

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v6i4><https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## Religious Radicalism in the Context of Indonesia Religious and Pancasila

Zulia Hastuti<sup>1</sup>, Kiki Yulia Sari<sup>2</sup>, Rendi Saputra<sup>3</sup>, Sri Lestari<sup>4</sup>, Ismail<sup>5</sup>, Fatonah<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Muhammad Azim Islamic Institute of Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia, [yuliahastuti0502@gmail.com](mailto:yuliahastuti0502@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Muhammad Azim Islamic Institute of Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia, [kikiyulia0127@gmail.com](mailto:kikiyulia0127@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Muhammad Azim Islamic Institute of Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia, [rendiisettiriss@gmail.com](mailto:rendiisettiriss@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup>Muhammad Azim Islamic Institute of Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia, [SriLestarijambi23@gmail.com](mailto:SriLestarijambi23@gmail.com)

<sup>5</sup>Muhammad Azim Islamic Institute of Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia, [ismail.albanjari@gmail.com](mailto:ismail.albanjari@gmail.com)

<sup>6</sup>Jambi State of University, Jambi, Indonesia, [fatolah.nuridin@unja.ac.id](mailto:fatolah.nuridin@unja.ac.id)

Corresponding Author: [yuliahastuti0502@gmail.com](mailto:yuliahastuti0502@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** The reality of religious radicalism in Indonesia is increasingly troubling every day, especially after reform. Religious radicalism is displayed in heartbreaking (inhuman) acts of dishonesty, such as the Bali Bombing, Poso tragedy, Ambon, Sambas, Tolikara, etc. All that is evil, such as the act of killing, terrorizing, burning, destroying fellow humans is strangely framed in the name of religion. This paper wants to limit itself to discussing religious radicalism in Indonesia from a philosophical and theological point of view. The method used is the verstehen method by listening to the reality of radicalism and looking at it in the eyes of philosophy. This becomes important for the growth of a good attitude in objectively viewing religions and living them properly in the context of a multicultural and Pancasila Indonesia. Religious theology, education and lectures should be education of peace, humanist aspects of growth, human culture bloomers, and not education about mastering religious materials that are very formal. Religious education must be in harmony with the values of the nation's called Pancasila.

**Keywords:** Radicalism, Religion, Pancasila, Indonesia.

## INTRODUCTION

The word "radicalism" etymologically comes from the word "*radix*" which means root. Radicalism is thus an understanding or movement that wants renewal by returning themselves to their "roots" in an extreme way. This view is often juxtaposed with fundamentalist movements. Radical movements are usually achieved by any means, from subtle to harsh (Asrori: 2015: 255). There are many types of radical movements and the motivations that frame them, but because what is discussed in this seminar is religious radicalism, this article will limit itself to discussing religious radicalism in Indonesia from a philosophical and theological perspective. This is important for the growth of a wise attitude in viewing religions objectively and experiencing them correctly in the context of a multicultural and Pancasila-based Indonesia.

The reality of religious radicalism in Indonesia is increasingly disturbing, especially after the reformation. Religious radicalism is displayed in heartbreaking *inhumane* acts, such as the Bali Bombing, the Poso, Ambon, Sambas, Tolikara tragedies, etc. (Umar, 2010:146). Everything that is evil, such as acts of killing, terrorizing, burning, destroying fellow human beings is strangely framed in the name of religion. What is even more heartbreaking is that it turns out that the figures, implementers, exponents, perpetrators of violence are people who claim to be religious. The questions that arise are: Does religion teach people to be radical and willing to hurt? What is the meaning of religion if it does not preserve human life? It is still clearly recorded how gripping the bomb explosion incident was framed by religious motivation. In various media, various interviews and broadcasts were expressed containing the reasons why the bomb terror was carried out. The most obvious motivation is religious reasons (Rokhmad, 2012:57). Again, religion is brought up as validation of a brutal act, as if dying in this way will automatically open up heaven for the perpetrators. Is it so easy to achieve the afterlife in this way? Does this mean that religion is the source of evil?

