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Abstract

Acts of intolerance and persecution against religious minorities rose significantly in Indonesia during the presidency of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (2004-2014), despite the nation's constitutional guarantees of religious freedom. This thesis aims to understand the motivations for and justifications of the persecution of Christians and Ahmadi Muslims in the world’s largest Muslim-majority country. It details the extent of the problem, explains how it differs from previous periods, and examines the actors including Islamist activists, conservative Muslims, President Yudhoyono, his ministers, state institutions, religious minorities and the public. A key question was: what role did morality play in the rise of religious persecution in Indonesia? And further: why do people do “bad” things in the name of “good”? Drawing on Haidt’s moral foundations theory, the thesis explores the ideological narratives of Islamists and situates those within global Islamist narratives. Data sources include media reports, scholarly literature on Islam, Islamism and Indonesian politics, as well as interviews conducted in 2014 in Bogor, West Java, with residents, activists and members of local Muslim and Christian faith communities, including the Ahmadiyah community. Morality is theorised as an evolved response to threat, wherein ideological narratives are created that cast outgroups as threats and sanction the ingroup’s righteous self-defence from the threat, real or imagined. In this way, morality plays a role both in motivating the persecutory actions of Islamists and in justifying those actions after the fact.
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INTRODUCTION

What role has morality played in the rise of religious persecution in Indonesia? Further, what explains the paradox that people can act within a moral framework and yet persecute or restrict the religious practices of others? In answering these questions, I hope to increase understanding of inter-group conflict, clarify what motivates people’s behaviour within groups, and cast some light on how people’s rationales for their behaviour.

Acts of religious intolerance – such as church closures, intimidation and sometimes murders – increased in Indonesia between 2004 and 2014, the period of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s presidency (see Table 1a). However, the years of Yudhoyono’s presidency were much less violent than the preceding eight years, from 1996 to 2003, when Indonesia endured a wave of church burnings, bombings and mass killings in conflicts apparently between religious and ethnic groups (Tables 1b and 1c). By the Yudhoyono era, Indonesia had stabilised following the turmoil of the transition period from the end of the autocratic New Order era (President Suharto’s time) through to an increasingly democratic period overseen by three presidents who held office for short periods from 1998-2004: presidents Habibi, Wahid and Sukarnoputri.

Table 1a: Acts violating religious freedom in Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All religions</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sourced from Setara Institute reports such as “Where Is Our Place of Worship?”

The rise of persistent and widespread violations of religious practices during the 10 years of the Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono presidency has often been blamed on so-called “hardliners” or radical Islamists.

An “Islamist” gives Islam a central political role, rather than primarily religious or

---

spiritual role. Islamists believe “Islam can and should form the basis of political ideology” and Islamist groups are “those movements that have a conception of Islam as a political system and strive to establish an Islamic state”. Other actors with political goals played significant roles, including the President, the state and its institutions – the military, courts, police and local government – and non-state actors including local communities and activists.

Table 1b: Collective Violence in Indonesia, 1990-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaths*</td>
<td>&lt; 25</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounded numbers: from Varshney, Tadjoeddin, and Panggabean

The problem of why, after religious and other violence declined, acts of religious intolerance rose during SBY’s presidency has been well explored. My focus on morality draws on ideas from moral and social psychology to help me examine issues around freedom of religion in Indonesia, with a specific focus on issues faced by members of Ahmadiyah and Christian communities in and around the city of Bogor, near Jakarta.

Table 1c: Terrorist fatalities in Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sourced from: “Terrorist fatalities recorded in the Global Terrorism Database, University of Maryland and US Department of State ‘patterns of global terrorism’ report.”

Morality plays a key role in mediating group dynamics, and therefore affects how people interact within and between groups. Humans are social animals and group impulses shape behaviours, as explained in the principal theory I will rely on, moral foundations

---

theory, which suggests that morality is a process that operates within a group in order to promote group survival. As I will explore later, moral frameworks bind groups into co-operative networks. We live in a complex modern world, and people belong to many groups. I will explore the interplay that occurs when one strong group identity, religious identity, comes into conflict with another strong identity, nationalistic. I will explore the difficult-to-reconcile tensions between loyalty to Islam, perceived as under threat from religious minorities, and loyalty to Indonesia and its rule of law, threatened by some activists’ actions.

My qualitative field research was interview-based exploration of these ideas and questions with local populations and activists, in and around Bogor, where Christian and Ahmadiyah communities have been prevented from worshipping. For the Christians, I focus on GKI Yasmin church in the Taman Yasmin residential area. For Ahmadiyah, I look at a number of communities and locations in the Bogor area. I seek to establish how, and to what extent, people working towards political goals in the name of Islam use morality to further their agendas, or conversely how morality shapes the political agendas and actions. While trying to avoid pre-judgments, I am looking for any evidence, in addition to the literature, that Islamists fuel religious intolerance and persecution to further their political goals.

I begin, in Chapter 1, by examining moral foundations theory, which places morality in its evolutionary context in order to show some of its universal characteristics. Some of the persecution in Indonesia is justified by reference to the need for greater morality, sometimes by citing the Koran and Muhammad. Moral foundations theory includes an analysis of the purpose of the concepts of sanctity and purity.

In Chapter 2, I examine the extent of the problem in order to show its significance. Persecuted minorities include the groups on which I focus, Christians and Ahmadiyah Muslims. Christians and Ahmadiyah are those for whom acts of intolerance have been persistent over most of the years under examination.

---

In Chapter 3, I trace the history of Islamisation, and its competitors, including nationalism in the 20th century, in order to show that contemporary events have roots in historical events. I highlight themes including the alienation of activist Islam and Islamists from political power, and a growing fear of Christianisation and proselytising. I aim to establish that the roots of current issues lie in the quite distant past.

In Chapter 4, I look at use of the Other as a threat or enemy as revealed in the language of Islamists in order to show some of the reasoning behind their actions. This leads me to examine the relationship between ideological narratives, persecution of minorities and fatwas. I will examine causes of persecution towards religious minorities in Indonesia, including fear of Christianisation and a desire for religious purity.

In Chapter 5, I examine the literature on the causes of religious intolerance in the Yudhoyono period in order to show how Islamists engaged with other political actors from 2004 to 2014. I consider government inaction, local politicians exploiting Muslim fears, government regulations, and Islamist and conservative clerics’ influence on governments, police and communities.

In Chapter 6, I will reflect on how data from my field research in Bogor relates to the literature on Islamism, morality and the causes of religious persecution in order to show the relationship between local, national and international narratives. I will attempt to answer the question: how does the interaction of morality, identity, ideological narratives, group interests and power help explain issues around religious persecution in Indonesia?

“Islamism” is a more neutral term than alternatives such as radical Islam, militant Islam and fundamentalist Islam, which some scholars use to distinguish between violent and non-violent Islamists or to divide Islamism into categories. The term Islamism more dispassionately distinguishes between that set of ideologies and Islam in general. Indonesians often use the term hardliners, which seems pejorative. However, van

---

7 Zachary Abuza, Political Islam and Violence in Indonesia (Routledge, 2007).
8 Martin Kramer, “Coming to Terms: Fundamentalists or Islamists?”, Middle East Quarterly Spring (2003).
Bruinessen’s definition of fundamentalist suggests fundamentalism and Islamism are synonymous: “Fundamentalists wish to place the sharia, God’s law, above human-made law. The striving for implementation of the sharia constitutes perhaps the most apt criterion for distinguishing fundamentalism, a minimum definition.” I have found no better definition of the terms than van Bruinessen’s:

The term “conservative” refers to the various currents that reject modernist, liberal or progressive re-interpretations of Islamic teachings and adhere to established doctrines and social order. Conservatives notably object to the idea of gender equality and challenges to established authority, as well as to modern hermeneutical approaches to scripture. There are conservatives among traditionalist as well as reformist Muslims (i.e. in NU as well as Muhammadiyah). By “fundamentalist”, I mean those currents that focus on the key scriptural sources of Islam – Qur’an and hadith – and adhere to a literal and strict reading thereof. They obviously share some views with most conservatives, such as the rejection of hermeneutics and rights-based discourses but may clash with conservatives over established practices lacking strong scriptural foundations. The term “Islamist” finally refers to the movements that have a conception of Islam as a political system and strive to establish an Islamic state.

These definitions reveal overlaps and differences between the terms. The distinction between Islam and Islamism, such as Tibi makes, avoids conflation, which might occur if someone assumed one interpretation of Islam represented all of Islam, or was the real Islam. Attempts to conflate Islamism and Islam are a trademark of conservative Western commentator-activists, particularly outside academia. Islamism tends to reject local variations and syncretism, instead harking back to Ahmad Ibn Hanbal (780-855), who created one of four Sunni schools of law that minimised private aspects of religion. Other influences from the Middle East on Islamism globally, and hence in Indonesia, include

---

9 Martin van Bruinessen, "Muslim Fundamentalism: Something to Be Understood or to Be Explained Away?,” Islam and Christian Muslim Relations 6, no. 2 (1995).
Ibn Taimiyya and his student Ibn Qayyim al-Jawiyya, some 800 years ago. A more recent reference point for Islamists is with Muhammad Ibn Abd al-Wahhab, the father of Wahhabism (1703-1792) and the contemporary Salafi current, a “militant Islamism that very frequently proceeded to a skewed and decontextualised reading of these authors, particularly in the case of Ibn Taimiyya”. Indonesian Islamists are also influenced by Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood, especially Hasan al-Banna and Sayyid Qutb.

A defining characteristic of Islamism is the desire to implement sharia law. For an Islamist, sharia is a litmus test of commitment to god, of loyalty, argue Feillard and Madinier, who write:

Militating for the enforcement of sharia proves the sincerity of one’s engagement and enables one to contribute to the group’s strength… The Muslim who does not want to implement the sharia is thus an apostate (murtad) and a traitor to his country.14

Answering the question “why?” will rely on the theory I will use, so I will turn in the next chapter to exploring the parts of the theories that will be useful in understanding religious intolerance in Indonesia and the role of morality.

---

13 Ibid., 181.
14 Ibid., 214.
Chapter 1: MORAL FOUNDATIONS THEORY

“A tribe including many members who, from possessing in a high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, to sacrifice themselves for the common good, would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection.”

Charles Darwin, The Descent of Man, 1871

In the introduction I set up the problem of understanding how morality can play a role as both a force for co-operation and a force for conflict. To help me answer this question I will refer to moral and social psychology theories that cast light on group behaviour.

Human beings have an impulse that unites us in a spirit of co-operation and yet divides us in conflict. This impulse helps humans survive and yet at its extreme is also a source of tragedies such as war, as well as the greatest cruelties of history – the dispossession of indigenous people by European colonisers, the oppression of women, the Holocaust or slavery. In the narratives that accompanied each injustice, one group was framed as separate and superior to another: masters over slaves, men over women, Aryans over Jews, farmer Europeans over nomadic native Americans. In Indonesia, the massacres of communists, Chinese Indonesians and others in the mid 1960s is an equivalent example. Every such framing solidified a group around difference; us and them. Us and the Other.

This research will examine group behavior across the religious divide between majority Muslims and religious minorities in Indonesia; one large group, and a number of smaller groups. Specifically, a Muslim majority exists, with activist groups claiming to represent that majority, or give voice to it, and a host of minorities, including Christians and small groups within Islam such as Ahmadiyah. What group dynamics are taking place, and which theories of groups can help us understand the dynamics? I will begin to operationalise my theory by highlighting instances of threat as a point from which to

---

examine how the actors use morality and tribalism to further their own ends and goals. My approach is consistent with one of Sidel’s arguments that religious violence is a product of the fragility and vulnerability of faiths in the face of competition with other ideas, while religious in-groups cast their internal problems on to the religious Other.³ These ideas relate to the theory I am using – moral foundations theory, along with elements of social psychology relating to tribalism – via the phenomena of threat. Groups have an inherent “need to unite against a threat”.⁴ Therefore, identifying threats and perceived threats to groups, and defining those groups, is a critical first step.

I am using a universal theory because I am interested in answers that explore the human condition, elements that humanity shares, thereby helping me understand intergroup conflict generally, as well as in Indonesia specifically. Many disciplines have tackled this problem. Political science, anthropology and sociology often call it ethnocentrism, social and evolutionary psychology call it groupism.⁵ Philosophy has looked at it, with Bertrand Russell noting that “instinctively we divide mankind into friends and foes”.⁶ In this thesis, I choose to refer to this impulse as tribalism, although tribalism can also refer to tribes and forms of government that revolve around (often patriarchal) kinship networks. Tribalism affects our everyday lives and its influence on humans is a factor in geopolitics.⁷ Early in the 20th century, anthropologist Franz Boas identified a form of tribalism, white supremacy, in which “the inferiority of the Negro race is dogmatically assumed”.⁸ Boas saw an assumption when others saw a fixed truth. The profound changes in assumptions in Europe and the US since then reveal that intergroup perceptions are not fixed, but subjective and fluid.

Why does banding together lead to conflict and violence as well as peace and cooperation? To answer these questions, I have chosen to focus on moral foundations theory, with additional references to social psychology. The American psychologist Jonathan Haidt, who developed moral foundations theory, says morality is the glue of the group. Haidt defines moral systems as “interlocking sets of values, virtues, norms, practices, identities, institutions, technologies and evolved psychological mechanisms that work together to suppress or regulate self-interest and make co-operative societies possible”. In short, morality regulates self-interest. If people pursued only self-interest, power (or a person’s ability to get what she or he wants) would determine every dispute. Power, the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes wrote, is man’s “present means to obtain some future apparent good”.

Moral foundations theory posits that “morality” is a mechanism that facilitates human co-operation in the interests of the group’s survival. The fewer competitions (power struggles), the more co-operation. Morality ensures that people think beyond themselves and their self-interest. Within groups, people temper individual self-interest in favour of some level of collective self-interest. Between groups, competition remains, and the self-interest of the individual finds expression in the collective self-interest of the group. Self-interest is not abolished within the group. The self is redefined; individual selfishness becomes group selfishness. ‘I’ becomes ‘we’.

Morality creates group cohesion through systems of accountability, which works because people care deeply about reputations. If someone does wrong, their reputation suffers. Accountability to a moral system means people’s responsibility extend beyond their kin or family to the group. The catch is that “co-operative groups will always be cursed by moralistic strife”. Cultures have some compulsory virtues which if not observed results

---

9 Haidt, The Righteous Mind.
10 Ibid., 270.
13 Haidt, The Righteous Mind, 74.
14 Ibid., iv.
in others making moral judgments of those who stray, which can lead to conflict.\textsuperscript{15}

Moral foundations theory draws on social, moral and cultural psychology. It explains the research about the human brain’s processes in relation to morality. Cognition is critical. There are two ways of thinking: intuition and reasoning. Moral intuitions (emotions) are made quickly. Moral reasoning is slow, a conscious and intentional process. Moral judgments appear quickly in the conscious, and Haidt contends that “moral emotions and intuitions drive moral reasoning”.\textsuperscript{16} In opposing the primacy of reason, Haidt rejects a common tenet of philosophers that the conflict between reason and emotion is a conflict between divinity and animality.\textsuperscript{17} He agrees with Hume and as such moral foundations theory sits outside the mainstream Kantian stream of philosophy of the past two centuries, as well as in opposition to the psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg’s cognitive rationalists. The idea of intuition trumping reason is not restricted to psychologists, nor is it new. Boas wrote early last century of:

\begin{quote}
the so-called ‘instinctive’ aversion to foreign types, founded to a great extent on the feeling of a fundamental distinctiveness of form of our own race… it is not based on scientific insight but on simple emotional reactions and social conditions. Our aversions and judgments are not, by any means, primarily rational in character.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

Yet humans do not hate all foreigners nor have conflict with everyone different, which is part of the complexity and the reason it is necessary to look at psychology in some depth in the search for insights. Psychology stepped out of the rationalist tradition in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century until the cognitive revolution of the 1960s shifted the balance of intellectual power in that discipline back to the rationalists. The cognitive rationalists dominated the debate from the 1960s until the early 21\textsuperscript{st} century.\textsuperscript{19} If reasoning is not primary, as the cognitive rationalists argue, but is in fact secondary – “the servant of the intuitions”\textsuperscript{20} – then moral reasoning is a “post hoc search for reasons to justify the judgments people

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 830.  \\
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 815.  \\
\textsuperscript{18} Boas, \textit{The Mind of Primitive Man}, 4.  \\
\textsuperscript{19} Haidt, "The Emotional Dog and Its Rational Tail," 816.  \\
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{The Righteous Mind}, 46.
\end{flushleft}
had already made”, Haidt argues.\textsuperscript{21} This helps explain why people’s justifications for their actions might not be the main reason or the real reason for their actions. I will examine the literature and my data for any evidence of people’s tendency to justify their emotional decisions with post-hoc rationalisations.

Haidt began work on moral and cultural psychology with Richard Shweder in the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{22} They argued that some cultures emphasise “autonomy” and the individual, others “community”, the group and duty.\textsuperscript{23} By 2004, Haidt was arguing that four patterns existed – formed out of an intuitive ethics – which fostered “an innate preparedness to feel flashes of approval or disapproval towards certain patterns of events involving other human beings”.\textsuperscript{24} This was the beginning of moral foundations theory, which incorporates an evolutionary perspective to argue that key aspects of morality are innate and shared across cultures and ethnicities. Humans have in-built templates of morality (nature), which include a range of options, and they choose how to prioritise those options (culture/nurture): “By recognizing that cultures build incommensurable moralities on top of a foundation of shared intuitions, we can develop new approaches to moral education and to the moral conflicts that divide our diverse society.”\textsuperscript{25} This claim – that humans share intuitions around morality but that cultures build moral codes that can have no common standard of measurement on top of the shared intuitions – will inform my search to understand what groups share and do not share morally. This will in turn inform my analysis of the way groups in Indonesia interact across religious divides.

According to the latest tenets of moral foundations theory, morality rests on these five foundations: care, fairness, loyalty, authority, and sanctity/purity.\textsuperscript{26} Each foundation is like a trigger that can be pulled by certain events or actions. The resulting intuitions of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 40.
\textsuperscript{24} Jonathan Haidt and Craig Joseph, ”Intuitive Ethics: How Innately Prepared Intuitions Generate Culturally Variable Virtues,” \textit{Daedalus} Fall (2004): 56.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26} Haidt, \textit{The Righteous Mind}, 124.
\end{flushleft}
approval or disapproval promote behaviour consistent with expectations embedded within these foundations. In the case of care, the trigger exists for the purpose of preventing harm, which serves to promote the protection of children, for example. A group’s collective approval of an action promotes the behaviour, while disapproval discourages the behaviour. The functions of the other foundations are: for fairness, to prevent cheating within the group; for loyalty, to prevent betrayal, which can cause harmful disunity within the group; for authority, to prevent subversion; for sanctity/purity, to prevent impurity or degradation, which can result in the spreading of disease, for example.

Haidt compares the five foundations to taste buds. In the way a person or cultural cuisine might prefer chili to sugar, a culture might put a higher preference on care/harm as a moral principle than authority/subversion. Each culture develops the importance of each foundation. They are like a graphic equaliser in a hi-fi system. There are five controls, and each culture or sub-culture can adjust the level of each, so that some foundations may assume relatively greater importance. Haidt says cultures “can shrink or expand the current triggers of any module”, placing more emphasis on one or two modules (or foundations), for example, care and fairness, and less emphasis on the other three.

Moral foundations theory has been criticised from various perspectives. One centres on evolution, because moral foundations theory relies to an extent on evolutionary psychology, which emerged in the early 1990s out of sociobiology. To argue that adaptations and natural selection can take place at the group level, that adaptations that benefit the group can be selected for in evolution, as Haidt does, and Charles Darwin did, has raised the ire and opposition of scientists such as George C. Williams. Another critique comes from a utilitarian perspective and argues that Haidt “leaves little room for the pursuit of moral understanding and progress through rational reflection and the

27 Ibid., 112.
28 Ibid., 124.
search for consistency.” This critic argues from a Kantian perspective that if in looking at the rights of men and women in a culture you believe they should be equal, then you must judge patriarchies accordingly. Haidt denies being a relativist, but he does try to get inside moral systems, to describe them more than to judge them. Criticisms from rationalists (who prefer reason as a driving force in morality) are unsurprising. Haidt acknowledges his differences with Kantian philosophy (he prefers Hume) and Kohlberg’s psychology (Haidt sides with cognitive intuitionists).

In contrast, neuroscientists level criticisms at the precision of his terminology, particularly “innate” and “modules”, while praising his emphasis on moral intuitions. The North American philosophers Christopher Suhler and Patricia Churchland accuse Haidt’s theory (Haidt is shorthand for all the researchers cited with Haidt) of creating “a vague ‘black-box’ restatement of the behavioural data, lacking computational, neurobiological, or other details”. They also claim that “no detailed factual support from neuroscience, molecular biology, or evolutionary biology (save for very general adaptationist speculations) is marshaled for the theory” and that there are more than five candidates for foundations, anyway. Haidt’s response to the last point was that the five foundations were only ever a start (he has a sixth in mind), that he and his colleagues were open to suggestions, and that it was a work in progress. On the neuroscience criticism, Haidt argues that it seems there are no genes for traits and that neuroscience is still developing, so it is unreasonable to insist they have all the answers when the science as a whole does not. On innateness, Haidt stands by his definition of organised in advance of experience, and claims Suhler and Churchland set the bar too high. On the modularity black-box accusation he says a theory being incomplete does not make it wrong. He concludes by noting that from the outset moral foundations

31 Haidt, The Righteous Mind.
33 Ibid., 2111-12.
35 Ibid., 2119.
theory had been “an attempt to bridge the nativism of evolutionary psychology with the constructivism of cultural psychology”.  

Moral foundations theory’s value will be in how useful it is analysing the literature and understanding my research data. The more we understand what drives people in their moral, religious and group behaviours, the better we can understand the causes of conflicts. Other researchers have made comparable links between neuroscience and politics with humans’ evolved moral systems for caregiving that resonate with Haidt’s argument about intuition, the quick-thinking mechanism. Hopefully, such psychological perspectives will aid understanding despite my research being mostly qualitative and my thesis discursive rather than positivist. I accept that a lot of the research in psychology takes place in clinical settings, but I maintain that I am able to use the insights fruitfully. Jesse Graham and Haidt suggest that moral foundations theory “provides the most comprehensive account of the ‘hooks’ in the moral mind to which a good ideological narrative can attach”. I will be looking for such hooks and ideological narratives, which I explore more fully in chapter 4.

Idealistic evil or violence is “nearly always fostered by groups, as opposed to individuals”, according to US psychologist Roy Baumeister, and will be more likely to happen across divides between moral visions or worlds. This sense that the other group is doing evil is related to the sense that they are a threat. Threats can occur outside the physical realm. An ideological-conflict effect can occur between groups with different moral visions. Such symbolic threats to values and beliefs strongly predict prejudice against groups that are ideologically different. While “much behaviour… appears to be produced or influenced by the limbic system”, such as in response to threats, people

---

36 Ibid., 2121.
40 Mackie, Maitner, and Smith, "Intergroup Emotions Theory."
41 Kullberg and Singer, "Bringing Neuroscience into Political Science."
still need to justify their actions after the fact in order to preserve their reputations as moral people. Ideological narratives help justify extremism using morality. I will argue that actors who persecute others in Indonesia justify their actions using moral arguments.

Haidt draws a distinction between authority and power, with human authority being not just power backed by the threat of force but responsibility to maintain order and justice. Authority is about hierarchical orders being legitimated by the functions they serve, one of which is to hold power – characterised by force – at bay. People willingly submit “to the rules and restraints that make social life possible”. The flipside of the obedience and loyalty they show to those in authority is that they expect guidance and protection in return. Positions of authority within human hierarchies carry responsibilities, and leaders are held accountable within the authority foundation. This moral foundation, the authority foundation, serves the function of encouraging people to support the hierarchy.

Hierarchies are part of the human brain’s structures, in the sense that humans are wired to respond to them. Chemicals in the brain reward successful attainment of goals, in the case of social dominance, serotonin. This brain chemical motivation system evolved to prompt actions that promote survival of the self or the self’s genes (offspring). All mammals, including humans, form social hierarchies around power or status within their herd or pack. “Status improves reproductive success, so mammals invest energy in status seeking.” This longing is similar to the urge to seek sex and food. “If your status rises within a social hierarchy, it feels good. Happy chemicals flow in your brain when you get recognition from others.” This desire for status is why fear of losing your good reputation inspires people to act, or appear to act, consistently with moral principles. Status serves a productive purpose in the group, on average motivating behaviour that
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conforms with the group’s morality, hence benefiting the group. This is one reason that people seek to justify their actions with a moral argument. Status hierarchies can even be created around religion and spirituality, either between individuals or between groups. “Some religions posit a hierarchy in which all members dominate all non-members.” Such religious tribalism deploys narratives that draw on people’s inclination to see their group as better than other groups, according to social identity theory. I will explore this more in chapter 4.

Methodology

My field research methodology is qualitative. I aimed to assume a neutral stance, by asking questions without preconceived answers and avoiding seeing events entirely through my own Western liberal perspective, to the extent I was able. Notwithstanding the perils and unlikelihood of a “view from nowhere”, I attempted, like Sidel, to avoid pinning the blame simplistically on one party, for example, “on ‘intolerant’, or ‘extremist’ Muslims.” It seemed appropriate to gather data via interview because the research problem related to matters of individual psychology. My questions were designed to explore the issues around religious freedom in Indonesia. The material I gathered during my field trips consisted of one-on-one interviews and documents gathered in the field. Much of the literature examines the big picture, large-scale trends and national implications, as well as some detail of individual situations, but there is not a lot of material which reports people’s perceptions of what was happening and why.

