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Abstract

Cases of violence involving extremist religious sentiment occur all too frequently in Indonesia, particularly after the collapse of the New Order Regime of President Suharto in 1998. Even during the post-New Order Reform Era, this trend of inter-faith discord continued, particularly during the last 10 years. Recent reports and surveys by non-governmental organisations such as the Setara Institute, the Wahid Institute and the Human Rights Watch provide detailed evidence of this disturbing reality. Violence against religious minorities remains problematic, particularly when viewed in the context of broader historical change, the end of the authoritarian regime and the onset of democratic governance.

This thesis aims to examine religious citizenship practices in Indonesia, employing a case study approach in two cities, Yogyakarta and Surakarta (also known as Solo). Despite some similarities in terms of diversity, population and cultural backgrounds, these two cities differ in many ways, most notably in relation to how inter-religious matters are approached. This research project asks three main questions: (i) how is religious citizenship conceptualised and implemented in the context of Indonesia’s diverse socio-political landscape?; (ii) to what extent do certain discursive constructions of citizenship affect its daily practices among different religious communities in both cities?; and (iii) how can the different approaches adopted in Yogyakarta and Surakarta form the basis for developing a more inclusive and democratic citizenship in Indonesia?

The data collected for this project includes individual interviews with three purposely selected groups: the NGO activists, the leaders/representatives of religious communities and government officials. This thesis found that the conceptualization and practices of citizenship in the two research sites have been derived from multiple sources including culture, religion and the constitution. These different sources and interpretations, by and large, have impacted the way they practice citizenship. Consequently, when it comes to religious practice, persisting tensions and conflict remain which, sometimes, end up in with violence, particularly in the case of Yogyakarta. While both cities share similar characteristics, the relationship between different groups in Surakarta in recent years has been relatively more peaceful compared to that in Yogyakarta. The social, political and cultural change over time in both cities, particularly after the collapse of the New Order Regime, has by and large shaped the current status quo in both cities. Effective local leadership at the governmental and non-governmental level has contributed to the relative peace between different communities. This does not necessarily mean that there
has not been any kind of conflict between groups but tensions have not developed into fully fledged violence.

Overall, key research findings show that contested religious practices are framing citizenship debates and at the state, civil society and individual levels. Contestations over this issue has often led to violations of and restrictions over the basic rights of minority groups. The existence of regulations and Laws in particular those pertaining to blasphemy, building places of worship and targeted groups such as Ahmadiyah, has emboldened hardliners and extremists to exercise even more violence and discriminatory behaviour towards minority groups. This thesis argues that extremist groups often operate by seeking to assert authority in parallel to the state, with the result that minority groups feel even more vulnerable and powerless to seek redress from key state institutions.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Objective

This project aims to understand the religious dimensions of citizenship practices in the multi-faith society that is Indonesian society, drawing on the case studies of two cities, Yogyakarta and Surakarta (also known as Solo). The Republic of Indonesia has experienced dramatic social, cultural and political changes throughout its history and this has shaped an evolving sense of what it means to be Indonesian. The world’s most populous Muslim country is also renowned as one of the most diverse countries in the world. Indonesia is home to more than 265 million people, with around 1,340 ethnic groups and 2,500 local languages (Na’im and Syaputra 2011, p. 5-6). The vast majority of Indonesians - around 87% -- profess to follow Islam but sizable minorities identify as being adherents of Protestant Christianity (7%), Catholicism (3%), Hinduism (1.7%), Buddhism (0.27%) and Confucianism (0.05%) (Na’im & Syaputra 2011, p. 7). Through the case studies in Yogyakarta and Surakarta this project seeks to better understand how citizenship in Indonesia is conceptualised, developed, and practiced. The ways in which different religious communities practice citizenship will be studied in order to reflect and learn about the possibility of forging a more plural and democratic society in Indonesia.

This study will use a theoretical framework based on Turner (1993) and Isin (2008; 2015), who approach citizenship in a more performative sociological sense rather than in a narrowly normative or juridical one. Citizenship, within this approach, is viewed as a set of practices or acts, rather than strictly a proclamation of rights and obligations. As citizenship is expected to minimise class divisions and conflict among different communities, it is, therefore, framed as a process, rather than a mere end-product: a process in which the state and civil society interact, compete and negotiate with each other in the course of defining rights and practices. The project takes a qualitative semi-ethnographic approach employing critical discourse analysis as a tool for interview and content analysis. This allows an examination of how certain discourses (stemming from religion, culture, social and political spheres) have shaped, produced, and constructed certain concepts of citizenship, and how such concepts affect the way various communities practice citizenship in their daily lives.

Theoretically, this research provides significant original conceptual insights into the interplay of culture, religion and citizenship in a culturally and religiously diverse society.
Empirically, this project’s findings aim to account for opportunities and challenges that shape the daily lives of religious minorities within a culturally and religiously diverse society. The research findings contribute to the discussion over the shaping of specific policy recommendations aimed at fostering a more inclusive and democratic citizenship, so that people from different backgrounds (religious, ethnic, social, and political affiliations) can live together in peace and harmony.

1.2 Research Context

The Human Rights Watch’s report (the HRW report) on violence against minority groups in Indonesia (2013) reports that many religious minority groups have experienced violence, not only in its physical forms, but also non-physical ones such as discrimination and harassment aimed at their religious institutions where rituals and practices are conducted. Intolerant actions toward religious minority groups have even led to some human casualties as well as the destruction of public and religious buildings. Yet, no specific measures or actions were taken by the majority groups (authorities) in order to stop this. Instead, the violence continues across many areas in Indonesia, with religious minority groups still being targeted on a regular basis. This is documented in the reports issued annually by leading non-governmental organisations concerned with the issues of religious freedom and beliefs, such as the Setara Institute and the Wahid Institute in Jakarta.

Reporting these incidents to the state authorities has, so far, not resulted in dramatic changes. Rather, in several cases, the state apparatus has instead been involved in pressuring these minority groups not to disclose such acts of violence, resulting in further institutional discrimination (Human Rights Watch 2013, p. 4). In most cases, it is difficult for non-Muslim communities to build places of worship due to the pressures of some hardliners within various government circles. Instead of protecting the minorities from the aggressors, the state apparatus typically fails to make serious interventions. More commonly, the solution has been to relocate minority groups to different locations (Human Rights Watch 2013, p. 3), thereby appeasing the hardliners. A further complication is the fact that local governments all too frequently urge that buildings erected by religious minority groups be shut down, despite meeting all requirements in terms of planning and building approvals (Human Rights Watch 2013, p. 3).

The HRW report echoes the findings of several studies by non-governmental organisations such as the Setara and The Wahid Institute. Based on the Setara Institute’s report
(2010), there were 185 cases related to religious violence in 2007. A year later, this number almost doubled, reaching 367 reported cases. In 2009, the number of cases reported, while reduced, remained very high at 291. Four years later, the number of cases had decreased but was still a concern with 222 cases of intolerance reported (Halili & Bonar Tigor Naipospos 2014, p. 16). In 2010, the Wahid Institute noted that there were 135 cases of violence related to religious issues in 13 observation areas, and in a follow-up report four years later, the number had increased to 185 cases (The Wahid Institute 2014). These figures, combined with the recent violence experienced by the Shia community in Madura, East Java and the Ahmadiyyah community in Java and Lombok, along with the way the government deals with such assaults, pose a serious question as to how the state can ensure the safety and rights of its minority groups.

These questions come against a background where Indonesia has been regarded as one of the countries where religion and democracy have able to combine quite successfully (Hefner 2000; Effendi 2003; Barton 2010). Indeed, the instrumental use of religious symbols in political affairs has been viewed unfavourably by the Indonesian people. A survey conducted by Lembaga Survey Indonesia (LSI, the Indonesian Survey Institute) revealed Islamic parties were preferred by just 8% of respondents, while the nationalist-secular parties gained 52% of the preferences (Lembaga Survey Indonesia 2007). Indonesia is also known as a country where religious moderation is preached and people are comfortable with the values of secularity and democracy over narrowly-framed interpretations of Islamic law, or sharia (Buehler 2009, p. 52). The findings of Lembaga Survey Indonesia revealed that only 33% of Indonesian people prefer sharia derived laws while 57% prefer secular law (Lembaga Survey Indonesia 2007). Indonesia is also known for its vibrant civil society organisations. However, despite these positive indicators about levels of tolerance amongst the majority of Indonesians, the violence aimed at religious minorities by a small number of extremists does not seem to be waning.

Expressions of intolerance towards religious minorities remain problematic when viewed in the context of historical change, the end of the authoritarian regime and the onset of democratic governance. Many Indonesia analysts and observers thought this would allow a re-examination of the past discriminatory policies and human rights abuses (Zurbuchen 2005, p. 4). Indeed, significant advances are clear in the new laws on human rights and human rights courts that have been passed in 1999 and 2001 respectively (Sulistiyanto 2007, p. 80-3). The 1998 fall of the ‘smiling general’ Suharto, to borrow the term used by O. G. Roeder (1969), signalled a new era in Indonesian politics with the hope of greater freedom for all Indonesians.
Yet, the continued violence towards religious minority groups poses serious questions about the nature of nation-building and citizenship in contemporary Indonesia.

From a more theoretical perspective, cases of inter-religious intolerance seem to justify part of Furnivall’s thesis about Asian pluralism, where in such deeply divided societies lacking a common social platform, anarchy is almost unavoidable (Furnivall 1944, cited in Hefner 2001, p. 6). Furnivall’s argument is based on his observations of colonial-era British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. While both seemed to be blended in terms of market activity, they still lacked a common social-cultural vision. Thus, with the rise of the nationalist movement, combined with the loose control of the European occupiers which enabled the countries to obtain independence, Furnivall predicted that these factors would lead to state disintegration: nationalism would fail to support and nurture diversity, and instead would end up deepening the differences and divisions among various groups. However, the post-colonial state still stands, and as Hefner noted ‘the native leadership proved more skilled at operating the machinery of government than Furnivall had imagined’ (2001, p. 7).

Indeed, throughout its history, Indonesia has been coloured by communal and ethno-religious conflicts. One of the most violent conflict in the history of the republic was the 1965 tragedy during which the Indonesian Communist Party was shut down and those associated with it were hunted-down, tortured and killed. The death toll of this bloody conflict is estimated to have reached at least 500,000 (Cribb 2001). In the 1970s, Indonesia has suffered from further ethno-religious conflict, particularly between Muslims and Christians. Following that, the end of the New Order Regime was marked by the outbreak of communal conflicts that involved religious, racial and ethnic-related issues. During these critical episodes, Indonesia was faced with significant social and political challenges.

Indeed, during these turbulent years, Indonesia’s ‘political institutions and principles of national models [were] renegotiated’ (Bertrand 2004, p. 10). This critical juncture was the result of ‘the embedded tensions in past institutional compromise’ and significant events such as economic crisis, war or regime changes (Bertrand 2004, p. 15). Bertrand (2004) argues that three critical junctures have been salient in the Indonesian history: the first took place during the state formation of Indonesia during which Indonesian nationalism competed with other political ideologies (Bertrand 2004, p. 18). This critical juncture ended by 1950 when Indonesia decided to become a unitary modern nation-state. The second juncture started in the mid-1950s and ended by the establishment of the New Order Regime in the 1968. During this period, Bertrand argues, the Indonesian political architecture was reshaped with a view to establish ‘homogenous
social, political, developmental, and even some cultural characteristics’ for the diverse
community of Indonesia (2004, p. 18). The third critical juncture began when the New Order
regime collapsed in May 1998. In the period that followed, in the so-called Reform Era,
‘negotiation and struggle over inclusion’ have taken place and are still in progress today.

Compared to the first and second critical junctures, the third features a fundamental
change in institutional and political approaches that did not appear during the two previous ones:
the adoption of the decentralisation policy. This was a drastic change from the old regime when
the political architecture was centralised and controlled by the government. The legislation of
this new policy with its regional autonomy dimension was drafted in 1999 and implemented in
and 33/2004), it is stated that the regions shall be administered at the levels of province, districts
and municipalities and that these will have the autonomy to ‘govern and administer the interests
of the local people’ within the boundary of a ‘unitary State of (the) Republic of Indonesia’.

In these critical junctures, nation-building and the concept of citizenship have been
revisited, contested and negotiated. Some significant themes appeared such as ethnic
representations, their access to ‘power and resources’ and cultural preservation (Bertrand 2004,
p. 19). Another important theme that will be the focus of this project is the role of religion (in
particular Islam) in defining the character of the Indonesian nation and its key institutions and
laws in particular citizenship. Some propose that Islam needs to be included in the consideration
of political membership of the nation, while others choose to defend the notion of an Indonesian
nation-state as one open to all its religious and cultural communities (Bertrand 2004, p. 19). This
is not to say some issues related to ethnic representation and cultural preservation are not
important, since these will relate and intertwine with the issue of religion.

But the fact remains that the number of violent acts perpetrated against religious minority
groups has remained quite high. This is especially true of the two sites selected for this project
(Yogyakarta and Surakarta), both of which are predominantly Javanese. For this reason, this
research project will be situated both theoretically and empirically at the heart of the unfinished
debates over the role of religion in nation-building and citizenship contestation in contemporary
Indonesia.
1.3 Situating the Research Project

Indonesia is considered to be one of the most diverse countries in the world with a population of more than 265 million people, and no less than 1,340 ethnic groups, 2,500 local languages, and six officially recognised religions (Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Confucianism (Na’im and Syaputra 2011). The challenge to manage such cultural-religious diversity and the associated politics of identity has been significant. Indeed, the history of modern Indonesia has been dominated by ongoing negotiations and contestations over national identity narratives and citizenship frameworks.

Apart from these six official religions acknowledged by the state, Indonesian people hold other forms of faith that are considered ‘aliran kepercayaan’, or ‘traditional beliefs’. More interestingly, within each of the six official religions, there is significant internal diversity with many different practices within each one, making the overall religious landscape even more complex. Because Indonesia consists of many different ethnic and language groups, an Indonesian citizen may possess multiple identities reflecting membership of a particular religious group, an attachment to an ethnic or language group, as well as a membership of certain social or political organisation.

The Indonesian constitution treats every citizen as equal and with similar rights and obligations. Every group is entitled to decent work and livelihood¹, equal opportunities in accessing education², protection from any violence and harmful action³. They are also free to associate and affiliate with any organisations or communities.⁴ In the context of religious practice, a citizen is also guaranteed the right to ‘embrace religion and to worship in accordance to his religion or belief’ / memeluk agamanya masing-masing dan untuk beribadat menurut agama dan

---

¹ UUD 1945 (the 1945 Constitution) Article 27 (2): Tiap-tiap warga Negara berhak atas pekerjaan dan penghidupan yang layak bagi kemanusiaan (Every citizen shall have the right to work and to earn a humane livelihood).
² UUD 1945 (the 1945 Constitution) Article 31 (1): Setiap warga negara berhak mendapat Pendidikan (Every citizen has the right to receive an education).
³ UUD 1945 (the 1945 Constitution) Article 28 G (1): Hak atas perlindungan diri pribadi, keluarga, kehormatan, martabat, dan harta benda, Hak atas rasa aman dan perlindungan dari ancaman ketakutan untuk berbuat atau tidak berbuat sesuatu yang merupakan hak asasi manusia. (2): Hak untuk bebas dari penyiksaan (torture) dan perlakuan yang merendahkan derajat martabat manusia dan berhak memperoleh suaka politik dari negara lain ((1): Every person shall have the right to protection of his/herself, family, honour, dignity, and property, and shall have the right to feel secure against and receive protection from the threat of fear to do or not do something that is a human right. (2): Every person shall have the right to be free from torture or inhumane and degrading treatment, and shall have the right to obtain political asylum from another country.)
⁴ UUD 1945 (the 1945 Constitution) Article 28 E (3): Hak kebebasan untuk berserikat, berkumpul dan mengeluarkan pendapat (Every person shall have the right to the freedom to associate, to assemble and to express opinions).
kepercayaannya itu]. With this guarantee, the different religious minority groups should in theory face no challenges in expressing their religiosity and practicing their faith.

In practice, however, this ideal is far from being achieved in reality. The trends of discriminatory actions against these religious minority groups have remained high over the years. However, it is also important to note that in some areas, the violence against religious minority groups remains relatively low. Yogyakarta and Surakarta, the focus of this research project, are an example of two cities that have vastly different experiences in terms of religious violence and intolerant actions against minority groups.

1.4 Research Questions

The two case studies selected for this project, Yogyakarta and Surakarta, are predominantly Javanese, are under the same jurisdiction and policies regarding citizenship, but differ in terms of the relationship between different religious communities. As such, the research project asks:

(i) how is religious citizenship conceptualised and implemented in the context of Indonesia’s diverse socio-political landscape?

(ii) to what extent do certain discursive constructions of citizenship affect its daily practices among different religious communities in both cities?

(iii) how can the different approaches adopted in Yogyakarta and Surakarta form the basis for developing a more inclusive and democratic citizenship in Indonesia?

1.5 Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into six chapters with the first introducing the background of the study. In this chapter the context of the research is outlined, which is the significant number of violent cases regarding religious minority groups in Indonesia. The number of cases remains high from year to year as reported by surveys of non-governmental organisations such as the Wahid Foundation, the Setara Institute and the Human Rights Watch. This remains a puzzle when the Constitution guarantees every citizen’s rights to perform their religious rituals and obligations. This chapter also sketches briefly the history of contestation over the national
political design that has led to a ‘critical juncture’ (Bertrand 2005) to situate and understand the recent violence cases, in which religious arguments in particular are used to justify the actions.

Following this is Chapter 2, which discusses the theoretical framework. This chapter is divided into two parts with the first of two outlines the literature review. The literature review reveals the discussion over religion and citizenship at the global and local level. The discussion on the global level provides information on studies over the issue and how this relationship between religion and citizenship is being conceptualized. The outline of the discussion at the local level delves into the history of Indonesia and how the state conceptualises and manages the issue of citizenship in the biggest Muslim country by population in the world. The literature review section ends with discussion on the gap on the studies and the contribution of this research.

The second part of this chapter discusses the theoretical framework used in this thesis. This part is divided into three sections: the first discusses the concept of citizenship in Islam, outlining this history of Islamic polity and how citizenship has been conceptualised and exercised throughout history. Following this is a discussion over the citizenship concept in Javanese tradition since the two research sites of this project are predominantly Javanese. A global discourse on citizenship, religion and culture in the global world is outlined in the third section, including the challenge of religion and culture seeking recognition. Adding to this is a critical discussion on key concepts of multicultural citizenship, differentiated citizenship, religious citizenship and performative citizenship. The end of this section summarises the previous discussion and outlines the approach used in this project to investigate citizenship practices.

The third chapter unpacks the methodology employed in this thesis. It starts with a discussion of the approach of this research and considerations on the choice of the two research sites. Following this is an explanation of data collection, which was conducted primarily from observation and interviews, and data analysis, which involved critical discourse analysis to unpack the power operations underpinning the citizenship practices in two cities.

The fourth chapter discusses the findings of this research. This chapter is divided into five parts. The first part provides a contextual analysis of the two cities. Following this is the outline of the citizenship practices in the two cities, which are coloured with tensions and violence. The extent to which these citizenship practices are exercised is discussed in the following section on the discourse of citizenship. This section reveals the discursive construction, based on religious, social, cultural or political factors, of such practices in the two cities. The
following part features the key comparative findings of the two cities to offer insights on cultivating a more inclusive and democratic citizenship.

Chapter 5 discusses findings and connects them to the theoretical framework outlined in this project. This chapter is divided into seven parts, with the first being an introduction to the chapter. The second part discusses the religious citizenship that is practiced and used to compete against each other at the nation-state, civil society and individual levels. The next part sketches the role of culture in navigating citizenship practices in two research sites. Following this is a discussion of the performative dimension of citizenship, which takes the form of habitus and acts of citizenship. The contestation over defining and claiming a (civic) virtue is delved on in the fifth part. Finally, the sixth part discussed how this competition and contestation over religious citizenship practices impact the religious minority management in Indonesia under Pancasila (the five principles) as a state foundation. The last part is the conclusion, which summarizes the chapter.

The last chapter of this thesis, Chapter 6, concludes the discussion of this project. The chapter presents a summary of the study and outlines its significance, theoretical and empirical contribution and limitations of this study. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of this project for further research.
2.1 Introduction

As this project interrogates the practices of citizenship in a society where diverse religious communities exist and interact with each other, this chapter focuses on the issue of religion and citizenship. The first section of this chapter is divided into three parts. The first part locates briefly the discussion over the challenges of religion in relation to political membership within the global context. The second part focuses the discussion over religion and citizenship in Indonesia. The topic of religion and citizenship covers many issues and thus resulted in a large number of reports, books or journal articles. For the purpose of this research project, however, the discussion is limited to highlighting key studies and briefly discussing the issue of religion and citizenship in the Old Order Regime, the New Order Regime and in the Reform Era. The purpose of this discussion is to explore the extent to which there is continuity or discontinuity over citizenship conceptualisation in the three different eras, and what can be learned from this brief history. The last part of this section discusses the gaps, or what has not been explored in the previous studies, to identify the place this research among the broader literature, as well as its contribution to the ongoing debates about religion and citizenship in Indonesia.

The second section of this chapter discusses the theoretical framework used in this research project. This section is divided into five parts. The first part briefly sketches the history and meanings of citizenship in the critical literature in order to develop a clearer sense of how this term will be used throughout this research project. This research project is situated in Indonesia, the largest Muslim country by population in the world, and will examine how the challenges coming from Muslim groups over national political design and thus of citizenship keep occurring, as the history records. The discussion over citizenship within Islamic and Arab tradition is highlighted in the second part. Furthermore, since the research sites of this project are located in Central Java, and both cities are predominantly Javanese, a discussion follows in the third part about the ways in which citizenship is conceptualised in Javanese culture and tradition. The fourth part delves with more conceptual details into the concept of citizenship from a global predominantly Western perspective. The fifth and last part synthesises the overall discourse around religion and citizenship and how these are to be examined in this study.
2.2 Literature Review

2.2.1 Discussion on Religion and Citizenship

2.2.1.1 Religion and Citizenship: A Global Context

The end of the Cold War was marked by a significant shift within political discourse at the international level. The triumph of ‘liberal democracy’ that marked ‘the end of history’ (Fukuyama 1992) did not accurately encapsulate what really occurred in the world as the problems related to culture and religion had proliferated to every corner of the globe. The association of certain religions and cultures with ‘illiberal practices’ was framed in some discourses (e.g. Huntington 1993) as posing a serious challenge to the liberal world view. While this seems to be particular to modern liberal democratic states, this challenge is also occurring elsewhere (Gutmann 1994, p. 3).

The new politics of recognition captures some of these new cleavages that modern states face, marked by complex forms of cultural and religious diversity. Huntington, in his influential *Foreign Affairs* article ‘The Clash of Civilizations’, forecast that culture and religion, or civilizations (he used these terms interchangeably) would be a new threat to the world that was likely to lead to a clash of civilizations: ‘The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future’ (Huntington 1993, p. 12). He predicted that conflict would likely occur between eight major civilizations: Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and African. This thesis was widely criticised, due largely to the simplification of the terms culture, religion and civilizations. Also, the predicted conflict was supposed to occur ‘between’ different cultures, religions and civilizations and not ‘within’ them. Yet, as recent events have shown, many of the bloodiest conflicts are occurring ‘within’ the same tradition, as is the case with sectarian violence between *Sunni* and *Shia* Islam across the Middle East (Reese 2013; Helfront 2013).

In the context of citizenship and political membership, the challenge posed by culture and religion, particularly in modern liberal states, has been vigorously debated in the literature (example e.g. Young 1990; Taylor 1994; Kymlicka 1995 2001; Parekh 1997; Barry 2001; Benhabib 2002). Much of this literature varies in terms of positioning and conceptualising the challenge posed by religion and culture, but could be summarised in terms of two levels: global and national (nation-state). At the global level, the challenge mainly manifests from the ‘cosmopolitan’ agenda in the form of global human rights movements that go beyond the boundary of the nation-state. This is a challenge not only to authority and sovereignty of the state,
but also to its very basic concept of citizenship. A similar kind of challenge is posed by the resurgence of radical religious groups at the international level that call for a global movement in the name of religion (jihad, a ‘globalized Islam’ (Roy 2006). The 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were considered a manifestation of this kind of movement. The emergence of the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) represents a more recent example of how this movement has attracted many fighters around the world who joined it as members of a worldwide caliphate.

Against these rising fissures and conflicts, and at the nation-state level, the demand for recognition has taken place in many countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Australia. Minority groups demand recognition of their cultural and religious practices in the context of a hostile liberal secular state policy. The headscarf affair in France is an example of how religious practices have challenged the state policy on managing religious minority groups and on the prohibition of wearing religious symbols in public schools (Meiers 2007). This struggle for recognition has sometimes involved excessive violence, as is the case with the persecution of the Muslim Rohingya community in Myanmar. This group has been pushed out by majoritarian Buddhist groups who consider them a threat to the state; the latter’s various security organisations have remained largely silent on this issue. In short, the positioning of citizenship as an articulation of political membership framed in terms of culture and religion has become increasingly contested in recent times, with Indonesia being no exception.

2.2.1.2 Religion and Citizenship: An Indonesian Context
2.2.1.2.1 Nationalism and the Rise of the Indonesian Nation-State

Nationalism and citizenship are interrelated concepts. The rise of nationalism has given birth to the nation-state and within this, the idea of citizenship in its modern form was crafted. Moreover, citizenship has been viewed as ‘a project of nation-building in which the creation of the national citizen is the primary project of the nation-state’ (Turner 2006, p. 125). It is largely through citizenship that the relationship between citizens and the state is formulated and, as Turner (2006, p. 126) argues, expected to overcome ‘the divisions of social class’. Consequently, the idea of citizenship is associated with a democratisation process, since it can be argued that the more democratic the citizenship, the more inclusive the diverse political community would be. With the close relation of nationalism and the creation of citizenship, it is important here to sketch briefly the birth of nation(alism) in Indonesia.
As a nation-state, Indonesia is a product of the twentieth century. Prior to the twentieth century there was no ‘Indonesia’ and thus ‘Indonesian’, though the term ‘Indonesia’ had been coined earlier, in 1850, by George Samuel Windsor Earl, an English traveller and social observer (Elson 2008, p. 1). This word was first used in the ethnographic sense to describe ‘the brown race of the Indian archipelago’ (Elson 2008, p. 1). Elson argued that, at the time, this word was used in a very general fashion. Elson’s colleague James Logan pointed out that the word more accurately refers to a geographical area (the Indian archipelago) than to an ethnic group (Elson 2008, p. 1-2). In fact, ‘Indonesia’ was not used to describe both the geographical and cultural (people share the same culture) until the Dutch ethnologist, G.A Wilken, first did so in 1885 (Elson 2008, p. 1-3).

The origin of Indonesia as a political community is signalled by at least two developments: the first one relates to the recognition of the previously politically independent archipelago becoming part of the Dutch controlled territories during 1870s. From then on, the Netherlands of the East Indies would become ‘roughly united’ and ‘economically integrated’ (Elson 2008, p. 4). The second one refers to the transport infrastructure developments that ensured this vast archipelago area would be well connected and potentially integrated. The railways and roads of Java, together with ports and coastal shipping, accompanied by a unified currency taxation and legal system, made other places connected. This made it possible for people from different areas to make contact with each other and to communicate. As a result, the major language of trade in the archipelago, Malay, was spread more broadly (Elson 2008:7), to the point where, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, it had become a very effective lingua franca. The emergence of innovative Malay newspapers such as Bintang Hindia, Retnodhoemilah, and Pewarta Prijaßi, contributed to the fostering of a new identity for one nation in what is now a more unified and integrated archipelago.

The next development of this process that brought together the idea of ‘one nation’ and ‘one community’ was the emergence of organisations such as Sarekat Islam, Budi Oetomo and Indische Partij (Indies Party, IP). Indonesian students that studied overseas brought back with them an idea of modernity that challenged traditional epistemologies. The exchange between these emerging leaders then led to the creation of a new sense of nationhood that overcame the differences between religion, ethnicity, class and other social affiliations (Elson 2005). The Youth Pledge [Sumpah Pemuda], which was declared by Indonesian nationalist youth on 28 October 1928, had been the manifestation of what becoming one political community means: being committed to ‘one nation, one language and one motherland.’ The rise of nationalism and the
national movement that led to independence in 1945 gave birth to Indonesia as a modern nation-state (for more detail on this, see Elson 2008; Elson 2003).

From this short history, the creation of Indonesia as one nation seems to initially reflect the idea of an ‘imagined community’ as proposed by Benedict Anderson (1991). Anderson argues that a nation is ‘an imagined political community’, being ‘imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign’ (1991, p. 6). It is *imagined* because the members of this political community never know all of the people living in the nation, nor meet them all, yet they see them as fellow citizens in the ‘image of their communion’ (Anderson 1991, p. 6). It is *limited* because it covers a certain territory with a definite boundary and it is a *community* because individuals see each other as sharing ‘a deep, horizontal comradeship’ (Anderson 1991, p. 6). Lastly, it is *sovereign* because it is imagined as a free political community (Anderson 1991, p. 6).

Nationalism here can be understood as something awakened from the process of imagining the nation, the community. Here, Anderson differs from Gellner (1964, cited in Anderson 1991, p. 6) who believes that nationalism ‘invents’ the nation ‘where they do not exist’; it is not ‘the awakening of nations to self-consciousness’. Nationalism is different from the politics of ethnicity due to two kinds of seriality produced by modern imagined communities: unbound seriality and bound seriality (Chatterjee 2004, p. 5). Unbound seriality, Anderson argues, is exemplified by ‘such open-to-the-world plurals as nationalist, anarchists, bureaucrats and workers’, while bound seriality is exemplified by finite notions of ethnicity such as Asian-American, Hutu, Tutsi, and so on (Anderson 2002, p. 19). Unbound serialities are ‘potentially liberating’, while bound serialities ‘can operate only with integers’ (Chatterjee 2004, p. 5).

Robert Hefner pointed out that nationalism in Indonesia differs from nationalism in European countries, since nationalism in Indonesia is more plural and multi-ethnic, while in most of Europe it is more ‘a single ethnic prototype’ (2000, p. 14). Despite the fact that the vast majority of Indonesians are Muslim, the founding fathers (and mothers) of Indonesia deliberately chose not to frame the nation as a religious state (an Islamic state), nor as a purely secular one, because of the heterogeneity of the population in terms of religion, ethinical background, language and other ideological and political attributes. On this, Indonesian nationalism does not seem to fit into the strict distinction of civic and ethnic nationalism. Civic nationalism connected people through a common civic culture, laws, equal set of rights and obligations, while ethnic nationalism ties people in the name of language, religion, ethnic pre-existing customs or tradition (Smith 1991 and Ignatieff 1993, cited in Shulman 2002, p. 556).
Bowen (2005, p. 166-167) notes that nationalism and citizenship claims within Indonesian context might deliberatively derived from three sources of normative pluralism: firstly, the claim to self-governance in the name of political independence. Secondly, the claim in the name of *adat* (indigenous) norms which have been there and were used to govern the social cultural practices before the birth of modern Indonesia. Thirdly, the religious norms with reference to Islamic law pertaining to family issues such as marriage, divorce, and inheritance that have been enacted as positive law. These three sources have shaped the claims of citizenship within the current Indonesian context. It is here that the full complexity of Indonesian nation building and citizenship project is to be found. This will be explored in the sections that follow.

2.2.1.2.2 Citizenship in the Old Order Regime

As citizenship is deliberately projected to overcome conflict among different social groups and class division, it plays a significant role in nurturing the democratisation process within the state. Citizenship can be viewed politically as an ‘administrative tool’ of the state to control the population. Citizenship provides a framework for the government to manage the population. Drawing on Foucault (1991), citizenship can be seen as a tool to govern, i.e. it engenders a notion of *governmentality*, where through a certain type of governmental technology the population is directed to be socially and economically productive (Turner 2006, p. 126). It is at this point that ‘citizenship is characterized by an ambiguity: it is a conduit of individual rights but also reflects the growth of state power over civil society’ (Turner 2006, p. 127).

In the process of crafting citizenship in Indonesia, the debate over citizenship was rather polarising particularly during the 1950s, which represents the first critical juncture (Bertrand 2004; Hefner 2001). There was a debate among the leaders of Indonesia at that time in relation to the legislative design of this important national law. While most Muslim groups, together with other religious groups and secular-nationalist ones, rejected the idea of an Islamic state and ‘advocated a plural and democratic nation-state’ (Hefner 2000, p. 15), there were others within certain Muslim groups who demanded an Islamic state or proposed the idea to bring Islam into the state. They argued that ‘the end of colonialism heralded a new age of cooperation with the state’ and ‘Muslims’ ascent into government...was the answer to their prayers for a deeper Islamization of state and society’ (Hefner 2000, p. 15). The debate concluded that Indonesia would be founded as a modern democratic nation state, and would not have a state religion but nor would it fail to recognise the importance of religion.
Despite this fact, Hefner (2001) states that religion has been a vital element in the discussion of citizenship in Indonesia. Rather than focus on whether citizen’s rights should be differentiated by ethnicity as is the case in Malaysia, the debate during that time was whether the rights should be differentiated by religion. The Jakarta Charter, which requires the state to implement the Islamic law for all Muslims, was an example of this debate (Feillard 1995, cited in Hefner 2001, p. 34). This charter was rejected and Pancasila (Five Principles) minus the demand of the Jakarta charter was proclaimed to be the state ideology.

Pancasila neither recognises certain religions as being state religions nor regards them as being merely private issues. Instead, it recognises religion as being an important element that constitutes the nation and places ‘believing in the one and only God’ [Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa] as its first principle. However, the meaning of ‘believing in the one and only God’ has been the subject of multiple interpretations, particularly between Muslims, and between Muslims and non-Muslims, including nationalist groups. Some Muslim scholars such as Hamka tended to interpret it in line with monotheism associated with the meaning of tawhid in Islam. While non-Muslim or nationalist groups rather tended to define that phrase more broadly insisting that the word God (Ketuhanan) does not refer to ‘belief in “God” in persona’ but rather into bringing ‘the sacredness’ or ‘the concept of divine’ rather than God (Tuhan) per se. With this space for ambiguity and ambivalence in interpretation, the phrase then could openly and variably be interpreted according to individual and group belief systems (Ropi, 2017, p. 91-94; Howell 1982, p. 522-523).

The defeat of Islamic groups in the Jakarta Charter debate did not constitute a total failure. The omission from the Jakarta Charter was compensated by the creation of Department of Religious Affairs in 1946 (Hooker 1999, p. 102). This department was initially intended to attend solely to the affairs of Muslim groups, but following allegations of discrimination, other recognised religious communities went on to be represented by the department (Intan 1996, cited in Seo 2012, p. 1051; Seo 2013, p. 49). This recognition of other religions is shaped by the debate over the meaning of religion (agama) and whether it includes all religions and beliefs or simply refers to some religions with certain characteristics. Six years after its creation, the Ministry of Religious Affairs introduced ‘a minimal’ definition of ‘religion’ that required recognised religions to contain core elements such as the prophet and a holy book but this definition, from the outset, was likely to ‘exclude’ mystical groups since these tend to emphasize more the inner aspect of belief in which the God may reveal ‘himself directly into the heart of a man’ rather than ‘through intermediaries such as prophets and holy books’ (Mulder 1980, p. 4). It is worth noting
that in 1953 there were more than 360 mystical groups in Indonesia in which Yogyakarta and Surakarta have been the important sites (Howell 1982, p. 532). This proposition was put on hold due to the rejection of the Balinese Hindu (Mulder 1980, p. 4) even if the Ministry of Religious Affairs persisted with defining religion in this manner.

In 1954, an institution called *Interdepartmental Peninjauan Kepercayaan-kepercayaan Didalam Masyarakat* (Interdep PaKem: the Interdepartmental Institution for Monitoring of Beliefs in Society) was established (Howell 1982, p. 532-533; Kholiluddin 2009, p. 184-186). Its function was to investigate the religious practices and aims of ‘local belief’ movements (*aliran kepercayaan*) (Mulder 1980, p. 4; Kholiluddin 2009, p. 184-186). A more detailed understanding of this institution was developed by the Indonesian national court (Kejaksaan Agung) by creating two divisions: one focused on ‘religious movements’ and the other on ‘local belief movements’. Part of their function was to monitor any symptoms or movements that might hamper the national development project. Thus, particular attention was paid to any signs of teachings or movements that might give rise to public disorder or otherwise create problems in society (Kholiluddin 2009, p. 184-186).

In 1957, leading mystical groups demanded that the government recognize mysticism as an official religion, but this demand was not granted, instead President Sukarno warned them about the *klenik*, black magical expression of mysticism. The discourse over mysticism needing to be treated equally as other religions has coloured the debate in the late 1960-s (Mulder 1980, p. 5). A more rigid definition of religion was proposed by the Ministry of Religious Affairs in 1961 and with this the mystical groups would be likely denied. To avoid any unexpected consequences such as social unrest and to keep social order in place, Sukarno decreed that there were ‘six officially and legally recognized religions’ (Islam, Catholicism, Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism) (Mulder 1980, p. 6). As a result, any groups or activities that are considered to be threatening to the ‘established religions or the stability of society’ could be ‘prohibited and dissolved’ (Mulder 1980, p. 6). It was with these concerns in mind that the Blasphemy Law, the Presidential Decree No. 1/PNPS/1965 on the prohibition of abuse and desecration of religions [*Pencegahan Penyalahgunaan dan/atau Penodaan Agama*], was finally introduced in 1965 (Kholiluddin 2009, p. 184-186). This decree ‘prohibited individuals from being hostile toward other religions or committing blasphemy of a religion’ (Human Rights Watch 2013, p. 13).
2.2.1.2.3 Citizenship in the New Order Regime

The Indonesian political landscape underwent a dramatic change brought about by regime change, from the Old Order under Sukarno to the New Order under Suharto. Under the New Order regime, soon after the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) was shut down in 1965-1966, religion was considered as a potential threat to the state (Sutanto 2011, p. 128). This was evident in the policy issued, which is commonly known as SARA: Suku, Agama, Ras dan Antar Golongan (Tribe, Religion, Race, and Class) which effectively prohibits defamatory statements and prejudicial actions that touch upon sensitive social matters. With this policy, the activities of religious communities were tightly monitored by the government. Any conflict that emerged between religious groups would be seriously dealt with by the government. It was this logic that framed policies taken by the New Order Regime to resolve the conflict involving different religious communities.

As part of this control and monitoring process, several other policies that dealt with the life and activities of religious communities were passed. Whilst during the Old Order, six major religions were officially recognised by the state, the New Order institutionalised this recognition by officially acknowledging five religions namely Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism. Confucianism – the spiritual tradition that many Indonesian Chinese identify with, in part or in whole – was no longer part of this set of officially sanctioned religions. This institutionalisation could be seen from the obligation to fill in the form of religion in national identity card where each person should choose one among five religions. This can be seen from the Circular (Surat Edaran) of the Ministry of Internal Affairs number 477/74054 issued in 1978.

Earlier, in 1969, as the logic of the blasphemy law continued to affect the way the state regulated religious affairs, a joint decree was issued by the Ministers of Religious and Internal Affairs regarding the Implementation of Government Mandates for Ensuring Law and Order and the Effective Administration of Religious Development and Worship by Religious Followers’ (Keputusan Bersama Menteri Agama dan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 1/BER/MDN-MAG/1969 tentang Pelaksana Tugas Aparatur Pemeritahan Dalam Menjamin Ketertiban dan Kelancaran Pelaksanaan Pengembangan dan Ibadat Agama oleh Pemeluk-Pemelukannya). Known as the Old Decree, it aimed to resolve the issues related to the building of places of worship, particularly in regions heavily dominated by other recognised religious communities, as these could be the potential source of social and religious conflict (Crouch 2007, p. 98). Instead of resolving the conflict, this ‘Old Decree’ is seen as being the source of conflict itself (Crouch 2007, p. 98).
As noted above, the New Order regime recognised and institutionalized five official religions - Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism, and Buddhism (Confucianism is recognised in the Reform Era) that all Indonesian people are required to align with. At the same time, religion was made part of the educational curriculum and students in government schools were required to partake in religious education for at least two hours a week. Furthermore, religion was made part of the public and official record via the national identity card (Hefner 2001, p. 35). This is one aspect of how the New Order regime dealt with religious matters. While the proposal of citizenship being differentiated on the grounds of religion was rejected, the New Order regime, by and large, both recognised and institutionalised religion.

2.2.1.2.4 Citizenship in the Reform Era

The end of New Order regime is marked by the ethno-communal-religious violence that broke out in many areas. The collapse of the New Order regime and transition to the Reformation Era signalled the third critical juncture in the institutional design of Indonesia. One of the dramatic changes that took place was in the political architecture, through the decentralisation policy that authorised local government to administer their region. Crouch (2009) notes that this change has significantly impacted regulation, particularly in relation to religious communities. Crouch notes that since being implemented in January 2001, the Decentralisation Laws ‘handed government control to the 400 regencies rather than thirty provinces (at that time)’ (2009, p. 55).

This decentralisation process also facilitated the governance and implementation of religious regulation at the district level in the form of regional regulations - peraturan daerah - commonly known by the contraction ‘perda’. Based on the Law 10/2004 on Law Making [Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan], the district governments cannot directly issue any regulation related to religion since they need to submit it to the national parliament for approval. The perda appear in different forms such as Letters from the Governors [Surat Gubernur], Instructions [instruksi] of the Mayor, Circulars [Surat Edaran] and Appeals [Himbauan] of the Regent (Crouch 2009, p. 56-57). With these kinds of forms, religious regulations have been issued in the majority of provinces; at least three quarters of the total provinces have passed such laws (Crouch 2009, p. 58). These regulations mainly regulate public order and social issues, religious skills and obligation, and religious dress codes (Bush 2008, p. 176). Crouch argues that these regional regulations often have pernicious consequences for vulnerable minority groups.
Religious regulation at the national level is also problematic. Regulations relating to places of worship both in 1969 and the subsequent one issued in 2006 have led to a number of difficulties for minority groups wishing to build places of worship (Crouch 2007, p. 97). The continuing attacks on Christian churches are an example of how the new regulation, which is aimed at fostering harmony among religious groups, can precipitate violence. Places of worship are no longer being respected as sacred, but rather have become sites of violence. Crouch (2007, p. 114-115) states that this regulation has been used by the elites to maintain support from Muslim voters. In other words, this regulation was applied in ways that favour protesting members of the Muslim community.

In this third critical juncture, the national discourse on citizenship has been renegotiated and redefined. Eddyono’s study (2013) on the construction of ideal citizenship found that it is highly contested among different communities. She compares three civic education books produced by three different institutions: government institution Lemhanas (the National Defense Institute) (book 1), State Islamic University Jakarta (book 2), and Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto (book 3). The three books produced by these different institutions are listed as national textbooks. In these three books, Eddyono found three different conceptions of ‘ideal citizenship’. In Lemhanas’s book, ideal citizenship refers to a secular understanding of citizenship framed within the conception of Pancasila/national citizenship, whilst book 2 idealises a pious multicultural citizen within the framework of religious-multicultural citizenship. Book 3 considers and promotes a strictly pious-Islamic citizenship. This shows how complex the relationship between religion and citizenship runs in Indonesia. These divergences reflect how the idea of forging multicultural ‘religious citizenship’ that is mainstreamed through religious education in schools – as proposed by Parker and Hoon (2013) – remains a challenging one.

2.2.1.3 Research Gaps

Several key studies (Hefner 2001; Crouch 2007; 2009; Bush 2008; Kholiluddin 2009; Sutanto 2011; Soe 2012; Eddyono 2013; Parker and Hoon 2013) have shown how the issue of religion has influenced the construction of nation building and citizenship in Indonesia. Of particular note is the fact that the New Order regime closely monitored the affairs of religious communities. Religion was considered a potential threat to the stability of the state. Thus, it needed to be controlled, resulting in the issuance of a number of regulations related to religious affairs. The collapse of the military-backed authoritarian Suharto regime was marked with violent conflict involving religious communities. A number of regulations relating to religion were passed
to manage the contestation and negotiation process in the crafting of citizenship at the national and local level.

Some gaps remain, however, in our understanding of these issues. For example, many studies (Crouch 2007; 2009; Bush 2008; Sutanto 2011; Soe 2012; Parker & Hoon 2013) seem to focus only on regulation and law. Indeed, while these play a role in crafting and defining citizenship, this does not necessarily mean that citizenship practices will be determined by them. This is because the reasons or justifications for certain actions might go beyond mere law and regulations arguments (i.e. religious messianic or primordial ethnic ones). Another gap in the research is that other studies (Hefner 2001; Sutanto 2011; Eddyono 2013; Parker & Hoon 2013) tend to focus only on the debate over the legislative framing of citizenship. This might be important to see how certain laws and regulations are passed and certain concepts of citizenship need to be crafted. Also, this might help to understand how an ‘ideal citizen’ is imagined and expected to behave. Nevertheless, the ideal and the real do not always align and, to some extent, they might contradict each other.

What has been particularly lacking from previous studies (Hefner 2001; Crouch 2007; 2009; Bush 2008; Sutanto 2011; Soe 2012; Eddyono 2013; Parker & Hoon 2013) is the empirical interrogation of how citizenship is conceptualised, developed and practiced by different communities in the ever-changing political climate in Indonesia. It is important to note here that crafting citizenship is a dynamic process where the structure (state) and the agent (civil society/individuals/minority groups) interact, negotiate, and affect each other. In short, it is not a one-way process, but rather a complex procedure where the state and civil society navigate their ideals and interests in the crafting of citizenship. Furthermore, in reality, religious minority groups are vulnerable in some areas but not others. It is at this point that this research aims to address these gaps and provide an important contribution on the discourse and practice of citizenship in Indonesia.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

2.3.1 Citizenship: A Brief History of its Plural Meanings

The term ‘citizen’ is derived from the word cite via the Anglo-French citeseyn, citezein, or sithezein (Turner 2006, p. 227). Its origin lies with ancient Greek and Roman societies and it is associated with the formalised participation of men in public matters, to the exclusion of women (Turner 2006, p. 227; Shafir 1998, p. 4). In ancient Greece, citizenship signals ‘liberation’
from ‘tribal loyalties’ to come into ‘a voluntary civic community’ (Shafir 1998, p. 3). Those who participate in public life are called citizens. In its pre-modern form, citizenship is associated with the city, not the nation-state, since the latter itself is, in its modern form, the product of the Westphalia Treaty in 1648. Citizenship is also associated with the bourgeois class, who ‘lives in the city and enjoys the legal privileges of an autonomous urban community’, which differentiates them from those living in rural areas (Turner 2006, p. 227).

The modern form of citizenship comes to the fore as a political product of major revolutions, such as the English civil war (1642-1651), the American War of Independence (1775-1783) and the French Revolution (1789-1799). There are some similarities between these revolutions such as ‘the evolution of citizenship, involving a set of exclusionary rights that established claims to collective resources, and contributing to the formation of the state and then the nation’ (Isin and Turner 2007, p. 6). The creation of nation-states in Europe in the seventeenth century led to the creation of homogeneous populations, while in ‘a less violent form’ there were various political and social pressures to create civil societies in the basis of common language, common religion, ethnicity and identity (Turner 2006, p. 127-228). This process, Turner argues, is the basis for the creation of citizenship, which functions to weaken class divisions, identity politics and differences (Bendix 1964, cited in Turner 2006, p. 127).

At the same time, citizenship is often defined in a more juridical sense as a set of rights and obligations. However, the meaning of citizenship has since evolved and transformed. It can be viewed as a status that denotes the ‘formal state membership and the rules of access to it’; as rights which are about ‘formal capacities immunities’ that are connected with ‘status’, and as an identity that brings a sense of collectivity where individuals ‘act and conceive’ themselves as part of it (Joppke 2007, p. 38).

