INTERFAITH INSTITUTION WORKING TO CREATE RELIGIOUS HARMONY IN SOCIETY (A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INTERFIDEI AND FPUB)

Kerja Lembaga Antariman dalam Menciptakan Kerukunan Umat Beragama di Masyarakat (Kajian Perbandingan antara Interfidei dan FPUB)

Faiz Tajul Millah[1], Gisela Webb[2], dan Zainal Abidin Bagir[3]

Program Studi Ilmu Perbandingan Agama
Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Gadjah Mada

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine religious harmony in Indonesia from the end of Soekarno's rule up to the *reformasi* era, to identify the factors causing the government's failure to keep the religious harmony, and to know how interfaith institutions in Jogjakarta work to create religious harmony in society. This is a descriptive, comparative, and qualitative research because the data are collected from books, documents, and interviews, then used in a comparative analyze.

The interfaith institutions examined are limited to only two institutions, Interfidei and FPUB. The research findings show that attempts to realize religious harmony should not be dominated by the government, but the role of society itself is very significant. The role of the society represented in NGO work is a more bottom-up approach to solve the problems in the society. Their work is the antithesis of the government approach. However, not all of the interfaith institutions have the same method to work. Although they work based on real problems of society, they use different ways to interact with them. Interfidei and FPUB are examples of this. Interfidei uses a more elite approach to contact with the society. FPUB uses a more non-elite approach, based on the grassroots level of society. Eash of Those two types of contacts has its strengths and weaknesses, so the two organizations complement each other. The best method would be if there was an NGO that could combine both ways, although it would be very difficult.

This research will give information related with the failure of the recent government, especially the New Order, in creating religious harmony, and so contribute to academic knowledge of interfaith or inter-religious dialogue, particularly at the level of practice.

Key Words: *Religious Harmony – Interfaith Institutions – Interfaith Dialogue*

[1] *Fakultas Tarbiyah Universitas Islam Negeri Malang*
[2] *Professor at Seton Hall University, New Jersey, USA*
[3] *Doctoral Candidate at Indiana State University, USA*

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Research

Indonesia is well known by people in the world as a pluralistic nation in terms of ethnicity, culture and religion. Geographically, Indonesia has more than 13.000 islands and is settled by more than 200 million people. Indonesia contains 370 tribes and more than 67 local languages. A number of ethnicities such as Malay, Chinese, Arabic, Hindustan, and Negrito collect in the frame of political union of the Republic of Indonesia.[4]

What is interesting and impressive is that Indonesia can keep defending its harmony in this pluralistic condition. There are even some great thinkers interested in and impressed with the experiences of this nation. Scholars of Islam and pluralists, such as Fazlur Rahman have expressed their interest in the pluralism of Indonesia. Rahman predicted that Islam which is peaceful, interesting and can revive the glorious values of toleration and moderation has appeared in Indonesia. The other thinker is Dr. Lawrence Sullivan, the leader of the Center of World Religions Studies at Harvard, who said that Indonesia creatively realized a new approach to make religious life harmonious, which is not found in Europe and America. Furthermore, he emphasized that Indonesia was a model of religious tolerance that other countries could do well to emulate.[5] Finally, the special delegation of General Secretary of The United Nations, Jamsheed Marker, came to Indonesia in March 1997 and he praised the harmony of inter-religious life in Indonesia. He also added that the inter-religious harmony in Indonesia was the success of the government program through its religious department in making harmony of the religious condition.[6]

B.J. Boland, a researcher on Indonesia political issues, predicted that although Indonesia was pluralistic and settled by a Muslim majority (about 85% of the total population), it would not interfere with the harmony of life in the state. His prediction was based on an evaluation of the determination of the state principles of Pancasila by Indonesia's founding fathers and the existence of a religious ministry to mediate and direct harmony in society.[7] Boland's assumption referred to religious political intrigues at that time as different religious groups tried to make their voices heard.[8] Thus, history can approve of the low level of religious conflict during the post-independence period, especially the "new order". This led to the assumption that Soeharto was the type of leader that could succeed in keeping and building integrity, harmony, and welfare of life in this pluralistic country. However, if it is seen accurately how Soeharto

held his strategy in keeping the living of this country, it is proper if it is said that basically the harmony and peace formed is "pseudo-harmony." Pressure with power and military applied to the possibility of conflict made this nation seem peaceful but meant that the potential for explo-. sive conflict still existed.

Potential conflict in Indonesia appeared as conflict phenomena when Soeharto's authority ended. Protest and conflict that happened began to be heard everywhere. Religious rhetoric was used in various conflicts, which enlarged until they could not be controlled any more. The cases of Situbondo, Sampit, Makasar, Maluku, Ambon, Jakarta, Solo and elsewhere became a proof that this nation was not ready for pluralistic life in terms of ethnicity or religion. Moreover, in recent phenomena, the violence has been considered a final solution by desperate participants in many conflicts. The Bali bombing followed by other bombings, especially the Marriot, has caused commotion not only in this country but also at the international level. Inter-tribal conflict in Irian Jaya occurred over the creation of a new province. All of these cases have caused the image of this nation that loves peace and harmony to undergo an 180-degree change. What then becomes a problem is how to attempt to make this nation understand the way to live harmoniously in the context of a plural society.

