

The Uneven Influence of Islamic Hegemony in Post-Authoritarian Indonesian State

Muhammad Ridha¹

Abstract

This paper aims to elucidate the unevenness of Islamic politics influence within the state: why has the aspiration of post-authoritarian Islamic politics in Indonesia gained influence in the democratic process despite the disappointing performance of the Islamic political parties. Using the lens of Islamic hegemony which draws inspiration from Antonio Gramsci's conception of hegemonic struggle in the terrain of political and civil society of the state, it suggests that the current paradoxical situation of Islamic politics is the result of the failure of Islamic forces to hegemonize the party politics at political society level while simultaneously success in maintaining their influence through the resurgence of Islamic conservatism in post-authoritarian civil society. It argues that both the failure and the resurgence are determined by two intertwined factors: the legacy of the New Order power structure and the adoption of a neoliberal free-market economy that operate differently in both political and civil society level of the state. At the level of political society, the legacy of the New Order power structure and neoliberalism tends to weaken and subordinate Islamic hegemony that are organized through political parties. At the civil society level, the legacy of the New Order power structure and neoliberalism leads to the reinforcement of Islamic hegemony that is regimented through conservative Islamic organizations.

Introduction

This project aims to examine the unevenness of Islamic politics influence within the state: why has the aspiration of Islamic politics been able to gain influence in the democratic process of the state despite the disappointing performance of the Islamic political parties? Hamayotsu (2011) finds that the Islamic political agenda promoted by Islamic parties has failed to gain significant votes in the national electoral arena. From 1999 to 2009, votes for Islamic political parties tended to decline. However, she argues that Indonesian politics still “exploits religious ideas, symbols, networks, and resources in order to win the hearts and minds of increasingly pious Muslim electorates” (Ibid. 154). As observed by Tanuwidjaja (2010), the

¹ 2017 Arryman Fellow at EDGS, Buffett Institute and Department of Political Science, Northwestern University. This work was conducted under the auspices of an Arryman Fellowship from the Indonesian Scholarship and Research Support Foundation (ISRSF) through donations from PT Djarum, Bank BCA, PT Adaro, the William Soeryadjaya Foundation, the Rajawali Foundation, and the Ford Foundation. I am particularly grateful to my mentors, William Hurst and Jeffrey Winters, for their insightful suggestions and feedback.

Islamic political agenda can still operate despite the struggle of Islamic political parties to gain votes. He found that this agenda has successfully penetrated the platforms of all political parties, including the nationalist-secular ones. For example, in district-based legislatures, many nationalist-secular parties deliberately promote *sharia* law. Thus, it is hard to claim that Islam as a political agenda has lost its appeal for Indonesian voters.

The previous work of Wanto (2012) and Miichi (2015) tries to provide explanations of this unevenness. Both suggest that we need to take a closer look on Islamic politics at societal level. Wanto suggest that Party politics is only one of many strategy that might be enacted by Islamic forces. Another methods that can be chosen is through bottom-up strategies that led by *ulama* (religious leader) on the societal level (Wanto 2012, 329, 360). While for Miichi, the modernization of education and urbanization enable more people to study religion by themselves which leads to Islamization of Indonesian society (Miichi 2015, 139). True as it is, by explaining the anomaly solely at the societal level assumes that the anomaly occurs as an automatic self-activity of the society detached from state power. Although for some Muslims, Islam cannot be limitedly defined merely as a religion, its political influence requires some relation with the structure of the state.

Aiming to understand this uneven condition of Islamic politics in relation with the state power, this article uses the lens of Islamic hegemony which draws inspiration from Antonio Gramsci's conception of hegemonic struggle in the terrain of political and civil society of the state. It suggests that the current paradoxical situation of Islamic politics is the result of the failure of Islamic forces to hegemonize the party politics at political society level while simultaneously success in maintaining their influence through the resurgence of Islamic conservatism in post-authoritarian civil society. It argues that both the failure and the resurgence

are determined by two intertwined factors: the legacy of the New Order power structure and the adoption of a neoliberal free-market economy that operate differently in both political and civil society level of the state. At the level of political society, the legacy of the New Order power structure and neoliberalism tends to weaken and subordinate Islamic hegemony that are organized through political parties. At the civil society level, the legacy of the New Order power structure and neoliberalism leads to the reinforcement of Islamic hegemony that is regimented through conservative Islamic organizations.

Islamic Hegemony: A Theoretical Reconstruction

This article will use the concept of Islamic hegemony as the main theoretical lens. The concept of hegemony in Islamic hegemony draws heavily from the work of Antonio Gramsci which posits the hegemony as a part of the techniques for ruling the state (Riley 2011, 3). He suggest that in ruling the state power, the ruling class always involve two interconnected techniques, “domination” and “intellectual and moral leadership” (Gramsci 1971, 57). For Gramsci, hegemony understood as the condition for this intellectual consent and moral leadership. Gramsci’s hegemony comes from Marxist’s theory of the state which suggest the state both as instrument of the ruling class and the terrain of class struggle (see Marx and Engels 1967; Marx 1937). Gramsci suggests that although the capitalist state is ruled by the power and influence of capitalist class, the internal contradiction of the capitalist state enables the emergence of the working class as a novel social force that has capacity to challenge the capitalist class. Gramsci argues that hegemony then become a political process to exert the intellectual position or ideas of the working class to gain moral leadership from whole member

of the society which aim to topple the dominant position of the capitalist class that rules the state power.

The relevance of Gramsci's hegemony for the proposed question about Islamic politics is in its importance of the promotion of ideas in the struggle for the state power. As a form of political articulation, Islamic politics cannot be detached from the promotion of Islamic ideas and values. These ideas become important in constructing moral leadership to gain support from whole member of the society, and thus enable their position to influence or conquer the state power. By using this framework, there will always be fractured of power in which any dominant power within the state won't be immune to resistance and thus become subject of transformation. This insight, I argue, can posit Islamic politics to become synonymous with hegemonic politics.

The use of hegemony as theoretical framework in explaining Islamic politics is not a novel endeavor. There is already considerable work on using hegemony as a framework in understanding Islamic politics (see Butko 2004, Tugal 2009, Kandil 2011, and Moudouros 2014). Nevertheless, most of these studies use the context of Middle Eastern and North African (MENA) countries. None of them studies the hegemonic process of Islamic politics in non-MENA countries such as Indonesia. These studies also tends focusing the explanation of Islamic politics as merely counter hegemonic forces that aims to challenge dominant power; whether as a revolutionary force (Butko 2004) or as a strategic social force that intends to transform dominant everyday life (Tugal 2009). With this regards, this article will conduct different trajectory on the studies of hegemony of Islamic politics. It will emphasis in the state process in hegemonic struggle of Islamic politics. The reason for this preference comes from the context of particular limitation on explaining uneven influence of Islamic politics in Indonesia. The limitation concerns how to reconcile the tension between elite (top-down) and non-elite

(bottom-up) processes in understanding Islamic politics within the state. Most of the available literatures are unable to provide satisfactory explanations of this unevenness without falling into one extreme or the other.

For example the work of Hadiz (2016) on Islamic politics as Islamic populism. He suggests that the influence of Islamic politics should be posited in relation to class power: the capacity of class power to represent *ummah* (the Muslim people) as a whole will determine the influence of Islamic politics on state power. In the case of Indonesian Islamic politics, the absence of a strong bourgeoisie becomes the reason that no strong and coherent Islamic agenda is carried out by Islamic parties (Hadiz 2017, 496). This weakness then becomes the condition for the unevenness of the influence of Islamic politics, since the power elite will utilize Islamic politics only for the purpose of mobilizing support (Ibid. 498; see also Aspinall 2010). True as it is, this argument can fall into a one-sided view of the elite process in explaining Islamic politics, because it constrains explanation of who formally dominates state power. The problem is that not every agenda of Islamic politics can be determined solely by the interest of the elite. The fact that Islamic politics can gain influence at the societal level despite the failure of formal Islamic parties marks this discrepancy in the influence of Islamic politics beyond the elite position. Therefore, there is some dimension of “non-elite provenance” (Hefner 2010) that is not captured in the analysis.