Citizenship can also be understood as ‘a set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person as a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups’ (Turner 1993, p. 1). The key to this definition is *practices*, which in a sociological sense differentiates it from the juridical framing, and focuses on ‘the dynamic of social construction of citizenship which changes historically as a consequence of political struggles’ (Turner 1993, p. 1); or acts (Isin 2008) that particularly investigates the dynamic of practices that demand changes. In short, the meaning of citizenship has evolved historically to refer in recent times to participation, interaction, civic engagement and public protest in everyday lives.
2.3.2 Citizenship in Islamic/Arabic Tradition

The concept of citizenship, together with the idea of nationalism and nation-state, has been the subject of considerable debate among Muslim scholars. Some believe that citizenship ideas are alien to the Islamic tradition, while others argue that they are not inimical to, but are in fact part of Islamic teachings. Indeed, these concepts did not clearly appear within Islamic tradition, particularly in the classical literature (Kamali 2009, p. 121); within fiqh (Islamic law) literature for example, there is no clear definition of citizenship. However, this does not necessarily mean there is no such concept within Islam resembling that of citizenship.

Some significant attempts have been undertaken by Muslim scholars in recent times to place the discourse of citizenship within Islamic tradition. Typical of these attempts is the tendency among Muslim intellectuals to subsume the idea of citizenship under the banner of dar al-Islam (the abode of Islam) and dar al-harb (the abode of war) (Kamali 2009, p. 121-122). Those who live in dar al-Islam are considered as citizens while those that live in dar al-harb are regarded as aliens unless they migrate to dar al-Islam. Subsuming the idea of citizenship under the banner of two opposite territorial forms of governance is unhelpful considering the developments in the last couple of decades, as many Muslims today do not live in the so-called as dar al-Islam, but live in many different nations and have become their citizens. Furthermore, the world has changed with international treaties and bilateral or multilateral agreements between Muslim and non-Muslim countries to the point where it is difficult to differentiate between dar al-Islam and dar al-harb.

Tracing back the history of Islam, the concept of citizenship has long been understood and applied within Islamic tradition, going back as far as the Constitution of Medina (623 CE) (Kamali 2009, p. 122). Not only in terms of its legal framework as a set of rights and obligation that bind people and the government in a certain territory, this Constitution has forged a common platform that bounds different communities together as one. The Constitution of Medina is considered the first constitution written in the history of Islam (Yildirim 2006, p. 110). Although the initiator of this constitution was Prophet Muhammad, it is mentioned that the draft was consulted and discussed by the leaders of the different groups before being signed and implemented (Albayrak 2010, p. 6). The prophet is understood to have acted as an arbitrator in dealing with the demands and needs of the various religious and tribal leaders. Because the prophet himself was involved in mediating conflicts between warring clans, this document is also sometimes referred to as a ‘conflict resolution charter’ (see for example Yildirim 2006).
Furthermore, this charter is considered as having marked a change in dealing with religious and ethnic diversity within Islamic tradition. Before the Constitution of Medina, people were living under different tribal laws with no central government nor a single common community. As a result, conflict occurred quite often among different groups at that time (Armstrong 2006, p. 19). The Constitution of Medina could be seen as chartering new relations for diverse communities in Medina at that time. Under this constitution, people were treated equally by the state, even those who were not Muslims, such as Jews. They had the same obligation and duty in terms of security, and protection, and the defence of the land where they lived from outside threats. The freedom of religion was guaranteed and protected (article 30) and religious minorities (in particular people of the book i.e. Jews and Christians) were treated as a community among the believers.

Those living in Medina, it was noted, ‘shall help each other in time of war’ (article 45), while at the same time, they were prohibited from fighting and killing each other (Article 49). With this, an equal protection of life is granted by the state as long as people do not do any harm to their fellow citizens. Whenever conflict occurs between these people, they are required to partake in a mutual reconciliation. Kamali (2009, p. 125) notes that with the Constitution of Medina, the Prophet did not place Islam as ‘a precondition of citizenship’; instead, as it is mentioned in many clauses within this constitution, the Prophet acknowledged other believers such as Jews as part of one community.

Centuries later and acting in the same spirit, the Millet system in the Ottoman Empire made it possible for religious minority groups such as Orthodox Christians, Gregorian Armenians, and Jews to live peacefully under the protection of the Empire as long as they performed their responsibilities and duties (for example paying the poll tax and maintaining internal security) and did not threaten the government (McCharty 2001, cited in Yetisgin 2007, p. 145). The word millet (religious community) as used by the Ottoman Empire may refer to religion, religious community, and nation (Ursinus 2015). In its implementation, the central government did not intervene in the life of religious minorities, as each community managed their affairs such as welfare and schools autonomously (McCharty 2001, cited in Yetisgin 2007, p. 145). Although they lived under the Islamic law, there was no coercion to convert to Islam; instead they were granted the right to practice their religious obligations, and to protect their cultural heritage. They were governed by their internal laws and headed by their own leaders (Earle 1925, cited in Ozturk 2010, p. 74; Ozturk 2014, p. 4; Pears 1917, cited in Yetisgin 2007, p. 146).
Within the *Millet* system, the religious community could be seen as the basis for inclusion in the broader political community for non-Muslim groups. Instead of leading to social and political segregation, both Muslim and non-Muslim communities lived ‘next to each other’ in relative peace and harmony (Berkes 1998, cited in Ozturk 2010, p. 73; Ozturk 2014, pp. 2-3). It is worth mentioning that while being governed under Islamic law, there was no difference in term of rights between Muslims and non-Muslims. To access jobs in the public sector, for example, the Ottoman Empire did not discriminate against non-Muslim groups, with some non-Muslims holding high offices such as state Ministers (Vezirs) or Prime Ministers (Grand Vezirs). This approach to equal citizenship among various ethnic and religious communities within the Ottoman Empire was described as ‘the great discovery’ of the time (Ozturk 2010, p. 76; Ozturk 2014, p. 6).

The practice of citizenship within Islamic polity, as can be seen from the Constitution of Medina, focussed not only on the issue of ‘right and obligation’ toward ‘the state’, but also forged and fostered a sense of belonging and social bond among different communities. The Constitution of Medina introduced the notion of *ummah* (a single united community). With *ummah*, it became possible for different communities living in Medina to be united not in the name of tribe or kinship but in the name of a new political community, *ummah*. Here, scholars differ as to what *ummah* means and to what extent it ties the community. Some scholars tend to interpret it in the sense of religion, while the others choose to define it in the context of socio-cultural settings.

Al-Baghdadi and Al-Mawardi are typical examples of Muslim jurists who believe that having ‘unity’ instead of ‘multiplicity’ among believers under one (religious) political leadership is a more effective way to manage the community (Ayubi 1991, p. 14-15). By this, unity means can be understood as being under one big religious community. Al-Mawardi believes that since the integration of *ummah* cannot be achieved politically then it must be achieved religiously. Thus, the term of *ummah* and *millah* are used interchangeably. Ayubi comments that the interpretation of *ummah* with the emphasis on religion is, by and large, due to the social and political situation of the time, when the Sunni-Abbasids dynasty was potentially threatened by the rise of Imamite Shi’ism and Isma’ili Fatimism (1991, p. 14-15). Thus, both groups inclined toward religion to, supposedly, integrate the *ummah* under its banner (Islam Sunni group).

Differing from those two classical Muslim Jurists, other Muslim scholars interpret the meaning of *ummah* more in terms of socio-cultural-historical settings. Al-Farabi, for example, sees the word *ummah* as synonymous as community, *jama’a*, or *jam’*, and it has something related
to the city. Furthermore, he characterises *ummah* as having ‘a physical character, natural traits, and a common tongue’, thus it differs from *millah* as ‘a set of views and deeds’ (Ayubi 1991, p. 14). Al-Mas’udi defined the *umma* in term of *millah*, but different from Al-Baghdadi and Al-Mawardi since this *millah* is not specific to Islam. As a consequence, one *ummah* may consist of several *millah*. Furthermore, he emphasises that this *ummah* has some characteristics such as physical appearance, common tongue and one king (Ayubi 1991, p. 14).

Another progressive interpretation of *ummah* comes from Ibn Khaldun. For him, *ummah* is different from *millah*, and is more related to race or group of people. The concept of Islamic community that classical jurists usually refer to as *ummah* is not accepted by Ibn Khaldun since for him *ummah* is more ‘a longer term’ than dynasty or *dawlah*; thus he spoke of Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, and so on (Ayubi 1991, p. 14). The term *millah*, not *ummah*, is used by Ibn Khaldun in reference to Islamic community (Ayubi 1991, p. 16). Another important feature of *ummah* in Ibn Khaldun’s interpretation is when he relates this term with *watan* (Ayubi 1991, p. 16), which has the connotation of state in the era of nation-state where it also implies the specific relationship between a certain group to a certain territory. With this kind of interpretation, the term *ummah* is compatible with that of nationalism, nation-state and, thus, citizenship.

The interpretation of *ummah* from the socio-cultural-historical settings is more similar to the Western idea of citizenship since it does need to be based solely on one single religion but also groups and diverse communities, and even a state in its territorial sense. On the contrary, defining *ummah* in terms of one religion could be seen as unrealistic considering the fact that there is now no single unity called as Islamic country whose power and legitimacy covers the whole Islamic community in the world. By the time the Ottoman Empire fell, any notion of Muslim political community has disintegrated, and it re-emerged as fifty-odd separate Muslim nation-states. Moreover, these countries have their own regulation and administrative systems including citizenship laws.

Based on the Constitution of Medina and the *Millet System*, it could be said that while acknowledging community rights and entitlements, Islam also guarantees individual rights. As can be seen from these practices, non-Muslims have been protected, and have had the same obligations and rights as Muslims; within the Millet System they were able to rise to high positions, even while being under the Islamic law. Islam respected the freedom of religion. It is mentioned in the Qur’ān, surah al-Baqarah [2:256]: *laa ikraha fid-Deen* (there is no compulsion in religion), that there should be no coercion to embrace any religion. Islamic polity practices as
seen in the Constitution of Medina and the Millet System also show that the practices of religious obligation among different religious communities are endorsed and acknowledged.

Discussing the concept of citizenship in Islam/Arab tradition is important because in most contemporary cases, the violence and intolerant actions against minority groups were committed by religious (Islamic) groups who claim to be acting in the name of Islam and often use religious (Islamic) arguments to justify their actions. Words such as infidel, heresy, kafir, are often used to refer to the religious minority groups, who are of different denominations or have different understandings of religion. Furthermore, Islamic accounts of citizenship may open new possibilities regarding the way the concept was conceived and can be developed in the context of the case studies in this project.

2.3.3 Citizenship in Javanese Tradition

As noted above, since the research sites are the two Central Java old royal cities of Yogyakarta and Surakarta, both being predominantly Javanese, it is important here to sketch briefly the concept of citizenship in Javanese tradition. These two cities are lying at the heart of ‘the court civilization of the Javanese’ (Koentjaraningrat 1989, p. 11) or are the places where ‘the heart of the Javanese tradition beats’ (Shiraishi 1990, p. 38). The term of modern citizenship may not appear in Javanese language and culture, but it is believed that the cultural practices of Javanese tradition have partly shaped the construction of politics, culture and social relations in Indonesia (Anthov 2005, p. 43). Javanese norms such as mutual assistance [gotong royong], consensus [musyawarah], respect [hormad], family-ness [kekeluargaan], Javanese spiritualism [kebatinan], and the whole man [manusia seutuhnya] have shaped the idea of national identity (Anthov 2005, p. 44). These values bring the notion of solidarity, togetherness and the way the Javanese interact with each other and other people.

In terms of the relationship between citizen and the government, the concept of kawula (servant) and gusti (lord) might help to illuminate how the King or the Government are seen in Javanese culture. While this concept is found to be expressed in religious terms to signify the relationship between human beings and God, this concept is also used when Javanese people interact with the King (Mudjanto 1986, p. 106-107). Kawula refers to the people, the governed subjects, while gusti refers to the lord, the rulers (Mudjanto 1986, p. 107). Together with this is the concept of acceptance [narima] that describes how citizenship is conceptualised in Javanese culture. In the words of Darmaputra (1982, cited in Anthov 2005, p. 49),
every puppet is assigned a specific role to play. That is why narima, the voluntary acceptance of one’s assigned role, is one of the most important virtues for the Javanese.

Due to narima, they obey and serve the government, gusti [lord] and do their role without any burden because it is ‘a blessing’ (Darmaputra 1982, cited in Antlov 2005, p. 49).

The concept of narima constitutes an important part in Javanese polity where a president symbolises Bapak [father], a person who nurtures the children and whom the children should respect to ‘apprehend social harmony’ (Antlov and Hellman 2005, p. 11). This metaphor may illustrate the position of ruler in Javanese tradition. The idea of narima is associated with commoners [wong cilik] (Darmaputra 1982, cited in Antlov 2005, p. 49) while power may refer to the ruler. This shows that the notion of citizenship within Javanese society is hierarchical. However, it is ‘characterized by harmonious reciprocity, even great satisfaction’ (Antlov 2005, p. 50). This is because the king or the ruler within Javanese tradition is conceptualised as ‘a man of many good deeds’ (Mudjanto 1986, p. 103), someone with a pure heart. Ideal governance in Javanese culture is associated with negari ingkang apunjang-apunjung, pasir wukir loh jinawi, gemah ripah, karta tur raharja, Javanese concepts that resemble the idea of ‘prosperity, wisdom, justice, and the emphasis on public welfare’ (Mudjanto 1986, p. 105).

With this idealised concept of governance, the Javanese polity also highlights the important role of power. Anderson (2007, p. 5-8) argues that the concept of power in Java is different from that of the European one. One of the main distinctions is that power in Javanese culture is concrete, not abstract. While in the West power is used to describe ‘a relationship or relationships’, in Java, it is ‘an existential reality... intangible, mysterious and divine energy that animates the universe...and is manifested in every aspect of the natural world’. Following on from this, the Javanese conception of power is understood to be ‘homogenous’, not ‘heterogeneous’ like the European construct; in the latter, relationships are not seen as unitary, but multiple, are classified in different forms and patterns, and thus are a different source of power. In Javanese tradition, as all power derives from ‘divine energy that animates the universe’, there is no difference whether the power relates to the individual or a group of people. There is no such division of power in Javanese polity, rather it is characterised by totality (Mudjanto 1986, p. 104). Furthermore, in Javanese culture, power ‘does not raise the question of legitimacy’ since it comes from the ‘single homogenous source’, thus the differentiation of power based on wealth or weapons for example, and whether which one is legitimate and illegitimate, is not recognised.

With this conception, power in Javanese polity can be possessed by individual persons but it is ‘never created or altered by them’; rather, it ‘flows from a radiating centre and spreads
like circles on the water’ (Antlov 2005, p. 51), or it can be seen as ‘a cone of light cast downwards by a reflector lamp’ (Anderson 2007, p. 12). Anderson (2007, p. 13) notes that instead of demonstrating the use of power, Javanese polity emphasises ‘the signs of Power’s concentration’ that can be represented in ‘the person of the Power-holder and in society in which he wields his Power’. Furthermore, the closer people are to the centre, the greater the power they can sense. Conceptualising power in this manner implies that the greater the spiritual power a person possesses the higher social position they attain (Antlov 2005, p. 51).

Nevertheless, the use of power in Javanese tradition should be understood more than ‘the idea of power per se’ but also ‘the justifications and explanations of the elite’s superior position and righteous rule’ (Antlov 2005, p. 59). Consequently, in Javanese tradition, the King or the rulers are illustrated as always being concerned with the welfare of the people (Mudjanto 1986, p. 105). In actual political practice, power may be seen as ‘flowing from the exchanges of goods and services’; it may take in the form of authoritative power ‘personified by the armed soldier placed in each Indonesian village’; or a ‘pluralist, democratic conception, in which community leaders (headman and village council members) are elected in power’ (Antlov 2005, p. 58). The different conceptualisations of power and politics in Java comes from the historical development of fragmented ideologies. This is evident in popular movements in Java, class struggles and ideological competitions.

The Javanese norms and how they contribute to the construction of national identity, the relationships between the ruler and the ruled, and thus of citizenship, point to the important relation between culture and politics. The use of cultural symbols in legitimising political powers and practices could be the best example of how culture plays an important role in defining powers and politics. The extent to which culture may affect the way politics is conducted may depend on the social, political and cultural circumstances. Even in Java, Antlov notes, people do not conceptualise culture and power in a single form (2005, p. 56). They have contested the meaning of power, how it should be conceptualised and how the relationship between the ruled and the rulers can be defined (Antlov 2005, p. 56). This is due, as Keontjaraningrat (1989, p. 11) notes, to Javanese culture not being a single homogenous one, but recognises regional diversity.

In term of social life, Javanese culture is characterised by ‘harmonious social relations’ whereas every decision requires ‘consensus, without conflict’ (Antlov and Hellman 2005, p. 12). This ‘harmonious’ and ‘consensus’ relation can be seen from how Javanese people emphasise more on the interest of the people, the community, over individuals. The concept of gotong royong, which stresses ‘common endeavour, mutual help mutual understanding’
(Koentjaraningrat 1989, p. 461) implies how the community or communal bond priority describe Javanese people’s conceptualisation of the relationship between community and individual. Thus, the idea of collectiveness or togetherness is central to Javanese tradition. As Koentjaraningrat (1989, p. 461) notes, the development of this concept in Javanese tradition may restrict the individual emphasis of liberal tradition.

The relationship between citizens and government, the ruled and the ruler in Javanese culture remains contentious and may take different forms in different cities. Therefore, looking at the citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta opens the possibility to see what kind of cultural understanding may assist in comprehending how citizenship is conceptualized and developed and, furthermore, how this conceptualisation of citizenship may affect everyday practice.

2.3.4 Citizenship in Western Traditions

Thomas H. Marshall (1992) introduced three forms of rights that constitute citizenship: political rights, civil rights, and social rights. Civil rights, such as the rights of property, were born in response to the absolutisms in the seventeenth century. Political rights developed in the following century, the eighteenth, with the evolution of modern parliamentary democracy, while social rights developed as the latest form of citizenship during the twentieth century with the advent of the welfare state as its political embodiment. Marshall argues that social rights, including health entitlement and unemployment benefit, are the latest evolution of rights and thus of citizenship.

Marshall’s account of citizenship, while being referred to as the foundation of liberal citizenship, has also been a subject of criticism. It is worth noting that the notion of citizenship developed by Marshall was a response to problems of class and social divisions due to the growing working class in Britain at that time (Turner 1993, p. 6). One of the criticisms is the evolutionist nature of citizenship, wherein it is difficult to explain how civil and political rights should come before social rights. In certain cases, it is possible to see where social rights have been granted, but the civil and political rights are underdeveloped, as is the case with women for example. Another important critique is that social rights are considered as the final form, in spite of the fact that the challenge on citizenship has been continually growing in the last decade, with the rise of cultural or communal and/or religious demands for recognition.
The basic tenet of the liberal tradition of citizenship is ‘individual’, while the argument proposed by the diverse cultural groups resonates more at the ‘collective’ level. Thus, the demand for recognition is in line with the idea of collective rights, which is not acknowledged in any significant way by many conservative liberal theorists.

Taylor (1994) in his seminal work on the ‘Politics of Recognition’ argues that identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning... picture of themselves.

Therefore, ‘non-recognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being’ (Taylor 1994, p. 15). Since individuals grow up in certain social contexts, to some extent individual identity relates to their social groups or culture. Thus, understanding people or groups may require understanding their culture. It is at this point that the demand for recognition lays the foundation for potential conflict, as with the basic idea of ‘colour blindness’ within modern liberal tradition implying that individuals (and groups) are equal before the law.

On this tension, Taylor sees that the politics of citizenship within liberalism is inhospitable to cultural differences, due to an application of uniformity with ‘the rules defining the rights, without exception’ and differences being ‘suspicious of collective goals’ (1994, p. 60). Taylor (1994, p. 62) argues that some Muslim groups believe that there is no separation between religion and politics, which is the hallmark of Western civilization. Therefore, liberal values may not serve as the basis to judge other cultures since liberalism is a product of a certain culture or civilization. To judge conflict in relation to different cultural and religious values is to potentially ‘violate’ the cultural differences, and thus the values of citizenship.

In response to the challenge of culture and religion within citizenship, a quite distinct account is offered by Kymlicka (1995), who proposes to grant cultural or religious groups a degree of cultural recognition rights. He begins his argument by defining what culture is since this is fundamental for his theoretical argument on minority rights. Culture may refer to ‘the distinct customs, perspectives, or ethos of group or associations’ (Kymlicka 1995, p. 18), which refers to a narrower definition of culture, compared to a wider one that can be defined along broader civilizational terms. Both definitions, for Kymlicka (1995, p. 18), have their own problems. The first definition leads to the consequence that ‘the most ethnically homogenous state’, such as Iceland, could be considered a multicultural country since its citizens are involved
or participate in groups of different associations, be they in the name of religion, lifestyle, gender affiliation or political ideologies. Contradicting this, the second definition would emphasise the notion that the most multi-national and multi-ethnic countries such as Switzerland and Australia respectively are less culturally diverse if their citizens share and participate into the same form of modern industrialised life.

These definitions, Kymlicka found, are not enough to build a more coherent theory of minority rights and therefore he uses a different meaning of culture, more akin to ‘a people’ or ‘a nation’ (1995, p. 18). By ‘a people’ or ‘a nation’ he means ‘an intergenerational community, more or less institutionally complete, occupying a given territory or homeland, sharing a distinct language and history’ (1995, p. 18). With this definition, he notes that a state could be called multicultural if ‘its members either belong to different nations (a multination state), or have emigrated from different nations (a poly-ethnic state), and if this fact is an important aspect of [their] personal identity and political life’. With this definition, Kymlicka (1995, p. 19) differentiates between national minorities and ethnic groups. The first refers to cultural groups who previously occupy a certain territory and are then incorporated in the larger society. One example of these groups is the Quebeccois in Canada who are francophone whilst the rest of the country are Anglophone. The second type is that of immigrant groups who have ‘a loose association’ to an ‘ethnic group’ within which these groups wish to be incorporated into the larger society. While they might be demanding recognition, they do not attempt to separate from the larger group, but ask for the laws to respect their cultural differences (Kymlicka 1995, p. 15).

The first group is eligible for special political status – the right to speak their own language and native land use as self-governance. This is due to the fact that before joining or being incorporated into the larger society they may have engaged in self-governing. They also have their own territory, distinct culture and are entitled to call themselves ‘a distinct society’ (Kymlicka 2001, p. 10). On the other hand, the second group do not have such rights because they do not qualify as a ‘nation’, as they simply do not occupy their own territory. Furthermore, they are still required to participate in the public sphere, adjust to the dominant culture and speak the common language. Their demand for recognition is not geared towards creating a parallel society but rather towards acknowledging their cultural particularity (Kymlicka 1995, p. 15); thus, they may be asking for poly-ethnic rights (Kymlicka 1995, p. 31).

It should be noted, however, that Kymlicka qualifies which cultural groups would be granted minority rights. The demands for such rights, he argues, would only be fulfilled when they respect the basic foundation of liberal principles such as freedom, autonomy, self-reflection
and choice (1995, p. 37). This goes in line with his idea to differentiate what he called as ‘internal restriction’ and ‘external protection’ regarding the notion of cultural membership (1995, p. 35). Internal restriction means that cultural groups demand restrictions on basic individual civil and political rights. This means that the individual may not be able to reassess the cultural value they subscribe to, implying that there is no freedom within minority groups. The external protection refers to the demands by cultural groups to reduce their vulnerability in relation to mainstream/dominant society. The liberal view prefers external protection as long as the group provides equal treatment to others (Kymlicka 1995, p. 37).

While the idea put forward by Kymlicka might solve the tension between ‘individual’ and ‘community’ membership, some scholars such as Young (1997, p. 50) still argue that the idea of distinguishing between cultural groups in what Kymlicka calls ‘national minorities’ and ‘the immigrants’ remains somewhat problematic. This is due to the diversity of cultural groups reduced only to these two categories. In fact, there are some groups that could not be considered as national minorities or simply as voluntarily immigrants (Young 1997, p. 50). A good example would be African-Americans, who are the descendants of slaves transported by colonial powers by force. This is similar to people of Indian descent brought by the British in many parts of Asia and Africa.

Furthermore, Young (1997, p. 51) argues that the distinctions between the two groups identified by Kymlicka could be simplified as one group who has the right to be a ‘separate and distinct society’, and those who wish or are expected to integrate into the larger society. Following this logic, therefore, separation and integration would be the only options available for cultural minority groups. This potentially questions the basic idea of multicultural citizenship since self-government may lead to a separation that may endanger political unity. At the same time, the integration argument for ethnic groups can also lead to problems. In some cases, the cultural and religious groups may demand access to economic opportunity and their incorporation into the political decision-making process, while at the same time rejecting the notion that they integrate into the dominant national culture (Young 1997, p. 52).

Young (1990; 1989) also points to the problem within the idea of liberal citizenship: the emphasis on universality in a way that potentially undermines the particularity and differences among communities. Young criticises the universality claim of citizenship on two points: universality as generality and universality as equal treatment (Young 1989, p. 151). As generality, the idea of universality concerns the activities of citizenship that produce ‘general will’ that in turn transcends the differences among different groups. While this idea sounds reasonable, the will
to seek general will tends to exclude certain groups, particularly those who are ‘not capable of adopting that general point of view’, for example those who still hold so-called ‘illiberal values’ against dominant liberal general will. In other words, the idea of universality tends to lean towards homogeneity and thus undermines the heterogeneity of people in terms of their tradition, culture or religion.

As for universality as equal treatment, universal citizenship tends to treat different groups of people as equal. While this idea sounds laudable and even benevolent, the problem with this is that in reality, groups of people are often treated discriminately due to their different culture, physical appearance, tradition or religion. It might be true that in laws or regulations such cases do not exist, however, in everyday life there are many groups who feel they are being excluded, as is the case with black, Indian, or Asian people in the United States. Thus, to some extent, speaking of equal treatment whilst negating the fact that in real life people are treated differently, will only serve to sustain the existing order of privileged groups and to undermine the non-privileged ones. As a result, Young highlights the important point of representation and thus proposes the idea of differentiated citizenship to accommodate these particularities and differences.

Therefore, and different from a general understanding of representation as more of substitution of groups of people during their absence, Young (2000, p. 126-127) tends to define representation as ‘a process involving a mediated relation of constituents to one another and to a representative’. The key point here is that representation is not an identity substitution for constituency since the will of groups of people cannot be represented by a single person. Rather, representation emphasises a relationship where there is a connection between the different groups (represented and the representative), and thus it is a kind of differentiated relationship. As a consequence of this logic, representation functions as ‘speaking for’, not ‘speaking as’. Furthermore, and borrowing the concept of trace by Derrida, Young (2000, p. 127) highlights that representation always involves the history of the relationship between the constituent and the representative where it can be traced back in the past as it can be anticipated in the future.

There are three modes of representation in which someone can be represented, as Young argues (2000): firstly, when it comes to interest. Interest here may mean something important to individuals or groups of people or organisations that can lead to achieve their goals. It may refer to material or non-material things such as cultural or religious expression. In social life, pursuing interests is inevitable and may lead to conflict between people, evident in the political arena where competing interests between political actors are a common scenario.
Secondly, people can be represented when it comes to opinion or, as Young (2000, p. 135) refers to, the ‘principles, values and priorities’ a person holds that affect the way they pursue or judge something, and what kind of policies should be issued. Within social life, groups or associations may offer certain principles or values in their name to express opinions on certain issues or to affect public policies. As such, political parties offer some programs that are designed in accordance with certain principles that they believe express the interests of the people. Thirdly, representation may occur when it comes to perspective. The perspective here refers to the way a person or groups of people view certain issues in relation to their experience, history, or social understanding, which comes from the social position they occupy in relation to other groups or people. Differing from interest and opinion, the perspective consists of ‘a set of questions, kinds of experience and assumptions with which reasoning begins’ (Young 2000, p. 137). With this definition, people may belong to different groups but are likely to share the same perspective, due to their position in social space in relations to others.

Given the importance of representation in the differentiated citizenship concept, it is important to sketch briefly what a social group means for Young. While Kymlicka focuses on cultural groups, Young (1989) tends to focus on social groups, which she defines as having a shared affinity either in the sense of history, perspective, or mode of reasoning. Its nature is more of an association rather than an aggregate that is signified by a certain attribute. A common objective attribute such as skin colour may set this affinity, but it is not always the case where people may have different colour skin but they share the affinity because of social relations. With this association, people join the group voluntarily, and may leave the groups whenever the affinity is no longer there. A social group or a group identity then needs to be understood in a relational term. With this in mind, the identification of social groups is always relational, meaning that there is no such an essence of group identity. As a social group, it may ‘come into being and fade away’.

What needs to be emphasised here is that while some social groups earn privileges, others often feel oppressed. Young (1989, p. 161) identifies several forms of oppression in which it may refer to exploitation, where others’ work benefit to other groups but not reciprocated. Oppression may also occur when people feel marginalised due to being excluded from participating in certain social activities. Powerlessness is another form of oppression whereby people may live under others’ control and have little autonomy and authority over themselves. Another form of oppression is a kind of cultural imperialism where people are stereotyped due to their differences from others, and with this they have limited opportunity to express themselves in any social events. Lastly, oppression may take in the form of violence, either physical or non-
physical, such as harassment or intimidation. It is at this point when citizenship needs to be differentiated to ensure that different social groups can be represented in any social and political decision-making process.

Parekh offers a similar critique to the concept of multicultural citizenship proposed by Kymlicka. Since Kymlicka argues his approach to multicultural citizenship from the perspective of liberal theory, Parekh (1997) contends that this is only relevant to liberal Western society and not other types of non-Western, ‘non-liberal’ ones. In fact, so-called multicultural societies today incorporate both liberal and non-liberal cultures, with ongoing contestations between the two. The question remains as to how acceptance and toleration of liberal groups can be justified vis-à-vis non-liberal ones, especially when the latter group is required to subscribe to the basic principles of liberal tradition. Otherwise, Kymlicka’s theory may well be considered as a framework for an internal dialogue strictly among liberal groups. Furthermore, Parekh (1997, p. 58) argues that Kymlicka tends to over-simplify things by stating that there is a single societal or national culture. In fact, there is a substantial range of variations in Western societies and it would be a simplification to call them ‘simply liberal’.

The argument posed by Kymlicka, whereby individuals can reflect on, revise or choose the values of cultures which are appropriate for them, or suit the liberal tradition, might be plausible. However, as Parekh (1997) notes, this is only one way among others to depict the relationship between the individual and group culture. Some communities, such as migrant religious minorities, tend to see their culture and tradition as part of a divine revelation that needs to be preserved, cherished and transmitted from one generation to the next. The attempt to revise or strongly criticise this sacred belief could be considered as a violation of basic rights and in some cases as an outright act of blasphemy. Moreover, this kind of culture also requires loyalty from members of the minority cultural-religious group. This is not to say that individuals, while preserving their culture or religious tradition, would fail to adapt to the new situation: they do in fact have the capacity to adapt to changing conditions, but in this way they may not follow what the liberal tradition proposes to them.

With regard to the important point of religious practice, the difficulties of universal liberal citizenship in accommodating religious expression is due to the fact that citizenship has been seen as something inherently secular in the same way that liberalism, in general, inherently implies secularism. Secularisation theories predict that as modernisation progresses religion will decline and will be constrained to the private sphere, since as it is perceived to be incompatible with modern society and its secular values. While the modern is characterised as rational and
civilised, religion is associated with superstition and backwardness, and thus does not conform with modern life (Berger 1999, p. 3). It is not surprising then that religion, in this secular framework, is increasingly viewed as hostile toward citizenship (Turner 2002, p. 262). This argument is rejected by Turner (2002) who argues that religion may provide a strong foundation for citizenship since it offers both a social bond that goes beyond kinship and primordial ethnic ties.

Hudson (2003) reflects further on how religion could be best theorised in the citizenship discourse. For him, religious citizenship can take different forms: firstly, a nation-state model where the state allows its citizens to perform religious obligations and it is acknowledged in the constitution, and secondly, a civil society model in which citizens could exercise their rights as religious person in the public domains. This model allows the citizens to develop 'different religious citizenships in different domains’.

Thirdly, religious citizenship could take into account the rights of persons that may be exercised within the community and when there is an obligation to perform these at the local, national, or international level. The fourth model refers to the specific legal documents that acknowledges and requires that the states oblige to these particular regulations on religious issues such as the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief, which was introduced by the United Nations in 1981. Lastly, religious citizenship may refer to a person who acquires citizenship by taking a position or declaring themselves as part of a particular religious group so that any rights could be claimed and obligations required of them could be exercised. This insight on religion by Hudson (2003) might help to unpack the complexity of religion in the discourse of citizenship in which it can take different forms and pose some practical challenges.

While Kymlicka, Young and Hudson offer a framework of citizenship to accommodate the expression coming from cultural and religious communities, it is also important to discuss the performative aspect of citizenship. This discussion offers a more nuanced approach to citizenship since rights, by nature, need to be exercised and claimed if they are to be accessed and practised. Within citizenship tradition, this performative aspect of citizenship could be traced back to the republicanism school of thought. Republican tradition emphasises more the notion of active citizens and public participation in order to pursue common interests and a public virtue (Honohan 2015, p. 10). This public participation defines what a citizen is. This participation or performative aspect goes beyond the legal-status aspect of citizenship. This suggests that looking at status only would be insufficient when studying citizenship in the context of culturally and
religiously diverse societies. In this context, citizenship needs to be understood as a set of practices that can be used to define a person as a member of a pluralist society.

Turner (1993) argues that to look at citizenship as practices, one is required to shift the focus from the legal status to ‘the dynamic of social construction of citizenship which changes historically as a consequence of political struggles’ (Turner 1993, p. 1). Furthermore, White (2008, p. 48) suggests that citizenship is comprised of ‘a pure tendency towards stasis and a pure tendency towards movement and change’. This ‘stasis’ tendency refers to habitual practices and collective beliefs that make it possible for the society to be sustained and remain stable, while the ‘movement and change’ refers to the dynamic of the society that might break the habitual practices and thus need for change. This means that citizenship may mean participation, civic engagement, interaction in everyday life and any acts or movements that seek social change.

Within this ‘movement and change’, Isin and Nielsen (2008) introduced the concept of ‘acts of citizenship’. Differentiated from practices that take the form of habitual performance and thus are based on ‘order’, acts of citizenship focus more on the rupture, and thus emphasise its dynamic aspect. This approach reflects how claims are articulated and subjectivities are formed (Benhabib 2004; Soysal 1994, cited in Isin 2008). Dealing with acts requires an investigation of the acts, actions and actors. Here, Isin (2008) differentiates between an act and an action. An act refers to ‘an expression of the need to be heard’, while an action is the actuality of such act, which could take different forms. Thus, act is more virtual and action is more actual. With this logic, an act precedes an action and produces an actor. Furthermore, since an act needs to be heard, it brings the sense of dialogical elements within it.

Drawing from the concept of the acts of citizenship, Turner (2008) discusses acts of piety as the foundation of citizenship and how this is institutionalised in line with the secularist conceptualisation in which religion has no place. The modern nation-state has its foundation in the Westphalian Treaty which, in 1648, separated religion from public life, thus making the relationship between ‘the act of piety and the act of citizenship become problematic’. Acts of piety, in this context, bring back the religious arguments into the public that ruptured the norm of secularised public life. This ‘pietization of acts’ can take the form, for example, of requesting a change of office hours because of an obligation to perform religious rituals. It might also take into consideration the demand of ‘islamization’ of certain regulations, where religious groups believe that ‘the secular regulation’ is outdated and insufficient to accommodate religious demands.
These acts of piety require further investigation in relation to their challenges to citizenship theories since they go beyond the legal-normative framing. There are at least four typical ways of dealing with the challenge that arises out of cultural and religious diversity in the context of citizenship (Parekh 2000, p. 165-266). The first is what Parekh called universal moral values, where the universal human rights are the standards of evaluation. The second is the principle of core or common values that may represent the moral minimum of each culture, are neutral in nature and can be a standard of evaluation. Since most cultures have their own unique history, this standard of evaluation potentially violates the different values among cultures. The third is what Parekh called the no-harm principle, which argues that since moral values are culturally embedded, evaluation should be based on whether the cultural practices do no harm to the people. Only those principles that cause harm to the people should be disallowed. The fourth is the principle of dialogical consensus, whereby dialogue will be conducted to make concessions and achieve compromises.

As such acts highlight the importance of dialogue, Parekh proposes the idea of dialogical consensus where dialogue is conducted in order to make concessions and achieve compromises. Nevertheless, Parekh argues, ‘it is unlikely to take us far in the abstract and context-less form proposed by its advocates’ (2000, p. 167). Consequently, there should be a clear starting point in engaging with this dialogue. Parekh proposes what he called operative public values that operate on three levels: (1), constitution; (2) laws; and (3) norms governing the civil relation between members of society (2000, p. 167-269). Constitution here refers to the ultimate source or regulation whereby the basic legal and moral design of the polity is formulated with reference to it. While constitution is general, laws are more specific, providing a legal framework that regulates the daily life of citizens. While the constitution constrains the laws, these laws are not necessarily derived from the constitutional values. The last one refers to norms or values that are agreed upon and regulate the daily lives of the people. Laws regulate many but not all of these kind of activities, for example the relationship between neighbours, the norms for using public transport, etc. Thus, these norms are also referred to as civic values. For Parekh (2000), these norms occupy ‘an intermediate realm between the structured relations of organized public life and the intimate relations of personal and private life’.

Drawing from the work of Gibson (2007) on the symbolic forms of knowledge in Southeast Asia, the first two might refer to the modern symbolic form of knowledge evidenced in the work of modern bureaucracy, while the latter could refer to traditional and charismatic symbolic form of knowledge that could take into the forms of religious and cultural values.
Discussing and negotiating these values in an intercultural dialogical process would help the different communities to create or craft a common sense of belonging and solidarity that can nurture democratic and inclusive citizenship.

To summarise, the idea of constructing citizenship in relation to minority groups in the Western liberal tradition has been challenged on many fronts, as it places the individual at the core of its concern. Some liberal theorists such as Kymlicka argued for multicultural citizenship where it is possible for minority groups to have ‘poly-ethnic rights’ and preserve their culture and tradition as long as these cultures and traditions meet the liberal criteria. Young, on the other hand, proposes the idea of differentiated citizenship in which the vulnerable groups have representatives that make it possible for them to be represented in public participation, and social and political decision making. This framework of citizenship allows vulnerable social groups to be freed from any forms of oppression: exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. Hudson goes one step further and proposes the idea of religious citizenship, which can take different forms and requires more interrogation on how to place religious issues in the discourse of citizenship. Furthermore, Turner, Isin, Nielsen, and White propose to focus more on the dynamic, performative aspects of citizenship found in everyday activities. Finally, Parekh proposes a more deliberative approach to citizenship, which could be situated along a dialogical process whereby people from different communities could deliberate democratically over common principles to reach an agreement that might facilitate a more dialogical approach to citizenship practices. These proposals make it possible to situate the idea of citizenship as an inclusive process that is open to being contested and negotiated.
2.4 Conclusion

The citizenship concept used in this project is sociological *par excellence* where, following Turner, it is understood as ‘a set of practices (juridical, political, economic and cultural) which define a person a competent member of society, and which as a consequence shape the flow of resources to persons and social groups’ (Turner 1993, p. 1). The key to this definition is the notion of *practices*, which differs from the more normative juridical approach. This allows us to understand ‘the dynamic of social construction of citizenship which changes historically as a consequence of political struggles’ (Turner 1993, p. 1). As a series of practices, citizenship is ‘essential for cultivating civic virtues and democratic values’ (Isin and Turner 2007, p. 5). Citizenship practices may refer to participation, interaction and civic engagement in everyday lives. This approach allows for a more performative interpretation of ‘religious’ citizenship, where acts of religious practice can engender outcomes associated with coexistence and conviviality rather than intercultural conflict and discrimination.

Therefore, a citizenship approach as adopted in this study is understood as a dynamic process where the structure (state) and the agent (individuals/community groups within society) interact, negotiate, and affect each other. This is not a one-dimensional process whereby a minority group is expected to simply acquiesce and abandon its collective religious and cultural
rights. Rather, it implies a complex two-way process, where the state and the community group negotiate, adapt and navigate their ideals and interests in the process of performing citizenship. In this respect, the religious and cultural dimensions of citizenship might play significant roles in the way religious communities understand and practice religious citizenship. It is worth noting the importance of space and how public spaces are organised in order to facilitate different social groups’ participation in social and political decision-making process (Young 1990; 1989). Citizenship can be seen as a process open to being questioned, contested and negotiated by the different communities in response to the dynamic of political and social change in order to achieve common ground. Whether there is a notion of poly-ethnic rights (Kymlicka 1995) or differentiated citizenship (Young 1990; 1998), for example, will be examined further in this study.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Approach

This research project is qualitative in nature and seeks to understand the meanings constructed by members of minority groups in Indonesia in relation to religious expression and practices; that is, how individuals make sense of the world in which they live and the kind of experiences in which they partake in the specific context of the study’s focus, namely religious citizenship (see Merriam 2009, p. 13; Denzin and Lincoln 2005, p. 3). The case study approach employed in this project can be defined as ‘an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’ (Yin 1994, p. 13). Its primary purpose is to understand ‘something that is unique’ and specific to the selected cases. Thus, it involves systemic strategies to gather in-depth contextual information about the phenomenon in question: be it relation to a person, social settings, event, or a group of people (Berg 2001, p. 225). The nature of case study implies that the cases need to be selected based on their uniqueness with the sample size being generally smaller than the case with quantitative approaches. A qualitative approach is aimed at excavating the finer, in-depth specificities of the selected case studies.

The two sites for this research are Yogyakarta and Surakarta (also known as Solo). There are several reasons for choosing these locations as research sites. The first reason is their historical connection. Both Yogyakarta and Surakarta were once centres of the great Mataram Kingdom, one of the biggest kingdoms in Java. Due to the internal conflict within the royal family and the intervention of the Dutch colonial enterprise, the kingdom was then divided into two regions which are now known as Yogyakarta and Surakarta. This split is recorded in the Giyanti Treaty of 1755. The second reason is cultural. Both cities are considered to be the capitals of Javanese culture and tradition and are central sites of ‘the court civilization of the Javanese’ (Koentjaraningrat 1989, p. 21) where ‘the heart of the Javanese tradition beats’ (Shiraishi 1990, p. 38).

Another reason is demographic, with the two cities being of a similar size. The total population of in Yogyakarta was estimated to be around 403,000 in 2013 (Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 2014), whilst the population of Surakarta in 2013 was slightly larger at around 508,000 people (BAPPEDA Kota Surakarta 2014). In terms of diversity,
people living in Yogyakarta and Surakarta are predominantly Javanese, along with small numbers of people from other ethnic backgrounds. In terms of religion, the majority of people living in both cities are Muslim. In the city of Yogyakarta, Muslims constitute 81% of the total population, followed by Catholics (19%), Protestant Christians (7.5%), Buddhists (0.5%) and Hindus (0.2%) with a very small number of ‘others’ (0.01%) (Badan Pusat Statistik Kota Yogyakarta 2013, p. 57). In Surakarta, Muslims constitute 77% of the total population, followed by Protestant Christians (13%), Catholics (10%), Buddhists (0.01%), and very small numbers of Hindus and others (less than 0.01%) (BAPPEDA Kota Surakarta 2014, p. 43).

It is worth noting, however, that although the numbers used here are important, the true measure of the dynamics of social, religious, and cultural issues goes well beyond mere statistics. It is often the case that parties involved in certain conflicts come from nearby areas but that the event itself happened in these two cities. The opposite can also be true with incidents occurring in nearby areas, with the actors involved being based in the city. Considering the fact that religious communities are spread throughout the cities and surrounding areas and that events in a certain area might socially and culturally affect the lives of others in nearby locations, the two cities and their surrounds represent a focal point in which to investigate citizenship practices. Socially and culturally Yogyakarta or Surakarta/Solo refer not only to the cities as administrative units, but also to their surrounding areas.

A further reason is related to the nature of religious life in these cities. Yogyakarta has been known as a city with a vibrant civic culture and for being socially harmonious, although this does not necessarily imply a total absence of conflicts. Surakarta, on the other hand, is considered a city with ‘a short fuse’ (Majeed 2012). The history of Surakarta has been coloured with inter-ethnic tension between Chinese and Javanese; and the emergence of radical Islamist groups further fuelled religious tensions between different communities.

More recently, the situation has dramatically changed. A survey by Setara Institute (2015; 2017) on cities and levels of tolerance has ranked Yogyakarta amongst the ten least tolerant cities in Indonesia. Surakarta, however, ranked in the top ten most tolerant. This survey has challenged the previous image of the cities, particularly Yogyakarta which as recently as 2006 was declared a city of tolerance. Despite the fact that both research sites share many similarities, sharp differences exist between them, particularly in terms of interaction between different religious communities. This is why a comparative study of these two sites will help us to account for the issues and challenges in cultivating a more democratic and inclusive citizenship.
Despite the fact that it is not be possible to generalise the research findings due to the selective case study approach adopted, the findings can, nevertheless, be useful in providing insightful perspectives through which one can comprehend the larger picture of the society in question and thus provide the foundations for another, more expansive project with similar characteristics.

3.2 Data Collection

The data collected in this project is divided into two categories: primary and secondary data. This secondary data is collected from national and local libraries, university libraries, and archival resources under the relevant ministerial department such as Internal and Religious Ministerial Affairs Department. Regulations, articles, news, and academic briefing papers by experts published in books, reports, newspapers or journals were also used. The type of data gathered from these resources is mainly focused on the issue of citizenship (discursively or policy-wise) in Indonesian history, particularly from documents related to the issue of religious communities. Employing this document discursive analysis is very important in this research project since the discourse on citizenship is supposed to be part of the broader discourse on the nation-state itself.

The primary data is collected by employing two methods: interviews and participant observations. The interviews were semi-structured with guiding thematic questions asked in a systemic and consistent manner, whilst still allowing the interviewer to formulate and follow up questions beyond the given answers for the prepared questions or topics (Berg 2001, p. 71). The interviews were largely conducted one-on-one and ran for around one hour for each participant. The interviews were conducted in Indonesian and Javanese since almost all participants in the research speak one or both languages. The participants for this project were chosen through purposive sampling techniques. As the literature suggests, this method is used to ‘study a small subset of a larger population in which many members of the subset are easily identified’, however ‘the enumeration of them all would be nearly impossible’ (Babbie 2010, p. 193).

The sample was grouped into three categories: non-governmental organisation (NGO) activists, religious groups leaders or activists, and government representatives. The reasons for selecting participants from these three categories have to do with the fact that they are the ones who are actively contributing and disseminating public statements related to the topic of this research project. The contact between the researcher and the participants was facilitated by the
host institutions. Once a contact has been made the following arrangements was then organised by the researcher and the participants.

The total number of participants interviewed for this research project was 32, 16 each from each of the two sites of Yogyakarta and Surakarta.
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Most of the NGO activists interviewed in this research project have experienced or have been involved in several incidents related to the everyday practices of citizenship, which also involve different religious communities in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. The involvement of NGO activists varied, from dealing with violence, to mitigating conflict, to engaging in research and public campaigns on building tolerance and harmony in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Nearly all of the NGO activists interviewed for this project are connected through a network where they may work together, though they do not necessarily have the same opinion on how to characterise the existing problems and challenges they faced.

