Research paper written in the framework of Research Mobility Program organized by the

Oriental Business and Innovation Center (OBIC)

PÁL GYENE, PHD

Associate professor

Budapest Business School, University of Applied Sciences

DEMOCRACY AND ISLAM IN INDONESIA:
SOCIAL CLEAVAGES, PARTY SYSTEM AND PARLIAMENTARY POLITICS

Content:

Abstract

The present paper studies the possibilities of adapting political democracy to Southeast Asia, more particularly to the context of Islam in Indonesia. I argue that the impact of the "Islam" factor on the Indonesian political system is worth studying on three different levels: 1. on the level of society's political divisions: the relationship to Islam and the state's secular nature still seems to be the most fundamental political cleavage in Indonesian society; 2 on the level of the party system: investigating the position and role of parties on the political Islam platform; 3. last but not least, on the level of parliamentary politics, raising a question about the extent the secular and Islam parties are influential actors in legislation and in the executive branch. While in the first two dimensions, i.e. as a social dividing line and a difference visible in the party system formation, the separation of secular and "Islamic" political subcultures is tangible up to this day, the parliamentary dichotomy of government and opposition does not reflect this separation. The current government coalition, for example, is composed of secular, traditionalist and modernist Muslim parties, and the profile of the political opposition is also similar. I contend that there is a specifically Indonesian "consensus-oriented" democracy model in the process of formation, which however is not without western prefigutrations, where political Islam and Islamist parties do not act as destabilizing factors, but on the contrary, as a kind of "Muslim democratic" force strengthening democratic consensus similarly to the functioning of some "western" Christian democratic parties. The research is partly based on a historical and, implicitly, a comparative approach. It strongly builds on the theoretical framework and methodology of Sartori's classic party system typology, Lijphardt's "majoritarian" and "consensus-based" democracy model, and the so-called neo-Institutionalist debate on the advantages and possible disadvantages of the parliamentary and presidential government.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Gerakan – *Gerakan Indonesia Raya* (Great Indonesia Movement Party)

GOLKAR – *Golongan Karya* (Functional Groups)

Hanura – *Partai Hati Nurani Rakyat* (People's Conscience Party)

ICMI – *Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Se-Indonesia* (Muslim Intellectuals' Association)

Masyumi – *Sujra Muslimin Indonesia* (Indonesian Muslim Liberation Council)

NasDem – *Partai Nasional Demokrat* (National Democratic Party)

NU – *Nahdlatul Ulema* (Ulema's Rebirth)

Parmusi – *Partai Muslimin Indonesia* (Indonesian Muslims' Party)

PAN – *Partai Amanat Nasional* (National Mandate Party)

PD – Partai Demokrat (Democratic Party)

PDI – *Partai Demokrasi Indonesia* (Indonesian Democratic Party)

PDI-P *Partai Demokrasi Indonesia – Perjuangan* (Indonesian Democratic Party – Struggle)

PKB – *Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa* (National Awakening Party)

PKI – *Partai Komunis Indonesia* (Indonesian Communist Party)

PKS – *Partai Keadilan Sejahtera* (Justice and Welfare Party)

PNI – *Partai Nasional Indonesia* (Indonesian National Party)

PPP – *Partai Persatuan dan Pembangunan* (Unity and Progress Party)

PRRI – *Pemerintah Revolusioner Republik Indonesia* (Indonesian Revolutionary Goverment)

SI – *Sarekat Islam* (Islamic Union)

Introduction and problem statement

While in the early 90s Huntington's clash of civilisations paradigm became one of the most frequently cited topics of the international relations literature, the issue of democracy and its cultural-civilisational embeddedness were also becoming popular topics of research and debates. The focus of scholarly and political discourse was usually the question whether in line with the Fukuyama's paradigm (Fukuyama, 1992), liberal democracy is a universal political and social model, marking out the endpoint of a unilinear development route for practically all the societies in the world, or on the contrary, as Huntington claimed, liberal democracy was the product of a unique development in the "West", which in its specific form can hardly be mechanically transplanted to societies based on cultural value systems different from that of the "West" (Huntington, 1996).

In Huntington's paradigm, it is especially the assumed relationship between the Islamic civilizational background and political democracy that is seen as problematic, which is likely to be due to the fact that for a long time research into the links between democracy and Islam concentrated on the Middle Eastern region. This perspective, however, is strongly biased. Undoubtedly, apart from Tunisia and post-Saddam Iraq, with its rather limited sovereignty up to 2011, there are practically no functioning political democracies in the Middle East, the cradle of Islam. This however, can be explained with the difficulties of adapting the Western nation state model to the Middle East rather than with a general incompatibility of "Islam" and democracy.

Today, the demographic, and increasingly also the economic hub of the Islamic world has shifted from the Middle East to South East Asia. The world's largest Muslim, or Muslim-majority country today is Indonesia with a population of 260 million[1], thus it is the third largest political democracy after India and the United States (Mietzner – Aspinall, 2010: 3).

It needs to be added that at the time of the Suharto regime's fall in 1998, the democratization perspectives of Indonesia did not look promising. The process of regime change was associated with ethnic and religious clashes. Separatist moves in East Timor, Papua, and Aceh were heating up, on Sulawesi and the Maluku Islands inter-communal violence between Muslim and Christian communities was rampant, and the Chinese minority was the target of pogroms across the whole country. It was rightly feared that in the course of its democratic transition the country would be

---

[1] 87 per cent of the population or 200 million people are Muslim in Indonesia. (By way of comparison: Arabic countries have a total of 300 million inhabitants.) The remainder of the population is made up of 6% Protestant Christians, 4% Catholics, 2% Balinese Hindu, and 1% are Buddhists and Chinese Confucians (Woodward, 200: 44).

exposed to ethno nationalist political mobilisation (Aspinall, 2011: 289); some analysts were even going as far as to envision the "Balkanization" of the Indonesian nation state along ethnic lines with the possibility of state failure (Woodward, 2008: 41).

The potential threat of the strengthening radical political Islam, as well as the army with its continued informal political impact and its actions possibly stirring ethnic and religious tensions in the background were causing similarly grave concerns. The hard to break deadlocks between the legislation and the president functioning as the representative of the executive were coded in the constitutional system. Majority government has been a major challenge for all presidents due to the weak institutionalisation of political parties and their often confusing ideological profiles and due to the proportional representation in the election system.

The situation was aggravated by the fact that the country was undergoing one of the most serious economic crises in its history. The national economy practically collapsed, the percentage of households below the poverty threshold went from 10 to 20%, with more than 20 million Indonesian citizens pushed into poverty (Tanthowi, 2012: 20).

However, belying all previous concerns and sceptical expectations, since the fall of Suharto and the "regime change" launched in 1998, Indonesia has seen four parliamentary and three direct presidential elections[2] , which both international observers and organisers have qualified as free and fair (Ufen, 2018: 307; Fionna – Tomsa, 2017: 5). In addition, Indonesia is the only country in South-East Asia that Freedom House has labeled as fully free in its civil and political freedoms, as both Larry Diamond and co-authors Mietzer and Aspinall emphasise in their papers focusing on the Indonesian democratisation process in a global comparative perspective. In this light, it may be said that the country is not just another "electoral" state, but is definitely a "liberal democracy" (Diamond, 2010: 31; Mietzner – Aspinall, 2010: 6). Although it has to be admitted that following 2013, in Freedom House's rating Indonesia slipped back into the "partially free" category[3], and some authors are still highly critical of Indonesian democracy, qualifying it as "stagnant" or "low quality" (Mietzner, 2012: 209-229) or explicitly as "oligarchic" (Robison – Hadiz, 2004; Fukuoka, 2013). As far as I am concerned, I would argue that despite all its weaknesses and dysfunctions the present

---

[2] In Indonesia, the institution of direct presidential election was introduced by the 2002 constitutional changes. Thus the country is fully presidential in its government. The first direct presidential elections were held in 2004, in parallel with parliamentary elections (Ufen, 2018: 308).

[3] This might be explained by the growing corruption, the occasional atrocities against ethnic and religious minorities and the government's clampdown on such independent institutions as the Anti-corruption Commission and the Election Commission (Freedman – Tiburzi, 2012: 131-156).

Indonesian political system meets the minimalist procedural criteria of democracy[4], and that it is not too much to say that it has passed the phase of democratic transition, thus from the mid-2000s, but definitely from the 2004 elections the latest, it can be regarded as a consolidated democracy (Barton, 2010: 476).

The present study analyses the interrelations of democracy and Islam in the Indonesian context. More specifically, I argue that the impact of the "Islam" factor on the Indonesian political system is worth studying on three different levels: 1. on the level of society's political divisions: the relationship to Islam and the state's secular nature still seems to be the most fundamental political cleavage in Indonesian society; 2. on the level of the party system: investigating the position and role of parties on the political Islam platform; 3. last but not least, on the level of parliamentary politics, raising a question about the extent the secular and Islam parties are influential actors in legislation and in the executive branch.

In more specific detail, my research objectives are to answer the following research questions:

- Does South East Asian Islam have distinctive features as opposed to "mainstream Islam? What were the effects of the peripheral type development of the colonial pat on the development of South East Asian Muslim political institutions and social structures?
- In the Southeast Asian states that had won their independence, has Islam gained any type of institutionalised political function? Has an Islam state been created in any sense of the term? What was or may have been the role of Islamic parties during the Sukarno regime and the subsequent Suharto era?
- Following the collapse of the Suharto regime, in the course of the "Indonesian regime change, what significance did political forces of an Islamic background obtain? Did religious fundamental radicalism gain considerable space? Did political parties based on the platform of political Islam appear as threats to democratic consolidation, or rather as stabilising factors?
- To what extent do these Islamic parties appear as influential actors in parliamentary decision-making? To what degree is the „Islamist agenda" significant in the post-Suharto era?