Meanwhile, work like Buehler’s (2016) represents the other pole of the argument. On understanding Islamic politics through the case of the promotion of *sharia* law, he suggests that the current influence of Islamic politics can be explained by the ability of Islamic groups to appropriate political opportunities in the course of democratization of the state. Due to the competitive nature of electoral politics, the elite has no other option than to accommodate the

Islamic groups as part of mobilizing support from the masses (See also Pisani and Buehler 2016). From this point of view, Buehler tries to provide a different explication from that of Hadiz. Buehler accentuates a non-elite process in the rise of Islamic political influence. However, his emphasis on the agential capacity of Islamic groups in capitalizing the political circumstances neglects pertinent questions. Why do the Islamic groups have the capacity to influence the political process in the first place? Why are the elites unable to ignore them? Without addressing these questions, one might slip into naturalizing Islamic politics and thus leaving unexplained the role of state power in strengthening these Islamic groups.²

To overcome this limitation, Gramsci's hegemony offers a solution by provide a framework in conceptualizing the process of hegemonic struggle within the state. He proposes a concept of "integral state," which explains "mutual interpenetration and reinforcement" (Thomas 2009, 137) in which hegemony is structurally intertwined with other technique to rule the state, domination. In the concept of the "integral state", the close relationship between hegemony and domination in hegemonic struggle projected through what he calls the unity between political society and civil society within the state. The state cannot be limited as merely "machinery of government and legal institution... rather, [it is] intended as a dialectical terrain upon which social classes compete for social and political leadership or hegemony over other social classes" (Ibid. 137). Bosteels (2014, 51) reminds us that that Gramsci's integral state distinction between coercion and consent should be understood as methodological in nature rather than organic. This means that civil society cannot be posited as a "sphere outside, or prior to, the state... [but must be] conceive[d]... within a dialectically unified state form." Therefore, for Gramsci, the state is a

² Buehler offers a glimpse of insight on the condition that empowered the Islamic groups. He suggests that the unequal strategic relation enacted by the state toward the Islamists relatively maintained their organizational capacity at the local level (Buehler 2016, p. 67). However, he not clear on how this unequal strategic relation enabled political empowerment of the Islamic groups.

unified political process between of civil society and political society (the state = civil society + political society).

The introduction of political and civil society can help us to clarify the unifying position of elite and non-elite processes within Gramsci's hegemony. The elite process of Islamic politics resonates through the concept of political society. Defined as the terrain of struggle for dominating the legal monopolization of coercive forces (Thomas 2009, 137), the elite process in political society actualizes from the fact that the elite have access to the coercive means of the state. It is noteworthy that political society is not only a formal-politico entity, but also "organizing and co-ordinating functions that emerged throughout the social formation that connected groups and individuals to common political goals" (Whitehead 2015, 10). Therefore, the Islamic forces in political society aim to dominate the control over the repressive means that would enable the organizing and coordinating of rules for the purpose of constructing their own common political goals.

The non-elite process of Islamic politics then becomes synonymous with civil society. Defined as "the ensemble of organism commonly called 'private'" (Ibid. 12), the non-elite process in civil society is manifested through a hegemonic struggle to gain consent for rule from the constellation of existing social organizations, such as educational institutions, religious institutions, trade unions, business communities, and other collective endeavors. The constellation of such civil society is conditioned by capitalist development which is structured by the competitive relation between class factions (intra-class) and the exploitative relation between classes (inter-class). Thomas (2009, 144) suggests that the primary role of civil society in Gramsci's conception is "to act as mediating instance or moment of 'organic passage' for the subaltern classes towards the state of the ruling class." For Gramsci, the struggle is conducted

through the contestation of class interest masked as ideas.³ In this case, the Islamic forces become social forces that have an interest in engaging in a battle to win the hearts and minds of the masses through a consensual process.

Consequently, the concept of integral state in hegemony suggests that hegemonic politics is always shaped by the state that relates to the political and civil society which define Islamic politics as both elite and non-elite political process. This framework enable us to see that It can also be said that hegemonic struggle always occurs through these two level of the state. The political outcomes of hegemonic struggle then strongly determine on how the struggle emerge in each level of the state. From this framework, one can see a possibility that some hegemonic struggle might experience a reinforcement at some level while fail at another level. It can be said that through this framework, one can locate the different degree of hegemony in each terrain. The differences, I argue, become the basis for explaining the unevenness of Islamic politics' influence within the Indonesian state.

The Origin of Islamic Politics Hegemony in Indonesia

The Origin of Islamic Politics Hegemony in Indonesia

The origin of the hegemony of Indonesian Islamic politics cannot be separated from the struggle for power of the indigenous Muslim petty bourgeoisie in the era of colonialism to address their marginalization. Colonial capitalism enabled a certain form of social classes that

³ Gramsci's hegemony extends the Lukacsian concept of reification (see Lukacs 1971) which suggests that although the commodity relation produces a fetishized consciousness within individuals that might obfuscate the class interest, the origin of this fetishization can be traced back to a certain sociological process maintained by the intellectual leadership of some social groups. That is, in Gramsci's hegemony, in order for a certain class as social agent to be capable of leading, some moral and ideal authority (i.e., worldview) must be constructed and transmitted. This process occurs to subjugate both its own class and other, low rank or subaltern classes. The transmission requires consent and acceptance wherein the ideals and interest proposed by the social agents are mirrored in the ideals of those in the other social positions. Thus, this process creates "commons sense" for the ruled (Gramsci 1971, 134) and enables social coherence and cohesion that become the political basis for the ruler of the state.

was divided into hierarchical groups according to race and positioned the native Malay-Java Muslim merchant as the lowest class among the colonial bourgeoisie that also included the Dutch and the Chinese. Kemasang (1985) observes that this social structure had a deliberate political agenda: the Dutch aimed to hinder the potential development of an indigenous bourgeoisie in Indonesia (Ibid. 64).

In its initial hegemonic development, pan-Islamism became the main ideological articulation of the Muslim petty bourgeoisie against the political rule of Western imperialism which in this case was Dutch colonialism.⁴ However, as the Muslim petty bourgeoisie needed to extend its influence beyond its class position, interaction with other political ideology becomes inevitable. This can be seen with the experience of Islamic politics under Sarekat Islam (Islamic Union; SI)⁵ which in its political line accommodated itself to many non-Islamic political platforms in its political line. This accommodation was related to the specific political development in the Dutch Indies which was experiencing the rise of nationalist and communist ideas. SI's leadership had to "compete with the secular and particularly with Marxist elements both within its own ranks and in other nationalist parties" (Von der Mehden 1958, 336). This accommodation to non-Islamic ideology then affected the articulation of Islamic politics in SI.⁶

4 Pan-Islamism is a modern phenomenon with the backdrop of the decline of the Ottoman sultanate in 1876 and the intensification of rivalry among imperialist Western powers who had colonized the Muslim world (Lee 1942). As a notion, pan-Islamism suggests a unity of the Muslim population guided by Islam as a universal value against the domination of modern Western imperialism (Landau 1990, 4; Keddie 1969; Kia 1996). The appeal of pan-Islamism to Indonesia's Muslim middle class can be explained by the fact that Western colonialism had strong economic motives, since it attacked the Muslim trading system in the archipelago (Reid 1967, 267). Pan-Islamism therefore has provided the ideological orientation for the Muslim middle class that the solution to their marginalization is through implementing Islamic values in all aspects of modern life.

5 Originally named Sarekat Dagang Islam (Commercial Islamic Union; SDI) and established in 1905 by a successful batik trader Haji Samanhudi, the initial purpose of the organization was to defend the interest of native merchants against their Chinese competitors who were backed by the Dutch. SI was structured like a patrolling organization responsible for protecting the assets of its members. This organizational structure led SI toward being confrontational and permissive of violence. Nevertheless, SI also operated in a modern way, using newspapers to spread the idea of the organization beyond its localities (Shiraishi 1997, 60-2).

6 SI came to care less about religion. Noer's (1963) observation on the internal political debate about the status of religion in SI verifies this notion. He finds that despite its being an organization based on religion, SI was not run by a "purely religious" sentiment, but rather it operated under the principle of the "nationalist Islamic" (Noer 1963, 122). Another interesting consequence of the accommodation was the emergence of Islamic communism.

Nevertheless, this inclusiveness of Islamic politics under SI did not last long. The accommodation generated class tension within the politics of the organization that led to two main conflicting political factions: the Red SI and the White SI. Representing the lower and working class, Red SI aspired for SI to strengthen its anti-capitalist politics against the colonial Dutch by giving priority to radical confrontation based on class struggle. For the White SI that was supported by the merchants, purification from the influence of non-Islamic values, especially communism, had to be priority. The tension was resolved by an organizational purge that expelled many communists, meaning also a victory for the Muslim petty bourgeoisie in SI.

The class tension that occurred in SI is not the only important tension experienced by the Muslim petty bourgeoisie. The tensional relation between factions of Muslim petty bourgeoisie also shape the development of Another class tension that needs to be taken into account in understanding the hegemonic development of Islamic politics. The specific colonial development produced two main factions of Muslim petty bourgeoisie: the urban and the rural. This class factionalism generated different interests and responses towards pan-Islamism. The urban petty bourgeoisie's response to pan-Islamism was articulated through the idea that the struggle against colonialism should be conducted by applying modern Western methods to spread Islam. Muhammadiyah (A Way of Muhammad) is one of the first well-known Islamic organization, established in 1921, to promote the modern idea of pan-Islamism, a stream of Islamism that later became known as the organization of the modernists.⁷ The rural Muslim petty bourgeoisie had a

Several important local leaders of SI, like Haji Misbach in Surakarta and Datuak Batuah in West Sumatera, became proponents of Islamic communism which argued about the compatibility of the idealist religious values of Islam with the materialist science of Marxist communism (McVey 1956, 171-2). One might argue that this form of articulation constructed by SI made political Islam appear inclusive.