The government is aware of this reality in which peace and harmony are decaying both within and among religions. One strategic step taken by the government is to build educational institutions oriented towards religious and ethnic plurality through programs such as Inter-Religious Relationship Program at IAIN Sunan Kalijaga and Religion and Cross Cultural Studies UGM. The institutions will create and produce scholars who are ready to give intellectual contributions to overcome the crises in peace and harmony in this country. However, common people do not yet see these institutions as affecting their lives, although the work of educational institutions is still important contribution as institutions which prepare pre-dialogue.[9] It means that discourse of theological discussion, religious harmony and politics are still effectively produced by the common people. These functions are very important for the basis of action of NGOs that cannot be done by educational institutions. What institutions of higher education offer is still seen as only intellectual work, rather than practical work facing the reality of conflicts in this society.

In order to mediate the gap between practical reality in society and the academic sphere, and particularly as a student of a Comparative Religion program, this author feels motivated to do a relevant research. When a conflict occurs, people at the grass-roots level feel it directly, so

there is a need for the existence of independent groups in society that are credible to have direct contact to the common people. In this situation, interfaith groups have an urgent role in the society.

Relating to the existence of interfaith groups, we see that many interfaith groups have appeared in recent decades, primarily when major conflict occurred in 1998-2001. Interfaith institutions working in Indonesia have a range of scopes, working at the local, regional, and national levels. Some groups are affiliated with a certain religion, but there are also groups that do not refer to any religions. The interesting things are how each of them struggles for harmony among people and what format and strategy that are used. However, it will be too broad to talk about all of the interfaith movements in the research of this thesis. In addition, not all of the institutions concentrate specifically on interfaith and religious harmony issues. Therefore, this research will be limited to only two interfaith institutions that are focused on the issues in most of their programs and actions and are very popular in national level, especially in Jogjakarta. They are Interfidei and Forum Perdamaian Umat Beriman (FPUB) (Jogja Interfaith Forum). There has been an assumption that Interfidei is a dialogue institution that uses academic actions and has elite participants mostly to do their work programs, while FPUB is an interfaith movement that uses non-academic actions and has non elite participants and that the institution is formed as a "non formal" institution. From this assumption, therefore, it will be understood that Interfidei and FPUB are very different in every aspect of organization. This research will explore these assumptions. This research takes the historical context and the contemporary problems in Indonesia as its starting point, and will explore the following questions.

B. Problem Formulation
1. What is the contribution of both interfaith institutions in creating religious harmony?
2. How do they work to create religious harmony in their society?

C. Research Objectives

To analyze the history of work for religious harmony including dialogue among religious communities in Indonesia

To analyze the content of the vision, mission, program, strategy, funding, staff of each inter-faith group.

To analyze the continuity and discontinuity, the academic and non-

academic action, independence and dependence of institution, effectiveness and scope of the vision, mission, program, funding, managerial structure/staff, and strategy of both interfaith institutions.

D. Type of research

This research is based on library research and field research. Library research is used to look for and pursue the history of religious harmony in Indonesia. This becomes the basis of examining the role of interfaith groups in creating harmony among religious followers in the society. The field research is used to look for data related to the action of interfaith groups in the field.

E. Resource and Types of Data

The resources used in this research are written sources, interviews, and actions. Words and actions of people observed or interviewed are the main form of data that is used. This data were noted in written form or recorded on audio tape. Written data primarily were obtained through interviews or participant observation. Both were the result of seeing, listening, and asking. In this research, the people who were interviewed or observed are religious figures (ulamas, priests, and bikhus), intellectuals, and some activists of interfaith institutions strongly related to this research.

In addition to direct interaction and observation, supporting sources of data are written sources including notebooks, journals, private documents and official documents that are considered to be related to the theme of the research. These sources, including secondary sources such as books, are particularly keys for the historical aspect of this research.

F. Research Object

This research is focuses on Interfaith Groups in Jogjakarta in making religious harmony in society. Actually, there are many interfaith groups in Jogjakarta. However, there is no certainty of number of Interfaith Groups in Jogjakarta. Some of them refer to the government or at least initiated by the government, such as Lembaga Pengkajian Kerukunan Umat Beragama (LPKUB) (Institution of Inter-religious Harmony Study), Forum Komunikasi Umat Beragama (FKUB) (Religious Followers Communication Forum), refer to certain religion such as KODAMA (Islam/ NU), Chatolic Relief Service (Chatolic), focus not only on interfaith and religious harmony issues, such as Lembaga Kajian Islam dan Masyarakat (LKiS) (Institution of Islamic and Social Studies), and Satu Nama. There-

fore, the author limits the interfaith groups that are be studied to only two interfaith institutions. The reason of choosing the two interfaith institutions is the independence of interfaith institutions from the government and other institutions including religions. The concentration only to interfaith and religious harmony issues is also part of the uniqueness of the institution. Thus, by this category, then, had been the two interfaith groups chosen: Interfidei, whose approach is primarily academic-elite, and FPUB, whose approach is more non-academic-directly related to the grassroots level. The choice of both institutions is also based on the reason that both are popular enough in national level especially in Jogjakarta and very different from each other in every aspect of institution.

G. Methodology of Research

Based on the problems of this research, basically descriptive and explanative answers are needed. Therefore, this research uses a qualitative research approach as a research procedure that results in descriptive data in the form of written and oral explanations from persons.

To optimize this research, the author's methodology includ the following various activities, as following:

1. Library Studies

The goal of the library studies was to obtain concepts regarding and insights about the history of religious harmony in Indonesia, which then could be made as the basis of theory and contexts in analyzing and comparing the content, concepts and programs of the interfaith groups in creating religious harmony in the society. In this phase, library studies was also done to reconstruct the mapping of thought of the movement of interfaith groups in the contemporary era, related to visions, missions, programs, managerial staff and strategies that they use in creating religious harmony in the society.