---

[4] In the procedural definition of democracy, the criteria of Robert A. Dahl's classic polyarchy model are borne in mind, encompassing free and multi-party elections, institutional division of power, media pluralism, etc. (Dahl, 1971). Following Samuel P. Huntington, it may be added that we speak of successful democratic consolidation when there is a smooth change of power in two consecutive free and multi-party elections. This is what happened after the 2004 elections in Indonesia (Huntington, 1991).

The research is basically a qualitative, descriptive case study, which does not fail to look at history and, implicitly, to use a comparative approach. Primarily it builds on the concepts and methodology of political science and transitology, the research into democratic transition processes. In the analysis of the post-Suharto era, it strongly builds on the theoretical framework and methodology of Sartori's classic party system typology (Sartori, 1976), Lijphardt's "majoritarian" and "consensus-based" democracy model (Lijphardt, 1984), and on certain findings of the so-called neo-Institutionalist debate on the advantages and possible disadvantages of the parliamentary and presidential government (Linz, 1990, Horowitz, 1990; Mainwharing – Shugart, 1993a).

The Islamisation of the Malay Archipelago and the socio-cultural features of South East Asian Islam

The literature on South East Asian Islam usually emphasises three decisive features: Its peaceful spread, pluralism and tolerant character (Buehler, 2009: 53.-54).

The earliest sporadic traces of the Islamic presence in the Malay Archipelago go back to the 9th century (in Sumatra), most probably related to the Indian Muslim and Arabic merchants settling there. Although the new faith seems to have been spreading – to a limited extent – in the region, the first large-scale conversions happened as late as the 14th or 15th century, following the collapse of the centralised Hindu-Buddhist empires.[5] Some scholars relate Islamisation to the overarching structural changes in the region's societies: strictly hierarchical and centralized, agricultural Hindu-

---

[5] According to contemporary norms, if a regional raja converted to another religion, in this case to Islam, his subjects would automatically follow him (Hefner, 2000: 28).

Buddhist empires gave way to smaller, more open state formations directed towards sea trade, where the new faith spread by merchants was dominant (Meuelman, 2002: 15). This thesis is supported by the fact that Islamisation in the Malay Archipelago always started near the sea, while in more isolated inner areas of several large islands (e.g. Borneo and Celebes), more ancient animist faiths are still practised today. Although the Malay Archipelago continued to be politically fragmented up to the 20th century, the Malay language and the Islam faith have functioned as a medium that helped form a major trade network, which in its size and organisation is comparable to the Mediterranean marine network of Italian city states (Hefner, 2000: 27).

Due to the fact that Islam spread in a peaceful manner in parallel with the growing trade, it usually showed great tolerance towards the earlier Hindu-Buddhist and animist traditions. On the island of Java, for example, this syncretism was so strong that the faith practised here was Islam on the surface only, while Middle Eastern and Indian Muslims, but even its own followers called it Javanism, suggesting that it was a kind of separate heterodox religious direction. In the courts of Java rajas, *sharia* law was applied rather liberally, and people's everyday life was guided more by the traditional unwritten law, the so-called *adat* (Hefner, 2000: 32-33).

Transmission of Islamic values was not only by merchants, but also by itinerant scholars of religious law and pilgrims. Their role increased considerably in maintaining contact between Indian and Middle Eastern Muslims when from the 16th century onwards, Portuguese and later Dutch colonisers completely disrupted the trade networks in the region that had been traditionally operated by Muslims (Meuelman, 2002: 15). From the late 19th century, hajjis returning from their pilgrimage to Mecca gradually became initiators of a movement that wanted to reform South East Asian Islam, purifying it from syncretic impacts and bringing it closer to a type of pan-Islamic ideal. In present-day Indonesia, the opposition of these two religious subcultures, i.e. of traditionalist- syncretic Islam and reformist pan-Islam, is still tangible both on the social and the political level.

The two trends have been labelled in many different ways; in Indonesian they are mostly referred to as *abangan* and *santri*.[6] Western scholarly literature typically uses the terms 'traditionalist' and 'modernist' (Eliraz, 2004: 21), but they may be misleading in some ways, especially the latter one. Traditionalists have always placed emphasis on the distinctive and unique features of South East Asian or Javanese Islam and have been tolerant of local and tribal traditions. By contrast, modernists have always strived for South East Asian Islam to be integrated into the 19th century pan-Islam movement, especially to the school represented by al-Afghani and Muhammad Abdu. In that vein,

---

[6] *Santri* originates from the Malay word *pesantren,* meaning a Muslim religious school. The term originally referred to a student of such a school (Hisyam, 2002: 302).

they usually fought for a stricter, occasionally fundamentalist, interpretation of the Muslim religion. Nevertheless, even this terminology is not universally accepted in the literature. Andreas Ufen narrows down this definition, arguing that the conceptual dichotomy of *abangan* vs. *santri* simply means a distinction between syncretic-heterodox and orthodox Muslim schools, adding that the traditionalist and modernist cleavage is, in fact, within the *santri*. Javanese traditionalists are characteristically followers of the so-called *Naskabandi Sufi* mysticism, while modernists reject mysticism and follow the puritanical interpretation and practice of Orthodox Islam (Woodward, 2008: 46).

The *abangan – santri* dichotomy also had its regional, geographical dimension. The tribal aristocracy and traditional elites of Java and the rural communities depending on them typically followed the syncretistic, and definitely the traditional school, while the modernist-puritanical Islam primarily gained ground in large cities and in regions wishing to be emancipated from Java's dominance, thus primarily on Sumatra and Sulawesi, and among the West Java Sundanese ethnic group.[7] This is part of the explanation of why in the later Indonesian nation state the separatist moves against the Javanese centre (e.g. in Aceh on Sumatra) frequently appear in the guise of political Islam (Barton, 2010: 479).

Islamist and secular movements in the period of Dutch colonisation

In the 17th and 18th century, Dutch colonisers had only the coastline of the Island of Java under their control. It was by the first decade of the 20th century that they managed to extend their control over the archipelago. They looked at the strengthening pan-Islamic ideologies of the 19th century as the primary potential threat against their rule over the islands. From the end of the 19th century, following the Java War (1825-30), the so-called Padri War fought on Sumatra (1830-1835) and the Aceh War(1873-1904), representatives of the Dutch colonial administration were more and more consciously playing on the conflicts between the *abangan* and *santri* groups, primarily listening to the guidance of Snouck Hurgronje, the acknowledge orientalist (Hisyam, 2002: 302).

Hurgronje's diagnosis was that the majority of Java's inhabitants were Islamic in name only; in fact they were following animistic tribal beliefs, and their everyday lives were defined mainly by tribal

---

[7] The demographic hub of the Indonesian Archipelago has always been the very fertile Island of Java. Therefore, the dominant ethnic group is the so-called Javanese, who constitute some 40% of the population today, and are mostly concentrated in Central and East Java. The second largest ethnic group is the Sundanese, who mostly populate West Java, with their percentage standing at about 15% of the population (Aspinall, 2011: 292).

customary law, the so-called *adat*. Accordingly, he argued that by codifying *adat* law, *sharia* law, as well as the influence of the ulema could be successfully cut back. Accordingly, they took sharia-based jurisprudence from Islamic theologians to rajas' and other local rulers' scope of authority, who in return for having their power ensured were usually willing to cooperate with colonisers (Hefner, 2000: 34). This colonial political attitude was strongly supported by the *abangan* communities, primarily by the traditional tribal aristocracy, while the *santri* religious schools, whose influence was growing despite all restrictions, strongly contested to it.[8]

No wonder therefore that the earliest anti-colonial movements in in the Indonesian Archipelago also had Islamic, generally modernist Islamic connotations. The first "modern' political organisation of the Indonesian Archipelago was born in 1912, the Sarekat Islam (lslamic Union – henceforth SI) movement. Initially, it served the protection of urban middle-class Muslim merchants against settling Chinese merchants. However, it soon turned into a mass organisation with anti-colonial demands, and a large number of religious, nationalist and even communist sympathisers joined them. This ideological heterogeneity soon exploded the movement, but the later decisive parties of the independence period all grew out of the SI (Bertrand, 2003: 30).

The Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia – PKI) was established in 1921. Its direct predecessor had been the Indian [meaning: Dutch East Indian] Social-Democratic Association, strongly influenced also by the Dutch socialists. As the Dutch East Indies did not yet have any considerable proletariat or industrial working class at the time, the social basis of communists was composed primarily of the Javanese *abangan* smallholder masses (Ufen, 2008a: 11).

The nationalist-secular mainstream of the independence movement, however, was continued by the more bourgeois Indonesian National Party (Partai Nasional Indonesia – PNI) rather than the communists. Its leaders were typically graduates from European universities rather than members of the tribal aristocracy or Muslim merchants, who then found jobs in the lower positions of colonial administration, as they had no other favourable options. Coming from a Javanese *abangan* background, Ahmed Sukarno, the head of the National Party, was a typical representative of this group. He graduated as an engineer in the Netherlands, and later became the first president of independent Indonesia. Another leading figure of the party and the independence movement was Mohamed Hatta, who came from the Minangkabau ethnic group in Sumatra (Schefold, 1998: 266). In addition to the *abangan* middle class on Java, the inclusive, secular rhetoric of the National Party and its head Sukarno attracted Christian and Balinese Hindu voters (Ufen, 2008a: 11).

---

[8] It is interesting to compare this practice with the politics of the British in Malaysia. As there was no ulema group independent of local sultans, the Brits did not restrict, but on the contrary, definitely supported the application of sharia as widely as possible. (Hisyam, 2002: 304).