⁷ Established by the puritan modernist religious figure Ahmad Dahlan, Muhammadiyah focuses on *da'wah* (religious teaching) and operates under a secular education system through which it has become a modern representation of the foundational rooting of Islamic values in Indonesian society. Most of its work is deeply social rather than political. Due to an organizational model that adopts modernism, Muhammadiyah became one of the major representation of the "Modernist groups" of Muslims in Indonesian (see Ricklef 2001).

different response since they saw pan-Islamism as a threat to their Muslim tradition that originated in Shafi'i orthodoxy. Against the rise of pan-Islamism, this rural Muslim petty bourgeoisie established Nahdlatul Ulama (NU, the Rise of Religious Scholars) in 1926 as an organization to preserve their long history of the Indonesian Islamic tradition, and NU later become the bastion of the traditionalists.⁸ While Muhammadiyah and NU are not political organizations, this division had political implications for the contested nature of Indonesian Islamic politics in its early development, especially for how Islam would be situated in the modern state.

However, the internal division between urban and rural Muslim petty bourgeoisie circumstances dramatically when the Japanese took over the colonial state from the Dutch in 1942. The Japanese takeover created new political chances for the Islamists to promote their agenda in the independence struggle ending colonialism. To obtain support and sympathy from the Indonesian Muslims,⁹ the Japanese consolidated the Islamic forces through the establishment of the Office of Religious Affairs (Shimubu) that facilitated the establishment of an important Islamic political party in the early Independence period, Majelis Syuro Muslimin Indonesia (Consultative Council for Indonesian Muslim, Masyumi) which unified all streams of Islamic tendency, especially the modernist and the traditionalist. This political unification enabled political reinforcement of Islamic forces.

⁸ The interest to maintain traditionalism has a strong political interest, since pan-Islamists tend to undermine their old influence in Mecca and Cairo, as two centers of Islamic teaching, and would like to increase attacks against them (Ricklef 2001, 223). The traditionalism of NU is also reflected in how a family connection with Hasyim Asyari became the main requirement in deciding the leadership of the organization.

⁹ The Japanese promoted several initiatives to maintain the confidence of the Indonesian people, one of which was accommodating the position of Indonesian Muslims. The Japanese were "establishing short-term courses for thousands of *kiai* (Muslim religious teacher), and longer courses for *madrasah* (Islamic school) teachers" (Elson 2009, 106) to propitiate the Muslims. The Japanese also made public statements that they would protect and respect the religion of Islam and its institutions, and they even revoked for Muslims the policy of bowing to the Japanese emperor (Ibid. 107).

With the strong presence of Islamic forces in Indonesian political constellation, Islamic politics become integrated with the state building agenda. Early political elites of Indonesian state consent to acknowledged Islam, together with nationalism and marxism, as the founding ideology of the new Indonesian state. In the official state foundation of Pancasila (*lima sila*, five principles), the Islamic monotheistic principle of “the One and Only God” (or *tawhid*) even pronounced as the first principle. The constitution of Indonesian state even explicitly mentioned that the Indonesia’s independence was thanks to God’s grace.¹⁰

The political unification that enable Islamic hegemony did not last long. The modern state’s accommodation of Islamic values did not necessarily suffice to resettle the aspiration of Islamic forces to be unified forces. This create contestation of interest over Islamic politics itself. The first form of contestation emerge in some elements within the Islamic forces that believed an Islamic Indonesian state was not negotiable for Indonesian Muslims. The emergence of the Darul Islam movement (DI) represents this case.¹¹ Another form of contestation was related to the inherent division within Islamic forces itself. Masyumi as a unified body of Islamic forces had to meet the challenge when younger modernist politicians took over the party and demanded a

10 This situation was also a result of political struggle between the Islamic forces and the secularist groups. In the early process of developing Indonesian constitution, the Islamic forces demanded a clause known as “*piagam Jakarta*” (Jakarta charter) that stated that the Muslim adherents were obliged to follow *sharia* law. Although it applied only to Muslims, this clause had a powerful impact for the state since it would formalize *sharia* law in the Indonesian constitution, thus prioritizing the interest of Muslims in the new state. However, the proposal from the Islamic forces was challenged by the secularist nationalist groups. The debate and negotiation between the Islamist and the secularist-nationalist elites led to a compromise in which the latter acknowledged Islam as an important element of the new state. The compromise resulted in a new draft of the constitution (see Hosen 2004).

11 Named after the aim of founding an Islamic state (*Dar al Islam*), the birth of DI cannot be separated from disappointment in the failure of the Islamist elite to achieve that goal. This disappointment exacerbated a loss of confidence in the leaders of the new state, since DI wanted the Indonesian state to take a strong stance towards the Dutch in the midst of the struggle for maintaining independence. As a formation coming from the military wing of Masyumi, DI then decided to take up arms against the new republic, declaring itself to be in a struggle to establish an Islamic state in Indonesia. While the rebellion itself lasted only several years, it can be said that DI’s experience became a major reference for the next generation of Islamists who had an interest in establishing an Islamic state in Indonesia. (see Horikoshi 1975).

modern viewpoint.¹² The change of orientation resulted in widespread marginalization of the traditionalists. Consequently, it created internal tension through the re-emergence of old frictions between the traditionalists and the modernists which then resulted in the separation of NU from Masyumi.¹³

This political split between modernist and traditionalist Islam had an effect on how the Islamic hegemony was accommodated in post-colonial state. It can be said that the influence of Islamic politics in the post-colonial state become uneven. The favorability of the new regime to Java's economic development while excluding outer-Java created resentment among the modernist Islamist Masyumi. This resentment led to their alliance with the United States-supported rebellion in 1957, known as Pemerintahan Revolusioner Republik Indonesia-Perjuangan Semesta (Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia-Universal Struggle, PRRI-Permesta), in Sumatera and Sulawesi.¹⁴ Sukarno's government intensified its anti-colonial politics with the support of the Communist Party of Indonesia (Partai Komunis Indonesia, PKI) as a progressive force to support its anti-colonial cause. The militaristic

12 This tension also had a politico-economic dimension. The traditionalists and modernists had different interests for controlling the Department of Religious Affairs. As argued by Mietzner (2009), this department became an important site for Indonesian Islamic forces, as part of the state machinery to distribute institutional and material resources for the Muslim constituencies. It is unsurprising that the conflict was resolved in 1952 when the traditionalists decided to separate their position from Masyumi by establishing Partai NU (NU Party) after the modernist element claimed the ministry for itself (Ibid. 76).

13 The situation was exacerbated with the political constellation in the new republic. The initiative of the first President of Indonesia, Sukarno, promoted Nasakom (nasionalisme, agama, dan komunisme; nationalism, religion, and communism) as a political consensus to strengthen the unity among the new elite in order to influence the internal tension in Masyumi. Because the traditionalists and the modernists had a different social base, it was important to engage with the other political forces. The traditionalists were based mostly in Java and had a pragmatic political orientation that aimed to maintain the interest of the traditionalist Islamic community through "a flexible, moderate, and compromise-oriented" politics. This approach brought them into a close relationship with a nationalist-populist party, Partai Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian Nationalist Party, PNI) which had a close relationship with Sukarno. Most of the social base of the modernists came from regions outside Java and allied themselves with the socialist and other non-Muslim parties. The modernist agenda was to promote political and economic modernization through technocratic and rational policy. The modernists also refuted traditionalist compromise politics as lacking principles and conceptual thinking (see Mietzner 2009, 76).

14 For the central government, the maneuver by Masyumi was considered treason against the new republic since the rebellion was supported by the United States. For Sukarno's government, the rebellion only invited the imperialist force to intervene in the political dynamic of Indonesia (Kahin and Kahin 1997).

Masyumi was sidelined in Indonesian politics which resulted in its being banned in 1960, and for years many of its leaders were jailed. Interestingly, Sukarno's marginalization of Masyumi was accompanied by accommodation of the traditionalist NU. The reason for NU's accepting the invitation of Sukarno was to ensure the representation of Islam in the new political climate and also to balance the influence of PKI in Sukarno's administration (Haidar 1994). NU's acceptance resulted in a political post in the Department of Religious Affairs in Sukarno's cabinet, replacing the position of Masyumi.

What can be concluded from the origin of Islamic hegemony in Indonesia is how fragmented the hegemony of Islamic forces itself. The fragmentation is the result of the internal division within Islamic forces itself which can be attributed by weak class position the Muslim petty bourgeoisie. This condition might facilitate political intervention from outside Islamic forces to influence and shape Islamic hegemony.