I acknowledge that the interview method throws up a range of potential problems. Firstly, in a partial attempt to counter my own subjectivity, the interviews will be interpreted in the context of the other interviews, the literature and documentary evidence. I made an effort to interview people who represent many sides, not just one or two perspectives. Time constraints also affected comprehensiveness, because my field trips involved four weeks in the Bogor area. I relied partly upon the “snowballing”
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method with each contact helping me find another interviewee. By the end, I had interviewed Christian and Ahmadiyah community leaders and community members, Muslim leaders, activists and community members, Yasmin housing complex community members, politicians and wannabe politicians, academics, journalists and a human rights expert. Within the largest group, Muslims in Bogor, I interviewed a range of people. I gathered conservative Muslim voices, as well as interviews with a nationalist perspective to religious tolerance. Interviewees skewed towards middle-class and upper middle class residents of Bogor because of my method of snowballing, with a starting point of a range of professionals I had contact with, as well as my method of contacting institutions, which tend to be administered by middle-class people. I countered this shortage to some extent by talking informally to people I met in Bogor. They were not particularly aware of or interested in the issues I was investigating. I believe the range of interview subjects was comprehensive enough for me to draw broad conclusions.

The issue of religious freedom and tolerance is sensitive, more so when the interviewer is from another country. Was the oft-stated response that Bogor was a very tolerant community in terms of religion the simple truth or was it what the interviewees wanted to present to a foreign academic and journalist? Many subjects chose to remain anonymous. This protected their security and made them willing to speak. Without this option I would not have had as many interviewees. While having anonymous interviewees reduces information for the reader, this thesis is richer for the comments made under that protection.

I think psychology provides the most direct focus on and most thorough analysis of group issues. Moral foundations theory provides an intellectual tool, which along with social identity theory and intergroup emotions theory, helps illuminate human behaviour from the perspective of what we share: our mammalian brains, our evolutionary history and our belonging to groups. The more strongly a person identifies with a group, the more that person will define what their group is doing as right, and what another group
is doing as wrong. Stronger identification with the group begets stronger group feelings and prejudices towards the ingroup and against outgroups. Ultimately, a key virtue of moral foundations theory, supported by some social psychology theories, is that it explains why inherently “good” values (morality) can result in “bad” outcomes (violence and exclusion) via analysis of the role of morality within groups.

Chapter 2: RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN INDONESIA

On October 1, 2010, there was an attack… They burned our houses, our vehicles, one motorbike, one car, the glass in our houses was broken, and 32 houses were hit with stones… They also stole goods from our houses, our small shops. They took everything, candies, cigarettes, and eggs. They said they were Moslem, but they burned Korans. Fifty Korans were burnt… This made me the most sad; they burned Korans.¹

This account of an attack on an Ahmadiyah community in Cisalada, West Java, Indonesia, is representative of the larger issue of persecution of minorities in Indonesia. The context of the attack relates to religious tolerance. While Indonesia is not riven with religious conflict, the issue deserves attention and examination. This chapter will outline the key events and statistics that establish the scale of religious persecution in Indonesia.

Indonesia is 87 percent Muslim, while 9 percent are Christians (Catholic, 3.1 percent, Protestant, 5.9 percent), nearly 2 percent are Hindu (mostly in Bali), 0.8 percent Buddhist, 0.1 percent follow Confucianism and 0.1 percent others.² Indonesia’s reputation for religious tolerance has been under threat abroad because of violence against Ahmadis, Christians and Shia, among others, particularly by hardline groups.³ Police, officials, courts and religious leaders are known to stand by or assist intolerant actions against religious minorities. The religiously different risk arrest.

In the first 21 years of Indonesian independence, under President Sukarno, only two churches were attacked. Most of the 455 attacked in the 32 years of Suharto’s rule from 1966-1998 occurred in the last three years when violence flared up repeatedly in a huge wave of riots and church burnings, mostly aimed at Chinese-Indonesians.⁴ In 1997 and

¹ Sayidul Mukhsin (Ahmadiyah community leader), interview with author, Bogor, August 30, 2014.
1998, 400 mainly Chinese-Indonesian churches were damaged or destroyed. This pattern continued as Indonesia began its transition to democracy, with churches becoming the targets of bombings. For example, in Medan, North Sumatra, in 2000, a bombing at a Protestant church injured about 47 people. Christmas eve in 2000 was a peak, with simultaneous bombings killing 18 and badly injuring 36 at or close to churches – Catholic and Protestant – in 10 cities in six provinces. While the incidents were extreme, they were not necessarily religious, with many attacks on churches indistinguishable from anti-Chinese violence or alternatively conflict between rival communities, as was the case in Maluku.

In his analysis of the religious violence of the past two decades, Sidel has identified three periods – riots (1995-98), pogroms (1999-2001), and jihad terrorism (2000-2005). These particularly violent periods were tied up with instability towards the end of the Suharto era and in the post-Suharto transitional period. The frequency and intensity of attacks declined by the mid 2000s. This thesis focuses on the following 10 years.

During Yudhoyono’s first term as president, the number of incidents of religious intolerance and lapses of religious freedom appeared to increase substantially as the number of violent incidents decreased, as shown in Tables 1a to 1c. My research focuses on this widespread and steady pattern of harassment and persecution from 2004-2014. Towards the end of this period, Indonesia was classified by an international report as tier 2 for violations of religious freedom, meaning that violations engaged in or tolerated by the government are particularly severe. As a tier 2 country, its company includes Kazakhstan, Afghanistan and Cuba, while if Indonesia became a tier 1 country it would join nations such as China, Iran and Pakistan. The commission that made this judgment reported that in 2012:
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governmental action and societal violence led to the death of a Shi‘i follower, the forced closure of Christian churches and Ahmadiyya mosques, and the imprisonment of individuals practicing allegedly heterodox versions of Islam or spreading atheism. Individuals who killed Ahmadiyya Muslims during a February 2011 mob attack were released from prison after serving light sentences of five to seven months.\(^\text{10}\)

While this is a fair summary of the concerns over religious tolerance at that time, religious life for most Christians in majority-Muslim regions in Indonesia is uninterrupted and uncontroversial.\(^\text{11}\) Similarly, Muslims can worship freely in non-Muslim majority areas, although Islamist activists cite some cases of intolerance of Muslims around Indonesia. The head of Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia’s women’s arm said Muslims were discriminated against in some non-Muslim majority areas of Indonesia: “The Muslim in Bali, Papua, their number is not small, not majority, but quite big in Bali, Papua, Ambon, as if they are deserve to get discrimination or restriction even to wear their hijab.”\(^\text{12}\)

Human Rights Watch gives the case of a Muslim minority community which experienced difficulties in building a mosque: “Since 2002, Muslim families in Batuplat, Alak district, Kupang, on Timor island in East Nusa Tenggara province, have faced difficulties in building a mosque due to protests from Christians in the predominantly Christian area.”\(^\text{13}\) These examples appear, however, to be the exception.

Zainal Adidin Bagir, a co-author of an annual report on religious life in Indonesia,\(^\text{14}\) suggests keeping the issue of religious intolerance in perspective, because terrorism and large-scale communal violence have declined in the face of effective government action, leaving Indonesia still religiously harmonious in many areas.\(^\text{15}\) Nevertheless, Bagir worried about the growing intolerance of the Yudhoyono period and feared at the end of

\(^{\text{10}}\) Ibid., 237.
\(^{\text{12}}\) Iffah Ainur Rochmah (women’s spokeswoman and head of women’s arm of HTI), interview with the author, Bogor, September 12, 2014.
2013 that intolerant acts would become more widespread. That has not happened yet, with an apparent decline in the number of attacks in 2014.\(^{16}\) Perhaps, as Robin Bush argues, that decline is because Yudhoyono’s policies and appointments contributed to the persecutions, and Yudhoyono left office in late 2014.\(^{17}\) If the period of Yudhoyono’s presidency was no longer one of “riot, pogroms or jihad”, as Sidel suggests in analysing the previous decade or so, then perhaps it could be described as something close to the US scholar of comparative politics Jeremy Menchik’s idea of productive intolerance.\(^{18}\) I will explore this idea through the thesis.

If the number and seriousness of the incidents make the issue worth examining, what are the numbers? According to the Communion of Churches in Indonesia, more than 430 churches were attacked between 2004 and 2013.\(^{19}\) The most systematic, regular and thorough analysis comes from the Setara Institute for Democracy and Peace, which has published reports on freedom of religion and belief at least annually since 2007. Although there are minor gaps in categories of data reported in the Setara Institute’s annual reports from 2007 to 2014, I have disentangled the data from each annual report and collated them into Table 2a, which distinguishes between violations (individual acts) and the events at which the acts occurred. Each year the reports detail the types of violations,\(^{20}\) which included: damaging of places of worship and properties; arrest and detention; forbidding of issuance of documents relating to religion; dismissal and limitation to access because of different belief; court verdict on particular belief; and, battery and attack.
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Table 2a: Ahmadiyah, Christian, All Religions
Acts (and events) violating religious freedom in Indonesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts against</th>
<th>2007 (Events)</th>
<th>2008 (Events)</th>
<th>2009 (Events)</th>
<th>2010 (Events)</th>
<th>2011 (Events)</th>
<th>2012 (Events)</th>
<th>2013 (Events)</th>
<th>2014 (Events)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All religions</td>
<td>185 (135)</td>
<td>367 (265)</td>
<td>291 (200)</td>
<td>286 (216)</td>
<td>299 (244)</td>
<td>371 (264)</td>
<td>292 (222)</td>
<td>134 (117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>28 (12)</td>
<td>15 (75)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian % of total</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6% (35%)</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadiyah</td>
<td>21 (193)</td>
<td>238 (33)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadiyah % of total</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65% (17%)</td>
<td>23% (17%)</td>
<td>47% (8%)</td>
<td>(27%)</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: SETARA INSTITUTE ANNUAL REPORTS, 2008-2014
* Unavailable

In 2012, for example, Setara Institute for Democracy and Peace counted 264 events that violated religious freedom, which amounted to 371 separate violations of religion or belief.\(^{21}\) This is a similar number to 2008. While other years from 2007 to 2014 recorded fewer violations, they still numbered in the hundreds. The numbers in each year reveal a consistent, ongoing issue. The violations in 2012 were spread throughout 26 provinces, with the highest number, 76, in the province with the largest population, West Java.\(^{22}\)

Table 2a shows that acts against Christians increased after 2009. As an example, early in 2012, HKBP Filadelfia church in Bekasi was prevented from worshipping by protesters despite having their permits, an apparent example of a local government ignoring the orders of a court decision.\(^{23}\) One Setara Institute report notes at least three cases of churches having licences, “but under the insistence of other religious groups government officials then revoked them”.\(^{24}\) These detailed lists of attacks reveal a national pattern of


\(^{22}\) Ibid., 37.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 51-60.

incidents every month, every year. It is not dramatic or extremely violent incidents that
are noteworthy, as might have been the case with extremely violent incidents of previous
years, but rather the ongoing and sustained nature of the incidents. The data reveals that
Christians in some areas, for example, are consistently harassed, and regularly attacked.
The authorities admit the scale, at least implicitly. Before Christmas in 2010, police met
crunch leaders to discuss security for the holy day, which included 87,000 security
personnel stationed at places of worship nationally.\(^{25}\)

Violations of religious freedom are often the result of activists taking vigilante action in
the name of enforcing these laws. For example, a vigilante group might justify its actions
violating religious rights against a church by claiming it was upholding the law because
the church did not have a permit.\(^{26}\) In response to the pattern of vigilantism, the
International Crisis Group concluded: “The Indonesian government needs a strategy to
address growing religious intolerance, because without one, mob rule prevails.”\(^{27}\) An
example of mob rule by Islamist vigilantes occurred in June 2008 at an interfaith rally for
religious harmony in Jakarta (the Monas tragedy), which led to the injury of 34 men,
women and children, with a muted government and police response.\(^{28}\) In some instances
it is authorities that act to prevent worshipping on the basis of the law. In Bogor, in July
2009, police tore down a church used by 375 parishioners who had consent forms
signed by locals, but no permit.\(^{29}\)

The Ahmadiyah Muslim community has experienced an even higher number of
violations against them than Christians, despite being a smaller group. Ahmadiyah is an
internationally persecuted group within Islam that has a reverence for its founder, Mirza
Ghulam Ahmad.\(^{30}\) Some orthodox Sunni Muslims strongly object to the status of Mirza
Ghulam Ahmad, claiming he is placed in the controversial role of prophet and imam

\(^{25}\) Arientha Primanita and Zaky Pawas, “With Hopes for Peace on Earth, Security Personnel Deployed to
\(^{26}\) Setara Institute, Where Is Our Place of Worship?, 21.
\(^{27}\) International Crisis Group, Indonesia: ‘Christianisation’ and Intolerance, Asia Briefing (Jakarta/Brussels:
International Crisis Group, 2010).
\(^{30}\) Detailed background available at "https://www.persecutionofahmadis.org/"
mahdi (messiah) that challenges Mohammed’s status as the final prophet. The national
statistics (Table 2a) show that Ahmadis experience greater persecution in some years
than others. The years 2008 and 2011 represent peaks of intolerance towards
Ahmadiyah community members, with 193 and 114 events that violated their freedom of
religion. The most violent and well-known incident against members of the Indonesian
Ahmadiyah community was the killing of three people in February 2011 in Cikeusik. The
subsequent mild sentences for those accused of the attack caused a human rights
outcry, not least because an Ahmadi victim received a similar sentence for not fleeing
the attack as police had ordered. That year, other attacks on Ahmadiyah communities
and mosques took place in West Java, Banten and South Sulawesi. Such incidents have
been ongoing and increasing since a July 2005 edict by the MUI (Majelis Ulama
Indonesia: Indonesian Council of Islamic Scholars) that Ahmadis deviate from the
Koran, as well as later ministerial decrees. Human rights NGOs have noted that
“prohibiting the Ahmadiyah from practising their religion also violates the International
Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified by Indonesia in February 2006”. One
such violation relates to a long-running issue in West Lombok. Dozens of families were
evicted from their village in 2006, and their subsequent struggles to return from internal
displacement within Lombok. Attempts by some of the 127 displaced people to
reoccupy their homes, such as in 2010, were rebuffed by their neighbours.

I chose Bogor as the location of my field research for a number of reasons. Firstly, it was
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close to the national headquarters of the Ahmadiyah community, which is a few kilometres outside Bogor, in Parung, in the regency of Bogor, a location at which the community has experienced a number of attacks on the basis of their religion that I will detail soon. There was also an attack on an Ahmadiyah mosque in Bogor itself in January 2006. Secondly, the city of Bogor is the location of a well-known example of a church being banned, the GKY Yasmin church, a case which does not particularly involve violence, so the focus is on the legal and community issues, rather than the physical conflict. Thirdly, this combination of two interesting and meaningful cases of religious disagreement in the same area provides the possibility of comparison. Fourthly and lastly, Bogor regency and Bogor city are in West Java, which is consistently the province with the highest reported number of violations of religious freedom in Indonesia. While most of the incidents in West Java that are cited in the Setara Institute reports did not occur in Bogor – but rather in Tangerang, Bekasi and Depok – West Java has a reputation as a province whose Islamic inhabitants are conservative by Indonesian standards.

I interviewed six Ahmadi community members, most of who lived in Bogor, near Bogor or in Parung. One of them told me in Indonesia “religious freedom is only meant for the majority”. Another Ahmadi community member, a leader of the community in the city of Bogor, said there was conflict in the area, especially in rural areas, but in his area “in fact they are kind to us” and they interact with their neighbours on many levels. Another Ahmadi missionary, who lives in a village (or kampung), said nevertheless “our relationship with people in kampungs is good in many ways. We work together to clean the environment, we make a visit of condolence if somebody dies, we also pay a visit if there’s somebody sick.” These comments contextualize the problem within Indonesia’s generally tolerant landscape. Mansur’s comments also supported evidence in various Setara Institute reports that attributed responsibility for acts of religious intolerance to

43 Atep Suratep (Ahmadiyah community), interview with the author, Parung, September 10, 2014.
44 Ghulam Wahyuddin (Ahmadiyah missionary), interview with author, Bogor, August 30, 2014.
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MUI (Majelis Ulama Indonesia: Indonesian Council of Islamic Scholars). Mansur said “the government is good to us. Those who did bad things are mullahs in MUI from outside the government.” However, I will present evidence that government and state institutions are involved in the persecution of, or not preventing persecution of, Ahmadiyah communities.

The actions against Ahmadiyah communities during the Yudhoyono years began with incidents that have had long-term consequences for the community at time before data was comprehensively collected and collated. A mob attack on its national headquarters compound in Parung, Bogor, in early July 2005 was led by Amin Djamaluddin, the head of Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengkajian Islam (LPPI-Islamic Research and Study Institute), resulting in the destruction of buildings, the plundering of houses and the displacement and evacuation of thousands of physically intimidated, injured or threatened Ahmadiyah community members. An Ahmadi community member said ever since the attack, which he had witnessed in July 2005, the Ahmadi community could no longer run its annual meeting, a large gathering on the extensive grounds of the Parung compound. He said that in 2005, 15,000 to 20,000 people had gathered for the event:

All of a sudden come some people to demonstrate and they attack us, throw stones. Even the government of Bogor they sent some vehicles and rescue some of our youngster… more than 30 people got injured… some of them badly injured.

Security remains tight at the compound and normal activities such as the annual gathering have not resumed. Another Ahmadi leader, who was also present on that day, said the Parung compound was closed to the community for four months and at the time of interview the community could still not use the mosque, so community members had to pray in their homes:

And we were discriminated against. They yelled ‘traitor’ [murtad]. They also paid attention if my wife went outside the house... There was someone who yelled at me...
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when I was standing in the street on my way to the market in Parung. He shouted at me: ‘Ahmadiyah!’ I understood the point was to attract attention to me… They also used the word ‘kafir’. Until now, they don’t want to shake their hands with me… I went to the market, and they threw stones and shouted at me. There was someone who shouted: ‘Qomar, I will beat you down’.  

The data from these interviewees demonstrate the impact of events on people’s lives, going beyond the numbers. The attack at Parung was one of several major incidents in the area during the Yudhoyono years. After the attack, in late July 2005, the MUI issued a fatwa against Ahmadiyah. Another interviewee has lived his long life as an Ahmadi community member in Cisalada, in the regency of Bogor, about an hour’s drive from the city of Bogor, and part of his account of an attack on his home and village begins this chapter. In further details of that event in 2010:

[The attack] took about two hours. The police station was nearby though. It was about 20 minutes from our place. We felt that they did nothing because they were afraid of the attackers… There were about 500 to 1000 people, many of them… It was around 8pm until 10pm. The fire didn’t stop until dawn because there was no firemen helping us.

The lack of action by the police is significant, because there are many instances of religious persecution in which the police are accused of standing by or not acting, for whatever reason, when they could have enforced the law, including at the July 2005 Parung incident. In its report on 2012, for example, Setara Institute notes that police perpetrated 40 of that year’s 371 violations of religious freedom. That is the highest number for a state actor. This fact undermines the Ahmadiyah member’s earlier statement that the problem came from the mullahs. Certainly MUI (Majelis Ulama Indonesia: Indonesian Council of Islamic Scholars) is a key non-state actor, with the highest number of violations (25) in 2012, followed by the Islamic Defenders Front (FPI) with 24. The state – national, provincial, district and local – is also an actor in violence.
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and in its failure to apply the law. In 2009, the Wahid Institute counted the state involved in at least 35 violations of religious freedom among 93 acts of intolerance nationwide.\(^57\) These acts have occurred despite Indonesia’s constitution protecting religious freedom, and with the assistance of various laws and local regulations around Indonesia restricting religious freedom.\(^58\) Legal restrictions are placed on groups including Ahmadiyah Muslim community and activities such as blasphemy, building houses of worship, overseas aid to religious institutions, proselytising and interfaith marriage.

Despite instances of police inaction there is evidence that the army on occasion filled the police’s domestic security, as a community leader notes in his description of an attack on his Ahmadiyah community:

> I was with my wife, and then we prayed inside our house. There were some people who stepped inside our house, I really wanted to hit them. But I took pity on them. They threw things at me, but nothing hit me. The glass in my house was broken... about six windows... I called the army and then the army sent their troops. Three trucks of troops to guard the location.\(^59\)

From these descriptions a pattern emerges of Ahmadis afraid and sometimes angered by attacks. Incidents such as the ones I have detailed and the many more recounted in Setara Institute reports constitute terrorism under a definition of terrorism as “premeditated, threatened or actual use of force or violence to attain a political goal through fear, coercion or intimidation”.\(^60\) The fear, coercion and intimidation is apparent from the data quoted. I will discuss how these attacks relate to political goals in later chapters.

Ahmadiyah community members I spoke to hoped to live peacefully in Indonesia. One
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leader said in reference to the 2005 attack on the Parung headquarters:

I am not free. I lived here before the attack and I could go outside through the front gate freely. We can go everywhere. Now, we live under the threats. I hope, my biggest hope, is that we can stay here. Our symbol of happiness is that we can get through that front gate without any threats.  

My research suggests this might be a difficult goal to achieve in the short to medium term, because many mainstream Muslims I interviewed quickly and unreservedly rejected the Ahmadiyah’s right to practise their religion, either at all, or within Islam.

As a group, Shiites were left mostly undisturbed until 2012, before which they rarely appeared Setara Institute’s reports; in 2007, 2009, 2010 and 2011 none, in 2008 two. In 2010, all manner of other religions and groups are mentioned as being subject to violations, including: Buddhist (9), Bahai (3), Confucian (1) and a range of named sects within one or two violations in the year. But in 2012, Setara Institute records that 34 of the 264 incidents violating religious freedom nationwide were against Shia, even more than the Ahmadis’ 31 events.

Regarding the other dispute I am examining in Bogor, the building of GKI church in the Taman Yasmin residential area, the church went through an extensive consultation and regulatory process from about 2001 until it received its permit in 2006, and soon after began building. However, opposition appeared quickly, culminating in the mayor suspending the permit in 2008, the church responding with various legal actions and the permit being revoked in 2010. The congregation held services on the land where the
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church was partially built or on the street outside the land for a number of years before the police forced them to move to home church services nearby after disputes with Islamist activists.

I attended a number of services held by this GKI congregation, which has an alternating fortnightly pattern of locations for their informal services, never held in a church. One week they hold a protest service near the presidential palace in Jakarta, and the alternate week they hold a service in a house of a congregation member. On the day I attended, as for a number of years, the location was secret and the address was text messaged to me on the morning. They used to tell the police each fortnight’s location, said one member of the congregation: “The police always ask where you did the service. When we told the police and then eventually the demonstrator know where we did the service… now we didn’t talk to the police anymore.” Like the situation faced by the Ahmadis, this experience demonstrates that religious minorities cannot always rely on the police to be impartial. This lack of trust comes at a time when the church most needs police protection, having been forced off their church land into private houses.

This feeling about a lack of impartiality extends to the state as a whole, and indeed the country, with one congregation member saying:

I feel sad, as if we are not part of Indonesia, which is fundamentally based on Pancasila, protecting all religions in Indonesia... I don’t think there is discrimination during the Soeharto era, unlike now. We were free. We had no problem during Soeharto, which is different after a decade of this reform era. My Muslim friends from Shia and Ahmadiyah also face the same problem.

This personal reflection goes beyond the statistics cited in this chapter, revealing lived experience which in this case suggests greater religious freedom under the Suharto regime than under democratic government. In this chapter I have tried to reveal the extent of the problem via referencing statistics and reports on religious persecution. The instances of harassment, violations of religious freedom and persecution are regular,
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widespread and consistent over years. The data I have gathered give voice to the statistical and other evidence.

In the next chapter, I will start my examination of the causes of the general upsurge in intolerance by considering the historical, political and ideological roots of the current situation.
Chapter 3: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO LAPSES IN TOLERANCE

Having looked at the extent of the problem of religious intolerance in chapter 2, I will turn to the causes. This chapter examines Islamisation in 20th century Indonesia and its engagement with colonialism, Christianity and nationalism. I will analyse the sense of threat that underpinned changing relations between religions, influencing events in 21st century Indonesia. I will explore four periods: colonialism, independence, authoritarianism (the New Order) and democracy. This chapter ends at democratisation in 1999. A later chapter examines how the patterns and relationships of the 20th century played out in democratic 21st century Indonesia, particularly during the Yudhoyono presidency in relation to religious persecution.

Colonial history: positioning for independence

Islam came gradually to Indonesia, with large-scale conversions beginning around the 13th century. The conversion to Islam of the Majapahit Kingdom, the last Hindu-Buddhist dynasty on Java, helped to shift the balance in Islam’s favour across the archipelago.1 Many Muslims in Indonesia practised a syncretic mix of the imported Islam with traditional local practices, creating multiple and complex versions of Islam over the centuries.2 Part of Indonesian Islam’s syncretic tradition is that it is a place where “the Indic world view continued under a nominal conversion to Islam” creating something of a “spiritual balance of power” in pre-independence times.3

To understand the Islamic world today, scholars recommend examining the colonial Muslim world, and the major forces competing for power in the late 19th and early 20th century.4 In Indonesia’s case four major forces emerged: Islamic, colonialist, nationalist and communist. Christian-Muslim antagonisms can be traced back to the mid 19th
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century, and the decision by the Dutch colonial government to support Christian missionaries. In the 19th and 20th centuries, Dutch colonial authorities discouraged Islamisation with measures that suppressed political Islam and the haj, and encouraged Christian conversion. These attempts to contain threats of Islamic anti-colonial rebellion led Hefner to conclude that the “Dutch legacy had a lasting illiberal influence on religious politics in Indonesia”. Dutch repression of Islam meant Islamisation occurred more in rural areas, away from the centre of Dutch colonial power in larger urban areas, through the establishment of Islamic boarding schools (pesantren) in the regions and villages. Dutch missionary and colonial activities were intertwined, with the goal of creating more loyal subjects, such that by 1935 more than 2 million Christians lived in the archipelago, mainly outside Java. Most Christian churches in Indonesia today descend from colonial-era missionary work.

