

THE EXISTENCE OF PROSELYTIZATION IN INDONESIA
(HOW RELIGIOUS REGULATION LEADS TO CONFLICT
BETWEEN
THE RELIGIOUS MAJORITY AND MINORITIES)

Abdul Mujib

Center for Religion and Cross Cultural Studies
Graduate School Universitas Gadjah Mada

Email: abdulmujib@mail.ugm.ac.id

Proselytization is problem life. In many chances, it disturbs government stability because people who live as religious majority always problematize their power. Moreover, “weak regulation” from the government in managing religious freedom causes public space to be dominated by the majority, on other hand, leaves minority groups alienated. As Parekh said that every right must be owned by individual or (sometimes) groups, so that they offer a way to manage rights in diversity in public spheres by dialogue. This paper discusses the policy made by the government and its impact on social life, especially discriminating against minority groups. The methodology of this paper is descriptive qualitative, through comparing some cases of proselytization. This paper also examines what should be done by majority, minority and government in managing diversity from Parekh perspective, which assumes each area has local wisdom. Through which people can deal with different regulation under constitution by using dialogue. Therefore, people (from majority or minorities) can gain their dignity as human being.

Keywords: proselytization, regulation, majority-minorities, dialogue

INTRODUCTION

Proselytization always creates problem in religious society. In Indonesia, after 1998 (in reformation era), proselytization circumstance is raised in public and it very often disturbed other people’s interest. According to Feener, proselytism and pluralism are linked to each other in complex ways and diversely configured in different national contexts (Feener, 2014: 3). In differs’ areas, it consists of many kinds of religions, commonly it is called by pluralist society. Therefore, proselytization is very susceptible situation, because religious adherents compete to get follower as many as possible to embrace their religions. Contextually in religious freedom, they are very possible to clash, because in one hand, as religious people, they have obligation to spread their religions. But, on

the other hand, state also makes regulation in proselytization. Even though this regulation is still weak, it thus only takes advantage by majority group.

Furthermore proselytization problem, as Hecket said “proselytization often functions as the thorn in the flesh of the secular state” (Feener, 2014: 3). It is dilemma if there is proselytization in secular state. Because, ideally in secular state, they ban religious practice, for instance people show their religious identity and organize it in public arena. In non-secular state, like Indonesia, people can express their religious identities. Yet sometime it makes hostility among religious adherents. Therefore, state must manage religious freedom openly and make a constitution, so that citizen’s activities which show religious identity do not disturb public order.

In managing diversity, state should not tend to one group such as majority group. But in reality, majority group are always prioritized because they are not only dominant but they also have many people in Council, so that they can make regulation for their (majority group) benefits. Public discourses on religious pluralism are opposed by some religious groups. This opposition is often elaborated by reference or postulate on. It creates contestation in religious propagation and conversion. Bagir and Cholil describe the situation in twenty-first century Indonesia: “Pluralism, just like liberalization and secularization, is considered as a threat to the solidity or unity of the Islamic community. It is also a threat to Islamic communalism and politics. The discourse about pluralism is seen as a discourse that destroys the *da`wa* (mission) movements, and the theological pillars of beliefs and the *Sharia*.” (Feener, 2014: 5). They show how dangerous pluralism into public if there is no well-regulation. It will only create conflict, because theologically, religious people have motivation to do what they want. Therefore, I suppose that there must be limitation of the regulation to restrict majority on pressing minority. In this paper, I propose three questions:

- 1) Why does proselytization become problem?
- 2) How does the regulation impact on proselytization?
- 3) How does Bhikhu Parekh deal with case for majority and minority gap?

Therefore, the distinction of regulation is expected for all groups, because the minority is always discriminated. Actually, with the existence of religious freedom in public sphere, it can become arena of existence for majority and minority to solve contestation without pressing and discriminating other as Bhikhu Parekh states.