## METHOD

The method used is the *verstehen* method by listening to the reality of radicalism and looking at it in the eyes of philosophy. This becomes important for the growth of a good attitude in objectively viewing religions and living them properly in the context of a multicultural and Pancasila Indonesia. Religious theology, education and lectures should be education of peace, humanist aspects of growth, human culture bloomers, and not education about mastering religious materials that are very formal. Religious education must be in harmony with the values of the nation's called Pancasila.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Religious Radicalism: A Movement to Defend God?

Radical movements in defending God and religion have become recurring activities in human history. Since humans have known religion, religious truth and faith in God have become the fuel for these various movements. There are two ways of looking at this, namely positively and negatively. Positively, humans with this passion want to confirm the authority of God that they have believed in. Negatively, various kinds of enthusiasm sometimes clash violently with other streams, which often give rise to fanaticism, apologism, and even the most violent terrorism (Asrori, 2015: 255-256). The very enthusiastic search for religious authenticity in turn tends to lead to increased violent encounters with other parties.

Endang Turmudi (2005) said that sociologically, there are at least three symptoms that can be identified from radicalism, namely: *first*, it is a response to rejection of socio-political-economic ideas and conditions. which is considered contrary to his beliefs. *Second*, this rejection continues to the imposition of the will to radically change the situation towards another order that is in accordance with the way of thinking and characteristics of thinking that are affiliated with certain values, such as religion or other ideologies. *Third*, there is a claim to truth and ideology that he believes is something superior than others. In turn, this *truth claim* attitude culminates in an attitude of denial and negation of other systems. To encourage this effort, there is the involvement of the masses labeled in the name of the people or the community which is expressed emotionally-aggressively.

Haedar Nashir in his dissertation entitled: *Islam Syariat: Reproduction of Ideological Salafiyah in Indonesia* (2007) said that there are several groups in Indonesia that are always *enthusiastic* about making radical changes when instrumentalizing their beliefs. *First*, the group that appears with legal-formal characteristics that demand changes to the legal system in accordance with the rules and guidance of religious law. *Second*, the group that appears with doctrinal characteristics by understanding and practicing religion in an absolute and rigid way. *Third*, the group that appears with militant characteristics that are

hardline, even not hesitant to carry out a frontal rejection of Pancasila as the basis of the Indonesian state and insists on making sharia its replacement. The understanding of radicalism that is always driven in various momentum, and does not rule out the possibility of being exploited by other parties, especially extreme groups whose existence is still small but whose voices are very noisy (*noisy minority*). When religious radicalism is used as a means of movement to resist the government, while their ranks are surrounded by ambitions of power and politics, it is not impossible that all means, even the most extreme, will be carried out, even framed in various actions that are in volume to suppress and intimidate anyone who is considered to be against (Yunus, 2017: 94).

Faith in God must be realized in real action. Belief in the greatness of God should indeed be a driving force for the growth of a person's piety. This has at least happened in the history of the Church. The Crusades and various wars with religious overtones became markers for the need to defend God's interests in the world. Religion must be defended, whatever the risk. War and killing sometimes must be done if that is the only way. Whoever blasphemes religion must be punished severely, even death if necessary. Even a great person like Galileo Galilei had to be executed when accused of blaspheming religion.

The Pharisees also defended religion and its various teachings. They feel that they really love God and Jewish customs. The values in religion that have been believed for centuries and are contained in the Torah must be defended to the death. True Jews for them are those who practice the Torah. Anyone who insults the Torah must be punished, even those who claim to be the Son of God. Jesus had to be crucified for having "destroyed" the sacred practices of the Jewish religion. Religion for them, once again, must be defended! At this point a big question arises, namely: "Does religion must be defended in such a way? Does the All-Perfect God need the defense of a very desperate human being?"

Charles Kimball (2004) once asked: "*Is religion the problem?*" The answer can be "no" and it can also be "yes." The answer to this question depends on how humans understand the meaning and nature of religion. On the one hand, religion gives meaning to human life. But on the other hand, religion also has to deal with various issues such as doctrine and institutional structure that make religion have a socio-political dimension as an *organized religion*. A religious person can say that the one who is wrong (which causes various acts of radicalism, violence, and terrorism) is someone who does not understand the meaning of their religion. However, Wilson in *Against Religion Why We Should Try to Live Without It* (1990) argues: "*If religion is true, but is unable to influence the behavior of its adherents, then how can we prove the truth of that religion? And what is the use of a religion that is true but is unable to influence the character of its adherents towards civilization?*" This is a series of rhetorical questions that inspire the wisdom of answers from all those who claim to be religious.