2. Pre-Field Research
  a.   Identifying variables that would be counted by data instruments in this research, such as:
      -   positions of interfaith group in regards with regarding funding institutions, state, society, religion, constituents, and networks;
      -   strategies of interfaith groups (internally);
      -   relationships with other institutions as networks.

     b.   Designing data instruments to obtain information about these variables.

         In this step of research, the method is used to choose the research subject, which will be the source for of obtaining/collecting data or research information.[10] In this research, the subjects are:

         a.   Dian/Interfidei and FPUB where the research will be done;

         b.   Elga Sarapung and her staffs, and also the thoughts of institution board such as Eka Darmaputra, Djohan Efendy and Daniel Dakidae in Interfidei. Kyai Muhaimin and his staffs especially the general secretary of FPUB, Aan Aprianto and Ngatiyar.

The objects of the research are visions, missions, strategies, programs and actions of them (both institutions).

3. Field Research

     a.   Interview

         To examine the continuity or consistency of interfaith institutions in building harmony in society, I interviewed some leaders and activists (at least two per institution). The survival quality and ability of the institutions is related to these leaders' and activists' concepts and activities, which can be ascertained through interviews.

         Interview means activities to collect and seek, look data and information by asking questions to subjects or objects of the research orally and face to face.[11]

     b.   Direct Observation

         Direct observation was done to measure the consistency between the vision, mission and program of each institution and the realization of the programs (activities) that are done for people at the grass-root level based on their concept of religious harmony. Observation also focused on understanding these institutions' roles as actors, motivators and transformers of the society and the relationships formed among them

4. Content Analysis and Comparison

In content analysis, the descriptive qualitative method was be used that is to describe data words received through discussion and interview, and separate the data in accordance with their categories to obtain a conclusion.[12]

Comparative analyses were done to evaluate the consistency of vi-

sion, mission and program of interfaith groups in the process of creating religious harmony in society. In this phase, the discourse of each inter-faith group, related to their vision, concept, program, and strategy to create religious harmony in society was analyzed, with particular atten-tion to their real activities. Then, all of these were compared in order to look for common ground and differences. As described above, these in-stitutions' continuity and relationships among institutions were be ana-lyzed.

CHAPTER II

Religious Harmony in Indonesia

It can be said that religious conflict is actually a product of the New Order because during the Guided Democracy governmental era, inter-religious conflict almost never appeared. The nation was busy with revo-lution and its aftermath. During the New Order, the state stamped out potential conflicts in order to allow a smooth path for development, with-out really resolving issues in plural communities. Thus the conflicts that had emerged can be considered typically New Order, a product of the Suharto regime and its regulations. The inter-religious dialogue at the beginning of New Order was also typically New Order in its style, struc-tured to create a shallow stability in order to allow development to progress, rather than to really resolve issues among the people.

These were the vital positions and roles of the Department of Reli-gious Affairs in the construction of religious policy, including granting or denying the right of legal existence to religious groups. However, there were also some critiques and the argument that the Department should have improved their role in helping the Indonesian people as a whole. The widespread objection to the Rancangan Undang-undang Kerukunan Umat Beragama (RUU KUB) (Draft of regulations for Religious Denomi-nation Harmony) reflected that Indonesia needed to move and change. The religious policy in the RUU KUB is considered the same as before.

Further, the government kept organizing inter-religious dialogues at the national level. Often, though, the dialogue was only a formality. The dialogue did not try to solve the conflict that had occurred by under-standing the root of the conflict. In many cases, the government inter-vened militarily to reduce tension and prevent conflict. It should be ac-knowledged, though, that in the short term the intervention of govern-ment through some policies, regulations and militaristic approach did succeed in overcoming the religious tension and conflicts, at least in as much depth as was needed to ensure a smooth path to development.

Since that time, the government through the Religious Affairs De-
partment had initiated inter-religious dialogues and promoted religious
harmony. The next ministries held more intensive activities. Since this
time, dialogue was a government program and a primary program of
the project of religious harmony of the Religious Affairs Department. It
may be the only program of the department which had proceeded con-
sistently for such a length of time, through various changes in leader-
ship. It seems that inter-religious dialogue is an obligatory program of
the Department of Religious Affairs as it is reflected in their programs.

The efforts of KH. A. Dahlan to make the institution of inter-reli-
gious consultation was continued by the next Ministers, primarily H. Mukti
Ali and Alamsyah Ratuprawira Negara.

The process is very significant. It can be seen since 1961, when com-
parative religion programs were founded at the Institut Agama Islam
Negeri (IAIN) (State Islamic Institute) Jakarta and IAIN Jogjakarta. At
both, there were many books aquired discussing religions and workshops
organized around religions. This influence was continued through reli-
gious conferences held by Balitbang Persekutuan Gereja-gereja di Indo-
nesia (the Indonesian Association of Churches Research and Develop-
ment Division) (1980s), and the development of some religious studies
departments in seminaries. Religious studies became a priority when
Mukti Ali became Minister of Religious Affairs (1971).[13]

In Mukti Ali's perspective, as stated above, the study of religions
should support an open attitude to other religions and encourage readi-
ness for dialogue. Thus it can be said that study or a serious introduction
to other religions or faiths is a requirement for coming into the dialogue;
that is a "pre-dialogue process."[14]

In the conclusion of an article, Mukti Ali confirms:

Although comparative religious studies in Indonesia theoretically is not
well-developed, in practical life, the existence of comparative religious stud-
ies is very helpful to the smooth processing of inter-religious dialogue in
Indonesia. This is probably because of the cleverness of Indonesians to
make everything relative.[15]

Mukti Ali has also said that at the beginning, comparative religious
studies were established in Indonesia because the condition of religious
life in Indonesia (especially Islam) had to come into the realm of theoreti-
cal thought and become open in order to be freed from only normative
understandings and *tasawuf* (mystical) orientations. Further, he pointed
to an academic mode of studying religion which must become longer
and stricter if the religions want to get out of provincialism of thought,

which is an obstacle to knowing other religions and faiths objectively. So, sincerity is needed to come into the western critical thinking process. Thus, the study of religions he initiated had to follow a tight methodology like the approach of thinker *religionswissenschaft* Germany, Joachim Wach, that is, it should be objective in method and in introducing the process to view ourselves and others.