Theoretical Framework / Literature Review

Proselytization is one of important activities in every religion. Government has obligation to manage it, so that among religions, they do not contrast each other (Wahid, 2012, 113). However, for religious adherents, proselytization is the duty for them in spreading religion. With regard to this definition, Feener, in his book entitled *Proselytizing and the Limits of Religious Pluralism in Contemporary Asia*, said that “Proselytization is both enabled by, and simultaneously tests the limits of, religious pluralism. So proselytization assumes a situation of diversity where individuals have the potential to change their religious identities and affiliations, while at the same time the goals of overcoming that diversity through the eventual conversion of the rest of society to one’s own religion” (Feener, 2014: 5). Proselytization has emphasis to convert people to other (different) religions. Proselytization is dangerous in social life because it sometimes emerges conflict among groups that want to exist.

Melissa Crouch, on her book entitled *Law and Religion in Indonesia Conflict and the Courts in West Java*, concerning in proselytism said that regulation over proselytization has been discussed and started from proselytization into some cases which are indicated into proselytization. The regulation still makes multi-interpretations and sensitive, because this regulation still takes side to majority interests. Later on, proselytization cases create conflict, because there is no strict-law which is made in Indonesia. Aforementioned, many cases are mutually accusing of proselytization that encountering Islam and Christianity into contestation. In this term, the regulation of proselytization in Indonesia is unlike in Malaysia. There is no legal restrictions imposed by the state in Indonesia that prevent a person from converting to another religion, especially for minority group (Crouch, 2014: 4).

Regarding to contestation, Lau Teik Soon on his book titled *Majority-Minority Situation in Singapore* showed the relations between majority and minority cannot be separated. The emergence of majority-minority, as the social structure social, is caused by migration, indigenous group or colonial policies. In many times, both of groups disturb the stability of government. However, government has to protect the minority rights and accommodate them into equality with group majority. Soon also goes further that the minority group will always seek the equality of opportunities and integration in national development of the state (Lau Teik Soon, 1974: 1-3).

Therefore, according to Parekh on his book titled *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, concerning in cultural diversity (majority-minority), human being is important part in

trajectory of developing the diversity. Generally cultural diversity has embedded in human being, because it has activities of human life and relationship among them. Therefore, cultural diversity increases the space of option and expands freedom of choice (Parekh , 2000: 165). So, here, human equality is emphasized to embody good religious freedom in the midst of cultural diversity. On the other word, the space of freedom must be existed by human being without differentiating majority or minority. He said that diversity has to be mutually beneficial dialogue (Parekh, 2000: 168), in order to cultural diversity, it can appreciate deeply each other.

Materials and Methods

The material of this paper encompasses the regulation of proselytization in Indonesia. In this paper, because of focusing in Indonesia, I only use Islam and Christianity as comparison. Proselytization, for some areas which does not have experience in plural society, will be difficult to receive diversity such as the building of church in Muslim area because most of them emerge conflict. Therefore, government participates to organize their citizens to get living in harmony. Yet, for society who used to live in diversity, the regulation from government make them difficult to fulfill the requirement. Whereas, according to Bikhu Parekh, society can handle their diversities without involving of state. Society can make a deal with others (ethnic or religion) because of social contract among them. They can build dialogue to make dealing with others, without obeying regulation made by government.

The method of this research used qualitative descriptive. It can be used to describe, analyze, and summarize the condition and situations of data collected from field. However, the analyzed data are secondary data from several sources. It can be from mass media, government and NGOs report.

Result and Discussion

A. The problem of proselytization

As two of religious proselytisms in Indonesia, Islam and Christianity have an obligation to get followers as many as possible, either openly or hiddenly. In terms of proselytism terminology, Christianity and Islam have different terms. Christians often refer to the term *misi* (mission), while Muslims use the Arabic term *da'wa* (Crouch, 2014: 4). Both of religions, fortunately, have same root history as theology, but they have different culture. For instance, Christianity is from western, and in that time, Christian had an idea to spread religion by mission in their colonizing area. Meanwhile Islam was from Arab and

Muslim uses *da'wa* to proselytize their religion. These terms are also strengthened by Feener that “attitudes toward proselytization vary both within and between Islam and Christianity in Indonesia. In Islamic view, Muslims engage in religious proselytizing (*da'wa*)” (Feener, 2014: 23).