This is a problem from time to time that is inherited by all mankind. The theology of all religions says that their own religion is the most correct, and others are wrong or deviant. Exactly what the terrorists say: "We are the most correct in carrying out worship, and others (our opponents) are infidels, so it is permissible to eliminate them!" At this point Charles Kimball said "*when religions become evil*". Kimball gave two signs that are the cause of why religions can become evil: *First*, there are claims of truth. Claims to this truth require loyalty and the same interpretation. Differences in interpretation, especially differences in understanding faith, result in people who oppose being labeled as heretics and infidels. *Second*, there is a militant missionary spirit that uses all kinds of means (even cruel ones) to save "infidels who are still covered in sin." Other people who disagree with him are then considered sinners who must be converted.

Religion is the tragedy of humanity. It invites us to the most sublime awareness in the human soul, but strangely there is almost no religion that is not responsible for

various forms of violence, war, persecution, tyranny, and oppression of truth. Therefore it is not surprising that in this kind of understanding religion is often used as a motivation to go to war, persecute others, justify their own opinions over others, and to claim themselves as the sole owners of truth. The recent rampant terrorism incidents in the name of religion have truly become a good and critical momentum for all religious communities to reflect. Religion (as far as an institution or system of beliefs, practices and values) is also an empirical phenomenon that has a socio-historical character, therefore religion certainly leaves objections if absolute. Why? Because only God is absolute, and not his religion! God's revelation is absolute, but human ability to grasp it is limited, so human ability to grasp His mystery is also limited.

Religion is often understood formally. Religion seems to be another reality separate from the reality of everyday life. The reality is: religious life feels complex, complicated, and at the same time shallow. This happens because the measure of devotion to God is often thought of in various shallow formal forms. We often think of obedience in relation to the colossal activity of building houses of worship, religious centers, radicalism and fanaticism in the struggle for the ratification of a regulation, law, sharia, and the like. Religion is often identified with the implementation of law and religious obligations alone. The question is: "When can people require their fellow humans to practice their religion? Or, can an agency outside of themselves require something related to their religion to be obeyed? The government, for example, can require me to carry out all the crimes of the provisions of the religion that I adhere to?"

The idea of "duty" is a political idea. Not a religious idea. When God created humans for the first time, God did not require humans to act this or that. The relationship between God and humans, at that time, was not a legal relationship. Not a sanction-reward relationship. Not a mandatory or coercive relationship. The relationship between the Creator and His creation (humans) is a relationship of love. Love is loyalty. If you are unfaithful, your love relationship will end. Did God at that time punish human infidelity? In a normal way of thinking, the answer should be: "no." It is humans who punish themselves. It is man who breaks the love relationship. It is man who removes himself from the intimacy of God's love. It is man who harms himself. If religion is understood as a love relationship with God, then the idea of "obligation" cannot be assumed. A love relationship cannot be made mandatory, whatever the reason. The relationship of love, especially with God, is His grace and guidance. Religious obligation is thus a reduction of divine personal obedience to the legal-political way of thinking (sanctions-rewards-coercion). In religious obligation there is no authenticity, because all there is is formality, rigidity, coercion, and even hypocrisy.

The terminology "obligation" is synonymous with *coercive* power. (force). Thomas Hobbes initiated the absolute *coercive* power of government over its citizens. The context of Hobbes' way of thinking was not to initiate the absolutism of power, but rather the importance of peace. When the order of life together is not led by a strong government, humans appear fierce. They hit each other and fight each other, so coercive power is needed that can guarantee peace. Religion at this point should not be forced for or in the name of peace. The crimes of mandatory provisions in religion should not trample on human freedom. When the imposition of a religious obligation arises from a decision of a government agency, or even from the most respected religious leader, the coercion of religion is entirely political. John Locke, the English philosopher after Hobbes, at that time immediately shouted: Stop. Stop the politicization of religion! Because the politicization of religion is the beginning of formalism. The principles of humanity are oppressed in the name of religion. Religion then becomes nothing more than a justification for actions that are sometimes unfair and even cruel, so that's where



the God-defending front appears who even has the power to curse those who are considered to have blasphemed religion. The question is: does God really need a defender? Isn't God the Almighty who doesn't need defense through volumes of demonstrations? If religion can be blasphemed, does that mean religion is greater than God?