The Islamist-santi wing of Serakat Islam then lived on mostly in the Muhammadiyah (Mohammed's followers) movement, established on Java in 1912. Although with its 25 million members it soon became the largest mass organisation in the Indonesian islands (and still is today), it did not take on any direct political role. It rather tried to adopt the modernist ideology in its members' lifestyle and education. (Hefner, 2000: 40). However, the political block on the Islamist platform was not free of divisions either. As opposed to the basically urban middle class-based modernist Muhammadiyah, traditionalist religious leaders called to life as early as 1926 the Nahdlatul Ulema ("Ulema's Rebirth" – henceforth NU) movement, which also mostly relied on the Javanese and conservative rural society (Barton, 2010: 481).

In summary, we can say that already in the colonial period, i.e. in the 1920s and 30s, those cleavages were present within the national independence movement that, in some sense, still divide Indonesian society. The one to emphasise is the secular-Islamist division, which has always been tangible. The Islamist block itself was also divided along traditionalist and modernist subcultures, which in Ufen's interpretation is the reflection also of a kind of city vs. country opposition (Ufen, 2008a: 9). The relatively fast breakthrough of the communists was partly due to severe social tensions, but they owed their popularity to their harsh anti-west and anti-colonial rhetoric as much as to the attraction of the Marxist ideology. Since there was practically no industrial working class or bourgeoisie in the Indonesian society,[9] class struggle in its classic definition, a fight between capitalists and working classes was not present. It is remarkable that all these political forces were based on a nationalist platform: at this point in time, the cleavages between later parties were already extant in the ideological or religious-secular dimension rather than in the ethnic-regional one. This is somewhat surprising if we consider the ethnically diverse character of the Indonesian Archipelago[10], demonstrating that the leaders of the basically Javanese-dominated national independence movement acted very tactfully. They carefully considered the sensitivity of the various ethnic communities when, for example, they decided to have Malay as the future independent Indonesia's national language rather than Javanese, as they acknowledged that Malay was the lingua franca of the region.[11]

---

[9] In the Malay Archipelago and later in independent Indonesia, the bourgeoisie in the European sense was recruited mostly from Chinese merchants, who however politically always remained in a highly marginalised position (Ufen, 2008a, 9).

[10] In the 1930 census, Dutch colonial authorities registered 1072 (!) ethnic groups (Aspinall, 2011: 292). Today there are about 700 ethnicities. Among them, the Javanese (42%) and the Sundanese (15%) represent the largest groups, while it is worth noting the some 1% Chinese minority, who have always had a much more important role in the country's economy than their percentage would warrant (Woodward, 2008: 44).

[11] It was at the 1928 Pan-Indonesian Youth Congress that the representatives of the various nationalist organisations decided that the basis of Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian language) should be the region's lingua franca, the ethnically neutral Malay (Schefold, 1998: 266).

Thus, four marked political subcultures crystallised around political parties along secular vs. religious, traditionalist vs. modernist, and rural vs. urban cleavages:

1. behind the secular-nationalist National Party (PNI) there was mostly the Javanese *abangan* aristocracy, together with the middle class of colonial officials and religious minorities (Christians and Hundus);

2. the equally nationalistic Javanese-based Communist Party (PKI), supported mostly by masses of the urban poor and poor rural peasantry;

3. Nahdlatul Ulema (NU), the party of traditional rural *santri* elite groups and of the landowner peasantry;

4. finally, modernist Muslims are mostly followers of the Muhammadiyah movement, that organised itself into a political party in the years of the Japanese occupation under the name of Sujra Muslimin Indonesia (Indonesian Muslim Liberation Council – henceforth Masyumi). Resembling the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood in its ideology and organisational network, this party's basis is mainly the urban middle classes and people recruited from outside, primarily from Sumatra and Sulawesi (Azyumadi, 2002: 33).

Two of the four political subcultures (the National Party and the Communists) were secular-nationalist, distinguished mainly by social differences. The Islamist camp was divided by the traditionalist – modernist cleavage. Of the four parties, the Masyumi was clearly city-based, while the Nadhlatul Ulema was undoubtedly of a rural background. The National Party's and the communists' voters, however, were not polarised along the city vs, country cleavage (Ufen, 2008a, p.10). These political subcultures[12], that the literature has often called *aliran* (flow) using the terminology of cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz that are conspicuously parallel to the "columnised society" of the colonial Netherlands, have proved to be surprisingly lasting structures, and even after the country had gained its independence, defined party politics in Indonesia.

Winning independence; the party system and the secular-Islamist confrontation during Sukarno's presidency and the period of "guided democracy"

The independent Indonesian state was proclaimed on 17th August 1945. Although after the Japanese occupation, the allied forces and the Netherlands tried to restore colonial rule, they did not succeed. They failed to restore the Dutch civil-colonial rule after WWII, and the Dutch army was also

---

[12] Andreas Ufen is citing Clifford Geertz, saying that the political division of the Dutch society was also defined by denominational subcultures, liberal vs. secular, fundamentalist vs. Protestant and Catholic (Ufen, 2008b, 9).

unable to gain military control. With the withdrawal of Dutch military units, the war of independence finally came to an end in 1949. This is the point in time that marks the de facto birth of the Indonesian state.

In the first years of independence, and even earlier, the main political debates were centered around the state's secular or declared Islamic character. Still during the Japanese occupation, on 1st March 1945, the Investigating Committee for Preparatory Work for Indonesian Independence was organized, presided by President Sukarno. One of its objectives was to elaborate the constitution of independent Indonesia. Muslim and secular organisations in the committee managed to agree on a number of issues related to the future economic and political setup, but they failed to compromise on whether Indonesia should be declared an Islamic state. President Sukarno intended to bridge the conflicts with his famous five principles, the *Pancasila,* included in the preamble to the 1945 Indonesian constitution, which was to become the foundation of the later Indonesian state.[13] Muslim organizations found the first principle, "belief in God" as formulated by Sukarno too general and rejected it. Later they suggested that it should be rephrased, "Belief in God, with the obligation for the followers of Islam to abide by Sharia law" (Bertrand, 2003: 32).

However, both secular nationalists and non-Muslim religious groups protested against this formula, commonly known as the Jakarta Charter. Although eventually the Preparatory Committee included the Jakarta Charter, due to the religious minorities' and nationalists' protests, one day after the declaration of independence Sukarno and Vice President Mohamed Hatta took it out of the Pancasila basic principles, with the concession to Muslim organisations that the final wording of the first principle was "belief in God with the obligation of adherents of Islam to live according to Islamic law" (Barton, 2010, 480).

Thus, the first big battle concerning issues of constitutional principles between nationalist and Muslim organisations resulted in a clear victory for secular forces. Following the Dutch withdrawal, in 1950 the pro-Sukarno nationalist organisations introduced a new provisional constitution, leaving it for the new Constitutional Assembly formed after the first free elections to elaborate the final constitution of the de facto independent Indonesia. The first free elections happened in 1955, and Islamic parties had high hopes concerning them. They assumed that if they had the absolute majority in the Constitutional Assembly, they would be able to correct Sukarno's earlier "anti-Islamic" decisions.

---

[13] The five principles of Pancasila: 1. Belief in the one and only God, 2. A just and civilized humanity, 3. Nationalism manifested in a unified Indonesia, 4. Democracy, 5. Social justice (Hefner, 2000: 42).

The 1955 elections however brought the nationalist-secular parties' unexpected victory. Of the large mass parties, President Sukarno's Nationalist Party secured most votes (22%) Equally surprising was the 16% gained by the communists. The 20% received by the modernist Muslim Masyumi was a disappointment. This was the only party that had included in its program the creation of an Islamic state. The more moderate traditionalist Muslim Nahdlatul Ulema reached 18%. Overall, almost as many people voted for Muslim parties as for the nationalist-communist block (Hefner, 2000, p.43).

The results of the 1955 elections were a true reflection of the *aliran* subcultures' ability to have an impact on politics; the party system was structured primarily along secular vs religious and traditionalist vs modernist cleavages. However, as Marcus Mietzner has also noted, the party system continued to be rather fragmented: although the above listed four political forces received more than 70% of the votes, as many as 35 political parties won seats in the Constitutional Assembly. In the given context, the situation was aggravated by the fact neither the "secular", nor the "Islamist" block had the two thirds majority required for constitution making. This created a practically impossible political situation in the Constitutional Assembly; the constitutional debate, which even after several trials was unsuccessful, gradually radicalised the opposing parties. Using Sartori's terminology, the Indonesian party system following the 1955 elections was a typical polarised multi-party system in which, as is often seen in the case of strong fragmentation, we witness centrifugal party competition. This led to extreme radicalisation in party politics, and eventually to the collapse of the democratic political order (Mietzner, 2008: 433.-438).

As even after years of attempts the Assembly was unable to elaborate a draft constitution, with the help of the army, President Sukarno finally dispersed the Constitutional Assembly in July 1959 and introduced the new constitution by a presidential decree, or more precisely, declared the return to the first Indonesian constitution of 1945 (Barton, 2010: 481), strengthening primarily the executive (i.e. the presidential) power to the detriment of parliament. Shortly afterwards a national unity government was formed with the participation of the National, Communist and the Nahdlatul Ulema Parties (this explains why the government was called NASAKOM, the acronym referring to the three parties involved). Although the new government cannot be called explicitly anti-Islamic, as it included an Islamic party as well, but the decisive pole in government was the nationalists, and later gradually more and more the communists. The influence of the Nahdlatul Ulema Party, which controlled only the Ministry of Religion, continued to enjoy a very limited impact (Hefner, 2000: 44).

The other large Muslim party was Masyumi, which always opposed Sukarno's politics. It also protested against the dispersion of the Constitutional Assembly. As President Sukarno's "guided democracy" did not tolerate open political opposition, in 1960 the Masyumi Party was banned, with

several of its leaders thrown into prison. At the same time, its youth organisations and provincial militia were allowed to continue.[14]

Overall, it may be concluded that the independent Indonesia was definitely born on the grounds of secular nationalism and did not turn into an Islamic state in any way. On the contrary, the "founding fathers" of the state saw a threat against the nation's unity in religious-based politics. And this fear was not unjustified, as the regional separatisms and even separatist armed conflicts that flared up all over Indonesia in the 1950s and 60s mostly had an Islamic background (as well).