Both of those terms becomes problem, because those religions have similarity to proselytize other people, thus they often mutually accuse for the sake of getting adherents. In Feener’s perspective, the term “Christianization” is generally used by Indonesian Muslims to refer Christian missionary practices which are considered to be deceptive due to whom they target and how they target them (Feener, 2014: 23). Meanwhile, Islamization is generally understood by Christians to constitute efforts by some Muslims to make Indonesia an Islamic state under Islamic law, rather than an effort to convert Christians to Islam (Feener, 2014: 24).

There are many contestations which happened between Islam and Christianity. In Indonesia, as democratic country, state is encouraged to make regulation or constitution clearly, in order to they have limitation in conducting proselytization. According to Feener, “Proselytization is both enabled by, and simultaneously tests the limits of, religious pluralism”. Proselytization describes that there is dilemma in religious freedom to ban proselytization and keep harmonious-living in religious pluralism (Feener, 2014: 5). Indonesia as democratic country is very different with proselytization circumstance in secular country. There is discourse in secular state to limit proselytization. Because, ideally in secular state, they do not recognize the existence of religion, so that proselytization cases are banned by state.

The issue of proselytization for religious people gives to simultaneous, yet it is separated with universal human rights idea. So that, proselytization, for state, is more about protection, not as rights as well (Feener, 2014: 11). In recent years, Feener says that “claims to the majority’s rights to ‘protection’ from secularism, from religious deviance, dissenters, and apostates have emerged with even greater force into the broader Indonesian public sphere”. Proselytization, when we talk in “rights” arena, will be characterized as individual. But if state intervenes their citizens by giving protection, that “rights” become communal (Feener, 2014: 12).

In Indonesia, the problem of proselytization is triggered by the discourse of Jakarta Charter (Feener, 2014: 9). This discourse mentioned that every single citizen has to believe in God (the further information is in the following point). However, the important thing from this point is the constitution brought up as the basic for Christianity and Islam to expand their religions through missionary or *da'wa* in many areas in Indonesia, precisely for people who have not had religion like them.

The peak of violence between Muslims and Christians happened in 1999 and 2001, when there were campaigns to close Christian churches or prevent proselytization activities. It continued to occur at the initiation of a minority of Muslims who are willing to use violence to achieve their goals (Crouch, 2014: 2). However, this event created rude reaction from Muslim as majority. Finally Muslims demonstrate the symbolic value of regulations on proselytization and thereby the state allows to be seen as a control of Christian proselytization. Feener states that “the state maintains the support of the Islamic majority” (Feener, 2014: 38). Therefore, reformation has allowed for the emergence of new voices in the Indonesian public sphere, as the effect of Christian proselytizing, it raises vocal Islamist groups increasingly (Feener, 2014: 12). This genealogy of proselytizing in modern era was begun in Indonesia. Later on, the debate over proselytization between Muslims and Christians in Indonesia is focused on who is ‘fair game’ for efforts of proselytization and what acceptable terms of engagement is (Crouch, 2014: 5).

To relate proselytization into discussions of religious pluralism in contemporary society, we must look at to the idea of “religious freedom,” often with reference to the development in the context of modernizing Europe (Feener, 2014: 13). Europe becomes prototype model to manage religious pluralism. Europe culture and Indonesian culture are different, therefore, the idea of human rights in Indonesia is still difficult to establish.

B. The Regulation of Proselytization in Indonesia

In general, the foundation policy of religions in Indonesia is constituted on Indonesian Constitution of 1945, prominently it includes the right to freedom of religion under Article 29 (Feener, 2014: 21, see also Crouch, 2014: 27). Then, this article has been amended until it has many derivative Articles, which mostly focused on more specific cases.