The global context of this Christianisation is that just five Muslim countries had escaped colonial control by a Christian European power between 1800 and 1950, a time of consistent ongoing warfare in defence of homelands with majority Muslim populations. The Dutch, colonialism and Christianity threatened the autonomy, culture, religion and safety of the indigenous residents of the archipelago. This threat has existed for centuries, which is an important fact in understanding current conflicts.

Until the late 19th century, the Dutch did not impose an educational system on the East Indies in the fashion of heavy-handed colonial powers elsewhere. The Dutch knew Islam was central to Indonesian communities and had fought “too many wars with Indonesians... not to know that the Indonesian, however easy-going, could become very fierce when his religion was encroached on”. While Indonesian Islam is not as
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monolithic as this quotation implies, nevertheless forces identified as Islamic have evidently long been recognised as willing and able to defend against threats. A notable example occurred during the Padri wars in Sumatra in the early 19th century. Three of its leaders were probably exposed on the haj to the puritanical Islam of Wahhabism, a somewhat milder and over time more compromising version of which they brought back to and spread in the region known as Minangkabau by peaceful and violent means. It is quite possible that this war contributed to Christianisation in Sumatra, because the Dutch response included pushing into Batak territory, where in the mid 19th century they forcefully, with official backing, converted pagans to Christianity.

In the 20th century, educational policies became increasingly intrusive under the influence of Christian Snouck Hurgronje. The surge of Westernised education aimed to reduce Islam’s influence, split opposition to colonial rule and increase support for the Dutch. One response to this push was the establishment in 1912 of Sarekat Islam (Islamic Union), the first mass political organisation for indigenous political rights in the modern era. Sarekat Islam soon developed opposing factions of leftists and Muslims, weakening the organisation in the face of Dutch repressions in the 1920s. The Dutch policies in the early 20th century also helped to generate nationalists such as Sukarno, who sought Western-style freedom for his people. In 1927, the Indonesian Nationalist Party (Partai Nasional Indonesia, PNI) formed under Sukarno’s leadership with a secular nationalist agenda, one aspect of which was to confine religion to the private sphere. This nationalist movement drew support from Westernised urban elites and became increasingly popular for its anti-colonial stance.

The nationalist movement did not draw huge immediate support from Islamic leaders, nevertheless Muslim life and politics in Indonesia was culturally plural, Hefner writes.
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The reformers of the late 19th and early 20th century supported modernisation by borrowing from Western education and science. In the early 20th century, the modernist movement developed. A strict Islamist strand, manifested in the Al-Irsyad and Persatuan Islam (Persis) organisations, identified with Indonesia’s Hadhrami Arab immigrant community. Modernist Islamic scholars in the Middle East influenced the groups’ interpretation of Islam. The groups were, Sidel notes, “more openly and stridently antagonistic towards the influence of Christianity in the archipelago, and towards the accretions of local customs, the worship of saints and shrines, and the mysticism of Sufis and Javanists alike”, compared with other modernist groups that formed soon after.

In 1912, one such group, Muhammadiyah formed to represent another strand of modernism, one which acknowledged different ways of being Muslim. Muhammadiyah was established partly in reaction against traditionalists, “a strongly rooted Indonesian version of Islam”, which modernists eschewed opposing the fact that “adat or traditional custom has been cherished by Indonesian Muslims throughout history”. In turn, these traditionalists, the second major strand of Indonesian Islam, emerged in response to the modernists with the establishment of Nahdlatul Ulama (NU: Renaissance of the Clerics) in 1926 to safeguard their practices, which included prayers for the dead, cult of saints and visits to sacred tombs. The traditionalist abangan (syncretic Muslims), many from Java, practised a more mystical mix of local and Islamic practices. Islam was not monolithic and these two visions marked a significant religious and political divide.

These Islamist groups – divided roughly into traditionalist, modernist and modernist/puritanical – opposed the creation of a secular state to varying degrees, seeing secularism as a threat to Islamic values. Mohammad Natsir – a Persis leader and early proponent of a democratic, Islamic state – was a leading voice within the puritanical strand. This strand was the strongest Islamic voice against secular-nationalists, while NU
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support for an Islamic state was tempered by its pragmatism and never strongly entrenched, Munhanif argues.\textsuperscript{22} Muhammadiyah supported an Islamic state, but due to the preferences of its urban, educated membership, not as wholeheartedly as Persis.

Despite the differences between these dominant strands, they were able to unite against those they completely disagreed with, such as the Ahmadiyah Muslim community. The marginalising of Ahmadis by Muhammadiyah, Persis and NU dates to soon after the sect’s arrival in Indonesia in the 1920s. NU issued the first fatwa on Ahmadiyah in Indonesia in 1935 condemning them as aberrant, infidels and apostates.\textsuperscript{23} Ultimately all major Islamic bodies excluded Ahmadiyah, which Menchik argues helped unify the generally divided Muslim groups, “demonstrating the productive power of exclusion for generating solidarity in the emergent nation”.\textsuperscript{24} Menchik details how this unity ultimately led to a partnership of Muslim organisations, excluding Ahmadiyah, that came to constitute the Ministry of Religion upon the formation of the Indonesian state.\textsuperscript{25} Menchik’s idea of productive exclusion or intolerance reveals a political purpose behind overtly doctrinal disputes, a scapegoating of the religious Other that I will explore more in the following chapters.

Muhammadiyah was the more active Islamic force in 1930s Java, focused mostly on reforming practices of santri (more observant, orthodox, pious) Muslims and less so with abangan, according to Ricklefs.\textsuperscript{26} Muhammadiyah was established partly in response to Protestant and Catholic missionary-led Christianisation, he writes. Any political action was severely limited, Ricklefs notes, by Dutch crackdowns after the communist uprising of the 1920s and the hardships of the Great Depression.

Notwithstanding some exceptions as outlined, by the 1940s, in the face of colonialism, Indonesia had developed a plural and multiethnic nationalism. Many Muslims eschewed the goal of an Islamic state in favour of joining Christians, Hindus, Buddhists and secular
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nationalists in search of a plural, democratic nation-state. The consequences of Japanese occupation included the establishment of Masyumi (Majlis Syuro Muslimin Indonesia, Consultative Council of Indonesian Muslim), which fused traditionalist and modernists strands temporarily. After independence Masyumi became a political party.

As the end of the war approached, some Muslim leaders, many of whom belonged to puritanical strands, saw in a post-colonial, independent state, “the answer to their prayers for a deeper Islamisation of state and society”. Islamic organisations fully supported the revolution. Islamists’ goal was an Islamic state. However, crumbling unity within Islam – splits between traditionalists and modernists, and within reformism between puritans and moderates – inhibited action to establish such an Islamic state in the face of opposition.

For some Muslims, the cultural memory of conflict with the Dutch, colonialism and Christianity goes back centuries. These patterns echoed throughout the 20th century, even as the groups periodically changed positions towards secularism, nationalism, the state and other religions. Even 70 years or more ago, religious minorities such as Ahmadiyah and Christians were situated in a similar fashion to today in relation to Islamic groups, albeit in a different legal framework and with some differences in scale. Even in the 1930s, Christians were perceived within the puritanical worldview as an external threat, while Sunni Muslim orthodoxy dictated that Ahmadiyah resided spiritually in or near the realm of heresy, a threat from within. This is an important and long-standing distinction to bear in mind when considering contemporary religious persecution. Although actions against minorities were limited in the colonial era, they increased over the following decades as narratives that cast minorities as threats to Islam developed.

**Independence: the constitution, Pancasila and Sukarno**

From its birth as an independent nation in the 1940s, “Indonesia has been divided over
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the question of the legal status of Islam in this multi-ethnic and multi-religious state”. 29

The founders of the Indonesian Republic created a state based on religious and moral principles through the ideology of Pancasila, five principles Sukarno argued reflected cultural and moral values shared by the diverse ethnic and religious communities across the archipelago. 30 One of its principles, often translated “Belief in the Oneness of God” (Ketuhanan yan Maha Esa), and referred to as “Belief in One God”, was a compromise born in controversy. The phrase was part of a deal that denied Islamists something akin to an Islamic state because the constitution’s preamble did not impose sharia law on Muslims. 31

At the birth of the nation in August 1945, Christians from the east of Indonesia threatened not to join the republic if sharia law was applied. 32 Disputes over the removal from the draft constitution of the seven words in the Jakarta Charter that would have imposed sharia have re-emerged periodically since then. 33 Dissatisfied supporters of an Islamic state rebelled against the Republican government. This led to the Darul Islam movement and its Islamic State of Indonesia, a Muslim militia that began in West Java and inspired rebellions elsewhere in Indonesia until its defeat forced it underground in 1962. 34 Darul Islam’s ideological descendants survive today as radical Islamists who maintain their grievance over the failure to achieve sharia law and an Islamic state.

A different political response to not achieving Islamist goals of sharia law occurred with the foundation of the Masyumi party – out of a Japanese-created organisation – in November 1945. Initially Masyumi included NU as well as modernist/reformist and puritanical groups. The animosity between Masyumi and communists in the late 1940s revolutionary Indonesia peaked when PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia, Communist Party
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of Indonesia) activists seized Madiun in 1948. PKI slaughtered Nationalist and Masyumi followers before the army crushed them with Sukarno’s approval. This critical incident highlighted the division between abangan and santri, or leftist versus Islamic. Ricklefs wrote that “for Traditionalists who relied on Qur’anic sources, the leftists of the emerging Indonesian scene represented not just a contending political ideology and competing faction, but people in rebellion against God who were destined for hell”. NU split from Masyumi in the early 1950s out of fear that modernist domination would threaten NU’s religious interests. Natsir remained, leading a Masyumi dominated by Muhammadiyah that was often compared to European social democratic parties and which supported a democratic Islamic state. Within the two main currents of Indonesian Islam, Nahdlatul Ulama’s party came to represent the traditionalists politically and Masyumi the reformists.

Aliran (streams) politics dominated independent Indonesia’s early years, with Ricklefs’ rough calculation that the Javanese population broke down into majority abangan and a sizeable minority of santri. Perhaps this was not obvious at the time, because before the nation’s first fully democratic election in 1955 (the last until 1999), the Islamic parties had been expected to gain a majority and fulfil their platforms by amending the constitution with the addition of the phrase “with the obligation for Muslims to carry out the sharia”. Liddle argues that the main reason Partai NU was campaigning for sharia was to avoid being outflanked by the larger and more assertive Masyumi. In the event, about 40 percent of the votes went to the two Islamist parties, Masyumi and Partai NU, while the majority of votes went to parties opposing sharia, including the nationalist PNI (22 percent) and the communist PKI (17 percent). The remaining very minor parties included the PSI (Socialist Party) and Partai Katolik, so even if the Islamic parties were united they could not reach a simple majority to introduce sharia, let alone the two-
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thirds majority required for constitutional change. A deadlock arose at the Constituent Assembly. Campaigning for the elections had hardened divisions between abangan and santri, Ricklefs writes, citing evidence from Geertz’s and others’ fieldwork. One cultural manifestation of this division was the increasingly hardened identification of santri women as wearing the kerudung (headscarf) and abangan women not wearing them. After the elections, the combined representations of PNI and PKI clearly blocked santri aspirations to introduce sharia, compounding the grievance established at independence.

By the late 1950s, the Islamists were isolated, with opposition from Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, PKI, those of nominal faith or holding to traditional spiritual practices, secular nationalists, and most of the leadership of the military. Masyumi – having lost their push for Islamic law and the reinstatement of the Jakarta Charter – became impotent members of a governing coalition dominated by PNI. Masyumi leaders felt unable to leave for fear of PKI taking their place, but they finally left in early 1957. Sukarno had never really supported democracy, Cribb says, preferring the ideal of a pre-colonial past and a consensus style that led him in this period to float his konsepsi (concept). Masyumi believed this idea favoured PKI it led to increased turmoil and martial law around the country. This facilitated the introduction of Guided Democracy and the greater involvement of the military as a counter to an increasingly assertive and politically successful PKI. In 1959, “a coalition led by Sukarno and the leaders of the army overthrew the fledgling democracy, ushering in four decades of autocratic rule.” Masyumi opposed Sukarno’s growing authoritarianism. After becoming involved in regional rebellions, it was banned in 1960. The ramifications of this banning are still felt today, Feillard and Madinier argue, contributing to the rise of radicalism over ensuing decades. Natsir was jailed soon after, and not released until 1966. In the early to mid
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1960s, NU allied with the army against a resurgent PKI, as violence spread.50

During the 1950s and early 1960s, the state’s role in religious affairs, interpretations of constitutional provisions on religious freedom and new laws on matters relating to religion had ensured religion remained a significant political issue. Highlights included: in 1950, constitutional revisions increasing state intervention in religious affairs; in 1951, compulsory religious study in state schools; and, in 1952, the establishment of a unit within the Ministry of Religion to combat new religious movements considered deviant. Hefner notes that these developments “consolidated and centralised the administration of religious affairs in Indonesia, thereby providing ‘a critical foothold pending the further Islamisation of Indonesia’”.51

This apparent normalising of state intervention in religion affected the character of the nation. If the law is a “powerful discourse coupled with the physical means to impose compliance on others”, as Bourdieu writes, and an “instrument of normalisation”, then laws and regulations around religion are “the efforts of dominant or rising groups to impose an official representation of the social world which sustains their own world view and favours their interests, particularly in socially stressful or revolutionary situations”.52 Introducing laws, in other words, is part of the process a group initiates to impose its worldview and accumulating power. In 1965, Islamic organisations helped create the intolerant law on prevention of abuse and defamation of religion (blasphemy law).53 The 1965 blasphemy laws originally targeted mystical Javanese sects, but they have come to be used against groups such as Christians, Ahmadiyah and Shia. Menchik notes that Sukarno’s 1965 blasphemy law, supported by those Islamic groups that had not been sidelined, including NU and Muhammadiyah:

formalised the orthodox definition of religion that the Islamic organisations had long sought... By demarcating the boundaries of tolerance, Sukarno brought together and placed himself at the head of a coalition of organisations... Sukarno strengthened the
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framework for godly nationalism put into place by the Muslim organisations [in previous decades].\textsuperscript{54}

Sukarno was attempting to leverage opposition to these non-orthodox religious movements to shore up his political power (productive exclusion), legitimising such methods. Prosecutions for both blasphemy and heresy resulted, but the full ramifications would take decades to emerge. While fewer than 10 cases were prosecuted during the New Order (1966-1998), between 1998 and 2011, 47 cases led to 120 people being convicted, with sentences of up to five years.\textsuperscript{55}

The period after independence was difficult for Indonesia, with political division amid violent conflict at home and abroad and an underdeveloped economy. By the mid-1960s the economic deterioration had created rampant inflation and 1 million people in Java and 18,000 in Bali starving.\textsuperscript{56} Sukarno’s economic policies “had the country in ruins by the mid 1960s, with accelerating inflation, crumbling infrastructure and an agricultural sector whose production fell increasingly short of the country’s needs”.\textsuperscript{57} Such an environment compounded the political pressure on Sukarno, increasing the temptation on him to deploy productive exclusion and isolate religious minorities. The post-independence era under Sukarno was marked by religious conflict and frustrated aspirations among Islamists, whose ultimate ambition, sharia law and some form of Islamic state, was prevented by political forces including the nationalists, the communists, the military and Christians. The failure of the Old Order to address fundamental issues and more effectively govern ethnic, religious and regional conflicts created space for a new authoritarian solution, albeit one that inherited the grievances generated by its predecessor.

**New Order: coercion, regulation and Suharto**

During the transition to the New Order in the mid 1960s, mainstream Islamic
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organisations allied with the regime and co-operated in the massacre of hundreds of thousands of the supposedly atheistic, internationalist communists.\textsuperscript{58} This tragic culmination of santri-abangan division occurred, Ricklefs writes, amid:

Mutual suspicions and stereotyping across hardening aliran boundaries, bitter political party animosities with aliran roots, politicized tensions over folk rituals and arts, the part-class and part-aliran conflict in the countryside of Java that had already turned violent – all of this now gave birth to the worst domestic bloodletting in the history of Indonesia.\textsuperscript{59}

I note Ricklefs’ use of the word stereotyping. Intergroup emotions theory holds that an individual integrates the group into the self via a depersonalisation process and sees the world from the group’s perspective, reacting emotionally to events on behalf of the group, whether or not he or she is personally threatened.\textsuperscript{60} The depersonalisation process results in a person seeing themselves and others in terms of shared stereotypes of the groups they belong to, with ingroup members evaluated more positively than outgroup members.\textsuperscript{61} Thus phenomena such as ethnocentrism occur, which is “a belief that ‘we’ are better than ‘them’ in every possible way... self, as social identity, is defined and evaluated in group terms, and therefore the status, prestige, and social valiance of the group attaches to oneself.”\textsuperscript{62} Such “we are better than them” behaviour is central to tribalism. Similarly, Ricklefs’ reference to hardening aliran boundaries suggests that a greater degree of identification took place within these groups. The strength of identification affects the extent to which people appraise their social situation according to the salient social categorisation.\textsuperscript{63} The more identified a person is with the group, the more positively they feel about the group, and the more negative they feel about outgroups, according to intergroup emotions theory.\textsuperscript{64}
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tendency towards conflict with outgroups, with highly identified group members “more likely to justify ingroup actions, feel inter-group satisfaction, and thus support further aggression”. 65 Indonesians were under stress and identifying strongly with their aliran (streams) in a manner that fuelled aggression and conflict. Sukarno was warning of such trends from late 1956, although he was referring to political parties, as part of his konsepsi promoting musyawarah (discussion) and muflakat (consensus). These ideas led to others, such as the ideology soup of NASAKOM (nationalism, religion [agama] and communism), which did not solve the problem.66

Despite the assistance of organised Islam in the slaughter, Suharto’s military-dominated New Order government began to restrict political parties, including Islamic. Natsir and other Masyumi leaders were released from prison full of hope that the diminution of its communist and nationalist rivals would provide fresh political opportunities for Islam. The New Order would not allow them to re-establish their party, in the end, because it wanted neither strong opponents nor forces pushing for an Islamic state.67 While the formal influence of Islamic groups declined in the early New Order, with Masyumi banned and NU sidelined, the demographic imprint of Islam also suffered a setback. As a result of the massacres of communists and others, in the late 1960s and early 1970s up to 2 million Indonesians, mostly in Java, converted to Christianity, not least because Islam had been seen as a partner in their persecution.68 Some former communists and some Javanese abangan Muslims adopted Christianity, to the dismay of conservative Muslims. However, over the following decades, most nominal Muslims shifted towards a more orthodox and pious version of Islam.69 The manner of this shift and its long-term implication for religious minorities and tolerance is the subject of this section.

By 1967, religious tensions between Christians and Muslims began to mount. An incident in Aceh that year in which a majority Muslim community objected to a new church, the Meulaboh case, gained national attention. This type of objection was to echo
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through the generations. Muslims saw Christianisation as a threat especially in the context of more proselytising from missionary activities sponsored by international funds, for example donations from Christians in the US.\textsuperscript{70} Mujiburrahman’s extensive study of Muslim-Christian relations details speeches to Parliament in 1967 by prominent Muhammadiyan Lukman Harun complaining that Christians used foreign aid for religious expansion (making Muslims apostates).\textsuperscript{71} They allegedly used unacceptable methods such as door-to-door proselytising and material assistance including food and medicine for poor Muslims. Also in 1967, attacks extensively damaged more than a dozen Christian buildings in Makassar. Natsir called the attacks excessive but also a response to “Muslim disappointment at the Christians’ aggressive missionary activities”.\textsuperscript{72}

This veiled sympathy towards illegal acts in the name of a grievance foreshadowed positions that would harden during the following years. The Muslims who objected to Christianisation and proselytising argued that as members of a recognised religion the government should protect them from foreign-backed attempts to convert them. They said Christian evangelising should only be allowed towards those without religion or a recognised religion. Natsir evoked the annihilation of Islam in Spain as a warning to Indonesian Muslims not to be complacent.\textsuperscript{73} That year the Arab-Israeli war ended and the US became identified with “the humiliating occupation of Muslim lands” and “an uncompromising commitment to Israeli military superiority”.\textsuperscript{74} Important themes of threat, aggression, foreign backing and trickery were established in 1967, another step away from mutual understanding between religions.

In the late 1960s, Christians felt threatened in turn by the push to reinstate the Jakarta Charter, fearing it would lead to their becoming second-class citizens.\textsuperscript{75} The push failed. Christian leaders countered the proselytisation and Christianisation arguments by drawing on discourses of freedom, for which they had Western support, was well as
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nationalism and Pancasila, for which they had support from the army and the New Order regime. Some alignment between the regime and Christians, particularly Catholics, became the cause of another grievance that some Muslim leaders and activists held against Christians. Christians, arguing for their right to proselytise to anyone, admitted their gospel required this of them, which seemed to confirm to Muslims that Christians wanted to evangelise.\textsuperscript{76}

The New Order government’s response was not conclusively on either side of this religious power struggle in 1967, but the government did reiterate the principle of religious freedom. It also warned Christians to consider Muslim feelings. In 1969, the government issued the houses of worship decree. Arifianto argues the law was the New Order’s attempt to appease conservative Muslims’ disquiet at the alleged Christianisation.\textsuperscript{77} Regional governments gained the power to regulate new places of worship. The law was part of the New Order’s system of control, according to Crouch.\textsuperscript{78} The law made it more difficult to establish a place of worship, except for members of the majority religion in a region. The resulting restrictions fell mainly on Christians, the largest minority in most regions except the less populated east of Indonesia.

The law did not promote harmony, instead furthering division and violence against minorities, especially Christians.\textsuperscript{79} Facing difficulties obtaining permits to build new churches, Christians sometimes resorted to worshipping at home. Such tactics were not always successful, as nearby Muslims could and sometimes did object.\textsuperscript{80} Eventually the New Order acted on the proselytisation complaint. In 1978, the Ministry of Religious Affairs issued decrees against proselytising towards those in recognised religions and restricted foreign missionary activities, in practice mainly targeting Christian missionaries. Conservative Muslims supported the regulations on the basis they would
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protect Muslims from Christianisation efforts directed towards them.\textsuperscript{81}

In the Suharto era, most actors in Islamic politics pursued goals other than an Islamic state.\textsuperscript{82} The regime’s focus was elsewhere, imposing a nationalistic, pro-development agenda, rooted in its interpretation of Pancasila, with economic and political stabilisation its top priority. One manifestation of this was the regime’s ban on the topics of tribe, religion, race and ethnic differences (SARA: suku agama ras antargolongan) from media, political and social discourse.\textsuperscript{83} The New Order saw such forms of division and disunity (tribalism) as a threat to the nation’s unity, and thus the nation. Its repressive solution typified the regime, but it was successful. Anecdotal evidence confirms this, with several of my research sources saying they felt freer to practise their religion in the Suharto era compared with 2014.\textsuperscript{84} Suharto manipulated divisions in Indonesia for his own political gain, as noted below, but the regime did not want anyone else to do the same.

With hugely restricted political space and representation, the Muslim community split into two camps, Hefner says.\textsuperscript{85} One group was alienated from the idea of party politics because of the social division it had caused. The other group still wanted to capture the state, but focused on dakwah (preaching/Islamic appeal) and a long-term view. The first strand of this split has been labelled neo-modernism – with its most influential Islamic proponents being Djohan Effendi, Nurcholish Madjid, Ahmad Wahib and Abdurrahman Wahid – and it helped reshape thinking among intellectuals and many in the public in the direction of pluralism and core democratic values.\textsuperscript{86} These thinkers concentrated on contextualised ijtihad (personal interpretation of the scriptures) and combined classical Islamic scholarship with Western-style rationalism. Wahid exemplified this trend, Barton wrote in 1993, because he represented “in his person the resolution of half a century of
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antagonism between modernists and traditionalists in Indonesia”. This tolerant strand drew on the scriptures to establish the right of all faiths and beliefs to exist and argued Muslims should not strive for an Islamic state. Barton records one of Effendi’s sentiments that “ijtihad must be an ongoing process because absolute knowledge of truth can never be achieved”. Madjid’s place within this strand was as a leader of the Muslim students association HMI (Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam: Islamic Students Association), which developed a slogan “Islam yes, Islamic party, no!” It promoted religious tolerance and an inclusive approach towards Christianity. The pembaharuan (renewal) movement’s embrace of an Indonesian Islam made it easier for them not to be in direct conflict with the New Order and through the 1970s and 80s the group became established within professional, bureaucratic and commercial elites.

The other strand was mainly former Masyumi politicians with new strategies and a new organization, DDII (Dewan Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia: Indonesian Islamic Preaching Council). It became a voice of dissent and a leading proponent of conservative and fundamentalist understandings of Islam, rejecting many pembaharuan ideas, for example. It accepted Saudi and other overseas funding towards its efforts to encourage religious schooling and proselytisation. Saudi money channeled through Rabitat al-Alam al-Islami (Muslim World League) supported preacher training, mosque building, translations of Wahhabi works and was influential among state university students. DDII became “the vector of a Wahhabi-inspired rigorism… [and] increasingly suffered from a siege mentality”. While al-Banna and Sayyid Qutb were among DDII’s intellectual influences, a non-revolutionary version of Muslim Brotherhood materials held more sway from the 1980s. The West became a threat, having previously been seen as an ally by Masyumi, amid what van Bruinessen described as “an almost paranoid
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obsession with Christian missionary efforts as a threat to Islam”. So too were Jews, while DDII’s Saudi and Kuwaiti patrons encouraged the sense of threat to Islam from within, such as Shiism and Islamic liberalism.