Sukarno however paid a high price for pushing political Islam into the background: the president who had been balancing between the army and the communists, came more and more under the latter's control (Rabasa – Haseman, 2002: 35). We have no room for introducing the internal and external political history of the Sukarno regime, but two factors are worth noting that directly led to the fall of the Sukarno government.

On the one hand, the pro-Soviet foreign policy, characterised by harsher and harsher anti-US and anti/imperialist rhetoric, in 1965 culminated in the *Konfrontasi* war campaign against Malaysia (Barton, 2010: 483). The other factor was that the Sukarno regime undertook the communists' agricultural collectivisation program. The Muslim organisations saw this as a clear attack against them, as it primarily meant the appropriation of properties of the pious *vakf* foundation.[15] As a result of the communists' economic policy, by 1965 the Indonesian economy was close to a total collapse, while due to various natural disasters, millions were already starving on the island of Java.

This situation required the army's response. After the declaration of independence, the army was the number one repository of the state's secular character and national unity. In this respect, the situation seems to show close parallels with the Turkey of Kemal Atatürk. General Suharto, commander of the army's Strategic Reserve Force decided to put an end to Sukarno's and the communists' rule. As initially he intended to stay away from the impression of an open military coup, he did not directly deploy the army, but called on the Muslim parties, i.e. the Nahdlatul Ulema and the banned Masyumi militia to help. In December 1965, at least half a million communist party

---

[14] For the sake of giving a full picture, it needs to be added that Masyumi did not always choose a legal form of opposition: in the summer of 1958 several of the party's leaders joined the Islamic uprising on West Sumatra against the Jakarta central government and to its „Revolutionary Government" declared in the town of Padang (*Pemerintah Revolusioner Republik Indonesia* – PRRI). The Sukarno regime then put down the armed uprising within a few months, as well as the separatist rebellion a year later on North Sulawesi (Barton, 2010: 482-483; Bertrand, 2003: 36).

[15] In the Islamic world, the maintenance of mosques, among other things, is funded by such *vakf* foundations and the rents of *vakf* properties. They deliver the functions of social welfare institutions, e.g. looking after the sick and the elderly, especially if there is no state social security.

members and their families fell victim in Indonesia to Muslim militiamen and, in several cases, to spontaneous outbreaks of fury. The Islamist militia tried to present the slaughters as acts of self-defence, arguing that otherwise they would have been eliminated by the communists, which was not an entirely unfounded assumption on the eve of a quasi-civil war situation (Barton, 2010: 483). The worst bloodsheds took place on Java and Bali, the formerly strongest bases of communists. With these moves, they practically eliminated one of the oldest communist parties with the largest membership in the whole of Asia, although the formal banning of the party happened only as late as 1967. The same year the government made President Sukarno resign, who was replaced by General Suharto. Although Sukarno was never impeached, he was kept under house arrest up to his death in 1970 (Hefner, 2000: 70).

Wielding power and party system in the age of Suharto's "New Order"

Islamist parties had high hopes for Suharto's "New Order", but had to be deeply disappointed. Although the "dirty work" was done by the militia of Muslim parties, the heads of the army did not intend to open the door wide to Islamist parties in the country's political life. In this period, among the generals the Kemalist-type secular modernists were in majority, who wanted to curb the power of political Islam as well as that of the communists. Unlike his predecessor, Suharto was not a charismatic figure or a talented speaker. As far as his references and family background were concerned, he seems to have been closest to the conservative Javanese abangan circlers. He admitted himself that before taking decisions he would turn to a Sufi mysticist for prophesies (Hefner, 2000: 83; Woodward, 2008: 43). His main political goal was definitely to strengthen his own personal power.

Suharto's system was a strictly centralised presidential dictatorship, becoming more personality-centred with the passing of time. Some scholars regard the regime as definitely "sultanistic"[16] (Fukuoka, 2013; Sulistyo 2002: 78), however this evaluatin may be strongly exaggerated, because

---

[16] Co-authors Houchang E. Chebabi and Juan J. Linz describe the "sultanistic" regimes as follows: Primarily they are different from other neopatrimonial and more institutionalised authoritarian systems in that they are strongly personality-centred. Sultanistic systems do not have any legitimation ideology, which they try to make up for by the widely propagated personality cult. In them, neither the army nor the state party appears as an independent branch of power: they are merely instrumental executives of the sultanistic leader's will. The "sultan" operates through his networks of interests, using the tools of sticks and carrots. The divisions between the regime and the state are blurred. These systems are also characterised by their rentier character, and the "cleptocratic relationship between the state and the market (Chebabi – Linz, 1998). Some of these traits are tangible in the late Suharto regime, but due to the institutionalised power position of the army and Golkar, which in fact functioned as a state party, I would argue that qualifying the regime as sultanistic is by no means appropriate.

Suharto's power also relied considerably on institutional bases. Regarding the constitutional structure, Suharto made maximum use of and even strengthened the executive's dominance guaranteed by the 1945 constitution and characteristic also of his predecessor's "guided democracy" and the overweight of parliament. In practie, the legislature hardly posed a counterweight to the president, although formally the president was elected for five years by the People's Consultant Assembly (500 MPs and another 500 appointed delegates). These elections were mere formalities, as up to the fall of Suharto, never did they have a candidate against Suharto (Barton, 2010: 484-485).

Naturally, the main guarantor of Suharto's personal power was the army. Therefore, the "New Order" is sometimes described simply as a military dictatorship. Although technically this is not quite accurate, it is certain that the armed forces enjoyed a privileged position. In addition to having in the constitution one fifth of parliamentary seats reserved for the army (Abdulbaki, 2008: 162), according to the openly declared concept of the army's "double function" (*dwi fungsi*), in addition to defending the state in a military sense, the army forces also took on a considerable part of the functions of public administration (Bertrand, 2003: 38). In the 1980s at least half of the positions in the government executive structure were filled by army men, and 75% of provincial governors also came from their ranks (Rabasa – Haseman, 2002: 36). All this covered up the tendency that, in addition to the army, over the years Suharto was trying to build his own power basis, relying on certain circles of state bureaucracy and on his ever more extensive personal patronage network. By the end of Suharto's rule, in the 1990s the tension was getting more tangible between the army and the "presidential family" emancipated from their protection. This is likely to have contributed to the 1998 fall of the regime (Rabasa – Haseman, 2002: 37).

The ideological basis of the "New Order" was provided by the 1945 Pancasila. No political actor was allowed to openly question the secular character of the state, the regime's anticommunism and state-level nationalism. In 1985, acknowledging Pancasila as the "only basic tenet" (asas tunggal) was made mandatory for all social and political organisations, naturally including Muslim ones (Azra, 2002: 34).

The state's successful economic development policies also greatly helped the regime's actual legitimisation. In the 1970s, development was driven by the exploitation of natural resources, primarily the oil price explosion, but from the 1980s conscious measures were taken to substitute imports, thereby strengthening productive sectors of the domestic economy. In the 1990s, economic growth stood at 7 to 9%, while GDP per capita trebled compared to the late 1960s (MacIntyre, 2006: 121.-124). In contrast to Sukarno's "guided democracy" and its catastrophic economic policies, Suharto's "New Order" and its modernisation efforts were impressive even if not all social groups

and regions benefited equally from the spectacular economic growth. Infrastructural and production investments were concentrated mostly in Jakarta and Java, and as a counterweight against the Chinese business elite, the regime was consciously favouring the pribumi ("native") entrepreneurs, with the goal of building a kind of "national bourgeoisie" (Ufen, 2008b: 13). The spectacular concentration and increase of wealth in the hands of the "presidential family" and its inner circle, the fast spread of corruption, and the emergence of oligarchs were certainly hurting the wider public's sense of justice. Thus, it is not surprising that when the national economy cracked because of the 1997 financial crisis, this immediately eliminated the regime's political legitimacy.

Concerning political pluralism and the free competition of parties, in the Suharto period, they were even more restricted than during Sukarno's "guided democracy". The 1971 elections, the first since 1955, were hardly "free and fair": authorities allowed only ten parties to run. (Sulistyo, 2002: 77). The modernist Mulims' Maysumi Party, banned by Sukarno, was not automatically legalised. Eventually, in 1968 they were allowed to reorganise under a new name, as the Indonesian Muslims' Party (Partai Muslimin Indonesia, or simply Parmusi), but its leader was appointed by Suharto, ignoring the preferences of the membership. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the 1971 elections, the party secured a mere 5.4% of votes, some 25% of the share they had in 1955. The National Party, strongly discredited because of Sukarno himself, also performed poorly, receiving less than 7% of the votes. Of the traditional large "subcultural" parties it was only the Nahdlatul Ulema that managed to maintain its support: similarly to their 1955 results, they had 18%. Overall, the Islamist type of parties won 27% of the votes, which meant a loss of over 10% compared to 1955 (Barton, 2010: 484).

The clear winner of the 1971 elections was Suharto's newly established Golkar Party, coming from the abbreviation of Golongan Karya, or "functional groups". As the name suggests, as opposed to old "aliran-based" parties, Golkar did not have a characteristic ideological profile. Strictly speaking, it was not even *one* party, but an umbrella organisation of various functional and interest groups, still serving as the regime's de facto state party (Sulistyo, 2002: 77). Its role was partly to give a human face to the regime's pragmatic-technocratic profile, and partly to guarantee the loyalty of the state bureaucracy and the army, and thereby the right number of voters in each election.