Regarding to the regulation, in the beginning of Indonesian government, specifically it did not use term of proselytization. State preferred using propagation for restricting regulation of proselytism. In this term, the Minister of Religion and Council has power to arrange and stipulate the regulation over religion. In relating to proselytization, The Minister of Religion responded, in August 1978, the Regulation 70/1978 on the Guidelines for the Propagation of Religion. It aims to preserve harmony among religious groups. Article 2 of this regulation prohibits proselytization if the propagation:

- (a) is directed at people who already have a religion;

- (b) employs the use of bribery (such as gifts, money, clothes, food and drink, medicine, etc.) in order to persuade a person to change religion;
- (c) involves the distribution of pamphlets, bulletins, magazines, books or other publications to people who already have a religion;
- (d) involves approaching the private residences of people who already have a religion. (Feener, 2014: 26)

Furthermore, these four limits on proselytization represent the fears of Muslims to Christians, thus Muslims propose the additional rules for the religious majority:

“First, Article 2(a) relates to fears of apostasy (*riddah*, literally “to turn back”), which is recognized within classical Islam as the desertion of Islam or conversion from Islam to another religion. Related to the fear of apostasy, as set out in Article 2(b), are concerns over “Christianization,” or the fear of conversion through bribery or dishonest missionary activity. Third, Article 2(c) relates to the fear of spreading false teachings through the distribution of Christian publications. Article 2(d) relates specifically to the practice by religious groups such as Jehovah’s Witnesses to go from house to house knocking on doors as a method of proselytization.” (Feener, 27)

After this article came up, Christianity, as religious minority, feels thread because of their rights of proselytization. On the other hand, Islam as religious majority will free when they want to conduct *da’wa* through many ways. It will raise attainment and mutually prejudice between them, because in that Article it is only mentioned “Christianization” or in other term is proselytization.

Furthermore, religious majority also attack people who do not have faith yet, such as *aliran kepercayaan*. They become object of proselytization not only for religious majority, but also for world religions which are looking for adherents. Therefore, many Christianization or missionaries, and Islamizations or *da’wa* in particular areas proselytize in which do not have religion yet.

With regard to object of proselytization, a common phrase used to refer to a person who does not adhere to one of the official religions is *orang yang belum beragama* (person who does not have a religion yet), which also implies that conversion to a religion is inevitable. It also because of The Ministry of Religion differentiates between religion, which has been increasingly officially recognized and sanctioned, and mystical beliefs, which are discouraged and sidelined (Feener, 2014: 21),

so they (mystical beliefs) become object of proselytization, precisely from Islam and Christianity.

Because of many cases in proselytization such as missionary and *da'wa*, Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) proposed judicial review for those cases. The case had been brought to the court by a group of NGOs that claimed the 1965 Blasphemy Law had been frequently used to intimidate adherents of minority religions. Later on, regulation to protect the minority religion is acceded in Article 28(E) of the Indonesian constitution, which declares that:

- (1) Every person shall be free to choose and to practice the religion of his/her choice, to choose one's education, to choose one's employment, to choose one's citizenship, and to choose one's place of residence within the state territory, to leave it and to subsequently return to it.
- (2) Every person shall have the right to the freedom to believe his/her faith (*kepercayaan*), and to express his/her views and thoughts, in accordance with his/her conscience.
- (3) Every person shall have the right to the freedom to associate, to assemble and to express opinions. (Feener, 2014: 2)

By existing of Article 28(E), it shows that state always strives to improve the regulation in order to be able to accommodate religious minority. So that they do not become the object of proselytization, even they will have rights like religious majority in public sphere or public order. In this term, role of NGO which always keep on struggling minority rights in order to get same level as good as citizenship should be appreciated.

The following regulation is focusing on education. In Law 2/1989 required schools to provide religious education (Article 11(1)) to equip students with an understanding of his/her religion (Article 11(6)). In education, schools must have curriculum about *Pancasila*, the state ideology, and citizenship (Article 39(2)). However, this law forces schools have to require providing religious education for religions other than the religion of that school (Feener, 2014: 31).

