Because religion increasingly plays an important role in political life, the relationship between religion and politics is an important topic of investigation. A review of the scholarly literature shows that different aspects of the relationship between religion and politics have been studied by many scholars. However, this review also concludes that the interrelationship between religious and political power has not been studied in Indonesia and is therefore a relevant topic of research.
The relation between religion and politics can be studied from different angles. First, we can investigate the impact of religion on politics, such as the effect of religious beliefs and institutions on electoral politics, the effect of religion on political attitudes, statements of religious groups concerning foreign and domestic policies, and the effect of religion on nationalism. Geertz's (1963a), Jackson's, and Mulhkan's works can be categorized in this category.

A second aspect of the study is the influence of religion on socio economic and political development. Castle's and Geertz's (1963b) works are examples of the third category of studies, which are concerned with the influence of religion on social economic and political development.

Third, we can concentrate on the influence of the state on religious life and organizations. Books by Suminto and Burn can be grouped into this category of study. Fourth, we can study religion as the means for achieving political power and we can study political power as the means for achieving religious goals. Included in this category are religiously oriented political parties and religious related pressure groups or interest group functioning in pluralist societies seeking to protect their interests and maximize the influence of their views. The studies that can be classified into this fourth category are those of Boland, Maarif, Ward and Web.

Fifth, we can look at the legitimating function of religion for various pattern of political organization, economic exchange, and established patterns of political power. This category is exemplified by the work of Purdy on Pancasila as a civil religion.

This work is worthy of review here because it treats Pancasila as a civil religion. What she meant by civil religion is a common religious culture distinct from any particular religion or faith in which all citizens can participate no matter what their particularistic religious affiliations might be. Integration, legitimation, and prophecy are the three most salient functions of civil religion in a given society. Her study shows that Pancasila has not only an integrating function but a disintegrating one as well. She maintains that Pancasila has been used as an end; means for legitimating power and authority, and as a means of maintaining the status quo, rather than to inspire change.

Purdy's conclusions were drawn mainly from events which took place from 1978 to 1983, when the New Order government, after waiting for almost ten years, began to implement a national consensus achieved in the beginning of the New Order regime. This national consensus is Pancasila as the sole ideology in social and political life, and the restructuring of political parties and societal organizations. However, if we examine the relation between religion and politics over a longer period from early New Order (1966) until the present, we will come to a different conclusion because the early New Order started with "good" relations between religious groups and the government and from 1984 until the present time has been.
characterized by the same "good" relations.

If a civil religion serves integrating, legitimating, and prophetic functions, there are reasons to believe that civil religion is no longer sufficient for analyzing the relationship between religions and politics. First, Purdy's conclusion that Pancasila as a civil religion functions not only as an integrating factor but as a disintegrating one as well, shows that civil religion alone is not an adequate conceptual framework for analyzing the relationship between religion and politics in Indonesia.

Second, the willingness of the government to compromise with religious groups' demands on various issues, including during the period of Purdy's own study, demonstrates that Pancasila has not only been used for legitimating purposes but also for accommodating religious groups' interests.

Three changes have taken place since 1983 which suggest that the civil religion perspective is no longer adequate for studying the relationship between religion and politics in Indonesia. First, in the 1983 and 1988 Broad Outline of State Policies (Garis-garis Besar Haluan Negara, GBHN), national development has been formulated as the practical realization of Pancasila (penganalanan Pancasila). In other words, Pancasila has been used as an ideology for development or an inspiration for change.

Second, Pancasila has not been used any longer as a political weapon to destroy political enemies, except against communism. At least it has not been used any longer against Islamic groups. For example, in the case of the Lampung Incident, the government (i.e. the armed forces) used aneural term for the rebels, the Warsidi Security Insurgent Movement (Gerakan Pengacau Keamanan Warsidi) — instead of other terms associated with Islam, such as Holy War Command (Komando Jihad).

And finally, after all major Islamic social and political organizations adopted Pancasila as the sole ideology, the Islamization of social and political life has taken place, especially in the bureaucracy (pegawai negeri). The government, without any pressure whatsoever from Islamic groups, even introduced a bill on the Islamic Religious Court of Justice to the House of People's Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, DPR) in 1989, which now has become a law.