The choice of the name Golkar suggested that the damaging and divisive period of party rivalry had come to an end, and that politics were already based on a technocratic-corporative basis. Government officials had to take an oath of loyalty to Golkar; cadres and candidates of the other two parties had to obtain approval from the same officials, for example, to run for elections. In villages and regional constituencies, only Golkar was allowed to have member organisations. The official justification for this was that they wished to prevent violence between party militia, which had been

characteristic of the Sukarno period (Hefner, 2000: 101). Nevertheless, it was not unusual during campaigns that wearing the yellow jackets of Golkar, public servants and even army officers would canvass votes for the government party[17] (Rabasa – Haseman, 2002: 36.). In fact, as a "vote collecting machine" Golkar did not perform poorly: in the six parliamentary elections following 1971 (1974, 1977, 1982, 198, 1992 and 1997), each time the government party collected more than 60% of the votes (Sulistyo, 2002: 77).

As far as the parliamentary opposition is concerned, their room for manoeuvre continued to narrow after the 1971 elections. In 1973 the main surviving opposition parties were forced to merge into two formations. Following Sukarno's fall, the considerably weakened Nationalist Party was united with the parties of the Catholic and Protestant communities, creating the Indonesian Democratic Party (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia – PDI), while the Muslim parties, including the Nahdlatul Ulema and Parmusi, were merged in the Unity and Progress Party (Partai Persatuan dan Pembangunan – PPP). The Potemkin opposition thus, in fact, had a "secular" and an "Islamist" wing, although the "Islamic" character of the latter was only acknowledged with some kind of silent public nod. Naturally, PPP was not allowed to challenge the Pancaseil as the exclusive state ideology, therefore it was not referring in any way to Islam or the party's Islamic character in its program, symbols or even in its name. (Bertrand, 2003: 39.). Nevertheless, the continuity seems to be conspicuous if we consider the proportions of the former NU and Parmusi, and compare them to the election results of PPP: in the six consecutive parliamentary elections, they always won 15 to 25% of the votes, with the best performance in 1977, when they secured as many as 29% of the votes (Sulistyo, 2002: 77).

In summary, applying Sartori's terminology, the party system in the "New Order" may be described as typically hegemonic: it is not a one-party system in form, but the free competition of political parties is institutionally limited, securing for nearly three decades the power monopoly of Golkar, that in fact was functioning as a state party. The opposition Democratic Party and PPP were no more than lookers on in this system, as they were unable to have an impact on parliamentary politics or government decision making. Nevertheless, the constant proportion of the votes that the PPP received suggests that on the social and socio-cultural level the traditional and modernist Muslim political subcultures lived on, and that there would have been a continued social demand for Islam, which however was mostly forced underground. In fact, despite the complete marginalisation of political Islam in the Suharto period – or perhaps because of it –a type of re-Islamisation process was taking place on the social and sociocultural level.

---

[17] Officially, army officers were not allowed to be active in politics or to vote (Rabasa – Haseman, 2000: 36).

Shift towards the "*santri*" in the Suharto period

There are several political, social and cultural factors explaining the "modernist Islamic Renewal" process in Indonesia's culture, way of life and especially education from the 1960s or 70s, which swept across the whole of the Muslim world (Barton, 2010: 485). The regime encouraged Muslim thinking in education partly because it assumed that this might pose a strong counterweight against the spread of radical leftist ideas. It was because of these assumptions that the introduction of Islamic religious classes was made mandatory in state-run primary and secondary schools. The literacy rate increased from 40 to 90% between 1965 and 1990, and the percentage of secondary school graduates also went from 4 to 30% between 1970 and 2000. At the same time, religious education was strengthened in higher education as well, with a State Islamic University established, the *dawkah* pious movement encouraged on campuses, and allowing female students to wear the veil again. Not unrelated to these developments, there was a boom in the market for Islamic books and periodicals (Ufen, 2008b: 14). Headed by the Ministry for Religion, a major program of mosque construction was launched. The number of mosques in Java increased from 15,574 in 1973 to 25,655 in 1990, while by way of comparison, the number of Catholic churches went from 206 to 324. The rate of building madrassas (religious schools) was similar (Hefner, 2000: 121).

All these data show that this period saw the emergence of a new, educated urban middle class, whose life style and values were very much defined by Islam, especially its modernist version. Thanks to the uninterrupted economic growth in the 1970s and 80s, the material conditions of this new santri middle class were also improving. Starting from the 1980s more and more Indonesian Muslims could afford their pilgrimage to Mecca. And in the first decade of the 2000s, Indonesia was sending the second largest number of pilgrims to Mecca after Saudi Arabia (Azra, 2002: 35). The 1970s and 80s also saw the blooming of various Muslim lifestyle movements. The best known are the already noted *Muhammadiyah*, and *Jema*'at *Tabligh*, established in 1974, which demanded that its members follow a "total" Muslim way of life. For example, they made rules about eating without shared utensils, men wearing Middle Eastern apparel and a beard, and women wearing headscarves that cover the full face. None of these requirements had had a history in South East Asia (Azra, 2002: 42).

As the climax of the social "*santri*" wave, big politics, as well as President Suharto himself opened towards Islam. In the background there must have been the fact, among other things, that by that time the relationship between the President and the formerly unconditionally supportive army had somewhat deteriorated. In the 1980s as a consequence of the liberalisation wave of the economy, several state companies, that army generals typically had considerable vested interest in, were

pushed into a crisis, while Suharto and his inner family circle were increasing their wealth at a spectacular rate. When privatised state companies went into the ownership of Suharto's children, this was openly frowned upon even by the heads of the army. President Suharto was trying to establish his base of supporters among the new Muslim middle classes (Tanthowi, 2012, 7).

The symbolic turning point in Suharto's Islamic policy was the establishment of the Muslim Intellectuals' Association (Ikatan Cendekiawan Muslim Se-Indonesia – ICMI) in 1990. The organisation was overseen by Minister for Research and Technology Jusuf Habibie, Suharto's confidante and expected heir, while the opening session was addressed by Suharto himself (Hefner, 2000: 128). Coordinated by ICMI, several novel initiatives were realised afterwards: The first Islamic bank, *Bank Muamalat*, was set up in Indonesia and the Islamic daily *Republika* was launched (Azra, 2002: 34). Mediated by ICMI, representatives of the new Muslim intelligentsia found jobs and received important decision-making positions in government offices. In 1989 a law restored Islamic sharia courts that Indonesian citizens could turn to with their family and property debates. This in fact restored the Ulema's jurisdiction function discontinued in the 19th century.[18] As part of the symbolic gestures, President Suharto also completed the *Hajji*, going on a pilgrimage to Mecca (Heiduk, 2012: 31).

As Robert Hefner states in his classic monograph on "Civil Islam", by the early 90s a pluralistic and differentiated Muslim "civil sphere" had been born with its own network, parties, associations and press (Hefner, 2000). Among these civil organisations there were some of clearly a political character and others that emphatically stayed away from politics; some declared the importance of liberal and democratic values, and others that rejected them from a fundamentalist platform. The new pro-Islamic politics of Suharto, paradoxically, won support primarily among the anti-western fundamentalist groups.[19] At the same time, we have to stress the role of democratic Islamic organisations, primarily that of the reactivated Nahdlatul Ulema, which in 1984 broke with the previously "official" Islamic opposition PPP (Barton, 2003: 486; Ufen 2008b: 14). Its president, the highly respected Professor Abdurrahman Wahid soon turned into one of the leading figures of the newly forming democratic opposition. As early as in the 1994 elections, he already called on his

---

[18] Nevertheless, we should note that besides Islamic course, state courts maintained their power. Thus, it depends on citizens' decision which court they choose (Hisyam, 2002: 312).

[19] Among them there was, for example, Muhammad Natsir (still prime minister under Sukarno) and later the *Dewah Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia* (Indonesian Islamic Dawah Council) led by Muhammad Natsir and Ahmad Sumarongo, which was in fact the Indonesian branch of the international Islamic organisation *Rabitah al-Alam al-Islami* sponsored by Saudis. KISDI, the Indonesian Committee *for* Solidarity with the Islamic World (Komite Indonesia untuk Solidaritas Dunia Islam) was a similar fundamental organisation. Its activists were among the main figures responsible for the 1997 ethnic and religious unrest (Azra, 2002: 38; Ufen 2008b: 14).

followers to support President Sukarno's daughter Megawati Sukarnoputril[20] (Woodward, 2008: 50). In the street demonstrations due to the 1997 financial crisis, the leading role was taken by youth organisations also close to Nahdlatul Ulema and Wahid (Hefner, 2000: 207).

In conclusion, the expectations were that following the regime change political Islamisation could be accelerated in a democratic Indonesia, or at least similarly to the 1950s, the catalysing secular-Islamist confrontation could once again become the main cleavage dividing the democratic political community. However, it seems that these expectations and fears were hardly confirmed by the party competition and parliamentary politics appearing after 1998. The next chapter of the present study does a more detailed investigation and tries to explain this phenomenon

Party competition and political Islam in the "post-Suharto" age

In August 1997, Indonesia was rocked by the most serious financial and later economic crisis of its modern history. When the financial crisis, which started in Thailand, reached Indonesia, in the course of 1997 the Indonesia rupee lost 70 per cent of its value against the dollar, a number of banks were insolvent and innumerable enterprises went bankrupt. Fury because of the crisis soon turned into political protests demanding Suharto's resignation. The regime made every effort at turning popular outrage against religious and ethnic minorities, primarily Christians and the Chinese.[21] Several large cities were swept by anti-Chinese pogroms, while in ethnically and religiously mixed regions, primarily on Java, Celebes and the Maluku Islands, Muslim-Christian conflicts broke out, which repeatedly flared up over the following years. The unrest shattered the little remaining prestige of the Suharto regime both inside and outside the country. Eventually, Suharto resigned on 18th May 1998, handing over power to his vice president and selected heir, Yusuf Habibie, an engineer by profession who had the image of a pragmatic technocrat (Sulistyo, 2002: 78).