After many years, sharply in 2003, Law 20/2003 on Education was passed as part of the reform process in Indonesia. Feener said that "There were two main provisions that related to religious education. Article 30 obliges government to provide religious education. Article 12 requires all schools to provide religious education for children according to their religion" (Feener, 31). When Muslim student attends to Christian school, it has to provide Islamic religious education for Muslim student (Feener, 2014: 32). Therefore, by constitution, if there are children who have different religion study in the school, and that school does not

provide over their religion, so it has broken law. However, if there is child who has minority religion and the school does not provide his/her religious teacher who has same with his faith, instead he/she is not given choice to study or he/she is not cared, therefore, state must regulate this case. There is gap between minority and majority groups when they get problem, especially in education as well.

C. The Case Studies of Proselytization

In the discussion of case studies, I would like to combine between proselytization cases and the effects of regulation which is made by state. Because, some of cases derive from vulnerable regulation and it still has multi-interpretation. Therefore, it is used to press religious minority into suspected by religious majority. There are many cases of proselytization in Indonesia. It is started from *da'wa* or missionary through giving aid, either food or medicine after disaster, or about education precisely about *sisdiknas* (National Education System).

1. Prejudice of giving aid from other religions

I take case from giving aid which has been done by Christians after disaster in Padang and tsunami in Aceh. In Padang case, many issues dispersed when the volunteers do their duties to help victims of earthquake. They, in hidden, also proselytize to those victims. Of course, this news is heard to the leader of Padang. Thus, many volunteers went home earlier because of that issue. Later on, in Padang, when volunteers from other religious work, they are always controlled by local government to prevent proselytization (Vivanews, November 3rd 2009).

The following case happens in Aceh. This prejudice occurs in the midst of social activities. After tsunami, there are many donations to help Aceh and to re-establish Aceh. The donation is not limited from specific religions, ethnics or others. But, after many times, there are issues that one of donation is from World help, America. The issue is that the donation is one of proselytization project and Christianization effort to Aceh. Of course Acehnese get angry with it, and state asks to that collage to clarify about that issue (Tempo, January 17th 2015).

Regarding to those cases, the state has organized about donation in Law 77/1978 that every donation from abroad must report to Religion Institution in order that donation is not used for certain agent as a mediator to proselytization (Bagir, 2011: 139). Yet, from that case above, why the donation can be passed and come to the disaster area, while in that area the donation is rejected. I argue that there is propagandize from religious majority to problematize the donation and raise it becomes proselytization. However, overall the power of religious majority in determining where is good or bad, aptly persuades in the social life,

while state with his regulation cannot control until in common ground area.

The next case is from humanitarian activity held by Jemaat Kristen Indonesia in Muntilan Magelang. In the beginning, Jemaat Kristen only wants to open free consultation-health to people as the devoting in humanitarian. But, after several times, many people from FPI (Islamic Defender Front) come and dissolve that activity. After that FPI continues and demonstrates in front of police office and ask them to quit the proselytization or missionary practice. Later on, in beginning, that activity is humanitarian motivation. But in a short-time, it changes into turmoil because of prejudicing from religious majority. However, police as representative of state also obeys religious majority's (FPI) demanding to dissolve the consultation-health that is held by Christians (Wahid, 2012: 136-142). Then, this case suspects as proselytization.

I argue when there is an intervention from state, in this case it is done by the police, thus among religious people, there has no idea of human rights. Because, when police gives protection to Jemaat Christianity and on the other hand, police obeys the asking from FPI, so here, majority can control state, and the regulation is useless. Therefore, there is one alternative solution that repairs the regulation which can accommodate religious group or individual.