In contrast to the NGO activists, the participants from religious groups or community leaders interviewed in this project ranged from a variety of Muslim and non-Muslim groups. Some are seen as moderate, some vulnerable to persecution, and others have been associated with extremist views. Also, some are imams in mosques or leaders in local churches. This was to ensure that as many different perspectives as possible were engaged in this study, so as to obtain a more meaningful picture on what is happening in both research sites and, furthermore, how these are analysed and understood. The category of extremist views used here refers to ultra conservative/resactionary versions of Islamism, or political Islam. The terms Islamism and political Islam are typically used to refer to a certain view which tends to see Islam as not just a religion but also a political ideology in which the creation of Islamic state and the implementation of sharia are part of the ultimate political goal (Hasan 2006, p. 6). Hasan (2006, p. 6) notes that political Islam may manifest in different ways, where some might place more emphasis on ‘assertion of parochial identity to a fully blooded attempt’ to achieve the goals. Within this range of manifestations of political Islam, the term extremist or extremism used in this particular project refers to the view or activity in which violence in its various forms is frequently used to bring the ideals of political Islam into reality. The extremist activities may include intimidation, attacks or protests against any groups that are considered as opposing the proponents of this version of political Islam. On the other hand, the term moderate here is used to refer to the views or activities that tend to emphasize the moderate and tolerant values and are against violent actions. Moderate interpretations of Islam reject the obsession of extremists with establishing an Islamic state and calling for the full implementation of sharia.
From the government side, the participants in this research project are represented by the Ministry of Religious or the Ministry of Internal Affairs and institutions associated with the
government, such as FKUB (Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama, the Interreligious Harmony Communication Forum) or leaders from the sub-district local level. The local leader selected for this research project was involved in managing tolerance and conflict-related religious issues occurring within his local area. This was to understand on a micro-level how interactions between different religious communities take place and how these are perceived and navigated in everyday life.

There is an issue with the gender distribution regarding the interviewees. Most of the participants are heads of mass organisations, religious communities or religious-based organisations or are in charge of the issues related to the research project. Given that most of the leaders or holders of key positions within this mass organisations are male, it proved difficult to find female spokespeople and would be willing to be part of this project.
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Interviewees for this project were chosen purposively by considering the local socio-political context. In Yogyakarta, for example, the number of non-governmental organisations concerned with issues of pluralism, religious freedom or interfaith dialogue is higher compared to that of Surakarta. On the other hand, the number of laskar (religious paramilitary groups) that are actively involved in religious issues in Surakarta is higher than Yogyakarta. Consideration of contextual factors ensures that various voices from these groups are covered in this research project. Another example are representatives from vulnerable minority groups. In Yogyakarta, religious minority groups such as Ahmadiyah and Shia do exist and are widely known for their activity, particularly Ahmadiyah groups. In Surakarta, however, these two groups do not exist at all, or at least their numbers are so insignificant that their existence has never been an issue for the community. Apart from these issues, the number of participants from each category does not differ much. It is also noteworthy here that the representatives chosen in this research project have, in general, been involved in and experienced either as ‘an actor’, ‘a victim’ or ‘a mediator’ in conflict involving religious issues within communities.

The categorisation of interviews into these three groups aimed to reveal what gaps, if any, exist between what is written and what is practiced in terms of citizenship, as well as what has been understood by different groups from different communities regarding citizenship practices in the two research sites.
The second source for primary data will be participant observation, which was used to describe what goes on, who or what is involved, when and where things happen, how they occur and why - at least from the standpoint of the participants - things happen as they do in particular situation (Jorgensen 1989, p. 12).

By doing participant observation, the unique attributes of the two case studies were accurately described and captured. Moreover, these observations helped to bridge the gap between what has been said and what has been done or has happened in the actual daily interactions between the different communities. In this participant observation exercise, the researcher observed and participated in some activities conducted by religious and other communities, such as festivals, interreligious meetings, local level forums and so forth. The researcher took extensive field notes during this observation process.

3.3 Data Analysis

The collected data was organised and analysed systematically using discourse analysis. Discourse analysis as adopted in this study is used to examine ‘the social construction of meaning’ produced by discourse and the ‘implication of such social practices’ in real life (Tonkiss 2004, p. 380). Discourse may be defined as ‘a group of statements which provide a language for talking about - i.e. a way of representing - a particular kind of knowledge about a topic’ (Hall 1992, p. 290).

Discourse is not only about ‘language or speech’, but is ‘also the way language works to organise fields of knowledge and practice’ (Tonkiss 2004, p. 374). The way it organises the field of knowledge through discursive practices - ‘in which texts are produced (created) and consumed (received and interpreted)’ - need not be seen as mono-directional, where one practice determines the outcome of other practices (Jorgensen & Philips 2002, p. 61). Instead, it is dialectical in nature, within which the process of shaping and re-shaping the social world and cultural practices occur. Fairclough states that ‘it is partly through discursive practices in everyday life (processes of text production and consumption) that social and cultural reproduction and change take place’ (cited in Jorgensen & Philips 2002, p. 61). Discourse analysis then ‘challenges, interrogates taken-for-granted meanings, and disturbs easy claims to the objectivity....’ (Tonkiss 2004, p. 380) of any social and political discourse(s) that shape the real world.
Following Fairclough (1992), this study employs discourse analysis to examine three discursive sources: text, discursive practice, and social practice. Text here may refer to speech, writing, images or a combination of them. Discursive practices may be defined as ‘one dimension or moment of every social practices in a dialectical relationship with the other moments of a social practice’ (Jorgensen & Philips 2002, p. 18-19). Meanwhile, social practices may refer to any particular activities in social space. The relationship between discursive and social practices is dialectical, where both are reproduced and shape each other.

The materials analysed for this research project come from the audio-recorded interviews which were transcribed, corrected, and edited. Adding to this are the observation activities during the fieldwork that helped to contextualize the text with the actual practices in the field. The transcriptions are in Indonesian and Javanese, with sections later being translated into English. The transcriptions were provided to the participants to check and make amends in case of factual errors. Data was then coded thematically with reference to the theoretical framework used in this project. Employing discourse analysis helped in identifying the underlying structures of power and knowledge (in the form of verbal and/or written statements) that produce certain versions of citizenship in a particular time and space, as well as the way they work and affect the way people experience their lived social world. Within the discourse analysis, the data gathered from three different methods was treated as inter-textually linked, which made it possible to connect in a complementary manner the data from the two case studies.

Textual analysis was used to frame and categorise the secondary data (constitution, law, civic norms), to shed light on how certain interpretations and discourse affect the way the different communities understand the operative public values that navigate their citizenship practices. The thematic coding used in this research project is derived from notions of public operatives suggested by Parekh (2000). The aim of employing this particular method of analysis was to reveal the competing discourses that shape the conception of citizenship and its practices in the everyday lives of the communities in the research sites.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This section outlines the analysis of the data collected through the fieldwork undertaken in the two sites of Yogyakarta and Surakarta. The data collected for this research project is obtained through secondary sources such as documents and articles, and primary sources through individual interviews and field observation. Documents such as reports, news, articles appearing in journals, books and magazines were analysed in order to gain an understanding of local settings and also to further contextualise insights made by the participants. The in-depth interviews were guided by thematic questions that helped to navigate the discussion during the interview. The fieldwork observations and notes were used to shed further light on any claims or statements made during the interview. The collected data was categorised and further analysed based on the key themes emerging from the all interviews.

This chapter is divided into five parts. The first part briefly outlines the context of both research sites to get an initial understanding as to the kind of context that facilitates the exchange between different groups in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Following this is a section discussing the practices of citizenship in both cities. Rather than looking at citizenship as merely a legal construct, this research places greater emphasis on the social practices associated with citizenship. In doing so, it is possible to see the conflict and tensions between different communities by investigating their actions. The third section reveals the discursive construction that informs the practices of citizenship in this city. Unpacking this discursive construction helps understand the kind of logics or discourse that encourage different groups to commit certain actions toward other groups. The fourth part outlines critical observations from both cities regarding the practices of citizenship that might be instructive in cultivating a more inclusive and democratic citizenship. Following this is the conclusion of the chapter which highlights the differences and similarities between the two cities.
4.2 Research Sites: Contextual Analysis

4.2.1 Yogyakarta: A Short Context

In Indonesia, Yogyakarta is one among few regions (the other two are Jakarta and Aceh) to earn a special status of regional autonomy and is among the first regions to recognise the declaration of Indonesian independence in 1945. Soon after the declaration, the Sultan of Yogyakarta of the time sent a letter to support this independence and recognising the political authority of the national government of Indonesia. It was also stated in the letter that Yogyakarta would be part of this new modern state, despite the fact that at that time, Yogyakarta was a powerful monarchy. Soon after that, Yogyakarta played an important role in stabilising the newly born nation-state. It served as the capital of Indonesia during the turbulent early years of independence in which both Jakarta and Bandung, two other important cities that house the national movement, were defeated by the Dutch. In the later years, Yogyakarta was also known as a site of cultural and political movements which played important roles in the democratisation process in Indonesia.

Historically, Yogyakarta was known as a place where national movements, particularly those focused on education, found their roots. It is in this city that one of the biggest mass organisations, Muhammadiyah, was established by Ahmad Dahlan in 1912. Adopting an Islamic Modernist approach to Islamic teaching, this organisation became known since its inception, particularly among young Muslims, for its educational initiatives and creating educational institutions in many places. Along with Muhammadiyah, another historical educational movement started in this city. Perguruan Tamas Siswa was initiated in 1922 by Ki Hajar Dewantoro, a well-known figure in Indonesian education and respected in national movements. Yogyakarta is currently the home of around 40 accredited universities, both private and government owned, earning it the label of a City of Students - Kota Pelajar.

This city embraces and celebrates different traditions, thus serving as ‘a meeting point’ for a range of diverse cultures. In this city, different traditions live side by side, from Javanese traditional beliefs (kejawen), abangan (nominal religious groups) to militant religious ones. Art and cultural performances have also proliferated here, with their leading figures such as Umar Khayam and Emha Ainun Najib, to name just a few (Subkhan 2007). In terms of the relationship between different religious communities, Yogyakarta has been recognised as a place which first initiated interfaith dialogue, or at least planted its seeds. In 1970s, Mukti Ali, a leading figure of interfaith dialogue in Indonesia, organised students group discussions, Limited Groups, that focused on a more inclusive and liberal interpretation of religious teachings. In 1990s, several
new institutions that ‘inherited’ this legacy were established, with LKiS (Lembaga Kajian Islam dan Sosial, Institute for Social and Islamic Studies) is being among the more notable. In terms of interfaith dialogue, DIAN Interfidei (Institut Dialog Antariman di Indonesia, Institute for Interfaith Dialogue in Indonesia) was established in 1992 by Christian and Muslim activists who shared a vision of tolerance among different religious groups and dialogue as the key to nurture a peaceful relationship between different groups (Subkhan 2007).

During the 1998 social and political movement, where many cities in Java were destroyed by mobs and riots (including Surakarta, which was severely damaged, Yogyakarta remained unscathed despite it being one of the cities that facilitated student movements against the New Order regime (Aspinall 1999). Furthermore, during the rally on May 20 1998 with half a million participated, Yogyakarta remained under control and ‘not a single shop window was broken, and not a single person was injured’ (Mas’oed, Panggabean & Azca 2001). It is believed that part of the reason for this is the effective leadership of the Palace. Within Javanese tradition, the Sultan of the Palace has a mandate to maintain balance between the different groups in his territory. Furthermore, the foundation for a more inclusive identity was laid by the palace in the 1940s, from Yogyakarta-based to Indonesia, one when the Palace recognised the authority of the modern nation of Indonesia.

After the New Order regime collapsed, the social-cultural-political situation changed dramatically throughout the country. The resurgence of political identity, particularly in the name of religion, proliferated in many areas across the archipelago. In Yogyakarta, a number of militia bearing the title laskar were established such as Laskar Jihad (Jihad Paramilitary Group) and Laskar Mujahidin Indonesia (Indonesian Mujahidin Paramilitary Group). These groups shared similar agendas calling for jihad in Maluku at that time (due to the conflict perceived by these groups as religious conflict between Muslims and Christians) to demanding a full implementation of sharia. With the latter demand, violent actions were committed by these groups by attacking places considered as facilitating sinful actions such as hotels, cafes, etc (Hasan 2006, p. 16-19).

At the government level, the introduction of the legislation on regional autonomy, Law No. 22/1999, has impacted the political landscape of Yogyakarta, particularly regarding the election process for local leaders. It had been a normal political occurrence that the governor and vice governor of Yogyakarta are automatically appointed by the Sultan and Paku Alam respectively, and this has been perceived by the people of Yogyakarta as part of the reason as to why Yogyakarta is a ‘special’ (istimewa) region. Ahnaf and Salim (2017, p. 31-37) argue that this new policy has instigated the protest movement among the people. Some supported this new
policy while others, see this as threatening the special position of Yogyakarta. The latter believe that the relationship between different communities in Yogyakarta being characterized by the social harmony is partly due to this special political privilege of the political leader being appointed rather than elected. Furthermore, they believe that an election would only lead to instability.

The debate over this political mechanism and how people view this special position has diverted the attention of the local leaders from the real problems faced by the people. Complicating this issue is the internal conflict within the palace over the succession plans, the rapid investment in Yogyakarta and problems related to land legal status, particularly the ones related to the palace. These all have contributed to what Ahnaf and Salim (2017) called the crises of this unique city (krisis keistimewaan).

One of the problems arising from this crises is the several intolerant actions that occurred in many places in Yogyakarta, particularly related to religious blasphemy allegations associated with vulnerable religious groups such as Shia and Ahmadiyah, and worship places, with the issue of Churches and their building permits. A report by the Wahid Institute in 2014 ranks Yogyakarta as the second most intolerant major city in Indonesia, an alarming result that surprised many. Another survey by Setara Institute has confirmed this changing situation regarding the interaction between different communities in Yogyakarta. The Setara Institute conducted surveys in 2015 and 2017 and produced an index of tolerant cities (Indeks Kota Toleran) by using four variables to determine the level of the tolerance: favouritism (whether the local government treat certain groups better over others), local regulation, social regulation, and the proportion of the population. In its survey in 2015, Yogyakarta was ranked 62 among 94 surveyed cities while two years later, in 2017, Yogyakarta was ranked 89, making one of the top ten least tolerant cities in Indonesia.

4.2.2 Surakarta: A Short Context

Compared to Yogyakarta, Surakarta, as noted in the previous chapter, has been characterised as a city with ‘a short fuse’. Though this characterisation is rejected by the people of Solo (Wong Solo), it has some historical justification in the history of conflict and violence that occurred repeatedly there. Mulyadi et al. (1999) recalled that, up until 1998, violent conflict was recorded eleven times in this city, seven of which related to the Chinese community. The
The repeated violence that occurred in Solo signals that the tension between different groups has a deep and long history. The emergence of political parties and civil society organisations such as Sarikat Islam (1912), for example, was initially intended as a response to the struggle between those who fought for economic and political interests in Solo (Mulyadi et al. 1999). Due to dissatisfaction with the authoritarianism exhibited by the colonial power and the Palace, a radical movement at the grass-roots level grew rapidly between 1918 and 1922. In 1920, under the leadership of Misbach and Tjipto Mangunkusumo, two national leaders, this movement gained momentum. In the period of 1922 to 1927, this popular movement gave birth to a prominent communist movement in Surakarta. Furthermore, the rise of national awareness movement took down the colonial power and the Palace. Since then, the authority of the Palace has lost its place among the people and the new national modern bureaucracy laid its foundations after that.

The collapse of the New Order regime and the May 1998 riots that accompanied it caused severe damage to the heart of the socio-cultural fabric of Solo, leading to new dynamics at the grass-roots level. Furthermore, the chaotic situation at the time and the weak performance of the state to maintain stability led to uncertainty. Violent conflict with strong religious dimensions occurred in many areas across Indonesia. The feeling of being victims, the solidarity among Muslims and the need to protect Muslim society led to the emergence of laskar (paramilitary groups). The laskar groups proliferated in many areas and Surakarta is no exception. It was during this period that many laskar groups were founded. Joni, one of the laskar senior leaders from LUIS (Laskar Umat Islam Surakarta, Surakarta Islamic Paramilitary Group), said that a laskar functions ‘to help security... so that we would not get overwhelmed by circumstances (kecolongan) [such as] the riots in 1998 and 1999...’ Furthermore, Salim, a youth
religious and *laskar* leader from Ngruki *pesantren* (traditional Islamic boarding school), noted that the communism and Christianity grew rapidly in Solo:

*we do not have any other choices rather that waking up the awareness of Muslim people... we do not want to wait until it becomes a case like Bosnia... like Myanmar...we do not do brutal things... attacking...but [we] stay alert...*

While the number of *laskar* groups in Surakarta reaches around 40, this does not necessarily mean that this is evidence of Surakarta being Islamised. The majority of Solonese are abangan (nominal Muslims, syncretistic) (Wildan 2013) despite the fact that the Islamic preaching organized by the mass organisations, NU and Muhammadiyah, has been there for a long time. There are also a number of majlis taklim and pesantren (council of Islamic teachings) such as MTA (*Majlis Tafsir Al-Qur’an*, the Council of Quranic Exegesis), jamaah Gumuk and Ngruki *pesantren*. MTA has been growing rapidly and has numerous branch across Indonesia. Yet, MTA does not demand explicitly the implementation of shariah since they believe that this demand would slowly emerge from the bottom up once people start getting a better understanding of Islam (Wildan 2013, p. 204).

Furthermore, the al-Mukmin pesantren in Ngruki has gained much attention due to its two key leaders, Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Ba’asyir. These two key figures who had been known as very critical to the New Order regime and are often associated with the resurgence of radical and terrorist groups in Indonesia. Founded in 1970s, The Ngruki *pesantren* aims to preach and develop Islam in Solo in a more rigorous way. Due to the dissatisfaction with the New Order regime, these two important figures had involved in the underground movement, NII (*Negara Islam Indonesia*, Indonesian Islamic State). The two were arrested and jailed before fleeing to Malaysia in 1985. While their influence was temporarily subsiding, they managed to regain influence. This was especially the case with Abu Bakar Ba’asyir after the collapse of the New Order regime, as Abdullah Sungkar died in 1999 (Wildan 2013, p. 195-201).

The emergence of these *laskar* groups can also be seen as an anomaly. In May 1998, violent riots occurred in Surakarta while other large cities nearby, such as Semarang and Yogyakarta, were relatively under control. Regarding this *laskar* and anomaly, Dendi, a senior LPLAG (*Lembaga Perdamaian Lintas Agama dan Golongan*, Peace Institution Across Religion and Groups) activist, said that ‘*the peak of anomaly is the emergence of something like that [laskar]...that is difficult to understand, [it is] breaking the law, anarchic...’ The growing numbers of *laskar* groups in Solo represent different Muslim communities and different demands from implementation of Sharia to eradicating sinful actions (maksiat). With this phenomenon and
adding to it is the growing power of communism and Christian groups in Surakarta; it does not seem hyperbolic to say that Surakarta may be an ideological battlefield in coming years, as Salim perceived it. Furthermore, after the Bali bombings (2002), Surakarta has also been reported as a breeding place for terrorism, particularly via the Ngruki network. This discourse portrays Surakarta as a ticking time-bomb that might explode at any time.

The emergence of Joko Widodo (Jokowi) as city mayor of Surakarta in 2005 has been considered as paving a way to revitalize Solo after the 1998 incident. The new government of Surakarta had been challenged to deal with the basic issues such as providing basic welfare, housing, health, education, infrastructure, etc. Masudi (2017) notes that Jokowi has been seen capable in delivering the demands of public due to his style of governance that he gained popular support among the people. As mayor of Solo (2005-2012) Joko Widodo as the city mayor) is widely seen to have successfully mended the social fissures in this city.

Notwithstanding these violent episodes in the past, Solo has remained relatively peaceful during the post-Suharto Reformasi Era, though this does not necessarily mean that no conflict at all happened after the 1998 period. Nevertheless, in general terms, no further notable violent conflicts on a large scale occurred after the May 1998 riots. This reality is reflected in the recent surveys conducted by the Setara Institute in 2015 and 2017 respectively. In its survey in 2015, Surakarta ranked 13 among 94 cities surveyed in Indonesia. Two years later, Surakarta was ranked amongst the top ten most tolerant cities in Indonesia.
4.3 Citizenship Practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta

4.3.1 Introduction

This section discusses the dynamics of citizenship policies and practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta as the participants of this research project perceive them. The presentation of the discussion on this section begins with an overview of citizenship policies and practices in both cities in order to get a general understanding of what is happening in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. As the surveys by Setara Institute suggest, Yogyakarta, which until recently was praised as a 'city of tolerance', is currently ranking toward the bottom of the tolerance index, while on the other hand, Surakarta, famous for its reputation as a ‘short fused’ city, is currently sitting in the top ten most tolerant. Whilst this survey provides a valuable information for this project, this section investigates sociologically the current situation regarding the interaction between different communities and, in the cases of Yogyakarta and Surakarta, what can be gleaned from these interactions. This discussion is then followed by an analysis of how citizenship practices are performed in these two cities outlining any signs of tension, conflict, and contestation.

4.3.2 Citizenship Practices in Yogyakarta: An Overview

A key finding from the interviews conducted with study participants relates to significant changes taking place in Yogyakarta in recent years regarding the relationships between religious communities. Reports and surveys from institutions and non-governmental organisations concerned with the issue of pluralism, democracy, and religious freedom have already indicated this trend. However, this change is perceived differently by different participants in this study. Those who are associated with the government still believe that Yogyakarta is conducive to religious life and tend to deny reports to the contrary. Jufri, a member of FKUB Yogyakarta, for example, said that ‘the report by Wahid Institute is inaccurate’. Indeed, ‘members of religious community can practice their religious teachings’, argued Fahmi, an officer of Ministry of Religious Affair, Yogyakarta. This is particularly the case when members of minority groups follow the rules of the law such as fulfilling the ‘procedural’ requirements regarding places of worship. Furthermore, Fahmi claimed that strict religious issues do not cause conflicts; rather, other factors such as social relations do.

Yet, those from non-governmental organisations, minority religious groups and mainstream mass organisation such as NU (Nahdlatul Ulama) and Muhammadiyah acknowledge that there has been a substantial increase in numbers of intolerant actions committed by certain
religious groups against others in this city and that this is far from encouraging. A member of a minority religious group, Salman, the leader of Raushan Fikr, expressed his concern: ‘I just do not feel comfortable...it is much harder [to believe] because this is happened in a city that is claimed to be tolerant’. Indeed, Yogyakarta was declared a tolerant city in 2006, but the current situation suggests something different. A network created by non-governmental organisations in Yogyakarta once declared Yogyakarta as a city with a ‘violence emergency’ (darurat kekerasan) in 2013 due to the increasing number of violent incidents related to religious, social, political and economic factors. Bagus, a youth activist from Gusdurian Network, said that in a three to four years period, around twenty cases of violence occurred and there is no plan from the state apparatus to address these problems.

There are many factors that contribute to these continuing actions of intolerance in Yogyakarta. One that is emphasised by the participants is the weak performance of the state apparatus to enforce the law in many cases. Instead of preventing the violent actions occurring or taking those who break the law to the court process, for example, the police tend to stay passive. Mahmud, a youth activist from LKiS, recalled his friend being punched in front of the police office due to his comment in the media where he regretted the objection by hardliner groups to the plan to organise Easter celebrations in a public area. Due to this statement, he was being threatened and chased out by the groups. Mahmud further stated that ‘he was identified and chased whilst in traffic, he then run to the police office there’. Instead of obtaining protection he was punched. Indeed, and even when ‘he was bleeding, the police did nothing’ to protect him.

Regarding this passive response by local security agencies, Feni, a senior activist from DIAN Interfidei, shared the story of when she came to the police and asked what could be done to progress investigations into the violence cases. The police answered that once the actors were clearly identified, the cases could be taken further. She then questioned the police action, citing a violent episode experienced by members of a certain church who were performing a religious ritual in one of its member’s house and were attacked by a group of people. During the incident, this member was injured, part of the house was destroyed and the ‘perpetrators’ and the police were there. She asked why the police did not take down ‘the perpetrators’, and the police responded that they were afraid of being accused of violating human rights: ‘This is [the response from] wakapolda [Wakil Kepala Kepolisian Daerah, Vice Head of Police Department at province level], if this is his logic, how can you imagine things are going to improve?’, Feni said in disbelief.
Passive responses by the authorities are, partly due to confusion in how to differentiate between exercising rights and breaking the law. Since none of the perpetrators was being investigated further, Bagus said that that kind of action is potentially not seen as a problem. Mahmud argued that ‘this weakness of law enforcement made them [the hardliner groups] feel arrogant (jumawa), [made them] feel that their actions are right’. The hardliner groups indeed exploit this absence of law enforcement. Idris, one of the leaders of the hardliner groups, said that it is the government who breaks the law since they do not perform their duty, for example to stop rituals in a place where it is not allowed. He argued further:

*If the government is not upholding the law, should we uphold it? Our position is the same, breaking the law... if they are informed [about a certain case] and they do not take any actions, we will act.*

This statement suggests how breaking the law is now normalised, and how the authority that should enforce the law is being undermined.

In addition to the weak performance of the state to uphold the law, the authority of the palace is also diminishing and is coming into question due to its slow response in the face of violent actions. Unlike Surakarta where the palace has lost its place among the people, the palace of Yogyakarta has a strong foundation in society. This can be seen, for example, in the 2009 massive protest organised by different groups in the city in response to the plans of the national government to choose the governor of Yogyakarta via election. Unlike other provinces, the Sultan of Yogyakarta is automatically appointed as the governor of the province. Plans for the election of the governor are opposed by many for fear that it will change the special status of Yogyakarta, as well as the position of Sultan among the people. For most Yogyakarta people, the special character of the city and the status of the palace is deeply rooted in history and consequently, they will defend it at any cost. The national government plan was abandoned, as did the protest.

For Yogyakarta people, the Sultan is seen not only as a political leader but also a cultural-spiritual leader. With this status, the Sultan possesses a powerful authority where his words will be listened to. However, the current situation has contributed to the authority of the Sultan being diminished in the eyes of the people and this leads to confusion over the extent of the authority of the Sultan. In response to the recurring violent actions in Yogyakarta, the Sultan issued statements condemning violence but no further serious actions were undertaken. Mahmud said that
Jogja [a nickname of Yogyakarta] people listen more to the Sultan. That is why I said that this is a chance to suppress the intolerant actions in Jogja. But I do not know why Sultan did not seize this opportunity.

Instead, when the violence in Yogyakarta led the NGO network in this city to declare it as at violence emergency level (darurat kekerasan) in 2013, it was clearly denied by the palace since they believed that it was not the case. The Queen of the Palace argued that emergency status refers to people not feeling safe when they go out; ‘indeed it is not safe, when we talk about pluralism, tolerance, etc., we do not feel safe’, Mahmud commented in response to the Queen’s statement. Here lies the tension of how tolerance and violence are understood and practiced between the NGOs activists who made the declaration and the authority (in the form of the palace or government).

As a cultural-spiritual leader, the Sultan of Yogyakarta holds the title of Sayyidin Panatagama Khalifatullah, a title in Javanese tradition that suggests the Sultan or the King is not only the ‘secular’ leader, but also the ‘religious’ one. Maman, an activist from NU, said that sayyid means the leader...panatagama [means] maintain religious life...maintain Java as something balanced but dynamic...khalifatullah. This is a spiritual concept, the integrity concept of the Sultan...the Sultan has a role to maintain the balance.

With this title, it is the task of the Sultan to maintain religious life in Yogyakarta but what happened in the last couple of years suggests that the balance has gone. This is because, as Maman argued further, the Sultan

does not care about the feelings of the people...he prefers thinking about business...economy...investments in Jogja ... [even] to stand against his own people...in Kulon Progo, and everywhere. There is no mercy feeling...

With this kind of position, whether the Sultan still holds the cultural authority, and whether his words can be listened to and expected to reduce the violence, remains in question. Rahmat, one of mass organisation leaders, argued that ‘if now there were a survey, the level of trust in the Sultan among Jogja people would be shown to have dramatically decreased’.

Another environmental factor that affects citizenship practices in Yogyakarta is the lack of formal social spaces due to rapid economic developments within the city. The current high level of investment in Yogyakarta has been identified by the participants as one of the factors that has led to the current uncomfortable situation in this city of learners. This significant investment can be seen, for example, in the number of hotels that are being planned and developed. Rahmat, an activist from Muhammadiyah, said that ‘...as of early January 2016, there will be 37 hotels with three to five stars in Jogja...and all have obtained permission [to be built] already’. The number
of hotels in Yogyakarta indeed increased gradually reaching 401 in 2013 (Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 2013) and 580 in 2018 (Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 2018).

This significant investment has several consequences. For example, these new buildings do require a lot of water and this has led to several protests such as the Jogja Asat (Jogja is dry) movement, due to water shortages experienced by local people. Furthermore, the investment has changed the landscape of the city. As the participants noted, while the rapid investment has attracted a lot of people, the social spaces where people of different backgrounds meet and intermingle no longer exist.

The availability of social spaces is seen as very important and plays a significant role in facilitating public discussion among different groups. There used to be this kind of space in Yogyakarta such as public squares (alun-alun), but Rahmat argued that

...there is alun-alun, but they do not want to go there. They tend to go to the cafe, but not everybody come to the cafe. The topic discussed is also limited...so, the issue of ethnic, religion, become serious issue in Yogyakarta... pesantren is attacked, the church is attacked...

Indeed, this rapid development has opened new spaces such as malls and cafes, but few people come there, particularly wong Jogja (people of Yogyakarta) who are mainly poor and have limited education. The rapid investment has, by and large, led to the marginalisation of these people, a concern noted by Rizal, an activist and researcher at Gajah Mada University, who stated that ‘these marginalized people then are being welcome by GPK [Gerakan Pemuda Ka’bah, Ka’bah Youth Movement, a paramilitary organization]. This new solidarity emerged in this new social religious group’. These kinds of groups might not be the only ones where marginalised groups can find their new place. Indeed, religion has become a new glue for these groups. With the absence of social public space, Rahmat said that ‘the one that can bind [people] together is religion, apart from ethnic...but in Jogja, mostly religion’. This is part of the reason the construction of places of worship and Christmas celebrations, for example, become a significant issue in Yogyakarta.

In addition to the absence of these social spaces there is also a lack of a shared common agenda among different groups in Yogyakarta. This city has been known as a place where many different groups – be they in the name of religion, tradition, or ideology – coexist. Many forums and discussions are regularly held in this city. However, most of those who come to these forums have similar perspectives. Forums or activities where different groups with very different
perspectives interact with each other are very limited. Furthermore, since attendance to these forums or activities is voluntary, there is a question over the continuity of these practices. This kind of situation, by and large, has affected the way citizenship is being exercised in Yogyakarta.

The section below discusses the citizenship practices in this city that are affected by conflict and tensions which sometimes lead to violent actions.

4.3.2.1 Procedural Requirements vs Basic Rights

One of the features of citizenship practices in Yogyakarta is coloured with tension between procedural administrative issue and exercising basic rights. This can be seen from the conflict over places of worship that affect the relationship between Christian and Muslim communities in Yogyakarta. One of the cases that received public attention is the attack on the Christian community of Jemaat Santo Franciscus Agung Banteng Church while they were praying the Rosary performing Rosario religious ritual in a member’s house in Sukoharjo, Ngaglik, Yogyakarta in 2014. The attackers were a group of people in long tunics [gamins], which are normally worn by Muslim groups. The owner of the house, Julius Felicianus, was informed about this attack, so he went back home from his office. Once he arrived, these groups attacked him too, causing him to be hospitalised. On this issue, instead of condemning this action, the head of the Indonesian police at that time told the people not to use the house for worship because it is against the regulation and might instigate a similar attack. This statement was strongly criticised by many groups, such as PGI (Persekutuan Gereja-Gereja Indonesia, the Communion of Indonesian Churches). PGI believes that performing religious obligation is the right of every person and is guaranteed by constitution.

Indeed, one of the main issues regarding these places of worship is the need to comply with procedural requirements. Since the joint regulation No. 9 2006 and No. 8 2006 on guidance for government at district level on managing religious harmony and functioning inter-religious forum and places of worship issued by the Ministry of Religious and Internal Affairs, the number of intolerant and violent actions increased in Yogyakarta. On this, Supono, a member of FKUB from Catholics group, admitted that ‘indeed, the problems have emerged due to the new regulations...the new regulation is being key of entrance to problematize the churches’. Supono said that there are many churches in Yogyakarta that have not yet received building permits. Due to this, he argued that ‘[these churches] are vulnerable to being questioned...the churches have been used as worship places, but they do not have the building permits’.
On this procedural issue, Fahmi, an officer from the Ministry of Religious Affairs Yogyakarta said that cases related to places of worship are mainly due to the procedural reasons, but in some cases the issues were more related to relations between the different communities in the area. This argument suggests that the problem related to places of worship is more than procedural. Supono recounted that, when he once asked his Muslim friends about the objections held by Muslim groups vis-à-vis other religious communities building worship places, the answer he received was that ‘the reason is worry. If there is a place of worship, there might be Muslims who will convert to other religions’. Supono did not oppose this reason, but said this is not always the case. He argued

> if they want to be fair, to check the places of worship that have not get the permits, there are many mosques that haven’t got the permits. But I do not problematize this. I like seeing people performing worship. Because the law guarantee for every person to perform religious obligation.

This argument suggests that there is a tension between the procedural requirement and the more substantive issue of the right to perform religious rituals that is guaranteed by the constitution. Furthermore, this procedural aspect may lead to a violation and denial of basic rights, such as the Jemaat Santo Franciscus Agung Banteng Church attack. While this has never been the intention of this regulation, the tension between these two are likely to keep simmering, considering the number of churches in Yogyakarta that have not yet received building permits. This will be one of the main challenges for nurturing a more inclusive and democratic citizenship in Yogyakarta.

### 4.3.2.2 Religious Teachings vs Basic Rights

Another feature that is notable regarding the practice of citizenship in Yogyakarta is the unresolved tensions between performing religious obligations and respecting others’ basic rights. The example here is the intimidation toward Raushan Fikr, an institution associated with the Shia community in Yogyakarta, by certain orthodox Muslim groups. The first intimidation took place in 2013, and two years later the same group committed another action. Idris, one of the leaders of FJI (Front Jihad Islam, Islamic Jihad Front) believes that Shia community members practice heresy. As he believes that Raushan Fikr is part of this community, he initiated an action to stop their activity. Idris said that ‘two years ago, they were asked to stop their activities’. Before 2013, some activities were organised by Raushan Fikr such as public discussions and ceremonies commemorating ashura. Due to the intimidation, these activities stopped, but discussions by students on Islamic teachings critical of such practices still continue.
Due to this activity, *Raushan Fikr* was accused of breaking the agreement in 2013 with the incidents of 2015 being viewed as a response to this. For Idris, the 2013 agreement was intended to stop all the activities of *Raushan Fikr*, but

it still continues ...MUSPIKA [Musyawarah Pimpinan Kecamatan, the Consultation Forum of Leaders at the lower level district under municipality] stay quiet... the camat [the head of lower level district under municipality], local police (polres) [too]...from [Raushan Fikr] breaking the agreement two years ago...that is their fault ... in other words, I said the government is stupid.

The small discussion activity on Islamic philosophy for Idris and his group is part of a brainwashing process. He further stated that ‘it is definitely ...to brainwash people ...with ideology and philosophy... we understand it clearly. One of the ways to get new followers’. Since he believes that Shia is heresy, he concludes that ‘if we know their wrongs, and we do not take any actions to save those who do not know... then we are in the wrong’.

In response to this intimidation, Salman, the leader of *Raushan Fikr*, believed he had done nothing wrong. He argued that ‘...here is a place of for learning...those who come here are not only Shia, [but also] Sunni, Christians’...’. He admitted that he himself is Shi‘i but his approach to Shia is rather different. He said that ‘...my approach to Shia is philosophy and tasawwuf [Islamic spirituality], not in theology...not in kalam...the debate of Sunni-Shia...to me, it is political’. Furthermore, during his stay in this area, he never acted in an exclusive way, saying, ‘from the start, I do not want to be exclusive...having our own mosque ... having our own mannerism, our own clothes...’. He and his community have been actively engaged in the societal activities. Furthermore, he believes that he does not practice religious blasphemy and does not understand the reasons that force them to stop their activities: ‘indeed, there are bad people in Shi‘i... [but there are bad people] in other groups too’, he added.

This case shows how practicing religious teachings as a particular group perceives it can undermine another group’s basic rights. In this case, Salman and his community have the right to organise public events and group discussions, since the constitution guarantees this. Differing from the case with the Ahmadiyah group, there is no regulation that prohibits Shi‘a to perform their activities. Even so, Salman claimed that his place and activities are open to the public, not exclusively for Shia. He himself does not represent the Shia community in any forum since there are others who are better suited to representing them, such as IJABI (Ikatan Jamaah Ahlul Bait Indonesia, Association of Indonesian Ahlul bait Group). He stated that he and his community will continue their discussion activities since it is not against the law and they do not disturb society. He and his community always inform the local leader whenever they organise activities.
Such decisions might invite intimidation in the future, particularly from groups that believe that they are practicing heresy and should therefore be banned.

4.3.2.3 Shared Common Interests Vs Indifferent Citizenship

An important feature of citizenship practices relates to those indifferent actions towards the rights of minorities. As stated earlier, the number of intolerant actions has increased in Yogyakarta. However, instead of getting further attention from the wider public, the concern remains mainly of the domain of the NGO activists or religious mass organisations such as NU and Muhammadiyah. The case of attacks on LKiS when they organised a discussion forum is an example of this. The speaker for the discussion was Irshad Manji, a controversial figure due to her extreme views on Islam and her sexual orientation. During the discussion, many participants were attacked. Mahmud, an activits from LKiS, recalled these events, saying ‘a lot of people know the case of Irshad Manji. It happened here, the glasses of the library cabinets were broken, there was a discussant that was brought to the hospital’. Despite the videos and photos available as evidence for prosecuting those who committed the violence, there has been no progress on that case.

While being related to the issue of weak law enforcement, what is highlighted here is the response of people in surrounding areas who tended to remain passive. Mahmud stated that ‘they [local people] do not take direct action against this violence because [they believe that] this is not their problem.’ This is different from how local people initiated a protest against the developers and builders of many hotels in Yogyakarta because of its impact on water services. Because of their concerns that the water might run out, they took initiatives to claim their rights as citizens. However, with the case of violence against minority groups, Mahmud said that ‘the issue of tolerance is not directly related to the public’. On this Rizal said that ‘...the language of tolerance, interfaith dialogue is segmented, not all of the people really connect to these languages.’ Therefore, tolerance, religious harmony or interfaith dialogue have not been a shared common agenda, not only for civic associations such as the sepeda onthel community (a biker community), but also for many other people.

In many cases this indifference is due to the absence of common interests. As argued earlier, the rapid expansion has led to the absence of social spaces in which people from different groups can interact with each other. The topic discussed is limited too and thus a shared common interest is difficult to achieve. Regarding the LKiS phenomenon, Rahmat argued that many offices in Yogyakarta are not managed by local people. There is a limited local involvement in
activities organised by these offices: ‘this makes the emotional bond [between local people and those work in the office] not close ... there is distance’, he argued. This distance not only separates them in terms of social relation, but also on issues that need to be shared concerns: ‘Actually, if they can make a close [relationship] to the local people such as [employing them as] the security guy at night, the waiter (those who prepare a drink), the office boy’ – he continued – the story might be different, but ‘this rarely happened’. Part of the reason is that for some NGO activists, these kinds of jobs require them to possess some qualifications such as speaking other languages - qualifications that are difficult for local people to obtain.

Cultivating an inclusive and more democratic citizenship requires a shared common understanding of local agendas across different groups. This common understanding could be achieved when the parties share common interests. Without this, cultivating citizenship will be only a concern for some groups, but not for others. The issue of indifference, intolerant actions and the languages used to overcome such problems has not reached a point in which wider public audiences have developed clear awareness.

4.3.3 Citizenship Practices in Surakarta: An Overview

Unlike the case in Yogyakarta, the relationship between religious communities in Surakarta, as the participants attest, is generally good. This does not necessarily mean that there is no conflict or tension between religious communities in this city, as will be elaborated upon in the next section, but it does not generally result in violence and widespread conflict. Surakarta has been recognised by the participants as a city with different ideologies of living side by side, from ‘red’ to ‘green’, from ‘left’ to ‘right’. As the history records show, Surakarta has been a central area where different ideologies can proliferate. There is no single dominant ideology, a fact that makes Surakarta a city where contestation over ideology occurs on a regular basis. On this, Muslih, a researcher and activist from Muhammadiyah, stated that whenever a strong group emerges, other groups will counter it. He said ‘so, there will be the ones that encounter them [the emerging strong group] ...if they have strong preman (thugs)...there might be strong laskar too’.

This contestation is further noted by Salim as something that could potentially lead Solo into the arena of an ‘ideological battlefield’ in the future. He stated that ‘maybe, Solo would be an ideological battlefield, which is serious’. Furthermore, he mentioned:

I see each of this ideological power has prepared [themselves]...Christian groups have laskar...called Kristus...they practice with soft guns...like warfare...and it
seems Chinese people have supported this...those involved are the youth at senior high school level...it seems this is a long term project.

While this seems to be a matter of finding to make this ideological battlefield turn into a real battle, a more optimistic view of the future Solo was articulated by Lukman, a leader of NU. He believed that currently Solo no longer has a fuse ‘because there is no fuse, thanks God, every ideologies and school of thoughts exist in Solo’.

The current interaction between different religious communities in Surakarta is relatively peaceful and, as the participants note, is due to several factors. The performance of the government and its apparatus, such as police, is one such factor. The rise of Joko Widodo first as mayor of Surakarta, then governor of Jakarta and then finally as president, along with the role of FX Rudyatmo as the mayor of Solo since late 2005, has brought more prosperity to the people of Solo after the social and economic turbulence following the crisis and riot in 1998. Joko Widodo and his vice city mayor have successfully tackled the problems and raised the living standards of the community, making it possible for him to change the perception of Solo. This legacy has been further progressed by FX Rudyatmo who replaced Joko Widodo’s position when he left in 2012 to run in the Jakarta governor election.

In terms of the state apparatus such as the police force, their performance has been rated by the participants as generally good and responsive. Melati, a priest and a leader of Church, said that the police have successfully accommodated and mitigated possibilities of conflict before they eventuated. Lukman added that any violence and anarchic actions are not tolerated, regardless of their religious or socio-political affiliation. Furthermore, the head of the police in Solo does builds strong connections at grass-roots level and talks to the people more directly. Lukman said that ‘what is so clever about him is he is getting close to the society (memasyarakat), he comes to their centres, talks, eats, goes outside, etc. He comes to all different groups [to talk]’.

One of the features of leadership in Solo after the New Order collapsed is what Hefner (2000) calls ‘pluricentrism’, whereby no single dominant authority exists, but rather, the authority is spread across different ‘centres’. Regarding this pluricentrism, Dendi said that ‘the centre is not single...but centres’. The ability of leaders of different groups to control their people have played an important role in keeping Solo calm. On this matter, Muslih said that ‘the leaders of the groups can still control [their people]...so, whenever there is tension, it does not continue [to turn into a big scale] ...I think it is important’. Despite its controversial nature, and because of its informal relationship with some leaders of MUI (Majelis Ulama Indonesia, Indonesian Council of Ulama) Surakarta, DSKS (Dewan Syariah Kota Surakarta, Shariah Council of the City of
Surakarta) is aimed partly at controlling the movement of laskar groups: ‘the point [of the DSKS establishment] is to discipline them’, Salim said. This is due to the fact that some laskar groups tend to use violence to solve the conflict. Adding to this are the formal and informal meetings between the leaders of different groups, be they facilitated by the government or initiated by themselves. These meetings play an important role in bringing the conflict to the negotiation table.

Another factor that prevents Solo from ‘exploding’ is the sense of belonging among the people of Solo (Wong Solo) that is growing stronger. This local identity of Wong Solo brings a strong sense of belonging and instils a responsibility to protect Solo from destruction. The experience of conflict and violence, particularly the one in 1998 that led to the damage to hundreds of offices and public facilities, has led to a new awareness among the Solonese. This awareness makes Wong Sala reluctant to see their houses destroyed and has, therefore, been highlighted by many participants from different groups as the reason for the relative social peace. Melati noted this awareness has been growing stronger, saying: ‘I have been here for 10 years...I feel the sense of belonging to Solo has increased. And this makes people reluctant to see their city being destroyed by certain groups of people’. Muslih stated that it is not easy to provoke Wong Solo since they love Solo and will safeguard it from falling once again into violent conflict.

As mentioned earlier, however, the strong performance of the government, the state apparatus and the leaders of different groups as well as the strong sense of identity of being Wong Sala do not mean that there is no tension and conflict between different groups in this city. However, these tensions do not escalate into deeper violent conflict. However, it is important to note here the contestation over claiming rights, performing religious obligations and upholding regulation which have coloured the interaction between different groups in this city, particularly between those who claim to be the majority and the minority groups. Examining this contestation is important to understand the competing dynamics of citizenship practices in this city, as can be seen from the section below.

4.3.3.1 Procedural vs Substantive Concerns

Like Yogyakarta, the issue of building places of worship has coloured the relationship between Muslim and Christian groups in Surakarta. Protests and objections over church construction occurred more than once since the joint regulation No. 9 2006 and No. 8 2006. Apart from this regulation, there is a local regulation issued by the city mayor in 2011 regarding the building of places of worship in Surakarta. It is possible to obtain a building permit IMB,
Ijin Mendirikan Bangunan) for redeveloping or renovating places of worship that existed before 2006. However, apart from this, all the requirements remain the same.

The latest case, that is currently being discussed, is a church in Busukan, Mojosongo. The problem does not begin from when the church applied for a building permit: this church has obtained all the documents needed and other relevant permits have also been obtained. Thus, the full permission to build this church was issued. The member of FKUB Surakarta, Adit, recalled the discussion when checking these requirements noting that:

> we already did the survey... all people leaving nearby were okay [with building the church]...they put down their signatures...even I remember the place that we used to check them [the documents], near...ehm that church...that is a house that belongs to Muslim...because of the Arabic writings so many...so at the end, because all were okay, we gave a recommendation...the church gave it to the city government, which then issued the building permit, and the church was built...when the building was finished, the local people did not complain, but people from outside did (orang luar).

The church was built and later on, a group of people, identified as ‘outsiders’ - orang luar, protested against this building. They claimed that procedurally it did not meet the requirements because one of the documents was not right. Among the national identity cards collected from these protesters, there were different addresses indicating these were ‘outsiders’ who could not represent the local people. This was admitted by Adit, who noted:

> if people look for the mistakes, they must be really meticulous ...there is a copy of the national identity card that is not from people living there...maybe, at that time, we were not really thorough or...I do not know... and this is used as the basis of argument...this is not legitimate... [the church].

To deal with this issue, dialogue and discussion have been organised and facilitated by FKUB, but the discussion was postponed at that time because of the local election in 2015.

In a different part of the interview, Sugiono, a member of FKUB Surakarta and one of the leaders of a Christian community, said that ‘the reason [for objection] is that there are already two churches, why there is one more...there is only one mosque’. He commented that the issue is not whether there are already two churches being built over there, but their specific affiliations and denominations. Furthermore, for Christians, it does not matter where to build the church geographically as long as it is allowed: ‘From the start when they got permission, it is smooth...if it is not smooth, we, FKUB, will not issue the permission,’ he said. Regarding the national identity card issue, he said that ‘[they] have been living there...in fact, de facto they have been living there’. He recalled that many mosques have not obtained building permits but it seems this does not
become an issue: ‘this one [the church] has the full permit... [it] proceeded according to the law... it is supposed to be tolerant of others... but maybe they have different agenda, I do not know’.

The Busukan church case shows how procedural issues become problematic when they are pursued in literal terms and can be used as the basis for highlighting problems that go beyond the procedural aspect. Sugiono’s statement points to a rather substantive concern being that church building permits is sometimes not only related to procedural concerns but also other factors, including the number of existing mosques and churches in the area. Moreover, these building permits are often problematised when it comes to churches but not mosques. This kind of tension between procedural and substantive concerns has the potential to undermine the socio-political process of inclusive citizenship.