Meanwhile, the "pre-dialog" attitude is a new attitude that needs to increase in our religions. Most of the religious followers, especially in the grassroot level, still understand the "others" in a simple way, knowing only a little about holidays, places of worship or just knowing others through prejudice and *a priori* assumptions. After following the system of study, people can go through a process of pre-dialogue and then the serious dialogue will be realized in inter-religious communities.

Generally, in the New Order era, it can be seen that one of the activities or governmental regulation related to religion were the "project" of harmony. It was commonly known that the government made the Department of Religious Affairs the agent to carry out this project. This department engaged in and initiated inter-religious dialogues in a very wide scope. However, what should be noticed is that the result of the dialogue did not reflect willingness from various elements of society non touch the real problem of society.

The dialogues did not dialogue on problems of the *aqidah* or dogma of each religion. Rather, they discussed issues such as how each religion can motivate its followers to take part in the development program. It is clear that the dialogue activities were related to the government's program, which was to make the situation conducive to its development programs. It was also hoped by the government that the dialogue in a forum like Musyawarah Antar Umat Beragama (inter-religious followers dialogue), would not become an arena for conflicts as occurred in 1967. Often, dialogues were held by the government to meet and talk about the problems in the view of government, such as the problem of demand to implement Islamic laws and the problem of Christian missionaries trying to convert Muslims. These problems used to be overcome in a legalistic fashion such as the decision of the Ministry of Religious Affairs No. 70/1978 on Religious Missions. In another way, the problems were approached by proposing an ethical code for the relationship among religions. In the vulgar way, it can be said that dialogue initiated and held by government was a meeting of religious elites attempting to save the prime project of the New Order, which was development programs. The New Order government felt that developing the nation could not be delayed, and development must proceed well. Development be-

came a demand of the whole society. Therefores development had to get an established basis and all people had to take part in the success of the development. Events related to interfaith harmony were designed for development goals, rather than to seek to identify and resolve the real problems of society. Dialogue became a way to control the religious communities.

When Alamsyah was the Minister of Religious Affairs, in 1970, an institution formed by name of Wadah Musyawarah Antar Umat Beragama (Inter-religious Communication Forum) (WMAUB) was the result of the meeting of religious leaders and the official of the Department of Religious Affairs on June 30 1970. This can be seen as the first embryo of interfaith institutions in Indonesia.

As discussed before, the government actually had its own concept about religious harmony. The "trilogy of harmony" was popular at the time: inter-religious harmony, intra-religious harmony and religious harmony between religions and the government. In order to realize the trilogy of harmony, government made regulations managing religious life. The regulations were made based on the assumption that the state, which had Pancasila as its principle, had a duty and responsibility to create religious harmony. In creating religious harmony, the government chose the policy of prevention with the principle of giving priority to national interests more than individual or group interests. Some of the regulations were:[16]

- Creating a Wadah Musyawarah Antar Umat Beragama (WMAUB) (Inter-Religious Communication Forum) through the Ministry of Religious Affairs (MORA) decision No. 35, 1980.
- Operation of developing harmony of religious life in all regions related to WMAUB that had been established before by giving the basic of law MORA instruction No. 3, 1981.
- Creating the coordination team of supervision for people of faith through the decision of the National Prosecutor No. 108/J/A/5/ 1984.
- Policy of faith groups through MORA Instruction No. 4, 1978.

The efforts of the government to create religious harmony, as reflected from the regulations above, had some critiques from thinkers. They tended to see that the government's effort was not effective and not successful, and even became counterproductive. In St. Sunardi's opinion, the mode of inter-religious relationships developed by the New Order government, which was based on two assumptions, was not right and realistic enough. First, the duty of inter-religious relationships was in the hands of religious leaders, and second, the duty included protection of

religious followers and increasing numbers of every religion's followers. In another word, the mode of communication among religions was reduced to spreading religion, and the sense of harmony and peace was reduced to no conflict rather than a sense of responsibility of all.[17]

For those reasons, the efforts to create harmony developed only on the surface, among the government elites and bureaucrats, including community figures or religious leaders, for certain temporary interests. They did not touch on the need for more general, friendly and interactive communication in the society with their problems.[18] For Azyumardi Azra, in the New Order era, dialogue among religious leaders tended to be activities sponsored by the government and still were only formalities. The result was conflict among religious followers, especially between Muslims and Christians, that could not be overcome.[19]

In Gus Dur's opinion, the failure of the New Order is was caused by the concept of harmony developed by the New Order itself. For him;

> We actually have not had a program in national level to have inter-understanding and inter-religious togetherness or solidarity. What existed in the New Order was a program of tolerance and mutual consideration. What appeared from the term made by the government was really appropriate with its condition: inter-religious harmony. It means that it is only harmony. The harmony mean peaceful coexistence: peaceful neighborhood life but not true inter-group understanding, whereas it was the sense of solidarity and inter-group understanding that needeed to be developed.[20]

Although the regulations were operating, there were still some tensions and conflicts occurring at the grassroot level, especially related to religious missionarizing, building of places of worship, and so on.[21] This appeared because of many factors, such as that the regulations above were not socialized well into the society, including to religious leaders and social leaders.[22] The efforts were less effective because they were still oriented to maintaining stability and national unity, so the inter-religious relationship was not effective or useful.[23]

Beside that, the role of religious institutions made the policy that made the inter-religious relation worse in the society. One example is the policy made by Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI) (Indonesia Muslims Leaders Assembly) fatwa in 1987 prohibiting Muslims to say seasons' greeting to Christian neighbors or friends on Christmas day and vice versa.[24] In this moment the policy became not only ineffective in creating religious harmony, but even counter-productive.