In recent days ago, there was case of proselytization in car free day in Sentul. That case happens in public sphere. There is grandmother uses veil who participates in car free day, and suddenly there are two people close to her and the people try to propagandize her to become Christianity (Islampos, 13 November 2014). This issue becomes popular because the object is the old woman and it is done in public spheres. Is it proselytization? But the important thing is whether state has not made the regulation about that. Obviously, there is regulation in article 2 of Regulation 70/1978 that says "is directed at people who already have a religion" means that is forbidden to conduct proselytization to people who has religion. I raise question how about when Muslim conduct *pengajian* or *da'wa* in public sphere in Sentul. At glance, it is allowed, but how if Christians conduct on the same activities in the same place. Of course it is forbidden; probably the reason is disturb public order. I suppose that the regulation from state must be just to both of them. In this term, between *da'wa* and missionary are allowed, in considering, because of in majority area.

2. Policy about education (UU Sisdiknas case)

In contemporary era, Proselytization Case is the first time in Indonesia that Christians have been convicted for the criminal offense of deceiving Muslim children to change religion. Moreover, since 1998, religious education policy arranged to mandate that all schools provide

religious education according to the religion of the student (Feener, 2014: 37).

There are many cases in education, as Feener describes, Islamic leaders complained to the local Indonesian Ulama Council when some of the Muslim children and children of mixed marriages start singing Christian songs at home (Feener, 2014: 20). When children sing from other religious song, for some people it is called proselytism, without investigating that it is true Christian song or not. Whereas children don't know about that song, they only sing. The understanding one is their parents. Meanwhile, their parents, before entering their children to other different school, have well considered for their children.

Although there is decision to uphold Blasphemy Law, the court affirmed that all schools, both public and private, are obliged to provide religious education for students according to their religions (Feener, 2014: 37). This term is suitable with the law 20/2003 in Article 12 that all school must provide religious education for children according to their religions (Feener, 2014: 31). The case over regulation of education in Christianity schools become prominently attention. Because as new order, Muslim children is fine when they studied in Christian school, but in reformation era, some certain group problematizes it, with justifying as proselytization.

To see proselytization case in education, I describe it:

“Three Christian teachers accused of proselytism will remain in jail after Indonesia's Constitutional Court rejected a claim that the law under which they were charged was unconstitutional. Instead, the judges ruled that the Child Protection Act is in line with the constitution and should not be amended. Rev Ruyandi Hutasoit, from the Church of the Shining Christian, had called for the law to be reviewed on the grounds that whilst it bans deceit, lies and enticement to convert a child, it also does not respect freedom of religion guaranteed under the constitution. Rebecca Loanita, Ety Pangesti and Ratna Mala Bangun, who ran a Sunday school in their village in Indramayu District (West Java), were sentenced to three years in jail for violating the 2002 Child Protection Act after members of the local Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI or Muslim Clerics Council) accused them of trying to convert Muslim children even though none of the Muslim children attending the Sunday school were ever converted, and all of them took part in the school's activities with their parents' permission” (Asianews, January 2nd 2006).

It is clearly seen that between minority and majority religion have different handling to see the solution. Beside the regulation is still not

clear or susceptible, pressure of religious majority to state is also significant factor over discrepancy.

D. Response to Proselytization's Cases

To respond these cases, I use Bhikhu Parekh's theory about how to make deal between religious majority and religious minority using religious freedom. Aforementioned, proselytization disturbs public order, so state must make 'good' regulation which can accommodate both of majority and minority religion. However, Christians demonstrate the symbolic value of regulations on proselytization and allow the state to see as controlling Christian proselytization. In so doing, the state maintains the support of the Islamic majority (Feener, 2014: 38). In this term, it seems that between Christian as religious minority and Muslim as religious majority always have contestation and it disturbs public order.

Regarding that case, if state also participates in both of group's contestation, it means that there is no public freedom and state failing to guarantee human right. Especially Indonesia as democratic country must aptly keep the religious freedom. However, practically, religious freedom still charge by majority, in this term is Islam. In which from many cases as I mentioned above, in study case, Islam really authorizes the public sphere or religious freedom. Muslim is dominant.