The Council of Indonesian Ulama (MUI) gained national prominence – soon after being established in the 1970s as the New Order’s representative within the Muslim community – by making generally conservative fatwas, “condemning inter-religious marriage in 1980 and banning Muslims from wishing Christians a merry Christmas the following year”. In 1980, it issued a fatwa regarding the Ahmadiyah group. There is a trend of escalation here, from a general anti-Christian stance within puritanical strands in the 1930s, through to stronger, specific complaints against proselytising and foreign-backed missionary activity. This developed into Othering (viewing or treating other people or groups of people as intrinsically different from and alien to the self) within increasingly elaborate narratives and more tightly grasped grievances.

Over the decades, anti-Christian and anti-Christianisation discourses within conservative and radical Islamic communication led to the spread of those ideas. Researchers such as Feillard and Madinier blame Islamists for escalating tensions with religious minorities, noting that bitterness was a factor in radicalisation. The radical Islamic media has been blamed for increasing the sense that new places of Christian worship were centres of proselytising, with DDII publications in particular repeating the theme that the Muslim community was victimised “in the hands of a New Order regime colluding with the Christian minority”. Such narratives of threat drew on aspects of reality, such as Christian overrepresentation compared with the population in appointments by the early New Order. Chinese Indonesians were associated with cronyism and the overriding of local concerns about development, and with the growth of churches in Muslim-majority
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areas. Meanwhile, the authorities fed clandestine Islamist radicalization, playing up its threat in the 1970s and 1980s, and curbing its political space. The narratives of threat were spreading.

The rise of discourses of threat from organisations such as DDII was but one of many ways in which Indonesia changed through the New Order period. The large mainstream Muslim organisations Muhammadiyah and Nahdlatul Ulama were still the driving forces in Islam, Hefner argues, with their leaders supporting the integration of Islam and democracy as they carved out a corner of the opposition to Suharto for themselves. From the 1950s to the 1970s, NU had seemed more conservative than most other sections of the Islamic community. By the 1980s and 1990s they appeared “perhaps more open to pluralism, inter-religious tolerance and secular conceptions of democracy than reformist Islam”. Wahid played a significant role in that change, and his insights into the New Order period are worth reviewing.

In 1994, looking back at nearly 30 years of the New Order, Wahid described a process of de-confessionalisation under which Islam and other ideologies were reduced to political orientations, culminating in laws in the mid-1980s requiring all political and social organisations to base themselves upon the Pancasila ideology. Wahid characterised the Islamist position as:

- the argument that Islam never recognises a total separation between religion and politics, and that the state should reflect in itself the norms of the majority... the nominal demand of those ‘legal-formalists’ among Muslim political activists has not changed during all those years; it merely submerges when the time is not appropriate for the making of such a demand”.
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Wahid said minorities were marginalised in the process and he noted the political patience and opportunism of the Islamists. He described an alternative – the moral, educational and persuasive approach – which would maintain political participation for goals consistent with Islam, and a third option that went further by working to enhance social institutions such that they reflect Islamic concerns for liberty, social justice and the rule of law. Ultimately, his goal to help democratise Indonesia was envisaged within “the framework of achieving a national identity shared by all Indonesians in the future”.

Islam surged in the late 1970s and 1980s, with mosque building, Friday worship, religious education and haj pilgrimages increasing, many more Muslim women wore head coverings (hijabs) and Islamic programming saturated radio and television. The opening up of Indonesia to the world, to globalisation and to itself (through movement around the country, including urbanisation), both accelerated secularisation and strengthened scripturalist Islam, and contributed to the decline of the abangan, van Bruinessen suggests. Abangan village life was de-institutionalised (PKI destroyed, PNI marginalised) while santri organisations flourished:

- Mosques and prayer-houses, pesantrens and madrasahs, universities, clinics and hospitals, orphanages, books, magazines, sermons, Muhammadiyah, NU, DDII, Persatuan Islam… government programs promoting Islam – all these institutionally strengthened the santri side of Javanese life. There were no abangan equivalents of any of them of any consequence. Pious Islam was associated with progress, modernity and development. Abangan were regarded as backward, ignorant peasants.

The piety can be seen in some ways as a reaction to a “pernicious subversion of public morality” that was blamed on the influence of American culture, which was becoming seen as representing “sexual hedonism and do-your-own-thing individualism”. In addition to the pembaharuan movement and groups such as DDII, Hefner identifies a number of others, such as the Salman movement and pop revivalists, remarking that
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“public Islam was one of the last remaining discourses of social resistance”.\textsuperscript{112} This is consistent with Ricklefs’ point that after the headscarf ban was lifted in 1991, it became a sign of protest against the regime, as well as of Islamic identity and piety.\textsuperscript{113} Despite the greater piety, a consequent rise in electoral support for an Islamic state did not occur, as evidenced by election results in the democratic era.\textsuperscript{114} Nevertheless, the piety was one sign that Islamisation was widespread, including in the villages, and it became known as \textit{santrinisasi} (santrinisation).

In the early 1990s, after a decline in its support among sections of the military, the Suharto regime began courting support from organised Islam via ICMI (the Association of Indonesian Muslim Intellectuals). The organisation drew in reformists, including Islamists, fundamentalists, Muslim bureaucrats and liberal neo-modernists among its members.\textsuperscript{115} Some of these told Ramage they hoped “to take advantage of Suharto’s perceived need for them to advance their own political interests, particularly to promote their conceptions of an Islamic society”.\textsuperscript{116} ICMI strengthened the radical Islamists’ position, van Bruinessen argues.\textsuperscript{117} The flagging New Order regime began to use minorities in a strategic process of divide and rule, despite these groups having been allies and contributing to development under the New Order.\textsuperscript{118} As Heîner notes, they used:

stridently anti-Christian and anti-Chinese appeals in an effort to divide the opposition along ethnic and religious lines. Responding to these overtures, a few Muslim ultraconservatives moved out of the opposition into alliance with the regime. They collaborated in the campaigns of intimidation and terror that marked Soeharto’s final years.\textsuperscript{119}
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The DDII was prominent among the more hard line Islamic groups that shifted from regime critic to supporter, blaming “Chinese Indonesians for the Asian financial crisis and Christians for the anti-Suharto democracy movement”.

The New Order period is contradictory in some senses, because of the way that Islam flourished into an ever-more complex and nuanced diversity while at the same time mostly being marginalised from the formal corridors of power. While Pancasila became increasingly dominant, and religious politics and conflict was mostly suppressed, Muslims got on with exploring what it meant to be Muslim. Innovative ideas from the neo-modernists emerged seemingly fusing Islamic and Indonesian identities.

The more puritanically inclined DDII, on the other hand, took a tribal path to an increasingly Islamic identity, complete with transnational Islamic influences and increasingly ingroup-centric worldviews. With the arrival of democracy at the end of the century, the stage was set for the Islamists to re-emerge, as Wahid would have it, into a freedom that allowed them more voice, but was correspondingly increasingly crowded with a multitude of other voices competing to be heard. No longer was Indonesia a nation whose Islamic community could be divided simply into abangan, santri and priyayi. Identities were complex and even uncertain for some, and yet a fundamentalist strand offered certainty and strong identities to its followers. This Islamist identity was increasingly a key source of religious division, with Islamists still hoping the state would help them enforce a more puritanical version of Islam.

In the 60 years from the late 1930s to the late 1990s, Indonesia changed and progressed to an astonishing degree. Forging an independent nation with a political compromise over an Islamic state and the Jakarta Charter was only the beginning. Religious divides reverberated through the 1940s and 1950s, but at the time the main Islamist groups, Masyumi (democratic) and NU (pragmatic), were not emphasising identities in opposition to other religions so much as towards the (atheistic) communists and the (Islamic state denying) nationalists. But from the late 1960s onwards, with the
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communists gone, the PNI nationalists marginalised and the nationalist military in charge, the resentments of the politically marginalised former Masyumi elite intensified to encompass not just the New Order but also their alleged fellow travellers, Christians and Chinese Indonesians. A hardening of their tribal identity over time only increased the number of their enemies (Jews, Shiites, the West), while other groups entrenched their Indonesian Islamic identity in the other direction, inclusiveness and democracy.

Sidel refers to the tendency of identities to contain a sense of a theft “that can be imputed to an Other who deprives ‘us’ of the full enjoyment of those material, discursive and social practices, which, we imagine, (would) allow ‘us’ to be fully ‘ourselves’.” 121 Within the DDII discourse, the theft is of the opportunity to create the Islamic state, and the actors who denied them that destiny change over time, as described above. One of the problems for Islamists living within a secular nationalist Indonesia without sharia law – although there is 

perda syariah in many areas now – is that: “Political Islam [Islamism] seeks to create a single Islamic identity that takes precedence, at least in one’s moral life, over even the national identity.” 122 With a single Islamic identity, compromise is not an option. There is one political goal, sharia. Muslims who do not agree are misguided, and non-Muslims who do not agree do not matter, because they have their designated place within an Islamic order. Dividing the world into Islamic, or Western or Hindu parts, that is, religious categories, is ultimately unsuccessful because other distinctions – such as class, language or nationality – cannot be obliterated, as Sen argues. 123 However much the “champions of Islamic fundamentalism would like to suppress all other identities of Muslims in favour of being only Islamic”, it cannot be done. 124 People have multiple identities. Defining and limiting an identity is an attempt to control people. Islamists do not see the world in relative terms, or value pluralism, as Burhani writes of the Indonesian context: “For the conservatives, the belief that all religions are equally valid violates the belief that Islam is the only true religion, whereas liberalism conflicts with
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the basic tenet of Islam that all Muslims must submit totally to God.” It is this righteous sense of Islam’s superiority and the proposition that submitting to God equates with submitting to an Islamic state that suggests to me that Islamism is the right place to look for further understanding of religious persecution in Indonesia. I will do so in the next chapter, aware that activists’ are only effective given the right context. That is, the preferences of the Muslim population are critical to determining how Islamic politics plays out.

**Conclusion**

In the 1930s, the Indonesian Muslim community could be roughly divided into traditionalist, modernist and puritanical strands. By the 1950s, NU and Masyumi were the dominant political players. By the 1970s, New Order politics forced former Masyumi politicians to come up with alternative tactics such as creating DDII, while NU undertook a rethink which led them away from the idea of an Islamic state. By the 1990s, NU and Muhammadiyah had assumed an oppositional but non-Islamist position, while Islamists made a Machiavellian pact with Suharto and his regimist Muslim allies. The dawning of democracy gave hope to those who still harboured ambitions for an Islamic state in Indonesia or sharia law, because Islamic forces were freed from New Order restrictions. Elections offered the prospect of popular support. Overall, the seven decades just described represented a period in which religious tensions built gradually from the first fatwas against Ahmadiyah and the colonial-era puritanical disinclination towards Christians, through the anti-blasphemy and houses of worship laws and on to increasingly explicit rejection of heterodoxy and difference, complete with anti-Christian and anti-heretical discourses.

Holding those impulses at bay at the end of the 20th century was Indonesia’s “proud tradition of Muslim civil associations, most of which have long been committed to constitutionalism and democracy…” Indonesia’s most distinctive political legacy by
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In a summary of the great achievements of Indonesian independence and development, Hefner argues that:

While affirming the legitimacy of religion in public life, civil Islam rejects the mirage of the ‘Islamic’ state, recognising that this formula for fusing religious and state authority ignores the lessons of Muslim history itself. Worse yet, without checks and balances in state and society, the ‘Islamic’ state subordinates Muslim ideals to the dark intrigues of party bosses and religious thugs.¹²⁷

In other words, Indonesia has created a political system that acknowledges the perils of theocracy as well as the benefits of religious insights and morality to better manage public affairs. In doing so, Indonesia has created checks and balances including democracy, Pancasila and its constitution. However, systems cannot obliterate the experiences of groups and the grievances they develop over threats, missed opportunities and unfairness. Significant risk factors remain, including the possibility that fundamentalists can activate group feelings among the majority that can push religious issues towards crisis.

In ensuing chapters, I will explore the questions: to what extent has Islamisation provided more fertile ground for Islamists to generate their versions of Islamic identity for political purposes, and what role does morality play?

¹²⁷ Civil Islam, 20.
Chapter 4: ISLAMISTS: THREATS, IDEOLOGICAL NARRATIVES, AGENDAS

In chapter 3, I outlined the historical forces that helped shape relations between religious groups through the 20th century. This chapter begins by looking at the period when Indonesia transitioned to democracy. In 1999, elections allowed the population to freely express their political preferences for the first time in 44 years. I will focus on the question of how Islamists’ moral motivations and ideological narratives contributed to the significant spike in intolerance in post-Suharto Indonesia.

Democracy’s political opportunities changed the ways groups interacted. A series of major conflicts characterised the late Suharto and early democratic periods. The US scholar of Southeast Asia, Islam and politics John Sidel, divides political/religious violence during into periods – riots of 1995-98, pogroms of 1999-2001, and jihad terrorism of 2000-05.1 Sidel concludes in a related work that extremist Muslims, or fundamentalist Islam, are not to blame, but rather: “Both the structures and the agency of forces associated with Christianity, secularism and ecumenism have been in considerable measure responsible for the broad pattern of religious violence in Indonesia, as well as many specific episodes of violence.”2

Religious violence in eastern Indonesia from the late 1990s was about Christians trying to win back the power and influence they had lost in the late Suharto era, when the ageing president began to court Islam more deliberately. But to protect their power bases, Muslim politicians in eastern Indonesia facilitated the entry of radical Muslim groups entry into the region – with their Wahhabi and Salafi influences from the Middle East. The resulting violence, particularly in Maluku and Central Sulawesi, played out over several years until 2001.3 These events are the backdrop to this thesis. Here, I am focusing on acts of intolerance after these three periods, which included sporadic violence not mass violence.

Political changes are often cited as the causes of the rise in religious persecution during
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the Yudhoyono years. These range from increased freedom of expression, decentralisation of political authority through to assertive Christian proselytising, Islamist vigilante groups, new regulations on religion and Indonesia’s status as a religious, although not Islamic, state. Some sources highlight the actions of radical Islamists and conservative Islamic organisations, which share the goal of achieving sharia. In 2002, the Islamists lobbied for the inclusion of the Jakarta Charter in the constitution, but once again the proposal to introduce sharia law for all Muslims collapsed. I will map the landscape of Islamism and conservative Islam during this period, identify some threats and present a model for understanding the role of morality in the rise of religious persecution.

**Defining the orthodoxy**

Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI: Council of Indonesian Islamic Scholars) has become a fundamental force in informal politics in the 21st century. MUI was largely a servant of the government under President Suharto but redefined itself as a servant of the ummah (Muslim community) in the democratic period. Since the early 2000s, MUI has pursued a strategy of defining and purifying Islam and Islamic identity, restricting opponents and promoting sharia. MUI leaders drove two initiatives; firstly, extending its support base by reaching out to centrist and conservative scholars in the major Muslim organisations, including NU and Muhammadiyah; secondly, removing moderates from its executive board, replacing them with more conservative scholars.

Meanwhile, in 2004, the mass-based Islamic organisations Muhammadiyah and NU purged liberals, ushering in what has been called “a conservative turn in mainstream
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Islam”, one symptom of which was a focus on confronting deviant groups and their ideas.⁹ Alongside the shift towards conservatism within NU and Muhammadiyah, transnational movements arose to compete with them. These included the political party PKS (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera, Prosperous Welfare Party), with its Muslim Brotherhood connections and influences, Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia, the local branch of a global caliphate movement, and some less political Salafi movements.¹⁰ These transnational, conservative and fundamentalist groups exerted influence through dominating MUI, creating what Hefner called an “ideologically hardened MUI executive”, the most influential component of which was associated with DDII (Dewan Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia: Indonesian Islamic Preaching Council).¹¹ At the national congress of MUI in July 2005, the council promoted a conservative orthodoxy, issuing fatwas against a range of activities, groups and practices including:

- inter-faith prayer, inter-faith marriage, and inter-faith inheritance; religious pluralism, liberalism and secularism; so-called deviant beliefs, including the Ahmadiyah sect;
- dealings with the spirit world (kahanah) and fortune-telling (irafah); and any form of conversion of Muslims away from conservative orthodoxy (pemurtadan, “apostasy”).¹²

These fatwas had an enormous impact, laying a foundation for years of political actions. I have identified three main underlying threats the fatwas address: the threat of freedom, the threat of apostasy and the threat of deviancy. Beneath each conceptual threat lies an existential threat to Islam. Each perceived threat provoked a response from organised Islam.

**Threat of freedom**

The 2005 MUI fatwa that targeted secularism, pluralism and liberalism was dubbed SiPiLis (an acronym for secularism, pluralism and liberalism which is also the Indonesian word for syphilis). It targeted ‘contaminating’ Western thought. The opposition to these
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belief systems is widespread among conservatives. Din Syamsuddin, who has been secretary-general of MUI and president of Muhammadiyah, was known “as a mastermind of anti-Semitic, anti-Christian, anti-secular Muslim and anti-democratic discourse and actions in Indonesia”, although his positions changed from time to time. Vickers writes that paranoid anti-Semitic, anti-Western conspiracies “had long been fed by the underground publication in Indonesian of works such as the fraudulent Protocols of the Elders of Zion”, which were published openly in democratic times. Islamists argued particularly strongly against pluralism, secularism and liberalism. A senior member of Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia (HTI) explained how democracy is un-Islamic: “Because democracy is based on freedom… the government and the parliament are always being taken hostage by certain groups. So, for example, alcoholic drinks, for Muslims it’s forbidden. But because Indonesia adopted a democratic system, there is a compromise.” That is, if Indonesia was truly Islamic such compromises would not occur and alcohol would not be readily available in Indonesia because it is a Muslim-majority country. HTI argues the US has created or fuelled conflicts and wars since 1945 in order to “control the world… maintain its hegemony and defend its economic interests… [which] shows how ugly the face of capitalist ideology is as practised by the US through its vulgar imperialism”. The values and system of the West, which arrives with the abusive and corrupt power of capitalism, is a godless ideology, with Jewish and Christian antecedents. Democracy, as a system born outside God’s law and in the West, places God below man in the power balance. This offends the dignity and authority of God, a threat to sanctity, authority and the natural order. This is an existential struggle, an idea that Islam is threatened with obliteration by the massive power of the West.
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Threat of apostasy

Of the four great forces of recent Indonesian history (colonialism, Islam, communism and nationalism), Islam and nationalism remain strong. However, Christianity is colonialism’s ghostly echo. The commonalities between Islam and Christianity partly explains the tensions between the religions, as does their thousand year-old history of rivalry, van Bruinessen notes. The historical context and discourses developed over time mean that Islamists often conflate Western civilisation with Christianity. In such an equation, Islam is not an overwhelmingly powerful majority within Indonesia but an embattled subject of Western Christian attack at home and abroad. Kato argues that fundamentalists perceive this “attack” as multi-faceted, including ideological elements such as materialism that fundamentalists frame as a neo-jahiliayah (time of darkness before Islam) and oppose with revivalism.

An International Crisis Group report suggests that as mass violence between Muslims and Christians receded around the archipelago in the early 2000s, the threat of Christianisation was used to rally people to the Islamist cause. New Order censorship had helped contain anti-Christian rhetoric until the 1990s, when radical Islamic media emerged and fanned the flames of inter-religious conflict, building from the mid-1990s. Feillard and Madinier analyse anti-Christian and anti-Christianisation discourses in radical Islamic media and the manner in which they promoted the sense that new places of Christian worship were also centres of proselytising. Christian missionaries were blamed for sinister acts, as opposed to previous decades when they were accused merely of unfair competition – using their economic advantage to spread religion and attract converts. “Sabili, for example, dedicated a dossier in 1999 to an alleged vast plan to have young Christian men seduce Muslim girls for the sole purpose of bearing Christian children.” This story is a narrative of threat. Firstly, the alleged seduction by Christian
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men is harmful to the girls who are used duplicitously. Secondly, the alleged activity threatens Islam demographically. Islamists’ grievance and martyr discourse of the 20th century (as discussed in chapter 3) hardened amid the media freedom of post-Suharto 21st century. Islamists had free rein to create stories that belittled Christians and Christianity, who were perceived as a fast-growing existential threat to Islam’s demographic dominance.

This agenda crystallised with the 2005 MUI fatwas. Ichwan notes that MUI’s apostasy fatwas were aimed at Christianisation, one of DDII’s main concerns.23 The anti-proselytisation agenda had found expression via an institution, MUI, which possessed more political power than radical Islamist groups. With the support of the fatwas, in August 2005, radical Islamist groups began attacking allegedly illegal churches in Jakarta and West Java as part of a campaign to force the government to regulate churches more tightly.24 In 2006, an MUI sub-committee against apostasy began co-operating in actions with radical Islamist groups opposing the building of new churches and against missionary activity. A joint ministerial regulation on houses of worship was pronounced in March 2006. MUI had proven its value as the intellectual spearhead behind which an alliance of Islamists and conservatives could act.

Threat of deviancy

The 2005 MUI conference also issued a fatwa on deviancy, which declared Ahmadiyah to be outside Islam. Part of the reasoning was expressed by a leading anti-Ahmadiyah activist, Amin Djamaluddin, who highlighted the group’s growth in the late 20th century as well as its apparent dream of dominating Islam in Indonesia by the end of the 21st century.25 Prominent Muslims, such as Yusril Ihza Mahendra and Hasyim Muzadi, call for Ahmadiyah to split from Islam and establish a separate religion rather than, as Burhani puts it, “linger threateningly on the fringes of the mainstream Muslim
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community”. In this idea lies the sense that Ahmadiyah are illegitimate as Muslims, and hence not protected by Indonesian principles of religious freedom. The community is marginalised and vulnerable, trapped between Muslim and non-Muslim identity within the discourse. Minority sects accused of heresy, one Salafi cleric said, are “thorns in our flesh... far more dangerous than the infidels” because they “weaken Islam from within”. To challenge that status is to risk being identified as defending heretics. Zito suggests the heretic presents a moral threat to orthodoxy: “The true believers sense that in some way their innermost selves have been violated, their moral values usurped, their very existence as a moral community placed in jeopardy.” Whoever defines the orthodoxy also defines heresy, both of which form part of the process of accumulating power.

**Purity, impurity and purification**

Purity plays an important role in the Islamists’ response to a range of threats to Islam. Islamists use language to elicit disgust, an emotional reaction to the threat of contamination. Burhani notes that conservative’s Othering of opponents attempt to manipulate feelings of disgust, with liberals labelled as a virus or poison that would destroy Islam. In the public discussion after the SiPiLis fatwa, DDII leader Cholil Ridwan said the edicts should be spread during Friday prayers. “We have to vaccinate our congregation to prevent them from this SiPiLis virus.” Similarly, the leader of FPI (Front Pembela Islam: Islamic Defenders’ Front), Habib Rizieq, used images of impurity when he said democracy was “more dangerous than pig’s meat... if we consume pig we are polluted, but can still be returned to a state of purity if we cleanse ourselves”, but “if democracy is fully embraced by Muslims, and the laws of Allah in turn ignored, then they become apostates (murtad). Democracy can transform us into infidels.” Terms of abuse with disease motifs used against Ahmadiyah include ‘abscess’ (bisul) used by staff reporter, "Preachers Told to Support Controversial MUI Edicts," *The Jakarta Post*, August 8, 2005.
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radical Islamists in Indonesia, and in Pakistan ‘cancer’. These are direct calls to register disgust, part of an appeal for purity.

Fealy has said Indonesians are “pre-occupied with the religious purity of their environment... the sanctity of their environment”. Within moral foundations theory, impurity is a threat identified within the purity/sanctity foundation, the function of which is to encourage purity and reject impurity. In an evolutionary explanation, the foundation’s function includes helping prevent people eating dangerous or contaminated food. Associating the Other with impurity is a way to trigger repulsion. In the Indonesian religious context, the repulsion people feel for the impure is instrumentally co-opted by the Islamists. According to McCoy, the purpose of labeling and associating the religious enemy with disease is to create a situation in which “the continued presence of this group may come to feel intolerable, making expelling the group from the body seem the only solution”. The act of expulsion could bring the sense of relief that follows recovery from an illness, or at least that is the feeling that those wishing to expel might anticipate. Banning Ahmadiyah as many Islamists and conservatives seek, would be in effect an expulsion, although one with profound and uncertain ramifications.

The MUI in particular deploys purity discourses. Hasyim argues that for MUI, heretical groups represent a threat to the purity of Islam that justifies actions to prevent their heretical activities, which if tolerated could lead to social unrest. He notes the way in which the terms “freedom” and “liberal” are considered Western contamination and used to destroy Islam: “The MUI argues that religious freedom paves the way for heretical groups to flourish.” Religious freedom is, according to this discourse, disorder, by virtue of being Western and threatening. Sharia, though, is order and purity.
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Ichwan argues that MUI’s 2005 fatwas are acts of purification, namely to purify: public morality (countering pornography); schools (preventing apostasy through the education system); the image of Islam (rejecting terrorism, defending jihad); Islamic thought against pluralism, liberalism and secularism; and, the Islamic faith (excluding Ahmadiyah). In these five cases, MUI is countering groups that threaten Islam. Purifying is morally good. Purification helps defend against others groups (Christians, extremists, Ahmadies, Western-style liberals). But what do purity discourses achieve? The anthropologist Mary Douglas wrote that purity rituals are unifying, while:

ideas about separating, purifying, demarcating and punishing transgressions have as their main function to impose system on an inherently untidy experience. It is only by exaggerating the difference between within and without, above and below, male and female, with and against, that a semblance of order is created.