The effort of interfaith institution to create religious harmony as counterpart or antithesis of governmental effort

In the early 1990s, inter-religious dialogues were also created by some non-governmental groups. This meant that initiative for dialogue did not appear from the government, but was initiated and conducted by the society both formally in formal institutions/NGOs and non formal organizations such as forum or communities.

Some of these groups are active in Jogjakarta[25], such as Dialog Antar Iman (DIAN/Interfidei), founded in 1992, which focuses its activities on an effort to develop the consciousness of pluralism and socialization of inter-religious dialogue towards society, especially among the young generation. Forum Persaudaraan Umat Beriman (FPUB) (Interfaith Brotherhood Forum Jogjakarta), established in 1995, involves members of leaders and figures of every religion and faith. They intend to socialize inter-religious dialogue consciousness toward the society especially at the grassroots level. Among the young generation, the Tikar Pandan Community (its embryo appeared in 1995) appeared, in which a number of young members of inter-religious and inter-ethnic groups in Jogjakarta did intensive dialogue.[26] They held the ideal of being religiously mature. They were concerned much with seeking of solution to overcome inter ethnic and inter-religious prejudice. Their focus was on continuous discussion and sharing of religious experience, and they also had unique activities such as exploration differ religious and ethnic tradition. There is also Lembaga Lintas SARA (LLS) established in 1996 as the continuation of inter-SARA groups followed by some students of student organizations such as Pergerakan Mahasiswa Islam Indonesia (PMII) (Indonesia Islamic Student Movement), Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam (HMI) (Islamic Student Association) GMKI, PMKRI, and so on. (SARA is a New Order acronym for Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Inter-Group divisions.)

In Jakarta, a major interfaith group established in 1995 was Masyarakat Dialoue Antar Agama (MADIA) (Inter-Religious Dialogue Community). This institution was concerned with developing inter-religious dialogue.

Beside the institution in only the dialogue, there are also some other institutions concerned with the dialogue, such as Paramadina, Lembaga Kajian Islam Sosial (Lkis), Forum Demokrasi (fordem) (Democracy Forum) and so on.

In the 1990s, other approaches appeared as the reaction to the inter-religious dialogue programs that had been initiated by the government. This non-governmental approach, said St. Sunardi, is the approach of

inter-religious dialogue as a social critique.[27] Almost all of these institu-
tions were pioneered by young thinkers concerned with the religious role
in democracy and social justice. Some of them were Gus Dur, Nurcholish
Madjid, Djohan Effendi, Rm. Mangunwijaya, Rm. Banawiratma, Th.
Sumartana and Eka Darmaputra. Gus Dur, for example, established
FORDEM which had some intellectual members coming from different
backgrounds. It was hoped that the inter-religious movement would be
integrated with new social movements developing at that time.

CHAPTER III
Content Analysis and Comparison

Referring to the models of inter-religious dialogue, Interfidei and
FPUB are the groups that have realized and developed many models of
dialogue, especially theological and action dialogue. They strongly real-
ize that inter-religious dialogue has to be done at all levels of society, not
only at the elite level of society or with religious elite, but also with com-
mon people. For them, religious theological problems can be talked about
and discussed openly. In addition, they also emphasiz the important of
cooperating concretely in society as the realization of dialogue.

The similarities of Interfidei and FPUB are mostly caused by their
intention to help in terms of religious-social problems of society. Based on
the national and local situation of this country, both try to build an inter-
faith institution, with dialogue, broadly speaking, as main tool and method
of work. Although the form of Interfidei and FPUB is different as an
institution and a forum, this does not differentiate the substance of their
function, that is to develop this nation and society towards peace, har-
mony and a better life. However, this concern is not considered wide
enough. Even some thinkers such as St. Sunardi said that to make inter-
faith institutions that are concerned with dialogue more significant in
their role in society, they should widen their scope of vision and mission,
if they don't want to be ignored and considered insignificant or irrel-
evant in terms of the needs of dynamic social life.

Based on that reason then Interfidei and FPUB has attempted to
accommodate it in their visions. Interfidei views the ideal of society as
not only harmony in religious life, but broader than that, harmony in
civil society life that has freedom, rights, and peace. FPUB views the ideal
society as not only harmony in religious life but more than that, the plu-
ral society should be peaceful, interactive, cooperative, and caring to one
another based on strong faith, solidarity and human rights.

In addition, what makes them different is the non-formal agreement

they made. They both agreed to share the job area. While Interfidei has chosen elite level of society such as students, activists, religious and social leaders, FPUB chosen the grassroot level of society. This job division then makes them become very different in almost every part of their institutional organization and activities. Besides the vision and status of their institution, the model of action, programs, job division, dependency of funding, and scope of mission are also different.

