoking ethno-religious differences to achieve state goals.

Major religious civil societies were instrumental in creating space for pluralism, human rights and particularly minority rights to take root. Muslim organizations such as NU and Muhammadiyah, the Catholic Church and others contributed to the transnational trend of religion contributing to human rights. Representing NU’s opinions, Muzadi stated, “I am of the view that religions must be returned to their rightful place: as religious teachings. It calls for proportionate efforts toward proportionate position, comprehension, and application of religions. In a multicultural world, religions should naturally be in harmony with the principles of humanity” (Potz 2010, 22). NU under Abdurrahman Wahid initiated the bridging of religious
communities to shape the civil society of the Democratic Era. Catholic intellectual Franz Magnis-Suseno commented:

…a special kind of dialogue that has developed over the last 30 years, not least through the influence of Abdurrahman Wahid, is the dialogue of ‘pluralist’ or ‘liberal’ Muslims and Christians on how to face fundamentalism and how to develop Islam and Christianity as a religion of the 21st century. There is a kind of intellectual brotherhood between ‘progressive’ Muslims and Christians, where they try to defend themselves against attacks by fundamentalists. (Potz 2010, 34)

Realizing their common interests in the human rights discourse, intellectuals from across the religious spectrum bound together to create a pluralistic center of multiconfessionalism based on the concept of one humanity.

Although a particular religion was not embraced by the state, some local governments proceeded to embrace Shari’a Law and compel the adherence to Islamic ordinances. The government issued Law No. 29 Year 1999 and the Local Government Act No. 32 Year 2004 which granted regional autonomy to the provinces. It also allowed regional governments to manage their provinces according to local distinctives. This empowered the regional governments to follow the national government’s example under Suharto and attempt to control religion. Regions such as Aceh, West Sumatera, Banten, Cianjur, and others took this opportunity to enact Shari’a ordinances known as Peraturan Daerah Shari’a (Perda Shari’a). Some of the ordinances covered topics defining what constituted the orthopraxy of Islamic disciplines. These ordinances covered disciplines such as five daily prayers and fasting during Ramadan, Qur’anic recitation, and giving of alms. Perda Shari’a had the effect of coercing citizens, adhering to government prescribed Islamic orthopraxy.
Women bore the brunt of this coercion. Perda Shari’a ordinances were not just defining religious disciplines but also determining the rights of women in society. Ordinances were issued covering the veiling for women (jilbab), prostitution, adultery, outdoor presence of women at night and the mixing of men and women (ikhtilat). For instance, Aceh caned women who were found to be alone with a male who was not their husband. More than 50 districts nationwide enacted ordinances mandating Islamic dress. In her book *Gender, Islam and Democracy in Indonesia*, Kathryn Robinson raised the question as to why Shari’a laws unevenly focuses on issues relating to women. “Siti Musdah Mulia (who is a lecturer at the Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah in Jakarta and head of the gender and religion section of the Department of Religious Affairs) stated that every country that has implemented sharia law has begun by attacking women’s rights” (Robinson 2009, 172). Perda Shari’a decentralized the state’s authority to define orthopraxy. Implementation and regulation of Islamic orthopraxy was unevenly applied both regionally as well as socially causing further state interference in religious matters.

After failing on a national basis to establish an Islamic state, Islamists have viewed the decentralization process as an open the door for promoting their agenda. Perda Shari’a provided a step towards replacing multiconfessionalism with monoconfessionalism. While still citizens of a Pancasila state, Muslim areas with a small non-Muslim minority were able to overwhelm government statutes to create virtual regional monoconfessionalism. But these regional steps had national consequences. The implementation of Perda Shari’a further complicated the delicate social contract of Pancasila:
Perda Syariat has become a polemical, even a tough problem because it encourages other religions to follow in its footsteps: in Manokwari, for instance, where the majority religion is Christian, a Perda Injil (Gospel Regional Law) has been implemented. As a matter of fact, the religiously tinted Perda is contradictory to the Pancasila and the spirit of the Indonesian constitution (UUD’45) spirit. Other religions naturally resent its presence. Moreover, the Perda reflects a strong sense of religious zeal by positioning religion as the single solution to all of the problems faced by this diverse nation. As a result, religious freedom has become a serious problem, not only in areas where Islam is a majority, but also in areas with Christian and other non-Muslim religion as a majority. (Intan 2011)