Some Indonesians consider life in the 21st century an untidy experience, with prominent examples including the perception of moral decline since the Suharto era, the financial crisis of the late 1990s and the uncertainties of freedom and democracy in an increasingly globalised world. Douglas’s insights help to clarify a link between the desire to define heresy and the will to purify. Both are part of a process of reducing anxiety by imposing order, a process that generates the accumulation of power.

Harmony, stability and order

Anxiety-producing change enhances the effectiveness of an order, harmony and stability discourse, and make purification drives more appealing. McCoy argues that in post-Suharto times Islamists have reimagined Suharto’s communist threat to the national body as a threat from religious minorities. Islam is imagined as a house or body, at risk of infection, defilement and assault, metaphors that deploy language that labels the religious Other as “infesting” and “spreading”, part of a discourse against Christianisation.
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and the building of new churches. Radical and mainstream religious leaders, backed by allies in government and state security, McCoy writes, use a “harmony-and-stability rhetoric to justify repression, arguing that certain religious groups are threatening public order by proselytising or otherwise insulting Islam”. If one key role of authority is to ensure order is maintained, then assuming the role of creating or imposing order could be described as seizing power.

The public order theme has become a consistent message from the Islamists, repeated so often as to resemble a script. One of Olle’s sources, identified as Pak S, believes “young people’s fashion and lifestyles... show that things are ‘out of control’ and society is increasingly unstable, thus making a ‘return to the sharia’ attractive”. In the worldview of this Islamist, Western-influenced lifestyles represent disorder, while sharia represents order. Pak S recounted a national MUI meeting in 2005 that agreed the solution was to return to sharia, hence MUI’s mission statement, which includes “to direct and guide the Islamic community in planting and fertilising Islamic beliefs along with carrying out the sharia”. Pak S said “if you talk about violence, there must be those who give rise to the violence”, which was his way of explaining that it was Ahmadiyah’s fault they were attacked, because they were heretics whose behaviour was provocative. Similarly, “Ma’ruf Amin (head of the MUI fatwa commission) said that the role of MUI was to prevent strife and mass violence, which it fears, could occur as a result of heresy”.

Who, however, is creating this strife?

In February 2008, the secretary-general of the FPI, Banjar, West Java, Sobri Lubis, declared:

Muslim people! We call upon you! Let’s fight against the Ahmadiyya! Kill the Ahmadies wherever they are, my brothers! Allahu akbar! Kill, kill, kill... kill them all! It is okay to kill them. This is a self-defense. They destroy our religion. [Therefore, their lives] are no
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longer sacred... Without any doubt, it is permissible [to shed Ahmadis’ blood]... Fight the Ahmadiyya, kill the Ahmadis, and exterminate the Ahmadis in Indonesia! Allahu akbar!\textsuperscript{46}

On the one hand, the Islamists claim Ahmadiyah disturbs public order. On the other hand, the violent actions are mostly at the hands of FPI and other activist groups. This public order argument is contradictory, as Hefner notes: “In the name of public order and morality, Islamist militias in the post-Suharto era have made the public arena more chaotic and insecure”.\textsuperscript{47} Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Islamists were ready with the solution to this chaos.

Inflammatory rhetoric forms part of the Islamists’ political arsenal. Via the media, the rhetoric fuelled the public opposition that it was supposedly responding to. The well-established desire for order in Indonesia is co-opted and twisted to serve Islamists’ political goals. The publicity generated by media interest in the religious conflict of 2008 led to a situation in which, “by June 2008, people in the Jakarta streets who had never heard of Mirza Ghulam Ahmad and his followers six months earlier expressed anger that they could continue to operate in Indonesia”.\textsuperscript{48} This Orwellian method is akin to a protection racket, although instead of money the troublemakers are paid off with laws against their opponents. On the surface, the argument is a moral one. It is good to preserve order and peace. Heresy disturbs the theological order because it casts doubt on the boundaries between Islam and non-Islam, boundaries that Islamists police in order to reinstate and maintain order.

\textbf{Threats and ideological narratives}

How do threats help those who identify them accumulate power? The first two threats to Islam discussed here, freedom and apostasy, are related because freedom discourses support proselytising. The freedom discourse is backed by the power of the West, with
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some Islamists calling Christianity “a willing partner in the vast Judeo-Christian conspiracy to annihilate Islam... a likely target of a holy war”. An ideological narrative has been constructed, a binary view of the world, with good Islam and bad Christianity, good Islam and bad West (the US, Jews, Israel).

In Haidt's idea of ideological narratives, sacredness resides within a story about good and evil, with heroes who will win the good fight against villains. Humans have developed, Haidt says, “the ability to rally around leaders when our group is under threat or is competing with other groups”. Threats have a binding role, like morality, which role is group forming and group binding. Within moral foundations theory, threat and morality have a symbiotic relationship. Each foundation has a threat embodied in it. In the case of the threat inherent in the first foundation, care, the threat is harm, and the intuitive emotional reaction against it serves the function of preventing harm. By responding intuitively to threats of harm, humans have a greater ability to reduce injury and death, aiding their survival.

The five moral foundations are deconstructions of a process that exists to ensure that the behaviour of people in the group conforms to agreed standards of care, fairness, loyalty, authority and purity. Behaviour that promotes these standards is considered virtuous or good. Behaviour that threatens them is bad. As Haidt details, people react quickly and powerfully to threats because their responses are intuitive. The morality mechanism reacts to the threat by provoking an emotional reaction against the “bad” and towards the “good”. Thus, moral virtues are agreements about what a group will value in order to protect the group and its members from those threats. In other words, morality is a mechanism that prompts positive and negative emotions in response to threats for the benefit of the group. Actions are justified by an implicit argument that what is good for the in-group’s strength, power and unity is good universally.
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How does this analysis of morality help us understand Indonesia’s religious politics? Alleged threats from another religion or ideology can elicit group emotions by those who identify with the group supposedly under threat, according to intergroup emotions theory.\textsuperscript{54} Persuading people to identify with a group is thus a primary goal of those who wish to lead (or manipulate) a group. Group emotions can even be activated when the perceiver is not personally threatened, provided the individual’s group identity is foremost.\textsuperscript{55} Characters within a narrative serve to personalise the ideas and make them more accessible. A villain plays a critical role as a threat personified. Obstacles play an important role in social psychology theories such as intergroup emotions theory. Obstacles provoke anger, and anger prompts action.\textsuperscript{56} If anger can be provoked through a threat or obstacle (Christians, Christianisation), an increased desire to support the ingroup and an increase in ingroup identification is likely to result. Once those villains become obstacles to a good Muslim’s path to God, force becomes necessary to right the world.

According to Hefner, conservatives mobilised in response to the 2005 fatwas with rallies and attacks on Christian evangelicals, Ahmadiyah and Islamic liberals in a tactical coordination across organisations and media that considerably increased their national influence.\textsuperscript{57} One of the reasons that the conservative coalition’s influence exceeded its numbers was that democratically and liberally inclined Muslims could not mobilise people in support of religious freedom as effectively as Islamists could mobilise people against supposed deviancy.\textsuperscript{58} Threats played a role in mobilising action by eliciting emotions, including anger, which helped consolidate the power of the Islamist/conservative alliance.
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The unattained goal of sharia law remains the central issue. The debate and anger over the omission of the Jakarta Charter from the constitution has been maintained since independence as a grievance against the secular nationalists, Christians and the state. Christians are seen as an obstacle to enacting sharia law. Feillard and Madinier argue that Islamists perceive and present sharia law as a sacred touchstone: "The sharia, if applied rigorously, would cure all of humanity’s ills." Moral psychologist Haidt writes that sacredness is “the human tendency to invest people, places, times and ideas with importance far beyond the utility they possess… [which] tie individuals to larger groups with shared identities and ennobling projects”. Shared emotions around sharia have a binding effect among Islamists and potentially among Muslims in general. The sacred nature of sharia enables believers to see their efforts on its behalf as part of an ennobling group project, in God’s name. This sacralising might have effects such as diminishing the importance of other values, such as tolerance, if they are perceived to prevent the realisation of a sacred value. Sharia forms a cornerstone of Islamists’ ideological narratives as the ultimate goal.

**Threats and the Other**

The goal of implementing sharia forms part of a utopian future within a narrative about recreating a lost – generally rendered as stolen – ideal, the way the Islamic world was ordered during the time of Muhammad. Threats to implementing sharia abound. Democracy is only legitimate to the extent it is consistent with Islam, and reinstating the Jakarta Charter and having sharia law in Indonesia would be evidence of such consistency, says Habib Rizieq, leader of FPI. Rizieq uses a threat against Islam, the idea of Islam being under attack, to justify the defence of Islam, which for FPI is generally a case of attacking sinful places (bars, discotheques, supposedly illegal churches, Ahmadiyah communities). Rizieq said of the alleged SiPiLis threat:
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If we want to prevent conflict, then the government should implement the *fatwa* and ban the teachings of liberalism, pluralism, and secularism from being taught in Indonesia. But if the government continues to allow these sources of conflict to exist, then it won’t be possible to prevent violence. They will continue to attack Islam, and we have an obligation to defend ourselves.\(^{64}\)

Even symbolic threats to values and beliefs strongly predict prejudice against groups that are ideologically different, according to intergroup emotions theory.\(^{65}\) What seems like an attack – on a minority religion, on a bar, on a disco – is within the narrative a defence against a moral threat or alleged moral attack. Hilmy argues that “Indonesian Islamists are constructing the concept of enemy based on the concept of binary opposition between the ‘authentic’ selves and the ‘corrupted’ ones.”\(^{66}\) That is, a narrative of good and evil. The most prominent binary opposition in the Islamists ideological narrative is between the authentic Islam and the corrupted West. Indonesian Islamists’ ideological narratives cast Americans and Jews (or the US and Israel) as evil, villains with the upper hand in a fight against Islam in Palestine and globally.\(^{67}\) Within this narrative, Jews and Christians (or Israel and the West, led by the US) attack Islam in part by preventing the implementation of sharia law. By association with the evil West/US, Indonesian Christians are no longer a minority, but part of a threatening global power.

Fundamentalists refer to feeling under siege “by the *kafir* and their systematically organised power”, presenting Muslims as being “ravished by packs of voracious wolves” within the “*kafir*’s global conspiracy against Islam”, recalling grievances and injustices such as the Crusades, colonialism, and the war in Bosnia, or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the US war in Afghanistan.\(^{68}\) This is not a discourse unique to Indonesia. It belongs to a narrative told worldwide. The German scholar of Islamism Bassam Tibi argues that “political Islam constitutes both a claim and a mandate to mobilise Islamic

---


\(^{65}\) Mackie, Maitner, and Smith, “Intergroup Emotions Theory.”

\(^{66}\) Hilmy, “Manufacturing the ‘Ontological Enemy’,” 365.

\(^{67}\) Feillard and Madinier, *The End of Innocence?*, 195.

civilization against the West and... to contest the Western institution of the nation-state”.\textsuperscript{69} The Islamist ideological narrative is situated within a global political context.

The Islamist narratives deploy language and ideas that stir emotions through a sense of moral violation. The Indonesian Islamist Imam Samudra said: “I hate America because it is the real centre of international terrorism, which has already repeatedly terrorised Islam.”\textsuperscript{70} Opposition to the US is framed as righteous. State-sponsored terrorism by the US is judged morally as harmful and unjust, violations of the care and fairness foundations. In the face of such moral violations and attacks on Islam, Islamists see a need to create a new world order. Tibi observes that Islamism is a “worldview, that seeks to establish its own order, and thus to separate the peoples of Islamic civilisation from the rest of humanity while claiming for their worldview a universal standing”.\textsuperscript{71} Over the decades this global context formed a backdrop to developments in Indonesia. Kristenisasi (Christianisation) and Islamisasi became rallying points for grievances over the unfair advantage each religion allegedly had in its access to power. Over time, Christians and Muslims developed, Arifianto notes, “more exclusivist religious expressions that portrayed the other religion through a lens of much distrust and hatred, which eventually encouraged them to address their grievances through violent means”.\textsuperscript{72}

\textbf{Islamist groups: narratives in action}

FPI and Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia were key members of the Islamist forces that cooperated to gain influence within MUI and in 2005 set up FUI (Forum Umat Islam) to enforce the fatwas introduced that year. Other members included DDII, MMI (Majelis Mujahideen Indonesia: Indonesian Mujahedeen Council), some conservative members of NU and Muhammadiyah, and representatives of the four Islamist political parties (PPP, PBB, PKS and PBR).\textsuperscript{73} A range of scholars and commentators have linked the 2005 fatwas to a rise in intolerance or weakening minority rights, especially by creating a pretext for

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{70} Abuza, \textit{Political Islam and Violence in Indonesia}, 43.
\textsuperscript{71} Tibi, \textit{The Challenge of Fundamentalism}, xxvii.
\textsuperscript{72} Arifianto, “Explaining the Cause of Muslim-Christian Conflicts in Indonesia,” 86.
\textsuperscript{73} International Crisis Group, \textit{Indonesia: Implications of the Ahmadiyah Decree}, 78.
\end{flushright}
attacks by radicals. In 2006, radical Islamists declared they would enforce the new houses of worship laws because the government would not, which led to an increase in “attacks on ‘unauthorised’ religious activities”, Jones notes. Anti-vice militias such as FPI have carried out a lot of the anti-minority violence. Setara Institute statistics show FPI conducted 29 (10 percent) of acts described as criminal or intolerant in 2008 (42 actions by MUI), with those actors appearing at the top the list again for 2009.

Islamist opposition to proselytisation became a containment strategy under which they use the law to justify their acts against churches old and new. Wilson says FPI leadership has “manipulated local tensions arising from demographic shifts in Jakarta’s peri-urban periphery into moral panics regarding the so-called ‘Christianisation’ of Jakarta, often linked in FPI rhetoric to the spread of secularism and ‘liberalism’.” This, Wilson says, is part of a method by which it appropriates “localised tensions and conflicts and frame them as part of a broader and unified ‘Islamic’ response to what are seen as the threats posed to the Islamic community by decadence and immorality”. Thus narratives around the two threats interweave, freedom spawned by the West allows immorality and proselytising. The rule of law is weak in Indonesia. This partially validates FPI’s argument that its morality policing is needed because state action is ineffective.

FPI frequently uses the provocation justification, including for its vigilante violence. This argument that Islamic morality supersedes the law is a critical aspect of FPI’s worldview. Hefner notes that activists’ appeal to amr bil ma’ruf wal nahi al-munkar (enjoining the good and forbidding evil) allows them to “legitimate their usurpation of state authority by
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claiming to act on the basis of divine law, rather than merely human.”80 Former Indonesian president Abdurrahman Wahid wrote that Islamists turn Islam into an ideology as part of their political struggle against those with different beliefs.81 They use the language of Islam, often used by all Muslims, but understand these terms differently, he wrote. In the hands of “radicals” amr ma’ruf nahi al-munkar becomes “a formula for legitimising compulsion, violence and attacks against anyone who differs from them. They excuse themselves by claiming to promote the good and forbid evil every time they commit such acts of violence or defame others”.82 Just as Wahid says, the ostensible concern and motivation of FPI and its leader, Habib Muhammad Rizieq Syihab, is the Koranic injunction amr bil ma’ruf wal nahi al-munkar (enjoining the good and forbidding evil), Jahroni says.83 This justification filters down to local branches. Bekasi FPI leader Murhali Barda justified the group’s attacks in 2012 with those very words.84 Barda has justified violent actions with anti-Christianisation arguments when he accused them of using deceit to convert Muslims, such as debt traps that are forgiven upon conversion.85 As Feillard and Madinier have noted, once an Islamist group has defined a group as evil, they have the justification to attack them.86 Grievance discourses of being wronged, moral arguments, become justifications for violent action. The radical Islamist discourse that Indonesian law is not legitimate compared with sharia is a self-justifying moral argument that, because illegal actions often go unpunished or under-punished, further undermines the rule of law.

Wilson explains some of the politics behind FPI’s vigilantism by noting that it occurs when the state does not meet the moral expectations of the community, with the supposedly unsatisfactory post-New Order governments being FPI’s justification to fight
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crime and establish order. As Wilson writes: “Rejecting the state’s label of their own violence as criminal, the FPI vigilante represents themselves as a virtuous vanguard protecting society from moral and social decay. As one FPI member explained, ‘If they [the state] won’t uphold decency and order then we will’.” This is an example of morality motivating as well as justifying action. In this case, they are justifying idealistic violence, which moral foundations theorist Haidt argues is morally motivated. FPI steps into alleged vacuums of authority to impose order, which is a moral act if it can justify its authority as legitimate. That justification is its ideological narrative.

Is there more to the situation than groups using the cover of the accusation of evil to wreak havoc? Rizieq’s family background is the puritanical group within the Hadhrami Arab community of Indonesia, which was instrumental in forming Persis (Persatuan Islam) in the early 20th century. According to Jahroni, Rizieq is genuinely concerned about the gambling, drugs and prostitution that beset poor neighbourhoods, which Rizieq blames on official failure to maintain law and order. Wilson confirms that the mix of motives for membership of FPI includes local populations trying to hold back the tide of drug dealers. Local populations argue that the FPI franchise (and uniforms) increased their power in these morality struggles. Conveniently, those FPI members who sought money could get it by enforcing haram levies.

FPI is the most prominent of the militia-type Islamic groups and through its use of street toughs (preman) is similar to Pemuda Pancasila and other New Order-sponsored preman organisations which acted as an extension of state control or elite interests. This preman element and the fact that FPI often targets nightclubs and bars, sometimes for the purpose of financial extortion, has discredited the organisation’s Islamic intentions and means it is sometimes not taken seriously. However, its leader Rizieq studied at the
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Saudi-backed Institute for the Study of Islam and Arabic (LIPIA) in Jakarta, before spending years studying in Riyadh. Rizieq’s study is typical of a pattern identified by van Bruinessen in which LIPIA, Saudi money and Saudi universities are sources of the growing influence of transnational Islamism (particularly the Salafi Islam or puritanical Wahhabism of Saudi Arabia), as well as Saudi and Yemeni clerics (ulama). Arabs, he says, including Indonesian Arabs, “have played a prominent part in the transmission of neo-fundamentalist and jihadist discourse from the Middle East to Indonesia”. The money has paid for translations of simple fundamentalist texts, while Indonesian Arabs’ prominence among radical circles points to their role in an Arabisation of Indonesian Islam. This Arabisation is an aspect of the ongoing Islamisation of Indonesia, which I discussed in chapter 3. With the goal of mobilising support for their Islamisation project, Islamists’ ideological narratives help generate a sense of Islamic consciousness through the politics of “us” and “them”.

‘Us and them’ narratives

Islamist discourses contain consistent negative images of the Other in words and stories, resulting in an us-and-them consciousness and narratives around enemies. The negative images form part of the narrative, specifically the creation of the villains (non-Muslims and non-conforming Muslims) who stand in the way of achieving the world order the Islamists seek. Islamists have associated their religious opponents with filthy matter as part of the process of creating the Other. Labeling such as this creates hierarchies, as Burhani notes, with groups placing themselves at the top of the hierarchies, and the ones down below in the hierarchy receiving offensive labels. According to Magee and Galinsky, US analysts of power, hierarchies can consist of individuals or groups, with groups stratified into hierarchies of groups and individuals
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able to feel the status of their group within a hierarchy. This contributes to individuals feeling good via reward signals to their brain as part of the bio-chemical motivational system. This process of status and reward occurs at least partly because the group’s status and prestige attaches to the person who identifies with the group via self-categorisation, according to social identity theory. Ramakrishna explains the research from social psychology suggests that a sense of control is important to overcome the uncertainties of life, with strong ingroups providing beliefs, norms and identities that contribute to this purpose. In this way, the very act of labeling, which positions the Other as inferior, helps to allay some of the anxiety over religious identity that Sidel refers to.

Such positioning brings with it inherent risks. The British philosopher and moral psychologist David Livingstone Smith argues that imagining the universe as a hierarchy with god at the top and groups placing themselves a step or two below god tends to legitimate treating those below worse than you would yourself, as lesser. This ultimately plays a role in the process that leads to the demeaning, enslaving and exterminating of others. The demonisation of the Other has a dehumanising effect, creating a clear distinction between the ingroup as civilised and the outgroup as uncivilised. The British philosopher and rabbi Jonathan Sacks attributes the beginning of violent, even genocidal, Othering to dualism:

Dualism resolves cognitive dissonance by saying, in effect, ‘It wasn’t us, and it wasn’t God, so it must be Them,’ whoever the ‘Them’ happens to be. It turns penitential cultures into blame cultures, externalising evil and projecting it on a scapegoat, thereby redefining the faithful as victims… From there it is a short step to seeing them as subhuman (for the Nazis, Jews were ‘vermin, lice’; for the Hutus of Rwanda, the Tutsi were inyenzi,
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‘cockroaches’). They can then be killed without compunction. There is a straight line from dualism to demonisation to dehumanisation to genocide.\textsuperscript{107}

This view suggests that the language that leads to atrocities is similar to the language Islamists use towards religious minorities, particularly Ahmadiyah, as discussed. Humans in general tend towards binary thinking, as Ramakrishna notes.\textsuperscript{108} The risk with Islamists’ ideological narratives is that they reinforce binary opposites and inflame feelings towards people thus framed. They are, unfortunately, engaged in a mode of thinking at risk of leading to dehumanisation.

\section*{Conclusion}

Graham and Haidt write that ideological narratives are always stories about good and evil. “They identify heroes and villains, they explain how the villains got the upper hand, and they lay out or justify the means by which – if we can just come together and fight hard enough – we can vanquish the villains and return the world to its balanced or proper state.”\textsuperscript{109} In the ideological narratives of Indonesian Islamists, they are the heroes who will vanquish the villains (the West, Christians, Ahmadiyah) who pose the threats of freedom, apostasy and deviancy, the primary obstacles on the path to their goals, including a morally pure Indonesia, based on sharia. Narratives such as this, with assignations of good and evil, appeal to emotions and moral intuitions. Morality exists within groups, to serve the groups, and groups are power structures. Hence morality serves power. A moral argument is not necessarily an argument about what is universally right, or right for everyone. It is often an argument about what behaviour suits the interests of the group, and therefore the interests of a power structure. This begins to explain how morality, which seems at first glance to be about doing good, can be used in the cause of doing bad (to another group). The behaviour seems good to the ingroup. Morally motivated actions can be justified by that morality, in a somewhat circular argument. The very acts of defining orthodoxy or heresy, or enforcing morality, are acts
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of power and control that the enforcers can attempt to justify. One means of justification is an effective ideological narrative. Narratives, through their persuasive power, their power to mobilise action, are sources of power. As such, they are often deployed in efforts to gain and consolidate power. This is what I believe is happening with Islamists in Indonesia, and indeed happens to humans around the world.

In addition to the narratives, the links between Islamist groups such as DDII and FPI with elite members of the state and society have helped them gain influence greater than their numerical strength. Hefner suggests a key reason that post-Suharto governments were hesitant to crack down on Islamists’ vigilante activities is that “a small but influential wing within the coalition governments that have ruled Indonesia since 1999 subscribes to an anti-liberal and anti-pluralist model of religious freedom.” Identifying some of the members of this “influential wing” is one aim of the next chapter, which will examine how Islamism operated in the Yudhoyono era, with reference to the state and the government.
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Chapter 5: THE YUDHOYONO YEARS: THE PUBLIC, PIETY AND POLITICS

Having examined Islamists’ ideological narratives, I turn now to how these were deployed during the years of the Yudhoyono presidency. I begin, after some brief background, by outlining Yudhoyono’s political relationship with organised Islam, as well as the relationship of his team. I follow that by examining the contextual question of the public’s involvement in, attitude towards and reaction to these issues.

At the 1999 national elections, the secular nationalist PDI-P won the largest bloc with 34 percent of the vote, see Table 5a later in this chapter. The Islamic vote was split among multiple parties totaling about 21 percent (modernists, not all of whom were Islamists) and another 12.7 percent for the NU-affiliated party, PKB. Despite not getting near a majority, a coalition of Muslim parties – the Central Axis – ensured Megawati Sukarnoputri did not become president, instead maneuvering to have Abdurrahman Wahid elected in 1999.1 As president, Wahid did not deliver the anticipated patronage to the Central Axis, concerned as he was for the rights of minority faiths as opposed to Islamicising Indonesia. He lost favour with those Muslim parties, which contributed to the opposition that led to his impeachment. Despite their inability to form a majority in parliament, the Islamic parties had established their ability to influence politics.

Suaedy says Yudhoyono made a pact with conservative Islamic forces before the 2004 presidential elections in his bid for power: “Yudhoyono and his political allies... approached conservative religious groups, including the MUI, and asked for their political support. In return, Yudhoyono promised to treat MUI’s doctrines as policy.”2 Suaedy, who worked for many years with the liberal Wahid Institute, says Yudhoyono’s support for and promotion of MUI as the authorised interpreter of Islam facilitated religious intolerance.3
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Yudhoyono’s statements at MUI events support that argument, for example his speech to the 2005 MUI congress:

We open our hearts and minds to receiving the thoughts, recommendations and fatwas from the MUI and ulama [Islamic scholars] at any time, either directly to me or the minister of religious affairs or to other branches of government. We want to place MUI in a central role in matters regarding the Islamic faith, so that it becomes clear what the difference is between areas that are the preserve of the state and areas where the government or state should heed the fatwa from the MUI and ulama.4

This statement, which was made at the conference that produced the fatwas discussed in the previous chapter, is explicit and important. An unelected body, which is subject to the influence of non-transparent forces, shifts from an advisory role in which it was a servant of state interests to an apparent reversal of that role. Members of MUI claimed this rule-making authority, this territory, for themselves. National chairman of the MUI fatwa commission Ma’ruf Amin said soon after the 2005 fatwa against deviancy: “Given the existence of the MUI fatwa, the government clearly has the obligation to prohibit [Ahmadiyah]. It’s not us asking. Because there is a fatwa from MUI, the government is automatically obliged to prohibit them.”5 Amin stakes out ownership of this territory. MUI, an institutional face of conservative Islam in Indonesia, used deviancy and heresy as a threat to unite people behind its agenda. An official role did seem to emerge over Yudhoyono’s presidency. The Australian scholar of Indonesian law Tim Lindsey writes that MUI, having achieved official regulatory functions overseeing Islamic banking, finance and halal certification, and influence over haj administration, produced some fatwas that “now have a regulatory status as a form of quasi-legislation”.6 Despite the ‘our morality trumps the rule of law’ argument of Islamists such as FPI having no legal basis, the status granted to MUI fatwas muddy those waters because of the quasi-official position they have came to occupy.