The models of action used by Interfidei are academic. Study of religions, conferences, trainings, book discussions, workshops and book publishing are part of these academic activities. These activities are relevant with the concern and the activity of students, activists, and religious and social leaders. FPUB uses more non-academic action. Inter-faith and inter-religious dialogue are formed as dialogue *karya, sarasehan*, collective praying, village cleaning, *rembug desa* and so on. Peace building is formed as mimbar bebas (open mic), peace campaign, advocating, non-formal cultural meeting or gathering, pernyataan sikap (attitude statement). All these are part of the non-academic activities. These activities are relevant to the concern and the activities of the grassroot level of people.

The model of action above then continues affecting the need for funding to finance the programs they hold. Interfidei, that used more academic and formal action, often needs a lot of money, because most of the academic and formal meetings such as conferences, trainings, workshops, publishing and so on are expensive. Therefore Interfidei often needs funding to finance most of its program and this makes it depend on the funding provision. In contrast, FPUB does not need a lot of money to finance most of its programs. The programs that FPUB holds are more non formal and non academic. Most of them are cheap. That is why FPUB tends to be independent from any funding foundation interference. It is a fact that FPUB has received funding from CCFD, but this is new and the funding has only been received since 2003. However, FPUB will be able to hold all of its programs although there is no funding provided as there was.

In addition, the different model both Interfidei and FPUB have chosen also affects the scope of their mission and program. Interfidei that has more elite participants for most of its programs is likely to broaden its scope as broad as possible. It is because contact with society is represented by some people. But FPUB tends to limit its scope only to the local area of Jogjakarta. It is more difficult for FPUB to broaden its scope wider than Jogjakarta, because the contact between FPUB and the people is directly at the grassroots level. Direct contact at the grassroots level of people means FPUB needs to know about problems and issues appeared

in among the people. It is impossible to know every problem and issue that appears in every area of Indonesia. Therefore, the issues responded by FPUB are local issues. Although some of the issues are national as well, FPUB has attemptedto make them as simple as possible so that the issues can be understood by all people.

It is rather difficult to indicate the effectiveness of every program of both Interfidei and FPUB. However, they have succeeded to facilitate some new interfaith institutions concerning religious harmony. Similar programs were held again in some areas because of the request of the people. Publishing books, newsletters, and magazine's spread to broader areas of Indonesia can be considered as an indication of effectiveness.

The fact that people are living in religious harmony in Jogjakarta through this turbulent period in which there have been conflicts in other areas of Indonesia is also one positive indicator regarding the effective-ness of Interfidei and FPUB's programs. Their work is of course not the only possible reason for the condition of Jogjakarta. Observers often point also to Javanese ethics, the charismatic, conflict-preventing leadership of the Sultan, and the lifestyle of the people of Jogjakarta.   It is difficult to separate out these different variables, but the number of people who are affected directly or indirectly by Interfidei's and FPUB's programs, whether by attending an event, listening to community radio, or reading a book or magazine, implies that Interfidei and FPUB are successful in disseminating these ideas to a larger audience.

The Differences between Interfidei and FPUB

INTERFIDEI	DIFFERENCE	FPUB
Formal institution, well organized	Institutional status	Non-formal institution (only a forum), not well enough organized
To develop civil society	vision	To develop peaceful, non-violent society, and human right
Pluralism, interfaith dialogue and cooperation, and religious transformation	Mission	Dissemination peaceful spirit, empower ment off people, advocacy, and promoting the non-violent community
Elite level of society (students, activists, academicians, religious and social leaders)	Target of program	Grassroot level of society
Formal, academic	Model of action	Non-formal, non-academic
Local and national	Scope of mission and programs	Limited to only local people of Jogjakarta
Mostly dependent on the funding institutions	Independency of funding	More independent

The Similarities between Interfidei and FPUB

1. Both use main method of dialogue in wide and many models to hold most of their programs
2. Both work as NGO work, which have access directly to society and stand to criticize governmental policies which cause over interference to social life
3. Both have their uniqueness of consistency in vision, mission, and program and of continuity to create religious harmony
4. Both have similarities in the effectiveness of work
5. Both use religious values and ethics to respond social, politic and religious issues
6. Both do not give priority to one certain religion and faith, but put religions equal

CHAPTER IV
CONCLUDING REMARKS

A. Conclusion

This thesis is an effort to remember and encourage the plurality of religious life of Indonesia. The plurality of religious life had been inherited from early history of Indonesia. Since the beginning of Indonesia, from the era when this region was governed by kingdoms, to this day, this plurality still exists and is never ending. It can not be avoided and must be accepted. It is true that, as is often said, this plurality holds the potential for conflicts, but it is not necessary. What Indonesia, and Indonesian individual, should be working on is how to manage, or interact with, this plurality to achieve or maintain the condition that they want.

Managing the plurality of religious life was part of the experience of the New Order era, as described above. The government attempted to create religious harmony by making a "religious harmony project" developed by the Ministry of Religious Affairs. From the beginning of the Soeharto era until the end of his regime, the project still existed. The project became a tradition that continued from one Minister of Religious Affairs to the next.

However, this project cannot be said to be totally successful, although it was known by many people at the international level. This is because the Ministry, especially under Minister Tarmizi Taher, often spoke about

the religious harmony of Indonesia in international forums. However, not long after the end of his term as Minister, about 1998, religious conflicts started appearing and grew more and more widespread, affecting almost all of the major cities in Indonesia. This was an embarrassing experience for Indonesians, as Indonesians and the world a like realized that the picture being painted of Indonesian religious harmony·was a façade, preserved by force rather than by he common will of the people. What we should learn from this experience is that religious harmony cannot be managed only by the government using a top-down approach. The weakness of this approach is that it results in a kind of imposition of people's ideas and acts, pushing people to avoid physical conflicts and sometimes even espouse pluralistic ideals, without really dealing with the needs and consciousness of the people themselves. The people themselves can understand and face the problems of inter-religious relationships and conflicts. The solutions should come out of genuine public processes involving the people. The duty and role of the government should only be as a facilitator. These lessons learned and the experience under the New Order motivated some people to develop interfaith institutions to manage the plurality of religious life and to create pure religious harmony based on the needs and consciousness of the people and society.