Islamists who advocated the management of religion on the local level to limit the space for other religions to operate in turn found themselves to be limited in areas where they were not in the majority. Perda Shari’a constituted a significant challenge to individual human rights since regional governments were imposing religious practices on adherents and limiting religious freedoms rather than letting civil religions manage their internal affairs.

Indonesia did not embrace the Western notion of radical individual human rights but instead settled on a pseudo-ideological pluralism in which the rights of everyone were to be respected as long as they were self-censoring. Not every form of religious expression was tolerant and therefore Indonesians felt that the individual or civil society should monitor those actions and control them:

In this environment, a new generation of young Muslim intellectuals is emerging. They do not simply adopt Western ideas regarding democracy, human rights, and social justice, but reconsider these issues themselves theologically on the basis of Islam….On the basis of a new reading of the Koran, the fundamentalist understanding of the shari’a is being deconstructed. Ulil Abshar Abdala, for example, the young leader of JIL who has already received death threats, writes that ‘the assumption that
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4 JIL stands for Jaringan Islam Liberal or in English, the Liberal Islam Network.
the introduction of the shari’a can solve all problems is merely mental laziness and an attempt to run away from the problems.’ (Schröter 2010, 357)

A public discourse was developing as an alternative to the world offered by strict religious elements. Yet this pluralism was pseudo-ideological since it was still not based on full human rights including true freedom of religion. Heterodox beliefs were permitted as long as they remained private and stayed hidden from public view. When heterodox beliefs were openly promoted, both the state and civil society struggled to deal with it. An example of this was the February 7, 2011 attack on Ahmadis in Cikeusik, Banten. The state and civil society were still not ready for complete rule of law and the protection of minority rights to cover issues of heterodoxy.

Religion served to create a new national community between religious groups. Gains made in establishing civil society and a discourse between groups needed to be continued. Franz Magnis-Suseno commented, “The existing consensus about democracy and – to a considerable degree – human rights should be deepened. Mutual consensus should be reached regarding a level of religious freedom that is in accordance with the human rights” (Schröter 2010, 359). Conversations have been facilitated nationwide by Muslim, Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist and Hindu organizations. These inter-religious dialogues have served to promote a true spirit of tolerance rather than a government controlled or manipulated narrative. These discourses independent of the government shaped and are continuing to shape how religions are organizing and governing themselves.

The actors of the new national religious community are not simply influenced by their local adaptations of their religious traditions but they are increasingly connected to
transnational religious movements. Groups such as the Islamic revivalist movement Tablighi Jama’at have made their way to Indonesia from India. “The movement was formed near Delhi in the 1920s by an Islamic religious scholar, Maulana Ilyas, who wished to correct lax and Hinduizing practices of the Islamic population in northern India” (Almond 2003, 112). Indonesians seemed to have an affinity towards the group due to the Indic influence found in their version of Islam and their history of receiving Islam through Indian traders from Gujarat. “It is believed to have been introduced into Indonesia in 1952, but it only began to gain momentum in this country in the early 1970s” (Azra 2006, 190). Taglighi followers have adopted more Middle Eastern dress with the women wearing a full face covering veil. The movement has opened branches in every province. Balinese Hinduism also renewed its relationship with its Indian roots during the 20th century. The Hindu Dharma movement has led to exchanges of ideas and formalized relations with Indian Hindus. Other transnational splinter groups such as Shi’ism have been not officially been permitted by the state due to their being labeled as heterodoxy. However, they were permitted to practice as long as they did so privately. For example, although known throughout Indonesia as the leading Shi’ite intellectual, Jalauddin Rahmat would not openly confess his adherence to Shi’ism.