The New Order's and the Nurturing of Islamic Hegemony

The rise of Suharto's New Order regime in 1965 changed the nature of Indonesian Islamic hegemony. The change was determined by the establishment of new relationship between Suharto's New Order and the Islamic forces and Islamic politics. This new relationship itself was inseparable from the agenda of transforming the economic base of the post-colonial state to be more capitalistic (Robison 1986).¹⁵ To sustain the agenda of capitalist development, the New Order regime pursued political stabilization to sustain economic growth (Huntington, 1968). This political development leads to the emergence of a new hegemonic project known as repressive-

¹⁵ To support this new orientation, Suharto consolidated the state power solely in his hand in order to establish a political order conducive to capitalist development. He strengthened the position of the military and the bureaucracy as the power foundation of his authoritarian regime (Robison 1978). In the process of constructing his political alliances, Suharto enfolded the Chinese business groups rather than the Muslim forces (Winters, 2011). Suharto's preference for the Chinese reflected the new government's interest to preserve the financial support of the economic group that had long dominated Indonesia (Ibid. 158).

developmentalism (Feith 1982). Repressive-developmentalism is referring to “strong state regimes engaged in facilitating fast capitalist growth... characterized by a heavy weight of power and a strong drive to eliminate or subordinate all potential centers of countervailing power” (Ibid. 493). Thus, the rise of Suharto opens up a period of authoritarian rule in Indonesian state.

New Order’s authoritarianism conduct selective accommodation towards Islamic forces. at political level, the New Order regime tended to promote tight political control towards Islamic politics. Although Islamic forces was one of the political forces that support the establishment of the New Order regime,¹⁶ the regime has its own agenda tries to control Indonesian politics to sustain political stability for economic development. In 1973, the regime introduced the policy of “political fusion” (*fusi politik*) as part of an attempts to enact political control. This policy aims to simplify all political parties, including the Islamic parties. Through this policy, the regime enforced Islamic forces that organized in several political parties to be unified under one party, known as PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan, United Development Party). With the introduction of political fusion, the regime disregard any possibility for re-establishing Masyumi. Although interestingly, the failure of the modernist Masyumi to revive leads to the rise of the traditionalist NU as the leaders of New Order’s Islamic politics.

The consequence of the stabilizing the politics through authoritarian political fusion enable depoliticization of Indonesian politics which constraining the political activity of parties (Rogers 1988, 248). It pruned the relationship between the political parties and the masses which enabled a loss of political education at the grassroots level. The New Order attempt to control the Islamic forces through depoliticization reached its peaked in 1978 when the regime decided to introduce the “single principle” (*asas tunggal*) in the Broad Outline of State Policy (Garis-garis

¹⁶ With Sukarno’s decision to disband Masyumi and the emergence of conflict that threatened the social base of NU due to the promotion of land reform legislation, it had been politically justified for the Islamic forces to displace him with Suharto. It is unsurprising that at the time of the political rise of the New Order, the Muslim force fully backed Suharto’s maneuver to topple Sukarno by aligning with the military.

Besar Haluan Negara, GBHN) in the parliament. The “single principle” aimed to make Pancasila the state ideology and prohibited any political ideology, including Islamism.¹⁷ The Islamic forces in PPP rejected the introduction of “single principle” since it would have relativized the position of Islam *vis a vis* other religions,¹⁸ especially the indigenous religion (Iqbal 2017).¹⁹ With the political fusion and single principle policy, the political process of Indonesia become fully depoliticize. The masses were no longer able to participate in the political process since all parties politics were being controlled and promoting aspiration through ideology was being repressed. This de-politicization also meant that the political process would be contained at the elite level, producing unaccountability in politics.

However, the depoliticization provide opportunity for the regime to capture the consent of the Islamic forces in societal level. While at political level the Islamic forces were clearly controlled by the regime, at civil society level the regime promote several political initiatives to accommodate Islamic forces. This accommodation can be seen the establishment of an Islamic body known as Majelis Ulama Indonesia (Indonesian Council of Ulama, MUI) in 1975. MUI is functioned as an advisory council of for the government related to Islamic affairs. The composition of MUI of Islamic scholars that affiliated with acknowledged Islamic organizations.

17 This decision cannot be separated from the election result of 1977 in which PPP gained a significant vote. The election result signified a political threat to the legitimacy of the regime, since Islamic political aspiration was influential among the masses (Liddle 1978).

18 The rejection did not appear only in PPP. Many Muslims saw the implementation of this policy as *shirk* (idolatry). One Muslim community that reacted harshly to this policy was in Tanjung Priok, Jakarta. They were using mosques to campaign about how the New Order regime had turned into an anti-Muslim government. The government responded to their campaign by incarcerating many members of the community. on September 12 1984, the community mobilized a great recitation occasion to protest the government’s unjust behavior toward it. The government answered the mobilization by cracking down on the participant, using repressive means. Eighteen people died and 53 participants were injured due to the violent measure of the government. Known as Tanjung Priok Tragedy, this moment left deep marks among the Muslims regarding how the state systematically marginalized their position (see Akmaliah 2014).

19 During the parliamentary assembly, many legislators from PPP decided to walk out, as they protested “single principle.” The regime countered the resistance of the Islamists by manipulating the leadership composition of the PPP. The general chairmanship of the party that had been held by NU was assumed by a government figure (Radi 1984, 152).

Most of these Islamic scholars come from the two major Islamic organizations, Muhammadiyah and NU (Hosen 2004). One can argue that the forming of MUI was a political cooptation by the regime towards the Islamic forces. But, this political cooptation can has as a political significance for Islamic forces since the state provided an institutional channel for them to shape and influence the policy of the state. Although the political space remains limited regarding Islamic affairs.²⁰

The regime accommodation to the Islamic forces then culminate with the establishment of Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Indonesia (Association of Indonesian Muslim Intellectuals, ICMI) in the early 1990s. ICMI is an Islamic organization that gathered Muslim intellectuals, professional, and businessman from various Islamic organizational backgrounds who aimed to support Indonesian development under the New Order regime. Hefner (1993) argues that the establishment of ICMI was related to the regime's need to gain support from the emergent Muslim middle class. This Muslim middle class had grown in the juncture of the success of Indonesian development due to the government's achievement in reducing the inflation level from 600% to 10% in 1969 and the significant contribution of the oil boom that brought economic growth to 8% (Dick 1985, 88). When Indonesian development was hit by a crisis in the 1980s, the government was forced by international capital to deregulate the economy (Soesastro 1989). As the regime (partially) did so, especially in the banking /financial sector, it needed a new social base to support its new development agenda. The existing social base that came from the military and the bureaucrats that had sustained the regime before the crisis needed to be re-arranged. With the government concerned about pursuing economic reform, the regime needed a new approach and started to embrace the Muslim middle class as the main supporter in

²⁰ Liddle (1996 614) even suggest that the regime has positively attitude toward various Islamic organizations' since they the regime can be really responsive to change certain policies that were considered disadvantageous by these Islamic organization.

the new political circumstances. It is unsurprising that ICMI “presented an opportunity to conjure up a corps of new mandarins that could countervail the influence of the military bureaucracy in particular...” (Robison and Hadiz 2004, 115).

Other mode of New Order’s political accommodation towards the Islamic forces was conducted through incorporating many elite figures from the forces to join the political machinery of the state. Apparent incorporation can be seen in how plenty of student activists from the student organization of Masyumi, Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam (Islamic Student Association, HMI) were recruited into the main political instrument of the regime, Golongan Karya (Functional Group, Golkar). Many of these activists became the future political elite of the organization (Suryadinata 2007, 338). Moreover, the regime allowed these activists to partake in the bureaucracy as they become an important part of sustaining the regime’s policy. Even at the local level, the regime encouraged ex-members of Darul Islam to become the functionaries of Golkar (Temby 2010, 6). Thus, to some extent, the ruling class in the authoritarian regime had certain behaviors to accommodate some element of the Islamic forces’ becoming part of the power alliance.

The state even played an active role in supporting the necessary infrastructure for the development of the religion of Islam during Suharto’s era. Hefner (1993) finds that under the New Order regime, the number of mosques constructed by the government increased significantly. For instance, in East Java the number grew from 15,574 in 1973 to 25,655 in 1990. A similar situation occurred in Central Java where between 1980 and 1992 the number of mosques doubled (Ibid. 10). The regime was also actively involved in the massive expansion of Institute Agama Islam Negeri (State Islamic Institute Colleges, IAIN) which during the 1970s and 1980s produced a large number of graduates educated in Islamic law, theology, and

education. In this process, Suharto even developed a presidential foundation, the Amal Bakti Muslimin Pancasila (Pancasila Islamic Charity Service), that was tasked with supporting the construction of 400 mosques and training for preacher to be posted in several area in Indonesia.