Interfidei and FPUB are two major interfaith institutions working for these goals. Based on plurality and its understanding of pluralism, Interfidei had developed an institution named Dian/Interfidei. Since 1992, when Interfidei was formally established, it worked and held many programs that supported the development of religious harmony in society. Unlike Interfidei, FPUB developed amidst conflict condition in 1996. This is why FPUB made programs and an institution based on the concept of true brotherhood to support the development of religious harmony in society. Because come from different backgrounds, tend to be separate from each other. Interfidei tends to hold programs that feature academic-elite participation and action, while FPUB tends to hold programs featuring non-academic or grassroots-level actions. Interfidei has developed a network to hold many programs with many other groups in national level, while FPUB tends to limit its work and scope only in Jogjakarta area. As a consequence, Interfidei needs a large amount of funding to finance most of its programs. This makes Interfidei depend on the funding provision, while FPUB does not depend on large grants to hold its programs.

However, they both have similarities in the continuity or consistency of their institutions and the effectiveness of their programs in supporting

the development of inter-religious harmony in social life. It is impossible to guarantee that there will be no inter-religious conflicts any more in this country, but at least the consciousness of peace and harmony of inter-religious life will be developed and widespread over time to the whole society of this country. People around Indonesia look to Jogjakarta for new intellectual ideas and methods to create peace and live together. Both Interfidei and FPUB, with their different strategies, can provide models for groups trying to work for the same goals throughout Indonesia. If institutions like Interfidei continue to develop, and institutions like FPUB grow up in every area of this country, it will lead to a condition in which people can live peacefully, and harmony will develop in this country.

B. Suggestion

1. It is clear that the religious conflicts that have occurred recently were caused by the latent problems existing in the society. The potential was not responded well by the government. That is why the government should change its method in approaching the conflicts, not only using the top-down method but also bottom up one considering the real and genuine problems of the society. Based on these considerations, religious conflicts can be eliminated as much as possible.

2. From the description of the organizations above, it is shown that the role of civil society organizations in developing religious harmony is very effective. That is why there is no reason any more for the government to dominate efforts to create religious harmony in the society. It will be better for the government to be only a facilitator or mediator of the efforts. Let the people themselves try to manage and solve their own problems, because they themselves know more about the real problems they face.

3. Based on the considerations above, the government should improve its relationship with civil society, especially with NGOs, including interfaith institutions, in developing religious harmony in the society. Try to make better cooperation with them and listen to their experience of how to contact with the society, especially the grassroot level of the society. This research encountered some difficulties in getting documents, especially written documentation of FPUB's programs. Only the simple data were available. It is rather difficult to draw a conclusion based on this. Therefore, it would be a positive development if FPUB could better manage its documentation and had a formal office with constant staffing.

4. Although Interfidei has a very good documentation, management,

and reputation, and FPUB has also very good connections and con-
tact with local people, it seems the two are separated from each other.
It will be bad if both are involved in some kind of competition in a
negative manner or even simply if they are not good in coordination
of how to create religious harmony in the society. Therefore their
unity and solidarity is very important, considering that their func-
tion is very significant but their methods are very different.

5. However, it would be wonderful if in the future there was an institu-
tion or NGO that is able to combine the ways that Interfidei and
FPUB have. Concerning this, the Interfaith Forum for Peace in Asia
(IFPA) that is driven by Mujib el Fikri and supported by some people
that have academic and practical backgrounds. This institution was
not chosen as a topic of study for this research partly because it is still
new and does not yet have a track record that can be studied, but it
has potential to make an important contribution to religious harmony
in Jogjakarta. Therefore, it is important for them to learn more from
both institutions, Interfidei and FPUB.

6. There are various possibilities for future research on the role of the
government and interfaith institutions in creating religious harmony
in the society. One important complementary topic is the concept of
pluralism followed by one or more interfaith institutions. This is im-
portant because the source of the concept is educational institution,
and student research will contribute their insight of the concept to
NGO activists and society.

7. In terms of academic contribution, this research found also that in-
terfaith and inter-religious dialogue is not rigid at the level of imple-
mentation. It can be done by many ways. Some activists use confer-
ences, trainings, workshops while some other activists use sarasehan,
rembug desa, bersih desa, dialogue karya, etc, These kinds of dia-
logue are very important to enrich the way to dialogue with people
at the grassroot level of society, and it can make efforts of creating
religious harmony more effective.