Islamist groups also developed transnational ties. Since the 1970s, students studying abroad in Cairo have become increasingly influenced by the Muslim Brotherhood (Abaza 1994, 91-101). “They have adopted not only these unfamiliar Islamic ideas, they have also embraced the framework and methodology of Muslim movements they saw and became involved in abroad” (Azra 2006, 187). The Democratic Era saw the establishment of groups such as the Islamic Defenders Front
(Front Pembela Islam, FPI) by Habib Rizieq al-Habshi in Jakarta around 2000. FPI’s main goal was the implementation of Islamic Shari’a law. They were known for violent attacks and intimidation against places of prostitution, gambling dens and even churches. The Indonesian Mujahedeen Council (Majelis Mujahideen Indonesia, MMI) was founded in 2000 by Abu Bakar Ba’ashir. Although not a terrorist organization itself, it served as a networking hub for Islamist groups within Indonesia with the goal of rescinding Pancasila and turning Indonesia into an Islamic state. The Warriors of Jihad (Laskar Jihad) founded by Ja’far Talib in 2000 was involved in ethno-religious warfare in the Moluccan Islands. They were active in religious based warfare in many regions of the country. These three hard-line groups were not simply homegrown Indonesian organizations but they were also networked with the broader transnational jihadi networks. However, hard-line and splinter groups such as these have not managed to attract or retain a large following. They do not appeal to the weltanschauungen of the Indonesians who show preference for their Indonesianized religious expressions.

Arbitration of Religion

Whereas in previous eras Sukarno or the state was the arbiter of religion, in the Democratic Era civil society moved alongside the state in the arbitration of religion:

Democracy requires civic organization characterized by voluntarism, independent associations, and a balance of powers between state and society as well as among civil organizations themselves. All these things help to create commitments and balances congenial to democratic habits of heart. But these activities are still not enough if they remain the stuff of isolated groupings. Democracy ultimately requires a public culture that draws on these separate experiences to promote universal habits of participation and tolerance. (Hefner 2000, 215)
Both Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah played important roles in integrating civil society with the state. Public civil Islam and political parties were both led by the same people. Amien Rais, the head of Muhammadiyah, became the leader of Parliament and Wahid, the chairman of NU, was elected President. Even Akbar Tanjung, who headed up the opposition Golkar party, had at one time held the position of president of the Muslim University Student Association (Himpunan Muslim Indonesia, HMI). The integration of civil society and state provided a strong center to withstand the forces aimed at rescinding the multiconfessional Pancasila state.

The post-Suharto transition was marked by significant ethno-religious conflict. Radical groups such as Laskar Jihad entered into conflict areas and exacerbated the problems. But the strength of the integration between civil Islam and political parties running the state allowed the Republic of Indonesia to regain control. “In response to the heightened activity of radical Muslim organizations after the fall of Suharto, Muhammadiyah and NU have taken a stance against these groups’ agendas and activities and have strived to portray a peaceful, tolerant image of Islam” (Azra 2006, 130). For example, NU and Muhammadiyah have cooperated with the government in countering terrorism (Azra 2006, 217–18). Abdurrahman Wahid assembled the book “The Illusion of an Islamic State” chronicling and documenting the expansion of transnational jihadi networks into Indonesia. NU and Muhammadiyah supported the government’s strong actions against the radicals. They also cooperated on building civil society through initiatives such as the Voter Education Network for the People (Jaringan Pendidikan Pemilih untuk Rakyat, JPPR), which provided voters with electoral information and monitored elections (MacIntyre and Ramage 2008, 35).
Yet the pseudo-ideological pluralism of the Democratic Era meant that the state continued its involvement in the arbitration of religion instead of leaving it solely to the realm of civil society. An example of the state’s foray into religious arbitration was the Parliament’s 2003 decree which established a Constitutional Court:

The Court has power to ensure that legislation enacted by Indonesia’s national parliament complies with the Indonesian Constitution….The Court’s function puts it in a critical position as an arbiter between the central government and Islam, because the Constitution contains both Pancasila—Indonesia’s state ideology which requires a role for religion within the state—and provisions guaranteeing freedom of religion for citizens. (Butt 2010, 280)

The balancing act between the state mandated adherence to a monotheistic religion and human rights had now been provided with another mechanism to enhance the rule of law. Then in 2004 the government began a process of updating the Compilation of Islamic Law (Kompilasi). In the ensuing debate, human rights took the forefront. Groups such as the Commission on Women’s Human Rights (KOMNAS Perempuan) argued for equality under the law. They argued that “the sections of the Kompilasi dealing with family law should be further revised to reflect principles of democracy and gender equity and contemporary Indonesian social practice” (Robinson 2006, 174). Women’s groups viewed the Compilation of Islamic Law as inordinately burdening women by not treating them as equal citizens under the law. They objected to laws in the Compilation such as considering the man as the head of the family, division of inheritance and polygamy claiming that these laws were a violation of their rights through gender discrimination. These groups found some success as evidenced by changes to Indonesia’s domestic violence laws.
The philosophy undergirding the arbitration of religion was that of human rights and particularly the right to hold private beliefs without coercion. During the Second Constitutional Amendments, much attention was placed on enhancing the 1945 Constitution’s protection of human rights. “The provisions of the new chapter were substantially drawn from the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR). It was recognized that the UDHR could not be incorporated in total, and this was not even discussed. Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution impose a requirement of universal religious belief” (Ellis 2002, 132). Indonesia readily acknowledged that it was not fully embracing radical individual human rights as advocated by western society but was still willing to provide wide latitude for many religious freedoms within monotheistic multiconfessionalism:

In 1998, only a few months after the fall of Suharto, when Muslim politicians had their greatest political influence, practically the whole 1948 declaration of the UN was given constitutional status, the only dissenting voices being the mentioned old time (Sukarnoist and Suhartoist) groups. It is noteworthy that the famous Cairo declaration of Human rights is essentially unknown in Indonesia, except by a few experts, and it never played any role in the human rights discussion. (Potz 2010, 37)

The overwhelming acceptance of the UDHR over the Cairo Declaration of the Organization of the Islamic Conference reflected Indonesia’s values of tolerance, acceptance of others as well as appreciation for its cultural heritage.

The amended Constitution made provisions for religious freedom but not for proselytization. The original 1945 Constitution provided limited human rights. Article 28 merely stated that, “The freedom to associate and to assemble, to express written and oral opinions, etc., shall be regulated by law.” The Second Amendment added
extensively to it. For instance, Article 28E dealing with religious freedom reads: “(1)
Every person shall be free to choose and to practice the religion of his/her choice...(2)
Every person shall have the right to the freedom to believe his/her faith (kepercayaan),
and to express his/her views and thoughts, in accordance with his/her conscience.” No
criminal charges could be brought against anyone who changed their religion. The role
of Shari’a was complementary to rather than above the Constitution. “Shari’ah is
neither above nor outside the human rights provision in the 1945 Constitution. The
principles of Shari’ah can be seen as an inspiration for human rights protection: they
can walk together side by side” (Hosen 2007, 211). Yet, active propagation of a non-
Islamic religion to those adhering to Islam was still prohibited. This was a vestige from
the Suharto Era’s control of religion. Indonesia’s pseudo-ideological human rights has
narrowly defined freedom of religion to mean freedom of worship rather than freedom
to practice one’s religious tenet of propagating one’s religion.