Burhani suggests Yudhoyono might be inclined towards the conservative agenda, and
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cites the president telling an MUI meeting in November 2007: “The MUI issues fatwas. The president cannot issue a fatwa. But after a fatwa is issued, the tools of the state can do their duty. Hopefully our cooperation will deepen in the future... We must all take strict measures against deviant beliefs.”

The implication that the MUI dictates the state’s duty reveals the overt power Yudhoyono granted it. Yudhoyono’s words on deviance suggest he supports the campaign against deviancy and is offering state support for it. Here, Yudhoyono projects a conservative Islamic identity and suggests he is one of them (conservatives who oppose deviant streams). The “us and them” discourse serves his political interests because it helps ensure ongoing support from his coalition allies. Yudhoyono’s use of “we” implies that the issue of deviance supersedes citizenship, since “deviants” such as members of Ahmadiyah are Indonesian citizens with various legal rights, but are evidently not included in “we”. Yudhoyono and conservative clerics are openly colluding to create an Other. Bush also suggests Yudhoyono might have sympathised with a conservative Islamic agenda and was “not an innocent bystander to the deterioration of minority rights and religious pluralism during his presidency”. Yudhoyono’s actions are more important than his personal preferences though, because it is his behaviour as a politician that matters, rather than his own beliefs.

As for his behaviour, Yudhoyono helped amplify the idea that Ahmadis provoked the troubles they face, blaming them for antagonising Muslims because of their outspokenness and continued proselytising, according to Fealy. Yudhoyono seemed to position himself in support of unlawful behaviour. He played a supporting role in the Islamist project, deploying similar ideas and language to their narratives. As the nation’s leader, he needed to maintain stability and order as a priority. Islamists appeared to exploit Yudhoyono’s and the nation’s desire for order and stability. Ultimately, was
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stability and order also a justification for the president acting, or not acting, in ways that happened to coincide with the preferences of his Islamic supporters?

**Pancasila and godly nationalism**

The context of these contemporary political positions is Indonesia’s ambiguous status as neither an Islamic nor a secular state. Human rights advocates argue for the primacy of the constitutional guarantees of religious freedom: “Indonesia’s constitution of 1945 explicitly promises the right to religious freedom under article 29(2): ‘The state guarantees each and every citizen the freedom of religion and of worship in accordance with his religion and belief’.” However, conservative Muslims tend to interpret article 29(2) illiberally as meaning it restricts religious freedom to those who express a religion, which opens the way for the state to determine who has religious legitimacy and who does not. Yudhoyono’s position and actions seem to confirm Menchik’s point that “despite claims to being a ‘secular democracy’, the state is fully involved in the firm demarcation of religious orthodoxy”. This insight seems critical in understanding the context of the state in religious affairs. The state, while not Islamic, is not secular either.

Menchik says the “Belief in One God” principle is central to the way the nation imagines itself and therefore “for a godly nation to endure, it must privilege some beliefs and prosecute acts of deviance as blasphemy”. Menchik concludes:

> The promotion of belief in God and the exclusion of heterodox faiths help unify the country’s diverse population behind a common theism... [one goal of which] is a polity where individuals, organisations, and the state are partly responsible for one another’s moral condition rather than it being the domain of self-determining individuals.

This reveals a role for morality expressed through the state beyond where Western secular liberal democracies generally legislate in the 21st century. Such a difference reveals the gap in worldviews between the system Indonesians have developed and the
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more individualistic West, each having had its own historical development, notwithstanding some common elements. Indonesia is not an Islamic state. The power and influence of the clerics (*ulama*) is not direct and is only wielded via the state, hence the need for MUI to argue and pressure the government to enact laws to enforce its fatwas. Yet religion, monotheistic religion in particular, is privileged in Indonesia, “through state support for religious orthodoxy over liminal and heterodox faiths. Godly nationalists feel that belief in God is a civic virtue that accrues both individual and social benefits.”  

The 2010 Constitutional Court ruling that affirmed the 1965 blasphemy law, which denied religious freedom to heterodox faiths such as Ahmadiyah, added judicial support to the view among some parts of official and elite Indonesia that the state is integrated with religion, Ricklefs suggests.

**Framing debate**

So how does godly nationalism and other religious politics actually play out in Indonesia? In the previous chapter, I discussed the role of purification initiatives, particularly by MUI, as a response to threats, including moral threats. MUI’s purification initiatives should be contextualised within its institutional strategising. Barker and van Klinken say MUI created a heresy crisis to influence the government as part of its struggle for rule-making authority among state institutions:

> By deliberately creating a moral panic about religious ‘deviants’ and then adopting a censorious stance it knew few would comfortably oppose, it aimed to insert itself into the place long occupied by the larger, more mainstream religious organisations... [targeting] the ‘heretical’ Ahmadiyah... not so much to injure Ahmadiyah members as to raise a panic about heresy among the wider population.

MUI and Islamist activists highlight threats that alarm the population at the same time as they present the solution to the threat, such as banning a sect. MUI’s impact during the Yudhoyono presidency included its 2005 fatwa against “pornografi (pornography) or
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pornoaksi (porno-action)”. The fatwa and subsequent activism, including FPI attacks on the headquarters of the new Indonesian edition of Playboy magazine, led to new anti-pornography laws being introduced, although in a form that was a compromise to MUI’s original plan. The Indonesian Muslim feminist Julia Suryakusuma argues the laws were “a potent combination of social conservatism and political opportunism” directed against women’s freedom. Suryakusuma summarises Neng Dara Affiah, a commissioner of the National Commission on Violence against Women and senior NU member, who explained her experience of Islamists’ strategic use of language, which:

enabled them to polarise the debate into simple extremes. Whoever was not with them against pornography, was, in their terms, against them – and thus for pornography. At one point, Affiah herself was summoned by the Central Board of NU, and questioned. “You wear a jilbab [headscarf] and are from a pesantren [traditional Muslim boarding school],” they said, “How can you reject the Pornography Law? You should repent!”

This method positions a moral good in a manner that is difficult to argue against from an Islamic position, a technique Islamists deployed in other circumstances. It is an application of the binary opposites way of dividing the world into good and evil. After 2002, after the presidency’s constitutional powers were reduced and limited, parliament became more powerful than the presidency. This meant that legislators became subject to such positioning, and subject to the way the public responded to such debates. For Yudhoyono’s part, his signing of the pornography bill into law in 2008 helped him gain endorsement again from the Islamist PKS (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera: Prosperous Justice Party). PKS, the party behind the bill, had used it to generate public debate on sharia. According to Hilmy, to Islamists “the history of human civilisation consists of repeated
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power struggles” with Islam being “spiritual guidance for individuals as well as a political order” based on the principal idea that Islam must achieve power and the sharia must regulate everyone’s lives, morals, habits and rituals.  

**Sharia and elections**

How is the Islamists’ broader power struggle to achieve power in society playing out? To answer that question, I will first talk about formal political outcomes Yudhoyono era before looking some more at informal practices. The relationship between sharia ambitions and formal politics is partly revealed in the positioning of political parties, which differ on whether or not sharia should be incorporated into the constitution. Figure 1 is a guide to the spectrum, from secularist on the left to Islamist on the right, which is sourced from academic-turned-Widodo-government education and culture minister Anies Rasyid Baswedan.  

**Figure 5a: Continuum of parties’ ideologies (2003)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secularist</th>
<th>PDI-P</th>
<th>Golkar</th>
<th>PAN</th>
<th>PKB</th>
<th>PKS</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>PBB</th>
<th>Islamist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From Anies Rasyid Baswedan’s “Political Islam in Indonesia: Present and Future Trajectory.”  

PPP (the Suharto regime Islamic party), PBB (linked to DDII) and PKS (associated with Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood and Indonesia’s KAMMI student movement), are Islamist parties that favoured a conservative Islamisation of Indonesia, reinstatement of the Jakarta Charter (Medina charter – a watered down version – in PKS’s case after 2002) and the application of sharia.  

Nationally, the Islamist vote is a minority. In 2004, the Islamist parties PPP and PKS won 15.5 percent of the votes, as shown in Table 5a. However, PPP and PBB, the two parties explicitly supporting the Jakarta Charter, received only 10.8 percent of the vote. In 2009, the Islamist parties (PKS and PPP, the only two Islamist parties to pass the 2.5
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percent threshold for parliamentary representation) garnered 13.2 percent, with a further 10.9 percent going to the Islamic but non-Islamist PKB and PAN (Partai Amanat Nasional, National Mandate Party, associated with Muhammadiyah).\textsuperscript{28}

### Table 5a: Parliamentary election results for 1999-2014 (popular vote)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>1999% of vote</th>
<th>2004% of vote</th>
<th>2009% of vote</th>
<th>2014% of vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDI-P</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golkar</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKB</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKS</td>
<td>1 (PK)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerindra</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanura</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasdem</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1999-2009 sourced from Mujani and Liddle’s “Personalities, Parties and Voters”.\textsuperscript{29}

2014 sourced from Fukuoka and Thalang\textsuperscript{30}

Compared with the strong support in the 1955 election for the sharia-supporting Masyumi (21 percent) and the sharia supporting but less committed NU (19 percent), the 2009 election result suggests a decline in popular support for implementing sharia, although the contexts are different.\textsuperscript{31} The overall Islamic vote was well over 33 percent, however the PKB and PAN were non-Islamist, non-sharia aligned parties. It seems likely that failure to achieve electoral dominance meant that Islamists and conservatives had to look elsewhere for political leverage. One way was in coalitions with other parties and reciprocal arrangements with the president. Another was informal politics, the politics of generating threats, publicity, emotions, and mobilising people into action, as discussed in the previous chapter.


\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{31} Mujani and Liddle, "Politics, Islam, and Public Opinion."
Organisations such as Nahdlatul Ulama and Mummadiyah that in the past had positions supporting sharia for Indonesia (in the 1950s, for example), today no longer call for sharia to be written into the constitution, although they still articulate Muslim values and aspirations.\textsuperscript{32} Such a position does not stop them and other Islamic group promoting an Islamic agenda, which during the Suharto years saw them succeed in having sharia-based or sharia-inspired laws enacted, such as the Basic Law of Religious Justice as well as the Compilation of Islamic Law.\textsuperscript{33} A large organisation such as NU must inevitably hold a broad range of views as just discussed. Not all leaders or member supported Wahid’s liberal attitudes, some believing them too radical.\textsuperscript{34}

Yudhoyono is accused of ignoring the GKI Taman Yasmin case in Bogor, among others.\textsuperscript{35} The apparent lack of action at the national level occurred despite successful court appeals by the GKI congregation, which the local authorities refused to implement.\textsuperscript{36} Despite advice from the Indonesian Ombudsman, Yudhoyono in effect left the matter to the local mayor, noting that the government must make the Muslim majority feel at ease “because the state’s duty is to prevent clashes from happening”.\textsuperscript{37} Yudhoyono’s rhetoric suggests he sees public order and harmony as more important than religious freedom and the rule of law. He takes a position that in effect supports Islamist activists who have stirred up trouble by suggesting the state would act to calm things down, rather than enforce the law. “President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) has closed his eyes to various incidents of violation of religious/belief freedom”,\textsuperscript{38} Setara Institute argued in 2011. Setara suggested Yudhoyono’s human rights agenda focused on abuses by the military and ignored religious rights and freedoms. By Yudhoyono’s second term, when intolerant acts peaked, he often dealt with difficult issues after commissioning polling to
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align his decisions with majority opinion. This suggests that a large number of the public, possibly a majority, might have supported the positions he was taking. I will explore the attitudes and role of the public later this chapter.

Fealy has detailed Yudhoyono’s extensive pattern of indecisiveness. This characteristic does not bolster action against intolerance, which requires a stand that could alienate Islamic activists. When the local and provincial MUIs ruled Shiism outside of Islam in the context of attacks in Sampang in 2012, the national MUI rejected that position, arguing as it had before that Shiism was inside Islam. Fealy writes that Yudhoyono’s government sidelined issues in the aftermath of the 2012 Sampang attacks on Shiites because it did not want to deal with challenging political and socio-religious issues. Yudhoyono had enough other priorities, including as Sidel notes, consolidating a democracy that ensured the continued gratification of the interests of Suharto-era financial, business, military and civilian elites. Yudhoyono condemned the violent attacks, but he did not act publicly against Suryadharma Ali when his religious affairs ministers said repeatedly that Shiites were not Muslims. Any indecisiveness on Yudhoyono’s part in circumstances such as this did not damage his political interests or those of his team, some of whom were appointed to senior roles at least partly because of their political support for him.

**Yudhoyono’s government and team**

Yudhoyono is only one man and as president is more akin to the conductor than the orchestra. Yudhoyono’s ministers and advisers inevitably played a major role on policies and positions. Bush and Fealy both note that Ma’ruf Amin, a member of the Presidential
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Advisory Council, a senior NU member and a director of MUI, had Yudhoyono’s ear on religious politics and contributed to government actions deemed to bolster intolerance, particularly by targeting Ahmadiyah. Amin chaired the MUI fatwa commission for many years after 2000 and was prominent in controversial MUI fatwas such as those against Ahmadiyah and secularism, pluralism and liberalism in 2005. Amin was but one conservative Islamic influence on Yudhoyono.

Yudhoyono’s relationship with conservative Islam was sustained through both terms. PKS received three ministerial positions in the first Yudhoyono government, in return for its support. At the 2009 elections, Yudhoyono retained the backing of four Islamic (including two Islamist) parties (PKB, PAN, PPP, PKS), to a greater or lesser extent, for a second term as president. Another party in Yudhoyono’s coalition government was PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan: United Development Party), whose leader Suryadharma Ali became Religious Affairs Minister. Suryadharma’s influence included granting a measure of official legitimacy to FPI by giving the keynote address at its 2013 annual congress in Jakarta. Suryadharma was one of four cabinet members who sat on the MUI board during Yudhoyono’s second term. The prevention of the construction of the GKI Taman Yasmin church in Bogor, which I will discuss in detail in the next chapter, also had Suryadharma’s backing. During most of the second Yudhoyono cabinet, Ahmadiyah communities were subject to Suryadharma’s power and influence. In 2010, for example, Suryadharma said banning Ahmadiyah would be the best solution, which led to subsequent demonstrations and attacks. Suryadharma framed the West’s liberalism as threatening to Islam, calling the human rights movement, for example, a
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“new radicalism” of “freedom without limitation”, including no moral limitations.\textsuperscript{51}

The engagement between conservative Islam and state elites extended beyond cabinet and into state institutions. MUI’s campaign against heresy gathered support from the attorney-general, Hendarman Soepandji.\textsuperscript{52} The deviancy fatwa and its aftermath helped to revitalise and give purpose to Bakor Pakem (Badan Koordinasi Pengawas Aliran Kepercayaan Masyarakat: Coordinating Board to Oversee Mystical Beliefs in Society), another Suharto-era organisation related to the regime agenda of control.\textsuperscript{53} Bakor Pakem, which is part of the Attorney-General’s department, became influential in the Yudhoyono years, pushing for the banning of Ahmadiyah, and the prosecution of Shiite, Ahmadiyah and atheist leaders.\textsuperscript{54} The government acted slowly in responding to the fatwa, and when it had not banned Ahmadiyah by 2008, pressure mounted and Bakor Pakem declared the JAI branch of Ahmadiyah had “deviated from the key tenets of Islam as it was understood in Indonesia, and had generated frustration and opposition in the public to the point where it was endangering public order”.\textsuperscript{55} MUI had an institutional ally within government, one that deployed the narrative of Islamism. This formal access to government increased the power of the alliance between conservatives and Islamists.

Other institutional support for the Islamist/conservative alliance includes senior elements of the police. MUI’s campaign against heresy gathered support from General Sutanto, a national chief of police during Yudhoyono’s first term.\textsuperscript{56} In 2010, Yudhoyono appointed General Timur Pradopo to be national police chief, whereupon the new appointee said “the FPI should be embraced, and empowered, as they can contribute to national security”.\textsuperscript{57} Hefner suggests that FPI’s link to members of the military and political establishment might be the reason it can engage in apparently illegal activity with limited
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official response. The failure of state institutions explains religious intolerance, according to a US report on religious freedom, which blames police, provincial officials and court tolerance for vigilantism, failure to enforce national laws protecting religious minorities, and lenient sentences for those convicted of violence towards minorities. These institutions’ failure to act may contribute to future acts of intolerance, with radical Islamist vigilantes knowing they can act with varying degrees of impunity. Reasons for police inaction are complex, because sometimes the under-resourced local officers are confronted with crowds of hundreds of angry activists. However, other reasons – such as a vigilante action having the backing of powerful elite figures – have also been used to explain police inaction.

Indonesian authorities are apparently unable or unwilling to consistently enforce laws and constitutional provisions on religious freedom, Hefner says. “The unwillingness reflects serious disagreements among the country’s political elites over the question of how to balance religious freedom with social cohesion.” What are the dynamics of these political elites? Olle argues that in the absence of a dominant leader like Suharto, who was at the centre of many networks:

- intra-elite competition, previously contained within the boundaries of the state, has become more visible... competing elite groups use various organisations, both formal state and non-state bodies, in order to build their power and mobilise public support. Authoritarian habits, politics based on clientelistic networks, and the use of scapegoating and violence as part of a political strategy, all have long histories in Indonesia.

Scapegoating is evident in the treatment of religious minorities in particular, an authoritarian tactic, with parallels in the idea of the creation of a villain in an ideological narrative. Meitzner explores an anti-reformist tendency among the elite that emerged in the early Yudhoyono years in opposition to ceding too much power to citizens. By
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2009, this loose, ill-defined group, which included bureaucrats, military, businesspeople, and mainstream and militant religious leaders, sought to regain some control over the political process by revoking the popular vote for provincial governors. One supporter of the idea was Gamawan Fauzi, Yudhoyono’s minister for home affairs. Fauzi made repeated positive statements about FPI, including soon after an attack that led to the death of three Ahmadis in 2011, of which FPI was suspected of involvement. Fauzi is but one clear link between conservative Islam, the Yudhoyono government and the anti-reformist tendency. Meitzner says a lapse in minority rights was one symptom of the democratic stagnation this group brought about. “Islamic elites… used the stagnation of reform to undermine the pluralist spirit of Indonesia’s legal and political foundations.”

Similarly, Islamist activist leaders have named retired generals (so-called “green generals”) as supporters of their conservative positions, including their stance against Ahmadiyah. All these elements highlight the interconnectivity of conservative power networks in the Yudhoyono era, straddling the elites of conservative politics, government bodies, the military and police, and Islamic organisations.

From the evidence cited, it seems some elites, borrowing from Sidel’s line of argument, are involved in acts of intolerance as part of efforts to forge or consolidate political blocs. Morality has a group-forming role in this process, similar to Menchik’s productive intolerance: “The debates over blasphemy are an attempt to affirm (by Muslim civil society) or disrupt (by liberals) norms and laws that help constitute the nation through belief in God”. In this process, actions are justified by the argument that what is good for the ingroup’s unity, strength and power, is good universally. If morality serves the group, and a group is a power structure, then morality serves the interests of a power structure. It is easier to unite when it is clear what the unity is against.
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2008 joint decree

The campaign to cast Ahmadiyah as deviant, which began in earnest in the lead-up to the 2005 MUI fatwas, reached crisis point in 2008. As detailed in chapter 2, attacks on Ahmadiyah spiked that year to a total of 238 acts of intolerance or violations of religious freedom, according to Setara Institute, which was two-thirds of the attacks recorded that year.\(^69\) The pressure contributed to the government’s decision to issue a joint ministerial decree in June 2008 ordering the Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (Indonesian Ahmadiyah Community: JAI) to cease activities inconsistent with Islam, such as recognising a prophet after Muhammad.\(^70\) It is worth noting Ricklefs’ insight that were other larger targets of deviancy that were not pursued, such as LDII (Lembaga Dakwah Islam Indonesia). Ahmadiyah’s smaller size made it easier to attack.\(^71\) The essence of the decision was to ban Ahmadiyah from proselytising and “terminate Ahmadi activities for so long as the group claims to be part of Islam”.\(^72\) The decree had a knock-on effect, contributing to further attacks and at least 25 regulations by regional governments banning heretical sects and beliefs, according to Suaedy:

A range of government agencies were involved, such as the Research and Development Agency of the Ministry of Religious Affairs; heads of regions and Bakorpakem (Badan Koordinasi Pengawasan Aliran Kepercayaan Masyarakat, Coordinating Body for Monitoring Mystical Beliefs in Society) of the Chief Prosecutor’s Office; the police; and, of course, MUI. This demonstrates the active and deep involvement of government elements in the persecutions.\(^73\)

The regional decrees and local regulations were based on the blasphemy law, the joint decree and the MUI fatwa. Most of them related to the banning of Ahmadiyah in regions including Bogor City, Bogor District, Bekasi City, West Java Provincial Government, the Lombok Barat District and the Governor of West Nusa Tenggara/Lombok, the East Java
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Provincial Government, the South Sumatra Provincial Government, Pekanbaru City in Riau Province; Padang City in West Sumatra Province; and the Samarinda District in East Kalimantan. This demonstrates the national impact of the joint decree, as well as the co-ordinated nature the process, with the participation ranging across government ministries, state institutions and Islamic organisations.

The mainstream

Fealy cautions against overemphasising the radicals’ role as the cause of intolerance and recommends giving more weight to mainstream attitudes, particularly those within NU and Muhammadiyah. For example, key members of NU’s and Muhammadiyah’s leadership encouraged Yudhoyono to ban Ahmadiyah. NU chairman Hasyim Mazudi argued in the crucial pre-joint decree period in 2008 that if Ahmadiyah was not banned, NU members might be drawn into violence against Ahmadiyah. This is another example of the instrumental use of the public order and harmony discourse, this time as an implied threat. Platzdasch suggests most NU leaders thought Ahmadiyah should be banned if they continued to claim to be Muslim.

The views of the local NU leadership I interviewed in Bogor were at odds with the sentiments of national leaders such as Mazudi. A senior member of NU’s political party, PKB (Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa, National Awakening Party), told me:

For NU, it doesn’t matter to live side by side with Ahmadiyah as long as we respect each other. The problem is raised by small groups who has loud voice and creates problems at many times. Yes, radical, fundamental. Fundamentalism. In our view, they don’t represent Islam. It is politic interest covered by Islam. Interest-based politics.

The Bogor leader acknowledged the nuances, and NU’s role, though: “We know some people inside NU don’t like Ahmadiyah, but they have never done things as the radicals
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have done.”

Ricklefs notes the problematic characterisation of NU and Muhammadiyah as moderate, and suggests that while the term might distinguish the groups from Islamist and violent groups, it is not analytically useful. Hilmy is more explicit still, when he writes:

> Given these characteristics, we cannot define a clear fault line dividing peaceful Islamism from radical and violent Islamism... In reality, Islamism is on a borderless continuum where the boundary between it and so-called “moderate Islam” is blurred. In other words, Islamist ideas are contiguous for “moderate” ones on particular grounds and can gain broad resonance within some mainstream Islamic organizations such as Muhammadiyah and Nahdlatul Ulama (NU). Despite their wide reputation as being “moderate” organizations, some segments of these organizations are surprisingly sympathetic to key points of the Islamists’ agenda. That is why their rhetoric can at times be remarkably similar to that of Islamist groups.

Perhaps that is why the idea of considering the emergence of a conservative Islamic/Islamist alliance in democratic Indonesia is useful, because of the shared views and interests of those groupings on some issues. As an example, NU leader Muzadi labelled the human rights movement “atheists riding on the democracy movement”, part of the new radicalism and extremism associated with Islamic liberalism. It would seem that more moderate leaders are the exception anyway, because contemporary surveys of Muslim civil society leaders show an overwhelming majority believe Ahmadis should not be allowed to hold public office, build houses of worship, or teach Islamic studies. Those same leaders believe Christians and Hindus should be permitted greater religious freedom and political freedom. Such results reveal a clear distinction between the attitudes of mainstream Muslim leaders towards Ahmadiyah and Christians.

So what does the population as a whole think? Hefner suggests the public is concerned about a collapse of public morality in the post-Suharto era. This would make the
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population more receptive to narratives around morality. Political party leaders told Fealy that the polls tell them most Muslims do not like Ahmadiyah, resulting in the leaders not actively supporting that threatened minority.\(^\text{85}\) Fealy cites surveys revealing Indonesians believe they are tolerant, but that intolerance for some religious minorities in Indonesia is high by global standards. In 2012, 78 percent of Indonesian Muslims did not regard Ahmadis as Muslims, while their support for violence as a means of upholding religious principles increased from 10 percent to 20 percent (between 2005 and 2012).\(^\text{86}\) Despite the rise, 80 percent do not support violence as a means of upholding religious principles, despite the trend in support for violence. These numbers suggest the conservative anti-Ahmadiyah campaign during the Yudhoyono years has had an impact on mainstream opinion.