Religion belongs to humans. This means that only humans themselves can oblige themselves to practice their religion. Not other people, not the government, not religious leaders, not the KWI, not the MUI, not the PGI, not the Holy Father, not the MPR, not the DPR, not the Cardinal, not the Kyai, not the Constitution, not even the FPI. God himself never even forces! The act of forcing religion on humans is an act of going beyond God. Who is he who can force religion? Humans or mass organizations are nothing, except those who are arrogant and haughty in the clothes of hypocritical political purity. Thus, who can make religion mandatory? Only oneself. Obligation to religion can only flow from love for God. If not from love, obligatory religion is compulsion. Coercion is hypocrisy.

Humans think too much that sharia and religious law are pleasant places for God's presence in the world. Humans think that the greatness of religious centers are places that are favored by God. What is even more stifling is that humans think that fanaticism, radicalism, jihad and the like are identical to the heroism of faith in God. The egoistic activities of individuals, groups or groups that we wrap up with various holy reasons, even various holy verses, seem to be fun. God. Why don't we ever ask whether God approves and likes all these plans and actions?

*Ubi caritas Deus ibi est* (where there is love, there God is)! Only where there is love, there God is present. God also does not ask for offerings. Also not all kinds of burnt offerings. Nor beautiful words in prayer that come out of our mouths (because our mouths smell bad because we often curse, judge, badmouth others and provoke others to do various acts of violence), all forms of shallow heroism in the form of war, terrorism, and various attitudes of defense wrapped in holy terms, such as "jihad," "martyr," and so on. It seems, if the consequences of all of that are misery, feud, division, suffering, is destruction that is far from the character of civilized humans, it is difficult to understand that God is pleased with all of those heroic activities. Also even if all of those heroic activities have justification in verses from the Holy Book. *Sweet Potato caritas Deus ibi est*. God asks for love! Only love. Because only love preserves human life.

## **2. The Role of Educational Institutions in Countering Religious Radicalism**

Said that after the enactment of the National Education System Law, what emerged was narrow formalism that appeared in various forms, and the increasing degree of religious intolerance (Lubis, 2014:4). The results of a survey by Media Indonesia and research by the Institute for Islamic Studies and Peace (Media Indonesia, 2011:4) on Islamic religious education teachers and junior high and senior high school students regarding tolerance towards other religions showed worrying results for communal life. The survey showed that educational institutions have become a source of growing attitudes of hatred and intolerance towards those of different religions, and ironically this is done by religious teachers. The survey also showed that the level of support for violent actions was quite high, as was their level of willingness to be involved in violent actions related to religious issues. The Wahid Institute even released the results of its study on the still high spirit of anti-tolerance among religious people in Indonesia during 2012 and 2013 after the National Education System Law was implemented. Throughout January to December 2013, the number of violations was 245 cases (from intimidation, prohibition, to physical attacks), while in 2012 there were 278 cases (The Wahid Institute, 2014:2). The question that then arises is: why do educational

institutions actually become the growers of the seeds of religious radicalism? Then what is the role of religious lectures, religious education, and also religious teachers to overcome this?

The task of teaching religion to students is not an easy task. Religious Education is not an exact science. There are many problems here: First, the demands of the curriculum that seek to measure students' abilities only from numbers are also problematic for Religious Education. Why? Because religious experience certainly cannot be narrowed down to numbers. Second, teaching Religious Education is closely related to the issue of methodology, namely how to transfer knowledge well to students. If educating is about how to transfer knowledge, is it enough to transfer religious and dogmatic truths into the religious teaching system? This is often complicated by the distinctive plurality of Indonesia.