Habibie's rather short interim presidency of only a year and a half is considered the period of political reforms or "*reformasi*" and Indonesian regime change (Tanthowi, 2012: 11). The constitutional amendments adopted mostly in 1998-2005 radically transformed the institutional framework of politics in Indonesia. In 1999 they liberalised the political parties' activity and passed a new election

---

[20] In 1993 President Sukarno's daughter, Megawati Sukarnoputri, was elected president of PDI, which had been a political dummy and Potomkin opposition before. The regime used every possible tool at the authorities' disposal and later even gangster-like methods to prevent this from happening, thus involuntarily elevating the female politician to the role of a democratic opposition hero. The reelection of Sukarnoputri was prevented using sheer violence within PDI (Hefner, 2000: 180).

[21] There is a considerable overlap between the two groups, as a large proportion of the Chinese in Indonesia are Christian.

law (Sulistyo, 2002: 79): as a result for the first time since 1955, they had the first truly competitive multi-party elections. Taking advantage of the legal framework, over two hundred new political parties were created, with over forty of them managing to run candidates, and eventually 15 parties won seats in parliament (Ufen, 2008b: 5.; Sulistyo 2002: 81).

Of the 500 members of parliament in 1999, only 462 were elected, and the remaining 38 mandates were reserved for the armed forces.[22] By 2004, however, they stopped the parliamentary of representation of the army, and also put an end to the privileges they enjoyed in different areas. Thus, they broke with the standard practice of *dwi fungsi*: military men were no longer allowed to hold civilian administrative positions, While in 1998, nearly 50% of provincial governors were active members of the armed forces, in 2004 practically all of them were civilians (Aminuddin, 2017: 4). It should be noted that this certainly does not mean that the army was left with no informal influence. On the contrary, the *purnawirawa*, namely the former, retired soldiers have had important positions in several political parties after the regime change; some of them have been crucial figures in post-Suharto internal politics, such as Generals Wiranto and Prabowo or Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, who was the directly elected president of democratic Indonesia from 2004 to 2014, over two parliamentary terms (Aminuddin, 2017).

Since 2004, Indonesian citizens have been directly electing not only members of parliament, but also the president and the provincial governors in regional elections (in the so-called *pilkada*). In addition to a complete switchover to presidential government on the constitutional level, in a more general sense too, this has meant the "presidentialisation" of the Indonesian political system, above all to personality-centred character of the election rivalry (Ufen, 2018; Aspinall, 2011: 297). It also strengthens the personalisation trends that although the Indonesian system is purely proportional-party list-based, since 2009 the 560 members of parliament are elected in an open list system in 77 multi-mandate constituencies (Ufen, 2018: 3). In the meantime, public administration has been decentralised, which has strengthened the role of some five hundred lower level administrative districts rather than that of 34 provinces. Although, as a result, some districts have seen a strengthening of *sharia* law in the local justice system (Barton, 2010: 487), it seems that overall the public administration reform has acted against regional separatisms (Aspinall, 2011: 305-307).

As far as the structure of the party system and the dynamics of party rivalry are concerned, it is striking already at first sight that in the post-Suharto period the system is highly fragmented, which is probably partly due to the application of a a proportional election system. The average number of

---

[22] Indonesian Armed Forces possessed 75 seats in the parliament elected in 1997 (Aminuddin, 2017: 9), previously they had hold 100 mandates out of the total 500 seats (Abdulbaki, 2008: 162).

parties entering parliament in the period 1999 to 2014 was 14. This is very high, even if it is decreasing with time: 21 in 1999, 16 in 2004, 9 in 2009 and 10 in 2014 (Highashikata – Kawamura, 2015: 8). At the same time, the effective number of parties and the effective number of parliamentary parties have actually increased over the past twenty years[23]: they were 5.1 and 4.7 in 1999, 8.6 and 7.1 in 2004, 6.1 and 6.2 in 2009 and 8.9 and 8.2 in 2014 respectively. These figures actually reflect growing fragmentation (Highashikata – Kawamura, 2015: 36). Accordingly, the effective value of the party system (including parties outside parliament) is 7.1, while the effective value of parliamentary parties is 6.55 as the average for the past twenty years (Fionna – Tomsa, 2017: 5). These are very high in international comparison.

In addition, the data reflect not only the relatively high numbers of parliamentary parties, but also the large fluctuation of their voters. According to the co-authors Higashikata – Kawamura, while democracy in the post-Suharto period was generally stable and consolidated, the Indonesian party system after the regime change is not (Higashikata – Kawamura, 2017: 2). The percentage of wavering voters was 23% (compared to the previous election) in 2004, 28.7 in 2009 and 26.3% in 2014. This is nearly three times as high as the average for "consolidated" western-European democracies in 1885-1985 although, admittedly, in comparison with Latin America and Eastern Europe, regions democratised in the 90s, it cannot be regarded as outstandingly high (Highashikata – Kawamura, 2015: 7).

Besides the relatively strong volatility generally characteristic of party politics dynamics in newly democratised countries, in the post-Suharto system there are some signs of stability and continuity as well. As the co-authors Fionna – Tomsa point out, since 1999 six parties have always been present in parliament. Their parliamentary mandates totalled 88% in 1999, 72% in 2004, 52% in 2009 and 63% in 2014 (Fionna – Tomsa, 2017: 5.). In close analysis, we see that these "core parties" show considerable continuity with the parties of Suharto's "New Order" period, and even with the subcultures defining the pre-Suharto age, the "*alirans*".

Three of the four political subcultures of the 1950s seem to have been surviving even in the post-Suharto age. The markedly secular-nationalist direction of the National Party was continued by the Democratic Party (officially Indonesian Democratic Party - Struggle; Partai Demokrasi Indonesia - Perjuangan, PDI-P) led by Megawati Sukarnoputri, which grew from a "salon opposition" into a

---

[23] According to the formula of Laakso and Taagepera, the effective number of parties in a party system is calculated as follows: 1 divided by the proportion of votes for parties expressed in decimal numbers, squared and values added up. The effective number of parliamentary parties can be calculated similarly, using the mandate proportions of parties entering parliament (Laakso – Taagepera, 1979).

genuine opposition force by the 1990s and in some sense remained the carrier of Sukarno's "legacy". The National Awakening Party (Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa – PKB) associated with the name of Professor Abdurrahman Wahid showed close personal and ideological parallels with the traditionalist Muslim Nahdlatul Ulema organisation. In comparison, the modernist Muslim subculture was definitely more fragmented on the party political level. PPP, which can be regarded as the successor of the Masyumi and the official Islamist opposition in the Suharto age, carried on.[24] Also related to modernist Muslim mass organisations were the National Mandate Party (Partai Amanat Nasional – PAN), namely to Muhammadiyah, as well as the Justice Party (Partai Keadilan Sejahtera – PKS), the later Justice and Welfare Party that had grown out of the campus movement. The radical leftist tradition represented by the communists, however, had no follower in the post-Suharto political palette. To many analysts' surprise though, Golkar, the technocratic profiled formation of bureaucratic and state functionaries, managed to stay a lasting factor even under the conditions of democratic competition (Ufen, 2008b: 17).

Of the six "core parties", two were clearly secular (PDI and Golkar), the other four were openly or – at least based on their voters' profile - covertly more moderately or more radically Islamic.[25] However, considering the proportions of votes, the position of Islamic parties is less favourable: In 1990, the four Islamic parties together received 33% of the votes, or roughly as many as Sukarnoputri's PDI alone. Nearly 60% of the votes were shared by two secular parties: PDI and Golkar. Higashikata and Kawamura calculate that since 1999, Islamic parties have constantly received 30 to 50% of votes (Higashikata- Kawamura, 2015: 11).

The above statement holds true only if the starting premise is accepted, namely that the traditionalist PKB or the modernist PAN are indeed "Islamic parties", even though these political formations were not in favour of incorporating sharia into the Constitution and still consider Pancasila principles as decisive for themselves (Eliraz, 2002: 69). Sine 1999 even the PKS Islamist rhetoric has become more moderate, and their program is also somewhat watered down. Many believe that mostly for tactical reasons, but they certainly gave up their demand for an Islamic state (Woodward, 2008: 54.). Nevertheless, if we still regard them as "Islamic" parties in the stricter sense, it seems that the program of a sharia-based Islamic state does not attract more than 10% of Indonesian voters at most.

---

[24] However according to some of the interviewed experts ift's questionable if PPP can be considered as „modernist" organization. For the reason that PPP was an artifically amalgamated political formation, since the Suharto era a strong modernist-traditionalist drift existed within the party. In latest years actually the traditionalist wing has gained upper hand withinh party leadership (the Author's interview with Prof. Muhammad Najib Azca Dr. Muhammad Najib Azca, Center for Security and Peace Studies and Prof. Wawan Masud at Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University).

[25] Author's interview with Mr. Farouk Alwyni, the Head of Diplomatic Bureau of PKS Party

As far as the regional spread of the listed parties' support is concerned, here too the patterns of continuity are visible since the first democracy in the 1950s. PDI-P, as well its predecessor PNI are strong primarily among Javanese *abangan* voters' groups and religious minorities, mainly Christian voters and Balinese Hindus. The core of PKB are characteristically the rural Muslim communities in Central and Eastern Java, as well as of the Nahdatul Ulema in the "pre-Suharto" period (Ufen, 2008a: 15). Traditionally, parties of the modernist Muslim subculture are strong mostly in large cities and outside Java. The strongest bastion of the moderately Islamic PPP is Aceh Province in North Sumatra. The originally Muhammadiya-related PAN is strong also on Sumatra, in the capital Jakarta and in the Javanese district of Yogyakarta, the home region of the party founder Amien Rais (who was the former president of the Muhammadiya organisation, and professor at Gadjah Mada University), although in South Sulawesi as well the election for governor was won by the party's candidate in 2018. The modernist PKS, considered more radical than other Muslim parties, is exceptionally strong in Jakarta, where at the peak of their popularity in 2004 and 2009, they secured over 20% of votes (Woodward, 2008: 54; Fionna – Tomsa, 2017: 36). In contrast to these parties, Golkar is getting more support in the more peripheral regions, namely in Sumatra, Kalimantan and the eastern (i.e. east of Bali) "outer" island, such as Sulawesi, Maluku or Papua (Ufen, 2008a: 15).