Although in the long run the involvement of civil society will prove more
beneficial for the arbitration of religion, the rule of law had yet to completely take root.
As a result, the Democratic Era had a mixed record in regards to religion. During his
presidency, Wahid added Confucianism to the list of government sanctioned
monotheistic faiths. Churches have worked with the government to establish a
mechanism for securing permits for their church buildings. But since the downfall of the
Suharto government, the violent persecution of religious minorities increased as militant
Islamic groups reformulated themselves. These groups appeared on the scene much like
when the cork is removed from a bottle and the genie appears. Inspired by Darul Islam,
the group Laskar Jihad went to the Moluccan Islands and waged warfare there. Vigilante
squads from the Islamic Defenders Front (FPI) were known for forceful intimidation of churches:

The increased radicalism of the groups mentioned above is not sparked from abroad, but has a lot to do with the Indonesian government’s failure to enforce the law and to solve a number of acute social ills….The abrupt decline of central government authority after Suharto, together with the demoralization of the police force, have become raison d’etre for these ‘vigilante’ groups to take law into their own hands. (Friend 2006, 24-5)

These militant groups have taken advantage of the power vacuum to exert themselves into long-festering social and ethno-religious problems without fear of punishment.

Radical groups took advantage of the social dynamics created by policies of the Suharto Era. In addition to weakening regional government authority, Suharto also implemented a transmigration policy which resulted in major demographic changes to different parts of the country. Since the 1970s, Muslims at the rate of more than 1,000 per day have arrived in Papua to settle in isolated communities, not mixing with the indigenous people. The island was nearly 100% Christian when the transmigration policy was enacted. In 2012, the island was roughly 50% Christian and 50% Muslim, with the percentage of Muslims increasing each year. In Central Sulawesi, immigrants move up Trans-Sulawesi Highway changing the demographics in the area (Schröter 2010, 268-281). The result has been a marginalization of the original inhabitants and an increasing clamoring for indigenous rights. Open violence has occurred on occasion in addition to a simmering animosity in these regions and beyond. At their essential level, these were communal conflicts. Yet religion mobilized the masses. “The disturbing fact is that the conflicts tend to boil down, in these cases, to confrontations simply between Christians and Muslims” (Potz 2010, 117). It was encouraging, however, that in these
cases the violence did not spill over into other regions. The conflicts were essentially local and did not lead to a Yugoslavia-type breakup of the country.

The power vacuum created by the fall of the Suharto security state coupled with the decentralization of power to the regional administrations resulted in an uneven application of the rule of law. Some local administrations ignored gross violations of human rights and continued to arbitrate religious matters based on their own standards of orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Although the government lifted the ban on a Christian sect (Mormonism), they continued to appease Islamist groups by outlawing a Muslim sect (Ahmadiyah). Ahmadiyah has been in Indonesia since 1928. Militant groups applied pressure on the government to act against what they deemed to be a deviant Islamic sect. In 2007, the Ministry of Religion issued a decree allowing adherents of Ahmadiyah to practice privately but forbidding them to declare publicly that they are Ahmadis. Harkristuti Harkrisnowo, who served as director general for human rights at the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights in 2007, criticized the government’s stance. As quoted in the Jakarta Post’s Article, Ahmadiyah can worship, Kalla says, Harkrisnowo asks, “Who has the authority to determine what is Islam and what is Christian or Hindu? Does performing religious duties in a different way exclude me from a religion?” (2008). Whereas officials in the more secular-minded Ministry of Justice and Human Rights were not of the opinion that government can or should determine orthopraxy and heteropraxy, the religious-minded Ministry of Religion believed otherwise. Events escalated in 2011 when Ahmadis in the village of Cikeusik, Banten were attacked by FPI members. Captured on video, FPI forces killed three Ahmadis and then proceeded to bludgeon the corpses while the police stood by and did
nothing to stop the violence. The perpetrators of the violence received sentences of only 3-6 months for the deaths of three people.