It is widely known that this nation consists of various tribes, religions, and cultures. The Law on the National Education System (No. 20 of 2003, Chapter V Article 12 (1a)) orders that every student receive Religious Education according to their beliefs from teachers of the same religion. It must be admitted that the problem of religious plurality in Indonesia is not resolved by teaching religion according to one's beliefs. Why? Because what actually emerged in this country after the National Education System Law was passed is the increasing number of cases of religious intolerance! Exclusive Religious Education has resulted in various movements that seem to be a negation of the foundation of the state, namely Pancasila (which actually accommodates differences and rejects the spirit of intolerance). Instead of solving the nation's problems, Religious Education has become part of the problem because it causes various conflicts. So how should formal Religious Education be provided?

Learning activities (studies) are natural human activities. Educational activities (especially formal education) are interpreted as a natural part of every human being to prepare for their future. Driyarkara said that creativity, feeling, and will are the triad-dynamics possessed by humans. The existence of these three elements cannot be separated and exist in humans. Understanding supports feeling, conversely feeling supports the existence of human will. These three elements must develop and run in balance with each other. These dynamic elements complete the understanding of the image of humans who have the ability for self-reflection. The peak of this dynamic is the unity of humans with the Absolute, God (Driyarkara, 1980:72-74).

The dynamics between the three keep humans alive, not only biologically, but humanly. Dynamics in this context explains the situation throughout human life that never ends. All human life is a process, there is hope and waiting. That's it the existence of the dynamics of human life. Dynamic elements that function in a balanced and integral way lead humans to truly become spiritual-physical individuals. Furthermore, Driyarkara (1980:72) said that the attainment of knowledge must be seen in a more complex framework, namely as a fundamental human activity in his world. Education and study activities are fundamental activities, because what is done by humans it is related to the search for one's identity. This kind of activity is interpreted as an educational act because it is given a certain meaning, namely that the act brings the person to a human level.

In the context of Religious Education, study activities thus contain a series of activities to change and determine human life in relation to oneself, others, and God. That is where it appears that Religious Education ultimately becomes an action that seeks to humanize and at the same time divinize humans. Religious Education should also be part of the activity of elevating humans to a level that is increasingly human and also increasingly divine. So, the process of educating religion is actually a process of revealing the identity of young people to reach awareness of their own authentic existence. Holistic Religious Education provides space for children to have a new awareness in understanding themselves, their abilities, and

their existence. Good Religious Education should emphasize the values and dignity of humanity, which ultimately makes children increasingly aware that they are not just biological creatures, but personal creatures with spiritual nature. In this kind of thinking, Religious Education should enable each student to find themselves, their fellow human beings, and their God better. Religious Education should thus promote values of goodness, for example: anti-violence, appreciation for multiculturalism, respect for adherents of other religions, and the elimination of exclusivism by considering themselves as the people most loved by God.

Educational institutions (especially formal educational institutions) as a place for the transfer of knowledge in this perspective have the responsibility to transfer ethical values. In the midst of the condition of the nation which is vulnerable to division, Religious Education should be able to contribute by developing a spirit of honesty, anti-corruption, and respect for fellow countrymen as creatures of the same God, rather than bothering to accuse adherents of other religions of being infidels, simply memorizing verses of the Holy Book, and learning how to pray devoutly according to their respective religious teachers. Why? Because there is no use for various formal pieties if the corrupt and hypocritical mentality remains attached in all areas. Isn't this what happens to the country? We, whose entire population is known to have a religion, but it turns out that our corruption index also won the title of champion?

Religious education and religious lectures should be peace education, fostering humanist aspects, fostering human culture, and not education about mastering religion, because it is nonsense for people to master religion, especially as it is curated by the state. Understanding that Indonesia is a multicultural nation and Pancasila must continue to be realized and fought for together. Indonesian and world history even records how great the role of religion is in inciting hatred, blowing suspicion, raising misunderstandings, and inviting conflict (Haryatmoko, 2010: 82). Haryatmoko (2010: 82-83) even said that religion often provides an ideological basis and symbolic justification for various conflicts. Religious Education should develop the dimension of inclusivity. This is what should be developed in Religious Education taught by teachers of the same religion according to the National Education System Law. Religious Education must be in line with the noble values of the nation called Pancasila!

