

Is Religion Really the Great Enemy of Pancasila?

written by Harakatuna



Statement by the Head of the Pancasila Ideology Development Board (BPIP) Professor Yudian Wahyudi drew cross-sectional responses. That was because of his statement, in an interview with Detik, that the greatest enemy of Pancasila was religion. The Chancellor of the State Islamic University (UIN) Sunan Kalijaga was considered to have created a new polemic, in addition to the polemic about the discourse of returning the former Indonesian citizen ISIS to Indonesia, which was initiated by the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT).

The criticism was quite strong expressed by the Secretary of the PPP DPR RI faction Achmad Baidowi. According to him, Prof. Yudian did not understand the difference between religion and religious understanding. What was said by Prof Yudian, according to him, did not reflect himself as an intellectual. He insisted, so far the problem was not with religion itself, but on religious understanding. For him, saying that religion is the greatest enemy of Pancasila is clearly biased and multiple interpretations.

“In fact, the first precept clearly mentions the Almighty God. Which means recognizing that in Indonesia the community is a religious community. This then questions among ordinary people will arise the question, actually who understands and does not understand Pancasila. As Head of BPIP, Prof. Yudian should avoid polemics and become a unifying symbol figure, instead of making a front when he was just in office, “said Baidowi on Wednesday (12/2) yesterday, reported Detik.

Not to mention MUI Secretary General Anwar Abbas who urged President Jokowi to remove Prof Yudian. He said, such statements could threaten the existence of the state. "If it is true that he has such a view, then the most appropriate presidential action for him is that the person concerned was dismissed with no respect," Abbas said in a written statement on Wednesday (12/2) yesterday, as reported by CNN Indonesia.

To explore this topic, we can stimulate two questions. Is it true that religion and Pancasila are in conflict, even a heavy enemy? That first. Secondly, is it true that Prof. Yudian wants to clash religion with Pancasila? These two questions are important. One side, he tried to understand Pancasila as a consensus that we used to become the nation's ideology. While on the other hand, he tried to understand Prof. Yudian himself. Empathic understanding, of course.

Occupy Professor Yudian

Perhaps not many people knew Prof. Yudian before. The founder of the Sunan Anbiya Congregation and Harvard Law School graduates are indeed, according to some, academic narcissists and seem arrogant. His controversial statement is not just the trend today. But there is one thing that is unique. That said, his attitude is such a characteristic to silence his opponents.

To find out what Prof. Yudian really meant, we must listen to that statement in full. The 39-second and 33-second Seconds Recording was actually discussing 'Jihad Defend NKRI'. For Prof. Yudian, Pancasila is the key. If Pancasila is gone, then we have lost this country. Then came the following statement: "If we are honest, the greatest enemy of Pancasila is religion."

Viral is the headline of the news and responds to the news itself. In fact, every media has a specific purpose. The language of the journalist cannot be digested whole. Those who responded were politicians. Are we sure that politicians really want to defend religion? Or does it desire to replace Prof. Yudian's position? Worth exploring.

What Detik is doing and what is understood by netizens, is the boundary between journalists and readers. Meanwhile what Prof. Yudian said and what Baidowi understood from the Indonesian Parliament, was a barrier between intellectual figures and politicians. Then how about a complete understanding of Prof. Yudian's statement? Let's understand carefully the statement of the Head of BPIP

in the following sentence:

“If I propose, it sounds like this, but slowly digest it. Pancasila is both religious and secular at the same time. In terms of the source and purpose of Pancasila, it is religious. The five precepts can be found easily in the sixth religious scripture recognized by the Republic of Indonesia, constitutionally. Well, but to make it happen, we need secularity, not secularism. That’s different, yes. ”

There are two important points in the statement. *First*, Pancasila. *Second*, religion. Is it true that Prof. Yudian was contrasting the two?

Pancasila and Religion as meant by Prof. Yudian

Pancasila in the context of the second interview with Prof. Yudian is Pancasila in the ideal sense. While religion, in the context of the interview, is a religion that has distorted the pragmatic interests of its adherents. This is important to note. When Prof. Yudian mentions religion, it is not in the ideal sense. The proof, he took the example of scholar consensus. Are we sure that the scholar consensus is a purely religious agenda? Nonsense.

There is already full of political interests. Religion is the most possible means for smoothing hidden interests. Religious narratives in Indonesia in recent years are indeed relatively high. Unfortunately, that is not in the positive sense, but rather negative. The strengthening of Islam in this country is precisely the strengthening of extremism. While the extremist agenda is delegitimacy of the state and government system.

Therefore it is not wrong if Prof. Yudian believes, the greatest enemy of Pancasila is religion. In the sense of religion that has been exploited pragmatic interests. Not religion in the ideal sense. The term ‘religion’ itself also does not mean Islam, but the six religions recognized by this country. In fact, what is often used as a tool to undermine Pancasila is indeed a religious narrative, right?

The idea that the implementation of precepts requires secularity, not in the intention of clashing religion with Pancasila. It is precisely the continuity of the universal concept of religion inherent in the five points of the Pancasila itself. The secularity in question is the fulfillment of our human potential.

For example we take the example of the third precept: Indonesian Unity. So the

implementation, we must mobilize all our existential potential as part of Indonesia itself. All infrastructures that lead us to the implementation of the third precept must be implemented. That's what secularity means. Pancasila contains the norm of religus, but at the same time, its application demands secularity.

So if you want to be understood carefully, Prof. Yudian is not playing with religion and Pancasila. It does not mean to contradict, because there is indeed no contradiction. As the Head of BPIP, as his particular style, he is silencing those who always manipulate religion for their pragmatic interests. The religion that is exploited is the enemy of Pancasila.

Nothing is Contradictory

Are we talking about Pancasila with religion today? The taste is not new anymore. Pancasila is the product of a consensus of religions, and each religion – at least the six recognized religions – does not encounter contradictions in the five precepts. And this topic we have often discussed. Why is today being questioned again?

The problem of Prof. Yudian, thus, purely is a matter of misunderstanding (misunderstanding). We know him as a critical intellectual. But the public often contrasts with the academic world. As the Head of BPIP, they should make public statements, the language is also common language. That is, easily digested by the community. That is in order to avoid misunderstanding to twist hate.

Contrasting religion with Pancasila in public will definitely reap conflict, however fresh the ideas offered about Pancasila and religion. The more so the reporters selling ratings through the news. Take care to be inevitable. The sensitivity of our religious sentiments is indeed at an extra level.

The agenda of Indonesian unity and the agenda of protecting the defense of the Republic of Indonesia are not only carried out by strengthening the relationship between religion and Pancasila, but also by protecting themselves from sensitive narratives regarding the two. So, we should, once again we should not clash religion with Pancasila. The discourse is final, we don't need to bring it up anymore.

The next step is testing Prof. Yudian's ideas into his own habitat, namely academic space, so that discourse becomes objective. The response of our

politicians returned to their habitat as well, as a comment from the politician. Religious teachings, in the direction of magnitude, are included in Pancasila. Then why are we contrasting the two?

So, if the question is: is religion the true enemy of Pancasila? The answer is clear, no. Our nation has reviewed their relationship at length. So it is not a new topic. Then is Prof Yudian's statement? Maybe this is called a barrier between journalists and netizens, intellectuals and politicians. The rest, Pancasila with religion is a mature topic. No need to debate. There is no collision between the two.

Wa Allah A'lam bi ash-Shawab...