Christians as well have felt the uneven application of human rights. The government issued a permit to the Indonesian Christian Church (Gereja Kristen Indonesia, GKI) in a middle class neighborhood of Yasmin, Bogor, located in the greater Jakarta metropolitan area. The local government sealed off the church and would not allow the parishioners to worship there in spite of the fact that the church’s building permit was upheld as valid by a Supreme Court decision. The local government felt free to ignore the Supreme Court. “The problem is that no court has jurisdiction to enforce constitutional law. There is no constitutional court in Indonesia and the general courts, including the Makamah Agung [MA] or Supreme Court, lack constitutional jurisdiction. One could therefore say that constitutional law is unenforceable in Indonesia” (Bell 2001, 786). Lawmakers from NU have shown support by attending rallies with the parishioners. President Yudhoyono has been criticized for not enforcing the rule of law in cases such as these. Yudhoyono only encouraged more discourse in his statement saying, “Sectarian or interreligious problems should be resolved in a right and peaceful way in accordance with the Constitution, laws and other regulations” (“Yudhoyono Calls on Muslims to Follow Prophet’s Lead,” The Jakarta Globe, 16 February 2011). The Yudhoyono administration appeared reticent to implement the rule of law in the face of militant Muslim resistance. Without a functioning rule of law, an environment would not be created through which discourse could resolve issues relating to religion in the public square.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE CHALLENGES AHEAD

In his *Public Religions in the Modern World*, Jose Casanova discussed the possibility for modern public religions. Indonesia provided an example of how religion can be deprivatized and become an integral part of constructing civil society and contributing to statehood. In spite of the overwhelming Muslim majority, Indonesia did not become an Islamic state like neighboring Malaysia which had a significantly smaller Muslim population than Indonesia. In Indonesia, “civil Muslims renounce the mythology of an Islamic state. Rather than regulating Islam to the realm of the private, however, they insist that there is a middle path between liberalism’s privatization and conservative Islam’s bully state. The path passes by way of a public religion that makes itself heard through independent associations, spirited public dialogue, and the demonstrated decency of believers” (Hefner 2000, 218). As Indonesia’s post-colonial history showed, the on-going discourse between religion and state was essential in determining religion’s contribution to the state and the state’s contribution to religion.

Since Independence, Indonesia’s leaders have repeatedly referred to Pancasila as a uniquely Indonesian solution to the relationship between religion and state. And that has indeed been the case. Pancasila was formed through a process of difficult discourse and may have been opted for by Sukarno as an escape from his dilemma of forming a modern nation state out of the complicated historical pluralism of Indonesia. In this light, Indonesia chose an implicit approach rather than an explicit one in which they have incorporated enough vagueness into the relationship between religion and state so that all groups had space to function. This nonconfrontational, low key, yet persuasive
approach fit the Indonesian personality. Over time, Pancasila has proven to be a nimble, default position. Successive regimes have fallen back to the position of Pancasila thereby maintaining the integrity of the state. Although it has proven to be adaptable and pliable, is it nimble enough to survive the coming decades of the 21st century?

All of the state-sanctioned monotheistic religions felt that they won something in the formulation of Pancasila and yet at the same time all of them felt as though they lost something. Monotheistic religions were placed on a quasi-equal footing in relation to the state. Since the nation state did not declare a majority religion, other religions did not automatically assume the label of being in the minority. Islam was conspicuously absent in the final formation of the post-colonial nation state. In fact, the word ‘Islam’ did not even appear in the Constitution. Instead, a community of religions was established within state-mandated parameters. Religious groups were encouraged to celebrate their common monotheism rather than debate their doctrinal differences. “Yet looking back over the history of Indonesia, and keeping in mind how profoundly pluralistic its society has been, the most striking and persistent general feature of religious life on these islands is their inhabitants’ sense of obligation to live, and learn to live, with one another” (Emmerson 1999, 235). In keeping with this spirit, Indonesians that adhere to a religion which fall outside the boundaries of orthodoxy were allowed to practice their personal beliefs as long they were kept private. Additionally, public expressions of heterodoxy were ignored by the state unless forced into action due to public outcry arising from the open practice of heterodoxy. Although this mode of operation did not satisfy the most robust definitions of human rights and religious
freedom, it did reflect the Indonesian view of avoiding confrontation unless forced to do otherwise.