Local communities are a significant, and perhaps under-considered, factor in the issue of religious freedom, as Fealy says.\(^\text{87}\) Politicians pay attention to the majority, and politicians say speaking up for minorities does not win votes. Fealy quotes a leader of PAN who said it was not possible to support unpopular groups such as Ahmadiyah when they were threatened because the party would lose too many votes.\(^\text{88}\) Just as tellingly, a PKB leader said in 2012 the party would only support Ahmadiyah against persecution if Ahmadiyah donated enough money, which would be needed to win back votes that it would lose for standing up for Ahmadiyah. That is how politics works, he said.\(^\text{89}\) Fealy believes radical groups can only affect opinion to a limited extent because “mostly they have to work within the parameters of the local population’s opinion”.\(^\text{90}\)

What are the parameters of the population? Indonesian Muslims are highly aligned with sharia, with 71 percent of those polled in 2002 supporting the idea of the government requiring Muslims being required to follow sharia.\(^\text{91}\) This number is not clear-cut though, because further questioning revealed that only a large minority of survey respondents
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preferred politicians who advocate and struggle for the implementation of Islamic law. When it comes time to vote, sharia is not pivotal, as revealed in the earlier discussion and the election results in Table 5a. Rather, the priorities of most Indonesians, according to data from Feillard and Madinier, are the cost of basic necessities, jobs, healthcare, education, security and political instability.\(^92\) This might not be as contradictory as it seems though, because as Hosen notes, most Muslims’ understanding of sharia is “looser” and “more abstract” than those who seek sharia’s integration into law.\(^93\) Nevertheless, Islamist activists can influence voters and help set agendas that politicians respond to. Islamist organisations “foster hostility toward non-Muslim minorities” among the population, according to Jones.\(^94\) Wahid notes that Islamists have a strong influence over public opinion via the use of “a common religious language [which] makes radicals extremely dangerous, because it enables them to easily deceive many Muslims”\(^95\).

Islamists, and indeed anyone, hoping to influence local populations had more opportunities after the fall of Suharto, when the Indonesian political system decentralised. This directed more power to provincial and city level with fewer remaining national responsibilities: security and defence, foreign policy, justice, and religious affairs.\(^96\) Local politicians in decentralised democratic Indonesia have the potential to play into Christianisation fears for electoral gain. For example, requests for a permit under the houses of worship law became increasingly politicised in the attempt to win votes, Crouch writes.\(^97\) Buehler argues that competition among state elites unleashed by free elections, reforms to the party system and decentralisation led to the elites seeking new political allies to survive. In the process they became more receptive to societal groups’ demands “but only if these groups provide resources that help those
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elites gain and maintain power in Indonesian politics.” He cites evidence from gubernatorial elections in South Sulawesi province after 1998 showing state elites believe Islamist networks can provide “mobilisational, financial, and coercive resources important to entice voters… Often, sharia regulations have also served as a means to accumulate capital.” The sharia regulations have ended up raising money for the politicians, while local Islamist paramilitaries “many consisting of local thugs and petty criminals, frequently serve as election witnesses, intimidate voters, and act as ‘enforcers’ for local government heads”. Sharia creep in the regions might not be as clear a sign of national trends as some scholars, for example Abuza, have suggested, if these laws are largely enacted as part of local political maneuvering. Nevertheless, the apparent lack of commitment to implementing religion- or sharia-inspired regulations by local politicians leaves a political opportunity for radical Islamists to assume their role as enforcer of the laws (the laws they agree with).

**Piety**

Islamisation in Indonesia over the past 50 years has seen most non-Sunni or nominal Muslims (such as Java’s abangan) move to the orthodox Sunni centre, Hefner suggests. Ricklefs writes that while statistical evidence is limited, the group that had been abangan had probably moved from a majority to a minority over the Suharto years, as a result of the increase in the number of observant Muslims. He notes that the Islamisation process of the late 20th century seemed like the resumption of a process that had been occurring for centuries, but had been interrupted in the mid-19th to mid-20th century.

One inference I could draw is that the opinions of the local population might be more
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amenable to Islamist messages than they would have been in the past. The public supported police morality crackdowns on gambling, drinking and prostitution, according to Ricklefs. It is only one step from there to supporting vigilante crackdowns. Brenner writes that over previous decades the Islamic movement (gerakan Islam):

has been marked by a dramatic growth of interest in the study and practice of forms of Islam that have been purified of local heterodoxy... As a result, the influence of global Islam became increasingly visible in both public and private realms ... as seen in changing modes of piety, ethical decorum, social interaction, and styles of dress... the struggle to gain symbolic dominance over public morality has rested in part on disputes over the shifting boundaries and meanings of public and private.

Thus in the context of an Indonesian Islam that is more comprehensively orthodox Sunni, less syncretic and “Indonesian”, as well as more conspicuously pious, the realm of public morality has become a zone of competition. The battle for moral authority between liberal and conservative Muslims promises political rewards for victory. The struggle is particularly over identities. Hence the need to maintain the awareness that there are moral threats, via public demonstrations, attacks and incidents.

In democratic 21st century Indonesia, competition over religious symbols and institutions increased, which saw “populist preachers, neo-traditionalist Sufi masters, and secularly educated ‘new Muslim intellectuals’ challenge the monopoly of religious power earlier enjoyed by the ulama”. Hefner often notes great diversity and plurality exists within Indonesian Islam, and Islamisation is an ongoing process, the terms of which “remain highly contested, and for the moment the dominant discourses still balance Islamic values with a strong commitment to multiconfessional nationalism”. While Islamists and conservatives were effective in obtaining media attention and agenda-setting power in the early democratic era, van Bruinessen argues that various forms of Sufism seem to
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be more influential among the urban middle class. Howell concludes that neo-Sufi practice in particular emphasises “felt connection with the Divine as a basis for ethical social prescriptions” which “strongly reinforces tolerance for religious pluralism”.

Overall, in this context of a more pious Indonesia, many aspects of which were evident by the late Suharto era and were noted in chapter 3, Yudhoyono’s contribution is important. In addition to the outcomes noted above, Yudhoyono – via biographies and other political messaging before his election in 2004 – wrapped himself in pious metaphorical garments, the effect of which Ricklefs notes would have been that “many thousands of politicians and bureaucrats across Java [and indeed Indonesia] understood such messages”.

While increased piety in society contributed to the way moral issues were framed and perceived, so too did decades of legislation, regulation and fatwas. A good example is the status of intermarriage between religions, which seems to have affected attitudes towards minorities. Fealy quotes a Pew survey which found only 2 percent of Indonesian Muslim parents would let their daughter marry a non-Muslim (6 percent would allow sons). The head of Setara Institute says the low rate of intermarriage is because of the 1974 marriage laws, (not to mention the 1980 MUI fatwa against it), with far fewer interreligious marriages resulting in more segregation and religious homogeneity within families. The overall effect of this is a more tribal religious context, in which people spend less time with the religious Other, which in turn creates fewer opportunities to understand and empathise with the Other. Islamist narratives, especially those that involve threats to Islam or use the language of Islam, might well have more resonance with a more pious population.
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Fundamentalists and the people

The apparent level of support for fundamentalism is potentially reversible, says Kato, who questions the strength of the masses’ religious conviction and commitment. He argues that economic disenfranchisement drives popular support for the fundamentalists and their condemnation of government incompetence. Kato perceives something closer to a political alliance that could fade if the masses achieve their economic ambitions. Wilson has reached a similar conclusion about Islamic vigilantism, including FPI, which:

- is invoked spatially as a territorial identity in the defence of communities from perceived or actual encroachment from new or accelerated social forces. It is a defensive and reactive form of social conservatism, reflecting culturally embedded understandings of Islam that are often more parochial than radical despite the use of radical and militant symbolism. Looking behind the rhetorical stance of the FPI’s leadership and its ostensive concern with enforcing piety, public morality and conformity to its interpretation of Islam, the interests of urban poor members remained focused upon three key areas: defending notions of a socially heterogeneous and conservative community in the wake of demographic and socio-economic shifts; using this process as a means of increasing their own social and political capital; and having a means through which to voice generalized rather than specifically religious resentments and grievances at the state, social and political elites and the impacts of market capitalism.

Islamists might have serious moral motivations and ideological narratives, but that does not mean that those responding to them are doing so on the basis of the original intention. The analysis in this quotation raises a question I have barely touched upon, which is class, and the lack of access to power among the poor. Yudhoyono’s coalition appears to balance the interests of economic elites as well as conservative Islamic elites, among others. Wilson’s analysis also suggests that we not confuse rhetoric with more structural, underlying forces. The level of inequality in Indonesia is very high, and yet social unrest on that count is not a major issue. By gathering many of the most powerful
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religious forces and voices into his political tent, Yudhoyono is obtaining their political support and their acquiescence on his economic agenda, with all its vested interests and unequal distributions of wealth. That raises the question of just who is playing whom?

Conclusion

Harmony, stability and order are highly valued assets in the Indonesian public space, unsurprisingly after the mayhem of the mid-1960s, and the riots, pogroms and jihad at the turn of the century. As president, Yudhoyono was committed to maintaining order and stability. Since democracy has widened the civic space in Indonesia, Islamists have attempted to provoke the still-present fear of chaos, not unlike conservative elites who have also used such manipulation as part of maintaining their interests and control. An appeal to group loyalty (within Islam) against those cast as heretics, such as Ahmadiyah, is the politics of identity, tribalism and morality. Conservatives and Islamists have procured elite support via presidential backing for MUI and cabinet-level endorsement of FPI. The elites, including Yudhoyono, have in turn benefited from the support of Islamists, shoring up their political positions. Islamisation proceeds in Indonesia, but it has resulted in multiple and varied manifestations of Islam in Indonesia. This is despite the increasing influence of a puritanical, Arabic stream of Islam. Islamists do not enjoy the power they would like given their expectation that a Muslim-majority country would be run as, essentially, an Islamic country. Instead, they exist like other players within a competitive environment where they must woo and win support. This competition creates too much uncertainty for them though, and is one of the main aspects of religious life they are trying to change. As a movement for whom morality is fundamental, morality is central to the manner in which they communicate with and hope to influence Indonesian Muslims.

While Indonesia’s Islamists are a minority, they are able through commitment and organisation to exert influence beyond their numbers, attempting to bring ideas such as religious freedom into disrepute by their associations with Western or liberal
ideologies. They achieve such influence through their use of provocative demonstrations that gain media attention and provide a platform to call for legal changes in the name of restoring calm and order to the disturbed population. These groups undermine Indonesia’s constitutionalism and to some extent its democracy with their claims to a morally superior position with regard to the law.

The “core Muslim leadership”, however, have rejected the Islamists’ reasoning, according to Hefner, instead supporting “a political framework that could work with rather than against their community’s diversity”. As such, key players have opted for a pluralistic Indonesian nationalism over the Islamists’ version of Islamic domination, which involves an attempt by this ambitious minority to manipulate the population with scapegoating discourses. In that sense, persecution of religious minorities has not overwhelmed Indonesia, because Indonesia’s democracy is alive, albeit challenged by the plutocracy. This democratic resilience is a testimony, despite the lapses, to the strength of the system created by Indonesians for their still relatively young nation.

Indonesians have rejected authoritarianism at every post-Suharto national election, and have not opted to bring sharia into their legal system in any purposeful, thorough way, especially at the national level. There have, however, been so many instances of intolerance and persecution, including violence, and lapses of religious freedom, that the issue remains critical and pressing, and explanations important.

Next chapter, I will examine the treatment of minorities in the Bogor area in the period under examination, 2004-2014, with reference to the GKI Taman Yasmin case and Ahmadiyah. I will explore the links between local, national and transnational Islamist groups and their ideological narratives, and opposition to religious minorities. I will also explore how morality relates to the law in the context of the treatment of religious minorities.
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Chapter 6: RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE IN BOGOR?

In this chapter, I will examine the case of the GKI Bogor Yasmin church and some incidents relating to Ahmadiyah mosques in the Bogor area with reference to the interviews I conducted in Indonesia in 2014. Some factors involved in opposition to the church are local. Another factor is Islamist organisations with local, national and international Islamist connections. I break arguments against the building of the GKI Yasmin church into three categories: local concerns, contextual factors, and permit issues. A key feature among the permit issues is the fake signature argument. I will then examine some cases relating to Ahmadiyah, draw together relevant links between Islamist organisations, explore the meaning and relevance of their involvement, and situate their actions within their local, national and transnational context.

A group of Christians in Bogor, West Java, has been prevented from building a church on land it owns in the Taman Yasmin residential district. The congregation collected local signatures in 2002 and 2003 as required by regulations, before being granted a permit by the Bogor city government in 2006.¹ The permit was withdrawn in 2008 after local protests. The church subsequently won legal victories up to the Supreme Court, which in ruling that it could not hear the case reaffirmed the lower courts’ ruling in favour of the church.² The church also drew support from the Indonesian Ombudsman.³ Indonesian legal authorities ruled that the local government’s initial decision to allow construction was legitimate and there had been no grounds for rescinding it. Yet the church grounds remained sealed from 2008 through to the time of writing in 2016, with building prohibited by local authorities.

Interviewees told me that Bogor was a religiously tolerant community and that people lived in religious harmony.⁴ One political activist and head of a woman’s organisation said: “We live harmoniously between one religion and another. We care for each other
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and respect each other in practising our religion." Nonetheless, many arguments against the church emerge in my data from local residents, as well as some in favour of the church.

**Technical concerns**

One Bogor resident neatly summarised the reasons some people oppose the building of GKI Yasmin church based on local concerns such as traffic problems, impact on property values and their desire not to live near civil disturbances and conflict. A Muslim Taman Yasmin resident, who lives near the church site, said some of his neighbours do not oppose the church: “Some they just don’t care… I don’t care. But some of them said it shouldn’t be here… I think economic motive… value of property.” This Muslim resident believes that a church affects property prices on the basis that Muslims do not want to live near churches. Another resident who lives close to the church site objected to the activists against the Christians who were holding their Sunday service on the footpath outside the sealed church site: “Every Sunday there is blocking mob in the street, it disturb us, Christian or Muslim [residents] disturbed by this group.” By referring to Christians and Muslims, I understood this source to mean that it did not matter which religion the residents were, they could still be put off the idea of the church by the civil disturbances.

The nearby Muslim local resident, who has at times been a community leader, said: “If you want to build something here and then the society say no, you have to choose; you build here and then you get confrontation. Or you can accommodate what they want.” In other words, to avoid confrontation about building a church, do not try to build a church where people will object. This argument is similar to the harmony, stability and order argument. The bigger problem with the argument is that it ignores the legality of church permits and the fact that in gathering 267 signatures in 2002 and 2003, the
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church did attempt to find consensus and permission. Activists against the church can exploit such arguments, by protesting, making noise and generating conflict.

**Contextual issues**

One local summarised a point about West Java’s religiosity: “West Java is very different than other, compare to central and east. More conservative... For example, the Islamic law supporter is high, formalisation of sharia also higher.”

It is often said that West Java is a conservative province. Evidence includes that the Darul Islam movement of the 1950s and 60s was strongest in West Java. West Java is Indonesia’s largest province by population, so perhaps it is unsurprising that Setara Institute reported that it was the province with the highest number of violations of religious freedom in the period 2007 to 2014, totalling 494. Ahmad Heryawan, the governor of West Java since April 2008, is a PKS party member. He has called for the banning of jaipongan folk dancing for being too provocative. Heryawan apparently made deals with FPI in his successful 2012 re-election bid, promising in writing to outlaw Ahmadiyah.

Another issue is the ethnic identity of the group trying to establish a place of worship. A Taman Yasmin resident said: “This church, Bataknese church always have problem… Batak people more open, just like me, more straight-forward, sometime more aggressive. This is creating problem in the community. Many place in Tangerang, in Bekasi, always Bataknese church, not Javanese church.” While the argument about assertiveness of Batak people compared with Javanese or Sundanese might resonate with some people, the related and perhaps more relevant factor is that Batak people come from a region in Sumatra. Thus they are often economic migrants from a low-development area moving
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to the high-development areas around Jakarta, such as Bogor, Bekasi and Tangerang.\textsuperscript{17} Identifiable new groups competing for jobs, land and other resources are a potential cause of conflict, as Wilson notes at the end of the previous chapter. Resentment towards Chinese Indonesians burst into violence several times in 20\textsuperscript{th} century Indonesia. In the Suharto era, Chinese Indonesians were associated with cronyism and overriding local concerns about development, as well as with an increasing sense of growth of Christian churches in devout Muslim-majority neighbourhoods.\textsuperscript{18} Such attitudes towards Chinese Indonesians contributed to the fear of Christianisation.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Permit issues}

Local residents also mentioned concerns over permits and regulations. One local community leader, who lives near the church site, explained why it was important to consider who had signed approval of the church construction, and who had not: “It should be signed by the people influenced by this. Not from outside… not from outside. That’s the problem.”\textsuperscript{20} The question for this resident is not about the law, or has the church followed regulations, but what he thinks the law should consider (him and his neighbours), because they are closest to the church site. Implicit in this argument is a hierarchy topped by location, with the people nearest having a right to be consulted and a right to veto. It seems the hierarchy argument is moral, rather than legal, a moral argument privileging his own opinion above the law. This ‘our approval is required’ argument bears similarities to the argument by Islamist activist groups such as FPI, detailed in chapter 4, which places FPI’s moral assertions based on interpretations of Islam above the national law. The ‘our approval is required’ argument places the opinion of local residents above the law in arguing that it does not matter what the law says, because only one thing matters: our approval. Residents who hold this opinion use it to justify their support for the local authorities’ decision to prevent construction of the church.

\textsuperscript{17} International Crisis Group, Indonesia: ‘Christianisation’ and Intolerance.  
\textsuperscript{18} Sidel, “On the ‘Anxiety of Incompleteness’.”  
\textsuperscript{19} Arifianto, “Explaining the Cause of Muslim-Christian Conflicts in Indonesia.”  
\textsuperscript{20} Interview with Taman Yasmin resident 2, very close to church site, Bogor, September 11, 2014.
Some Islamist activists claim they became active in order to help local people. A Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia member described a demonstration at Bogor city hall:

We [HTI] did the demonstration together with other Muslim groups such as KMB [Keluarga Muslim Bogor]… It was started from a Muslim group in Yasmin area. They were shocked when they saw the church being built. They had never signed anything approving the church. Then they discovered the church had manipulated the list of attendance in an RT [local community] meeting. This list was claimed as approval. It fired the demonstration and then we joined them.21

Political activism is predicated on the “fake signatures” argument linked with the “our approval is required” argument. There are two arguments. Firstly, “our approval is required” but has not been granted. It implicitly suggests the law did the wrong thing by the people. Secondly, “fake signatures” suggests the church did the wrong thing by the law. Both are moral arguments, defining right and wrong. In the quotation from the HTI member, the claim about the fake signatures is almost certainly erroneous, as I will explain below. The church did not use the contentious signatures in its application, which was completed years before. I will elaborate on this issue because of its national implications, its use within Islamists’ ideological narratives and its centrality to the prevention of the church building.

Fake signatures

The fake signature argument, widely used in Bogor, is worth examining because it is also used elsewhere Indonesia, such as Bekasi.22 The allegation provides support for Islamists’ moral arguments and ideological narratives. The fake signatures argument fits within a discourse about the illegitimacy of the process. By raising doubt about the legality of the process, the activists have created a sense of the church as cheating. A local resident leader continually refers to the opinions and preferences of the community he belongs to: “They [the community] think they [the church] are cheating about the sign [signature] and you know for some people if you are cheating and then we cannot trust you

21 Interview with member of HTI’s women’s arm, Bogor, September 12, 2014.
22 Human Rights Watch, In Religion’s Name, 54.
anymore. That’s the problem.” The issue of trust and the alleged bad behaviour of Christians outlined here is an example of moral arguments against a minority community undermining trust. This aligns with broader Islamist narratives about the untrustworthy nature of Christians and the West’s moral failings and attacks on Islam.

Diani Budiarto, as mayor, was ultimately responsible for cancelling the permit to build. In 2008, Mayor Budiarto argued that the permit freeze was temporary and was due to Muslim activist protests. By 2010 he was arguing: “This is about a permit that is legally flawed because a community leader faked signatures of residents to procure it.” At other times, including in 2011, Mayor Budiarto also used the Muslim street scholar argument, which says the church should not be located on a street named after a Muslim scholar.

Hamdani argues that in the Bogor GKI Taman Yasmin case and in Indonesia generally, “radical Muslim groups will continuously trigger various social and cultural problems both with non-Muslims and moderate Muslim groups due to their conflicting ideology with the democratic and legal principles”. I discussed a number of these groups in the previous chapters, including FUI (Forum Umat Islam; Islamic Community Forum), FPI (Front Pembela Islam; Islamic Defenders Front) and HTI (Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia). FUI has had close links to HTI in the past, and senior members include those who warn loudly of the perils of Christianisation and call for the restoration of the caliphate.

Another group involved in GKI Yasmin protests has been the local Taman Yasmin-based Forkami (Forum Komunikasi Masyarakat Muslim Indonesia: Indonesian Muslim Society Communications Forum). Forkami’s chairman, Ahmad Iman, said the group was coordinated by FUI: “We report our activities to the FUI.” Forkami apparently developed in 2009 and 2010 out of Taman Yasmin-area Islamic prayer groups to prevent
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the church being built, ultimately making an alliance with FUI. A Forkami activist, its secretary Ayu Agustin, was quoted in the Jakarta Globe just before Christmas in 2011, as saying the group had evidence of the fake signatures, and so:

‘Forkami will always push security forces to disperse the congregation from the [church’s] sidewalk,’ she said... ‘It was proven that when we didn’t push hard enough, the congregation even dared to use musical instruments and sing... If they insist, we will act according to our Islamic law... This is the land of Muslims.’

Several Islamist themes appear in this quotation. One is that Islamists have to push the state agencies, such as the police, to act against Christians. The fake signature argument is one of the justifications Islamists use to encourage police action to prevent Christian worship at the site. Another Islamist theme in this quotation is that leaders of Forkami, a local civil society organisation, believe the group can act to prevent other civic actors (Christians in this case) from carrying out activities of which it disapproves. The justification for acting as a quasi-police force is the fake signature argument as well as “our Islamic law”. This is another instance promoting an interpretation of Islam, framed as Islamic law, as above Indonesian law. “This is the land of Muslims” is a tribal statement of territory and dominance that says in six words more about the activists’ motivation in opposing the church than a book full of arguments about street names or signature forgery. In this argument, this activist is co-opting a large group of people without their consent. Forkami is a self-appointed voice of Muslims claiming the right to define what Muslims believe in relation to the GKI Yasmin church. The signatures of approval from hundreds of local residents gathered by the GKI Yasmin congregation as part of the regulatory process acts as a strong counter argument. The church’s argument is supported by court and ombudsman rulings that the church building is legally approved and legitimate. That might explain why the signatures needed to be undermined. The legality of the church’s building process challenges the assertion of Islamist activists that the people do not want the church built in this location. It was politically advantageous to the Islamists for doubt about the signature process to arise.
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This discourse of the people’s will, as defined by activists, backed with the weight of “our Islamic law” establishes an apparent clash between local desires and national law. The “we” are not Indonesians ruled by Indonesian law, but Muslims ruled by Islamic law. The foregrounding of Islamic identity precludes the Indonesian identity. The contest is not merely about whether or not to have a church, but about who decides whether it is permitted. The Islamists’ assertion of a right to speak on behalf of local Muslims against the church is an assertion of power, of Islamic power against state power.

Mayor Budiarto denied his revoking of the permit to build was about religion, explaining to a newspaper in 2011: “This is about a permit that is legally flawed because a community leader faked signatures of residents to procure it.” However, there is considerable doubt about whether this occurred. In the Bogor GKI Yasmin case, the mayor and Islamist activists rely on the conviction of a local man, Munir Karta, for their fake signature argument. The Indonesian Ombudsman said the Munir Karta case was irrelevant, because the church relied on two other petitions with 170 and 97 signatures from 2002 and 2003 for its legitimately obtained permit.

The signatures in dispute in the Munir Karta case appear to have been collected as a record of a community meeting in 2006 but were only filed to the local government by another local community leader in 2010, long after the church was approved and the dispute had become heated. Nevertheless, Karta was convicted in 2011 over a list of 10 signatures of local residents. The case against him claimed these misrepresented support for the building of GKI Yasmin. Karta said later that he had signed a police deposition under pressure from Forkami: “I was all alone seated there [at the police station] and was forced to follow what [Forkami] members said, and I now regret that.”
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Forkami’s efforts do not stop at legal arguments. There have been several documented attempts by Forkami members to harass and intimidate local community members into opposing the construction of the church.\textsuperscript{36} This forms part of a pattern of harassment by activist groups, such as when the GKI congregation were forced off the street on Sundays to worship in nearby private homes, Hamdani writes: “Some of them brought weapon and threatened the members of congregation, visitors from House of Representative and human right activists.”\textsuperscript{17}

Despite the legal irrelevance of the Munir Karta case, and the doubts about the conviction, many Bogor residents cite the fake signature allegation as their first and main reason for opposing GKI Yasmin church being built, or as the explanation for why others oppose the church. My evidence for this assertion is a range of interviews with Bogor residents. A Bogor PDI-P politician said: “The permit issued... is not good because at the beginning they have false signature.”\textsuperscript{38} The publisher of a local daily newspaper, whose office is situated directly across the street from the vacant church site with its half-built church said: “Regarding the legal permit, it was aborted by the court because of the fake signatures. So the main issue wasn’t about religious freedom, it was about the legal permit of the church.”\textsuperscript{39} The permit had been withdrawn by the mayor, but not by a court and long before the fake signature case arose. A number of other sources cited the fake signatures as the reason for the failure of the church to have a permit, sometimes in addition to the technical reasons already detailed.