### **3. Pancasila as the Basis for Rejecting Religious Radicalism in Indonesia**

History says that the formulation of the state foundation into what is known as it is today actually went through a long road. Until the end of the first meeting at the BPUPKI session, there was still no agreement on the formulation of the state foundation, so finally a small committee was formed called the Committee of Nine to discuss various inputs. After making a compromise between four people from the nationalists and four people from the Islamic side, on June 22, 1945 the Committee of Nine met again and produced a formulation of the state foundation known as the Jakarta Charter which contained: "Belief in God with the obligation to implement Islamic law for its adherents, Just and civilized humanity, Unity of Indonesia, Democracy guided by the wisdom of deliberation among representatives, and Social justice for all Indonesian people."

The journey of history records that the Jakarta Charter received resistance, especially from non-Muslims and people from Eastern Indonesia. Finally, seven words in the first principle were crossed out to become "Belief in the One Almighty God" in order to accommodate all parties who would later live together in an independent Indonesia. The romanticism of returning to the Jakarta Charter is what at least the radicals want to revive in various ways, (Nurjannah, 2013, 21) even though inserting the terminology "obligation to practice religion" means placing the state as a coercive force in religion, and the implications will certainly be complicated. The state then has the right to punish people who

do not practice religion (break fasting, do not pay zakat, do not prayer, etc.) if the clause is inserted. Religious practice then becomes merely a formality, seemingly external, and as long as it is not punished by the state. Religious experience is no longer about my relationship with my God. The following 1946 Republic of Indonesia News contains the official formulation of Pancasila:

“.....The Almighty God, a just and civilized humanity, the unity of Indonesia, and democracy guided by the wisdom of representation, and by promoting social justice for all Indonesian people (Republic of Indonesia News Year II No. 7, 15 February 1946).

If the Preamble to the Proclamation Constitution includes the basis of the state, then this formulation is the one that is officially used as the foundation of an independent Indonesia. If this foundation is replaced, then the building of Indonesia will collapse. Boelars (2009:147) noted that although the 1945 Constitution has established Pancasila as the basis of the state, there are still parties who want to replace Pancasila with another basis. Faith (1988:15) in his introduction to Soekarno's speech before BPUPKI argued that Pancasila was Soekarno's hard work to oppose the idea of establishing a religious state and at the same time reconcile differences of opinion between nationalists and religious groups. This is evident in Soekarno's speech below:

"We founded the Indonesian state, which we all must support. All for all! Not Christianity for Indonesia, not Islam for Indonesia, not Hadikoesoemo for Indonesia, not Van Eck for Indonesia, not the rich Nitisemito for Indonesia, but Indonesia for Indonesia, all for all! If I squeeze the five into three, and the three into one, then I can get one genuine Indonesian word, namely the word 'gotong-royong.' The country we establish must be a gotong-royong country!" (State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995:82.)

Since the beginning of the formation of this country, there has been much controversy about the form of the state regarding whether this country was founded on the basis of religion or a secular state. There were at least two large groups that were facing each other, namely religious forces and nationalist forces. "All for all" and "no religious egoism," said Soekarno. Darmaputera (1989:291) at this point concluded that independent Indonesia 'is not an Islamic State and not a secular State,' but a Pancasila state. Soekarno dreamed of realizing "Indonesia for all," so all citizens must feel like Indonesians and build the same Indonesia:

"Brothers who are called nationalists here, as well as brothers who are called Muslims, have all agreed that this is not the kind of country we aim for. We want to establish a country of 'all for all'.... Not Christianity for Indonesia, not Islam for Indonesia, but Indonesia for Indonesia, all for all! If I squeeze the five into three, and three into one, then I can get one genuine Indonesian word, namely the word 'gotong royong.'. The country that we establish must be a gotong royong country! The principle of gotong royong between the rich and the poor, between Islam and Christianity, between those who are not genuine Indonesians and those of the *peranakan* who become the Indonesian nation. This, brothers and sisters, is what I propose to you. (State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995: 71-82)."

The idea of togetherness, nationality, justice, and welfare is the ideal of the people and the goal of this country. All social differences are accommodated admirably in Pancasila, so this is where Pancasila's superiority lies as an ideal foundation for national and state life, even in society. The Indonesian nation and society in the deepest dimension of their lives are united by faith and devotion to God Almighty, and complemented horizontally by the principle of Just and Civilized Humanity, realizing unity, people's values, and social justice. If the basic vertical and horizontal attitudes are understood, internalized, and practiced consistently and consistently, then the fruit is a culture of friendship, brotherhood, mutual support, and expansion.