While the accommodation suggests an asymmetric relationship between the regime and Islamic forces, it also indicates that to some extent the relationship between these two elements was not necessarily contradictory. This argument comes from the fact that they shared the anti-communist tendency which had contributed to the political change in the Indonesian state after Sukarno. As stated by Hamka, an initial leader of MUI, the reason on why the Islamic forces should welcome the invitation of the regime to form MUI was because they were both shared anti communist sentiment (Hosen 2004, 151). This common interest against communism facilitated the regime for allowing the Islamic forces to maintain their influence and ideas in the authoritarian environment.

This accommodation that provided by the regime, albeit limited, enable a space for the Islamic forces to outmaneuver the state power. The Islamic forces started to use cultural methods to spread their ideas and an implicit political agenda to make the society more receptive to Islamic agenda. Interestingly, the attempt to spread out Islamic message to the New Order's public did not occur monolithically. There was a struggle of Islamic ideas on how the relationship between Islam and politics should be developed in the context of New Order politics. One of the position of Islamic ideas that emerge during New Order was what Hefner (2000) nuancedly argues as "civil Islam." Civil Islam posits a pluralistic interpretation of Islam that enriched the treasures of Islamic thought and tradition. "Civil Islam" suggest that every Muslim has responsibility to engage with political and economic issues in order to create an Islamic civil society "affirming democracy, voluntarism, and balance of countervailing power in

a state and society” (Ibid. 12). The condition of civil Islam generates Islamic thinking like the Neo-Modernist Islam which aimed to provide humanistic, moderate, and rational interpretation of Islam has a close affinity with the interest of the regime to construct a “model of faith, reason and common sense, apolitical and moral... in ascension and socially responsible practice” (Cone 2002, 54-5).²¹ From this current, a democratic based Islamic thinking starting to emerge. One of the key proponent of Indonesian Neo-Modernist Islam is Nurcholish Madjid (1983). He suggests that the ultimate ambition of Indonesian Muslims is to establish democracy. For him, the importance of democracy lies in its function, since it provides an open political rule that can anticipate and correct any political wrong-doing by the government and also guarantee that the government will rule according to the aspirations of the people (Ibid. 19).

Other Islamic position that also occur in the context of New Order’s civil society was hardline Islamic current. This stream was signified by its direct opposition to the regime. However, the sources of their hardline Islamic position were varied. The first inspiration derived from the experience of the Islamic revolution in Iran with its revolutionary interpretation of Islam that derived from Shiite tradition (van Bruinessen 2002, 131). While another sources for hardline Islam was developed by the role of Dewan Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia (Indonesian Islamic Missionary Council, DDII). Founded in 1967 by a former chairperson of Masyumi and also a prominent figures in modernist Islam, Muhammad Natsir, DDII is an Islamic organization that initially aimed to disseminate Islamic teaching. However, as an organization, DDII has strong affinity to conservative Islamic current that mostly developed in Middle East, especially Saudi Arabia.²² This connection makes DDII has particular interest to spread out conservative

21 It is unsurprising that many proponent of this current have a convenient position in state structure, such as a vice-chancellor of IAIN (Cone 2002, 61). This mode of thinking became the main position of the Islamic forces that initiated the establishment of ICMI.

22 This connection could occur because Natsir was a member of the founding committee of Rabitat al-Alam al-Islami (World Muslim League, the Rabita), an international Muslim organization supported by conservative Saudi Arabia which aimed to counter the influence of Nasser’s Arab radical nationalist movement.

interpretation of Islam. The Saudi's financial support not only granted DDII to build mosques, train preachers, and establish an educational program for continuing religious study in Saudi Arabia, but also encourage them to spread out the idea of conservative Islam. In the 1970s and 1980s, DDII deliberately disseminated the thinking of conservative Islamists like the founder of Ikhawnul Muslimin (Muslim Brotherhood, IM) Hasan Al Banna, Sayyid Qutb, Yusuf Qardawi and Al Mawdudi (Van Bruinessen 2009, 5). Many Indonesian graduates from Saudi Arabia supported by DDII also played an active role in spreading this Islamic conservatism that derived from Wahabi tradition (van Bruinessen 2009, 5).²³

DDII's important role on developing Islamic conservatism had two apparent organizational implications for Islamic politics. First, the conservatism of DDII successfully penetrated the old network of DI. Two preachers who were well-connected in DDII circles, Abdullah Sungkar and Abu Bakar Basyir, revived the political agenda of DI in their Islamic boarding school (*pesantren*) in Ngruki, Central Java (Van Bruinessen 2002, 129). Second, DDII dissemination of the conservative idea that comes from IM facilitated many members of the Muslim middle class to replicate IM movement by establishing a covert Islamic politics known as Tarbiyah (education) movement in the early 1980s. This movement used a specific system consisting of an open study circle known as *halqah* that is usually held in campus mosques, and a more secretive one called *usroh* held in the homes of their members. This structure was needed since the theme of the education was quite risky in that they rejected "the Pancasila state and of un-Islamic practices in modern Indonesia" (Ibid. 133).

It is important to note that although the conservative Islamic groups might have strong opposition to the regime, they were not necessarily disconnected from the politics of the regime

23 DDII also engaged with an anti-Shi'a campaign. With support from Saudi and Kuwait, DDII denounced Shi'a as a "fatal deviation from Islam" (Van Bruinessen 2002, 127).

itself. Suharto attempts to control the military that at that time led by Christian general figures, Benny Murdani, enable internal conflict within the military in the mid 80s. To counter Murdani's influence, a military faction called as "Green army" was organized under the supervision of Suharto. The use of "green" in here was deliberate since it represent the Islamic symbolism as the faction aimed to mobilize religious sentiment to challenge Murdani's personal identity. From this internal struggle, the "Green army" started to organize support from outside the military, especially coming from the conservative Islamic groups. The support of the regime to the position of conservative Islamic groups was deepened with the rise of a general that coming from "green army" faction, Faisal Tanjung, replacing Murdani in early 90s (Jahroni 2004, 214). Tanjung's leadership in the military marks the integration Islamic conservative groups to the politics of the regime. One can argued that this process effects to the enforcement of certain element Islamic politics in the late phase of authoritarian rules.

It can be said that although Islamic politics had been marginalized, the influence of the Islamic forces did not diminish accordingly. The New Order's hegemony might sideline the political position of Islamic forces. It is important to note that the marginalization of Islamic forces did not necessarily means fully eliminate Islamic politics itself. The regime marginalization simultaneously isolates the existence of Islamic forces at civil society level which maintained the influence of Islamic politics from any political suppression. The influence of Islamic politics strengthened when some element of Islamic forces, which is the conservative Islamic groups, was utilized for the purpose of the regime's politics. As Suharto fell and Indonesia experienced a political change, this social formation of Islamic forces became an important factor on why Islamic politics could gain influence despite the failure of the Islamic

parties. This process, I argue, provide the basis for Islamic hegemony in post-authoritarian Indonesia.

Islamic Hegemony in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia

The fall of Suharto in 1998 eliminated the hegemonic power of New Order's repressive-developmentalism. It seems obvious that for Islamic forces, this condition can be opportunities for establishing their own hegemony. However, the opportunity for establishing Islamic hegemony has to meet two important factors that penetrate the political and civil society level of the state: the legacy of New Order's politics, in the form of the remaining old political elites and social organization, and the adoption of neoliberal agenda of free market economy. I argue that the collision between Islamic hegemony with these two factors at political and civil society level of the state enable the uneven influence of the Indonesian Islamic politics within post-authoritarian state. At political society level, these two factors seems to weaken and subordinate Islamic politics that organized in political parties. While at civil society level, both factors precisely leads to the reinforcement of Islamic politics in its conservative form of social organization.

Before, we need to understand how these two factors occur in the aftermath of the fall of New Order regime. As the fall of Suharto was nudged by 1997 economic crisis in Indonesia, the free market economic reform become an economic formula that aims to resolve the crisis. Deliberately promoted by the International Financial Institution like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, the free market economy agenda occur as the critique to the New Order capitalist policy that heavily driven by state developmentalism. Unlike the 80s reform in which the state only conduct partial economic restructuring in financial sector, the economic

reform for the 1997 economic crisis required a deep and comprehensive adjustment. Through the role of the international financial institutions (IFI) such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, the Indonesian government had to submit to the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) that required the Indonesian economy to be structurally deregulated, liberalized, and privatized. The submission to the SAP signified the adoption of free-market economic project to Indonesian economic. This adoption transformed the Indonesian state structure in which its economy become more integrated into the global market, which in turn unleashed the need for *reformasi politik* (political reform) (Robison et al 2005).