In brief, Pancasila is not a religion that competes with other religions in society, but rather it is a national ideology that, on one hand, allows all religions to develop (and therefore diversity) and on the other hand, provides common values for all groups in society (and therefore unity). Pancasila may not successfully create total integration but it does prevent total disintegration. (8) Pancasila has to be understood not as a civil religion alone or as a totalitarian ideology, but as an unity and diversity ideology as stated in the motto of the Republic of Indonesia, "Unity in Diversity" (Bhinneka Tunggal Ika). But in empirical terms, what is the pattern of relation between religion and politics within the framework of unity in diversity?

The foregoing studies have one or two other characteristics in common: they deal only with the relation between a certain religion (mostly Islam) and politics, and they are not concerned with the interrelation of religious and political power (the sixth category). That most of the studies deal with Islam is understandable, because most Indonesians are Moslems, and the teaching of Islam encourages the Moslems to be involved in social and political life.

But it should not result in overlooking the study of the relation between politics and other religions (Christians and others). Like Moslems, Indonesian Christians (Protestant and Catholic), for example, are socially and politically involved in the building of the Indonesian nation state.

One area of study concerning the relationship between religion and politics that has not been studied in Indonesia is religiopolitical power or the interrelation between religious and political power within a political system. Included in this category of study is the power relations between the government and religious associations and the interpenetration of religion and the government. This kind of study is

believed to be able to describe the empirical relations between religion and politics within the framework of unity in diversity.

The following empirical facts and theoretical explanation may be able to clarify the significance of this area of study.

**Interactions Between Religions and Politics**

There are several reasons to study the interrelation between religious and political power from empirical facts. First, Indonesia is a plural society in terms of religion (as well as ethnic, regional and linguistic identities). Although most Indonesians are Muslims, some provinces and regions are mainly Christian or Hindu, and considerable numbers of Indonesian social, economic and political elites are Christians (Protestants and Catholics) so that they have something to do with political activity. Therefore, it is relevant to study the relation between all religions and politics in Indonesia.

Second, historically there was and still is a strong and widespread involvement of religious social and political organizations (Islam, Protestantism, Hinduism, Catholicism, and others) in society in general and in politics in particular.

Third, historically there was a bitter and long conflict between the supporters of religious ideology (especially Islam) and the proponents of a national ideology (Pancasila) which was won by the supporters of national ideology (by emergency law, consensus, and elections). But this victory of Pancasila over Islam was not without conditions from Islamic organizations, since for Islam there is no separation between religion and social and political life, so that they certainly tried to influence government policies. Even for Indonesian Christians (Protestant and Catholic) politics cannot be separated from religion. As minorities, Protestants and Catholics (and other religions as well) tend to be more politically active in order to get and maintain a fair place in politics and society in general.

Finally, the most important reason to study the interrelation of religious and political power is that during the New Order Government in Indonesia there have been many major events concerning the interrelation of religious and political power which will be the focus of this study. These events include the following. First, there was a strong Islamic movement (in the form of petitions, protests, demonstrations and riots) against the Government’s draft of a Law on Marriage in 1973; subsequently the Government demonstrates its willingness to accept the Islamic demands. Second, the Government adopted a policy to restructure political parties, reducing them from ten to three (this was formulated in the Law on Political Parties and Functional Group in 1975), and to prohibit the use of religion as the identity of a political party (this was formulated in the Law on Political Parties and Functional Group in 1985).

Third, the Christians (Catholic and Protestant) protested against the Religious Ministry Decisions in 1977, followed by Joint Decision of the Ministers for Religion and Home Affairs which established codes for religious propaganda and required all foreign religious aid to be

9. According to the 1980 Census, 87.1% of Indonesian are Moslems. There are three provinces which are predominantly Christian (Protestant and Catholic): East Nusa Tenggara, Irian Jaya, and East Timor; one province predominantly Hindu (Bali); about half of population of two provinces are Christian (Maluku and North Sulawesi); and one fourth of three other provinces are Christian (North Sumatra, West Kalimantan, and Central Kalimantan).

10. After the parliament failed to reach a decision on the State Principle (Pancasila or Islam), President Soekarno in 1959, with the backing of military, nationalist, and Christians, issued a decree which stipulated a return to the first Constitution (the 1945 Constitution) in which Pancasila was stated as the State Principle. In 1969, there was a consensus among all political forces in Indonesia to accept Pancasila as the sole ideology. Since the first elections held by the New Order regime in 1971, all contestants included Pancasila as one of the guiding principle of their programs.


reported to the Ministry of Religious Affairs. Fourth, the Islamic Faction walked out of the People’s Consultative Assembly (MPR) session in 1978 as a protest against the Government’s proposal to recognize the existence of mysticism (aliran kepercayaan) in the Broad Outline of State Policy (GBHN) and the subsequent willingness on the part of the Government to place the aliran kepercayaan not under the supervision of the Ministry of Religious Affairs but under the Ministry of Education and Culture.