4.3.3.2 Religious vs Social Practices

Another point of contestation in Solo that is worth noting is the activities of a program supplying cheap and affordable food for breaking the fasting during Ramadhan, which is organised by a Church at Manahan. The initial idea of this activity began after the financial crisis in 1997/1998 by providing basic food for take away (nasi bungkus) for pedicab drivers (becak), since the members of the church, particularly old women, come to the church by riding pedicab. The idea was then developed into a regular activity since the pedicab drivers need this food during the month of fasting which in that year coincided with Easter. Since there was a request to provide food regularly, this basic food program organised during the month of Ramadhan lasted for a few years until 2005.

The new priest, Melati, came in 2005 and saw this as a big opportunity for developing dialogue between Muslims and Christians. She said:

*I came here in 2005, I saw that this is good as a learning process... for the church to learn to respect other religious traditions. I think this is a bridge than can be built for dialogue... so, dialogue not to [be something] too big (muluk-muluk) ... but, let’s package it into a tool for dialogue between interfaith [members].*

With this consideration, the take-away food activities were then changed to dining-in, with more menus added and dessert served during the weekend. The place was set up in the front yard of the church, not inside. Because it was Ramadhan, every Monday the organiser invited religious leaders, *kyai* or *ustadz* to deliver religious sermons before breaking the fasting. Some performances such as *keroncong* (traditional Javanese music) were also organised. In 2009, this
activity was reported in many media outlets as one of the successful stories of dialogues. ‘We were glad but at the same time worried’, Melati recalled.

This worry turned into reality when after the report, a group of people questioned and objected to this activity. The objection was mainly due to the fear of Christianisation. Although they did not have any data for this Christianisation, Joni, a senior leader of a laskar group, argued that

they do not respect the holy month of Ramadhan. Clearly it is crossing the borders [melanggar]...and it is painful (menyakitkan)...if they [Christians people] want to eat just eat. Those who go through the street are Muslims...then the church gives [them food] ...if we use the logic, it is not reasonable.

While she considered it fine to give food to the people on the street, Joni argued that the time is not right because it is the holy month of Ramadhan. Furthermore, it is likely to get sympathy from Muslims, ‘so that Muslims will sympathize with Christians. So that in the future...[they may] convert... like that....and influencing [to convert] those who [already] have a religion is not allowed,’ Joni further added.

The leader of the church rejected this accusation, saying that she had the data for all the members. Also, she would not invite kyai or ustaz to give religious sermons before breaking the fasting. Furthermore, she said that ‘indeed the contribution is mostly from the church, but many Muslims contribute too. Because they see this has other values’. However, this argument does not refute the accusation, with warnings that some people would come to the church with swords if they continued the cheap food program. While some people urge the continuation of this program because they believe that there is nothing wrong with it, the priest considered the fact that too many people were involved in this program. A discussion with several community leaders was organised and then she decided to stop this program. Melati recalled:

when we conducted the program, we did not have any intentions...means, we only want to share, develop dialogue...develop the form of life when the church is learning to respect others even though we do not ask other to respect us...this is not our business...but this has turned out into something counter-productive, and there are people who play behind this... then I said enough. If we continue, it will be too risky.

Indeed, though the action took place during the holy month of Ramadhan, the intention of the church activity was more social by helping others to break the fasting and opening up space for people to learn and respect other traditions. This is of critical importance in order to forge a more inclusive society and a democratic citizenship framework.
4.3.3.3 Religious Teachings vs Basic Rights

While the anti-Shi’a sentiments have proliferated in Surakarta, the most notable sentiment observed during the fieldwork of this research project is the rejection of what is seen as a non-Muslim leader: the city mayor. This sentiment was communicated and campaigned for via banners in public areas and newsletters that were placed in some mosques as well as during public religious gatherings. For the last couple of years, Surakarta has been led by a Christian city mayor, who succeeded Joko Widodo (the current Indonesian president) when he ran for the gubernatorial election in Jakarta in 2012. His vice mayor, FX Rudyatmo at that time, was automatically nominated mayor to replace Joko Widodo. While a non-Christian leader in Solo should not pose any problems, particularly for the moderate Muslim groups such as NU, this has alerted other religious groups, particularly the Islamist ones.

Part of the response was the establishment of DSKS. Arman, the leader of DSKS, explained the reasons for creating DSKS, saying that ‘firstly is the political change where Jokowi (Joko Widodo) went to Jakarta...then replacing him is a Christian...and we do not want that there will be oppression (kedholiman) for the Muslims...also, we do not want there [to] be conflict...[between Muslims and Christians]’. From this, it could be evinced that the emergence of a non-Muslim leader, at some points, is associated with kedholiman (oppression) and a new organisation to deal with the conflict that might potentially occur between non-Muslim and Muslim groups is urgently needed. This DSKS later on became the place where laskar groups gathered and organised campaigns and protest actions.

Among Islamist groups, the emergence of this non-Muslim leadership has led to new awareness, particularly related to the movement of non-Muslim groups. Salim said: ‘We clearly felt, when Jokowi and Rudi [nickname for FX Rudyatmo] emerged, the Christians people rose too...raised their heads...their spirits, positions...we also saw the arrival of Chinese people’. He added: ‘what I see from him in the last two years or more, is more to strengthen his position and his people...those who support him, Christians, or those who do not support him...the Muslim groups have been eliminated’.

FX Rudyatmo ran for the city mayor in 2015 and won the election. With another 5 years of leadership to come, Salim said that ‘we do not have any other choices rather that raising the awareness of Muslim people...we do not wait until [it becomes a case like] Bosnia...like Myanmar...we do not do brutal things...attacking...but [we] stay alert’.
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Not all Muslim groups are against Rudyatmo. Indeed, some Muslim groups have supported him, despite the fact that he is not a Muslim. These groups believe that he performed well during his first period of leadership as the city mayor. As Salim noted,

*Muslim people here [can be grouped into] is at several levels in terms of their extremist understanding...there are those believe that Shariah should be enforced whatever the means...if not the totality [of it] at least its values are free to be exercised...and need to be [included] in the regulation...there are some, those who believe that as long as one can do sholawatan or hadrohan [reciting some praises for the prophet Muhammad]...that is Islam...and it is enough...there are also those who do not care at all.*

The first group of Muslims, he claimed, are those who stand for the people *(keberpihakan)* because for him the local government does not function well.

Prior to the local election, the campaign against Rudyatmo’s election among Muslim groups was widespread. Salim believed that it is the obligation of *ulama* to enlighten people over this issue: ‘*yes, it is part if the duty of ulama to enlighten the people...because according to the religion, it is not allowed to elect a non-Muslim as the leader*’. However, more moderate groups believe that this is only a matter of interpretation of Islamic texts and the prohibition is not the only interpretation available for Muslims. After consulting with respected *ulama*, Lukman said that ‘*it is not an obligation [to not choose a non-Muslim as a leader], so it is up to you.*’ Furthermore, Indonesia is not an Islamic state and the law used here is an Indonesian law, so ‘*as long as it is complying with the constitution, everyone has the right to be chosen for candidacy*’, he added.

The tension here pertains to the issue of performing religious obligations, as the Islamist groups believe, and respecting others’ freedom to exercise their rights as guaranteed by Constitution. The Constitution does not prohibit a non-Muslim from being the political leader and thus he or she has the same rights and obligations as a Muslim. However, religious principles might be used to stand against this constitutional right due to a narrow interpretation of religious texts. This kind of interpretation remains one of the main challenges in nurturing inclusive citizenship practices in this city.
4.4 Discourse of Citizenship in Yogyakarta and Surakarta

4.4.1 Introduction

The section below discusses the discourse of citizenship that circulates in the two cities. The interviews with the participants highlighted several discourses that have played important roles in navigating the practices of citizenship in Yogyakarta. These discourses do not necessarily come from one single analytical unit such as politics or religion, because in many cases these also relate to other factors such as culture and economics. The no non-Muslim leader discourse, for example, is not necessarily driven solely by religious perspective, but also political and economic ones. Thus, to understand the meaning and impact of certain discourse on the citizenship practice in the two research sites, the analysis employed here contextualized by interrogating the political, social, cultural and legal context.

4.4.2 Discourse of Citizenship in Yogyakarta

4.4.2.1 Discourse Leading to Inter-religious Tensions

One particular discursive construction that emerges in navigating citizenship practices in Yogyakarta is the sentiment toward religious minority groups which emerges prior or during political events. The example here refers to the use of anti-Shia and Ahmadiyah slogans that could be found in many places during or prior to the local elections in Yogyakarta. While expressions of anti-Shia sentiment are relatively recent, anti-Ahmadiyah sentiments have been present throughout the two decades following the collapse of the New Order regime in May 1998. Of particular significance is the attack on the Ahmadiyah Centre in Bogor in 2005 during the annual meeting. The attack resulted not only in extensive damage, but many Ahmadiyah people also suffered severe injuries, according to reports. Since then, the anti-Ahmadiyah issue has spread across Indonesia, and Yogyakarta is no exemption. Since the fatwa (religious edict) by MUI and the joint regulation between the Ministry of Internal and Religious Affairs, the Ahmadiyah community has suffered significant discriminatory treatment including having their mosques shut down and their activities stopped because they were seen as potentially spreading Ahmadiyah teaching, and thus they were forbidden from practicing in accordance with the local laws and regulations.

Following the many anti-Ahmadiyah attacks over the past two decades, virulent anti-Shi’a sentiment has emerged. Despite the fact that there is as yet no fatwa and regulation issued by the government regarding the prohibition of Shia’s teaching, the discussion on Shia as a deviant sect
in Islam has been widespread. With the case of Yogyakarta, anti-Shia sentiment has been made public, particularly prior or during the election. As Mahmud stated: ‘anti-Shia banner (spanduk) is quite unique. The advice (seruan) of anti-Shia, sometimes, it gets the public attention (ramai), sometimes it does not (sepi) or it just disappears (hilang)...it might appear again, for example prior to local election.’ This statement highlights how the election event, as an instrument of political practice, intertwines and plays an important role in constructing certain religious narratives. Apparently, political leaders encourage this sentiment in public discourse believing that it might lead to them securing more votes from Muslim groups, particularly those who oppose Shia. And for religious groups, bringing up this issue prior to elections is seen as a way of getting more attention, particularly from those who are running for office.

Indeed, protest and intimidation toward a community associated with Shia did occur prior local election in Yogyakarta, and the anti-Shia sentiment has gone further. One active and vocal Islamic group even declared not only Shia, but also those who protected them as the enemy of Muslims (Panjimas.com, 31 December 2016). Prior to this, several protests against Shia community or those who are considered as part of it occurred more than once in Yogyakarta. There has been an effort from some extremist religious groups to seek fatwa from the MUI leaders on the prohibition of Shia teaching, but this request was rejected. The first was in 2013 when the extremists demanded the closing of the activity of Raushan Fikr, an organisation that is seen as having a close relationship with Shi’a. The second protest occurred in late 2015. The plan of protests spread via WhatsApp groups and gained a lot of attention on the day of the protests. As discussed earlier, their objection on Shia community is due to them believing that the Shia community practices heresy.

Although there were no violent actions committed, due to the involvement of local citizens and police in mitigating this protest, this anti-Shia sentiment has gained significant public attention. This happened prior to local election in three municipalities in Yogyakarta: Bantul, Sleman, and Gunung Kidul. In this context, the local election has served as a way to open up a political opportunity structure, defined as ‘specific configurations of resources, institutional arrangements and historical precedents for social mobilization, which facilitate the development of protest movements in some instances and constrain them in others’ (Kitschelt 1986, p. 58). While the connection between this protest and the local election needs to be examined further, in this case, the anti-Shia sentiment that can be found in many public areas prior to the local election does show how this particular political event facilitates the opening of a political opportunity structure.
Apart from, anti-Shia and anti-Ahmadiyah discursive construction, the citizenship practices in Yogyakarta by and large have been driven by the logics of legal discourse related to worship places (worship places discourse). This can be seen in the number of conflicts related to places of worship in Yogyakarta that arose since the joint regulations No. 9 2006 and No. 8 2006 that provide guidance for government at district level for managing religious and inter-religious affairs, including permits for building places of worship. This new regulation replaces the old one issued in 1969. In many cases, this new regulation has been used by Islamist groups to justify their actions to against new building permits for places of worship, particularly by minority groups such as Christians. Not restricted to building permits, this new regulation is used to justify actions against older places of worship that have been used for a long time but are yet to receive building permits (IMB).

The number of these kind of churches in Yogyakarta, as Supono pointed out, is large. Indeed, obtaining a full permit is rather difficult due to the increasing number of members/adherents required by the new regulation. Furthermore, another requirement that is difficult to meet is for the places of worship not to disturb social orders. Supono said that ‘if people want to build a church [for example], it should not to disturb the order and interest of the society’. This point, he argued, tends to be interpreted differently and politicised by other vested interest groups. Fahmi admitted that this point is rather subjective, meaning that different groups might interpret it differently, but ‘for the state apparatus [police], this level of disturbing social orders [keresahan] has a standard... the state apparatus has known about this’. Idris, one of the leaders of Muslim groups that raised concerns with the issue of churches, stated that what has happened in these cases is that the Christian community ‘cheats’ by building churches without having full permits, and this is the reason for his and his groups’ objection to these churches.

The problem related to ‘disturbing social order’ tends to be politicised even further, meaning that meeting the procedural requirements to obtain full permits will be even more challenging. Considering the weak performance of the state apparatus, as discussed earlier, referring to the standard of the state apparatus might not solve the problem, particularly when there is confusion as to how to determine which action is breaking the law and which action facilitates performing basic rights: ‘the procedural things will we achieved when there is a good relationship with local people’, Fahmi argued further. He did make a point, however, that the problem related to the churches sometimes goes beyond this. Apart from the building permits, Idris and his groups tend to see that many churches have not obtained full permits because they
are only a sect, not part of the mainstream group. Therefore, they need to be disciplined, otherwise their activities may potentially undermine the process of nurturing inclusive citizenship.

Related to this is the anti-Christianisation discourse with the example of the rejection over the Easter celebration for the elderly in public areas in Gunung Kidul, Yogyakarta by the Islamist groups. This celebration invites around thousand elderly people from Yogyakarta and surrounding cities to celebrate Easter in a public area. Considering the number, it was to be organised in an open public area. It was also to include a traditional culinary festival by having ‘Tiwul’, a traditional food from Java. However, this plan was challenged because of a perceived Christianisation agenda. As a result, the organisers of this event had difficulties securing an open public space for this celebration. Many NGO activists tried to resolve this issue and organised a meeting with the Sultan of Yogyakarta. However, in the end, nothing could be done by the Sultan despite the authority he possesses as the king of Yogyakarta. The celebration was not conducted in an open public area, but was then organised in eight to nine different churches.

Having a socio-religious ceremony in a public area is common in Indonesia. Muslim communities across Indonesia have organised this kind of event many times, such as public religious sermons while collecting donations for social-cultural needs. However, when it comes to non-Muslim groups, this practice becomes almost impossible to implement. In this particular case, feeling threatened by Christianisation has served as a major reason to protest this socio-religious event. Furthermore, this kind of argument has been used in many other cases too. As mentioned earlier, part of the objection regarding church building is due to Christianisation. Mujiburrahman (2006) notes that this particular feeling has coloured the relationship between Muslims and Christians in Indonesia due to the history of conflict between them (Mujiburrahman 2006). This feeling, combined with such narrow interpretation of religious teachings, remains a serious challenge to achieving more equality and inclusion in Yogyakarta.

Hefner (2001) notes that the policy of the New Oder regime to acknowledge and institutionalize only five official religions (Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism, and Buddhism) may implicate the creation of what could be termed ‘religiously differentiated citizenship’ (something that was avoided during state formation) where people might be treated differently due to religious membership. Those who are not part of these five official religions, such as those who hold traditional beliefs, might have some difficulties in claiming their rights since declaration of religious membership has been part of the national identity card. Whether the column of religion should be part of national identity card is being debated. However, what is currently happening in Yogyakarta has shown that different treatment is not only experienced
by those who are not part of official religions, but also those who are part of it due to perceived socio-religious agendas – most notably a fear of a Christianisation program.

Adding to the anti-Christianisation discourse is the marginalisation discourse linked to the rapid investment in Yogyakarta. This rapidly increasing investment has been highlighted by the participants in this project as contributing to the current situation of conflict. This investment drive has changed how people give meaning to local place and space in this city. Of particular note is the absence of social place where people from different groups can intermingle. There are new spaces open, however these are limited to the few people who can access them. On this, Bagus noted that ‘the different between now [and the past] is the increase in new spaces where Wong Jogja are not present’. This is because the newcomers have all the resources, access and assets to the newly created places and spaces while at the same time local people, Wong Jogja, have been pushed away. This indicates that the investment has at some point led to exclusion and marginalisation that further widened the social distance between Wong Jogja and newcomers.

This situation, in some cases, leads to discriminatory practices as can be seen from the issue of intolerance towards minority groups which has remained a concern for NGO activists and mainstream organisations. Furthermore, whenever violence is committed, such as the case of LKiS, the people living in surrounding areas tend to be passive. At other points, this marginalisation might lead people to find a new bond in this changing space. One of these important new bonds is religion, and religious militant organisations find their base and supporters in marginalised areas. As some participants from NGOs argued, most Wong Jogja live in villages. The vigilante groups such as GPK operate in the villages, and these groups are often accepting and welcoming these marginalised people. Thus, as Rizal mentioned, a form of new solidarity emerged in this new social religious interplay.

GPK, as well as other extremist religious groups, are well known as vocal groups that actively play important roles in closing churches or protesting against religious minority groups. However, the reason such actions is not always religious. Rizal said that

*the action of these groups to close the churches could also be seen as the internal dynamics of this organisation, not solely resistance against the churches or the ritual itself...the loyalty is then measured by whether you are brave enough to close the church. Even if the church has obtained the permit, they will still try to close it.*

A strong point was made by Mahmud when he said that the
religious issue is only a mask. What is clear is that there is a strong power in Yogyakarta that need to show their force. So, if you would like to feel safe, there is the way. From this, it can be seen that this group is ideological, but also opportunistic.

4.4.2.2 Alternative Discourse

Some efforts have been undertaken by NGO activists to counter social-religious issues by advocating religious pluralism discourse. This can be seen from their constructive engagement with different groups at different level such as having regular meetings between the leaders of religious communities to engage in some form of interfaith dialogue. This kind of activity is organised by DIAN Interfidei, for example. They also regularly have discussions and invite many people from surrounding areas and from across Yogyakarta; and not only those with similar perspectives but also those with extremist views, although they do not necessarily come. The aim of this activity is to exchange perspectives and gain a better understanding about how living in harmony in spite of the diversity of backgrounds. Feni, a senior activist from DIAN Interfidei, recalled when her institution once organised a discussion about Jewish people: ‘MMI (Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia, Mujahidin Council of Indonesia) and FUI (Front Umat Islam, Muslim Ummah Front) came. There is Ahmadiyah, Jews… MMI, FUI…it is complete. They [MMI, FUI] asked a lot about Jews’. For her, this was a social capital to further formulate the inter-faith dialogue activities.

Inviting those who strongly oppose the idea of pluralism and religious freedom to participate in these types of activities is part of a strategy to nurture a more democratic citizenship. This is because many NGOs in Yogyakarta have been dealing with extremist groups in a different way: rather than including them in the process of dialogue, they tend to exclude them. Feni said:

we campaign for peace, but at the same time we spread the hatred. We criticize the groups who spread hatred, [but] we at the same time build hatred...we cannot build a wall with anybody, with the government and even the militia groups. We need to build a bridge. we are institutions that concern with dialogue...if we can smash the wall to fall down, it will be wonderful. This is what we need to strive for.

Feni foresaw a place in Yogyakarta where people from different groups can come, interact and participate in inter-faith activities. She said:

so there is tourism, education, cultural elements of Jogja [are] included there...the visitors, domestics or overseas can come there...people can participate. Like Dian Interfidei have a workshop...IRE, CRCS, UGM...in that place there is dance...and people can watch a movie.
For her, what makes Yogyakarta special should not be limited only to how people shall learn about “kejogjaan”, the culture of wong Jogja. More than that, she added that ‘the uniqueness of Jogja is that there are people from different ethnic backgrounds [who] can live together...and when we talk about miniature of Indonesia, it is Jogja’. Organising this kind of discussion with people from different backgrounds and perspectives is a start to pursuing this ideal.

Indeed, bringing this ideal into reality is really challenging. One of the key points affecting the practices of citizenship that is highlighted in the previous section is the lack of shared common interests across different groups in Yogyakarta. The language used by the activists tends to be segmented and inaccessible to public audiences. Supardi, the local leader of the area where Rauhan Fikr is located, stated he was not really involved in the mediation process related to the Rauhan Fikr case: ‘I do not get involved in anything...because this issue is their [MUI and other groups] problem’, he explained. A casual conversation between the researcher and ojeg driver (motorcycle taxi) regarding the conflict related to religious communities revealed a similar response. The ojeg driver said that religion is not his business; rather, it is a matter for religious community leaders.

Organising a discussion and inviting different groups may serve as the start of an inter-faith dialogue to identify common interests. However, many of these discussions tend to be held in large hotels or universities, where few local or grass-roots people are involved. Furthermore, the topics discussed are often unrelated to the daily interests of the local people. NGOs started thinking about making the issue much more grounded, as stated by Bagus who thought that NGOs need to organise activities in which local people will be actively involved. On this point, he stated that

*for tolerance day for example, we campaign tolerance by donating the blood and say that donating blood is not just that but there is a tolerant message there, such as your blood can be used by people from a different religion, different group.*

This is part of the initiatives that he and his network organise to campaign for peace and tolerance in Yogyakarta. Such grounded initiatives are still small in scale, though he was optimistic that most NGO activists are making progress towards this objective.

Another counter-discourse is inspired more by digging and introducing human rights values to Muslim groups. This can be seen from the activities associated with organising public discussions or training related to religion and human rights issues. One such an example is a workshop on human rights education for pesantren leaders organised by LKiS, Yogyakarta to highlight role that the religious leaders could play in dealing with violence. Mahmud stated that
‘the furthest they could go is issuing advice to the people [to not commit violence] ... the religious leaders can do nothing to them [the wrongdoers] because it is not their authority.’ He further argued that ‘they might think that as long as they [the hardliner groups] did not attack their pesantren... [it would be fine, but] once they attacked, they might retaliate...’, something that he and his institution did not anticipate.

Feni noted that the role of pesantren in Yogyakarta in dealing with violence is quite strategic. She had high expectations of the pesantren leaders to deal with current acts of intolerance in Yogyakarta. Part of the reason for this are the internal issues in the palace after Sabda Raja. Furthermore, the Palace has been seen as losing its spiritual and cultural authority because of its involvement in the rapid development and investment in Yogyakarta, which in turn led to a number of problems in society. Consequently, as Feni stated, ‘the strong institutions that can back up the palace is kyai-kyai [the pesantren leaders].’ She did hope that the pesantren leaders will be able to deal with the emerging actions in Yogyakarta and start building a strong network with other groups that have similar concerns.

With the weakness shown by law enforcement, there is concern here that there will be conflict at the horizontal level between religious groups. Mahmud recalled a time when he organised an event, but was threatened by some hardliner groups: ‘I was called by Banser (Bantuan Ansor Serba Guna, Multipurpose Ansor Front) [paramilitary organisation under NU], they offered me protection, I said no, because this is not their obligation’, so he refused that offer. Against this context, LKiS has taken the lead to organise human rights education training in pesantren. Introducing this topic to the pesantren would not only help them to understand the principle of human rights but also to counter the extremist groups’ arguments in public. Mahmud stated that ‘[it is hoped that] with human rights education training, there will appear religious leaders with the perspective of tolerance and human rights’. This is important because at the time in Yogyakarta, the public discourse on religion was filled with sentiments of intolerance in particular against religious minorities, and in particular being explicitly anti-Shia and anti-Ahmadiyah.
4.4.3 Discourse of Citizenship in Surakarta

4.4.3.1 Discourse Leading to Tensions

While the anti-Shia discourse in Yogyakarta has led to incidents intended to force those associated with Shi’a community to stop their activities, the banning of non-Muslims from leadership positions has served as a discursive framework (no non-Muslim leader discourse) that navigate people’s actions, particularly during the local election in Surakarta. For those who campaign for this idea, it is an obligation for Muslims not to choose a non-Muslim as their leader. Arman, the leader of DSKS, said that

*If we are Muslims, profess Islam, it is imperative [that we want] to be led by Muslim. All leaders must want their people to be what they want...as Muslims, [they] must want to be led by Muslim the Islamic way.*

Furthermore, he argued that ‘as a Muslim, one’s loyalty is to Islam... how can we consider as Muslim if our loyalty is not for Islamic ideology...this is what we are directed to’.

These groups do realise that groups of Muslims supported and voted for Rudyatmo during the election. Joni said in a satirical way:

*Muslims support Rudi...is it not great? This is an extraordinary [form of] tolerance...firstly, they do not really understand religion... what a leader is... its character... and how to crown a leader... [it is] regulated by shari’ah...so, it is like they do know but do not want to know. Secondly, perhaps there are something to be given [to them]...position, facility, food [sembako].*

Salim further commented that those who support Rudyatmo are ‘level 2’ (those who believe that it is enough as long as they can do sholawatan or hadrohan (reciting praises for the prophet Muhammad) and ‘level 3’ Muslims, those who do not care at all.

Apart from this obligation, they do believe that a leadership under a non-Muslim leader would be unorganised and chaotic. Even they tend to call them *kafir* rather than non-Muslim: ‘in Quran, there is no non-Muslim...so, it is definite, it is kafir...there are only two groups in this world [Muslim and kafir]’, Joni said. Furthermore, *kafir* leaders will not be just leaders: ‘it is impossible, until the end of the day’, simply because it is not according to the Shariah as he believed. Joni believed that governance under a *kafir* leader would be negative at every level, ‘the government, economic power, cultural power,’ and furthermore, ‘there would be no tolerance’. Salim claimed that the number of ‘level 1’ Muslims is less than 30% of the total Muslim population in Solo, and ‘because [of that] we have to [be vocal] ... if we just keep silent, we will be finished.’
Adding to the no non-Muslim leader discourse is the places of worship discourse. As is the case in Yogyakarta, the issue of building places of worship has also coloured the relationship between Muslim and non-Muslim groups in Solo. The church at Busukan, Mojosongo, is an example of how tensions can easily emerge due to the regulation of building of worship. While there might be other motives behind this protest, such as local election, the legality of the documents has been the basis for the arguments. This protest and its argument could be seen as a way that legal regulation has instigated other actions, or simply justified them. Furthermore, this legality argument has put the emphasis on ‘procedural’ rather than ‘substantive’ matters: for example, the case of the national identity card which omits the fact that the people who owned this card have been living there, despite the fact that the address on their identity card, administratively, suggests a different place.

The use of regulation to justify any protests or actions, or simply open up a space for problematising the existence of places of worship would be challenging in Surakarta, considering that hundreds of these places have not yet obtained their building permit. Adit said that

we have the database, the current places of worship be they churches, mosques, viharas (temple for Buddhism), all for these 6 religions [Islam, Christianity, Catholicism, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Confucianism], the total is more than 870 worship places, but almost 500 of them have not yet received their building permits.

With this in mind, the problems faced by FKUB regarding these building permits, due to the new legal regulation, will continue to be significant.

In relation to the Busukan church, Joni said that information from his informants about the church in Busukan shows that it was built illegally. He said that

...we have informants. In one RT [Rukun Tetangga, lowest district level]...there are two churches established that are illegal...it is so big...and that is enforced to be established by Rudi...and it becomes a problem...a big problem. And a lot of churches [like that].

Furthermore, for him and his groups, the issue is no longer getting permission or not, but whether these churches will cause more damage to the local people. This ‘negative effects’ argument is interpreted differently according to different parties, and tends to be politicised to serve the socio-cultural-political interests of a certain group.
Due to this, the issue of Christianisation is important in navigating actions taken by Islamist groups in particular. The case of the Manahan church that organised the basic food program clearly demonstrated how the fear of Christianisation led to the opposition of a program that had run for several years. Despite the fact that this program had been organised by a church, Muslims and people living nearby the church did participate. Furthermore, kyai and ustadz were involved, but the fear of Christianisation took precedence over this fact. For this accusation, the priestess of the church argued that Christianisation is clearly not on the agenda. Melati said that there is no data that people come to this church is due to the cheap rice [program] ... I have data for those who are baptised here and what for [reason]...if I want to Christianise, I will not ask for haji [a call for those who did pilgrimage to Mecca] or ustadz [to deliver religious speech] ...there is never been this agenda.

Indeed, the groups who objected to this program had no proof of this Christianisation, since they did not find Muslims being converted through it; rather, they argued that it would be a hidden Christianisation: ‘It means that there is a long process...such as the blur of the values and principles [between Islam and Christianity]’, Arman said. Furthermore, he claimed that it offended Muslims because fasting is part of worship. Joni questioned why they did not start this program earlier. Indeed, the program has run for a few years, but, he argued, ‘why not in the other months?’. For Joni, this program only added fuel to the situation of inter-religious strife in Solo: ‘We only asked them to stop doing it,’ Arman said, since ‘we do not want to deal with this issue with violence’.

It is worth noting here that those groups who objected to this program have no experience in working together with groups from different religious backgrounds, particularly Christian ones. Joni said that ‘we do not work together with them...never...but we do understand them...but please they have to understand us [too]’. He believed that ‘mutual understanding’ is the key for tolerance. However, what this ‘mutual understanding’ actually means is not clear, though he did indicate that being tolerant does not always mean to work together, ‘so, we do not need to work together... for example/ let’s make a joint team’. The program for breaking fasting during Ramadhan did continue for several years in the place across from the church but there was no involvement of the church itself in this program, despite the fact that they did initially start it and most people had become familiar with them.

While the changing landscape of the city and the huge investment in Yogyakarta have been key issues that inform citizenship practices, the participants do not clearly highlight this issue. However, they did note that the circulation of the money and the flow of people from Surakarta did affect the citizenship practices in this city. Dendi noted that Surakarta is small but
rich in resources and opportunities. For Sugiono, Solo is an urban destination for those who do not have land or occupation. Dendi further said that

*the money circulated every day is more than 20 billion...only in the city of Surakarta...so, owners of a national identity card in Surakarta are only 500,000...574,000, but during the day, it is occupied by more than 2 million people...to look for money, to learn.*

This, it is implied, will impact on the flow of people, information, ideas, value, and interests.

The phenomenon of *laskar* groups and their activities can be seen from this perspective. Indeed, many *laskar* groups do their activities, such as sweeping some places for money, as admitted by Salim and Joni, respected figures in *laskar* groups. Parades of *laskar* groups have been organised more than once in Surakarta. While these parades are intended to apply pressure on other parties such as the government and those who they perceive as organising sinful actions (prostitution and so on), their exhibitions of physical power, such as performing body skills or martial arts, have made them synonymous with violence. As a symbol of violence, *laskar* is potentially used by other parties. It is at this point where the show of force of the *laskar* groups meets economic interests: in fact, Joni admitted that some *laskar* groups committed certain actions for the sake of money.

Furthermore, Dendi reported that he once heard a report on how an entrepreneur used *laskar* to make drunkards move away from his place: ‘*He told me...I invited laskar...thus they are gone...what did you give to them? Something for buying tea and coffee...like that...the laskar is glad...both [of us] are glad*’. *Laskar* with a reputation of violence are used by those who own the capital to destabilise a strategic area, so that the price of land will become cheaper: ‘*so that they can buy this [land] cheaply*’. With this kind of socio-economic interest, Yasmin, an interfaith dialogue activist, mentioned that some churches have no problem with *laskar* traveling around, ‘*because [they] received the money. This is an interest that clearly can be seen, and is money oriented*’, she said.

### 4.4.3.2 Alternative Discourse

From a different perspective, many groups make efforts to keep Surakarta peaceful. For example, a regular meeting between religious groups is organised by FLAG (Forum Lintas Agama dan Golongan, Cross Religion and Social Group Forum). It is a forum where ‘*every religious leader meets and communicates*, Lukman said. Created in 2011, FLAG is more of an
informal forum rather than a formal institution and pioneered in bringing the pluralism discourse into the public domain. Many religious leaders are involved in this forum and leaders of traditional beliefs are no exception. The meeting is organised once every two months with many issues related to diversity in Solo being discussed. Lukman, the local NU leader, stated that ‘we are not trying to be hypocrites...at the elite level, between religious leaders...they can hug each other, say something good, but at the grass-roots level, there is indeed a tension’. Thus, this forum becomes important in bringing this kind of issue up for further discussion by various stakeholders.

These meetings discuss important local issues that have serious implications for inter-faith relations, such as the negative sentiments towards non-Muslims during the local election, in particular when Rudyatmo ran for office in 2012. The negative sentiments towards non-Muslims was exaggerated by Islamist groups since they believe that it is forbidden to choose a non-Muslim as a leader within Islam. During this meeting, they worried that there would be a clash between the supporters of the different candidates, due to manipulation by other religious interest groups; but those who attended the meeting made a commitment to not let this happen and to keep Solo peaceful.

Lukman, the coordinator of this forum, believes that abiding by the law and regulation will be the key to keeping Solo safe:

> As Indonesians and Wong Solo, the unity in diversity spirit (ke-bhinneka tunggal ika-an) has coloured [our] daily life...and the regulation has been there. When people live in a place, first [they] will be bound by religion and then [they] will bound by the local government regulation.

Thus, by following the rules, they hope to live a serene and peaceful life. He warned that ‘Once there is someone [that] breaks the rules and believe that they are more superior [than the others], this will lead to restlessness’. Indeed, different groups share their concerns, listen, and learn from each other, and together keep their commitment, as Indonesians and Wong Solo, to follow the rules.

Further efforts to lower the tensions among different groups in Solo are made by institutions such as LPLAG by organising training seminars and public discussions related to the issue of peace and humanity. This institution was established in 2002 by leaders of different groups in Solo, partly in response to the Bali bombings, where the perpetrator is an alumnus from one of leading religious institutions in Solo. Its main focus is to eliminate conflict related to
economic, social, cultural, and religious issues and promote a spirit of peace and plurality so that the people can resolve conflict in more just and respectful ways.

Empowering people at the grass-roots level is part of the key to promoting peace. Dendi, one of the leaders of this institution, realised that at an elite level, some issues might have been resolved as different leaders discuss and talk to each other. However, this does not necessarily mean that problems at the grass-roots level are already solved. Dendi said that ‘The question [is], people at the grass-roots level, can it [the resolved issue] reach them...are they represented [by the elites]?’. Several efforts have, indeed, been organised to reach out to people at the grass-roots level. Apart from organising training seminars and public discussions, members of LPLAG have organised more concrete programs, such as engaging families that are vulnerable to terrorism and helping the members of laskar groups whose houses need repairing; but, instead of asking someone else to do this, they have to do it themselves. Dendi stated that ‘peace is concrete... and reflective, real and gives advantages [to the people]’.

One of the more successful stories of activities led by one of the LPLAG members is their engagement with one of the prominent leaders of a laskar group which is against Christians (Suyanto & Hartono 2015). Although several invitations to talk were rejected by the leader of this laskar, due to the LPLAG member’s identity being both Chinese and Christian, the LPLAG member never gave up on this ideal as he believed that an engagement via intensive communication would be the key to reducing the tension between this laskar and Christian groups. It took time but in the end this LPLAG member successfully engaged with the laskar leader, who was invited to several discussions conducted by LPLAG and sent for peace and conflict resolution training. During the earthquake and tsunami in Aceh, this leader cooperated with the Christian community to do humanitarian work to help the people of Aceh at that time. Constructive engagement is arguably one of the keys to reducing tension and establishing more peaceful citizenship practices.

An initiative to transform the tension into a more constructive engagement was also initiated by several young activists in Solo. Solo has been known as a city where every ideology from nationalism, communism, and Islamic militancy can develop. Furthermore, different religions and beliefs are able to grow and live side by side in this ‘Spirit of Java’ city. Conflict and tensions among the members of these ideologies and religions are unavoidable, as history records. The idea to introduce this diversity from an early stage was championed by youth activists in Solo, who created Sobat Anak Surakarta (SAS, the Friends of Surakarta Kids) in 2010:
'We do need [to find a way for] kids to be able to play with other kids from different religions', Yasmin, one of its founders, said.

There are also activities which bring children from different religions to play and visit different places of worship: 'We rode on a two-level bus together. We stopped at a Protestant church, a Catholic church, a mosque, a vihara [Buddhist temple] and then we went home', Yasmin said. During this visit, an interesting encounter between these children, the places of worship and their imams or priests occurred. The children asked the imams or priests many questions regarding the places of worship. A Muslim child asked the priests about ornaments in the church, the statue of Christ and why there was no Allah there; meanwhile a non-Muslim one asked the imam about the absence of ornaments in the mosque. 'This is why this is an extraordinary activity and my son is happy', Yasmin pointed out.

Involved in this activity are many ordinary mothers who actually partially fund this activity: 'The money comes from our donations. So, those who agree on the activity, donate [towards it]', Yasmin said. After the successful first activity where children from different faiths become friends, a number of plans were made for children to become more engaged with each other, such as camping together. The feature of this activity is that the initiatives come from the grassroots level, involving many ordinary parents and children. This kind of normalising initiative that involves young generations is one of the key points aimed at cultivating a more inclusive citizenship, that in turn can help reduce tensions between different religious communities.

4.5 Comparative Summary of Key Findings

4.5.1 Key Findings from Yogyakarta

As discussed earlier, there are different factors emphasised by the participants that contribute to the current citizenship practices in Yogyakarta. The weakness of law enforcement has provided a loophole to be exploited by some hard-line religious groups, who often use violent methods. Confusion over what is exercising rights and what is acting to break the law has slowed down the law enforcement process against violent actions. Furthermore, the authority of the Sultan has diminished among the people. His involvement in some investment projects have created problems for him with the local people. As rapid investments continue, social spaces for different social and religious groups no longer exist. This has led to situations where these groups have no physical space where they can interact and exchange ideas, which is conducive to creating
shared common interests across different groups. The section elaborates more on specific common issues that impact the practice of religious citizenship in Yogyakarta.

The first issue is the lack of social forums to facilitate exchanges between different groups. When there are such forums, those who are involved are mainly those who already have the same vision. While this is important, it can limit the scope and impacts of such activities to the wider public. Indeed, an initiative to include hardliner groups in a discussion such as the experimentation by Feni and her institution (DIAN Interfidei) was organised. However, this was still limited in scale. Such an effort does need commitment and perseverance, since having discussion with those who have different ideas is always challenging. During a rare meeting with the hardliner groups, Bagus said that ‘we can’t talk too much because they will say “it has to be like this” (pokoknya begini)’. This limits the chances of further discussion.

There is an initiative from the government, either via FKUB or other meetings organized by the Department of Religious Affairs. However, this kind of forum is, at some points, rather formal and bureaucratic and thus somewhat slow to respond. Idris claimed that his group informs the Ministry of Religious Affairs regarding the churches that, for them, are problematic. He said:

‘We go to the Kemenag [Kementrian Agama, Ministry of Religious Affairs] ... they should ask [about this church issue] to Christian Bimas [Bimbingan Masyarakat, a guidance council within the Ministry of Religious Affairs] ...why they have never been asked for discussion...this becomes our question’.

He argued that after the reports he did not know what to do:

*but we are not directed to where...what is the progress of the discussion...what should be done...While we are waiting and there is no response from them [the government, the police] ...we take the action...the people take action...in our word, we hit the drum first so it will make the sound [and be heard by the government].*

The challenge is not only with this particular group in the forum, but also with non-governmental organisations. Feni recalled a time when she asked her colleagues to have a discussion with MUI but she was questioned instead. She said, ‘Our friends still hold old paradigms...because MUI often issued a fatwa, instigates “problems” related to religious freedom’. This kind of paradigm will not solve the intolerance issues in Yogyakarta because, for her, it is like building a wall that separates them from the others. She argued further that

*if we do this, we could not get angry with them...thus we [have to] try to intervene as much as possible...glad if we can be involved in the internal process... [related to issuing fatwa].*
With the issue of religion now becoming a glue for new solidarity, building the wall will make efforts to reduce intolerant actions more challenging. Rather, ‘we need the new languages that resonate with the interests of the different social group in Jogja’, Rizal pointed out.

Another feature that is worth noting from Yogyakarta is the diminishing authority of the Sultan as a cultural-spiritual leader. Yogyakarta is one of a few areas in Indonesia where the Sultan has had strong authority and where he is automatically appointed to the governorship. As mentioned earlier, the position taken by the Sultan in dealing with intolerant actions is questioned because he has power but does not use it. Mahmud describes the actions taken by the Sultan, who expressed regret without taking serious action, as *adh'aful iman* (the weakest forms of faith). This is a religious language to describe the passivity of someone to deal with the problems because he is powerless. This term is also understood as a satire; to say that the Sultan does have the power but decides not to exercise it.

Indeed, as a cultural-spiritual leader, the Sultan’s authority had shown its power in the past. Mawar, a member of Ahmadiyah, remembered a statement from the Sultan in the past: ‘*He said, everyone can live in Jogja, no matter their background or affiliation, you are welcome to stay in Jogja as long as you do not cause chaos (rusuh)*’. Regarding the Ahmadiyah issue, she said further that

*there was a demand to ban Ahmadiyah in Jogja...Sultan said that Ahmadiyah can live in Jogja...the one that has the authority to ban is the national government...I have no authority.*

While in many places Ahmadiyah are subject to attack, they feel safe in Yogyakarta. Feni said that

*Ahmadiyah everywhere is likely to be attacked...in Jogja they were safe because of the Sultan... [who said that] “if you want to protest, you can, from your headquarter until alun-alun (public square)...no more than that,” and they followed it.*

However, this powerful authority seems to have faded away as the issue of intolerant actions have become more frequent. Rahmat said that despite the Sultan describing Yogyakarta as a house for everyone, what he is actually doing suggests something different. His involvement in the large investments in Yogyakarta that potentially causes social problems, such as pushing local people to the periphery and creating difficulties in accessing water, has indicated that Yogyakarta is not a house for everyone. Therefore, Rahmat claimed that if there were a survey to measure the level of trust of the Sultan among the people, the result would have shown a drastic decrease. This indicates that the Sultan is out of touch with the people. Maman said that
the Sultan does not keep the mandate of their ancestors (amanah leluhur) ...to maintain the inner feeling relationship between the Sultan and the people’; instead, ‘he prefers thinking business...economy...investment in Jogja.

The Sultan’s cultural-spiritual authority has previously balanced the power in Yogyakarta, as indicated by the cultural title of the Sultan as Sayyidin Panatagama Kalifatullah. With such authority slowly fading away, borrowing the category on charismatic, traditional and modern power by Gibson (2007), the power is rather pluri-centralised among the leaders of different groups as well as the modern bureaucracy. The weak performance of the state apparatus suggests that the ball now is in the hands of traditional, religious leaders. However, the latter also face challenges, since there is no shared perspectives among them. Idris and his group are an example of how they tend to act their own way, rather than exchanging ideas with the other religious leaders. He said that ‘We are part of Islam, but only the left hand...for cleaning the dirty [bad things] ...the other will be acting as the right hand [the good things]’. Re-awakening the charismatic power of the Sultan and restoring the function of the bureaucratic machine are important factors for cultivating inclusive citizenship.

One last notable feature regarding the practice of citizenship in Yogyakarta is the growing awareness of local people to maintain social peace, which requires locals to be active citizens. As mentioned earlier, there were specific factors that ensured the protest on Raushan Fikr, an institution associated with Shia community, did not turn to violence. Part of the reason was the involvement of the community there to ensure their area remained peaceful. Supardi said that

the involvement of people here is to protect the area...we do not have any intention to defend them [Raushan Fikr] ...our principle is...please...if it is not good, please finish it outside...not in our area.

He mentions that people living in that area are actively engaged in social activities: ‘Our members here are in solidarity. If something [happened], we like to gather here [his house] ...discuss...to protect our area’.

Regarding the Raushan Fikr community, Supardi said that they have been good members of society and the relationship between them and other people in that area was positive. He said that

there is no problem [with the relationship] ... [they participated in] working together for community (kerja bakti) and every activity in this area...they do participate...there is no problem [with them].

Salman said that his community has never had any intention to be an exclusionary one. He and his students have always come whenever invited: ‘I do not personally come [for every
meeting...but my students... they know that they are from Raushan Fikr’. As a member of this community, he always does what is supposed to be done: ‘we inform that we have [regular] discussion...every new student comes, we inform RT and RW...we are not a closed community’.

Practicing active citizenship has been the key here that makes the bond between different members of community grow stronger. Apart from the Raushan Fikr case, this strong bond between the members in this area is exemplified in the theme they chose for the village anniversary:

Our theme is for the unity of religious communities...we asked them to perform...the five religious leaders and all of them came...and participated in kirab budaya [cultural event] in the village.

For Supardi as the leader of this village, to keep this strong bond between members, it is necessary to be a good and active member of the community: ‘For beliefs, it is their own business...we are not allowed to mind (mengurus) their business...we also do not know... [about their personal beliefs].’

4.5.2 Key Findings from Surakarta

As discussed earlier, many initiatives have been taken by different groups in Solo to reduce tensions and maintain peace between different parties. The government and its state apparatus have facilitated several meetings either via FKUB or other institutions. The police have also played an active role in maintaining close interaction with the community and enforce the law regardless of the perpetrators’ backgrounds. The performance of the leaders of different groups to control their members has been important too. The emerging awareness of Wong Solo among different groups have served as a glue to keep Solo together. This section highlights some common features that are important in cultivating more democratic and peaceful practices of citizenship.

The first feature is the existence of different forums arranged by the government, community leaders or people at the grass-roots level. While these forums have served to share common concerns and issues, those who attend these forums already share a tolerant perspective. Thus, the forum has created a space for ‘tolerant people’ to talk about some issues with ‘tolerant perspectives’. This does not mean that this kind of forum is not necessary, since as an initial stage it may pave a way for a broader collective citizenship movement. However, dealing with issues which arise from a diverse society such as Surakarta requires more engagement with different parties, particularly those with different perspectives. This is because what comes out
from that kind of forum will only be likely considered as ‘their concern’, not a common concern. Excluding those with different perspectives will only turn this kind of forum into a closed and exclusive one.

Sugiono, a member of this informal forum FLAG, said that no representative from laskar attends regular meetings, despite the fact that there are more than 40 laskar groups in Solo. He believed this is an issue of concern, although he realised that inviting those who have different ideas might affect the mood of the forum. He said that ‘if we have a meeting, we do not meet them...[and] that is the problem’. Bringing together different groups, particularly those who have different perspectives, is something that needs further work in the case of Surakarta since the issue is more than a meeting, but also a question of representation. Surakarta belongs to all groups, not only those who have ‘tolerant perspectives’. Some of the leaders of Islamist groups were involved in several formal discussions, but they admitted that they rarely engage in more constructive debates with different groups in the city. In those formal discussions they mainly tell audiences about what they believe, yet this is not followed up with a more engaged conversation. Arman said that

With non-Muslim [groups], in principle we tell [them] our ideas...our perspectives... if we work together... it’s not [that we] do not want to... so we have the Shariah principle... so, we are ready to work together... even with demons... as long as [it is] something good [takwa, doing something good and avoid something bad according to religion].