Pancasila is thus the anti-radicalism values themselves. The movement to base oneself on a certain religion that is carried out in a radical way is actually a rejection of the values of Pancasila. How can someone claim to believe in God but simultaneously violate humanitarian values by making bombs that kill other people? How can someone claim to defend God but simultaneously refuse to deliberate (deliberate) and choose to resolve all problems with anarchy that harms national unity and goes against justice?

## CONCLUSION

Theology, education, and religious lectures should be peace education, fostering humanist aspects, fostering human culture, and not education on mastering religious material that is very formal in nuance. Religious education must be in line with the noble values of the nation called Pancasila! Understanding that Indonesia is a multicultural and Pancasila nation must continue to be realized and fought for together. It is true that This nation is one, but this unity is built on the foundation of cultural, religious, ethnic, racial, etc. diversity. The fundamental threat to this multicultural democratic country is the emergence of sectarian culture. One manifestation of sectarianism is an intolerant attitude towards "others," and that is the door to becoming radical.

Humans are *human beings*, but humans are also those who *are human beings*. He is becoming more human. *Human being* is *human being* too. Humans are not perfect. Man is a "being" that is not yet full. When does it become complete? When his life shows the reality that he is humanizing and treating others humanely, as he treats himself or expects others to treat him, and radicalism is an act that destroys humanity. Indonesia is not a godless country, but it would be a very different story if this belief in God made him reject his fellow countrymen. Pancasila provides a strong foundation for how Indonesians should embrace their religion. Religious renewal to return to the roots is the right of every religious adherent, but of course it will cause problems when the movement to return to the roots is only interpreted narrowly as enforcing certain religious laws (even by cruel means) and conquering adherents of other religions in the midst of a diverse and Pancasila-based Indonesia.

## REFERENCES

- Asrori, Ahmad., (2015), "Radicalism in Indonesia: Between Historicity and Anthropocene", in *Kalam: Journal of Religious Studies and Islamic Thought*, Vol., No.2, Lampung
- Dahm, Bernhard, (1965), *Sukarno and the Struggle for Indonesian Independence*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Darmaputera, Eka, (1989), *Pancasila: The Identity and Integrity of the Indonesian Nation*, Jakarta: Mount Mulia.
- Darmodiharjo, Dardji., (1979), *Main Points of Discussion of Pancasila, the Philosophical Basis of the Republic of Indonesia*, Pancasila Laboratory, IKIP Malang-National Enterprise, Surabaya.
- Driyarkara, (1980), *Collection of Driyarkara's Writings*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius Faith, Herbert (ed), 1988, *Indonesian Political Thought 1945-1965*, Jakarta, LP3ES Library.
- Haryatmoko, (2010), *Full Domination of Anti-Violence and Discrimination Tricks*, Gramedia, Jakarta.
- Nashir, Haedar, (2007), *Islamic Sharia: Reproduction of Ideological Salafism in Indonesia*.
- Nurjannah, (2013), "Factors Triggering the Emergence of Islamic Radicalism in the Name of Da'wah," in *Jurnal Dakwah (Media Komunikasi dan Da'wah UIN Yogyakarta)*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Yogyakarta.
- Rokhmad, Abu, (2012), "Islamic Radicalism and Efforts to Deradicalize Radical Ideology", in *Walisongo Journal: Journal of Research and Social Religion*, Vol. 20

No. 1, Semarang.

State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995, *Minutes of the Session of the Investigating Committee for Preparatory Work for Indonesian Independence* (BPUPKI), Jakarta.

Turmudi, Endang, (2005), *Islam and Radicalism in Indonesia*, Jakarta.

Umar, Ahmad Rizky, (2010), "Tracing the Roots of Islamic Radicalism in Indonesia," in *JSP (Journal of Social and Political Sciences UGM)*, Vol. 14. No. 2, Yogyakarta

Yunus, Faiz., (2017), "Radicalism, Liberalism, and Terrorism: Their Influence on Islam", in *the Journal of Al Qur-an Studies*, Vol. 13 No. 1, Jakarta.

-----, *Republic of Indonesia News* Year II No. 7, 15 February 1946).