At this point, it is worth noting that although the spread of the big national parties' voters does reflect a kind of regional pattern, but in the same way as in the "first democracy" of the 1950s, in the post-Suharto period too, regional cleavages were not decisive, and the country did not turn into the mobilisation field of ethno-nationalist politics. In addition to showing the relative strength of the Indonesian national consciousness, this also reflects the minimal politicisation of ethnic identities and is partly due to the institutional control of party rivalry. In public administration, the administrative weakening of the provinces' level in favour of sub-provincial districts, the purely proportional election system, the relatively low 2% parliamentary entry threshold and the rule that parties wishing to obtain seats in parliament should run candidates in at least two thirds of the provinces (and two thirds of their constituencies)[26] all worked against parties forming on the regional or provincial level and helped the Indonesian party system's ideological fragmentation (Aspinall, 2011: 296; Ufen, 2008a: 16). This happened despite the fact that due to the separatist and ethnic conflicts flaring up after the fall of the Suharto regime many expected the exact opposite to happen.

The ideological cleavages of the Indonesian party system are still largely defined by the "aliran" subcultures inherited from the first democracy in the early 1950s. As a number of analysts have already shown, the relatively large wobbling between parties happened within these subcultural

---

[26] The only exception to this regulation is the Province of Aceh where according to the 2005 peace agreement with separatist organisations, regional parties are allowed to function (Ufen, 20ba: 16).

blocks. In other words, when certain Islamist parties, as e.g. PPP lost votes, they usually went to other Islamist parties, such as PKS, rather than to secular political forces. Thus, there still seems to be little exchange between "Islamist" and "secular" voters' blocks. (Hagashikata – Kawwamura, 2015: 11; Mietzner, 2008: 440). Based on ideological block-formation and the fragmented political palette, we could also argue that in the post-Suharto period, similarly to "the first democracy" in the 1950s, a polarised multi-party system of centrifugal dynamics was emerging. Moreover, in political science it is a commonplace that the combination of the proportional party list election system, the ensuing fragmented multi-party system and the purely presidential system is not very fortunate, because if there is a lack of supportive majority, conflicts between the legislature and the executive branch may become permanent, and destabilise the whole democratic political order (Mainwaring – Shugart, 1993; Linz, 1994; Mietzner, 2016). However, these expectations are defied by the dynamics of the post-Suharto party system's dynamics and the relative stability of government system.

As Marcus Mietzner also points out, rather than a centrifugal spiral and a radicalisation of opposing blocks and their parties, in the post-Suharto period basically a centripetal type of party competition with limited dynamics was emerging (Mietzner, 2008). This may be due to several factors. Firstly, although on the level of political subcultures, the secular- Islamist cleavage is still tangible in Indonesian society, on the party system level, unlike in the 1950s, they are not grouped into two rigidly opposing blocks. On the one hand, it is highly questionable whether political parties under the "Islamic" block parties can be placed under one big umbrella, as PKB, PPP and PAN are clearly moderate, which have always recognised the Pancasila ideology, but even the more radical, somewhat anti-elite and populist PKS has always kept the rules of parliamentary democracy. The decisive secular forces, thus PDP-P and Golkar also characteristically follow a pragmatic, centrist political trend. The secular-ideological radicalism represented by the communists in the 1950s is practically missing from the current political palette. As a result, rather than radicalisation, the centripetal force of the political centre is more marked even in the fragmented multi-party environment (Mietzner, 2008: 444-447). Generally speaking, the ideological profile of Indonesian parties is more confused than it was in the 50s; the "core parties" of traditional political subcultures tend to be dominated by charismatic personalities rather than by their marked ideological character.[27]

---

[27] In the case of PDI-P, such is Megawati Sukarnoputri; for the traditionalist PKB in the reformasi period such was Professor Abdurrahman Wahid, who died in 2009; PAN was organised round Amien Rais, the leader of Muhammadiya (Ufen, 2008b: 17). Rais had similar intellectual – academic backround like Wahid. He was professor of political science at Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta, which explains his party's particular poularity in Yogyakarta region (the Author's interview with Prof. Muhammad Najib Azca).

Indirectly, certain institutional reforms have also contributed to this centripetal dynamic and to these processes of personal cult. From 2004 direct presidential elections, from 2005 direct provincial elections for governor, and from 2009 the introduction of the open-list system in parliamentary elections have all weakened the role of political parties and added to personality-centered trends (Fionna – Tomsa, 2017: 15-18). This has led to the fact that since 2004, in addition to the traditional "aliran" "core parties" a completely new type, namely "one-person" political movements have emerged. One of them was the retired General Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's "Democratic Party" (Partai Demokrat – PD). After having lost the elections to Sukarnoputri, he launched his own movement, which came practically out of the blue and broke into the political mainstream in 2004, finishing as the third party in the elections. Similarly, the Great Indonesia Movement Party (Gerakan Indonesia Raya – Gerakan) serves the personal ambitions of Prabowo Subianto, established by Suharto's former son-in-law and a former general, after having lost in 2004 to Aburizal Bakrie in the fight for the leadership of the Golkar party. The same can be said of General De Wiranto's People's Conscience Party (Partai Hati Nurani Rakyat - Hanura) set up in 2006, or of the National Democratic Party (Partai Nasional Demokrat – NasDem) of media baron Surya Paloh (Ufen, 2018: 12).

Over the past two decades, the drivers of party politics and parliamentary politics in the post-Suharto period tend to be personal patronage strives and clientelism rather than ideological confrontation (Aspinall – Sukmajati, 2016). Getting hold of a share of government patronage positions has proved to be the decisive motivation for Islamist parties as well, trying to participate in governance rather than withdrawing into opposition (Mietzner, 2008: 445; Ufen, 2018: 10). On the other hand, in the context of the fragmented multi-party Indonesian parliamentary palette, presidents have been able to successfully exercise their executive power only through building possibly the widest "rainbow coalitions". President Joko Widodo, for example, has been consciously using parliamentary parties' internal power fights, repeatedly empowering fractions that support his government (Ufen, 2018). As a result, although President "Jokowi" received his power in the 2014 elections as the candidate of PDI-P that obtained 19% of all the votes, today he is at the head of a coalition of six parties: PDI-P, Golkar, Hanura, Nasdem, PKB and PPP. PAN's position seems to be a bit ambigious, because they were also part of Jokowi's coalition, however on upcoming presidential elections in 2019 they seem to slide with Jokowi's main challenger Prabowo Subianto.[28] Of the four parliamentary Islamist parties, three were, and two still are on the side of the current president. The actual political opposition in the present term is constituted by the Gerinda Party of General Prabowo (a personal rival to the

---

[28] The Author's interview with Prof. Muhammad Najib Azca and Prof. Wawan Masudi. „Prabowo Subianto to run for 2019 Indonesian presidential election with Jakarta deputy governor" *The Straits Times,* Available form [online]: https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/se-asia/prabowo-subianto-says-to-run-again-for-indonesian-president-in-2019-election

president), and PKS, whose political identity is built on Islamism and an uncompromising stand against the elite and corruption. In exchange for their support of the president's power, the government sometimes embraces the Islamist parties' political agenda. This is what happened in 2006 when they voted for the law against pornography, which had originally been urged by PAN (Ufen, 2018: 24).

Considering upcoming 2019 presidential elections we witness two camps emerging: current president Jokowi enjoys support from PDI-P, Golkar, Hanura, NasDem, PKB and PPP parties, while his main rival Liteunant Prabowo seems to be supported by Gerindra, PD, PKS and PAN alliance. If we consider PPP as a traditionalist muslim party[29] the make-up of Jokowi's coalition can remind us of the 1950's NASAKOM government (noticing the not unsignificant difference, that communists are not taking part in it). However the current political opposition consists secular parties besides the modernist muslim PAN and PKS. So unlike the period of "First Democracy" in the '50-s we cannot speak about a clear secular- islamist drift. Especially that Jokowi had chosen 75-year-old Islamic cleric Ma'ruf Amin as his running mate in next year's presidential election.[30]

It is also frequent that in parliamentary politics, decisions on bills are taken as a result of compromises negotiated in the background in commissions out of the public eye; parliamentary parties take the final decision consensually and without voting (Ufen, 2008b: 32). For these reasons, parliamentary legislative procedures may seem obscure and corrupt, but the functioning of the Indonesian model may be looked at from a positive angle, treating it as a multi-party consensus-oriented democracy – in the same way as of the former colonial Netherlands – where political decision making is not one-sidedly in the hands of a political force with a relative majority mandate, but where they try to involve as many political subcultures as possible into legislation and into exercising executive power.

---

[29] Eventhough PPP is widely considered as successor of the modernist Maysumi party, we need to keep in mind that PPP was actually an artifically amalgamated political formation, since the Suharto era a strong modernist-tradititionalist drift existed within the party. In latest years actually the traditionalist wing has gained upper hand withinh party leadership (the Author's interview with Prof. Muhammad Najib Azca Dr. Muhammad Najib Azca).