This argument shows that there is a willingness from Islamist groups to be involved in a more engaged conversation – even to work together with the ‘demons’ (a word used by the Islamist groups to refer to really bad groups of people). While Arman did not clearly explain to which groups this word refers to, he did state that as long as the process of engagement is conducted in a Shariah way, based on his interpretation, he would be willing to work together. This Shariah principle is indeed contested, even among Muslim groups in Solo, for example when it comes to the interpretation relating to voting for a non-Muslim leader. However, cultivating citizenship requires a space for it to be questioned, contested, and negotiated by the different communities in response to the dynamic of political and social change to achieve a common ground. As Young (1990; 1998) points out, an open space is needed to facilitate different social groups’ participation in social and political decision-making process. This would make it possible to transform ‘their concern’ into ‘our concern’. The experimentation of LPLAG member in engaging the leader of a hard-core laskar group is an example of success, but it is
limited in scale and needs to be translated into a more collective process that involves more diverse groups in Solo.

A rather more formal forum such as FKUB also faces similar issues, as currently there is no representative from Islamist groups. Furthermore, FKUB tends to be limited in its focus on more procedural issues, meaning that as long as all parties meet the ‘procedural requirement’, the case will be resolved. There is a limitation here, however, as more substantial issues tend to be neglected. As mentioned earlier, for example, the issue of places of worship is more than about procedural documents. Joni, a *laskar* leader, protested the Busukan church, saying that ‘[the issue of] building a church is not [whether they are] getting permission or not...but [if] in the surrounding area, there are negative effects...so don’t [build the church]’. This line of argument is rather more controversial, and thus requires a more careful engagement that goes beyond procedural contestations.

Another lesson to be learnt from Surakarta is the emergence of a more natural bottom-up engagement between different religious communities at the grass-roots level in this city. This is not to say that many top-down initiatives organised by the leaders of the elites are not important. Rather a more inclusive and democratic citizenship needs to be cultivated at multiple levels and requires the co-operation and commitment of people across different groups. As stated earlier, the role of leaders of different groups in Solo in controlling their members has been positively highlighted by participants in keeping Solo under control. However, as Lukman noted, while effective communication and commitment toward peace and harmony are easily forged at the leadership level, the clash between the member of different groups at the grass-roots level does occur. Furthermore, Dendi said that the elites do not necessarily represent the grass-roots people and thus the problems solved by the elites do not always mean the same to the people. Thus, it is not surprising that elitist forums are often questioned as to whether they represent the interests of the people or are simply serving the elites’ own interests.

Yasmin critically commented on such forums as potentially hiding the danger, which is only serving the so-called leaders who often use these opportunities to pursue their own self-betterment agendas. She said, ‘*When engaging in interfaith forum...indeed there is someone who wants to improve his/her social class, want to get a status, want to get opportunity.* ’She highlighted that it is partly because of these interests that the current situation in Solo is the way it is. As noted by Dendi, Solo is a small city with numerous opportunities for the flow of people, interests and ideas to meet. Yasmin did not mind this as long as pursuing one’s interests is conducted in a transparent way, although she lamented if in the end, ‘*it is all about the money*’. This is because
this greed can potentially undermine efforts to cultivate a more robust citizenship. A strong critique directed by the Islamist groups to this kind of elitist-initiated forum is that they are aimed only at gaining favours from the government.

Initiatives at the elite level need to be translated into a more concrete and natural way that can be reflected in every day interaction between different groups. The story of Joyodiningratan GKI church (Gereja Kristen Jawa, Christian Church of Java) and the Al-Hikmah mosque shows a natural interaction between the Muslim and Christian communities in this area. This church and mosque share the same address; both buildings are separated by a slim wall so that whenever there is *adzan* (signal for praying) the people at the church will clearly hear it. The same goes for Muslims in the mosque whenever the church is organising religious ceremonies. Instead of feeling disturbed, they see this as part of normal process. One of the leaders of the church said that ‘maybe if it [adzan] is not heard, we even feel guilty...or strange’. Similarly, whenever the church is having a ceremony, on Christmas Eve for example (*kebaktian natal*), Muslims do not feel distracted during the praying, even though it is considered important for a Muslim prayer to be very focused (*khusyu*). Sajad, the leader of the mosque, said

*Imagine during the Christmas celebration [while] we are praying...Muslims who are very focussed during the praying need to listen, it is so beautiful...the ear of Muslims, during praying, does not mean cannot be used to listen, but [that] they have to listen... but the praying is still very focussed.*

Since they share the same address, they have the same front yard, and they both use it together when they need it. During Christmas, for example, the members of the church park their vehicles in front of the mosque while on Eid Adha, the Muslim community put all the animals for slaughtering in front of the church. This process has been organised in a natural way, by informing the church or mosque whenever they have certain activities that require using the yard. Sajad described this relationship ‘just like a friendship’. To symbolise this harmony, a candle with an inscription (*prasasti lilin*) was made and placed at the front yard located between the mosque and the church. ‘*This candle inscription symbolizes that being different is beautiful*,’ said Sajad. This kind of friendship highlights an intimate relationship akin to brotherhood: ‘*indeed we are brothers, of the same nation and motherland, even though with different beliefs*,’ he continued.

The key point of this friendship is that it is based on a bottom-up natural process where the interaction between these two communities occurs based on their everyday needs. Whenever there is something to discuss they will communicate with each other: ‘*if not, then not... by doing that it [the communication] will flow naturally*’, Sajad argued. There is no meeting regularly
scheduled between the leaders of these communities, but they do meet in many societal activities such as when the church has an event and the people of the mosque are invited. The priestess of this church is also involved in PKK (Pemberdayaan dan Kesejahteraan Keluarga, Empowerment and Family Prosperity), an organisation to support mothers and their family, regardless of their backgrounds. Communication also takes place when the priestess plays with children in the neighbourhoods. Thus, the communication between the church, the mosque and the society occurs in a more subtle and natural way and therefore has lasted from generation to generation.

A concern emerges regarding the future of this peaceful interaction between these two communities as a result of the increasing number of militant groups, particularly those who always ‘monitor’ the churches. Leaders of these two communities acknowledge the importance of understanding the history of these two buildings. New religious and political leaders are also required to understand the history and peaceful relationship between them. The church has its own system whereby every leader needs to understand the history of the church to which she or he is going to be appointed. Meanwhile, for Muslims, Sajad said that ‘If [someone] does not understand this detail [of the history], he cannot be the leader of this mosque, [because it will be] so dangerous’. This statement shows that the active involvement of community leaders and local people can be a strong base to cultivate an active-inclusive citizenship.

The last feature of the dynamic of citizenship practices in Surakarta is the emergence of Wong Solo identity. The 1998 riots that resulted in the economic crises that impacted the social and cultural life of the people led to new awareness among people in Solo regarding their identity. At the same time, they served as a glue that brought the people of Solo together. Dendi used these events to construct a narrative that is then communicated to different people, regardless of their backgrounds. When he was appointed to lead a discussion, he used these words to address those who attended the forum: ‘I tell them, we are Wong Solo... [who are] glad to discuss important things in our area to be a lesson learnt’. In this language, the emphasis is on bringing all people from different groups together and constructing them as being part of a more collective identity, regardless of their differences.

Melati emphasised that the sense of belonging amongst the people living in Solo keeps increasing. Melati has been living in Solo for 10 years and she felt that her love of Solo has increased. Part of the reason is because people start to see Surakarta as a comfortable city, a place to invest in, one that requires collective commitment to protect:
Solo people have awareness to love Solo, to keep Solo. I have been here for 10 years. I feel the sense of belongings of Solo has increased...and this means they do not want their city to be destroyed by certain people.

She acknowledged the history of violence of Solo and the growing number of militant groups that, for her, might spoil the current peaceful situation: ‘If not for these local people [wong Solo], who else [can] protect Solo?’, she added.

As a Wong Solo and an Indonesian, she sees living with people from different backgrounds like living in a family. Although there are many rooms that separate the various members, they are connected to each other as members of the same family: ‘There is a space for meeting, where every member of family can share and live together’, she said. Despite the different characteristics of the members of the family, she hoped that every member of the family could learn from each other and accept their differences. She believed that differences are ‘not only to be respected but to be celebrated as a gift’. For her, differences do not threaten but offer opportunities for learning.

The idea of Wong Solo also resonates within Islamist groups. While depicting the future situation of Solo as an ideological battlefield, these groups still considers Wong Solo as a factor to consider: ‘[regarding the ideological battlefield] ...whether it will be subdued by the kind-heartedness of Wong Solo, I do not know’, Salim laughingly said. He himself feels the responsibility to protect Solo, since Solo is his home too. He said, ‘I personally see that this is our house. Do not destroy it’. He was concerned about some issues in Solo, such as the youths’ high exposure to alcohol. Thus, he said this needed to be resolved and ‘if we cannot do it our way...let’s make a local regulation. If it is a local regulation, they will follow’. Arman, another figure within Islamist groups, also shared the dream to build Solo as a peaceful and prosperous city, although emphasising a ‘Solo that progresses in the name of Islam, because I believe that Islam will take us there’.

These different narratives of Wong Solo show how people from different groups have concerns about Solo and how to make it a better city. However, what Wong Solo means and what kind of responsibility it brings is perceived differently. Melati’s concept of Wong Solo, for example, derives from an inclusive perspective, where differences need to be acknowledged and respected. People, regardless of their backgrounds, need to be treated equally since they are the same members of the one ‘family’. On the other hand, the dream of Islamist groups comes from their religious understanding, where they believe that focusing more on religious values (i.e. Islam) will lead Solo to become a peaceful and prosperous city. While this kind of religious perspective will be highly contested when it comes to interpretation and application, the inclusive
perspective also faces challenges from a more sectarian one, be it in the name of religion, culture, or ideology.

Therefore, there is a need to bring these different perspectives into a more synthesised discussion. The awareness of Wong Solo has paved the way for bringing all parties together since they share the similar concerns and hold same responsibilities. However, they seem to work differently. A more constructive engagement is likely to bring them closer together. The aim is not to find a one single solution for all the local problems, since the ‘pluricentrism’ of Solo opens up a space for different logics and narratives; it is to find shared common grounds for different groups to come and work together.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the practices of citizenship in two cities, namely Yogyakarta and Surakarta. These two cities have a shared history being previously part of the same political entity: The Kingdom of Mataram, the biggest Islamic kingdom in the 17th century in the archipelago.

Recent incidents bearing on relationships between the faith communities in both cities, however, suggest important developments in social dynamics affecting religious minorities. Looking at the dynamic of citizenship practices, this research has highlighted some key factors that contribute to the problematisation of citizenship practices in both cities. The allegedly weak performance of the state apparatus in Yogyakarta, the steadily diminishing authority of the Palace, the paucity of physical social spaces conducive to positive interactions, and the absence of shared common interests between different groups have all contributed to significant changes in patterns of interaction between different communities. On the other hand, the strong performance of government and state apparatus in Surakarta, the active participation from leaders of different groups, their role in controlling their members, as well as the increasing dedication among Wong Solo to protect their city have contributed to the relatively peaceful interaction between different groups in Surakarta.

These differences notwithstanding, both cities share similar challenges. Most notably, procedural requirements for new places of worship have led to renewed tensions between the Muslim and Christian communities. There are many places of worship that still do not have buildings suitable for performing religious rituals and ceremonies. The objections to building churches due to fears of Christianisation have persisted in both cities. The main difference is that
the tension in Yogyakarta has sometimes resulted in outright violence, while in Surakarta, it has not. The active role of government in Surakarta to mitigate the tension has prevented the eruption of violence. Furthermore, the role of traditional leaders has lessened the levels of tension in the city. As mentioned earlier, many laskar miitia groups exist in this city and remain quite active in problematising many issues they perceive as being against religion or regulation, in particular building places of worship. However, many of these groups have been coordinated in one organisation that functions to control the actions of these different groups. In Yogyakarta, the existence of similar groups is also a challenge for maintaining peaceful interactions between different groups. Unlike in Surakarta, however, there is no organisational function to control the movement of these groups, which tend to act independently.

The active citizenship evident in the everyday practices across the two cities gives some grounds for optimism regarding the future of religious minorities and inter-faith dialogue. But these practices need to be ‘scaled up’ and normalised so that they can become an enduring feature of mainstream interaction between different communities in both cities.

One last feature that sheds light on the differences between the two cities is the increasing awareness of collective identity in Surakarta, which is largely missing in Yogyakarta. The identity of Wong Solo has acted as a glue that made different parties feel responsible for protecting Surakarta and keeping it peaceful. They have a shared history of inter-group violence and thus do not want this to happen again. Their collective identity encourages them to think about their daily practices and their implications for the social peace in their city. In Yogyakarta, this kind of collective identity has not emerged, partly due to the lack of social spaces that facilitate encounters and exchanges between different groups. Rather than serving as a collective identity, the discussion over Wong Jogja seems to be referring only to local people while at the same time differentiating them from newcomers. The uniqueness of Yogyakarta (Yogyakarta Istimewa) also seems to be interpreted rather narrowly and is often defined as a unique entity in term of cultural backgrounds.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

The study’s key findings suggest that citizenship is practiced in distinctly diverse ways in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Indeed, the discursive constructions that navigate these practices take different forms that cannot be simplified into the single categories of either politics or religion. The conceptual framework adopted in this project suggests that the practices of citizenship are dynamic and are bound up with contestation over the meaning-making process. This involves not only the state, community, or individuals as the actors, but also the justifications for these actions, be they in the name of religion, culture, constitution, or the intersection of these three.

The first section of this chapter reflects on the role of religion in the practices of citizenship at the two research sites. As the findings suggest, religion has played an important role in navigating the practices performed by different actors in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. The concept of religious citizenship introduced by Hudson (2003) sheds light on the dynamics of religion and citizenship in Yogyakarta and Surakarta, exploring how and to what extent it is used and how this is reflected in performative acts of citizenship.

The second section discusses the issue of culture and citizenship practices. As the theoretical framework suggests, looking at the role of culture provides insights into understanding how certain citizenship practices are developed, conceptualised and how they are practiced in two research sites. As both research sites are predominantly Javanese, key cultural symbols, terms and practices of Javanese culture will be examined to reflect on how they are being used to conceptualise citizenship.

The third section discusses the practices of citizenship in the form of everyday life activities. As citizenship literature suggests, citizenship is about much more than simply voting during the elections, paying taxes, and working for public services; it also shapes numerous everyday activities that are deeply rooted in a society. Many of these practices function as glue to cements the disparate elements of society together, maintaining harmony and cohesion. This section further examines this issue. It also discusses what Isin (2008) referred to as ‘the act of citizenship.’ One can understand citizenship as being something ‘static’, such as in the form of long-performed practices that stabilise the society and help it function. However, citizenship also has a dynamic element. As a citizen an individual has rights which are available for them to claim.
through day to day practices and this is what the act of citizenship investigates. The findings from Yogyakarta and Surakarta (Solo) suggest that these dynamic practices of citizenship deserve further investigation. This requires looking not only at the order and the habitus, but also the rupture that facilitates the acts of citizenship.

The fourth section discusses the issues surrounding the virtues of citizenship. As the literature suggests, citizenship is not only about rights but also duty and responsibility. The findings show that the different actors act out citizenship practices differently in the two cities. This makes cultivating a more democratic and peaceful citizenship in both cities challenging, as common agendas have not yet been established. This tends to result in the segmentation of efforts to forge democratic citizenship, diminishing their capacity to resonate among the broader population. The extent of this lack of common agendas in cultivating citizenship and how this issue is placed within in citizenship theory is discussed in this section.

The fifth section reflects the findings of this research regarding the regulation over citizenship practices under Pancasila, the Five Principles, the statement that constitutes the ideological foundations of the Indonesian state. The section briefly sketches the history of Pancasila and the attempts of different regimes, from the Old Order Regime to the Regime in the Reform Era, to interpret Pancasila in a more practical way.

5.2 Religion and Citizenship: Competing Religious Citizenship in Practices

In the 21st century there are indications that the level of interest in understanding religion at the local, national, and global contexts has increased sharply, particularly after the 9/11 al-Qaeda attacks in America in 2001, which shocked many into thinking about issues relating to religion and violence. These attacks caught people off-guard, particularly those living far from conflict zones in the West, leaving them struggling to understand what was happening to international affairs and intercultural relations. After being overlooked for many decades within international relations discourse, particularly during the Cold War where the issue of religion had been subsumed under history, economics, ideologies, or politics category, religion has become a major topic of discussion once more.

Western liberalism, being self-consciously secular in nature, has not placed religion as an important factor in public life. Indeed, religion has been seen as an enemy of this modern progress as it is often associated with a chauvinistic and barbaric nature that can lead to violent
conflict, thereby making it incompatible with the modern, rational and civilised new world. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, religion, together with the idea of nationalism, has come to surface and become a vital part of the new language of freedom, particularly in developing nations. Once predicted to become irrelevant, even extinct, religion is now being perceived as back at the centre of many current events and the contribution of religious to regulating public life is once again a serious matter for public discussion (see for example Casanova 1994). Consequently, the role of religion in causing, prolonging, or transforming conflicts, as well as the ways in which it contributes to the modern world, has gained renewed attention by many scholars.

The findings of this study in Yogyakarta and Surakarta suggest that religion continues to play a key role in public life. Though it functions and is used differently by the participants, the findings show that instead of religion declining and retreating into the private sphere, as modernisation theory had predicted, it is once again gaining popularity. Previously, religion had been associated with backwardness and superstition (Berger 1999) and was also seen as incompatible with democracy, transparency, human rights, and so forth. However, this is no longer automatically assumed. While some religious institutions and communities may have lessened their influence, religion is by no means fading away.

To explain this phenomenon, Berger (1999, p. 3) argues that in responding to modernisation, religious communities or institutions react in two main ways: rejection and adaptation. With rejection, certain religious groups see modernisation as an enemy to be resisted, much like the ways in which proponents of modernization see religion. Those pushing the rejection stance advocate either a ‘religious revolution’, which requires the whole modern system be substituted by the religious ones, or that ‘religious subcultures’ need to protect religious communities from the harms of (Western) modernisation.

Those advocating adaptation argue that religious institutions and communities should change and evolve to meet the needs of modern society. Scholars like Berger (1999) note this adaptation has the potential to help religion not only survive but also to flourish. Although not without points of controversy, as will be discussed later, this can be observed generally in public life in Indonesia.

The role of religion, with respect to the issue of citizenship, has long been marginalised. Indeed, religion has been seen as the ‘archenemy of citizenship.’ As Turner (2002) notes, religion has been considered as being hostile towards citizenship, due to the latter being a secular notion. The religious and the secular, while they offer ‘separate but parallel form of membership’, potentially conflict to each other, particularly when it comes to their members claiming rights,
performing duties and acting on behalf of obligation (Turner 2017, p. 3). It is argued that
democratic citizenship can only rise when religion wanes or citizenship requires the liberation of
society from religious hegemony’ (Turner 2002). However, Turner (2002) suggests something
rather different. Drawing upon the work of the Weberian tradition, he argues that the
relationship between religion and democratic citizenship can be conceptualised along the
relationship between religion and capitalism. Therefore, ‘if the unintended consequence of
religious asceticism was the spirit of capitalism, then the unintended consequence of the rejection
of the world was the spirit of liberal democracy’ (Turner 2002, p. 260).

This argument suggests that while religion is often seen as an obstacle toward cultivating
secularised modern values, at the same time, it is advocating for social bonds that go well beyond
mere primordial ones. In fact, faith-based communities have at times undermined primordial
associations, such as those of ethnicity and kinship, and have made it possible for the people to
have more transcendent associations (Turner 2002, p. 261), increasing the likelihood of more
democratic citizenship. Therefore, and following Turner’s framing, it can be argued here that
the more religious a society is the greater the chance of constructing a more democratic
citizenship. However, this does not necessarily mean that every religious aspiration will always go
hand in hand with the democratic citizenship principles, nor does it mean that religious demands
will always obstruct the process of creating a more democratic and inclusive citizenship. In fact,
the relationship between religion, democracy and citizenship is anything but simple.

As the findings from this study suggest, most participants, with the significant exemption
of the extremist Islamist groups, believe that religion, democracy, and nation-state are not
mutually exclusive, but rather can enhance each other. Being religious does not prohibit them
from being good citizens; and nor does being a good citizen require them to give up their religious
convictions. Instead, the values of religion as they interpret them, by and large, have shaped their
understanding of citizenship. Furthermore, when translated into the regulations, the principles
of religion and democratic values do not violate to each other. They regulate their own domain
but are not necessarily in opposition. Thus, being a good citizen means to obey the rules without
making claims of superiority. This is because democratic principles do not prohibit them from
exercising their faith. Instead, as the Indonesian constitution guarantees, every person has the
right to perform their religious obligations; it is the interpretation of religious teachings that can
give a more solid foundation to cultivating democratic citizenship.

Nevertheless, the findings of this study point to ways in which democracy and nation-state
might not always be compatible with religious values such as those associated with certain Islamic
interpretations. Islamist groups, to greater or lesser degrees, reject democratic values, saying they are created by human beings and therefore stand in stark contrast with religious tenets created by God. For them, democracy and nation-states represent something new and create difficulties for Muslims when practicing their religion. For them, the current political model in Indonesia does not facilitate Muslim aspirations. Due to this, instead of conceptualising the governance based on democracy and nation-state, they assert that Islamic-based governance in the form of Islamic state or *khilafah Islamiyah* (Islamic caliphate) is the only answer, whilst claiming that this enlightened religious governance will not discriminate against non-Muslim groups. The history of the first *Islamic caliphate*, they assert, is an example of this enlightened governance. In short, they reject modern democratic values and propose religious ones because they believe that the former is inferior to the latter.

These two opposing views are well-known within the Indonesian context and have been the subject of considerable debate. As history shows, the foundations of the Indonesian state have been the subject of much discussion among the founding fathers since its beginnings. Among conservative Muslim groups, the argument over the philosophical foundation of the state has long been a crucial point. More progressive Muslim groups, however, believe that Indonesian political architecture can and should be inclusive, making it possible for people from different communities to live equally, side by side. Nevertheless, a vocal minority of Muslims believe that Indonesia should be designed as Islamic state or at least shariah Islam should be incorporated into the state. The latter proposal was rejected and Indonesia was designed as a modern democratic state – neither secular nor religious.

With this in mind, the findings of this research project show that the aim of reactionary Islamist groups to establish an Islamic state in Indonesia continues to find considerable support. As Bertrand (2005) argues, Indonesia has experienced at least three critical junctures in which its *Pancasila*’s secularity faced intense criticism as well as concerted efforts to overturn it. The first critical juncture, which occurred during the establishment of the nation-state, was briefly discussed above. The second happened during the transition from the Old Order regime to the New Order. The third critical juncture occurred during the collapse of the New Order regime and at the beginning of the Reform Era. Within these junctures, religion and the national political philosophy of state were central issues of contention.

Throughout the history of the republic, Islam has been an important part of the nationalist movement. This is one of the most important ways in which Indonesian nationalism differs from European nationalism. Anderson suggests that nationalism as an expression of an
‘imagined community’ emerges, in part, due to the decline of religion (the other main reason being the decline of the existing political order such as the political-based dynasty). Anderson (2006, p. 16) notes that part of the reason for the decline of religion is ‘the demotion of the sacred language’ (Anderson 2006, p. 18). Anderson points to experience of medieval Western Europe, whose foremost language of scholarship and intellectual exchange was Latin. The arrival of the printing press and the expansion of print-capitalism quickly ended this hegemony as vernacular languages began to dominate the print market. With this trend, he argues, ‘the fall of Latin exemplified a larger process in which the sacred communities integrated by old sacred languages were gradually fragmented, pluralized, and territorialized’ (2006, p. 19).

This is not to say that nationalism automatically emerges because of the decline of religion and the accompanying decline of dynastic realms. Anderson (2006, p. 22) states that their decline facilitates the possibility of apprehending the world in dramatically new ways, and thus ‘made it possible to ‘think’ the nation’. Chatterjee (2004, p. 5-7) argues that nationalism as an imagined community as proposed by Anderson is conceptualised as something emerging in the ‘empty homogeneous time-space of modernity’ that makes it possible to think of the world as ‘one’, and the activities referred to as politics occur ‘everywhere’. Chatterjee argues that this conception of time-space, however, is a decidedly utopian one, (2006, p. 7). For him, instead of being homogeneous, time-space is heterogeneous, in that people may live in the same place but have different conception of their shared time-space. In short, political concepts such as nationalism, or citizenship in particular, may mean very different things to different people. In line with this argument and within the Indonesian context, Hefner (2000, p. 14) points to the plurality of nationalism conceptions in Indonesia, arguing that it is more plural and multi-ethnic than that of Europe, where the tendency is towards ‘a single ethnic prototype’. This plurality, I argue, includes the different religious imaginations within Indonesian nationalism.

Bringing this theoretical discussion over to nationalism and religion in the Indonesian context is important. As the idea of nationalism closely relates to the citizenship project, the different conceptions of nationalism tend to result in different conceptions of citizenship. When considering the European experience, it can be argued that nationalism, at least as Anderson imagines it, tends to be secularised amid the decomposition of sacred language and thus of religion. The citizenship project is then conceptualised in a more secular way in which religion is viewed as hostile toward citizenship. And, as Turner (2002) argues, instead of further affirming this idea, religion provides a foundation to build a more inclusive citizenship since it transcends
the primordial bonds of kinship and ethnic solidarity. It is at this point that the discussion of religious citizenship within the Indonesian context finds its significance.

Hudson (2003) introduced the concept of religious citizenship as taking on different forms: firstly, the nation-state model where the state allows (and disallows) its citizens to perform religious obligations. Secondly, the civil society model, in which people can exercise their rights in public as religious people. Thirdly, it can take the form of a person’s right to exercise their religious obligations freely within local, national, and international contexts. Also, it may refer to the specific legal documents that makes the state oblige to this. Lastly, it may refer to the declaration of a person of a certain religion who, with this declaration, can claim their rights. The ways in which these different forms of religious citizenship shed light on the citizenship practices in the two research sites of Yogyakarta and Surakarta will be discussed in this chapter.

The nation-state model of religious citizenship has been practiced since the establishment of the Republic of Indonesia. The 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945) guarantees that every person is free to perform their religious obligations. However, during the Old Order regime, the state acknowledged only six religions: Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. This meant followers of other faith traditions, including indigenous spiritualities as well as agnostics and atheists, did not enjoy the same freedoms and so experienced a less privileged form of citizenship as, effectively, ‘second-class’ citizens. When the Blasphemy Law was introduced in the 1965, the situation deteriorated even further. This law, at that time, was aimed at controlling the rapid rise in popularity of indigenous spiritual beliefs (Kholiludin 2009, p. 184-186). However, this regulation has been used to judge what religious expression is allowed and what is not.

When the Old Order collapsed in 1965 and the New Order was established in 1966, the practice of religiously differentiated citizenship did not fade away, but became even stronger. The acknowledgement of official religions was institutionalised (but with the elimination of distinctively Chinese Confucianism) when, in 1978 the government obliged people to declare their religious identity on their national identity card. These national identity cards featured a column nominating which of the five official religions the holder belonged to. The obligation to declare religious affiliation presented challenges for many, particularly for those who did not feel that they belonged to any of the five official religions. In addition, in the 1980s the regime declared the Pancasila to be the ‘sole foundation’ (asas tunggal) of every mass-based civil society organisation and political party (Ismail 1995). This policy was met with heated reactions, particularly from those who maintained the dream of The Jakarta Charter being reinstated. In
short, at that time, religious life was heavily regulated by the state. Religion was seen as a potential threat to the state, and thus represented something to be tightly controlled.

The collapse of the New Order regime in 1998 marked a new hope towards reconfiguring matters of identity, particularly with respect to religious identity and associated political aspirations. Some progressive reforms were quickly instituted, such as the official recognition of Confucianism as a religion, making it possible for its followers to celebrate their religious rituals in public after many years of prohibition by the New Order regime (BBC, 7 April 2011). More recently, the obligation to indicate religious affiliation to one of six officially recognised religions on the identity card has been annulled, meaning that the followers of traditional beliefs can now nominate their beliefs on the card. Previously, they left the religious column blank and consequently were discriminated against when exercising their rights to access public services (Erdianto 2017). Nevertheless, key instruments that ‘maintain’ religiously differentiated citizenship remained in place. And, apart from institutionalised religions, some new regulations relating to religious life have since been issued. The regulation on adherence to Ahmadiyah offers an insight as to how the state continues to be involved in disciplining the practices of religious communities. Apart from that, some policies at the local level that regulate religious lives illustrate how the state’s desire for control over this area has never really faded away.

Religious citizenship at the state level continues to pose significant challenges even though the constitution guarantees freedom with respect to the practice of religion in daily lives. This results in challenges for some, particularly when performing acts or exercising roles that invoke citizenship rights. As Hudson (2003) argues, defining citizenship at civil society level makes it possible for each citizen to exercise religious citizenship in different domains by practicing what is not directly controlled by the state. The findings from this project suggest that religious citizenship at the state and civil society level, or within civil society domains, are sometimes diametrically opposed.

The competition between different approaches to religious citizenship can be seen in the campaign to prohibit a non-Muslim from becoming a political leader in Surakarta. Advocates of this argument indicate that it is their religious and nationalist obligation to disseminate such information to the public, since they believe that this represents a central element of Islamic teaching. Furthermore, this group believes that a non-Muslim leader could not be made to act justly towards Muslims, especially under a non-Islamic system such as democracy. They refer to Western countries where they believe Muslims suffer discrimination from secular governments.
Choosing a Muslim leader, they argue, is required by *sharia* and that complying with this is essential to establishing an Islamic system, to achieve a just and prosperous society.

This argument of prohibiting non-Muslim leaders does not, in fact, represent the views of Muslims in general. Indeed, the argument was rejected by many Muslims in Surakarta who believe that this ‘Islamic’ view of prohibition represents only one interpretation amongst many and is not superior to the others. Furthermore, the Indonesian constitution does not prohibit non-Muslim leaders from competing for political positions at any level. For many, being a non-Muslim in Indonesia should not mean being a second-class citizen with less rights. However, the populist campaign for prohibiting non-Muslims from becoming political candidates puts non-Muslims in a very different position from Muslims, and effectively makes them second-class citizens. Furthermore, vigorously advocating for this in public might be expected to impact on non-Muslim candidates’ chances of being elected, to the point of making it practically impossible. Although this does not appear to be the case in Surakarta (where non-Muslim candidates have won elections), putting this kind of action in a larger picture could be seen as acting against the spirit of equality as it is promoted by the constitution.

The contestation around religious citizenship does not only occur at the state and civil society level, but also at the individual level, referring to the third form of religious practice. This is demonstrated in the case of intimidation towards a Shia-associated group in Yogyakarta, the *Raushan Fikr*. As discussed above, *Raushan Fikr* is an organisation officially registered and based in Yogyakarta. The leader of this group is a Shia follower but the organisation itself officially has nothing formally to do with the Shia community. Its main activities include class-based teaching and learning and public discussion, particularly on the topic of Islamic philosophy. The attendees do not all identify as Shia. This organisation has become the focus of certain extremist Islamist groups who demand that they cease such activities. Some classes and public lectures were called off, but the teaching and learning activities continued until the same group intensified their intimidation and forced them to stop all the activities.

The group was encouraged to stop the activities because they were accused of disseminating Shia teachings. Teaching and learning about Islamic philosophy, its accusers argue, is only a veneer. For such extremist Islamist groups, Shia teachings and practices are not considered to be part of Islam, even though other institutions such as MUI (from which the government frequently asks for religious edicts), does not say anything against Shia in Indonesia (with the exception of the more extremist branch of the MUI East Java, which states that they are practicing Islam the wrong way and thus need discipline). MUI Yogyakarta has been asked to
intervene by the groups who are against Shia teachings, but it has refused to issue any anti-Shia fatwa. Despite this, the Islamist groups believe that actions should be taken since, in their view, opposing Shia heresy represents an obligation for every Muslim. In the words of the leader of this extremist Islamist organisation, ‘if we know their wrongs, and we do not take any actions to save those who do not know..., then we are in the wrong’, which means that as a religious person, a Muslim, they need to exercise such action, otherwise they would be part of the ‘wrong’ groups, something that they act against.

The findings from this research project also suggest that the competition around religious citizenship may lead to competition between the domains of the state, civil society and the personal, where certain rights are acquired when someone declares themselves as part of religious community - the fifth form of religious citizenship. This can be seen in cases regarding Ahmadiyah communities across Indonesia, and Yogyakarta is no exception. Ahmadiyah groups represent one religious minority group that has suffered hardships in the past ten years as they are considered to practice blasphemy. Beginning with the attack on Ahmadiyah headquarters in Bogor in 2005, the attacks on Ahmadiyah communities across Indonesia have led to many casualties and numerous buildings related to Ahmadiyah have been destroyed.

In response to the attack on Ahmadiyah, the government issued the joint regulation of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the General Attorney on Warning and Order to Ahmadiyah Believers, Members, and/or the Members of Board of Ahmadiyah Community of Indonesia and the Members of Community (Peringatan dan Perintah kepada Penganut, Anggota, dan/atau Anggota Pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) dan Warga Masyarakat). This regulation warns the Ahmadiyah community, especially, the JAI group, to stop spreading Ahmadiyah teachings publicly. In particular, they are instructed to stop disseminating any teachings regarding the emergence of Prophet (Mirza Ghulam Ahmad) after the Prophet Muhammad. People are also warned to maintain religious harmony and that those who do not will be sanctioned according to the law. With this regulation, the Ahmadiyah community are restricted in the public dissemination of key elements of their religious teachings, since they are considered as deviating from the main tenets of Islam.

Based on the Indonesian Constitution, it is guaranteed that every person has the right to assemble, organise and express their ideas in oral and written forms. Bringing this to the discussion of religious citizenship, this regulation has limited the rights of Ahmadiyah people. While Yogyakarta is more tolerant than elsewhere in the case of Ahmadiyah, the limitations on their rights, as stated in the joint regulation, remain in place. Furthermore, their mosques also
have been sealed and access closed. Menchik (2016, p. 85) notes that the Ahmadiyah case indicates that the government practices ‘a limited form of pluralism without extending religious freedom to heterodox faiths’. The position of the government is shared among the two biggest mass organisations in Indonesia, NU and Muhammadiyah, both of which support the practice of pluralism and freedom of religion but not without any limits (Menchik 2016, p. 85-86).

However, in practice, it is not only the state apparatus but also some Islamist groups frequently monitor the activities of Ahmadiyah groups so that any activities that are deemed to be preaching their teachings would be dismissed. There have been many cases of certain Islamist groups acting to persecute Ahmadiyah groups. As Ahmadiyah teachings are considered to deviate from Islamic tenets, the rights of Ahmadiyah people to express their ideas on religion in public would only be retained if they decide ‘to come back to the true Islam,’ otherwise they would be unable to re-acquire these rights. It is at this point that the practice of religious citizenship at the state definition, civil society definition and the individual or groups domain do not only intersect, but serve to suppress other forms of religious citizenship.

***

Viewed within the broader context, the findings pose another puzzle about the relationship between religion and democracy. While the findings suggest that there are at least two different views of how religion and democracy are related, in practice, things are not quite as simple as that. The contestation over religious citizenship practices have shown the complexity of this relation by which different actors from state, (un)civil society and individuals navigate their everyday practices. The question is to what extent can majoritarian religion be facilitated in political and civil life without diminishing the rights of minority religious groups rights. Religion should, in fact, play an important role in nurturing democratic citizenship.

The relationship between religion and democracy, particularly Islam, has been a subject of considerable debate between scholars. Some believe that Islam is not compatible with democracy due deep differences between the two. Scholars such as Huntington (1993) and Lewis (2002) argued that instead of nurturing democracy, Islam would be one of the major threats that lead to the clash of civilizations, or instead of reflecting more on ‘what went wrong’ with Islam, the Muslims would always blame the west for their inability to adapt to the modern life, and thus of democracy. Both scholars referred to the historical conflict between Muslims and Christians (as representing the West) that has been lasted for long time and see this as a pattern of antagonist relationship between them.
These views have been rejected by many as essentialising Islam and portraying it as something monolithic and static. Roy (2004) for example strongly criticizes this kind of view that tend to see Islam as ‘a discrete entity, a coherent and closed set of beliefs’ that allow the western scholars such as Huntington or Lewis as ‘an explanatory concept for almost everything involving Muslims’ (Roy 2004, p. 9). This notion is shared by Esposito (1986) who notes that Islam, like other world religions, is in practice, represented by different voices and groups, meaning that there is no singular ‘true representation’ of Islam. In line to this argument, Stepan (2001) believes that Islam is multi-vocal and with that in nature it may provide resources for nurturing democracy.

Among Muslim scholars, Hilmy (2010) notes that there are different voices too as some of them believe in the compatibility of Islam and democracy. Scholars such as Abdolkarim and Abou el-Fadl are among the key proponents of this idea as they tend to see that Islam is not only compatible with democracy but in fact that democratic values are embedded within it (Hilmy 2010, p. 35). Among those who reject the idea of this compatibility are seminal Islamist writers such as Sayyid Qutb and Abd al-Qadim Zallum (one of the key leading figure in Hizbut Tahrir). These radical Islamists not only reject democracy, saying that it does not come from Islamic sources, but also that there is no place for it in Islam.

The different voices among scholars, in particular within Muslims, on the relationship between Islam and democracy points to the reality that there is no single and simplistic agreement about between the relationship of the two. Rather, it is multi-vocal, as Stepan (2001) asserts, and consequently the way in which the relationship is expressed depends on which groups and voices are considered as representing Islam. The more inclusive Islam is seen to be, the more compatible it is to the democratic values and vice versa. In Indonesian context, the two biggest mass organisations, NU and Muhammadiyah, have long been considered as performing such inclusive and tolerant Islam, yet the ‘vocal minority’ Islamist groups have been competing their voices in response to public issues. The competition of the two, as the findings suggest, would be colouring the public life in the contemporary Indonesia with no indication of getting decline soon.

The question remains of how to facilitate these different voices so that democratic system may work without suppressing other views that are considered against democracy. Stepan (2000) argues that democracy should facilitates the articulation of religious individuals or groups’ interests in the political arena. They may create a political party or sponsor any organisations as long as they do not violate the democratic principles. At the same time, the religious institutions should not be privileged with any mandate of public policy that might dent critical freedom of
individuals. With this minimal boundary, religion, intellectually and institutionally, may play important role in nurturing democracy.

Casanova’s works (1994) on public religion, based on studying five cases of religious transformation in Spain, Poland, Brazil and the United States, not only informs the de-privatisation of religion in public life, but also the public functions of religion in calling upon the modern system to reflect more on their normative structures and values in regulating public life (228). It might, nevertheless, be contended that the state and market assumptions of what can be considered the ‘common good’ tend to be reduced in a more individual sense. Allowing religion to enter public life would facilitate the different rationalisation of ‘the traditional’ and ‘the modern’ that might result in checking and balances roles between the two, or facilitates what Stepan (2000) calls as ‘twin tolerations’.

Within this context, it is worth returning to the thesis proposed by Turner (2002) on the role of religion in cultivating democratic citizenship. Departing from the perspective of religious hostility toward citizenship and referring to the work of Weber, he argues that religion is to citizenship is what the spirit of the Protestant work ethic is to capitalism. He says, ‘If the unintended consequence of religious asceticism was the spirit of capitalism, then the unintended consequence of the rejection of the world was the spirit of liberal democracy’ (Turner 2002, p. 260) This is due to the fact that religion provides an inclusive foundation and a social bond that goes beyond the traditional one, be in the name of kinship or tribal-ethnic, which is a faith-based association. This kind of association may serve as a common civic culture, an idea nurtured by the liberal norm, that in turn would serve as solid foundation for democratic citizenship.

Considering the dynamics of practicing religious citizenship in Indonesia, it can be argued here that the thesis proposed by Turner (2002) would stand as long as religion is conceptualised in a more tolerant and inclusive way, or is positioned as a social ethics to function as checks and balances partner with the state to assert their public role that safeguards the practice of healthy democracy. Otherwise, it can constitute a hindrance to cultivating a more democratic citizenship in emerging democracies like Indonesia.

5.3 Culture and Citizenship Practices: Re-cultivating Values and Tradition

Apart from religion, the issue of culture has been widely addressed within the discourse of citizenship, particularly in immigrant countries such as the United States, Canada, Australia,
and some European states. One of the issues is whether these different cultures and traditions should be recognised and treated accordingly or whether they need to be treated equally based on the current civic norms, and adjusted to the rules and norms that the majority of people embrace. One of the proposals to deal with the challenges that come from these subjects, cultures, and traditions is the idea of multicultural citizenship. In fact, as Kymlicka proposes, these cultures and traditions need to be recognised and granted special rights or minority rights as long as they can conform to the basic tenets of liberalism such as freedom, tolerance, and autonomy. While this idea is criticised by many in terms of its conception of culture and how it places liberal values above ‘illiberal’ ones, he acknowledges that culture or tradition play important roles for the community that affect the way they think and act in their public life.

Unlike the countries mentioned above, Indonesia is not a country formed substantially by migration, thus its experiences are different from those of deeply plural Western countries like Britain and France, and especially New World nations formed through migration like the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Furthermore, the weltanschauung or the basic philosophical foundation of Indonesia, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (unity in diversity), has acknowledged diverse cultures and traditions, since it is these differences that have defined Indonesia since its inception. If there is a challenge for recognition, this comes from the indigenous people, whom national regulation has yet to provide protection for and who are often in conflict with large corporations. Due to this, the demand for recognition of their culture and tradition from the state is strongly voiced. The research sites of this project, namely the cities of Yogyakarta and Surakarta, experience no issues with indigenous people and their demands for recognition. Rather, this section discusses to what extent the issue of culture plays a role in navigating citizenship in the two research sites.

As discussed above, both research sites are predominantly Javanese. While the Javanese are dominant in these two cities, they co-exist with other groups of people, most of whom came as migrants. People of Chinese and Arabic heritage, for example, have been living for many generations in Surakarta. In Yogyakarta, diverse groups of people from all over Indonesia have been living side-by-side with the Javanese people. Open conflict between these groups in the name of culture or traditional values rarely occurs, even though conflict over political and economic interests between Chinese and Javanese people has occurred many times throughout the history of Surakarta. If there are tensions in terms of cultural values, they are between religious values such as Islam and Javanese values. This is because while some Islamist groups advocate their ‘purification,’ others seek to incorporate Javanese values or rituals into religious
performance. Consequently, the tension lies on whether Javanese rituals need to be accommodated by religious ones or clearly separated, so that the religion will remain pure.

Differing from the religion that is expressed demonstratively by the participants in Yogyakarta and Surakarta, the values of Javanese culture are not clearly articulated. With religion, basic tenets and sacred texts can generally be identified. At least, ontologically speaking, to paraphrase the words of one participant from Surakarta regarding democracy and religion, ‘culture is man-made, while religion is God-made.’ Nevertheless, in practice, religious elements and cultural elements interact and are intertwined with each other since religions do not exist in an empty space but in one which is occupied by cultural values and performances. On the other hand, culture is difficult to define. There are many disagreements among social or cultural theorists regarding how to define culture: whether it is merely about rituals, something tangible or intangible, a tradition that has been inherited through generations, or a combination of these. Due to this, instead of defining what Javanese culture is, since Java is not a single entity and thus of its culture, the discussion over culture and citizenship in this section focus more on cultural symbolic forms, terms and practices, and how these are used to navigate citizenship practices.

One of the important cultural symbols within Javanese culture is a kingdom or a palace. Not only does it symbolise the centre of polity, it also symbolises statecraft and governance. The ruler or the king is seen as someone with great power, with which he is believed to bring prosperity to the people. The king is always depicted as wise, pure-hearted and concerned with the welfare of the people. With this conceptualisation, it is not surprising that the terms used between people and the king are *kawula* (servant) for the people and *gusti* (lord) for the ruler. With this kind of relationship, it can be seen how Javanese people place the rulers among themselves and how important it is for them to listen to the king, as a *gusti*. It is with this kind of relationship that Javanese people have the concept of *narima* (acceptance), whereby they will act according to what they have been appointed to do or accept what they have been given, and to do so with gratitude.

The two research sites used to be part of the same, greater kingdom in the past, the *Mataram* Kingdom. Due to colonisation and political intrigues within the Kingdom, however, this last great kingdom in Java was split into two palaces, namely Yogyakarta and Surakarta. As history unfolded, the palaces came to function differently. In Yogyakarta, the palace has been
central to the Yogyakarta people, whereas in Surakarta, due to the ‘unholy alliance’ between the royal palace and the colonial regime at that time, the palace no longer plays a significant role in the lives of the people there. Consequently, in the current political system, whilst the Sultan (king) of Yogyakarta is automatically appointed as the governor of Yogyakarta, the Sultan of Surakarta does not enjoy this privilege. Instead, the modern bureaucracy long ago took over the administrative function within local government. In other words, in Yogyakarta, the Sultan acts as cultural and political leader while the Sultan of Surakarta does not.

Recent developments regarding the interaction between different communities in Yogyakarta, however, have undermined the position of the Sultan as a charismatic cultural leader. The incidences of violence, particularly related to religious issues, occur repeatedly in the city. Even though the Sultan has issued some statements to condemn these actions, no major changes have occurred and thus the violent trend has continued. It is at this point that the cultural position of the Sultan starts to be questioned. For some non-governmental organisations, the Sultan has not acted appropriately to stop intolerant actions, despite the fact the cultural leader has the power to act beyond simply issuing a statement. Furthermore, when a network of non-governmental organisations in the city declared the violence a state of emergency in Yogyakarta, the Palace denied this emergency status. This status would not only undermine the position of the Sultan as the cultural, charismatic and political leader of Yogyakarta, but also the assertion that Yogyakarta is a city of tolerance.

Indeed, the increasing number of violent attacks in Yogyakarta could not solely be explained from this cultural perspective. As Alnaf and Salim (2017) note the increase in attacks relates to structural changes at the social, economic and political levels that in turn affect the cultural life of people in Yogyakarta. The introduction of regional autonomy after the collapse of the New Order Regime brought about some political consequences such as choosing the local leader via election process. Complicating these changes is the internal conflict within the palace that has impacted how the government could control the city and thus led to the crises of the special (krisis keistimewaan).

Therefore, the power of Sultan as a cultural charismatic leader is questioned whenever he does not act decisively in solving inter-communal tensions and conflicts. In the Javanese kingdom, the Sultan is given weighty titles such as Senapati ing Ngalaga Sayyidin Panatagama

Kalifatullah (Supreme Commander of War and the Organizing Head of Religious Affairs, the Apostle of the Prophet) (Mudjanto 1986, p. 105). This title suggests that the Sultan is also a leader of the religious community and is expected to keep the balance between different religious groups within the city. Yogyakarta has been a home for different religious communities and cultural beliefs, from the radical to the syncretic. Consequently, maintaining harmony, as the Javanese culture desires, and achieving a balance among these diverse groups is important. For some representatives of mass organisations, the current situation in Yogyakarta has become untenable because the Sultan no longer maintains balance and harmony. This is, as one of the participants suggests, because the connection between Yogyakarta people and the Sultan has been broken down.

This disconnect between the Sultan and the people is partly due to the distancing of the Sultan from the people. Traditionally, the Sultan had to present himself regularly among the people, for example, by attending Friday prayer in different mosques. Not only did this show that the Sultan is physically present among the people, but it was also a way to communicate more directly with them. After the Friday prayer, informal conversations were held so that the Sultan could hear directly the issues faced by the people. This tradition, however, is no longer maintained by the Sultan. Instead, with the rapid influx of investment in Yogyakarta, the Sultan is increasingly situated in opposition to the people. This is exacerbated by the number of infrastructure projects that have been permitted, leading to difficulties for the people. This has led to protest movements such as the Jogja Asad (Jogja is dry) movement, who criticises the neglect of Yogyakarta’s water crisis stemming from the rapid development of infrastructure. Similar protests have arisen around plans to build an airport and iron sand mining. While these cases do not directly relate to the discussion of religious life, this shows how this disconnection no longer leaves the Sultan in a position to understand what is felt and experienced by the people. In the case of the outbreaks of violence, the denial of the emergency status could also be seen as part of this disconnect.