Fifth, various religious organizations resisted the Government’s policy to require all social organizations (including religious organizations) to accept Pancasila as the sole ideology; subsequently a compromise was reached in 1986. Sixth, the conflict between the government and religion was apparent in acts of violence involving the “Komando Jihad” (Holy War Command), the “Terror Warman” (Warman Terrorism), the bombardments of the Asian Central Bank, the Borobudur Temple and the Christian Seminary in 1983, the Tanjung Priuk Incident in 1984, and the Lampung Incident in 1989.

Seventh, the Draft of Islamic Private Law (the bill on the Islamic Court of Justice) as part of National Law got critical reactions and amendment proposals from other religious groups while in the deliberation process in the House of People Representatives (DPR). Eighth, the Islamic organizations demanded that all public and private schools be required to include religious education as a part of the standard national curriculum; subsequently a compromise was achieved in the Law on National Educational System in 1989.

And finally, a significance influence of Islam (Islamization) in bureaucracy and politics especially since the formation of the Association of Indonesian Islamic Intellectuals (Ikatan Cendekiaan Muslim Indonesia, ICMI) in 1991. These nine kinds of events were only the major ones, other events occurred as well, but were less obvious.

**Religion, Politics, Power, and the State**

Religion here is defined not only as a belief system with its ritual and symbols, but also as an institution and its leaders.13 As a belief system, religion contains a set of teachings, principles, and laws on worldly life as well as on spiritual life. As an institution, religion manifests its belief system through religious associations which function internally for the religious community as well as externally for contacting with the government and other groups in the society. As symbols and rituals, religion represents group self esteem, group identity, and group interest. Religion also manifests itself in the religious leaders who interpret and clarify religious teaching to the followers as well as articulate the religious interest through religious associations to the government.14

Another term that needs to be defined is the similarities and differences between ideology and religion. Ideology, according to the functionalists social science, is a system of values that prescribes the preferred kind of society or individual life that is going to be realized in this world. The religious teaching of a religion can be identified as an ideology if it prescribes the preferred kind of society or individual life that is going to be realized in the world. However, religion will not prescribe the preferred kind of society for the sake of this worldly life, but mainly for the sake of the other worldly or life after life.

In other words, based on the goal of this preferred kind society or individual life, ideology can be distinguished into two types: a secular ideology, which prescribes the preferred kind of society or individual life for the sake of this worldly life, and a religious or sacred ideology, which prescribes the preferred kind of society or individual life for the sake of both this worldly and the other worldly life. Communism and individualism, as materialistic ideology, can be identified as secular ideology. The for-

---

14. This definition of religion is certainly not according to any religion but according to perspective of social sciences in general. The relation between religion and politics in this study is not approached from a religious but from political science perspective. Such definition and approach undoubtedly contains an intrinsic and unavoidable reduction.
mer is anti religion, while the latter is neutral toward religion. Islam or Christianity can be identified as religious ideology. The Indonesian national ideology, Pancasila, can be classified as a secular ideology that promotes the religious life of the people and supports all recognized religions.

For the last three decades, social science, especially sociology of religion, perceived religion as a system of meaning and rarely treated religion as a power contender in the society. For the Third World, especially for Indonesia, this study would like to suggest that religion should not be understood only as a part of the general apparatus of socialization and social control supplying meaning through culture, but also as a sphere of activity where efforts are deliberately made to influence, manipulate, and control people’s thoughts, feelings, and actions in accordance with various religious values.\(^{(15)}\)

Religion is increasingly perceived as a fundamental medium of social protest and mobilization. As such, it increasingly becomes the prism through which a variety of issues and stresses are interpreted and reacted to. Therefore, religion not only has cultural influence, i.e. indirect influence in shaping political issues and a way of life, but also has political influence, i.e. directly influence elections and policy decisions. Religion has not only negative power, i.e. the ability to veto change and innovation, but also positive power, i.e. the capacity to initiate new policies.\(^{(16)}\)

Politics is defined as an interaction between the government and social organizations and individuals in their effort to formulate and execute public and authoritative decisions for a good society in a certain territory. Politics in this sense involves a power relation between government and social organizations; that is, social organizations try to influence the government’s decisions by utilizing their power resources while the government uses its legitimate power to enforce its decision upon all citizens and social organizations, in their efforts to create a good society.