The implementation of market reform facilitated the continuation of New Order legacy. The process occur through the reorganization of oligarchic elites that had been incubate during New Order rule. As argued by Robison and Hadiz (2004, 50), the elite consolidation occurred not through rejecting market reform, but by selectively exploiting the neoliberal agenda and using it according to the elites' interest. As these elite forces become powerful, the Islamic forces could not escape their influence. The 2004 election signified a moment when the non-Islamic elites captured the Islamic forces under their influence. The political fragmentation of the Islamic forces coincided with the political maneuvering of the non-Islamic elite to accommodate some segment of the Islamic forces as part of the electoral nomination.

How the legacy of New Order and free market economy effect the impairment of Islamic hegemony that organized through parties can be traced back in their attempt to rule the post-authoritarian state. This possibilities cannot be separated from the historic role of the Islamic forces in supporting *reformasi* movement (Kadir 1999). Islamic forces, through their neo-Modernist current, also contribute comprehensively in developing the idea of Islamic democracy that become hegemonic and successful to mobilize the population to support democratic

Indonesia against Suharto's authoritarian rule (See Thaha 2005). Two important figures that becomes the leaders of *reformasi* movement, Amien Rais and Abdurrahman Wahid, were also chairpersons in Muhammadiyah and NU, respectively. The contribution entailed political leverage from Islamic forces to be a decisive factor in the transitional process.

This possibilities then realized when Indonesia hold its first democratic election in 1999. The victory of Abdurahman Wahid's nomination as the first president of the post-authoritarian Indonesia provide opportunity for Islamic forces to promote agenda of Islamic politics.²⁴ Yet, the prospect for the Islamic forces to rule the state without any problem seems far from reality. As Wahid become the first president after the 1998 reform, he had to proceed with the reform agenda that been presented. His effort to promote reform unfortunately was not running smoothly. Wahid ruled without any clear agenda on economic reform and development. The state bureaucracy inherited from the New Order regime also became an obstacle because of the administration's incapability in promoting a market economy (Parker and Skytta 2000, 42-43). The absence of effective state machinery to support reform combined with Wahid's erratic leadership created difficulty for the first government of a post-New Order regime. Robison and Hadiz (2004) argue that the difficulty was rooted in the structural condition of the state, in which the new government had to face political power that resisted any institutional change suggested by the IFI. They even see the erratic behavior characterizing Wahid's leadership as "a response to the overwhelming political obstacle to reform faced by Wahid and the meagre political resources he was able to mobilize to drive a reformist agenda" (Ibid. 217).

24 One has to remember that during the transitional phase in 1999, Indonesian politics had not yet implemented direct election because the constitution had not been amended. As parliament became an important arena for electing a president, the Central Axis led by Amien Rais successfully endorsed Wahid in October 1999. To maintain political stability, the vice-president position was given to PDI-P's presidential nominee who was also the chairman of the party, Megawati.

The difficulty of Wahid's administration to enact reform had an impact with his Islamic supporter base. Unclear political maneuvering of the administration to promote reform isolated many elements of the Islamic forces that supported Wahid's presidency. This can be seen in Wahid's carelessly dismantling some positions of his ministry without considering the Islamic parties that had supported his candidacy. This careless measure created tension within his Islamic base and triggered old conflict between the modernists and the traditionalists. The modernists saw that Wahid's administration had abandon his promise to accommodate the aspiration of the Muslim community. This tension then undermined the political unity ended the "intra-Islamic honeymoon" which resulting in the fall of Wahid's presidency and internal fragmentation of Islamic forces (Mietzner 2008, 263).

The failure of Wahid's administration elucidate the momentum for the weakening of Islamic hegemony in the sphere of parties politics. The weakening thus enable political captures by the old elite forces that reorganized during political transition. The peak of elite capture toward the Islamic parties occurred with the victory in the 2004 election of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. As a figure, Yudhoyono came from a non-Islamic party, Partai Demokrat (Democratic Party, PD). He also had a strong connection with the New Order regime. He had been an army general who during Suharto's rule played an active role as a chairman of a military faction in the parliament that participated in electing Suharto to his seven terms. During his own campaign, Yudhoyono's and his party's proclaiming themselves to be a religious-nationalist force successfully gained support from Muslim voters, especially the educated urban middle class (Miichi 2015, 136). To support his presidency, Yudhoyono embraced two Islamic parties, Partai Bulan Bintang (Moon and Star Party, PBB) and Partai Keadilan Sejahtera (Justice and Prosperity

Party, PKS), as part of his official coalition.²⁵ The success of Yudhoyono by bringing a catch-all platform into his candidacy affected the Islamic parties to move into centrist politics. The Islamic parties became more tolerant of a non-Islamic agenda and accepted political pluralism in their organizational platform.²⁶ This situation leads to the weakening the influence of Islamic forces that organized as parties at political society level.

Meanwhile, the legacy of New Order and neoliberalism enables different processes at post-authoritarian's civil society level. Unlike to what happens in the terrain of political society, the political elite that nurtured by New Order politics plays an important role in strengthening the position of Islamic forces, particularly the position of conservative Islamic groups, at civil society level. The political elite organized social organization for the conservative Islamic groups as part to maintain their interest in civil society. As noted by Hadiz (2011), the close relationship between the elite and conservative Islamic forces can be seen in the case of the formation of Pasukan Pengamanan Swakarsa (voluntary security guard, Pam Swakarsa). Pam Swakarsa originated from an Islamic conservative group that in the past had taken a critical position against the regime. It was organized by the military, with the pretext on the military accusation that the resistance of the student movement was influenced by communist forces.²⁷ The leader of

25 With the failure of Islamic parties in 2004, Islamic forces started to re-calculate their position in the existing political constellation. The impetus to revisit their position came from established Islamic organizations like NU and Muhammadiyah. The experience of the 2004 election generated political tension and division among Muslims that prompted them to de-politicize their organizational position. They were no longer attached to any Islamic parties, especially the Islamic parties that had been deliberately established by their cadre, like Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa (National Awakening Party, PKB) for NU and Partai Amanat Nasional (National Mandate Party, PAN) for Muhammadiyah (see Mietzner 2009)

26 The consequence of elite capture during Yudhoyono's rule and the repositioning of Islamic forces through its parties was the re-insulation of Islamic politics from its social base. The Muslim constituents no longer had an official political channel and direct connection with Islamic parties. Interestingly, at the same time, this situation enabled the spread of Islamic politics beyond party constraints. This moderation prompted the condition for the absence of a political monopoly over an Islamic agenda by Islamic parties, thus mainstreaming Islamic politics into the political constellation of the elite. The elite accommodation to Islamic politics can be considered merely as a symbolic gesture to gain popularity among Muslim voters. However, it is hard to deny the appeal of Islamic identity as a political advantage for gaining votes in electoral politics (See Pepinsky et al. 2012).

27 However, during the political transition, the fear of a communist revival became a crucial factor in the collaboration between this Islamic group and the elite. This fear was only rhetorical since the formation was aimed at crushing the student movement which at that time demanded total reform, potentially undermining the interest of

Pam Swakarsa, Habieb Rizieq, was part of the network of conservative Islamic groups that had a strong link with DDII (Hefner 2012, 110).

The experience of Pam Swakarsa marks an important condition for the distinct development of Islamic politics. Pam Swakarsa inspired the formation of many conservative Islamic groups (or militants) to preserve the interest of the political elite in the new state (Mudhoffir, 2017). The inclusion of the conservative Islamic groups under elite politics entailed the strengthening of influence of Islamic conservatism in civil society. With the existence of this kind of conservative Islamism, the adoption of democracy as the result of political reform would not necessarily lead to a diverse and vibrant civil society. Instead, any plurality of ideas would have to meet the challenge from conservative Islamic groups. The conservative Islamic groups might prevent any thought or idea that could be considered problematic according to their view. This hindrance can be seen in how, after *reformasi*, the conservative Islamic groups forcefully protested against many public activities that were demanding the state to resolve the 1965 pogrom according to human rights principles as they fear that it will allow communism to live in Indonesian (Zurbuchen 2002). Although their claim seems ridiculous, their power to systematically suppress and limit the development of public discourse facilitated the illiberal democratic space in civil society (Hadiz 2004).

However, the elite process is not the only process that enable the reinforcement of conservative Islamic position at civil society level. The free market agenda reinforce the conservative interpretation of Islam since it provide a cultural channel for consumerist expression for the Muslim middle class and ideological expression for the lower class as to response their social marginalization. The amplification of free market agenda to Indonesian Islamic conservatism manifested into what Rudnyckyj (2009) describes as “market Islam.”

the existing elite (Hadiz 2000, 7).