Furthermore, recent developments in Yogyakarta after the Sultan issued a sabda raja (the King’s decree) have led to internal conflicts within the palace, particularly between the Sultan and his brothers. It is believed that this decree makes it possible for the Sultan’s daughter to inherit the crown since the Sultan has no male children. Such an action is seen as a deviation from palace custom, since according to tradition, the Crown King is always male (Ahnaf & Salim 2017, p. 40). This conflict was widely known by the public and gained different responses. While this may be an internal affair within the family of the Sultan, this Sabda Raja has sparked suspicion among
the inner circle, as some of the participants from religious groups argue. It is widely known that
the Sultan maintains a good relationship with some religious groups, both Muslim and non-
Muslim. Once the *Sabda Raja* was issued, some Muslim groups suspected that non-Muslim
groups were behind the decree. Therefore, this *sabda raja* and the internal conflict within the
royal family have led to questioning the role of the Sultan as a cultural and political leader, with
many wondering whether he has the capacity to resolve the conflict among the people while
enduring the internal conflict within the family.

While in Surakarta the position of the Sultan differs to that of Yogyakarta, and thus plays
a limited role in navigating citizenship practices among the people of the city, a more vernacular
cultural term has emerged which plays an important role in maintaining the current social
relations among different groups in Surakarta. The term *Wong Solo*, meaning people of Solo,
is used to describe the collective identity of the people of Surakarta. Solo is the name of a village
in the area and is informally used to refer to Surakarta as an administrative city. The term *Wong
Solo* has been used by different participants in this research projects, who come from diverse
groups, from Muslim to non-Muslim and from moderate to extreme ones. *Wong Solo* has also
been used as an inclusive term, as it incorporates people who have been living there for
generations as well as those who have come more recently. Within the discourse of citizenship,*
*Wong Solo* can be seen as an identity that brings to sense of collectivity, where individuals ‘act
and conceive’ themselves as part of it (Joppke 2007, p. 38). *Wong Solo* is to Surakarta what
citizen is to a nation-state.

As a collective identity, *Wong Solo* are characterised by qualities such as kind-
heartedness. As one of the participants argues, Surakarta has long been expected to become a
battleground for different ideologies. Surakarta is home to diverse groups, from ideologically
moderate to radical, and from religious to *abangan* (nominal Muslims). One participant argued
that these different ideological groups have been preparing for battle by creating their own *laskar*
(paramilitary groups). It is worth noting here that within Muslim groups, there are more than 40
*laskar* groups in this city. While the ‘future ideological battleground’ argument needs to be
validated further, this imagination is ingrained in the mind of this participant, who was one of the
*laskar* youth leaders in pesantren in Surakarta.

Nevertheless, he also said that while he could not predict the outcome of this ideological
battle, he doubted whether this situation would be conquered by the kind-heartedness of *Wong
Solo*. In other words, as the history of violent conflicts has repeatedly occurred in the past, this
ideological contestation between different groups might again result in violence unless it is pacified by the kind-heartedness of Wong Solo.

Wong Solo are also associated with harmony. Antlov and Hellman (2005) note that harmonious social relations characterise Javanese society; not only among themselves, but also when interacting with other groups. This harmonious characteristic poses a question as to the conflict that occurred many times throughout its history, as well as the more recent tensions. While these tensions do not escalate into large-scale conflicts, they do occur frequently. In this regard, some participants suggested that those who instigate the conflict are invariably orang luar (people not from that place, the outsiders). These may be people who do not come from villages or other low district regions within Surakarta – as in the case of the protests against Busukan and Manahan churches, where protesters were not locals – or it may refer to people from outside Solo, such as in the case of 1998 riots. Therefore, orang luar is used to strengthen the image of Wong Solo as people who love harmony, while at the same time it may serve to mask the violence committed by Wong Solo.

Another cultural term that is used by the people of Solo is the concept of ‘Solo as our home.’ A participant of this research project imagined Solo as a home where different communities are considered the children. In this house, there are many rooms. These rooms symbolise different communities with their different traditions, cultures and religions. The rooms are separated by walls, but despite these the members of the house acknowledge and recognise the existence of the other children there. In other words, rooms are a space where different communities develop and maintain their private issues. However, when these children come to dining rooms, living rooms or other shared spaces, they need to be respectful toward each other, since they all have the same rights and obligations. Conceptualising Solo as house requires each member to be tolerant towards each other. Mutual understanding is therefore the key to sustaining the positive relationship between the members of the house.

Imagining Solo as a home also implies a responsibility to protect it. As history records, Solo has experienced violent conflict many times. Consequently, Solo earned a label as a city with a short fuse. As Solo is considered a house, it requires the members to develop a sense of responsibility to protect it. Just like mutual understanding, the responsibility is shared among its members. It functions to protect the house from internal conflict or destruction by orang luar, and also to develop and nurture it into a space in which each member can have a good life. It strengthens the in-group identity. In short, Solo as represented in terms such as Wong Solo and
‘Solo as a home’ cultivate a notion of mutual understanding and respect toward the members as well as responsibility - values that characterise a democratic citizenship.

Similar to the idea of Wong Solo, the cultural term Wong Jogja (people of Yogyakarta) is also used repeatedly by the participants. However, differing from the inclusive Wong Solo, the term Wong Jogja is used somewhat exclusively, referring mainly to the people who are originally from Yogyakarta. This term emerged when discussing the newcomers to the city. The number of the newcomers increases yearly, which is understandable considering Yogyakarta is a centre of education. Furthermore, the new investments in hotels, shopping centres, and so on are designed to attract more people to Yogyakarta. New spaces are created but Wong Jogja do not occupy them. At this point, as some participants noted, the social distance between Wong Jogja and the newcomers becomes greater. Due to this, there is a social and cultural segregation between Wong Jogja and non-Wong Jogja. While the intention of citizenship is to weaken social class division, the practice of using the term Wong Jogja here has the opposite effect, by strengthening these divisions.

This social and cultural segregation between Wong Jogja and newcomers has, to some extent, led to indifferent practices of citizenship. The incidents of violence in LKiS are an example of this. During and after the attack, there is little evidence of local people preventing the attack or helping victims during the aftermath. This is different from the case of Raushan Fikr, when a group of people who came to intimidate were prevented by the local people from causing any violence. The locals helped to mitigate the tension by having a dialogue with the conflicting parties. On this difference, one of the participants noted that many offices in Yogyakarta do not hire local people to work there. There may be issues regarding education levels here, as most Wong Jogja have not attained higher education qualifications. Despite this, the practice of hiring outsiders has led to another social distinction, as one of the participant argued, between orang lokal (local people) and orang kantor (people at the office).

Another cultural term that is central in navigating citizenship practices is the conception of Jogja Istimewa (‘Yogyakarta is special’). Yogyakarta earned this title partly because while Yogyakarta was a significant independent power during the 1940s, the Sultan of Yogyakarta decided to ‘give up’ its sovereignty and become part of the new, modern nation of Indonesia when the national government declared its independence on 17th of August 1945. Consequently, the national government decided to give special administrative architecture to this city, different to other regions in Indonesia. The arrangement whereby the Sultan is automatically made the governor of Yogyakarta is part of this special administration. Looking from a cultural perspective,
this integration also means giving the new and more inclusive identity of ‘Indonesians’ to the people of Yogyakarta.

This new inclusive identity does not necessarily mean that the people of Yogyakarta have to give up their identity as Wong Jogja. Rather, what has been an issue is the meaning of Jogja Istimewa, which fostered the birth of politics of identity. One of the participants who has been living in Yogyakarta for many years felt that this title tends to be interpreted in narrow ways by referring only to the culture of Yogyakarta, ke-jogja-an (‘things about Yogyakarta’), the palace and so on. The case of Florence Sihombing, who was prosecuted after expressing her feelings at being refused service at a Petrol Station in Yogyakarta, exemplifies this. After not being served due to her refusing the queue line, she insulted the people of Yogyakarta calling them ‘poor, stupid, and uncivilized’ and posted on her social media, Path. Suddenly, this post spread and she received many negative responses. One of these came from the mayor of Yogyakarta, who said,

Yogyakarta adalah kota yang menerima siapa pun yang datang. Namun demikian, masyarakat yang datang pun harus menjaga dan menghormati kota dan masyarakatnya. Ikut menjunjung budaya yang ada...jangan mengusik (‘Yogyakarta is a city that welcomes everyone. But, they must maintain and respect this city and its people. Participating and upholding the culture... don’t disturb’) (Okezone 2014)

This case shows how cultural identity (‘ke-jogja-an’) has been used to exclude people considered to be acting against what ‘ke-jogja-an’ is believed to be. Reflecting on this case, the participant argued for a broader interpretation of the Jogja Istimewa slogan, whereby everybody is welcome and any cultural expression is acknowledged. In short, what makes Jogja Istimewa for her is when Yogyakarta becomes a model of tolerant pluralism.

Despite the differences between the two, Yogyakarta and Surakarta shared cultural activities of selamatan and tahlilan. Selamatan (sometimes called kenduren), as Geertz notes, (1976, p. 11) refers to ‘a communal feast’ where people from various places, be they friends, neighbours, coworkers or relatives, come together to ‘celebrate, ameliorate, or sanctify’. In Javanese tradition, selamatan is held on special occasions such as a marriage, the birth of a baby, circumcision, the communal prayer for a deceased loved one, to celebrate a village anniversary or other such public occasion. Despite these distinct functions, Geertz (1976, p. 11) argues that in all cases, whether explicitly religious or not, it symbolises the social unity among people participating in this communal feast. The feast also signifies mutual support and co-operation as virtues within Javanese tradition. Similar to selamatan is tahlilan. Tahlilan is a more specifically religious occasion and it most often held when meeting to pray for a recently deceased relative.
It is typically associated with Traditionalist Muslims (such as members of Nahdlatul Ulama) who, unlike Modernist Muslims (such as Muhammadiyah), reject these kinds of activities because are considered un-Islamic.

What is interesting about selamatan and tahlilan events is that they serve as a space for social interaction and communication. Both before and after a selamatan or tahlilan, people talk with each other about their activities or discuss the topical issues in their area. The people invited to these events are not limited to specific groups. Even in the case of a tahlilan, which is explicitly Islamic, people from different religious communities happily attend. In the words of the participants of this research project, the selamatan functions to ‘pacify any grudge’ or different political or ideological affiliation. At a selamatan, all people, whether they are rich or poor, whether they are highly educated or not, whether they are community leaders or just ordinary members, sit side-by-side as equals. Consequently, a selamatan denotes an idea of equality and egalitarianism in their vernacular form.

Many efforts taken by the non-governmental activists tend to focus on seminar, dialogue or workshops held in a university or hotels. While these kinds of activities have their own strength in disseminating ideas, it is very rare for ordinary people to participate, thus the forums tend to be elitist in nature. This is of particular note in Yogyakarta where there is a gap in terms of interest and issue between the activists and the people at the grassroots levels. At a time when a connection between actors is an important matter, looking at the vernacular practices of cultural performance such as selamatan and tahlilan might offer insights in forging a shared, common ground between people, which may create a more democratic and inclusive citizenship.

***

The findings of this project suggest that cultural symbolic forms and expressions may serve as a useful navigation tools in citizenship practices. Not only do they inform us by which people conceptualise the nature of relationship, but also how, to some degree, they function to regulate the interaction between different group. This particular topic seems to be largely overlooked in citizenship studies since most of the works on the culture focus mostly on how the challenges arising from cultural expressions may be resolved and shall they be recognised (see for example Kymlicka 1995; Barry (2001); Benhabib 2002; Carens 2000). This does not necessarily mean that the issue of recognition, for example, is not important, but focusing more on this has come at the cost of overlooking the role of culture in crafting citizenship. The multicultural citizenship framework, for example, strongly highlights the point whether the cultural or religious tradition conform with liberal tenets in order to be recognised and granted
special rights (Kymlicka 1995). The function of culture or religion for their community is contained with liberal values in so much that their role in public life is meaningful as long as liberal principle confirm it.

In fact, the significant role of culture in public life such as maintaining peace, order and resolving conflict has been highlighted by many scholars, particularly peace studies and conflict resolution tradition. The works of Lederach (1997) and Avruch (1998) are among the first few that acknowledge and recognise the role of culture in building peace and resolving conflict. Furthermore, Abu-Nimer (2003), among others, also highlights how Islamic or Arabic tradition, its allegedly different conception of peace and conflict, such as sulh and other tribal mechanism have proved to be resourceful to mitigate conflict. The acknowledgement of non-western traditions of conflict resolution has instigated discussion about formulating a non-western approach of conflict resolution (see for example Brigg & Bleiker 2011).

Within citizenship studies, approaches other than the traditional liberal approach have tended to be labelled as ‘illiberal’ and held suspect as to whether its conception of membership, for example, limits individual freedom and autonomy (Kymlicka 1995). Whenever a more collective nature is found, it needs to be checked as to whether it undermines individual liberty. This kind of perspective in looking at non-western conceptions of citizenship needs to be re-examined as the findings suggest that other cultures, that is not necessarily ‘liberal cultures’, could, in fact, play and important role in nurturing citizenship. It is worth noting here that the called universal liberal tradition is also culturally specific as it is underpinned by certain conceptions of human beings, behaviour, social system, etc. In short, it could be argued that liberal tradition represents certain elements of White-Anglo culture. As a consequence of this, evaluating different cultures based on ‘the liberal tradition’ serves to privilege Western culture over non-Western culture. Some element of culture, whether liberal or non-liberal may pose challenges in forging a more inclusive and democratic citizenship. So, if there is to be a common benchmark in which cultural expressions need to be ‘re-examined’, this should be the subject of discussion among different groups and the benchmark does not have to be based solely on the ‘universal liberal tradition’.

It is clear then, that looking at the role of culture in their symbolic forms and expression may enrich the discussion in citizenship studies. As the findings suggest, cultural practices in the form of selametan or tahlilan in the two cities provide opportunities for people to meet and talk as equals. Such vernacular practices and other cultural symbols that create a sense of collectivity and responsibility between different actors serve to contribute to a strong foundation and nurture
a more matured citizenship in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. If maintained and exercised, these
cultural practices can foster a common ground and the civic virtues of citizenship.

5.4 Citizenship Practices: Habitus and the Act of Citizenship

The previous two sections discussed the role of religion and culture in citizenship
practices in the two research sites. When they are interpreted openly and used contextually, both
religion and culture offer potential constructive qualities regarding the cultivation of a democratic
and inclusive citizenship. Conversely, they may also pose serious challenges to nurturing
citizenship when they are defined exclusively and narrowly, since they are likely to contribute to
a religious or culturally based political identity, and hence could be a hindrance to notions of
democratic citizenship. Borrowing the terms used by Kymlicka, it needs to be determined
whether religious or cultural values are used as an ‘external protection’ or an ‘internal restriction’
in order to best situate the two and how they function in the citizenship-forging process. This
section discusses citizenship in its performative aspects as well as how certain cultural or religious
values are used to justify certain actions and claim certain rights, and questions their meaning to
the effort of crafting citizenship in a diverse society.

The findings of this study suggest that acts of religious practice in both research sites could
be classified into the categories of habitus and the performative acts of citizenship that can be
seen from everyday life and public activities of the people in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. These
everyday activities have been practiced by people for a long time and have become normalised.
On the other hand, there are some practices that challenge and question the current structure
and are aimed at achieving change. Investigating citizenship in these two forms requires moving
beyond classical understandings of citizenship that merely focus on its legal-formal status. This is
because legal recognition as a citizen does not necessarily mean that the rights of every person
will be automatically upheld. In reality, these rights need to be exercised or claimed, as will be
discussed below.

White (2008) argues that citizenship can be understood as a ‘composite’: something
which is constituted by ‘static’ and ‘dynamic’ aspects. By static aspects, he refers to the
understanding of citizenship as practices that have been performed for a long time and are
unquestioned, becoming a requirement to maintaining the society, or as something necessary
that makes it possible for the society to function. These practices serve to preserve order. On the
other hand, the dynamic aspects of citizenship refer to any actions or practices that are needed
to break from an ‘order.’ As an ‘order’ does not necessarily satisfy all groups within society, certain actions then need to be done. It is at this point where an ‘order’ is questioned and challenged. These actions could take different forms, from public protests to civil disobedience. Thus, while the static is associated with ‘order,’ the dynamic aspect of citizenship is associated with ‘rupture.’ In the following discussion, the static aspect of citizenship is referred to as the concept of *habitus*, while its dynamic aspect is framed into the concept of *an act of citizenship*.

### 5.4.1 Citizenship as a Habitus

The static dimension of citizenship focuses on everyday activities as being routine, normal, or natural that need not be questioned. For example, the relationship between the church community and mosque community in Surakarta. As mentioned previously, these communities have been living side by side for more than 60 years. Both buildings share the same postal address, separated only by a thin wall. Consequently, whenever there is *adzan* (a call for praying) the church community will hear it, and whenever the church community organises praying rituals, they are heard by the mosque community. Quite often, during *adzan*, the loudspeaker interrupts the prayer or rituals of the church community. The Muslim community frequently experiences similar interruptions during *sholat* (the prayer performed five times a day): the voices from the church will disrupt their silence and focus (*khusu*).

For both community leaders, these ‘interruptions’ and ‘disruptions’ are normal, part of their everyday lives. For the church community leaders, it would be unusual not to hear *adzur*, and the mosque community leader considers it beautiful to pray while listening to others from the church community. It is a challenge to maintain silence and focus not only in the rituals, but also in other activities as they share the use of the front yard. Both the church and mosque do not have a large front yard, so whenever celebrating *Eid Fitri* (the Muslim celebration at the end of Ramadhan, the fasting month), the church’s front yard will be used by the Muslim community for parking. The same happens for the church community when they celebrate Christmas, as the yard is used by their congregation members. Apart from these religious activities, both communities are involved in social activities, such as regular meetings at the RT or RW level (a local administrative area, below village level). These practices have been part of the everyday life of both communities and as such, both leaders agree that this maintains order and the harmonious relationship between the two groups.

Similar activities to maintain order may be observed in Dukuh Manggung, Yogyakarta. Dukuh Manggung is located not far from Gajah Mada University, one of the oldest and largest
universities in Indonesia. Similar to other places near the university, the people living in this area come from different regions, particularly the students. What needs to be emphasised in the everyday lives of the people in this dukuh is the active participation of the community members. This active participation can be observed through their regular attendance at meetings at dukuh level, involvement in community-based activities as well as their attendance at religious or cultural celebrations, and so on. For them, this participation has become a part of normal life and is vital to a sense of belonging; a lack of participation would be unusual for them. This is part of their habits and is one of the keys to maintaining order and harmonious relationships between different members of the community. Religious, cultural, or ideological background has never been an issue in this community.

The citizenship practices shown by the church and mosque community as well as those of Dukuh Manggung take the form of habitual processes – they are unquestioned and have been accepted and celebrated for a long time. This is reminiscent of *habitus*, a concept introduced by Pierre Bourdieu. For Bourdieu, habitus is:

> the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations, produces practices which tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation (Bourdieu 2013, p. 78)

In other words, *habitus* consists of practices that have been exercised for an extended period and, thus, are ‘durable.’ Furthermore, this durability produces a ‘generative principle’ whereas this principle ‘produces practices.’ These practices will ‘reproduce’ that principle and the structure, however, this does not necessarily mean that no agency is being performed, as per Bourdieu’s ‘improvisations’. In other words, within habitus, a practice is generated by certain principles or structures while at the same time, when they are exercised, the practice will impact to the reproduction of the structure itself. It is at this point that *habitus* brings experience of personal subjective and social objective altogether (Maton 2008, p. 53). Put differently, habitus is a process that involves the ‘dialectic of the internalization of externality and the externalization of internality’ (Bourdieu 2013, p. 72).

Yet and as a concept, habitus does not stand alone, but needs to be understood through auxiliary concepts, namely *field* and *capital*. Field here can be defined as ‘a structured system of social positions – occupied either by individuals or institutions – the nature of which defines the situation for their occupants’ (Jenkins 2006, p. 53).
The positions and roles within field relate to notion of capital, which for Bourdieu does not simply refer to economics and monetary exchange. Rather, he situated capital in ‘a wider system of exchanges whereby assets of different kinds are transformed and exchanged within complex networks or circuits within and across different fields’ (Moore 2008, p. 102). With this definition, Bourdieu introduces four forms of capital, namely: economic, such as money and assets; cultural, which can be seen from taste, literature, and sport preferences; social, which refers to networks, and symbolic, such as credentials.

With this understanding, the everyday practices of citizenship performed by the church and mosque community or people of Dukuh Manggung actively represent the idea of habitus, as these practices have been performed for a long time and thus are durable. They occur in a particular field, for example, a socio-religious field for the Church and Mosque community and a socio-cultural field for people in Dukuh Manggung. This field has its own structure, norm or system that require the members to maintain cohesive and harmonious relationships between the members. This norm, system, or rule ‘is taken for granted,’ as a doxa (Bourdieu 2000, cited in Deer 2008, p. 120). Due to this, members’ actions are structured, although this does not necessarily mean that they cannot improvise. Every action taken by the individuals in this particular field affect the structure itself, either strengthening or weakening it. In this example, individuals decided to act according to the structure, thus maintaining the order.

The decisions of individuals or the roles they play in this context relate to their capital, either economic, cultural, symbolic and social. An individual acts as a referee because a structure makes it so; they possess the capital to make them the referee, and thus the football game progresses. Within social life, each individual plays their own role, as an ordinary member, a leader, etc. For example, an ordinary member would not act as a leader because they do not possess the same capital, whether symbolic or cultural. In short, the different roles taken by different members make it possible for the society, ‘the game,’ to function. Therefore, habitus, field, and capital are not separated from each other and should be considered together to understand the reasons for an order being sustained for a long time.

As the individuals gain experience, it affects the ways in which they internalise and externalise the structure, thus habitus might transform. This new experience, a result of ‘accumulation of symbolic capital and economic capital’ (Hardy 2008, p. 132), may result in a change of capital. With this, the structure or the field will change too since the structure itself is partly conditioned by the habitus. Changes may take place gradually so that the habitus and the field will remain ‘synced’ to each other. However, there are times changes are sudden and the
structure changes, but the habitus cannot change at the same rhythm as the field. It is at this point where the crisis occurs. This crisis is *hysteresis*, a moment to signify that the habitus and the field no longer correspond. Hysteresis might occur due to the intervention of the state that changes the field structure, for example when the state introduces new building regulations for places of worship. This may potentially dislocate the habitus and the field, and thus a crisis that can affect the interaction between different groups may emerge.

This hysteresis is not something unanticipated by the Church and Mosque community as well as for the people of Dukuh Manggung. It is at this point that some efforts to maintain order are organised, to ensure that the habitus and field always synchronise. For example, on one occasion a poster or newsletter related to religion and politics was on the information wall of the mosque, but the leader of the mosque prohibited this action, preventing disruption. At another time, some activists from a political party used the mosque to discuss political issues, but they were asked to stop when the leader of the mosque found out. It is part of the requirement for the new leader of the mosque community to understand the history and 'norm' that structures the relations between the Mosque and the Church communities. Without this knowledge (capital), a person would not qualify as leader. In Dukuh Manggung, the order and harmonious relationship between the different communities was interrupted by an Islamist group who accused a group of practicing heresy and demanded they stop their activities. The members of Dukuh Manggung, however, actively intervened to stop any further trouble and suggested dialogue to address the issues.

Within the discourse of citizenship, habitus is seen as vital to maintaining order, although it may be argued that it is insufficient to understand the dynamic aspects of citizenship. The findings, however, suggest that while habitus itself might not be sufficient to fully capture the complexity of the dynamic performance of citizenship, it may nevertheless help in identifying why particular acts of citizenship occur, and would do so by drawing upon the concept of hysteresis, a moment when habitus and field no longer synchronise, as will be discussed in the following section.

5.4.2 Citizenship as an Act of Citizenship

While some citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta might usefully be observed through the lens of habitus, there are some actions that are performed deliberately to change or
break the order. White (2008) refers to this as the dynamic aspect of citizenship, which resembles the idea of the act of citizenship (Isin, p. 2008). Different forms of habitus tend to emphasise order; the act of citizenship is interrogating more on rupture. For Isin (2008, p. 21), an act is different from action, but is not separable from it, for ‘act’ is defined as ‘to put [something] in motion’. With this in mind, an act refers to something before the action, something that precedes it. An act can be in the form of expression which, when actualised, will result in an action. An act of citizenship, as Isin (2008) argues, produces an actor and an action. These ‘three musketeers’ cannot be separated since this constitutes the very basic concept of an act of citizenship.

Acts of citizenship can be observed in a series of actions perpetrated in the name of (Islamic) morality performed by Islamist groups in Surakarta. These actions include organising a public parade for the laskar groups, monitoring places they suspected to be overrun by sinful actions (makāṣid), such as prostitution, demanding the prohibition of alcohol, actively protesting church activities (particularly relating to building permits) and, as previously mentioned, the public campaign to prohibit non-Muslims from being elected as political leaders. This is the subject of campaigns by religious groups and gatherings (pengajian), circulated through newsletters and posters, but also publicly via large banners stretched across streets and in other public spaces. While these series of actions are an expression of rights, they can mean more than that. Thus, an investigation of the actors is needed here to capture the logics of these acts of citizenship.

The actions mentioned above were performed mostly by laskar groups in Solo. While a clear number of laskar groups in this city is difficult to estimate, it is thought to be more than forty groups. These groups have their own management and structure, but do intersect with each other. An initiative to establish an umbrella organisation called DSKS, to facilitate meetings between laskar groups, was initiated with the support of some members of MUI Surakarta. Apart from facilitating the meeting, this organisation served as an educational space in which the ustadz (religious teacher) could deliver religious advice for the members of laskar groups. The leaders of DSKS say that they realise that some actions taken by the laskar groups in expressing their demands were not always right or Islamic, particularly when they apply the amar ma’ruf nahi munkar (‘promoting good deeds and preventing bad ones’) principle, in which some of them used violence. Furthermore, not all actions were purely religious, but rather were economic-oriented. This organisation claims that it functions to discipline these particular behaviours.

While some behaviours might be corrected, actions in the name of Islam or Islamic morality are supported. One prominent leader of the groups said that, while their behaviour
might be wrong, their intentions are good and need to be supported since Islamic teachings are against anything that impacts negatively on society, such as the circulation of alcohol. According to this leader, alcohol has led to the degeneration of Muslim youth in Surakarta, and thus they demand specific regulation to prevent its sale in the city. Their campaign to prohibit non-Muslims from being elected to public office has been seen as an obligation for every Muslim, because, as he said, this is what Islamic teaching demands. Furthermore, as he saw it, the rise of non-Muslim leaders (such as Christian leaders) in Surakarta could only see harm come to Muslim groups.

What lies behind this action is the demand for the implementation of a narrow interpretation of Islamic law (Shariah) and ultimately the attainment of an Islamic caliphate. While he and his group do not deny that Muslim groups are currently allowed to perform their religious obligations, they face significant limits in doing so. In his opinion, Muslims do not have full freedom – not only in Surakarta, but across Indonesia. The issue of excessive drinking among young Muslims is an example of how a Muslim leader could not do much to prevent this because of national laws and regulations. While they propose their own ‘legal reforms’ on this issue, they have yet to be processed, despite the lengthy timeframe since their proposal, and he recognised that implementing Islamic law is difficult in the current Indonesian political system.

In a similar case, initiatives were taken by non-governmental organisations in Yogyakarta to run a workshop on human rights education for the pesantren community in Yogyakarta. These kinds of activities, which introduce modern discourse to religious communities, are not new and have analysed by many such as Hefner (2000) in Civil Islam, but this particular case is analysed here using the acts of citizenship framework. The initiators of this workshop were graduates from pesantren. With regards to the recent violent cases that involved the religious community, this workshop was aimed at introducing the concept of human rights to this so-called traditional religious community so that they would have a better understanding of religious violence and how best to respond to these incidents – such as giving an alternative pro-human rights perspective rather than the so-called religious but anti-human rights view.

The question is: what makes these two cases ‘acts’ of citizenship? As mentioned earlier, the act of citizenship involves practices that lead to rupture rather than maintaining order. As described earlier, a series of actions performed by Islamist groups were aimed at breaking up secular domains. The act here intends to reject the current secular system and to build a new religious one. By proposing the implementation of Sharia or the establishment of a caliphate they aim to break the secular world. They consider the current laws in Indonesia as not being fully in accord with Islamic principles. One of the leaders of these groups explained this, saying
that Indonesian laws were adopted from the Dutch system. Furthermore, the current system of
democratic politics is un-Islamic as democracy, he argued, is man-made while Islam is God-
made, and that democracy, capitalism and liberalism have led to the destruction to Muslim society.

The ideal political system that they are striving for is the Islamic caliphate, referring to the
leadership of early Muslim community after the passing of the Prophet Muhamad. The first
four caliphates lasted for centuries until the last recognised caliphate system, the Ottoman
empire, fell in 1924. Ignoring the fact that there are multiple interpretations, and multiple
historical versions of the caliphate, the leader of this Islamist groups believes that fighting for an
Islamic caliphate is obligatory for every Muslim since, he argued, this is the only political system
that is recognised by the Qur’an. He rejects the concept of the modern nation-state (born after
the Westphalia Treaty in 1468) because this is something new. With this rejection, he does not
recognise the Republic of Indonesia as a valid Islamic nation-state. For him, the Islamic caliphate
will come, as predicted by a hadith (Prophet Muhammad’s statement and actions). This hadith
has been the subject of the debate among Muslim scholars.

The actions of Islamic groups in Solo could also regarded as breaking from the traditional
religious world since their demands are a modern phenomenon. Demanding the
implementation of Islamic law and establishing an Islamic state or Islamic caliphate are among
the many features of the fundamentalist movement. An-Naim notes that these features are
innovations developed by the fundamentalist groups in the twentieth century (1999, p. 117). In
line with this argument, Bassam Tibi (1998, p. 14) argues that fundamentalism is a new, modern
phenomenon, because it selectively picks certain elements from religious tradition to construct
their new political order. This reinterpretation of selective tradition and how the Islamist groups
situate it in a binary opposition to the secular world is indeed new, since Islamic tradition does
not necessarily oppose secularism. For some Muslims, the idea of the modern nation-state is not
against Islam since Islam does not specifically introduce any one political system. The concept
of ummah does not necessarily differ from that of nation, since it could be interpreted in terms
of race or groups of people, as Khaldun argues (cited in Ayubi 1991, p. 14).

In ways that are similar to the Islamist groups, the workshop initiative organised by the
non-governmental activists was intended to break two domains: the secular domain and the
religious domain. The act here is an expression to combine secular discourse into traditional
religious education. It is widely known that the concept of human rights was first developed in
the West. Islam does not recognise the concept of human rights as it is associated with the secular
world, however this is not to say that there are not similar concepts within Islam. The workshop broke down this conception and taught traditionalist Muslim communities that the concept is, in fact, compatible with their religious understanding. Similarly, the workshop initiative dismantled notions that the traditional system of religious education in pesantren must rely exclusively rely on classical Islamic texts (kitab kuning). In fact, new discourses, particularly those from the West such as democracy, gender, and human rights are not typically learnt in pesantren communities.

***

This section discussed the performative aspect of citizenship by looking at citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. As a habitus, citizenship performances refer to the everyday practices of the Christian and Muslim communities in Surakarta and Dukuh Manggung, Yogyakarta. Both daily practices have been performed by the communities for so long, so they are durable, and have been produced and being reproduced by the field or the social structure in this community. As habitus recognises change, because of the individual accumulation of symbolic, social, cultural, and economic capital, the field might change. The introduction of new regulations on worship building by the government, for example, might affect to the change of the field and thus of habitus. To ensure that the changes do not disrupt the harmonious relationship between two communities and cause a crisis (hysteresis), the community leaders take initiatives so that the habitus can always correspond to the field.

This hysteresis facilitates the emergence of the act of citizenship when the habitus and the field no longer synchronize. These acts of citizenship are aimed at breaking the order of the religious and secular world since the actors of the actions believe that the current system needs to change. The acts of citizenship as performed by the Islamist groups in Surakarta bear a resemblance to the idea of the ‘act of piety’ by Turner (2008). This refers to actions motivated by religious teachings that demand change in a secular system, such as demanding times for praying during office hours, or promoting the new Islamic fashion. While piety within Islam is concerned with reverence and obedience to God, the series of actions performed by the Islamist groups are not only demands for changes in regulation but also in the design of the state. This might be an unintended consequence of the act of piety, or a religious act of citizenship; an act that might affect the practices of citizenship in two cities.
5.5 Contesting the (Civic) Virtue(s) within Citizenship

Rights, duties, and responsibilities have been central to the discussion of citizenship and have been the subject of debate among theorists. Two large clusters of theory can be mentioned here: liberalism and republicanism or communitarianism. Liberalism puts more emphasis on rights and individual autonomy, in the sense that obligations for the community or state, such as paying tax or voting, tend to be minimal. In contrast with this, republicanism places greater emphasis on community responsibility but without disregarding individual rights. For republicanism, greater engagement with the community for the common good is emphasised. This community obligation or responsibility is at the centre of the civic virtue debate. Despite the differences between liberalism and republicanism, some efforts have been taken to reconcile the two, such as Dagger (1997), who proposed the idea of republican liberalism. However, the spread of liberalism with its machinery apparatus of market, democracy, privatisation, and autonomy, makes the discussion of civic virtue come under the shadow of rights-claiming activity. As such, the discussion over citizenship as rights (but not duty or responsibility) has dominated public discourse.

This discussion has implications, as Dagger notes (1997, p. 3). Firstly, when someone seeks to claim and defend their rights, it generally leaves no room for further discussion, thus it is difficult to reach an agreement, particularly when the other party also similarly demands their rights. Secondly, claiming certain rights that are associated with a person as an individual suggests that the claimants are attempting to separate themselves from society, particularly when it comes to the issue of cultural or religious arguments. Indeed, the idea of rights has been associated with individuals, particularly within liberal tradition. It is only recently that a group rights approach based on culture or religious attachment has been more fully formulated. This can be observed in the works of cultural liberalists such as Will Kymlicka, who proposed the idea of minority groups rights. Thirdly, the more rights are claimed, the more claiming rights becomes common, and as a result appeals for certain rights are no longer special. With these implications, it can be argued here that the more people emphasise rights, the more community responsibility is undermined.

The findings of this research suggest that while the arguments for rights are articulated in many cases, the sense of community responsibility is proposed at the same time and some actions have been performed in the name of civic virtue. However, in both research sites, civic virtues are articulated differently based on the way these virtues are cultivated. As a result, civic virtue
has never been single, but rather plural, thus virtues. This does not necessarily mean that there is no possibility to forge a public civic virtue, as will be discussed later in this section. Since the virtue or virtues have been developed in certain context in which individuals grow and learn, the conception of virtue is different for one person to another; yet is not necessarily conflictual. To forge a shared common virtue, a civic virtue, it needs to be situated in an ongoing process of deliberative discussion where different conceptions of virtue are articulated, contested, questioned.

Like ‘citizenship,’ ‘virtue’ is derived from the Greek, in this case arete, meaning excellence (Dagger 1997, p. 14). In general, it is used to refer to any outstanding performance of individuals, thus he or she possesses what may be called excellence. Within the discourse of citizenship, however, the meaning of virtue refers to the moral excellence of individual. An individual possesses a virtue when they show an excellent quality of moral behaviour in society, such as upholding justice and wisdom. A virtue can be understood as a set of ‘the disposition to act in accordance with the standards and expectations that define the role or roles a person performs’ (Daggers 1997, p. 14). Daggers argues that the value of virtues is that ‘they promote the good of the community or society, not because they directly promote the good of the individual.’ Due to this, a civic or public virtue could be defined as a disposition that always puts the interest and the good of the public above that of the private (Burtt 1990, p. 24). A virtue is not given, but is developed and cultivated in different spheres, from family to community, from informal to formal learning. Also, it is derived from values such as the constitution, religion, culture or tradition.

Due to the importance of civic virtue towards the good of the public and apart from formal education, some initiatives, which are relevant to this project, have been taken by different actors (state and non-state) in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Among the state initiatives, the most notable is Forum Komunikasi Umat Beragama (FKUB). This forum was introduced by the Ministry of Religious Affairs and the Ministry of Internal Affairs through their joint decree No. 9 2006 and No. 8 2006 on Pedoman Pelaksanaan Tugas Kepala Daerah/Wakil Kepala Daerah Dalam Pemeliharaan Kerukunan Umat Beragama, Pemberdayaan Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama, Dan Pendirian Rumah Ibadat (‘Guidelines on Tasks Implementation of Heads/Deputy Heads of Regions in the Maintenance of Religious Community Harmony, Empowerment of Interreligious Forum and the Establishment of Places of Worship’). Part of the function of this forum is to engage in dialogue with the religious and community leaders, listen to their aspirations and disseminate government regulations or policies related to religious
community harmony and society empowerment. From this description, it could be argued that the virtue that is expected to develop from this forum is a religious law-abiding disposition.

At the non-state actor level, some initiatives are taken by NGO activists and the leaders of mass organisations in Surakarta such as FLAG. The NGO activists in Surakarta initiated a trip for children to different places of worship in Surakarta with the aim of introducing the principle of tolerance and respect to different religious communities. They believe that cultivating such virtue from early period is important so that their children can play with others from different communities without any prejudices.

As previously discussed, the FLAG forum was initiated by several leaders of religious organisations in Solo to facilitate a discussion between the leaders. One of the topics discussed was related to the local election in 2015, as they were worried that the tensions between the supporters of two candidates would escalate and lead to horizontal conflict. This forum is organised regularly to promote a constructive dialogue between the leaders of the community, as one of the initiators of this group believes that meetings and dialogue are easily organised between the leaders, which is not always the case at the grass-roots level. The virtue being developed in this forum is that of developing a religiously tolerant attitude.

Similar forums were organised in Yogyakarta by one of the oldest non-governmental organisations to facilitate discussion between different groups. This organisation co-ordinates regular public discussions and invites diverse groups of people, including those who have tolerant perspective and those who are radical or intolerant. This is because the leader of this non-governmental organisation believes that a bridge needs to be built between them and other groups, particularly those who have different ideas on interfaith dialogue, tolerance, religious freedom, or pluralism. For this leader, campaigning for tolerance in public but at the same time building a wall to separate groups that are identified as intolerant is neither consistent with the values of tolerance nor is it likely to be effective. Instead, this wall needs to be broken down. As the discussions progresses, it is hoped that the virtue of religious tolerance among the people will increase and that this in turn will help prevent religiously intolerant actions from occurring in Yogyakarta.

Despite these initiatives, in practice, such virtues are highly contested, not only because they are developed and cultivated in different contexts, but also because they draw upon various sources. The way actors also define public good is different. Paraphrasing Gibson (2007) about the concepts of the symbolic form of knowledge (traditional, charismatic, and modern), the source of virtue could be derived from religion, culture, or other modern forms such as the
constitution. Based on this, there are at least three different virtues exercised in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. The first one is religious virtue, a moral principle or behaviour that is obtained through performing religious obligation; the second one is cultural virtue, a personal disposition that is derived from cultural values, while the last is modern virtue, one that is forged and promoted by the Constitution.

This contestation over religious and modern virtue is evident in a series of actions performed by the Islamist groups in Solo and Yogyakarta. In Solo, the public campaign against the election of non-Muslim leaders to public office is motivated by certain religious virtues, such as being righteous, religious, or Islamic. This is not to deny that there might be other motives such as politics behind this action. However, the argument or performance of religious obligations could be understood as promoting values or virtues within religion as they interpret them. In other words, to be a good Muslim then is to behave according to Islamic rule.

Informing the public about the necessity to prevent non-Muslim leaders from being elected becomes central to how this virtue is acted out. This is contested by the virtues promoted by the Indonesian constitution that do not discriminate against people based on their religious identity. The virtues promoted by the constitution focus more on fairness and equality. However, this virtue is contested by religious virtue as it proposed by the Islamist groups in Solo.

The contestation between modern and religious virtue could also be seen from the intimidation towards the Raushan Fikr group in Yogyakarta. As they were associated with Shia groups and accused of practicing blasphemy, it was suggested that they be warned. One of the arguments used to justify this action was that when one sees something wrong, one needs to speak up. Without doing so, all the people will fall into fault. This line of justification claims the virtue of being pious or righteous. In this case, the existence of Raushan Fikr, or Shia community, is not prohibited in Indonesia. This is different from the Ahmadiyah group, for example, where a regulation has passed to regulate their activity. Furthermore, the blasphemy accusation has not yet been proven. In this regard, the constitution guarantees every person the right to express their ideas, to organise and to assemble; therefore, the constitution promotes freedom, but is contested by the religious virtue of being pious or righteous as it is interpreted by this Islamist groups.

Different virtues that come from various sources do not always have to be pitted against each other, since at some points they share similar values. Dahlsgaard, Seligman and Peterson (2005) show that some virtues such as courage, justice, humanity, temperance, wisdom, and tradition are shared among Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, Hinduism, Athenian philosophy, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. Certain virtues, such righteousness, are also shared by different
religious traditions and cultures. Virtues inherent within the idea of *Wong Solo*, for example, which emphasise being kind-hearted, harmonious, wise and tolerant, are shared by different groups. The ways in which they are acted out and translated might differ, but this does not mean they are unrelated.

Nevertheless, cultural virtue does not always come into consideration. The protest over the Church at Busukan, Mojosongo, is an example of this. While the issue is superficially procedural, it involves deeply-held religious motives to prevent imagined Christianisation in this area. From the point of view of the Christian leaders who are involved in mitigating the protest, the protesters stand as being intolerant as they have refused to accept the fact that the Church community has obtained a full permit. This tolerance here could be understood in a Javanese cultural sense of *tepo sliro* (mutual understanding), which is a virtue that goes beyond the procedural argument.

### 5.5.1 Civic Virtues and Representation

Despite some efforts in crafting civic virtues by state and non-state actors through different forums, the contestation over different virtues remains. Regarding these forums, one issue that needs to be highlighted is that of representation. One example is the FLAG forum in Surakarta where participants share a similar perspective on the issue or tolerance. However, Islamist groups are not involved in this forum. The six officially recognised religions are represented proportionally within FKUB, Muslim representation being the largest. However, people from outside these groups are not represented and the Islamist groups in Surakarta are still reluctant to engage in a constructive dialogue with the non-Muslim community. This makes the idea of crafting shared civic virtues among diverse groups challenging.

From a theoretical perspective, religious identity representation has been and remains a contested issue. Indeed, whether such a representation may truly take place, the extent to which all people are being represented and what kind of political arrangement would facilitate this representation all remain matters of public contestation. To complicate the discourse of representation further, it can be more challenging when it comes to the discussion of representation for marginalised or vulnerable groups. The proponents of deliberative democracy believe that political or social deliberation must involve different groups in the society. To participate in the deliberation process, all groups need to act as citizens, not as representing particular identity, so a shared general interest could be articulated (Williams 2000, pp. 134-135). While this process may sound reasonable, it might not necessarily work so well for marginalised
groups since for them acting on behalf on their particular identity would further contribute to the deliberation process. Their voices may disclose the existed social structure, that by and large, has inflicted harm to them. Phillips (1995, p. 147) argues that demanding the marginalised groups to give up their interests on behalf of general ones would ‘lock them into the very structures they are trying to dislodge’, thus representation in deliberation process becomes unattainable.

Furthermore, another issue to consider is the way that representation is being arranged and pursued in the public domain. It is worth noting here that the norm and the structure of social and political-decision making process are not universal, but culturally specific instead. To some degree, it may represent or be derived from the existing structure that, in turn, normalising the whole process of social and political deliberation. At this point, the norm or structure of representation may act as a form of power that further marginalise the vulnerable group. Because of this asymmetrical power relationship, the voices of the marginalised groups may not be favoured (Williams 2000, p. 135). Representation thus remains challenging and it is at this point the concept of representation proposed by Young need to be considered further.

Representation, as Young (2000) argues, is not about substitution, whereby people present on behalf of another’s absence. This is because an individual’s identity cannot be substituted by that of another. Young (2000) proposes the idea of representation in a relational term that involves the historical relationship between the represented and the representatives. Here representation may function as ‘speaking for’, not ‘speaking as.’ Representation might occur when it comes to matters of interest, opinion, or perspective. Interest here may refer to something material or non-material such as religious expression. Opinion, on the other hand, may refer to ‘principles, values or priorities’ (Young 2000, p. 135), while perspective refers to ‘a set of questions, kinds of experience and assumptions with which reasoning begins’ (Young 2000, p. 137). This perspective derives from the way people view some issues, due to their social position in relation to other groups. People may share the same perspective even though they come from different groups.

Referring to this concept of representation, the findings suggest that the existence of different forums does not always mean that they adequately represent the distinct groups in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. Part of the reason for this is that the groups here tend to be understood more as aggregates, as places where people who share similar attributes may converge. A Muslim group might simply be put in one bracket since, to an extent, all Muslims share similar attributes, such as performing the five pillars of Islam (namely shahada, the profession of faith, salat, the prayer ritual, sawm, fasting during Ramadan, zakat, almsgiving, and
The problem with this simplistic approach to aggregation is that it tends to undermine the different opinions and perspectives among Muslim groups. The Ahmadiyah are not included in the forums mentioned above and as a result their perspective is not represented either. The viewpoint on social and religious issues that come from a position as a vulnerable minority group is most unlikely to be represented because the people involved are from mainstream groups.

Therefore, to forge a civic virtue which benefits the public, there should be a mechanism where various groups are involved in social and political decision-making processes. Since there are so many diverse groups, those involved in this process should represent them in terms of interests, opinions, and perspectives. Engaging in this process is challenging precisely because it involves different opinions and perspectives. However, it can start with what Parekh (2000, p. 267-269) calls ‘operative public values’ that are attached in three levels: (1) constitution; (2) laws; and (3) norms governing the civil relationship between members of society. In the Indonesian context, the constitution may refer to UUD 1945, while laws refer to regulations related to some issues being discussed in this project. Civic norms may refer to religious, tradition or cultural values. The participants in the dialogue need to be open to being questioned and evaluated based on public operative values.

***

As discussed earlier, contestation over virtues (religious, cultural, and modern) occurs in the two research sites when some groups of people perform their citizenship practices. Even though initiatives that seek to forge a common civic virtue have been initiated by different actors (state and non-state), the contestation continues to occur. This project found that one of the key drivers is the issue of representation. Some religiously vulnerable groups for example, despite being part of majority groups, do not find representation in the majority groups. Within Muslim groups, the Ahmadiyah community, which is currently being marginalised socially, culturally, and politically, is generally not represented unless the representatives share a similar perspective to that group.

This contestation is normal in the democratic process. While this contestation might hinder the effort to cultivate a more democratic and inclusive citizenship project, it does open it up for dialogue. This dialogue, however, needs to start with and based on public operative values as Parekh (2000) suggests, and every group, therefore, needs to be open to question and evaluation. As highlighted by this research project, one of the issues in forging a more mature citizenship in the research sites, particularly in Yogyakarta, is that of recognising interests that are
shared among different social and cultural groups. Thus, promoting a shared common civic virtue remains a challenging process. It is at this point that public operative mechanisms that represents the interest, opinion, and perspective of diverse groups are likely to facilitate and forge a shared common civic virtue among separate groups.

Exercising rights and bearing public interests are important to citizenship practices which are aimed at weakening class divisions, identity politics and differences (Bendix 1964, cited in Turner 2006, p. 227). Individual rights and public interests are not necessarily in contradiction with each other. Autonomy might serve as a necessary condition for individuals to act in the name of community and public virtue (Blanken 2012). Without autonomy, individuals would not have the capacity to consider what is best for them, as individuals and as part of the community. To forge common civic virtues, traditional bonds, or associations such as those found in religion and culture, need to be oriented towards ‘external protection’ rather than ‘internal restriction’ (borrowing from Kymlicka). These differing orientations, however, must be open to being contested and interpreted differently since what is understood by ‘protection’ and ‘restriction’ may vary from one group to another.

