

## Indigenous Belief Adherents in the Electoral Arena: Candidacy, Political Platforms, and Barriers to Participation in the 2019 and 2024 Elections

Halili\*, Aditya Perdana, Hurriyah

Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia

Email: halili@uny.ac.id\*, aditya.perdana@ui.ac.id, hurriyah@ui.ac.id

---

### Abstract

This article examines the political participation of *penghayat kepercayaan* in electoral competition following Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016. Integrating democratic inclusion theory with a multi-dimensional citizenship politics framework, the study investigates three dimensions: the candidacy phenomenon, the political platforms pursued, and the factors underlying most candidates' electoral failure. A qualitative explanatory case study design was employed, drawing on in-depth interviews and document analysis. The findings demonstrate that formal recognition via the Constitutional Court ruling has not translated into substantive citizenship in the electoral domain. Of the candidates identified across the 2019 and 2024 elections, only Tony Hatmoko is confirmed as elected to a legislative seat in the post-ruling period, through PKB in Karanganyar Regency in 2024. Electoral failure stems from a compound of structural, cultural, and political barriers: a de facto citizenship hierarchy produced by Indonesia's system of religious governance; the paradox of democracy weaponised by religious identity politics; the limited political capital of candidates from a historically marginalised minority; the absence of electoral incentives for mainstream politicians to champion their interests; and deep path dependency within state religious governance institutions. This article contributes to scholarship on minority citizenship politics and differentiated citizenship in emerging democracies.

**Keywords:** indigenous belief adherents (*penghayat kepercayaan*); citizenship politics; democratic inclusion; electoral politics; differentiated citizenship; religious governance.

---

### INTRODUCTION

Democracy as a political system rests on the equilibrium of two foundational principles: majority rule and the protection of minority rights (de Tocqueville, 2000). Within this framework, the political inclusion of minority groups stands as one of the most critical indicators of democratic quality (Greenaway, 2025; Hakim, Kolopaking, Sjaf, & Kinseng, 2025; Nurlaily, Minin, & Samararatne, 2025). The experience of new democracies in the Balkans demonstrates that broadening minority political participation is a legitimate democratic mechanism for fulfilling minority rights (Bieber, 2008).

In the Indonesian context, *Penghayat kepercayaan terhadap Tuhan Yang Maha Esa* (hereinafter: *penghayat kepercayaan*) represent a religious minority of singular historical irony: they are among the oldest spiritual communities in the archipelago, yet they were the last to receive formal state recognition. *Penghayat kepercayaan* practise indigenous spiritual traditions whose roots predate the arrival of the Abrahamic religions in Nusantara by centuries (Aritonang & Steenbrink, 2008). This paradox reflects the architecture of Indonesia's religious governance, a system in which the state has historically privileged a small set of official religions, thereby generating a de facto hierarchy of citizenship that has marginalised indigenous belief communities (Bagir, 2018).

A pivotal shift occurred when the Constitutional Court issued Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016, recognising *penghayat kepercayaan* as equal citizens entitled to record their belief identity in the religion column of civil registration documents (Hidayat, 2025; Kusmayanti & Mulyanti, 2025; Natalis, 2025). However, formal recognition constitutes citizenship as status; citizenship as practice, the active exercise of rights in public and political life, demands far

more (Isin & Nielsen, 2008). The critical question is whether the Court's ruling has genuinely opened the electoral arena to *penghayat kepercayaan*, and if so, why most candidates from this community have struggled to convert formal recognition into electoral success.

The urgency of this study lies in the fundamental gap between the formal recognition given through the decision of the Constitutional Court No. 97/PUU-XIV / 2016 and the substantive reality of the political participation of the faithful in the post-verdict electoral arena. Although legally *penghayat kepercayaan* has been recognized as an equal citizen, empirical data shows that of the many candidates who ran in the 2019 and 2024 elections, only Tony Hatmoko was confirmed to be elected as a member of the legislature after the MK decision. This electoral failure cannot be explained solely by individual candidate factors, but rather reflects deeper structural issues related to state religious governance, identity politics that arm religion in democratic competition, and the absence of electoral incentives for political parties to fight for numerically insignificant community interests. Without a comprehensive understanding of why the formalization of Rights does not necessarily result in substantive inclusion, efforts to achieve inclusive democracy for minority groups will remain at a symbolic level. Therefore, this study is important because it provides an in-depth analysis of the mechanisms and factors that impede the electoral participation of trust beneficiaries, which in turn can serve as a basis for policy advocacy and institutional reforms to bridge the gap between formal recognition and substantive justice in Indonesian democracy.