Market Islam can be considered a transformation of the concept of “civil Islam” in Indonesia. If civil Islam puts emphasis on the social responsibility of Muslims in the face of state power, then market Islam is concerned less with state and social issues and more with personal morality aimed “to merge religious practice and capitalist ethics” (Ibid. 183).²⁸

Market Islam enable the construction of Islamic symbolism as the solution for the capitalist “worldly difficulties” (Joshnloo 2013, 1865). Hasan (2009) observes how this ideational construction promote of a new model of Islamic *da'wa* (preaching). Unlike its predecessor in the New Order era when Islam was usually preached to a limited audience, this new model of *da'wa* was able to “creatively translate and package Islamic messages for mass consumption” (Ibid. 247). Although this model had strong motives for capitalist accumulation since the mass consumption “opened up market opportunities for so-called Islamic products” (Ibid. 247), it had a consequence on how Islam would appear in the public face. The need to provide mass consumption of Islamic teaching bypassed any of the complexity of learning that is embedded in Islamic scholarship. The requirement for deep learning in order to understand Islam became redundant since the message was instantaneously provided by the *da'wa* agent. It is unsurprising that market Islam enabled the development of a consumerist orientation among the Muslim middle-class post-authoritarian state (see Rinaldo 2008; Heryanto 2011).

However, “market Islam” is not the only effect that created by free market economy. The economic inequality combine with the absent of state social protection that produced by free market economy leads to social marginalization for some members of Indonesian Muslim,

²⁸ The practicality of market Islam for many Indonesian Muslims became an important factor for the conservative resurgence of Islamic life at the civil society level in the post-authoritarian state. In the backdrop of political transition and social uncertainty due to the continuous effect of economic crises, this approach became appealing for many Indonesian Muslims. Rudnyckyj also suggest that accentuation in individual religious practice provided a practical way for Muslims to address a broader social problem surrounding them: that the social difficulty faced by Muslims was the consequence of their lack of piety and effort to enhance individual religious practices (Rudnyckyj 2009. 197).

especially for the Muslim lower class. This condition of social marginalization creates class resentment for the Muslim lower class. As the constellation of social organization inherited by the New Order regime hindered any development of leftist/progressive forces to channel class resentment, most of the Muslim lower class can only make use on what available for them which are the conservative Islamic organization (Hadiz 2011, 32; Alamsyah and Hadiz 2017). This condition leads to the incorporation of class discontent of the Muslim lower class within the organization of the conservative Islam.

The case of Front Pembela Islam (Islamic Defender Front, FPI) can be an example on how the lower classes also empowered and utilized conservative Islam to meet their own interest. As a vigilante organization founded in 1998 by the leader of Pam Swakarsa, Habib Rizieq, FPI provided an institutional channel for the urban poor to express their class resentment through Islamic sentiment. As observed by Wilson (2014), FPI's use of the Quranic edict *amar maruf nahi munkar* (enjoining good and forbidding evil), attracted "unemployed youths and men from slums, poor neighborhoods and peri-urban areas" (Ibid. 248). FPI successfully appropriated local conflicts and defined them as part of a larger Islamic response to the decadence and immorality directed toward the Muslim community (Ibid. 250). The attraction of the lower class to FPI was related to three important reasons: "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 resentment and grievances at the state, social and political elites and impacts of market capitalism" (Ibid. 268).²⁹

29 In similar fashion, Saefullah's (2017) observation on the religious turn in the contemporary Indonesian punk underground scene also affirms that notion that Islamic conservatism become the voice to deal with their pertinent situation. He suggests that the fall of Suharto was not in tandem with the affirmation of left-wing ideology (in this case, anarchism) in punk communities, but rather cast doubt in punk communities about left-wing ideology because that ideology fails to provide any satisfying solution in life (Ibid. 272). The market economy threatened the everyday life of the punk community, as it had to face the increased social and high financial costs of maintaining an

The post-authoritarian context might enable the Islamic forces to exert their hegemony over the state power. However, different effect of the legacy of New Order politics and free market economy that operates at political and civil society level of the post-authoritarian state produces different outcome of hegemony. At political level, the hegemonic struggle of Islamic forces that organized through political parties had to meet strong challenged from the reorganized political forces. However, at civil society level, the Islamic hegemony that organized through conservative Islamic groups can operate without any serious repudiation from different societal actor. This condition enables the conservative Islamic groups to hegemonize the civil society level which enforce the ruling elite to accommodate their political aspiration.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that the hegemonic struggle of Islamic forces yields uneven political influence within the post-authoritarian state. The legacy of the New Order politics and the adoption of free market economic agenda provided structural constraint and the enablement of Islamic politics. At the political society level, the adoption of neoliberalism generated a reorganization of the old force, facilitating the defeat of Islamic forces' ambition to dominate the state. Interestingly, these same factors also contributed to the resurgence of Islamic conservatism that has reinforced the influence of Islamic forces at the civil society level.

The uneven influence of Islamic politics suggests that ambiguous relationship between the Indonesian state with Islamic hegemony. Islamic hegemony can be utilized by the interest of the powerful elite as part of gaining political support from the population. The ruling elite might has no problem to accommodate or capture the interest of Islamic forces. However, this

underground scene. With the failure of left-wing ideology to provide an answer to their predicament, Islamism successfully penetrated the community, since it offered “a moral framework for youths to deal with the hardship of living in the modern capitalist world” (Ibid. 283). This process enabled a conservative turn in a community that traditionally identified as left-wing aspiration.

accommodation can have unintended consequence. The accommodation also suggest that Islamic politics can also become a political articulation that went beyond the utilization of elite power. Non-elite actor might use Islamic rhetorics and ideas as instrument to mobilize their interest. Due to the multilayered process within the state, Islamic forces might find a space to exert their own hegemony of power and influence within the post-authoritarian Indonesian society regardless to the position of the ruling elite.

References

- Akmaliah, W. (2014). Islah sebagai Dalih: Studi Kasus Penyelesaian Konflik “Peristiwa Tanjung Priok (1984) dan Talang Sari (1989) Pasc Rezim Orde Baru. *Jurnal Masyarakat & Budaya*, 16(1).
- Aspinall, E. (2010). The irony of success. *Journal of Democracy*, 21(2), 20-34.
- Bosteels, B. (2014). Towards a theory of the integral state. *Historical Materialism*, 22(2), 44-62.
- Buehler, M. (2016). *The politics of shari'a law: islamist activists and the state in democratizing indonesia*. Cambridge University Press.
- Butko, T. J. (2004). Revelation or revolution: A Gramscian approach to the rise of political Islam. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 31(1), 141-162.
- Cone, M. (2002). Neo-Modern Islam in Suharto's Indonesia. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 4, 52-67.
- Dick, H. W. (1985). The rise of a middle class and the changing concept of equity in Indonesia: An interpretation. *Indonesia*, (39), 71-92.
- Elson, R. E. (2009). Another look at the Jakarta Charter controversy of 1945. *Indonesia*, (88), 105-130.
- Gramsci, A., Hoare, Q., & Nowell-Smith, G. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2000). Retrieving the past for the future? Indonesia and the New Order legacy. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 28(2), 11-33.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2004). The rise of neo-Third Worldism? The Indonesian trajectory and the consolidation of illiberal democracy. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1), 55-71.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2011). Indonesian political Islam: Capitalist development and the legacies of the Cold War. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 30(1), 3-38.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2014). A new Islamic populism and the contradictions of development. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 44(1), 125-143.
- Hadiz, V. R. (2016). *Islamic populism in Indonesia and the Middle East*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hadiz, V. R., & Robison, R. (2017). Competing populisms in post-authoritarian Indonesia. *International Political Science Review*, 38(4), 488-502.
- Haidar, M. A. (1994). Nahdlatul Ulama dan Islam di Indonesia: Pendekatan Fikih dalam Politik.