Apart from expressing the views of his fellow residents, this local resident also has his own opinion:

In this case, as a Muslim, I don’t like... Because most of us is a Muslim, and I know that some of the church is using as a basis for, try to influence another people to become Christian. So we don’t want to do that because mosque, we have several mosques here and they do the intensive pengajian [study, teaching], meeting with our group. So if there
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is one group here, one group here, the location is very near I’m afraid it will be potential conflict among these two groups.\textsuperscript{40}

This local resident has expressed his judgment with an identification of himself as a Muslim, rather than as an Indonesian, which is consistent with the idea that people make assessments of a situation through the prism of a group’s identity if that identity is salient or active. His argument appears to be a combination of a stability and order argument, and an anti-proselytisation argument, combined with the previous argument about fake signatures. All these arguments were expressed despite this man’s earlier assertion of tolerance – and indeed friendship – between religions. This is not necessarily inconsistent. Menchik surveyed NU and Muhammadiyah elites and found that 82 percent were comfortable living next door to a Christian, while 20 percent would approve the building of a church in their neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{41} It is possible to draw parallels with the general population, because Menchik cites surveys that show 84 percent of Indonesians would be willing to live next door to a person from another religion. The distinction here is that Indonesians seem able to distinguish between tolerance of individuals and tolerance towards an institution, such as a church. A neighbouring Christian is not necessarily a proselytising Christian. I posit that Christians pose little or no threat to most Indonesian Muslims, unless they proselytise or attempt to build new churches.

Such was the consistency of the Muslim interviewees’ statements about Bogor’s tolerance, as well as the pattern of saying fake signatures caused the church’s problems, that I argue they are related discourses. On the one hand, Bogor is overtly and demonstrably tolerant, with Christians able to worship freely (in existing churches), albeit not always as near to their homes as they might prefer. On the other hand, there have been stark instances of religious intolerance against Ahmadiyah in Parung, near Bogor, and elsewhere, as well as against Christians hoping to build their GKI Yasmin church. One of the GKI congregation’s activist leaders perceives the situation in this way:

\textsuperscript{40} Interview with Taman Yasmin resident 2, very close to church site, Bogor, September 11, 2014.
I think there is a tendency just to keep kind of an illusion Indonesia as a really tolerant country. I mean, in general yes, but covering up cases like what happen with us, what happen with Ahmadiyah, what happen with the Shia... And why do they keep saying about regulation? It’s just to make it people will think that really there is no problem about intolerance in Indonesia, while actually it exists.42

I suggest the fake signature discourse allows Bogor residents to maintain their sense of living in a tolerant, religiously free and untroubled community without having to closely examine the reality of the GKI Yasmin case. What, then, is the reality? One Bogor resident, an Islamic studies teacher, conducted in-depth research on the GKI church dispute, producing a thorough report.43 He said:

In 2008, we held a local election. There was a new provocation. It was run by certain groups. The so-called militant radical such as KMB [Keluarga Muslim Bogor; Bogor Muslim Family], HTI. They took benefit from the election momentum to push the mayor withdraws the IMB [church building permit]... They will vote for him as long as he withdraw the church IMB... They built opinion among the community that the biggest mission in Southeast Asia will be located here.44

The first point is local electoral politics, pressuring politicians with a threat not to vote for them. The Christian activist leader sees it this way: “This situation was started when Diani Budiarto, the previous mayor, was trying to get the seat for the second time, when he was then get a deputy mayor from PKS party.”45 The church activist believed formal politics played a role, PKS in particular. The deputy mayor of Bogor, Ahmad Ruhayat, belonged to the Islamist PKS party, which was part of a coalition that supported Budiarto, was also involved in some decisions about the church site’s closure.46

The second point, on a potential Christian mission, is (admittedly anecdotal) evidence by an informal expert of activists’ attempts to reinforce the Islamist discourse about Christian
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proselytisation using an immense exaggeration. One Taman Yasmin resident who was also a former local Nahdlatul Ulama leader said the opposition by activists, that is Islamist groups, was not necessarily about signatures, but about Christians. “They refuse at all, don’t build the church here. I was invited in a meeting some religious leaders and I know that some of them try to refuse the building of the church in Bogor. So for whatever reasons. Any church. Any new church.” The groups he referred to were opposed to the development of other religions. He said they were FPI and HTI.

The suggestion revealed by this interviewee that FPI and HTI were involved in the opposition to the church because they always oppose new churches is worth examining. An HTI spokeswoman, who lives in Bogor, said: “The Christian community, they didn’t follow the rules. They manipulate signature of some people around the building.” Yet the spokeswoman continued with an argument that had no relationship with the legality of the process, but related to her interpretation of the houses of worship laws as being about “the number of followers of religion in that area”, and therefore:

in this case, the GKI Yasmin I think the best policy is not giving the permit because the majority is Muslim and then the Christian in that place is only some number, so when there is a church there the one coming to the church is not people from around the place, but people from other places, even from other cities.

When combined with the Forkami spokeswoman’s statement above that “this is the land of Muslims”, there appears to be an Islamist argument to limit the growth of Christianity in so-called Muslim areas. It is worth noting, and fair to note, that like other Muslims, this HTI spokeswoman says Christians can and do worship in Bogor and Indonesia. However, if these Christians want to build a new church, they should do so where “there are relatively big number of Christian, so in that area it is possible and it is their right to build their church”. This quotation seems to say that majority Muslim areas get no new churches, but majority Christian areas could get new churches. This seems similar to an
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argument for segregation. It suggests that no new churches is what the Islamists want, and the arguments used to achieve that goal, moral or legal, are justifications to help them get what they want.

An example of activists from elsewhere is Garis (Gerakan Islam Reformis: Islamic Reform Movement), a Cianjur-based group with links to Darul Islam. Its leader, Chep Hernawan, established the group in 1998, and its actions have included campaigns against Ahmadiyah since 2005, and against a pilgrimage at a Catholic monastery in 2007. Hamdani notes that Garis has at times mobilised 200 to 300 militant supporters against GKI Yasmin church, coordinating activities with FUI, FPI, HTI, KMB (Keluarga Muslim Bogor: Bogor Muslim Family), and the local Forkami group. Garis sent members to Bogor every Sunday to confront the GKI Yasmin congregation and their supporters in front of their abandoned church, where they were holding makeshift services. During the Suharto era, Hernawan – who is suspected of talent scouting for Jemaah Islamiyah – was an activist with the student group GPI (Gerakan Pemuda Islam: Islamic Youth Movement), which supports the establishment of an Islamic state and sent hundreds of jihadis to Afghanistan in late 2001 to fight with the Taliban against the US.

In 2014, Hernawan said he had been appointed president of the Indonesian chapter of ISIS (Islamic State in Iraq and Syria) and had recruited jihadis to send to the Middle East to fight with them. Hernawan had been encouraged to set up a mass-based militant organisation by leaders from DDII (Dewan Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia; Council of Indonesia for the Propagation of Islam), which as previously detailed had developed an anti-Christianisation, anti-Zionist and anti-Western discourse.

The national MUI has also opposed the construction of GKI Yasmin, including support

52 Human Rights Watch, In Religion’s Name, 28.
53 Hamdani, "Radical Muslim Groups and Confrontation to Church [GKI]."
54 Abuza, Political Islam and Violence in Indonesia, 72.
56 Hamdani, "Radical Muslim Groups and Confrontation to Church [GKI]."
for Bogor Mayor Budiarto in defying the Supreme Court decision. While Mayor Budiarto’s actions and decisions can be seen at least partly as “sharia policymaking... an investment strategy aimed at establishing and reproducing social relationships that can be used by local state elites to gain or maintain power”, the same reasoning cannot apply to MUI. The GKI Yasmin issue is bigger than local politics, the support from MUI and other organisations strongly suggests. Instead of this being a case of genuine outrage and concern about a particular legal breach – fake signatures – I argue this case fits into the pattern of harassment of churches around Indonesia, the dimensions of which have been explained in chapter 2 based on research by Setara Institute and other sources. The Islamist activists deploy ideological narratives that help to mobilise support against imagined enemies or threats. Islamists tell the story of the GKI Yasmin church as one in which Islamic activist heroes oppose church construction and villainous Christians cheat their way to a building permit. The angry confrontations at the closed church site are one means of vanquishing the evil misdeed, and the balanced and proper state is a Muslim-majority community that should not have to experience the existence of an alien entity, a church, in its midst.

There is a connection between these activist actions against minorities, their ideological narratives and morality. Morality serves to bind groups together, making them more functional, but also to justify actions towards outgroups that would not be tolerated towards the ingroup. Haidt suggests racism can be taught by triggering disgust towards other groups, for being dirty, or anger can generated towards them because of their cheating. Indonesian Islamists have associated their religious opponents with filthy matter as part of the process of creating the Other. My data shows a pattern of belief among interviewees in Bogor that the GKI Yasmin had been proven to have cheated in their application for a church-building permit. However, there is credible evidence that they did not cheat, and that the cheating allegations were fabricated, or at least
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irrelevant, albeit widely believed.\textsuperscript{61} I conclude that it is easier for people who believe in religious tolerance to agree with the prevention of establishing a church if there is some justification, such as the wrongdoing of the church. It appears that Islamist activists have attempted to create the impression of cheating in the Bogor GKI Yasmin case to further their cause.\textsuperscript{62} This in turn allows tolerant people to justify intolerant actions, in the case of the community, and in the case of the activists, a cover under which intolerant people can attempt to deny their actions are intolerant in an effort to secure more support.

**Ahmadiyah**

The Ahmadiyah communities in and around Bogor are subject to different dynamics than Christians. Yet despite these different religions being persecuted for different reasons, Ahmadiyah and GKI Yasmin Christians are targeted by the same groups. Garis leader Hernawan has admitted responsibility for attacks on an Ahmadiyah community in Sukadana in September 2005.\textsuperscript{63} In the Bogor area, FPI was involved in the attack on Ahmadiyah’s national headquarters in 2005.\textsuperscript{64} FUI was formed in the wake of the MUI fatwas against Ahmadiyah, and HTI and FPI were two of its core groups.\textsuperscript{65} FPI, HTI, Garis and FUI have all been closely involved in the actions against GKI Yasmin and Ahmadiyah, as detailed. This cannot be a coincidence. The shared targets and cooperation reveal a mutual intention, the unifying factor being their common ideology of Islamism. They present their attacks and harassment of these religious minorities as defence of Islam, against heresy and deviance in the case of Ahmadiyah, and against proselytisation and Western imperialist aggression, in the case of Christians.

In previous chapters I detailed some aspects of Islamists’ ideological narrative against Ahmadiyah. During my interviewees with Ahmadiyah community members and leaders, they mentioned different ways that they were described or labelled by those who attacked them or intimidated them, including this reference to the Islamist-led attack on

\textsuperscript{61} Hamdani, “Radical Muslim Groups and Confrontation to Church [GKI].”

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{63} Robertson, “Indonesia: Guarantee Freedom of Religion and Stop Attacks on Ahmadiyah. Letter to President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.”

\textsuperscript{64} McCoy, “Purifying Islam in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia.”

\textsuperscript{65} International Crisis Group, *Indonesia: Implications of the Ahmadiyah Decree*, 78.
their national headquarters in Parung in July 2005: “We were discriminated against. They yelled ‘Murtad’, [traitor to the religion]... They also used the word ‘Kafir’, [not within Islam]... If I go to the market, they throw stones and shouted at me. There was someone who shouted ‘I will beat you down!’” These words are consistent with the narrative that depicts Ahmadiyah as heretics or deviants. On some occasions, that is precisely the way they were referred to by people intending to accuse them, calling out: “Sesat... gone astray, not the real Muslim. They said Ahmadiyah is deviate and led astray.”

I have detailed in previous chapters the other labeling that Ahmadiyah receives, including some that are apparently imported from Pakistan, which is the global centre of discrimination against Ahmadiyah. I have previously noted that the origins of the rejection of Ahmadiyah date to the 1920 and 1930s, and to Sukarno in the 1960s. Ahmadis see a direct link to Islamic politics in Pakistan, with a senior leader describing the response in Indonesia:

After 1974 when something moved in Pakistan, so they try to make intolerance to Ahmadiyah community. After 80s the ambassador of different countries especially Muslim countries try to influence the Muslim country to act upon the tradition in Pakistan against Ahmadiyah. Before that, it’s OK, we were in peace, free in conveying Ahmadiyah message.

This quotation situates the response to Ahmadiyah in a global Islamist context, a point that Menchik notes when he writes that in 1974 the Organisation of Islamic States urged Muslims worldwide to declare Ahmadis a non-Muslim minority, with Indonesia’s MUI subsequently issuing a fatwa in 1980 that classed them as heretical.

Ahmadis also blame petro-Islam, or Saudi promotion of Wahhabi doctrine, for increased persecution:

Wahhabi. They dropped a lot of money to ban Ahmadiyah. They will give the money to
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those who ban Ahmadiyah, burn the mosque, lock the mosque, and destroy the
mosque… Only to shifting the issue, instead of focusing on corruption or government
official mistakes… This is an opportunity for them to get money from Arab countries.70

This quotation suggests scapegoating of Ahmadiyah might advantage elites by focusing
attention away from corruption and bad government. The suggestion that Saudi money
influences events in Indonesia rests on solid ground. The July 2005 attacks on the Parung
headquarters were co-ordinated by LPPI (Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengkajian Islam:
Islamic Research and Study Institute) led by Amin Djamaluddin.71 The Saudi-funded LPPI
is focused on opposing “deviant sects”, has links to Persatuan Islam (Persis) and FUI and
is credited with persuading the attorney-general’s office and the ministry of religion to
take a stand against Ahmadiyah, leading to the 2008 ministerial decree banning teaching
of its faith.72

The evidence of the transnational character of the campaign against Ahmadiyah ranges
from Saudi funding through to groups with explicit international networks such as HTI,
and other Islamist groups with national networks that have international connections
with Saudi Arabia (FPI) and ISIS (Garis), among others. Given Islamists concern with
international issues, be it US hegemony, or the fate of Palestinians, it seems their
influences are national and global, while they are expressed locally. All these factors
interact, with the local and national aspects constituting Indonesia’s particular
characteristics within the global Islamic and Islamist diversity.

The French scholar of Islamism Olivier Roy referred to religion in a globalised world,
writing that fundamentalism breaks away from culture and promotes identification with
people of the same faith, as opposed to an accommodationist position in which “the
believer can share a common culture and values with the non-believer”.73

Fundamentalists thus see a secular state as pagan and the space for accommodation non-
existent, leading to a deculturating of religion which defines a religious purity that:
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transforms the gap between believer and non-believer into a barrier… all the intermediary spaces of non-practising believers, nominal followers, culturally religious non-believers are vanishing… Believers feel themselves to be minorities surrounded by an atheist, pornographic, materialistic, secular culture which worships false gods.\textsuperscript{74}

This description resembles aspects of the Islamisation of Indonesia. The last sentence in the quotation is similar to the situation in 21\textsuperscript{st} century Indonesia, in which Islamists see themselves as holding back a tide of pornography and porno-action in just such a materialistic, secular culture. Furthermore, in the early to mid-20\textsuperscript{th} century, the modernists began attempts to remove syncretic practices. Islamists have constructed a barrier between believers and non-believers, fostering a sense of being under siege while they seek to define and impose orthodoxy. Christians are protected by Pancasila and state freedom of religion laws, as well as by the concept of dhimmitude, which promises protection to people of the book. The Ahmadiyah are more marginalised than Christians due to their alleged heretical status and by virtue of attempts to declare them outside Islam. But what is this heretical status?

Burhani argues that heresy is not an objective state, and deviance not inherent in a person or a group, but conferred by others. “Is there any boundary that separates reformer from heretic? … The boundary is blurred.”\textsuperscript{75} Instead of Ahmadiyah having a difference of opinion with fellow believers with whom they share so much, Ahmadiyah are framed as heretics and their opinions become an attack on the rest of Islam and its institutionalised ways of speaking about the world. Zito notes: “It is therefore a thing of distinctly social kind, directly related to social deviance… the labelling of some statement as heretical must be performed by some authoritative group constituting a moral community.”\textsuperscript{76} The act of proclaiming a group heretical is an assertion of power, while a successful attempt is the consolidation of that power.

I described in chapter 3 Menchik’s analysis that Ahmadiyah served a role in the 1930s and 1940s as the act of exclusion which “helped to congeal the fractious Muslim groups
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and contributed to the institutional foundation for the postcolonial state”. The binding role of the Ahmadiyah threat continues to the present with the group playing the role of villain in an ideological narrative that presents non-orthodox expressions of Islam as attacks on Islam, in some ways reflecting power struggles within the Islamic community internationally. In this case, a crucial aspect of the threat is towards a sacred object, Muhammad, and his status as the final prophet. Ahmadiyah members are vulnerable because of the status they grant their founder-guru Ahmad, a status that Muslim orthodoxy casts as heretical. Ahmadiyah occupies a different space to Christians, the space on the margins of Islam or outside as defined by some, in the zone of heresy.

Conclusion

The threat of Christian proselytisation, in contrast, is the threat of a competitor, of being outnumbered and of apostasy. Ahmadiyah and Christians share the role of being cast as a threat to orthodox Sunni Islam by those who seek to define and shape orthodoxy. Both these minorities have productive roles in generating fear among Muslims that benefits Islamist elites. The targeting of GKI Yasmin seen this way is not about permits but its role in the Islamist narrative, a manufactured threat exacerbated by a contrived fake signature outrage that serves to remind Muslims that certain Islamist groups have a right to and are protecting their spiritual territory.

In this chapter, I have outlined three categories of reasons that Bogor residents believe explain the GKI Taman Yasmin church has not been built: local concerns, contextual issues and permit issues. Underlying these, however, is an Islamist activist agenda that connects these local actions with national and international patterns of Islamist thought and behaviour. These connections include links to jihadi networks and international power struggles within the Islamic world. GKI church and Ahmadiyah centres of worship, including in Parung, Bogor, are territories in the symbolic battleground of the righteous fight for Islamic purity in the face of the threat of the religious Other. Morality plays a role in justifying actions against the Other, who are cast as the villain in an
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ideological narrative that sees Islamists as the heroes and territory governed under sharia law as the utopian goal.
CONCLUSION

During the 20th century, Indonesia underwent significant Islamisation, which only served to heighten the competition to define Islam. In the early 21st century, Islamists aligned with conservatives on issues including the problem of deviancy. MUI fatwas in 2005 provided a foundation for a conservative and Islamist alliance to pressure national, regional and local governments for responses to their concerns, including deviancy. A mutually beneficial arrangement produced conservative/Islamist alliance support for President Yudhoyono, while the president supported the alliance’s leadership on Islamic matters, via MUI and various appointments he made. The win/win for this coalition of networks was a loss for Indonesia’s religious minorities. Fealy presents strong evidence that pressure from conservative elements of the mainstream groups NU and Muhammadiyah had at least as much influence as radical Islamists on the decision to issue the 2008 joint ministerial decree on deviancy. Members of Ahmadiyah were the principal victims of this push. But conservatives and Islamists were not so united in response to Christians, with radical Islamists taking a hard line.

So, what role did morality play? Threat is the common element in the persecution of minorities in Indonesia. Morality as understood in moral foundations theory is a mechanism that responds to threats, and those threats are to the group. Therefore morality extends to the boundaries of the group. Islamists assign right to themselves and wrong to the Other, in this case religious minorities. While morality appears to motivate Islamists’ desire to protect Islam, it also justifies their persecution of minorities, by inviting Muslims to see the world in binary terms, us and them, Islam against the unbeliever or heretic. A shared belief within a group that another group is evil is a precondition for inflicting idealistic violence on them; an act of evil in response; a defensive act. Idealistic evil or violence is “nearly always fostered by groups, as opposed to individuals” and is most likely to happen across divides between moral visions or
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worlds. This sense that the other group is doing evil is related to the sense that they are a threat.

Perspective explains the contradiction by which two groups can label each other as evil. Each group lacks insight into the other’s perspective. Empathy is missing when someone fails to perceive another’s perspective. Empathy is antithetical to selfishness (and tribalism: group selfishness) but is instead “a dignifying experience precisely because, as a witness to someone else’s emotional experience, one is transported out of oneself”. I have detailed the Islamist positioning of the US as evil. Islamists are not wrong in an objective sense. They stand within their perspective, in this case a distinct worldview, separate from other worldviews such as capitalist democracy. Moral outrage is part of an argument about moral norms, or people’s neglect of moral norms; a process of holding people to account.

It is easy to see the international human rights agenda from the West’s perspective. From an Islamist perspective, human rights, like freedom, are part of an alien ideology being forced upon the world. “Capitalism and democracy lead to freedom values, which break Islamic values, Islamic rules,” a Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia leader said. A range of Islamists and conservatives – including within mainstream groups such as NU and within the Yudhoyono government – share this perspective. This view was expressed in the MUI fatwa against secularism, pluralism and liberalism. In a sense, the notion of godly nationalism is part of Menchik’s effort to see the Muslim perspective “beyond the secular-liberal conception that dominates scholarship on religious pluralism,” which allows him to argue that Islamic organisations are tolerant but not liberal.

If freedom means free to consume in malls, consume drugs or alcohol, to consume immoral services such as prostitution, is freedom positive? Is freedom objectively good? Or is freedom a Western notion that ultimately privileges power, the law of the jungle?
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Islam, and indeed religion in general, as Haidt notes, offers an alternative to the indulgence of profane desires. Religions offer not only a moral order that allows everyone to live together, but also a series of activities (prayer, spiritual life, social service) that allow people to focus on noble themes, longer-term goals, and other people. At the same time, the rituals bind people together in their groups.

The problem lies not in the perspective or the argument, but in when a moral position becomes absolutist. Isaiah Berlin warns that “unbridled monism… some call it fanaticism, but monism is at the root of every extremism”. The argument for instituting sharia law is that it is God’s law and the right thing to do. If instituted by Islamic fundamentalists as part of an “absolutist universalism”, as Tibi expresses it, it becomes one aspect of a transnational effort to undo the international order of nation-state superstructures that was imposed “after the West’s dissolution of the Islamic order” in the period of European colonialism. Following this line of reasoning, instituting sharia law nationally in Indonesia would increase the clerics’ power at the expense of democracy. There is also a possibility that any Islamic state would develop in an authoritarian direction, as with Iran or the Taliban in Afghanistan. Possibilities such as these have led Tibi to describe Islamic fundamentalism as the “most serious challenge to secular democracy” globally. From an Islamist perspective that is not bad, because theirs is a project that resists Western imperialism and defends Islam, Islamic culture and the ummah against the threat of alien and hegemonic ideology.

After the New Order, democracy created the space for competition for power. Versions of Islam have to compete with other viewpoints, ideologies and interests. In this competition, Islamists deploy ideological narratives that situate their global struggles for justice and Islamic dominance in Muslim lands against religious freedom. Feillard and Madinier conclude Islamism is a tempting “simplistic explanation… [an] unquestionable norm in a relativist world… [and] the temptation of an instrumentalisation for social or
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political ends”. In other words, Islamism uses a simplified form of Islam to achieve political goals. With the physical absence of God on Earth, and democracy considered illegitimate, many Islamists position themselves as moral judges and the legitimate political leaders in a drive for power that tends towards the totalitarian. Many conservative Muslims, and their Islamist allies, take Islam as their sole or dominant identity and ideological influence. More liberal Muslims, however, accept that secular nationalism is a part of the Indonesian political fabric and constitution. As such, secular nationalism, democracy and liberal versions of Islam are all in competition with a conservative version of Islam.

Morality helps confirm people’s righteousness within this confusing, competitive environment. Morality is determined within a group, and perspective is critical in the sense that someone’s group membership and perspective critically influences their morality. Morality is ultimately part of a mechanism that supports a power structure, but from inside an individual’s perspective it appears to be the truth. Conservative Muslims in Indonesia, including Islamists, are resisting American-flavoured modernity as it thrusts people out of their traditional world into the individualistic world that is Western in origin and emitting a neo-colonial aroma. They reject the aspects of Western thinking they see as threatening to Islam. Christianity, democracy, secularism, Judaism, human rights, women’s rights, individualism, and consumerism all challenge Islam on some level (as Islam challenges them in return). Christians within Indonesia are a threat, explicitly because of proselytisation (if enough Muslims convert eventually there will be no Islam) and by association (Christians represent the imperialistic West remnant in Indonesia).

The data I collected in Bogor and the literature show that Islamists played a significant role in the persecution of Ahmadiyah members in the area, and against Christians trying to build their GKI Taman Yasmin church. I conclude then that Islamists have created ideological narratives that activate tribalistic impulses in an appeal to the Islamic

---

12 Feillard and Madinier, The End of Innocence?, 3.
community to defend against the demonised Other, who threaten the Islamic order. Islamists base such narratives on a range of moral grounds, such as loyalty in defence of the group, as well as purity. As moral foundations theory has helped to explain, this range of moral motivations are formed within group perspectives. They inspire emotions that in turn inspire actions. These actions might be harmful to the Other, but they are deemed beneficial to the ingroup, which has cast itself as acting defensively. Ultimately, Islamists and those who accept a message of intolerant action towards religious minorities justify the actions they have taken with moral arguments after the fact. As Haidt argues, moral reasoning is mostly “a post hoc search for reasons to justify the judgments people had already made”. Morality both motivates and justifies.

---

14 Haidt, The Righteous Mind, 40.
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