This article addresses three research questions: (1) What is the landscape of *penghayat kepercayaan* candidacy in post-ruling electoral politics? (2) What political platforms do these candidates advance? (3) Why did the majority of candidates fail in the 2019 and 2024 elections? The article integrates democratic inclusion theory with a multi-dimensional citizenship politics framework to provide a comprehensive analysis.

## **METHODS**

This study employed a qualitative approach with an explanatory case study design (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The design is appropriate because the research aims not merely to describe the phenomenon of *penghayat kepercayaan* candidacy, but to explain the mechanisms and factors underlying both electoral success and failure.

Data were collected through a combination of field study and desk study. The field study involved in-depth interviews with key informants drawn from four groups: (1) executive members of the Majelis Luhur Kepercayaan Indonesia (MLKI) at both the national and regional levels; (2) candidates and sitting legislators from *penghayat kepercayaan* communities, including a direct interview with Iswan Sual (9 March 2026); (3) officials from the Central Board of Kerokhaniatan Sapta Darma Yogyakarta (2026); and (4) ministerial officials from the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Religious Affairs, and the Ministry of Education and Culture. Informants were selected through purposive sampling based on positional relevance and depth of knowledge.

The desk study comprised analysis of policy documents, legislation, research reports, and candidates' campaign platforms and public statements spanning the 2019 and 2024 electoral cycles. Data were analysed thematically across four analytical dimensions: candidacy dynamics, political platforms, electoral strategies, and structural barriers to electoral success.

## **Theoretical Framework: Citizenship Politics and Democratic Inclusion From Status to Political Practice: Theories of Citizenship**

Citizenship is a complex and contested concept in the social and political sciences. T. H. Marshall's (1950) classical typology identifies three cumulative dimensions: civil citizenship, political citizenship, and social citizenship. While Marshall's framework remains foundational, it has been criticised for its Eurocentric and linear evolutionary assumptions. In post-colonial settings such as Indonesia, citizenship is better understood as a contested and multi-directional process in which different dimensions are simultaneously negotiated across competing fields of power (Fraser, 2020).

A decisive theoretical advance was made by Isin and Nielsen (2008), who conceptualise acts of citizenship as political deeds through which individuals and groups claim rights and constitute themselves as citizens, often outside, and sometimes against, the formal legal framework. The act of standing as a candidate for legislative office is, for *penghayat kepercayaan*, precisely such a constitutive act: it transforms formal legal recognition into substantive civic practice.

### **Religious Governance and the Hierarchy of Citizenship**

One of Indonesia's defining institutional features is the state's active role in governing citizens' religious lives. Bagir (2018) theorises this as the politics and law of religious governance. Under this model, the state formally recognises a limited set of official religions, regulates religious organisations, controls religious education in public schools, and assigns legal consequences to the religion/belief column in civil registration documents, thereby generating a de facto hierarchy of citizenship.

The Constitutional Court's 2016 ruling disrupted but did not dismantle this hierarchy. Its effects have been uneven and contested across regions, a pattern consistent with Wiratraman's (2022) analysis that formal legal victories are routinely contested, diluted, or ignored at the implementation level.

### **Democratic Pluralism and the Paradox of Majoritarian Democracy**

Hefner (2009) observes that pluralisation does not automatically produce substantive democratisation, producing what he calls the democracy paradox: a system that formally guarantees rights while enabling their systematic erosion through majoritarianism. Hasan (2025) underscores the importance of building an inclusive public ethics grounded in principles that all citizens can endorse irrespective of their particular beliefs. The absence of such an inclusive public ethics means that *penghayat kepercayaan* candidates enter electoral contests in which the very terms of competition are shaped by frameworks from which they have historically been excluded.

### **Constitutional Struggles and Legal Contestation**

Wiratraman (2022) analyses the Indonesian Constitutional Court as a site of constitutional struggle in which minority groups contest the meaning and scope of constitutional rights in a political environment increasingly marked by authoritarian tendencies. The successful judicial review that produced Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 represents a hard-won constitutional victory, yet it also illustrates the limits of legal reform as a vehicle for substantive inclusion when implementation depends on political actors who lack incentives to enforce it.