- Hamayotsu, K. (2011). The end of political Islam? A comparative analysis of religious parties in the Muslim democracy of Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 30(3), 133-159.
- Hasan, N. (2009). The making of public Islam: piety, agency, and commodification on the landscape of the Indonesian public sphere. *Contemporary Islam*, 3(3), 229.
- Hefner, R. (2012). "Islamic radicalism in a democratizing Indonesia". In Akbarzadeh, S. (Ed.). *Routledge handbook of political Islam*. Routledge.
- Hefner, R. W. (1993). Islam, state, and civil society: ICMI and the struggle for the Indonesian middle class. *Indonesia*, (56), 1-35.
- Hefner, R. W. (2000). *Civil Islam: Muslims and Democratization in Indonesia*. Princeton University Press.
- Hefner, R. W. (2010). Religious resurgence in contemporary Asia: Southeast Asian perspectives on capitalism, the state, and the new piety. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 69(4), 1031-1047.
- Heryanto, A. (2011). Upgraded piety and pleasure: the new middle class and Islam in Indonesian popular culture. In Weintraub, A. N. (Ed). *Islam and Popular Culture in Indonesia and Malaysia*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Horikoshi, H. (1975). The Dar ul-Islam movement in West Java (1948-62): an experience in the historical process. *Indonesia*, (20), 59-86.
- Hosen, N. (2004). Behind the scenes: fatwas of Majelis Ulama Indonesia (1975–1998). *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 15(2), 147-179.
- Hosen, N. (2005). Religion and the Indonesian constitution: a recent debate. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 36(3), 419.
- Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press.
- Iqbal, M (2017). "NU, PPP, dan Represi Orde Soeharto terhadap Islam." retrieved from <https://tirto.id/nu-ppp-dan-represi-orde-soeharto-kepada-islam-ckx2>
- Jahroni, J. (2004). Defending the Majesty of Islam: Indonesia's Front Pembela Islam (FPI) 1998-2003. *Studia Islamika*, 11(2).
- Joshanloo, M. (2013). A comparison of Western and Islamic conceptions of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(6), 1857-1874.
- Kadir, S. (1999). The Islamic factor in Indonesia's political transition. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 7(2), 21-44.
- Kahin, A., & Kahin, G. M. (1997). *Subversion as foreign policy: the secret Eisenhower and Dulles debacle in Indonesia*. University of Washington Press.
- Kandil, H. (2011). Islamizing Egypt? Testing the limits of Gramscian counterhegemonic strategies. *Theory and society*, 40(1), 37-62.
- Keddie, N. R. (1969). Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism. *The Journal of Modern History*, 41(1), 17-28.
- Kemasang, A. R. T. (1985). How Dutch colonialism foreclosed a domestic bourgeoisie in Java: the 1740 Chinese massacres reappraised. *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 9(1), 57-80.
- Kendie, D. (2006). How Useful is Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony and Domination to the Study of African States?. *African Social Science Review*, 3(3), 5.
- Kia, M. (1996). Pan-Islamism in late nineteenth-century Iran. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 32(1), 30-52.
- Landau, J. M. (1990). *The politics of Pan-Islam: ideology and organization*. Clarendon Press Oxford.

- Lee, D. E. (1942). The origins of pan-Islamism. *The American Historical Review*, 47(2), 278-287.
- Liddle, R. W. (1978). The 1977 Indonesian Election and New Order Legitimacy. *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 122-138.
- Liddle, R. W. (1996). The Islamic turn in Indonesia: a political explanation. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 55(3), 613-634.
- Lukács, G., & Lukács, G. (1971). *History and class consciousness: Studies in Marxist dialectics* (Vol. 215). MIT Press.
- Madjid, N. (1983). Cita-Cita Politik Kita. *Aspirasi Umat Islam di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Leppenas, 7-36.
- Marx, K. (1937). The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon translated by Saul K. Padover from the German Edition. Prepared by Engels (1869).
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1967). The Communist Manifesto. 1848. *Trans. Samuel Moore*. London: Penguin.
- McVey, R. T. (2006). *The rise of Indonesian communism*. Equinox Publishing.
- Mietzner, M. (2009). *Military politics, Islam, and the state in Indonesia: from turbulent transition to democratic consolidation*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Miichi, K. (2015). Democratization and 'Failure' of Islamic Parties in Indonesia. In *Southeast Asian Muslims in the Era of Globalization* (pp. 127-144). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Moudouros, N. (2014). Rethinking Islamic Hegemony in Turkey through Gezi Park. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 16(2), 181-195.
- Mudhoffir, A. M. (2017). Islamic Militias and Capitalist Development in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 47(4), 495-514.
- Nasr, S. V. R. (2005). The Rise of "Muslim Democracy". *Journal of Democracy*, 16(2), 13-27.
- Noer, D. (1963). *The Rise and Development of the Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia During the Dutch Colonial Period, 1900-1942*. University Microfilms, Incorporated.
- Pepinsky, T. B., Liddle, R. W., & Mujani, S. (2012). Testing Islam's political advantage: Evidence from Indonesia. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(3), 584-600.
- Radi, U. (1984). *Strategi PPP, 1973-1982: suatu studi tentang kekuatan politik Islam tingkat nasional*. Integrita Press.
- Rahman Alamsyah, A., & Hadiz, V. R. (2017). Three Islamist generations, one Islamic state: the Darul Islam movement and Indonesian social transformation. *Critical Asian Studies*, 49(1), 54-72.
- Reid, A. (1967). Nineteenth century pan-Islam in Indonesia and Malaysia. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 26(2), 267-283.
- Ricklefs, M. C. (2001). *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1200, 3rd ed*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Riley, D. J. (2011). Hegemony, Democracy, and Passive Revolution in Gramsci's Prison Notebooks. *California Italian Studies*, 2(2).
- Rinaldo, R. (2008). Muslim women, middle class habitus, and modernity in Indonesia. *Contemporary Islam*, 2(1), 23-39.
- Robison, R. (1978). Toward a class analysis of the Indonesian military bureaucratic state. *Indonesia*, (25), 17-39.
- Robison, R. (1986). *Indonesia: The rise of capital*. Equinox Publishing.

- Robison, R. (2014). Political Economy and the Explanation of the Islamic Politics in the Contemporary World. In Teik, K., Hadiz, V., & Nakanishi, Y. (Eds.). *Between dissent and power: The transformation of Islamic politics in the Middle East and Asia*. Springer.
- Robison, R., & Hadiz, V. (2004). *Reorganising power in Indonesia: The politics of oligarchy in an age of markets*. Routledge.
- Robison, R., Rodan, G., & Hewison, K. (2005). Transplanting the neoliberal state in Southeast Asia. In Boyd, R. and Ngo, T. *Asian states: Beyond the developmental perspective*. London and New York. RoutledgeCurzon.
- Rogers, M. L. (1988). Depoliticization of Indonesia's Political Parties: Attaining Military Stability. *Armed Forces & Society*, 14(2), 247-272.
- Saefullah, H. (2017). 'Nevermind the jahiliyyah, here's the hijrahs': Punk and the religious turn in the contemporary Indonesian underground scene. *Punk & Post*
- Shiraishi, T., & Farid, H. (1997). *Zaman bergerak: radikalisme rakyat di Jawa 1912-1926*. Pustaka Utama Grafiti.
- Soesastro, M. H. (1989). The political economy of deregulation in Indonesia. *Asian Survey*, 29(9), 853-869.
- Suryadinata, L. (2007). The decline of the hegemonic party system in Indonesia: Golkar after the fall of Soeharto. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 29(2), 333-358.
- Tanuwidjaja, S. (2010). Political Islam and islamic parties in Indonesia: critically assessing the evidence of Islam's Political decline. *Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs*, 32(1), 29-49.
- Temby, Q. (2010). Imagining an Islamic State in Indonesia: From Darul Islam to Jemaah Islamiyah. *Indonesia*, (89), 1-36.
- Thomas, P. D. (2009). *The Gramscian moment: philosophy, hegemony and Marxism* (Vol. 24). Brill.
- Tibi, B. (2002). *The challenge of fundamentalism: Political Islam and the new world disorder* (Vol. 9). Univ of California Press.
- van Bruinessen, M. (2002). Genealogies of Islamic radicalism in post-Suharto Indonesia. *South East Asia Research*, 10(2), 117-154.
- van Bruinessen, M. (2009, November). Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Indonesian Muslim Responses to Globalisation. In *Workshop "Islam and Development in Southeast Asia: Southeast Asian Muslim Responses to Globalization"*, organized by JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) Research Institute, Singapore (pp. 21-22).
- Von der Mehden, F. R. (1958). Marxism and Early Indonesian Islamic Nationalism. *Political Science Quarterly*, 73(3), 335-351.
- Wanto, A. (2012). The Paradox Between Political Islam and Islamic Political Parties: The Case of West Sumatera Province. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, 50(2), 329-368.
- Whitehead, J. (2015). Au Retour a Gramsci: Reflections on civil society, political society and the state in South Asia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 45(4), 660-676.
- Wickham, C. R. (2002). *Mobilizing Islam: Religion, activism and political change in Egypt*. Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, I. (2014). Morality racketeering: Vigilantism and populist Islamic militancy in Indonesia. In In Teik, K., Hadiz, V., & Nakanishi, Y. (Eds.). *Between Dissent and Power* (pp. 248-274). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Winters, J. A. (2011). *Oligarchy*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

- Zurbuchen, M. S. (2002). History, memory, and the "1965 incident" in Indonesia. *Asian Survey*, 42(4), 564-581.
- Parker, R., & Skytta, T. (2000). "Indonesia-Accelerating recovery in uncertain times" *World Bank Report for the Consultative Groups in Indonesia*. retrieved from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/198031468772507220/pdf/multi-page.pdf>
- Thaha, I. (2005). *Demokrasi Religius: Pemikiran Politik Nurcholish Madjid dan M. Amien Rais*. Teraju.
- Tuğal, C. (2009). Transforming everyday life: Islamism and social movement theory. *Theory and Society*, 38(5), 423-458.