Power in this study will be broadly defined, following Weber’s definition, as the opportunity existing within a social relationship which permits one to carry one’s own will even against resistance and regardless of the basis on which this opportunity rests.\(^{(17)}\) Whether this imposition is exercised by those who already are in a position of power, or whether an attempt is made to impose one’s will against established groups, the central characteristic of power remains the same: power is a tension between interests, ideologies, classes, or individuals, and is always defended and contested, using all the weapons physical and ideological at the group’s disposal.

At the same time this give and take takes place not in a vacuum but within structure that are themselves constituted by power relations.\(^{(18)}\) The difference between one political system from the other lies among other things at the pattern of power relations between the government and social organizations and individual citizens.\(^{(19)}\) Religious association is one of many associations and organizations in the society.

According to Alfred Stepan, a state is characterized by the following elements: it is the continuous administrative, legal, bureaucratic and coercive systems; it is a mechanism of domination and control; it consists of executive, permanent administrative, legislative, judiciary and coercive apparatus which are not necessarily unitary or monolithic; it requires obedience from the citizens; and its decisions are binding not only over the members of the state but also over all actions taking place in the
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19. This power relations is determined by a prescribed good society (best regime).
area of its jurisdiction. But empirically, the manifestation of the state can be seen in the government functions and activities. The difference between a type state from other types of states lies at the scope of government’s power over society. Therefore the terms state and the government is always used interchangeably.

Since religion and politics both strategic networks of power relations, they are necessarily interrelated in the systematic distribution of power within any society. Religion pervades and informs a whole way of life, and more critically it points out sources or principles of power which are regarded as particularly creative or destructive. Religion in this sense is not simply a domain of power that is separate from mundane or profane areas of human action, it is a dynamic force that penetrates all aspects of human life within a society. It involves human beings in belief, practice and form of association that activate a particular distribution of power. Therefore there is a political dimension to religion, and a religious dimension to politics because both religion and politics are concerned with power.

Religion and politics are two aspects of the same distribution of power within a network of social relations. The political scientist Donald E. Smith expressed this point when he observed that “this vital connection between religion and polity, so widespread as to be almost universal, is rooted, psychologically and doctrinally, in fundamental assumption about power.

The exercise of power is at the center of the polity and in virtually all cultures power is an attribute of divinity. Recognizing that religion and politics, the sacred and the profane, represent different dimensions of power, it may be necessary to use a term like religiopolitical power to capture the inevitable interrelation between religious and political power within any social system.


Religious and Political Power

At least two basic categories of religiopolitical power are essential to any interpretation of the way religion and politics operate in social relations. First, an area of conflict is a situation of social tension between two or more power systems. An area of conflict opens at the encounter between two or more mutually exclusive systems, such as the government and religion. Since they are involved in the same society, interpenetration of religion and the government is inevitable. One of the models used to analyze this interpenetration is a typology of state and religion relations.

Research questions that can be posed are how are religions and the state related, and can this relationship be understood using existing typology of state and religion relations? Empirically, the question that has to be answered is the influence of religion (laws, teaching or principles) on the government’s policies and the influence of government policies on religious life. Which government are influenced by religious teaching? Conversely, which religious practices are influenced by government's policy?

From this interpenetration of religion and government a conclusion can be drawn about the Indonesian state in terms of its religion and state relations. One thesis that can be offered is that the Indonesian state tends to be a religiously accommodating state, rather than secular state.

The second category of religiopolitical power is power as an organized network of power relations. In a religio political system, religious and political power are organized in a particular way that supports the structure of the system as a whole. One conceptual framework which is often used to analyze the authority relationship between the government and social organizations (associations) is the interest representation system.

Since there are many religious associations that function as interest articulators in Indo-
nesia, the question then arises: how are these religious associations and the government related, and can this relationship be understood using existing conceptualizations, e.g., state corporatism? This is a question regarding the power relationship between religious associations and the government or a question about the autonomy of societal organizations from government controls.

Empirically, the question that has to be answered is, to what extent are religious associations subordinate to or dependent on the government for their survival and functioning? Which activities of religious organizations autonomously and which ones are controlled by the government?

From the power relationship between the government and religious associations a conclusion can be drawn about the type of interest representation practiced in Indonesia. A thesis that can be formulated is that the religious interest representation model practiced in Indonesia tends to be more pluralist rather than corporatist. (24)

24. Ramlan Surbakti, Interrelation..., Bab III.