According to Parekh, in cultural diversity, human being is important part in trajectory of developing the diversity. Generally cultural diversity has embedded in human being, because it has activities of human life and relationship among them. Therefore, cultural diversity increases the space of option and expands freedom of choice (Parekh , 2000: 165). So, here, human equality is emphasized to embody good religious freedom in the midst of cultural diversity. On the other word, the space of freedom must be existed by human being without differentiating majority or minority.

Parekh states that gives no good reason to cherish cultural diversity that is perfectly happy. He suggests that diversity has to be mutually beneficial dialogue (Parekh, 2000: 168), in order to get cultural diversity that can appreciate deeply each other. To embody religious freedom, majority and minority or in this case Muslim and Christians must have commitment to have good relationship independently, without intervention of state. Using dialogue in public sphere, majority and minority can establish harmony living together and eliminate prejudice between them.

Furthermore, respecting for culture is afforded to respect for a community's right to its culture and for the content and character of that culture (Parekh, 2000: 176), because every community claims that has good right to its culture as others. There is no basis for inequality. It has

expectation by appreciating another culture, multicultural can exist and no longer becomes conflict caused by diversity. Therefore appreciating culture and religion are aptly important to establish good dialogue. Also, human right as community can be dealing with both of majority and minority in public sphere. Finally, by dialogue, minority and majority can eliminate prejudice, because they seldom encounter each other.

CONCLUSION

Proselytization becomes problem not only it presents religious adherents but also it is caused by the 'weak' regulation from state. If state makes the regulation without taking benefit from certain groups (ex. religious majority), the practice of proselytization is not exist. I use Parekh's theory to deal with individual and community right. By dialoguing from Parekh, minority can negotiate with the majority in public sphere about proselytization. If state intervene conflict as well, there will be no freedom. It will be only "protection" that is done by state to their citizen. Ideally, here, state is only as facilitator, they cannot barge on amidst of contestation. State only guarantees that public spheres must free from majority or minority group.

Overall, if there is effort from state to improve the regulation as much as possible, it can accommodate not only for religious majority but also for religious minority, so that they can live harmoniously in social life. Therefore, proselytization issue will disappear, if there is sphere for religious freedom between majority and minority or in this term Islamization and Christianization can be negotiated by dialogue in public sphere. So both majority and minority are honored as human being that has equally dignity.

References

- Bagir, Zainal Abidin. *et al.* (2011) *Pluralisme Kewargaan: Arah Baru Politik Keragaman di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: CRCS.
- Crouch, Melissa. (2014) *Law and Religion in Indonesia Conflict and the Courts in West Java*. New York: Routledge.
- Feener, Michael. (2014) *Proselytizing and the Limits of Religious Pluralism in Contemporary Asia*, Singapore: Springer.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. (2000) *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. New York: Palgrave.
- Soon, Lau Teik. (1974) *Majority-Minority Situation in Singapore*. Singapore: University of Singapore.
- Wahid, Yenni Zannuba. *et al.* (2012) *Mengelola Toleransi dan Kebebasan Beragama: 3 Isu Penting*. Jakarta: Wahid Institute.

Additional reading

- Amrullah, Amin. (2009, November 2) [Online] Available from http://nasional.news.viva.co.id/news/read/101730ada_upaya_peny_ebaran_agama_tertentu_di_padang
- No-name. (2006, January 2) Three Christian teachers accused of proselytism in Indonesia to stay in prison. *Asianews* [Online] Available from <http://www.asianews.it/news-en/Three-Christian-teachers-accused-of-proselytism-in-Indonesia-to-stay-in-prison-5263.html>
- No-name. (2014, November 13) Komunitas Peduli Bangsa di Balik Kristenisasi Car Free Day. *Islam Pos* [Online] Available from <https://www.islampos.com/komunitas-peduli-bangsa-di-balik-kristenisasi-car-free-day-145109/> and youtube about proselytism in sentul.
- No-name. (2015, January 17). *Tempo* [Online] Available from <http://nasional.tempo.co/read/news/2005/01/17/05555080/Komunitas-Kristen-Indonesia-Tolak-Kristenisasi-ala-World-Help>.