[30] Amin is the influential head of the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI), who issued a statement condemning the ethnic Chinese Christian former Jakarta governor Basuki Tjahaja Purnama, as a blasphemer for insulting the Koran in the middle of a heated Jakarta election campaign last year. Sita W. Dewi: Who is Ma'ruf Amin, Jokowi's running mate? *The Jakarta Posrt.* Available form [online]:
http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2018/08/09/who-is-maruf-amin-jokowis-running-mate.html?src=mostviewed&pg=news/2018/05/13/jakarta-east-java-riau-islands-on-highest-alert-after-surabaya-bombings.html

Conclusion

The present study has studied the possibilities of adapting political democracy in the content of South East Asian Islam. In the history of Indonesian democracy, the secular and Islam political subcultures have always been present, at times opposed to each other, at other times cooperating. The latter is further divided along the traditionalist vs, modernist cleavage. The party system reflects these cleavages. In the first democracy of the fifties, the confrontation of the secular and Islamic "blocks" led to dramatic consequences: radicalisation of party politics and eventually to the collapse of the democratic political order. In the post-Suharto age, however, the government vs. opposition dichotomy in parliamentary politics does not follow the same cleavages. In the present government coalition, for example, traditional and modernist Muslim parties are – or were - both present, and the ideological profile of the political opposition is similarly mixed.

According to local analysts regarding the four islamic parties, the traditionalist PKB and the modernist PKS have strong chance to keep their mandates or even gain more seats at upcoming parliamentary elections in 2019. However there are serious doubts that PPP weakened by internal party struggles, and PAN – of which popularity is constantly shrinking since the step down of Amien Rais as party leader – can pass the elevated 4% parlimentary threshold.[31] Anyway most probably at least one traditionalist, and one modernist islamic party will be present in indonesian national legislation after 2019 also.

I would argue that there is a specifically Indoenisan "consensus-oriented" democracy model in the making, which is not without certain western predecessors. In it, political Islam and Islamist parties are not active as destabilising factors, but on the contrary, similarly to a number of "western" Christian democratic parties, they act as a type of "Muslim democratic" force that strengthens democratic consensus.

---

[31] The Author's interview with Prof. Muhammad Najib Azca and Prof. Wawan Masudi.

References:

Abdulbaki, Louay (2008): Democratisation in Indonesia: From Transition to Consolidation. Asian Journal of Political Science, Vol. 16, No.2 August, 151.-172. pp.

Aminuddin, Faishal M. (2017): The Purnawirawan and party develpoment in post-authoritarian Indonesia, 1998-2014. Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, Vol. 36, No. 2, 3.-30. pp.

Aspinall, Edward (2011): Democratization and Ethnic Politics in Indonesia: Nine Theses. Journal of East Asian Studies, Vol. 11, No. 2 May-August, 289.-319. pp.

Aspinall, Edward – Sukmajati, Mada (2016): Patronage and Clientelism in Indonesian Electoral Politics. In: Edward Aspinall – Mada Sukmajati (eds.): Electoral Dynamics in Indonesia: Money Politics, Patronage and Clientelism at the Grassroots. Singapore, NUS Press, 1.-38. pp.

Azyumadi Azra (2002): Globalization of Indonesian Muslim Discourse. In Johan Meuelman (ed.): Islam in the Era of Globalization. London and New York, Routledge – Curzon.

Barton, Greg (2010): Indonesia: Legitimacy, Secular Democracy and Islam. Politics & Policy, Vol. 38, No.3, 471.-496. pp.

Bertrand, Jacques (2003): Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia. Cambridge University Press.

Buehler, Michael (2009) : Islam and Democracy in Indonesia. Insight Turkey, Vol.11. No.4, 51.-63. pp.

Chebabi, Houchang E. – Linz Juan J. (1998): A Theory of Sultanism 1: A Type of Nondemocratic Rule. In: Houchang E. Chebabi – Juan J. Linz (eds.): Sultanistic Regimes. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Dahl, Robert A. (1971): Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition, New Haven, Yale University Press.

Diamond, Larry (2010): Indonesia's Place in Global Democracy. In: Marcius Mietzner – Edward Aspinall (eds.): Problems of Democratisation in Indonesia. ISEAS – Yusof Ishak Institute.

Dewi, Sita W.: Who is Ma'ruf Amin, Jokowi's running mate? *The Jakarta Posrt.* Available form [online]: http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2018/08/09/who-is-maruf-amin-jokowis-running-mate.html?src=mostviewed&pg=news/2018/05/13/jakarta-east-java-riau-islands-on-highest-alert-after-surabaya-bombings.html

Eliraz, Giora (2004): Islam in Indonesia. Brighton – Portland, Sussex Academic Press.

Fionna, Ulla – Tomsa, Dirk (2017): Parties and Factions in Indonesia: The Effects of Historical Legacies and Institutional Engineering. ISEAS Working Papers.

Freedman, Amy – Tiburzi, Robert (2012): Progress and Caution: Indonesia's Democracy. Asian Affairs: An American Review, Vol. 39, No. 3, 131.-156.pp.

Fukuoka, Yuki (2013): Oligarchy and Democracy in Post-Suharto Indonesia. Political Studies Review, Vol. 11, No.1, 52.-64. pp.

Fukuyama, Francis (1992): The End of the History and The Last Man. Avon Books.

Hefner, Robert W. (2000): Civil Islam. Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press.

Heiduk, Felix (2012): Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Radical Islam in Indonesia. International Journal of Conflict and Violence, Vol.6, No1, 26.-40. pp.

Higashikata, Takayuki – Kawamura, Koichi (2015): Voting Behaviour in Indonesia from 1999 to 2014. Religious Cleavage or Economic Performance? Institute f Developing Economies, Working Paper No. 512.

Hisyam, Muhammad (2002): The Interaction of Religion and State in Indonesia. In Johan Meuelman (ed.): Islam in the Era of Globalization. London and New York, Routledge – Curzon.

Horowitz, Donald L. (1990): Comparing Democratic Systems. Journal of Democracy. Vol.1, Nr.4, 143.-149. pp.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1991): The Third Wave. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century, Norman and London, University of Oklahoma Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1996): Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. Simon & Schuster.

Laakso, Maarku – Taagepera, Rein (1979): Effective Number of Parties. A Measure Application to West Europe. Comparative Political Studies. Vol 12, No.1, 3.-27. pp.

Lijphardt, Arend (1984): Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-One Countries, Yale University Press.

Linz, Juan J. (1990): The Perils of Presidentialism. Journal of Democracy, Vol.1., No.1, 51.-69. pp.

Linz Juan J. (1994): Presidential or Parliamentar Democracy: Does It Make a Difference? In: Juan J. Linz – Arturo Valenzuela (eds.): The Failure of Presidential Democracy: The Case of Latin-America. Baltimore, Maryland, John Hopkins University Press, 3.-87. pp.

MacIntyre, Andrew (2006): Indonesia as a Poorly Performing State? In: Nancy Birdshall – Milan Vaishnav – Robert L. Ayres (eds.): Short of the Goal? U. S. Policy and Poorly Performing States. Washington D.C., Center for Global Develpoment.

Mainwaring, Scott (1993): Presidentialism, Multipartism and Democracy: The Difficult Combination. Comparative Political Studies. Vol 26, No.2, 198.-228. pp.

Mainwaring, Scott – Shugart, Matthew (1993): Juan Linz, Presidentialism and Democracy. A Critical Appraisal. Kellogg Institute Working Paper.

Meuelman, Johan (2002): South-East Asian Islam and the Globalization Process. In Johan Meuelman (ed.): Islam in the Era of Globalization London and New York, Routledge – Curzon.

Mietzner, Marcus (2008): Comparing Indonesia's party systems of the 1950s and the post-Suharto era: from centrifugal to centripetal interparty competition. Journal of Southeast Asian Studies, Vol.39. Issue 3, 431.-453. pp.

Mietzner, Marcus – Aspinall, Edward (2010): Problems of Democratisation in Indonesia: an Overview. In: Marcus Mietzner – Edward Aspinall (eds.): Problems of Democratisation in Indonesia. ISEAS – Yusof Ishak Institute.

Mietzner, Marcus (2012): Indonesia's democratic stagnation: anti-reformist elites and resilient civil society. Democratization, Vol. 19, No. 2 April, 209.-229. pp.

Mietzner, Marcus (2016): Coercing Loyalty: Coalitional Presidentialism and Party Politics in Jokowi's Indonesia. Contemporary Southeast Asia: A Journal of International and Strategic Affairs. Vol.38; No. 2, 209.-232. pp.

„Prabowo Subianto to run for 2019 Indonesian presidential election with Jakarta deputy governor" *The Straits Times.* Available form [online]: https://www.straitstimes.com/asia/se-asia/prabowo-subianto-says-to-run-again-for-indonesian-president-in-2019-election

Rabasa, Angel – Haseman, John (2002): The Military and Democracy in Indonesia: Challenges, Politics and Power. RAND – National Security Division.

Robison, Richard – Hadiz, Vedi R. (2004): Reorganising Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets. London and New York, Routledge.

Sartori, Giovanni (1976): Parties and Party Systems. A Framework for Analysis. CUP Archive.

Schefold, Reimar (1998): The domestication of culture; Nation-building and ethnic diversity in Indonesia. Bijdragen to de Taal-, Land- en Volkekunde, Globalizatiopn, Localization and Indonesia, Vol.154, No.2, 259.-280. pp.

Sulistyo, Hermawan (2002): Electoral Politics in Indonesia: A Hard way to Democracy. In: Aurel Croissant (ed.): Electoral Politics in Southeast and East Asia. Singapore, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Office for Regional Co-Operation in Southeast Asia.

Tanthowi, Pramono U. (2012): Religiosity, parties and democratization in post-Soeharto Indonesia. Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies, Vol.2. No.1 June, 1.-27. pp.

Ufen, Andreas (2008a): The Evolution of Cleavages in the Indonesian Party System. German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Working Paper 74.

Ufen, Andreas (2008b): From aliran to dealignment: political parties in Sukarno. Indonesia. South-East Asia Research, Vol.16, No.1, 5.-41. pp.

Ufen, Adreas (2018): Party presidentialization in post-Suharto Indonesia. Contemporary Politics, Vol. 24. Nr. 3, 306.-324. pp.

Woodward, Mark (2008): Indonesia's Religious Political Parties: Democratic Consolidation and Security in Post-New Order Indonesia. Asian Security, Vol4. Nr.1, 41.-60. pp.