NOTE IN THE TEXT

[1] See. Achmad, Nur, *Pluralitas Agama: Kerukunan dalam Keragaman*,
Kompas, Jakarta, Agustus 2001, hal 95

[2] See. Shihab, Alwi., *Islam Inklusif*, Mizan, Bandung, Juni 2001, page
335

[3] See. *Harian kompas*, 27 maret 1997

[4] See. Boland, B.J., *Pergumulan Islam di Indoesia 1945-1970*,

Terjemahan, Grafiti Pers, Jakarta, 1985, hal 110-115

[5] The polemic among religious leaders and social leaders about Pancasila occurred in July-August 1945. they were in polemic of the first phase of Pancasila, especially the sentence of "operating Islamic laws for Muslims." This polemic became tension between Muslim leaders and Christians leaders supported by people in Sulawesi. They intimidated to build their own state if the sentence was not erased. Not long after agreement and proclamation of freedom August 1945, about October 1945 Muslims leader proposed to establish The Ministry of Religious Affairs. It became polemic too. The Catholic leader, Bakker, said that the ministry was only first step of Muslims to build Islamic state. A muslim leader, Wahid Hasyim, argued that. See.Ibid...page 106-107

[6] See, Trisno S. Sutanto Dkk. (ed), *Meretas Horison Dialog: Catatan dari Empat Daerah,* MaDIA, Jakarta, December 2001 page 28-30

[7] Suryabrata Sumadi, *Metodologi Penelitian,* Jakarta: Rajawali, 1990, page23-24

[8] Abdurrahman, Dudung, *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian dan Penulisan Karya Ilmiah* , Jogjakarta: IFFA Press, 1998, page 54

[9] Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik,* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1998, third edition, page 13

[10] Ibid....page 29

[11] Ibid....page 30

[12] Mukti Ali, *Perbandingan Agama di Indonesia: Beberapa Permasalahan,* INIS, Jakarta, 1990, page 3-11

[13] See for details ibid...., page3-11 and also Balitbang Depag, *Kompilasi Peraturan Perundang-undangan dan Kebijakan Pembinaan Kerukunan Hidup Beragama,* Jakarta:Balitbang Depag, 1994

[14] See St. Sunardi, *The Dead End of Religious Dialogue in Indonesia,* in Interface, Vol. 4, No. 1, May 2001, page 56

[15] Syafa'atun Elmirzana, et al., *Pluralisme, Konflik Dan Perdmaian: Studi Bersama Antariman,* Jogjakarta: DIAN/Interfidei, 2002, page 6

[16] Azyumardi Azra, *Islam and Christianity in Indonesia: the Roots of Conflict and Hostility,* in Joseph A. Camilleri, (ed.), *Religion and Culture in Asia Pacific: Violence or Healing?* Melbourne: Bista Publications, 2001, page 91

[17] Abdurrahman Wahid, *Dialog Agama dan Masalah pendangkalan Agama,* in Nurcholis Madjid, et al., *Passing Over: Melintasi BatasAgama,* editor: Komaruddin Hidayat & Ahmad Gaus AF. Jakarta: Gramedia &

Paramadina, 1998, page 56

[18] Burhanuddin, et al. (ed.), *Sistem siaga Dini*, op.cit..., page 27

[19] Ibid......, page 32

[20] See Hairus Salim,Majalah Basis No.01-02, 53thyear, January-February2004

[21] Syafa'atun Elmirzana, et al., *Pluralisme, Konflik dan Perdamaian*, page 108

[22] The full list of the institutions can be seen in report, *Forum Refleksi Kelompok Antariman se-Indonesia*, by institute DIAN/Interfidei, 2002. Unpublished

[23] See, Suhadi, *Sharing Pengalaman Mengelola Kelompok Antariman: Komunitas Tikar Pandan*, in Newsletter Interfidei, special edition , 2002, page 42-43

[24] St. Sunardi, *The Dead End of Religious Dialogue in Indonesia*, in interface, ..., page 57-58

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdurrahman, Dudung, *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian dan Penulisan Karya Ilmiah* , Jogjakarta: IFFA Press, 1998

Abdurrahman Wahid, Dialog Agama dan Masalah Pendangkalan Agama, in Nurcholis Madjid, et al., *Passing Over: Melintasi Batas Agama*, editor: Komaruddn Hidayat & Ahmad Gaus AF. Jakarta: Gramedia & aramadina, 1998.

Achmad, Nur, *Pluralitas Agama: Kerukunan dalam Keragaman*, Kompas, Jakarta, Agustus 2001.

Ali, Mukti, *Perbandingan Agama di Indonesia: Beberapa Permasalahan*, INIS, Jakarta, 1990

Arikunto, Suharsimi, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1998, third edition

Azra, Azyumardi, *Konteks Berteologi di Indonesia: Pengalaman Islam*, editor: Idris Thaha, Jakarta: Paramadina, 1999

Balitbang Depag, *Kompilasi Peraturan Perundang-undangan Kerukunan Hidup Umat Beragama*, sixth edition, Jakarta: Balitbang Depag, 1997

Boland, B.J., *Pergumulan Islam di Indoesia 1945-1970*, Terjemahan, Grafiti Pers, Jakarta, 1985

Burhanuddin, et al, (ed), *Sistem Siaga Dini*.

Shihab, Alwi., *Islam Inklusif*, Mizan, Bandung, Juni 2001

Suhadi, *Sharing Pengalaman Mengelola Kelompok Antariman: Komunitas Tikar Pandan*,

in Newsletter Interfidei, special edition, 2002.

St. Sunardi, *The Dead End of Religious Dialoque in Indonesia*, in Interface, Vol. 4, No. 1, May 2001.

Suryabrata Sumadi, *Metodologi Penelitian*, Jakarta: Rajawali, 1990.

Syafa'atun Elmirzana, et al., *Pluralisme, Konflik dan Perdamaian: Studi Bersama Antariman*, Jogjakarta: DIAN/Interfidei, 2002.

Trisno S. Sutanto dkk. (ed), *Meretas Horison Dialog: Catatan dari Empat Daerah*, MaDIA, Jakarta, Desember 2001.

Harian kompas, 27 maret 1997

The full list of the institutions can be seen in report, *Forum Refleksi Kelompok Antariman se-Indonesia*, by institute DIAN/Interfidei, 2002. Unpublished