5.6 Paralleling the State Power and Authority: Pancasila at the Crossroads?

The findings of this research indicate that while some citizenship practices offer optimism regarding the future of religious citizenship practices in Indonesia, the challenges posed by the Islamist groups in Yogyakarta and Surakarta are not to be overlooked. As mentioned earlier, religious citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta have been coloured with tensions, violation and intimidation against minority groups. These practices occur frequently and are often justified by the religious arguments and existing regulations as they perceive them. Reflecting further on the findings of this research, the questions remain as to how religious citizenship in Indonesia shall be regulated and/or whether special rights for minority groups should be formulated. On these questions, this section will discuss further on key issues within multicultural citizenship and differentiated citizenship. A discussion on Pancasila will be provided as it is the state ideological foundation, which navigate statecraft and citizenship practices in Indonesia.

One among the many features to highlight from multicultural citizenship is its proposal to address properly the challenges coming from different cultural or religious groups. It is worth noting that the context of multicultural citizenship proposed by Kymlicka is Canada, with the
challenge of francophone Quebeckers, or Western liberal countries in general. Kymlicka suggests that religious or cultural groups that wish to incorporate into the larger society and demand only recognition (not separation) may be entitled to special group rights. However, he adds that for them to have these special rights, they need to comply with basic liberal tenets such as freedom and autonomy. If these groups practiced what he calls ‘internal restriction’ by limiting basic civil and political rights of the members, they would not be entitled for these rights.

Kymlicka’s proposal about these special rights seems to be problematic in Indonesia. One of the main issues that would likely instigate the debate is how the category of religious minority shall be defined. While the category minority is western liberal framework is associated with particular demands of certain groups, Kymlicka (2005) outlined, at least four different groups of minorities, namely (a) minority nationalism such as Quebeckers in Canada or the Catalans in Spain, (b) indigenous people with the example of Inuit in Canada and the Aborigines in Australia, (c) immigrant groups, (d) metics referring to ‘migrants who are not admitted as permanent residents and future citizens’. This group may refer to those enter the country legally and illegally with the students or guest workers who overstay at the host country as the obvious example for the former (Kymlicka 2005, pp. 23-28).

While these groups might be clearly identified in western countries, it would be difficult and challenging, and to some degree could be misleading, when it comes to Asian countries. He and Kymlicka notes (2005) that applying the western concept of minority in Asia would potentially simplify the different nature of these kind of groups in Asia. The category of national minorities would be problematic to be used as general labelling toward the Aceh people in Indonesia or the Tamil groups of Sri Lanka despite the fact that they may share some commonalities with that of the Catalans or the Basque. A further careful investigation is needed as the movement initiated by the Aceh people, for example, while it might have ethnic and linguistic base, but they may not necessarily share the self-determination concept as the national minorities in the West.

Kymlicka and Norman (2000, pp. 18-19) did ‘renew’ the category of minority by adding religious groups on the list. They classify religious groups into two categories: isolationist and non-isolationist ones. The former refers to religious groups who do not actively participate in public life. They do not care about marginalisation and remain unconcerned instead since they believe that the worldly institutions ‘as corrupt’ (Kymlicka & Norman 2000, pp. 22-23). To exemplify this is the Amish groups in the United States who maintain their original traditional way of life. The non-isolationist groups refer to those who do not isolate themselves from political
and civic life. Instead, they shield themselves from some aspect of the mainstream culture and seek for an exemption such as that of the Sikh community from military and police dress codes. Again, this category is based on, allegedly, the nature immigrant groups.

Another issue with minority is that it is generally attributed by the state of the outsiders. The groups themselves might not necessarily acknowledge this attribution. Mahmood (2016) notes that the Copts in Egypt proclaim themselves to no constitute the minority groups. So as the human rights activists who seldom call them as minority groups despite their experience of marginalisation by the majority groups. Similar notion is shared within so called the minority groups in Indonesia as the findings suggest that the representative of this group rejected the label of minority for them. This means that the attribution of minority groups remains problematic and highly contested.

For some Islamist groups in Indonesia, his idea of minority rights proves challenging. His classification of religious or cultural groups as having to choose integration or separation to be eligible for minority rights, so as the classification of isolationist and non-isolationist one, seems simplistic compared to what happens in the field. Despite their claim of representing the majority groups, at some point, they tend to see themselves as constituting a ‘minority’ compared to the bigger Muslim groups such as NU and Muhammadiyah. Furthermore, they also proclaim themselves as being marginalised by the government and feel as being excluded from the political and social-decision making process. Indeed, the Islamist groups in Surakarta, as one of the leaders argue, are reluctant to be fully integrated into the national culture. This can be seen from their unwillingness to have a national identity card since it may mean recognizing the socio-political architecture of Indonesia, which they deny. However, they wish to be involved in the political decision-making process and request their demands to be incorporated into a regulation. An example of this is their request for alcohol prohibition to be included in a local regulation, while the idea proposed by the local government is to manage its circulation.

What happened in this particular case justifies Young’s critique (1997), where she argues that some religious or cultural groups might demand to be able to access economic opportunities and be involved in the decision-making process, but they reject full integration into the national culture. Furthermore, they aim not only for separation, but for a gradual re-establishment of the national political architecture. Instead of the nation-state, they demand what they call *khilafah isliyiyah ala minhajin nubuwwah*, a global Islamic caliphate. This is a system where states or territories will be governed by the principles of Islamic law. They believe that under the implementation of Islamic law, non-Muslim groups would be treated justly.
The Islamic political practices that can be seen from the Madinah Charter indeed propose an inclusive community where the rights and obligations of the Muslim and non-Muslims communities are equal. Within the millet system, non-Muslims may hold high positions such as state Ministers (Vezirs) or Prime Ministers (Grand Vezirs). However, the case of the Islamist group is Surakarta campaigning against non-Muslim leaders suggests that the position of Muslims and non-Muslims as members of political community is not equal. This raises a question as to what kind of Islamic system they propose, if their actions are different from the political practices of earlier Islamic communities.

Before discussing the implications of the findings of this project for Pancasila, the state ideology of Indonesia, its history will be briefly sketched below to gain a better understanding of its context. Pancasila was established on 1 June 1945, but the discussion over Pancasila had been ongoing since May that year. It started from the discussion initiated by BPUPK (Badan Penyelidik Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan, Investigating Committee for Preparatory Work for Independence). The members of this committee consisted of 69 different representatives (among which were two women), including Muslim people, bureaucrats, nationalist and other groups such as people of Chinese and Arabic descent (Latif 2011, p. 9). It can be argued here, as Latif (2011, p. 10) notes, that BPUPK members represented the different social political groups at that time.

The discussion over what shall be included as the state ideological foundation had been proposed by different group members at that time. The inclusion of religious values in the principle of believing in God, for example, was proposed by nationalist and religious figures such as Muhammad Yamin (one of the nationalist leaders), Agoes Salim, Ki Bagoes Hadikoesoemo (the Head of Muhammadiyah), Soepramo and Mohammad Hatta (the first vice President of Indonesia). Similar to this were the idea of humanity, unity, consensual democracy (democracy permusyawaratan) and justice and social welfare. The values of Pancasila were agreed upon by all members of BPUPK at that time, and thus it can be considered as representing a national agreement (Latif 2011, p. 9-10).

Following this meeting were several discussions organized by key figures within nationalist and religious groups such as Sukarno, Hatta and Agoes Salim. The five principles of Pancasila were set. The debate between the nationalist and religious groups emerged when it came to translating the first principle into the Constitution (Latif 2011). Some Muslim representatives proposed the inclusion of seven words, the so called as the Jakarta Charter, which are ‘dengan kewajiban menjalankan syariat Islam bagi pemeluk-pemeluknya’ (‘with the obligation to
implement Shariah Islam for its adherents’) within the ‘believing in God’ principle. This idea was rejected by the nationalist groups because it may potentially disintegrate the unity of Republic as a neither religious nor secular state. After significant lobbying, the seven words were removed from the first Principle and were replaced with the words ‘One and Only God’ (Yang Maha Esa) (Picard 2011, p. 12). On this removal, Hatta argues that it does not reduce the importance of religious values in Indonesia. The acceptance of Pancasila minus the Jakarta Charter represents the concept of kalimah sawa’ in Islam, a common platform for different groups (Azra 2004, p. 50).

The inclusion of the believing in One God in the first principle agreed upon by the founding fathers and mothers of Indonesia suggests that Indonesia considers religion to play an important role in the country’s social, cultural and political life. In Sukarno’s words during a 1945 speech, Indonesia is a state in which each of its citizens believe in God and can perform the rituals and obligations accordingly and conveniently. Sikarno called this ‘believing in God in a civilized way’ (ber-Tuhan secara kebudayaan) in which people were to respect to each other regarding their religious belief (Latif 2011, p. 17; Saksono 2007, p. 21). Furthermore, as Hatta argues, placing the belief in One God as the first principle would not change the state ideology. Instead, it would strengthen the moral foundation of the state and its political practices (Latif 2011, p. 78).

With this, Latif (2011) states that the inclusion of the religious values among the five Principles of Pancasila is distinction of the role of religion and politics in regulating public life. Religious values as they are represented in the first principle would be the moral foundation for political governance foundation as they are represented in the other four principles (Latif 2011, p. 78). In other words, the first principle of Pancasila ‘not only allows, but encourages’ religion to inspire the realization of the idea of humanism, national unity, representative democracy and social justice (Hosen 2005, p. 424). This is reminiscent of the idea of differentiation. Casanova (1994, p. 221) argues that secularization theory consists of three different propositions. The first one is secularization as a separation in which the role of religion and politics are strictly separated. Islam, as Hatta argues, does not recognize this kind of separation, so that it is different from that of Christianity tradition (Latif 2011, p. 106). The second one refers to privatization, in which religion may function in private spaces such as mosques or churches. The third one is differentiation, which refers to the different role between religion and politics in public life.

This differentiation may serve as a concept to facilitate what Stepan (2000, p. 37) called twin toleration, which is ‘the minimal boundaries of freedom of action that must somehow be
crafted for political institutions vis-à-vis religious authorities, and for religious individuals and
groups vis-à-vis political institutions.’ In this ‘minimal boundaries’, Stepan argues that the
individuals and groups shall have the freedom to perform their religious obligations and to be
involved in civil or political society as long as they do not violate civil liberties and democratic
values. They should not be prohibited to form a political party and the prohibition over whether
the party violates democratic principles should be determined by the courts, not to the
government (Stepan 2000, p. 39-40).

While Pancasila has laid the foundation for navigating the statecraft and religious
citizenship practices, the principles are too general to be implemented in social and political
practices. Due to this, during the history, Pancasila was interpreted differently from one regime
to the other. During the Sukarno presidency, an attempt to interpret Pancasila was expressed in
Manipol-USDEK (Manifesto Politik, Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Sosialisme Indonesia,
Demokrasi Terpimpin, Ekonomi Terpimpin dan Kepribadian Indonesia – the Political
Manifesto – the 1945 Indonesian Constitution, Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy,
Guided Economy, and Indonesian National Identity) (Morfit 1981, p. 843-844). This political
manifesto was aimed to realise the vision of just and human society as it is outlined in the
Pancasila. The Manipol-USDEK was translated into courses and taught not only to civil servants
but also to students at primary, secondary and university level. While there was a question as to
whether this political manifesto synthesized political orientations in Indonesia, Sukarno’s attempt
to oppose the political aspiration to establish an Islamic State in Indonesia was clearly identified

When the Old regime collapsed and the New Order was established in 1966, Suharto
attempted to translate Pancasila in a more practical way by introducing what he called Demokrasi
Pancasila (‘Pancasila Democracy’). During his speech in 1967 (cited in Suroso 2001, p. 15-16),
Suharto criticized the implementation of Pancasila by the Old Order Regime by claiming that
practices such as Sukarno’s introduction on the concept of Nasakom (Nasionalisme, Agama dan
Komunis – nationalism, religion and communism) deviated from Pancasila principles. This
concept that facilitated communism within Pancasila was against the principle of believing in
God, since communism, as Suharto perceived it, is against God. Also, social justice principles
were far from turning into reality since the guided economy served only those who had a close
connection to the elites; the people’s power turned into the elites’ power too.

In implementing Pancasila Democracy, Suharto introduced a program called P-4
(Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila, ‘Guidance for the Realization and
Implementation of Pancasila’ in 1970s. These programs were not only for government officers and civil servants, but also for students at the junior and senior high school level. This added to the existed Pancasila indoctrination programs for students, such as PMP course (Pendidikan Moral Pancasila, Pancasila Moral Education) (Weatherbee 1985, p. 134). For the New Order Regime, Pancasila democracy aimed to achieve ‘harmony, cohesion, and consensus’ and within this framework continuous development was strived for to consolidate independence (Weatherbee 1985, p. 134). One feature of Pancasila democracy was ABRI’s special role (Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Indonesia), as it did not only serve for security purpose but also to ensure development projects ran smoothly.

Under the New Order Regime, opposing their interpretation of Pancasila would be considered against the regime and thus against the state itself (Weatherbee 1985, p. 134). Any opposition to the state would be considered an extremist position, either left (communism) or right (radical Islam) (Weatherbee 1984, p. 189; 1985, p. 134). The establishment of the New Order Regime occurred after the extermination of the PKI in 1965: with the large number of members of this party, the regime considered that communism would be a source of social and political threat (Abdullah 2013, p. 80). Similar to communism, Suharto’s regime was suspicious of any political activity organized by Muslim fundamentalist groups in the 1970s (Ismail 1995, p. 200). Moreover, the regime’s attitude toward Islam also posed a political dilemma especially for Islamist political groups to articulate their political aspiration (Abdullah 2013, p. 80). On this, it is argued that among the political agendas of the New Order Regime was to ‘contain political Islam’ (Baswedan 2004, p. 671). The political fusion was introduced in 1973 where four Islamic political parties were forced to merge into one single party, namely PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan, the United Development Party) (Baswedan 2004, p. 671).

In stabilizing the power and politics, Suharto introduced the policy of Pancasila as the sole foundation of political parties and mass organisations in Indonesia in 1982. This policy instigated different reactions from different groups, but PPP, a party that was seen as representing the voices of Muslim groups, had no choice but accept this policy, although they refused to replace their political party symbol, which was ka’bah (Ismail 1995, p. 229). Many mass organisations such as NU and Muhammadiyah accepted this policy, with some of them opposing it. Part of the reasons for opposing the proposal was, at first, that Pancasila would replace Islam or it would be considered as equal to religion, or it would restrict any religious activities they organized (Ismail 1995, p. 239-240). Although the government stated that Pancasila would not
do this, and become a concern for them (Ismail 1995, p. 240), the idea to implement shariah Islam has never faded among Islamist groups.

After the collapse of the new order regime, Pancasila is open for new interpretation. Abdullah (2013, p. 75) argues that in this period, the responses of Muslim community towards the relationship between religion and the state can be seen as a continuum, from the extreme ones that are intolerant toward pluralities to broad-minded ones that are open to plural expressions and opinions toward religion and the state. It is at this point that different religious attitudes towards state and society are being widely expressed. The politics of identity in the name of religion are emerging in many places across Indonesia, often leading to conflict and violence involving religious matters (Abdullah 2013, p. 84). In terms of politics, PPP and the new Islamic-based political parties, such as PKS (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera, Prosperous Justice Party) and PBB (Partai Bulan Bintang, Star and Crescent Party) demanded to reinstate the seven words of the Jakarta Charter on the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution (Raillon 2011, p. 95). Adding to this is the local shariah regulation (Perda shariah) at the municipality level, which begs the questions of the boundary between the state and society (Abdullah 2013, p. 77).

Within this reform era, whether certain actions are acted out as based on the Pancasila principle is a subject of great debate. The policy on P-4, TAP MPR II/1978 was revoked in 1998 (Fahcrudin 2018, p. 14), and so was the BP-7 (Badan Pembina Pendidikan Pelaksanaan Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila, Supervisory Body for Implementation of Guidance for Comprehension and Practice of Pancasila), a special body that monitors the indoctrination programs during the New Order regime (Abdullah 2013, p. 84). Thus, there is no single interpretation of Pancasila. Many consider that Pancasila, as representing national consensus, guarantees Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity). For Islamist groups leaders such as Hidayat Nurwahid, one of the leaders of PKS, claimed that Pancasila is often used by some people to serve their own interests such as those who campaign against shariah Islam but claim to be supporters of Pancasila (Fachrudin 2018, p. 16). Another figure such as Adian Husaini, a Muslim writer, (2010, cited in Fachrudin 2018, p. 16) argues that the first principle of Pancasila is tauhid (the Islamic principle emphasising the meaning of the One and Only God). Husaini criticized those who consider Pancasila as something secular.

The contention between non-Islamist groups and Islamist groups regarding Pancasila interpretations continues to colour the public space. Regarding the concept of citizenship, there are different interpretation offered. Eddyono (2013) explores three higher education citizenship education books: Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan (Citizenship Education, Sumarsono 2008),
The findings of this research reflect this continuum. Religious citizenship practices between the state, civil society and individual actors have been exercised differently and competed with each other in certain contexts. In a more performative sense, the religious act of citizenship is aimed to break the secular and religious order, as can be seen, for example, from the social political imagination of the Islamist groups in Solo to implement Islamic law and establish the Islamic caliphate, *khilafah Islamiyah*, in Indonesia. Also, the series of actions are justified as being the responsibility of individuals in order to pursue the public good. Their acts in the name of civic virtues derived from the constitution, religion and culture are also contested.

Playing alongside this continuum, as the findings suggest, has allowed Islamist groups to find their own strategy. The Islamist groups in Surakarta, while proposing the argument of Islamic law or *khilafah Islamiyah*, took advantages of the idea of democracy and the rights to express idea as is guaranteed by the Constitution. It was suggested earlier that one of the leaders of the Islamist groups rejects the idea of modern state or democracy; if they were to accept them, it would be a matter of emergency because they have no choice or power to change them. While problematizing places of worship such as churches, these groups acted in the name of the regulation. Also, when they campaign publicly against the election of non-Muslims as leaders, they use their own Islamic interpretation to justify their actions. The Islamists groups in Yogyakarta do not reject Pancasila, but they play with it. They justify the actions they commit with local regulation or their own religious understanding.

As Turner argues, the religious and secular memberships, while they are separate but parallel, tend to be at odds in many respects when they are exercised with regard to dominating public sphere (2017, p. 3). With this in mind, I argue that playing strategically alongside this continuum has made the Islamist groups parallel the power and authority of the state in regulating public life. Power here is not defined as something possessed or hierarchical, but more according
to the Foucaultian tradition, where it is always ‘out there’, in relations with others and can be analysed when it is exercised (Foucault 1982, p. 786; Foucault 1991, p.26). They exercise their power over minority groups, Muslim and non-Muslims, and act as those with the authority to decide who is right, who is wrong, who is a law abider and who is a law breaker. Even if their actions were regarded as breaking the law, they believe that the state apparatus are breaking the law too, as one of the head of Islamist groups in Yogyakarta claimed. Therefore, breaking the law is being normalised. These groups took over the state duty in disciplining ‘the law breakers’ without any qualms. In other words, there are two different powers and authorities: the state and the Islamist groups, and these are exercised in public to regulate religious citizenship practices that make minority groups feel inconvenient and vulnerable, as the findings suggest.

Also, the findings remind us of Stepan’s observation that for religious organisations to participate in political space to not being privileged to ‘mandate public policy’ so that they might ‘deny critical freedoms’ of the citizens (2000; 2017). However, paralleling the power and authority of the state becomes possible due to the existence of some regulations that grant extremist groups power and authority that parallels those held by state. Adding to this is that, as the mass organisation bill states, the mass organisations are assigned a role to maintain public order so that regulating public life in the name of ‘maintaining public order’ become possible. Having said this, this project does not neglect that there are other factors that navigate these actions, as the discursive practices involved different discourses from religion, to politics, to economics. This discursive confusion implicates individuals as nation-state citizens who have rights, obligations and responsibilities, and as members of religious groups who require them to perform certain obligations; and this has been exploited by Islamist groups in order to exercise power and authority at the expense of religious minorities.

In a different sense, playing in to a continuum has been a powerful strategy to achieve political goals. The works of Sian Lazar (2008) on everyday practices and resistances of indigenous people in Bolivia have shown that, by and large, these performative actions have successfully overthrown the White government and began the new era of Indian leadership in this country. One of important features of Lazar’s work is how the citizenship is articulated in a different range of claims, thus as a continuum, from individual, groups, to professional membership such as trade unions. The articulation through different sites has challenged the very notion of citizenship in western tradition which emphasize on individual. Furthermore, the idea of group rights proposed by Kymlicka, for example, has been inadequate to capture this dynamic since his idea is limited by whether such groups intent to separate or integrate to the
country as for them to be eligible for special groups rights. This is so with the case of the Islamist
groups in Indonesia who often play along the notion of individual citizen and part of religious
community (to act for collective groups) when they claim their demands and pursue their own
interests.

On June, 7, 2017, President Joko Widodo created UKP-PIP (*Unit Kerja Presiden-
Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila*, A Working Unit on Guidance of Pancasila Ideology). This
working unit aimed to assist the President in formulating the general concept to implement
Pancasila. President Joko Widodo argues that the function of this unit will be different from that
of the New Order Regime, which was more about indoctrination (Kuwado 2017). Also, Yudi
Latif, as the head of this unit, argues that this working unit would be different from BP-7 under
the New Order Regime (Ihsanuddin 2017). Part of the role of this unit will be re-examining
existing regulations and government policies to determine whether they are in line with *Pancasila*
principles (Kuwado 2017b). This working unit has recently changed into a special body called
BPIP (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila*, A Supervisory Body for Guidance of Pancasila
Ideology) to keep it in existence despite the change of President (Setiawanto 2018; Egeham
2018).

While the products of this unit have yet to be seen, two months after the creation of this
working unit, the President issued President Regulation No. 2 2017 (*Perppu, Peraturan
Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang*) to substitute bill No. 17 2013 on Societal Organisation.
One feature of this new regulation is adding the meaning of ‘ideologies that are against Pancasila’.
In Bill No. 17 2013, these ideologies refer to atheism, communism, Marxism and Leninism.
This regulation adds to those ‘any ideologies that are aimed to replace Pancasila and the 1945
Constitution’ (Fachrudin 2018, p. 1). Furthermore, with this regulation, the government can
disband any organisations that are considered to be against Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution
without first going to court, although this decision can be reviewed via court process after that.

This regulation was soon implemented and the HTI (*Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia*, Hizbut
Tahrir of Indonesia) was disbanded. This organisation actively and publicly campaigns for
khilafah Islamiyah, rejects the idea of nation-state and denounces the idea of democracy. Instead
of them, they propose shariah Islam under a global caliphate governance. The reason to ban this
organisation is to safeguard Pancasila as a pluralist state ideology and the 1945 Constitution. This
decision instigated a debate among citizens, with some of them agreeing on this decision (because
the ideology proposed by the HTI has clearly threatened the state ideology) while other disagreed
as this is against Indonesian constitution (Ghazali 2017). The HTI objects the government’s
decision and go to court to review this decision. However, their proposal was rejected (Astungkoro 2018).

What can be learnt from this case is that every regime in Indonesia has attempted to implement Pancasila in a more practical way. In the Old Order Regime, this attempt can be seen from the creation of the Manipol-USDEK, while the New Order Regime introduced P-4 and several similar courses such as PMP. In the Reform Era, the creation of UKP-PIP (later BPIP) was meant to provide guidance to translate Pancasila at a practical level. What might be different from the previous regime is that both the Old and Order Regime (ab)used Pancasila to stabilize and consolidate the power of the regime and eliminate all those considered to be against them. Meanwhile, in the Reform Era the government use Pancasila to eliminate all ideologies that are clearly identified to be against Pancasila, such the HTI (which publicly campaign for their ideology to replace the state foundation). Furthermore, Indonesia is not the first country to not allow this organisation to operate. Other countries such as Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Uzbekistan, China, Rusia and Germany have already banned this organisation (Counter Extremism Project 2018).

The attempt of the government to outline the boundary, though it remains general and open to multiple interpretations, needs to be respected and left open for further discussion. One of the issues could be that the boundary outlined by the government as it is stated in the President Regulation No. 2 2017 works only for registered social organisations. Meanwhile, as the findings of this research suggest, the religious citizenship practices in the two research sites have led to tensions and violence, either physical or mental, to minority groups in Indonesia. The perpetrators of this violence are not all registered and not all of them publicly campaign for ideologies that threaten Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. As one of the leaders of the Islamist groups in Yogyakarta stated, he clearly supports Pancasila. However, their practices have led to violation of basic rights or have posed a threat for minority groups.

Unless the government attempts to further deal with these actions, these will not only spoil the efforts to cultivate a democratic and inclusive citizenship in Indonesia but also place Pancasila at the crossroads, as the Islamist groups will play strategically alongside its interpretation in a continuum. In order to place Pancasila as the common platform and dealing with continuous violence against minority groups, Stepan’s minimal boundaries might be further considered. However, Stepan’s argument on whether a political party or a mass organisation could not to be banned prior the courts might be contextualised. In Indonesian case, the government did ban HTI before the court process, but this decision could be reviewed via legal process in order to
prevent the absolute authority of the state in regulating the mass organisation in Indonesia. It is at this point, the historical background might take into consideration. Indonesia has, at least, experienced three critical junctures in which the national political design has been questioned. Though these critical situations could be secured, as the history suggests, this does not mean that the government could not prepare for a preventive action to defend the society and the state ideology regarding the threat of violent extremism.

For a comparative approach, Neumann (2013) introduces two different approach in dealing with violent extremism. The first one is the Anglo-Saxon approach in which the state may take actions against individuals or groups whenever they have an intent to break the law. This is the limit of where the state can intervene. The state tend to disregard the political ideas or motivations of individuals or groups, whether they are divisive and anti-democratic, as long as there are expressed in a peaceful manner. Freedom of expression is nearly absolute within this approach (Neumann 2013, p. 885). The example of county using this approach is the USA. Different from Anglo-Saxon, the European approach tend to see the radical, extremist idea not only dangerous but also potentially lead to violence. This approach believes that when the proponents of this radical and extremists ideas have successfully ‘exploited and manipulated’ the freedom within democratic system, it is highly likely that they might instigate an active extremist movement that may threaten the state and the society (Neumann 2013, pp. 886-887). The example of state adopted this approach is Germany.

Regarding the decision to ban the HTI, the approach taken by the Indonesian government seems quite close to the European approach, however regarding the challenges to deal with the extremist Islamist groups who are not publicly campaign against the state ideology, the government tend to align with the Anglo-Saxon approach. Considering the frequent violence cases against minority groups in Indonesia, the current approach, whatever it is, taken by the government seems to be inadequate to deal with this issue. As the finding suggest, the challenges posed by the Islamist groups are prevalent and need to be dealt with in due time.

Indeed, the idea to acknowledge and recognise the different religious and cultural expressions, as it is highlighted in multicultural citizenship, might be further reflected upon, as during the New Order regime this kind of expression was muted. However, it shall be noted that there should be a boundary in which this expression could be accommodated. The idea of representation in terms of opinion, interest and perspective as it is highlighted in the concept of differentiated citizenship might also be considered further so that the vulnerable minority groups would be properly represented in the social and political decision-making process. They may not
be granted a religion, not religiously, differentiated citizenship, however, the government need to ensure that their voices are freely expressed in public space without being intimidated by the extreme religious groups. As the findings of this research suggest, the government might consider to create framework in which the active involvement of the vulnerable minority groups could be performed.

5.7 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the research findings in relation to the theoretical framework used in this research project. This theoretical framework highlights the dynamic practices of citizenship whereby different state and non-state actors interact and compete with each other in navigating citizenship practices. Within the context of this research project, religion plays a key role in crafting citizenship. Despite the fact that it has been positioned in a binary opposition toward citizenship due to its allegedly secular nature, religion has, all along, been a key part of the citizenship project in Indonesia. This makes the discussion over religious citizenship proposed by Hudson (2003) particularly insightful in understanding the role of religion in citizenship practices in Indonesia and, specifically, the two research sites. As Hudson (2003) argues, religious citizenship can take different forms and be exercised into state, civil society, and personal domains.

The religious citizenship practices at the state, civil society and personal level are contested to varying degrees across the two research sites. An example is the intimidation toward an organisation in Yogyakarta suspected of spreading Shia teachings, which are considered heresy by a certain religious group. While the state guarantees the rights to assemble and express ideas, some religious factions compel other groups to halt their activities, and thus violate such rights. In other cases, the phenomenon of the Ahmadiyah also shows how state religious citizenship has led to the restriction of some of the basic rights of that community, including their right to express their ideas in public. Their critics maintain that their rights can only be returned to them once they return to Islamic teachings as the majority understand it.

Apart from religion, culture also plays a significant role in navigating citizenship practices. The cultural concepts discussed in this chapter refer to symbols, terms, or practices. As the research sites of this project are situated in close proximity in Central Java, and are therefore predominantly Javanese, cultural symbols linked to the kraton (palace) and the Sultan are of vital importance. The study found that the function of these cultural symbols has been declining, or
at least they are no longer central to the discussion, due, in part, to the involvement of the palace in investment projects which are seen to disadvantage many people. Furthermore, traditions involving the Sultan appearing among the people, such as performing prayer in the public mosque, are no longer upheld as they were in earlier times. As a result, the social and cultural bond between kawula and gusti (servant and master) is no longer seen to be as robust as it once was.

Other than cultural symbols, some cultural terms such as Wong Solo (a person from Surakarta), Solo rumah kita (Solo is our house), Wong Jogja (a person of Yogyakarta) and Jogja istimewa (Yogyakarta is special) are referenced as navigating citizenship practices in the two research sites. Wong Solo and Solo rumah kita function to reinforce a sense of collective identity and are thus inclusive. Properly understood they mean that citizens of Solo bear some responsibility to protect their home, and thus show respect and tolerance towards each other. In sharp contrast with this, Wong Jogja and Jogja istimewa tend to be interpreted narrowly, invoking a sense of exclusivity. Nevertheless, both research sites share many similarities in terms of their Javanese cultural practices which can bring different communities together. These practices include selamatan and tahlilan, communal cultural rituals used to celebrate a new birth, to pray for the dead, to give thanks and ask for blessing when moving to a new house, and so forth. The research project found, however, that these practices can be undermined when neglected in favour of modern activities to craft citizenship such as discussions, workshops, or seminars.

This chapter also discussed, from the perspective of theory, the practice of citizenship seen through the lens of habitus and the act of citizenship. As a habitus, citizenship practices can be seen to form the everyday activities performed by Muslims, Christians, and members of Dukuh Manggung. In Surakarta and Yogyakarta citizenship practices are oriented to maintain order, which is understood to be a harmonious relationship between separate groups. As a habitus, the practices of citizenship in this area are structured by the norm. When members of the society internalise the norm and act based on this, the structure is strengthened. Any activities or events that might disrupt these relationships are avoided so that the habitus, which changes over time, will always remain synchronised with the field and with the structure.

Seen through the lens of acts of citizenship, citizenship practices can also be aimed at rupturing order. The series of actions performed by the Islamist groups in Surakarta are good examples of how citizenship acts can aim to cause a rupture with the secular order. The demand for the implementation of Islamic law instead of national law, and the dream of establishing an Islamic caliphate to replace the nation-state and republic, represent acts of rupture. Their actions
are breaking with traditional religious worlds since their conceptions of Islamic law and Islamic caliphate does not represent mainstream Islamic tradition. The political form and membership in Islam has been a subject of contestation between Muslim scholars. The initiative of establishing a human rights workshop for pesantren community members could also be seen as aiming to break the order of secular and traditional religious education, in which they are seen as excluding each other. The human rights, gender and equality discourses have been excluded from most pesantren education, although this does not necessarily mean that there are no such concepts within Islam.

As citizenship practices are aimed to weaken class divisions, identity politics and differences (Bendix 1964, cited in Turner 2006, p. 227), a shared civic virtue is needed so that the public interests would be the priority. Virtue is not something given, but rather something that needs to be developed and cultivated throughout life. Apart from formal education, different actors, state and non-state, have initiated some efforts to forge shared civic virtues. In practice, however, contestation over virtues, be they religious, cultural, or modern, occur repeatedly. While a certain degree of contestation is normal in democratic process, when it is overexercised it leads to tension between different groups. This is evident in the case of the accusation of blasphemy toward an organisation associated with Shia Islam. This action is performed in the name of pious and righteous virtue.

Furthermore, as discussed in the previous section, the implementation of Pancasila has been contested among different groups; so is the conceptualisation of virtue and citizenship. The government interpretation of Pancasila, as the history suggest, has led to the abuse of these principles to serve only the power, with the example of the Old and New Order regime. Due to this, any attempts from the government to interpret Pancasila have been viewed with suspicion. The new organisation initiated by the President Joko Widodo is the first serious initiative to formulate Pancasila at the practical level during the Reform Era. While the products of this organisation are yet to be seen, the challenges over religious citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta urgently call for further investigation.

To mitigate this contestation over religious citizenship practices, a constructive dialogue is needed. As diverse groups have different opinions and conceptions of virtue, it is paramount that a dialogue be started with public operative values: constitution, laws, civic norms. This dialogue needs to facilitate the representation of different social groups in terms of their interests, opinions, and perspectives. Although it is difficult to put them into practice, such mechanisms
have the capacity to forge common shared virtues, and thus, democratic and inclusive forms of citizenship.
6.1 Summary

This thesis discussed the citizenship practices in Indonesia’s multi-faith society, employing a case study approach in two cities, Yogyakarta and Surakarta. The two cities were selected because, despite some similarities in term of historical and cultural backgrounds, they show important differences in terms of their respective approach to religious matters. Based on the latest survey by the SETARA institute in 2017, Surakarta ranked among the top 10 of the most tolerant cities in Indonesia. In contrast, Yogyakarta ranked among the bottom 10 of the list, meaning that Yogyakarta is now seen as a significantly less tolerant city – a fact that surprised many. This thesis does not aim to verify this survey, instead it investigates the dynamic of the citizenship practices at the everyday life activities by mainly doing observation and conducting interviews with the participants who were purposively selected for this project.

The participants for this research project are grouped into three categories: activists from non-governmental organisations; religious community leaders; and government representatives. These three groups represent different voices, though not necessarily conflictual, regarding the practices of citizenship in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. The religious groups selected for this project vary in terms of their religious understanding, from moderate to extremist, thus ensuring that as many different voices as possible were captured during the data collection process. There is a gender distribution imbalance regarding the number of participants, particularly for religious community groups. Indeed, religious and political leaders are mostly male, meaning that it was difficult to find enough suitable female participants to interview.

The perspective used to investigate citizenship in this project is more sociological than legal/normative. This is not to say that the legal-normative perspective is not important but investigating the citizenship practices using only this lens would be insufficient to capture the dynamic and complex manifestations of citizenship in Indonesian society. Drawing on the work of Turner (1993) and Isin (2008; 2015), this study emphasises the importance of every day performative activities and interactions between different groups in public space, participation in community events or public protests. The framework developed in this project defines citizenship as dynamic and involving contestation between the state, community and individuals over the discursive construction, the meaning-making process and lived application of
citizenship. It is not a mono-directional process, but rather a pluri-directional one in which certain conceptions of citizenship are always in the process of being questioned, problematized and exercised by different actors.

In the process of conceptualizing citizenship, this project uses the operative public values framework developed by Parekh (2000, p. 267-272). Operative public values consist of values derived from constitution, law, and civic norms. The first refers to a value that ‘lays down the basic legal and moral design of the polity including the fundamental rights and sometimes the obligation of its citizens’. While law refers to legal frameworks or regulations that regulate the daily life of citizens, civic norms can be defined as values that govern civil relations between the members of society. Civic norms signify the ‘intermediate realm’ between private life and public life (Parekh 2000, p. 268). These three operative public values navigate the type of data gathered in this research project.

As culture and religion play an important role in the way individual or people define themselves and understand their world (Taylor 1994), these two were paid special attention. This is because a particular understanding of cultural and religious values will significantly affect the way people see and interact with each other. In turn, this will influence the way they participate in public life and navigate their actions in the civic engagement process. These values of culture and religion might not necessarily go hand in hand when it comes to the interpretation of different communities (e.g. syncretism and harmony in Javanese culture vs purification within Islamic tradition), and this will affect the way they conceptualize operative public values. The particular understanding used to justify the citizenship practices was the focus during the interview and observation process.

The findings of this study suggest that citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta are characterised by persistent conflict and tensions, and in the case of Yogyakarta outright violence. The conflict over places of worship occurred in Yogyakarta and Surakarta, with the arguments revolving around procedural requirements and substantive concern over exercising rights. The tensions over this issue, as the findings suggest, sometimes go beyond the procedural requirement debate, which is only used to cover the intention of preventing religious proselytization in certain areas. The issue then moves to whether the plan to build places of worship would disturb the social order. Even though building permit requirements are met, this does not necessarily mean that the issue can be solved effectively.

The tension over religious and socio-cultural practices also impact the citizenship practices in the two research sites. The arguments focus on whether such practices are seen as
being essentially cultural or religious. The case of the cheap food program in Surakarta and an Easter celebration for elderly people in a public area in Yogyakarta exemplify this. Islamist groups consider these activities to be religious and suspect Christianisation of Muslims people; thus they reject both activities. While this Christianisation effort is denied by the organizers, the suspicion remains. The cheap food program, which had lasted for many years, was stopped and the Easter celebration was organized in a number of churches instead of in public area.

Other tensions regarding the citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta are due to the perceived conflicting ideas of performing religious obligation and exercising basic rights. This can be seen in the case of the public campaign against the election of non-Muslims to political positions in Surakarta, and an intimidation toward Raushan Fikr, an organisation associated with the Shia community, in Yogyakarta. In both cases, Islamist groups believe that their actions fall under religious obligations. Meanwhile, the Indonesian constitution does not prevent non-Muslim people to participate in elections, since every citizen, regardless of their background, is entitled to such political rights. Also, the constitution guarantees every citizen the rights to assemble and to express ideas.

The findings also suggest that some deliberate discursive constructions have informed and directed citizenship practices in certain way often leading to inter-communal tensions. These discursive constructions are reflected in the form of political-religious events, for example with the anti-election and anti-Shia campaigns cited above; religious-legal context is exemplified by the opposition to more places of worship being built for minorities, such as churches because of regulations introduced by the government; and the socio-economic factor refers to the economic interests that affect the way religious citizenship practices are exercised in the two cities.

Some alternative discourses are also proposed by different actors such as NGO activists and religious community leaders. The human rights discourse is translated into the training or workshop on human rights, peace building and conflict resolution for religious groups. The religious pluralism discourse is reflected in the form of initiation of meetings between different groups to discuss contemporary issues in their area. It is also embodied in the initiative for children to travel to different places of worship in Surakarta, with the aim to introduce the concept of tolerance and respect, as well as the promotion of tolerance within a social cultural activity such as donating blood (in which the participants were told that donating blood may contribute to tolerance since their blood might be used by people from different religious communities).
6.2 Significance of the Study

This study, focusing on religious minorities in plural society, uncovers challenges that still endure in relation to the problematic understanding and instrumentalised application of certain notions of citizenship. This leads to a diminished if not an absence of protection for minority groups from the state’s as well as extremist groups’ excesses. The state various agencies in particular compound the (ab)use of religious teachings and regulations often used to justify violent actions. This implies that without further actions from the government to seriously deal with violent actions against minority groups in Indonesia, their position would become more vulnerable. Their rights would be continuously violated.

This project also highlights some features that might shed a light of optimism toward cultivating a more democratic and inclusive citizenship in the two research sites. The commitment to maintain harmonious relationship shown by the church and mosque community in Surakarta and the active participation the members of Dukuh Manggung in Yogyakarta need to be further promoted. The cultural activities of communal feast such as selamatan and tahlilan that facilitate discussion and deliberation among different groups need to be scaled up so that the violence against particular groups might be minimised through this vernacular form of everyday conversation.

6.3 Contribution of the Study

Empirically, this study has shown that citizenship practices in Yogyakarta and Surakarta are far from simple because they involve different actors and motives in exercising their rights and perceived obligations toward the state and religion.

Theoretically, this study has enriched the debate over the idea of religious citizenship, the role of culture in navigating citizenship practices, and the importance of performative acts in the framing of citizenship. Furthermore, this study’s findings contribute to the debate over the limits of multicultural citizenship in particular in relation to cultural recognition and special group rights, differentiated citizenship on the idea of representation and identification of social groups, the Islamic version of citizenship that is interpreted rather differently by various Islamist groups, and Pancasila citizenship conceptualisation and its implementation throughout history.

The findings of this research and their theoretical implications indicate that the challenges regarding the religious practices in Indonesia urgently call for further normative as well as policy
consideration. The government’s initiative to create UKP-PIP (later BPIP) might be seen as a first attempt to outline a general rule to implement Pancasila at a practical level to navigate citizenship practices in a social, political, and cultural sphere. As the discussion of the findings suggest, currently Pancasila has been placed on a continuum where different groups may interpret it based on their own ideology and political economic interests. With the trend of violence against minority groups in Indonesia, placing Pancasila in this ambivalent position would only endanger the vulnerable groups, while at the same time ‘giving’ the power and authority to extremist groups to pursue their objectives by using violence (if necessary) through the existing regulation discussed in this project.

However, it is also important to note that providing general guidelines to implement Pancasila need not be treated as final and closed to different interpretations. History suggests that a monopoly over the interpretation of Pancasila by the state would lead to the abuse of the Pancasila as a political instrument. Therefore, these general guidelines should not be treated as dogma but rather need to be open for debate and interpretation. There is a need for a more organic engagement with mainstream society so that more considered deliberations among different groups can take place in order to ensure a broad-based participation and representation in defining the actual meaning and value of Pancasila in particular as an important framework for regulating public life.

6.4 Limitations of the Study

As with any similar research project, there are some methodological limitations that need to be acknowledged in this study. Firstly, a there is a limitation in relation to actual sampling. Indeed, the participants in this research project are, mainly, the leaders of each of the institutions or someone who has been appointed by the leaders of the same institutions. This means that the voices of ‘ordinary’ members of the community are not consistently heard. The main consideration in deciding to focus on the leaders was that they have been the ones most actively involved with the conflict. Also, it is these leaders or their representatives that are involved in campaigning or producing certain discourses in the public space.

Secondly, and due to scope and time constraints, even when more individuals could have been included for some groups, this study’s scope dictated that only one representative was invited to formally take part in the study. There may be an issue here regarding whether this one representative adequately represents the different voices of the organisation or the relevant
community. It is, in fact, acknowledged by some participants involved in this research project that there are sometimes different opinions on certain issues between the leaders of these institutions. In other words, there are often competing factions within these organisations and this sometimes makes it difficult to obtain opinion truly representative perspective. With this in mind, it is not the intention of this research project to generalise the findings on the basis of the opinions articulated by the participants. Rather, they are seen and acknowledged as being among multiple voices coming from these organisations. Therefore, further research can examine this issue further within different design in order to obtain more representative insights from similar groups and organisations.

6.5 Future Research

Any examination of religious citizenship practices in societies where Muslims are the minority group would be inherently interesting and likely to yield valuable insights. This project is conducted in two cities in which Muslims are the majority, therefore, Islamic arguments would tend to shape discussions, particularly when it comes to justifying actions committed by extremist Islamist groups. Similar studies in Indonesia for example involving mainly non-Muslim cities, such as Bali, might offer a different insight into the citizenship practices.

Furthermore, and going beyond Indonesia, studies on religious minorities and their citizenship claims and practices in a non-predominantly Javanese society would be most useful generating useful insights. For example, studies examining the role of culture or religion in accessing and navigating citizenship rights in other culturally and religiously plural societies would contribute to this important body of knowledge. As it is argued in this project, Javanese cultures emphasises harmony, consensus and order, and due to this any violent conflicts tend to be avoided. A different culture might emphasise different values that may affect the citizenship practices exercised by different actors in that particular area.

Finally, this research project offers unique empirical insights aimed at understanding the limitations of democratic and inclusive forms of citizenship in contemporary Indonesia. The research findings offer cautious optimism regarding the cultivation of democratic citizenship in the everyday practices of everyday citizens in particular among minority groups. The project’s findings, in addition to contestations and tensions, also highlight an active public participation and community engagement between different groups in some areas. This commitment towards maintaining social harmony and inter-religious tolerance can be seen in the form of grassroots
community activities such as regular meetings and mutual support for celebrating religious rituals and ceremonies. These kinds of everyday practices need to be scaled up so that the foundation for a more inclusive and democratic citizenship may be solidly forged, not only in these two cities, but also in many areas across Indonesia.
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The approval given by the Deakin University Human Research Ethics Committee is given only for the project and for the period as stated in the approval. It is your responsibility to contact the Human Research Ethics Unit immediately should any of the following occur:

- Serious or unexpected adverse effects on the participants
- Any proposed changes in the protocol, including extensions of time.
- Any events which might affect the continuing ethical acceptability of the project.
- The project is discontinued before the expected date of completion.
- Modifications are requested by other HREC.

In addition you will be required to report on the progress of your project at least once every year and at the conclusion of the project. Failure to report as required will result in suspension of your approval to proceed with the project.
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Human Research Ethics Unit
research.ethics@deakin.edu.au
Telephone: 03 4421 7123
Appendix 2: Sample of Language Plain Statements and Consent Forms

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Interviewee

Plain Language Statement

Date:
Full Project Title: Citizenship in Multi-faith Society: A Case Study of Indonesia
Principal Researcher: Professor Fethi Mansouri
Student Researcher: Muhammad Khoirul Muqtafa
Associate Researcher(s): Muhammad Khoirul Muqtafa

You are invited to take part in this study. Please read this Participant Information Statement in full before deciding whether or not to participate in this research. If you would like further information regarding any aspect of this project, you are encouraged to contact the researcher via the email address listed below.

You have chosen to participate in this research because you have responded to the information given by organizations where the research team of this project has made initial contact with. You meet the criteria of the participant groups of this research project because you are political leaders, religious or community leaders, member of non-governmental organizations or ordinary members of religious communities and you are above 18 year old. Further, you accept that there is no remuneration and that participation is voluntary.

The aim of the study is to understand how citizenship is conceptualized, developed, and practiced in Indonesia which has experienced dramatic social, cultural and political changes.
throughout its history. As to what extent these changes affect the way you practice citizenship will be studied in order to reflect and learn about the possibility of forging a more plural and democratic society in the world’s most populous Muslim country that is also renowned as one of the most diverse countries in the world.

The study involves an interview which will be audio recorded. The interview will take half an hour to one hour, and will take place in a mutually agreed upon location.

The benefits from this research include the opportunity to share your understanding and perspective about the concept of citizenship and what kind of factors which affect the way you understand citizenship. This will help to forge a more democratic and inclusive form of citizenship where people from different cultural and religious background could live in peace and harmony.

It is not expected that your involvement will cause inconvenience and/or discomfort to you. A pseudonym will be used to de-identify your contribution to this project.

Data collected will be stored in accordance with Deakin regulations. The interview recordings and transcripts will adhere to University regulations and be kept on University premises in a secure electronic file and locked cupboard/filing cabinet for 5 years. The project has been funded by Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University.

Being in this study is voluntary and you are under no obligation to consent to participate. If you do consent to participate, you have the right to withdraw during the interview or at any stage after the interview. If you withdraw from the interview, you will not be penalised or disadvantaged in any way. To withdraw your consent after the interview has finished, please contact either Professor Fethi Mansouri or Muhammad Khoirul Muqtafa directly (contact details below).

Professor Fethi Mansouri  
Director  
Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation  
Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia  
Email: fethi.mansouri@deakin.edu.au

Muhammad Khoirul Muqtafa  
PhD Student  
Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation  
Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia  
Email: mmuqtafa@deakin.edu.au

Complaints
If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:
The Manager, Research Integrity, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125, Telephone: 9251 7129, research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Please quote project number [2015-202].