Yet in the early Democratic Era, full pluralism has yet to take root. Instead, the concept of pluralism is given mention but the state continues to view itself as part and parcel of the arbitration of religion rather than leaving it to the realm of civil society. These two paradigms are in tension with one another. The free exercise of religion cannot be controlled or managed by the state. A state that respects human rights will allow its own civil society to safeguard the rights of the individual as well as the rights of the group. The remnants of the Suharto New Order government are still under the mindset that it is possible and commendable for the state to control religions. The paradigm of civil society managing religion is one that looks to the future where civil religions organize and police themselves. Indonesia today is stuck trying to hold to the past while implementing the future. Since the future is not fully realized, a tension is created between the state’s suppression of individual religious liberty and the state’s laws guaranteeing freedom of religion. For Pancasila to survive, it will need to prove that it is fully compatible with robust civil society. As shown by the suppression of Ahmadiyah, Pancasila is under tremendous strain to allow less state control of religion and to give more opportunity for civil society to manage religious issues. Without such a shift, Pancasila will find it increasingly difficult to cope with the changes in the nation state.

The Pancasila paradigm of statehood has gained traction in large part because of the two dominant Islamic movements in the country. Both NU and Muhammadiyah have committed themselves to being both a civil Islamic organization as well as
allowing its members to participate in the public square. NU has historically found itself in the middle position between Muhammadiyah and secular nationalist parties. “By mediating between Muhammadiya and the nationalist parties, NU helped sustain a multipolar ideological field that encouraged inter-elite competition, negotiations, and accommodation” (Brumberg 2001, 396). NU and Muhammadiyah have in recent years moved increasingly towards a common ground between the two of them with NU adopting a more neo-traditionalist stance and Muhammadiyah becoming neo-modernist. Increasing commonality has served to strengthen civil society.

The role of the state in managing and controlling religion has changed from era to era. The Democratic Era has brought to the forefront a new set of questions. In light of inalienable human rights, is the state justified defining which religions are orthodox and which religions are not? Indonesia has operated on a basis of static boundaries in terms of orthodoxy but relied on negotiation between sanctioned religions to resolve problems. Flexibility within the monotheistic religious categories allows for Christians to permit Pentecostal groups to spring up and Muslims to allow Tablighi Jama’at to expand. However increasing globalization will result in even greater religious plurality in the future thereby pressuring Pancasila to open itself up to more religious categories. One obvious issue is, why are only monotheistic religions sanctioned by the government? Also, how will new religions be added in the future? Confucianism was added because the ethnic Chinese community raised the issue with the government. Will other religions only be added on a case by case basis after its adherents clamor for official status? Presently, the state vis-à-vis the Department of Religion determines what is a legitimate religion. The addition of new religions to Pancasila is not done through
mutual recognition by the civil society. Indonesia needs to move to the free exercise of religion for all and leave it up to each religious group to work out their internal matters.

Pancasila is a political tool that has proven its utility over the past 70 years. Can Pancasila, however, survive under the Democratic Era? With the growing worldwide awareness of human rights, Indonesia will face questions that challenge the very foundations of its state. Pancasila, although restrictive of religion, does provide a mechanism for future flexibility particularly in light of the Second Amendments to the Constitution ensuring individual human rights. Perhaps the next political era will once again prove that Pancasila’s flexibility allows it to retain its utility to the state. As seen by its adaption to the early part of the Democratic Era, Pancasila has shown itself to be more than just a symbol. Pancasila continues to be an authentic expression of Indonesian society.
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