Thank you,

Professor Fethi Mansouri
Deakin University
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Interviewee

Consent Form

Date:

Full Project Title: Citizenship in A Multi-faith Society: A Case Study of Indonesia

Reference Number:

I have read, or have had read to me in my first language and I understand the attached Plain Language Statement.

I freely agree to participate in this project according to the conditions in the Plain Language Statement.

I have been given a copy of the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form to keep.

The researcher has agreed not to reveal my identity and personal details, including where information about this project is published, or presented in any public form.

I consent to the following:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree to be interviewed by the researchers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree to allow the interview to be audio recorded</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that any information I provide is confidential and that no information that could lead to the identification of any individual will be disclosed in any reports on the project, or to another party.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that I can request a transcript of this interview for my approval before it is included in the write up of the research.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that the interview audio file will be kept in secure storage and accessible to the research team. I also understand that the data will be destroyed after 5 years unless I consent to it being used in future research.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand that any data that the researcher extracts from the interview for use in reports or published findings will not, under any circumstances, contain names or identifying characteristics, unless I request it.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant’s Name (printed) ...........................................................................................................

Signature ................................................................. Date .................................

Muhammad Khoirul Muqtafa, School of Humanities and Social Science
Bld EB.2.22 Deakin
University, Burwood Campus 3125
Phone: +61 3 9244 5135
Appendix 3: Presidential Decree No. 1/PNPS/1965 on the Prevention of Blasphemy and Abuse of Religions

PENETAPAN PRESIDEN REPUBLIK INDONESIA
NOMOR 1/PNPS TAHUN 1965

TENTANG
PENCEGAHAN PENYALAHGUNAAN DAN/ATAU PENODAAN AGAMA

PRESIDEN REPUBLIK INDONESIA,

Menimbang: a. bahwa dalam rangka pengamanan Negara dan Masyarakat, cita-cita Revolusi Nasional dan pembangunan Nasional Sempurna meningkatkan adil dan makmur, perlu mengadakan peraturan untuk mencegah penyalahan guna atau penodaan agama,

b. bahwa untuk pengamanan revolusi dan ketentuan masyarakat, sah terdapat peraturan Presiden,

Mengingat: 1. pasal 29 Undang-undang Dasar,
2. pasal IV Aturan Peralihan Undang-undang Dasar,
3. penetapan Presiden No. 2 tahun 1962 (Lembara Negara tahun 1962 No. 34);
4. pasal 2 ayat (1) Ketetapan M.P.R.S. No. II/MPRS/1960;

MEMUTUSKAN:

Menetapkan: PENETAPAN PRESIDEN REPUBLIK INDONESIA TENTANG PENCEGAHAN PENYALAHGUNAAN DAN/ATAU PENODAAN AGAMA.

Pasal 1

Setiap orang dilarang dengan sengaja di muka umum mencemarkan, mengangkat atau mengusahakan dukungan umum, untuk melakukan penafsiran tentang sesuatu agama yang dianut di Indonesia atau melakukan kegiatan-kegiatan keagamaan yang menyimpang dari kegiatan keagamaan dan agama itu, penafsiran dan kegiatan mana menyimpang dari pokok pokok ajaran agama itu.

Pasal 2

(1) Barang siapa melanggar ketentuan tersebut dalam pasal 1 diberi perintah dan peringatan keras untuk menghentikan perbuatannya itu di dalam suatu
keputusan bersama Menteri Agama, Menteri/Jaksa Agung dan Menteri Dalam Negeri.

(2) Apabila pelanggaran tersebut dalam ayat (1) dilakukan oleh Organisasi atau sesuatu aliran kepercayaan, maka Presiden Republik Indonesia dapat membubarkan Organisasi itu dan menyatakan Organisasi atau aliran tersebut sebagai Organisasi aliran terlarang, satu dan lain setelah Presiden mendapat pertimbangan dari Menteri Agama, Menteri/Jaksa Agung dan Menteri Dalam Negeri.

Pasal 3

Apabila, setelah dilakukan tindakan oleh Menteri Agama bersama-sama Menteri/Jaksa Agung dan Menteri Dalam Negeri atau oleh Presiden Republik Indonesia menurut ketentuan dalam pasal 2 terhadap orang, Organisasi atau aliran kepercayaan, mereka masih terus melanggar ketentuan dalam pasal 1, maka orang, pengikut, anggota dan/atau anggota Pengurus Organisasi yang bersangkutan dari aliran itu dipidana dengan pidana penjara selama lamanya lima tahun.

Pasal 4

Pada Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Pidana diadakan pasal baru yang berbunyi sebagai berikut.

"Pasal 156a

Dipidana dengan pidana penjara selama-lamanya lima tahun barangsapa dengan sengaja di muka umum mengelarkan perasaan atau melakukan perbuatan

a. yang pada poloknya bersifat permusuhan, penyalih-gunaaan atau penodaan terhadap suatu agama yang dianut di Indonesia;

b. dengan maksud agar supaya orang tidak menganut agama apapun juga, yang bersendikan ke Tuhanan Yang Maha Esa."

Pasal 5

Penetapan Presiden Republik Indonesia ini mulai berlaku pada hari diundangkannya. Agar supaya setiap orang dapat mengetahuiya memerintahkan pengundangan Penetapan Presiden Republik Indonesia ini dengan penempatan dalam Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia.

Ditetapkan di Jakarta

PRESIDEN REPUBLIK INDONESIA,

SUHARNO
Diundangkan di Jakarta
pada tanggal 27 Januari 1965
SEKRETARIS NEGARA,

MOHD. ICHSAN.

LEMBARAN NEGARA REPUBLIK INDONESIA TAHUN 1965 NOMOR 3
PENJELASAN

ATAS

PENETAPAN PRESIDEN REPUBLIK INDONESIA

NOMOR 1/PNPS TAHUN 1965

TENTANG

PENCEGAHAN PENYALAH-GUNAAN DAN/ATAU PENODAAN AGAMA

I. UMUM

1. Dekret Presiden tanggal 5 Juli 1959 yang menetapkan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 bertujuan lagi bagi segenap bangsa Indonesia telah menyatakan, bahwa Piagam Jakarta tanggal 22 Juni 1945 menjadi dan merupakan suatu rangkaian kesatuan dengan konstitusi tersebut.

Menurut Undang undang Dasar 1945 Negara kita berdasarkan:

1. Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa,
2. Kemanusiaan yang adil dan beradab,
3. Persatuan Indonesia,
4. Kerakyatan,
5. Keadilan Sosial.


2. Telah teryata, bahwa pada akhir-akhir ini hampir diseluruh Indonesia tidak sedikit timbul aliran aliran atau Organisasi organisasi kebajinan kepercayaan masyarakat yang bertentangan dengan ajaran ajaran dan hukum Agama. Diantara ajaran ajaran/perbuatan perbuatan pada pemeluk aliran aliran tersebut sudah banyak yang telah menimbulkan hal-hal yang melanggar hukum, memecah persatuan Nasional dan mendat Agama. Dari kenyataan terangkah, bahwa aliran aliran atau Organisasi organisasi kebajinan kepercayaan masyarakat yang menyalah gunakan dan atau mempergunakan Agama sebagai pokok, pada akhir-akhir ini berlambah banyak dan telah berkembang kearah yang sangat membahayakan Agama-agama yang ada.

3. Untuk mencegah berlarut-larutnya hal-hal tersebut diatas yang dapat membahayakan persatuan Bangsa dan Negara, maka dalam rangka
kewaspadaan Nasional dan dalam Demokrasi Terpimpin dianggap perlu diteklurkan Penetapan Presiden sebagai realisasi Dekret Presiden tanggal 5 Juli 1959 yang merupakan salah satu jalan untuk menyalurkan keteladaban negara dan keagamaan, agar oleh segenap rakyat diseluruh wilayah Indonesia ini dapat dinikmati keterlarutan beragama dan jaminan untuk menunaikan ibadah menurut Agamanya masing-masing.

4. Berhubung dengan maksud memupuk keterlaman beragama inilah, maka penetapan Presiden ini bertanda menoceha agar jangan sampai berjadi penyelewengan penyelamten yang dianggap sebagai ajaran-ajaran pokok oleh para ulama dari agama yang bersangkutan (pasal 1-3), dan kedua kalinya aturan ini melindungi keterlaman beragama tersebut dari penodaan/penghinaan serta dari ajaran ajaran untuk tidak memeluk agama yang bersendikat Ke-Tuhanan Yang Maha Esa(Pasal 4).


II. PASAL DEMI PASAL

Pasal 1


Karena 6 macam Agama ini adalah agama-gama yang dipeluk hampir seluruh penduduk Indonesia, maka kecuali mereka mendapat jaminan seperti yang diberikan oleh pasal 29 ayat 2 Undang undang Dasar, juga mereka mendapat bantuan-bantuan dan perlindungan seperti yang dibebankan oleh pasal ini.


Dengan kata-kata "Kegiatan keagaman" dimaksudkan segala macam kegiatan yang bersifat keagamaan, misalnya menamakan suatu alam sebagai Agama, mempergunakan istilah-istilah dalam menjalankan atau mengamalkan ajaran-ajaran
kepercayaannya ataupun melakukan ibadahnya dan sebagainya. Pokok-pokok ajaran agama dapat diketahui oleh Departemen Agama yang untuk itu mempunyai alat-alat/cara-cara untuk menyelidikinya.

Pasal 2
Sesuai dengan keputusan Indonesia, maka terhadap orang-orang ataupun pengikut-pengikut sesuatu aliran kepercayaan maupun anggota atau anggota Organisasi yang melanggar larangan tersebut dalam pasal 1, untuk pemulihan dirasa cukup diberi nasihat sepoletnya. Apabila penyelenggaraan itu dilakukan oleh organisasi atau pengikut-pengikut aliran kepercayaan dan mempunyai efek yang cukup serius bagi masyarakat yang beragama, maka Presiden berwenang untuk membubarkan organisasi itu dan untuk menyatakan sebagai organisasi atau aliran terlarang dengan akibat-akibatnya (jo pasal 169 K.U.H.P.).

Pasal 3
Pemberian ancaman pidana yang diatur dalam pasal ini, adalah tindakan lanjutan terhadap anasir-anasir yang tetap mengabaikan peringatan tersebut, dalam pasal 2. Oleh karena aliran kepercayaan biasanya tidak mempunyai bentuk seperti organisasi/perhimpunan, dimana mudah dibedakan siapa pengurus dan siapa anggotanya, maka mengenai aliran-aliran kepercayaan, hanya pengikutnya yang masih terus melakukan pelanggaran dapat dikenakan pidana, sedang pemuka aliran sendiri yang menghentikan kegiatannya tidak dapat dituntut.

Mengingat sifat idil dari tindak pidana dalam pasal ini, maka ancaman pidana 5 tahun dirasa sudah wajar.

Pasal 4
Maksud ketentuan ini telah cukup dijelaskan dalam penjelasan umum di atas. Cara mengelakkan persamaan atau melakukan perbuatan dapat dilakukan dengan lisan, tulisan atauupun perbuatan lain.

Huru’ a, tindak pidana yang dimaksudkan disini, ialah yang somata-mata (pada pokoknya) ditujukan kepada niat untuk memusuhi atau menghina.

Dengan demikian, maka, uraian-uraian tertulis maupun lisan yang dilakukan secara objektif, zelikul dan ilmiah mengenai sesuatu agama yang diserang dengan usaha untuk menghina atau adanya kata-kata atau susun kata-kata yang bersifat perusuh atau penghinaan, bukanlah tindak pidana menurut pasal ini.

Huru’ b, Orang yang melakukan tindak pidana tersebut disini, disamping mengganggu ketentraman orang beragama, pada dasarnya menghianati sila pertama dan Negara secara total, dan oleh karenanya adalah pada tempatnya, bahwa perbuatan tersebut dipidana sepanjangnya.

6
Pasal 5
Cukup jelas.

TAMBAHAN LEMBARAN NEGARA REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 2726.

KEPUTUSAN BERSAMA
MENTERI AGAMA DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI
No. 01/16TR/mdn-mag/1969

TENTANG

PELAJARANAN TUGAS APELATER PEMERINTAHAN
DALAM MENJAMIN KETERTIBAN DAN KEJANDERAN
PELAJARANAN PENGEMBANGAN DAN IBADAT AGAMA
OLEH PEMESUK PEMELUKNYA

MENTERI AGAMA DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI,

Memangh :

1. bahwa Negera menjamin kementikan tiap-tiap penduduk untuk
   memeluk agamanya masing-masing dan untuk beribadat mematuhi agama dan
   kepercayaan itu;

2. bahwa Pemerintah mempunyai tugas untuk memberikan bimbingan
   dan bantuan guna mempercepat usaha mengembangkan agama sesuai dengan ajaran
   agama masing-masing dan melakukan pengawasan sedemikian rupa, agar setiap
   penduduk dalam melakukan ajaran agama dan dalam usaha mengembangkan agama
   itu dapat berjalan dengan lancar, tertib dan dalam suasana kurnia;

3. bahwa Pemerintah berkomitmen menerima serta usaha
   pengembangan agama dan pelaksanaan ibadat penuh pemeluknya, sepintas
   kongenial-kongenial tersebut tidak bertentangan dengan hak yang berlaku dan
   tidak mengganggu kesan dan ketertiban umum;

4. bahwa untuk itu, perlu diadakan ketentuan-kotentuan mengenai
   pelaksanaan tugas aparatur Pemerintah dalam menjamin ketertiban dan
   kelancaran pelaksanaan pengembangan dan ibadat agama oleh pemeluk-pemeluknya.

Mengingat: 1. Pasal 17 ayat (3) dan pasal 39 Undang Undang dasar
   1945;
   2. Ketentuan MPR/RI Nomor XXVII/35/1966;
   3. Undang-undang Nomor 16 tahun 1968;
   4. Peratur Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 27 tahun 1968;

MEMUTUSKAN

Menetapkan: KEPUTUSAN BERSAMA MENTERI AGAMA DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI

TENTANG

PELAJARANAN TUGAS APELATER PEMERINTAHAN DALAM MENJAMIN KETERTIBAN DAN
KEJANDERAN PEELAJARANAN PENGEMBANGAN DAN IBADAT AGAMA OLEH PEMESUK
PEMELUKNYA.

Pasal 1

Kepala Daerah membatikan kesempatan kepada setiap usaha penyelamatan agama dan
pelaksanaan ibadat oleh pemeluk pemeluknya, sepansang kongenial tersebut

tidak bertentangan dengan hak yang berlaku dan tidak mengganggu ketertiban

umum.
Pasal 2

(1) Kepala Daerah membimbing dan mengurus agar pelaksanaan penyehatan agama dan ibadat oleh pemeluk pemeluknya tertib:

a. tidak menimbulkan perpecahan diantara umat beragama;

b. tidak disusut dan inti disiadi, baju, pakaian atau alat absen dalam segala bentuknya;

c. tidak melanggar hadam serta keamanan dan kotoran umum.

(2) Dalam melaksanakan tugasnya tersub pada ayat (1) pasal ini, Kepala Daerah dibantu dan mengganyakan alat Kepala Perwakilan Departemen Agama setempat.

Pasal 3

(1) Kepala Perwakilan Departemen Agama memberikan bimbingan, pengarahan dan pengawasan terhadap mereka yang memberikan penerangan/penyehatan/ceramah agama/khotbah-khotbah dimah-ramah ibadat, yang sifatnya menyusup kepada perumahan antara semua golongan masyarakat dan saling pengendalian antara pemeluk-pemeluk agama yang berbeda-beda.

(2) Kepala Perwakilan Departemen Agama setempat berusaha agar penerangan agama yang disebutkan oleh sahabat dan tidak berbaur masyarakat atau masyarakat lain.

Pasal 4

(1) Setiap pemindahan rumah ibadat perlu mendapatkan ijin dari Kepala Daerah atau pejabat pemerintahan dibawahnya yang dihukumkan untuk itu.

(2) Kepala Daerah atau pejabat yang dimaksud dalam ayat (1) pasal ini memberikan ijin yang dimaksud, setelah mempertimbangkan:

a. pendidikan Kepala Perwakilan Departemen Agama setempat;

b. Planologi;

c. kondisi dan keadaan setempat.

(3) Apabila dianggap perlu, Kepala Daerah atau pejabat yang dimaksud ini dapat meminta pendapat dari organisasi-organisasi keagamaan dan utama/rokhmaniahan setempat.

Pasal 5

(1) Jika timbul perbebasahan atau pertentangan antara pemeluk-pemeluk agama yang disebabkan karena kegiatan penyehatan/penyehatan/ceramah/khotbah agama atau pendidikan rumah ibadat, maka Kepala Daerah segera mengadakan penyelidikan yang adil dan tidak memihak.

(2) Dalam hal perbebasahan/pertentangan tersebut menimbulkan tindakan pidana, maka penyelidikannya harus diserahkan kepada alat acara pemogokan hukum yang berwenang dan diselesaikan berdasarkan hukum.

(3) Masalah masalah keagamaan lainnya yang timbul dan diselesaikan oleh Kepala Perwakilan Departemen Agama segera dilaporkannya kepada Kepala Daerah setempat.
Pasal 6

Keputusan bersama ini mulai berlaku pada hari ditetapkan.

Ditetapkan di: Jakarta
Pada tanggal: 13 September 1960

MENTERI AGAMA
MENTERI DALAM NEGERI
Cap/ttd Cap/ttd

KH. MOH. DAHLAN AMIR MACHMUD

PERATURAN BERSAMA
MENTERI AGAMA DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI
NOMOR: 9 TAHUN 2006
NOMOR: 8 TAHUN 2006

TENTANG
PEDOMAN PELAKSANAAN TUGAS KEPALA DAERAH/WAKIL KEPALA DAERAH DALAM PEMELIHARAAN KERUKUNAN UMAT BERAGAMA, PEMBERDAYAAN FORUM KERUKUNAN UMAT BERAGAMA, DAN PENDIRIAN RUMAH IBADAT

DENGAN RAHMAT TUHAN YANG MAHA ESA

MENTERI AGAMA DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI,

Menimbang :

a. bahwa hak beragama adalah hak asasi manusia yang tidak dapat dikerang dalam keadaan apapun;

b. bahwa setiap orang bebas memilih agama dan beribadat menurut agamanya;

c. bahwa negara monjakin komorsehakaan tiap- tiap penduduk untuk memeluk agamanya masing-masing dan untuk beribadat menurut agamanya dan kepercayaannya itu;

d. bahwa Pemerintah berkebajian melindungi setiap usaha penduduk melaksanakan agama dan ibadat memeluk-pemeluknya, sepanjang tidak berlantangan dengan peraturan perundang-undangan, tidak menyalahgunakan atau mendatang agama, serta tidak menganggu ketenteraman dan ketertiban umum;

e. bahwa Pemerintah mempunyai tugas untuk memberikan bimbingan dan pelayanan agar setiap penduduk dalam melaksanakan ajaran agamanya dapat berlangsung dengan rukun, lancar, dan tertib;

f. bahwa arah kebijakan Pemerintah dalam pembangunan nasional di bidang agama antara lain peningkatan kualitas pelayanan dan pemahaman agama, kehidupan beragama, serta peningkatan kerukunan intern dan antar umat beragama;

g. bahwa daerah dalam rangka menyelenggarakan otonomi, mempunyai kewajihan melaksanakan urusan wajib bidang perencanaan, pemanfaatan, dan pengawasan tata ruang serta kewajiban melindungi masyarakat, menjaga persatuan, kesatuan, dan kerukunan nasional serta keutuhan Negara.
Kesatuan Republik Indonesia:

h. bahwa kerukunan umat beragama merupakan bagian penting dan kerukunan nasional;

i. bahwa kepala daerah dan wakil kepala daerah dalam rangka melaksanakan tugas dan wewenangnya mempunyai kewajiban memelihara ketenteraman dan keterlibatan masyarakat;


k. bahwa berdasarkan pertimbangan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam huruf a, huruf b, huruf c, huruf d, huruf e, huruf f, huruf g, huruf h, huruf i, dan huruf j, perlu menetapkan Peraturan Bersama Menteri Agama dan Menteri Dalam Negri tentang Pedoman Pelaksanaan Tugas Kepala Daerah/Wakil Kepala Daerah Dalam Pemeliharaan Kerukunan Umat Beragama, Pemberdayaan Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama dan Pendidikan Rumah Ibadat,

Mengingat : 1. Undang-Undang Penetapan Presiden Nomor 1 Tahun 1965 tentang Pencegahan Penyalahgunaan dan/atau Penodakan Agama (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1965 Nomor 3, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 2726);

2. Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1985 tentang Organisasi Kemasyarakatan (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1985 Nomor 44, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 3298);

3. Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1999 Nomor 165, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Nomor 3886);

4. Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2002 tentang Bangunan Gedung (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2002 Nomor 134, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4247);

5. Undang-Undang Nomor 10 Tahun 2004 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 53, Tambahan Lembaran Negara
6. Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 125, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Nomor 4437) sebagaimana telah diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2005 tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2005 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah menjadi Undang-Undang (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2005 Nomor 4 Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4498);

7. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 18 Tahun 1986 tentang Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1985 (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1986 Nomor 24 Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 3331);


15. Peraturan Menteri Agama Nomor 3 Tahun 2006 tentang
Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Departemen Agama:

MEMUTUSKAN:

Menetapkan: PERATURAN BERSAMA MENTERI AGAMA DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI TENTANG PEDOMAN PELAKSANAAN TUGAS KEPALA DAERAHKANIL KEPALA DAERAH DALAM PELAKSANAAN KERUKUNAN UMAT BERAGAMA, PEMERDAYAAN FORUM KERUKUNAN UMAT BERAGAMA DAN PENDIRIAN RUMAH IBADAT.

BAB I
KETENTUAN UMUM

Pasal 1
Dalam Peraturan Bersama ini yang dimaksud dengan:

1. Kerukunan umat beragama adalah keadaan hubungan sesama umat beragama yang dilandasi toleransi, saling pengertian, saling menghormati, menghargai kesetaraan dalam pengamalan ajaran agamanya dan kerjasama dalam kehidupan bermasyarakat, berbangsa dan bernegara di dalam Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia berdasarkan Pancasila dan Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.

2. Pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama adalah upaya bersama umat beragama dan Pemerintah di bidang pelayanan, pengaturan, dan pemberdayaan umat beragama.

3. Rumah ibadat adalah bangunan yang memiliki ciri-ciri tertentu yang khusus dipergunakan untuk beribadat bagi para pemeluk masaq-masag agama secara permanen, tidak termasuk tempat ibadat keluarga.

4. Organisasi Kemanusiaan Keagamaan yang selanjutnya disebut Ormas Keagamaan adalah organisasi nonpemerintah bervisi kebangsaan yang dibentuk berdasarkan kesamaan agama oleh warga negara Republik Indonesia secara sukarela, berbadan hukum, dan telah terdaftar di pemerintah daerah setempat serta bukan organisasi sayap partai politik.

5. Pemuka Agama adalah tokoh komunitas umat beragama baik yang memimpin ormas keagamaan maupun yang tidak memimpin ormas keagamaan yang diakui dan atau dihormati oleh masyarakat setempat sebagai panutan.

6. Forum Kerukunan Umat Beragama, yang selanjutnya disingkat FKUB, adalah forum yang dibentuk oleh masyarakat dan difasilitasi oleh Pemerintah dalam rangka membangun, memelihara, dan memberdayakan umat beragama untuk kerukunan dan kesejahteraan.

7. Panitia pembangunan rumah ibadat adalah panitia yang dibentuk oleh umat
beragama, ommas keagamaan atau pengurus rumah ibadat.
8. Izin Mendirikan Bangunan rumah ibadat yang selanjutnya disebut IMB rumah ibadat, adalah izin yang diberikan oleh bupati/walikota untuk pembangunan rumah ibadat.

BAB II
TUGAS KEPALA DAERAH DALAM PEMELIHARAAN
KERUKUNAN UMAT BERAGAMA

Pasal 2
Pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama menjadi tanggung jawab bersama umat beragama, pemerintahan daerah dan Pemerintah.

Pasal 3
(1) Pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama di provinsi menjadi tugas dan kewajiban gubernur.
(2) Pelaksanaan tugas dan kewajiban gubernur sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dibantu oleh kepala kantor wilayah departemen agama provinsi.

Pasal 4
(1) Pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama di kabupaten/kota menjadi tugas dan kewajiban bupati/walikota.
(2) Pelaksanaan tugas dan kewajiban bupati/walikota sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dibantu oleh kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota.

Pasal 5
(1) Tugas dan kewajiban gubernur sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 3 meliputi:
   a. memelihara ketenteraman dan keterlibat masyarakat termasuk memfasilitasi terwujudnya kerukunan umat beragama di provinsi,
   b. mengkoordinasikan kegiatan instansi vertikal di provinsi dalam pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama,
   c. menumbuhkembangkan keharmonisan, saling pengertian, saling menghormati, dan saling percaya di antara umat beragama; dan
   d. membina dan mengkoordinasikan bupati/wakil bupati dan walikota/wakil walikota dalam penyelenggaraan pemerintahan daerah di bidang ketenteraman dan keterlibat masyarakat dalam kehidupan beragama.
(2) Pelaksanaan tugas sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) huruf b, huruf c, dan huruf d dapat didelegasikan kepada wakil gubernur.
Pasal 6

(1) Tugas dan kewajiban bupati/walikota sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 4 meliputi:
   a. memelihara ketenteraman dan keterlibatan masyarakat termasuk memfasilitasi
      terwujudnya kerukunan umat beragama di kabupaten/kota;
   b. mengoordinasikan kegiatan instansi vertikal di kabupaten/kota dalam
      pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama;
   c. menumbuhkembangkan keharmonisan, saling pengertian, saling
      menghormati, dan saling percaya di antara umat beragama;
   d. membina dan mengoordinasikan camat, lurah, atau kepala desa dalam
      penyelenggaraan pemerintahan daerah di bidang ketenteraman dan keterlibatan
      masyarakat dalam kehidupan beragama;
   e. menerbitkan IMB rumah ibadat.

(2) Pelaksanaan tugas sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) huruf b, huruf c, dan
    huruf d dapat didelегasikan kepada wakil bupati/wakil walikota.

(3) Pelaksanaan tugas sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) huruf a dan huruf c di
    wilayah kecamatan dilimpahkan kepada camat dan di wilayah kelurahan/desa
    dilimpahkan kepada lurah/kepala desa melalui camat.

Pasal 7

(1) Tugas dan kewajiban camat sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 6 ayat (3)
    meliputi:
    a. memelihara ketenteraman dan keterlibatan masyarakat termasuk memfasilitasi
       terwujudnya kerukunan umat beragama di wilayah kecamatan;
    b. menumbuhkembangkan keharmonisan, saling pengertian, saling
       menghormati, dan saling percaya di antara umat beragama, dan
    c. membina dan mengoordinasikan lurah dan kepala desa dalam
       penyelenggaraan pemerintahan daerah di bidang ketenteraman dan keterlibatan
       masyarakat dalam kehidupan keagamaan.

(2) Tugas dan kewajiban lurah/kepala desa sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 6
    ayat (3) meliputi:
    a. memelihara ketenteraman dan keterlibatan masyarakat termasuk memfasilitasi
       terwujudnya kerukunan umat beragama di wilayah kelurahan/desa; dan
    b. menumbuhkembangkan keharmonisan, saling pengertian, saling
       menghormati, dan saling percaya di antara umat beragama.

BAB III

FORUM KERUKUNAN UMAT BERAGAMA
Pasal 8
(1) FKUB dibentuk di provinsi dan kabupaten/kota.
(2) Pembentukan FKUB sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dilakukan oleh masyarakat dan diselenggarakan oleh pemerintah daerah.
(3) FKUB sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) memiliki hubungan yang bersifat konsultatif.

Pasal 9
(1) FKUB provinsi sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 8 ayat (1) mempunyai tugas:
   a. melakukan dialog dengan pemuka agama dan tokoh masyarakat;
   b. menampung aspirasi ormas keagamaan dan aspirasi masyarakat;
   c. menyalurkan aspirasi ormas keagamaan dan masyarakat dalam bentuk rekomendasi sebagai bahan kebijakan gubernur; dan
   d. melakukan sosialisasi peraturan perundang-undangan dan kebijakan di bidang keagamaan yang berkaitan dengan kerukunan umat beragama dan pemberdayaan masyarakat.
(2) FKUB kabupaten/kota sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 8 ayat (1) mempunyai tugas:
   a. melakukan dialog dengan pemuka agama dan tokoh masyarakat;
   b. menampung aspirasi ormas keagamaan dan aspirasi masyarakat;
   c. menyalurkan aspirasi ormas keagamaan dan masyarakat dalam bentuk rekomendasi sebagai bahan kebijakan bupati/walikota; dan
   d. melakukan sosialisasi peraturan perundang-undangan dan kebijakan di bidang keagamaan yang berkaitan dengan kerukunan umat beragama dan pemberdayaan masyarakat; dan
   e. memberikan rekomendasi tertulis atas permohonan pendirian rumah ibadat.

Pasal 10
(1) Keanggotaan FKUB terdiri atas pemuka pemuka agama setempat
(2) Jumlah anggota FKUB provinsi paling banyak 21 orang dan jumlah anggota FKUB kabupaten/kota paling banyak 17 orang.
(3) Komposisi keanggotaan FKUB provinsi dan kabupaten/kota sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (2) ditetapkan berdasarkan perbandingan jumlah pemeluk agama setempat dengan keterwakilan minimal 1 (satu) orang dan setiap agama yang ada di provinsi dan kabupaten/kota.
(4) FKUB dipimpin oleh 1 (satu) orang ketua, 2 (dua) orang wakil ketua, 1 (satu) orang sekretaris, 1 (satu) orang wakil sekretaris, yang dipilih secara musyawarah oleh anggota.
Pasal 11

(1) Dalam memberdayakan FKUB, dibentuk Dewan Penasihat FKUB di provinsi dan kabupaten/kota.

(2) Dewan Penasihat FKUB sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) mempunyai tugas:
   a. membantu kepala daerah dalam merumuskan kebijakan pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama;
   b. memfasilitasi hubungan kerja FKUB dengan pemerintah daerah dan hubungan antar sesama instansi pemerintah di daerah dalam pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama.

(3) Keanggotaan Dewan Penasehat FKUB provinsi sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) ditetapkan oleh gubernur dengan susunan keanggotaan:
   a. Ketua : wakil gubernur;
   b. Wakil Ketua : kepala kantor wilayah departemen agama provinsi;
   c. Sekretaris : kepala badan kesatuan bangsa dan politik provinsi;
   d. Anggota : pimpinan instansi terkait.

(4) Dewan Penasehat FKUB kabupaten/kota sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) ditetapkan oleh bupati/walikota dengan susunan keanggotaan:
   a. Ketua : wakil bupati/walikota;
   b. Wakil Ketua : kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota;
   c. Sekretaris : kepala badan kesatuan bangsa dan politik kabupaten/kota;
   d. Anggota : pimpinan instansi terkait.

Pasal 12

Ketentuan lebih lanjut mengenai FKUB dan Dewan Penasihat FKUB provinsi dan kabupaten/kota diatur dengan Peraturan Gubernur.

BAB IV
PENDIRIAN RUMAH IBADAT

Pasal 13

(1) Pendirian rumah ibadat didasarkan pada keperluan nyata dan sungguh-sungguh berdasarkan komposisi jumlah penduduk bagi pelayanan umat beragama yang bersangkutan di wilayah kelurahan/desa.

(2) Pendirian rumah ibadat sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dilakukan dengan tetap menjaga kerukunan umat beragama, tidak mengganggu ketenteraman dan ketertiban umum, serta mematuhi peraturan perundang-undangan.

(3) Dalam hal keperluan nyata bagi pelayanan umat beragama di wilayah
kelurahans/desa sebagaimana dimaksud ayat (1) tidak terpenuhi, pertimbangan komposisi jumlah penduduk digunakan batas wilayah kecamatan atau kabupaten/kota atau provinsi.

**Pasal 14**

(1) Pendirian rumah ibadat harus memenuhi persyaratan administratif dan persyaratan teknis bangunan gedung.

(2) Selain memenuhi persyaratan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) pendirian rumah ibadat harus memenuhi persyaratan khusus meliputi:
   a. daftar nama dan Kartu Tanda Penduduk pengguna rumah ibadat paling sedikit 90 (sembilan puluh) orang yang disahkan oleh pejabat setempat sesuai dengan tingkat batas wilayah sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 13 ayat (3),
   b. dukungan masyarakat setempat paling sedikit 60 (enam puluh) orang yang disahkan oleh lurah/kepala desa,
   c. rekomendasi tertulis kepala kanitor departemen agama kabupaten/kota, dan
   d. rekomendasi tertulis FKUB kabupaten/kota.

(3) Dalam hal persyaratan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (2) huruf a terpenuhi sedangkan persyaratan huruf b belum terpenuhi, pemerintah daerah berkewajiban memfasilitasi tersedianya lokasi pembangunan rumah ibadat.

**Pasal 15**

Rekomendasi FKUB sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 14 ayat (2) huruf d merupakan hasil musyawarah dan mufakat dalam rapat FKUB, dituangkan dalam bentuk tertulis.

**Pasal 16**

(1) Permohonan pendirian rumah ibadat sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 14 diajukan oleh panitia pembangunan rumah ibadat kepada bupati/walikota untuk memperoleh IMB rumah ibadat.

(2) Bupati/walikota memberikan keputusan paling lambat 90 (sembilan puluh) hari sejak permohonan pendirian rumah ibadat diajukan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1).

**Pasal 17**

Pemerintah daerah memfasilitasi penyediaan lokasi baru bagi bangunan gedung rumah ibadat yang telah memiliki IMB yang dipindahkan karena perubahan rencana tata ruang wilayah.

**BAB V**
IZIN SEMENTARA PEMANFAATAN BANGUNAN GEDUNG

Pasal 18

(1) Pemanfaatan bangunan gedung bukan rumah ibadat sebagai rumah ibadat semantara harus mendapat surat keterangan pemberian izin sementara dari bupati/walikota dengan memenuhi persyaratan:
   a. laik fungsii, dan
   b. pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama serta ketenteraman dan ketertiban masyarakat.

(2) Persyaratan laik fungsii sebagaimana di maksud pada ayat (1) huruf a mengacu pada peraturan perundang-undangan tentang bangunan gedung.

(3) Persyaratan pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama serta ketenteraman dan ketertiban masyarakat sebagaimana di maksud pada ayat (1) huruf b, meliputi:
   a. izin tertulis pemilik bangunan,
   b. rekomendasi tertulis lurah/kepala desa,
   c. pelaporan tertulis kepada FKUB kabupaten/kota; dan
   d. pelaporan tertulis kepada kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota.

Pasal 19

(1) Surat keterangan pemberian izin sementara pemanfaatan bangunan gedung bukan rumah ibadat oleh bupati/walikota sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 18 ayat (1) diterbitkan setelah mempertimbangkan pendapat tertulis kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota dan FKUB kabupaten/kota

(2) Surat keterangan pemberian izin sementara pemanfaatan bangunan gedung bukan rumah ibadat sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) berlaku paling lama 2 (dua) tahun.

Pasal 20

(1) Penerbitan surat keterangan pemberian izin sementara sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 19 ayat (1) dapat dilimpahkan kepada camat.

(2) Penerbitan surat keterangan pemberian izin sementara sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) diakukan setelah mempertimbangkan pendapat tertulis kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota dan FKUB kabupaten/kota.

BAB VI
PENYELESAIAN PERSELISIHAN

Pasal 21

(1) Perselisihan akibat pendirian rumah ibadat diselesaikan secara musyawarah oleh masyarakat setempat.
(2) Dalam hal musyawarah sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) tidak dicapai, penyelesaian perselisihan dilakukan oleh bupati/walikota dibantu kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota melalui musyawarah yang dilakukan secara adil dan tidak membahayakan dengan mempertimbangkan pendapat atau suara FKUB kabupaten/kota.

(3) Dalam hal penyelesaian perselisihan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (2) tidak dicapai, penyelesaian perselisihan dilakukan melalui Pengadilan setempat.

Pasal 22
Gubernur melaksanakan pembinaan terhadap bupati/walikota serta instansi terkait di daerah dalam menyelesaikan perselisihan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 21.

BAB VII
PENGAWASAN DAN PELAPORAN

Pasal 23
(1) Gubernur dibantu kepala kantor wilayah departemen agama provinsi melakukan pengawasan terhadap bupati/walikota serta instansi terkait di daerah atas pelaksanaan pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama, pemberdayaan forum kerukunan umat beragama dan pendirian rumah ibadat.

(2) Bupati/walikota dibantu kepala kantor departemen agama kabupaten/kota melakukan pengawasan terhadap camat dan lurah/kepala desa serta instansi terkait di daerah atas pelaksanaan pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama, pemberdayaan forum kerukunan umat beragama, dan pendirian rumah ibadat.

Pasal 24

(2) Bupati/walikota melaporkan pelaksanaan pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama, pemberdayaan forum kerukunan umat beragama, dan pengaturan pendirian rumah ibadat di kabupaten/kota kepada gubernur dengan tembusan Menteri Dalam Negeri dan Menteri Agama.

(3) Laporan sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dan ayat (2) disampaikan setiap 6 (enam) bulan pada bulan Januari dan Juli, atau sewaktu-waktu jika dipandang perlu.
BAB VIII
BELANJA

Pasal 25
Belanja pembinaan dan pengawasan terhadap pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama serta pemberdayaan FKUB secara nasional didanai dari dan atas beban Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara.

Pasal 26
(1) Belanja pelaksanaan kewajiban menjaga kerukunan nasional dan memelihara ketenteraman dan ketertiban masyarakat di bidang pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama, pemberdayaan FKUB dan pengaturan pendirian rumah ibadat di provinsi didanai dari dan atas beban Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah provinsi.

(2) Belanja pelaksanaan kewajiban menjaga kerukunan nasional dan memelihara ketenteraman dan ketertiban masyarakat di bidang pemeliharaan kerukunan umat beragama, pemberdayaan FKUB dan pengaturan pendirian rumah ibadat di kabupaten/kota didanai dari dan atas beban Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah kabupaten/kota.

BAB IX
KETENTUAN PERALIHAN

Pasal 27
(1) FKUB dan Dewan Penasehat FKUB di provinsi dan kabupaten/kota dibentuk paling lambat 1 (satu) tahun sejak Peraturan Bersama ini ditetapkan.

(2) FKUB atau forum sejenis yang sudah dibentuk di provinsi dan kabupaten/kota disesuaikan paling lambat 1(satu) tahun sejak Peraturan Bersama ini ditetapkan.

Pasal 28
(1) Izin bangunan gedung untuk rumah ibadat yang dikeluarkan oleh pemerintah daerah sebelum berlakunya Peraturan Bersama ini dinyatakan sah dan tetap berlaku.

(2) Renovasi bangunan gedung rumah ibadat yang telah mempunyai IMB untuk rumah ibadat, diproses sesuai dengan ketentuan IMB sepanjang tidak terjadi perubahan lokasinya.

(3) Dalam hal bangunan gedung rumah ibadat yang telah digunakan secara permanen dan/atau memiliki nilai sejarah yang belum memiliki IMB untuk rumah ibadat sebelum berlakunya Peraturan Bersama ini, bupati/walikota membantu
memfasilitasi penerbitan IMB untuk rumah ibadat dimaksud.

Pasal 29

Peraturan perundang-undangan yang telah ditetapkan oleh pemerintahan daerah wajib disesuaikan dengan Peraturan Bersama ini paling lambat dalam jangka waktu 2 (dua) tahun.

BAB X
KETENTUAN PENUTUP

Pasal 30


Pasal 31

Peraturan Bersama ini mulai berlaku pada tanggal ditetapkan.

Ditetapkan di Jakarta
pada tanggal 21 Maret 2006

MENTERI AGAMA

MENTERI DALAM NEGERI,
ttd

ttd

MUHAMMAD M. BASYUNI
H. MOH. MA’RUF
Appendix 7: The Joint Ministerial Decree on Warning and Order to Ahmadiyah Believers, Members, and/or the Members of Board of Ahmadiyah Community of Indonesia and the Members of Community

KEPUTUSAN BERSAMA
MENTERI AGAMA, JAksA AGUNG, DAN
MENTERI DALAM NEGERI REPUBLIK INDONESIA

NOMOR : 3 Tahun 2008
NOMOR : 199 Tahun 2008

TENTANG

PERINGATAN DAN PERINTAH KEPADA PENGANUT, ANGGOTA, DAN/ATAU
ANGGOTA PENGURUS JEMAAT AHMADIYAH INDONESIA (JAI)
DAN WARGA MASYARAKAT

MENTERI AGAMA, JAksA AGUNG, DAN
MENTERI DALAM NEGERI REPUBLIK INDONESIA,

Menimbang:

a. bahwa hak beragama adalah hak asasi manusia yang tidak dapat dikurangi dalam keadaan apapun, setiap orang bebas untuk memeluk agamanya masing-masing dan beribadat menurut agamanya dan kepercayaiannya itu, negara mengacu kemandirian tap-tap penduduk untuk memeluk agamanya masing-masing dan untuk beribadat menurut agamanya dan kepercayaiannya itu, dan dalam menjalankan hak dan kewenangannya setiap orang wajib menghormati hak asasi orang lain dalam tertib kewilayahan bermasyarakat, berbangsa, dan bernegara, serta tunduk kepada pembatasan yang ditetapkan dengan undang-undang;

b. bahwa setiap orang dilarang dengan seraya di muka umum mencemarkan, mengannyarakan atau mengusikah dukungan umum, untuk melakukan perdataan tentang suatu agama yang diamalk di Indonesia atau melakukan kegiatan-kegiatan keagamaan yang menyingap kegiatan-kegiatan keagamaan dari agama itu, penafsiran dan kegiatan mana-mana yang mengganggu dan pokok-pokok asaran agama itu;

c. bahwa Pemerintah telah melakukan upaya persuasi melalui serangkaian kegiatan dan dialog untuk mencapai penyelesaian permasalahan Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) agar tidak membebani kerusakan dalam keseheruan beragama dan mengganggu keterlambatan dan keterlambatan kehidupan bermasyarakat, dan dalam hal ini Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) telah menyampaikan 12 (dua belas) butir Perjedasan pada tanggal 14 Januari 2008;

d. bahwa dari hasil penantuan terhadap 12 (dua belas) butir Penjedasan Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) sebagaimana dimaksud pada huruf c, Tim Koordinator Pengawasan Aliran Kepercayaan Masyarakat (PAKEM) menyimpulkan bahwa kegagalan terhadap beberapa butir yang telah dilaksanakan namun masih terdapat beberapa butir yang belum dilaksanakan oleh pengasat, anggota, dan/atau anggota pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) sehingga dapat mengganggu keterlambatan dan keterlambatan kehidupan bermasyarakat;

e. bahwa warga masyarakat wajib menjaga dan menjalani kekerukan umat beragama untuk menepatkan ketenteraman dan ketertiban kehidupan bermasyarakat demi terwujudnya persatuan dan kesatuan nasional;

f. bahwa dengan maksud untuk menjaga dan memupuk ketenteraman beragama dan ketertiban kehidupan bermasyarakat, serta berdasarkan pertimbangan pada huruf a, huruf b, huruf c, huruf d, dan huruf e perlu memetapkan Keputusan Bersama Menteri Agama, Jaksu Agung, dan Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia...
tentang Peringatan dan Perintah Kepada Petigamut, Anggota, dan/atau Anggota Pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) dan Warga Masyarakat,

Mengingat:

1. Pasal 28E, Pasal 281 ayat (1), Pasal 28J, dan Pasal 29 Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945;
2. Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP) Pasal 156 dan Pasal 156a;
3. Undang-Undang Nomor 1/Phnr/1965 tentang Pencegahan Penyalahgunaan dan/atau Penedhan Agama jo Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1969 tentang Pernyataan Berbagai Penetapan Presiden dan Peraturan Presiden sebagai Undang-Undang;
4. Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1985 tentang Organisasi Kemasyarakatan;
5. Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia;
6. Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 tentang Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia;
7. Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah sebagaimana telah diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2005;
8. Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2005 tentang Pengesahan Kovenan Internasional Hak-hak Sipil dan Politik;
9. Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 18 Tahun 1986 tentang Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1985 tentang Organisasi Kemasyarakatan;
10. Keputusan Presiden Nomor 86 Tahun 1989 tentang Susunan Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia;
14. Keputusan Jaksa Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor KEP004/JA/01/1994 tanggal 15 Januari 1994 tentang Pembentukan Tim Koordinasi Pengawasan Aliran Kepercayaan Masyarakat (PAKEM);
15. Keputusan Jaksa Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor KEP-115/JA/10/1999 tanggal 20 Oktober 1999 tentang Susunan Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia;
17. Peraturan Menteri Agama Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2006 tentang Organisasi dan Tata Kerja Departemen Agama;

Mempertahankan:

1. Hasil Rapat Tim Koordinasi PAKEM Pusat tanggal 12 Mei 2005;
2. Hasil Rapat Tim Koordinasi PAKEM Pusat tanggal 15 Januari 2008;
3. Hasil Rapat Tim Koordinasi PAKEM Pusat tanggal 16 April 2008,
MEMUTUSKAN:

Menetapkan: KEPUTUSAN BERSAMA MENTERI AGAMA, JAKSA AGUNG, DAN MENTERI DALAM NEGERI REPUBLIK INDONESIA TENTANG PERINGATAN DAN PERINTAH KEPAKA PENGANUT, ANGGOTA, DAN/ATAU ANGGOTA PENGURUS JEMAAT AHMADIYAH INDONESIA (JAI) DAN WARGA MASYARAKAT

KESATU: Memberi peringatan dan memerintahkan kepada warga masyarakat untuk tidak mencerminkan, mengancamkan atau mengusahakan dukungan umum melakukan penafsiran tentang suatu agama yang diamat di Indonesia atau melakukan kegiatan keagamaan yang menyerupai kegiatan keagamaan dari agama itu yang menyimpa dari pokok-pokok ajaran agama itu.

KEDUA: Memberi peringatan dan memerintahkan kepada penganut, anggota, dan/atau anggota pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI), sepanjang mengaku beragama Islam, untuk menghentikan penyebaran penafsiran dan kegiatan yang menyimpan dari pokok-pokok ajaran Agama Islam yaitu penyebaran faham yang mengakui adanya nabi dengan segala ajarannya selain Nabi Muhammad SAW.

KETIGA: Penganut, anggota, dan/atau anggota pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI) yang tidak mengindahkan peringatan dan perintah sebagaimana dimaksud pada Diktum KESATU dan Diktum KEDUA dapat dikenai sanksi sesuai dengan ketentuan peraturan perundang-undangan, termasuk organisasi dan badan hukumnya.

KEEMPAT: Memberi peringatan dan memerintahkan kepada warga masyarakat untuk menjaga dan melindungi kerukunan umat beragama serta ketenteraman dan ketertiban kehidupan masyarakat dengan tidak melakukan perbuatan dan atau tindakan melawan hukum terhadap penganut, anggota, dan/atau anggota pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI).

KELIMA: Warga masyarakat yang tidak mengindahkan peringatan dan perintah sebagaimana dimaksud pada Diktum KESATU dan Diktum KEEMPAT dapat dikenai sanksi sesuai dengan ketentuan peraturan perundang-undangan.
KEENAM : Memerintahkan kepada aparat Pemerintah dan pemerintah daerah untuk melakukan langkah-langkah pembinaan dalam rangka pengamanan dan pengawasan pelaksanaan Keputusan Bersama ini.

KETUJUH : Keputusan Bersama ini berlaku sejak tanggal ditetapkan.

Ditetapkan di Jakarta
pada tanggal 9 Juni 2008