## **Analytical Synthesis**

This article integrates two complementary frameworks. The first is Wolbrecht and Hero's (2005) theory of democratic inclusion, specifying five benchmarks: full access to participation; representation in key institutions; influence in government policy; adoption of policies accommodating disadvantaged groups; and socio-economic parity. The second is a multi-dimensional citizenship politics framework comprising four dimensions: (a) the legal-institutional dimension; (b) the participatory-political dimension; (c) the religious governance dimension; and (d) the discursive-cultural dimension. This integrated framework enables a more comprehensive analysis than either framework would yield alone.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **From the Margins to the Ballot Box: Historical Background**

Before the 2016 Constitutional Court ruling, *penghayat kepercayaan* occupied a position of multiple marginalities. Law No. 1/PNPS/1965 placed indigenous belief communities outside the system of state protection and recognition, and this exclusion had practical consequences for access to civil documents and full participation in public life (Ma'arif, 2017). The Constitutional Court's recognition transformed the formal framework but did not dissolve these accumulated disadvantages overnight.

Of particular historical importance are the cases of Jenang (dec.) and Monang Naipospos, both of whom were elected to their respective regional legislative assemblies in 2009, before the Constitutional Court ruling. Their elections represent the earliest documented instances of *penghayat kepercayaan* securing legislative seats, achieved prior to formal state recognition and against considerably greater institutional obstacles (Hidayat, 2025a; Katimin, 2012).

### **Mapping Candidacy Across the 2019 and 2024 Elections**

Empirical data drawn from academic sources, field interviews, and direct communication with key informants reveal a more complex picture than earlier accounts suggested. The corrected and verified data are presented in Table 1.

In the 2019 elections, Muslim from the Sapta Darma community contested a seat in the Banyumas Regency DPRD through PDI-P but did not succeed. Earlier reports citing a candidate named 'Mustam' as having been elected in Banyumas could not be verified; the name was corrected to 'Muslim, not elected' on the basis of confirmation from MLKI executives (interview, 9 March 2026). In the 2024 elections, Tony Hatmoko, a member of the Himpunan *Penghayat kepercayaan* (HPK), was elected to the Karanganyar Regency DPRD through PKB, making him the only confirmed *penghayat kepercayaan* candidate to win a legislative seat following the Constitutional Court ruling (interview with Iswan Sual, 9 March 2026). Three anonymous Sapta Darma candidates contested various Regency/City DPRD seats in East Java through PDI-P, NasDem, and Golkar respectively; none were elected and their identities were not disclosed at the informant's request (Central Board of Kerokhaniatan Sapta Darma Yogyakarta, 2026). Agung Masihor from the Aluk Arat Sangihe community was not elected in Sangihe Regency, and Iswan Sual received approximately 300 votes against a threshold of approximately 8,000, and was also not elected (interview with Iswan Sual).

**Table 1.** Verified *Penghayat kepercayaan* Legislative Candidates (2009-2024)

No	Name	Electoral Constituency	Election	Belief Community	Party	Outcome
1	Muslim <sup>2</sup>	Banyumas Regency DPRD, Central Java	2019	Sapta Darma	PDI-P	Not elected
2	Unidentified (3 candidates) <sup>3</sup>	Various Regency/City DPRDs, East Java	2024	Sapta Darma	PDI-P / NasDem / Golkar	Not elected
3	Tony Hatmoko <sup>4</sup>	Karanganyar Regency DPRD, Central Java	2024	Not specified (HPK member)	PKB	<b>Elected</b>
4	Agung Masihor	Sangihe Regency DPRD, North Sulawesi	2024	Aluk Arat Sangihe	NasDem	Not elected
5	Iswan Sual	North Sulawesi Provincial DPRD	2024	Ada' Mappurondo/LAROMA	PSI	Not elected

Sources: Hidayat (2025a, pp. 77-78); Katimin (2012); interview with MLKI board member (9 March 2026); interview with Iswan Sual (9 March 2026); interview with Central Board of Kerokhaniatan Sapta Darma Yogyakarta (2026).

### Party Affiliation: Strategy, Ideology, and Political Calculation

The party choices made by *penghayat kepercayaan* candidates reflect multi-dimensional strategic calculation within the constraints of Indonesia's fragmented multiparty system (Fossati et al., 2020b). Table 2 presents the analytical breakdown for the four candidates for whom sufficient data are available.

Muslim's choice of PDI-P was grounded in historical, ideological, and structural logic. PDI-P's ideological commitment to Pancasila pluralism, its historical proximity to the Sapta Darma community, and its extensive party infrastructure made it a natural vehicle. Tony Hatmoko's choice of PKB reflects a different but coherent logic: PKB's emphasis on religious moderation and respect for Javanese tradition created common cultural ground with the *kepercayaan* community in Karanganyar, and the outcome confirms that this calculus was well-founded. Agung Masihor's choice of NasDem in Sangihe reflected the party's openness to non-mainstream candidates and the importance of personal networks with local party officials (Warburton, 2019). Iswan Sual's choice of PSI was ideologically coherent but structurally disadvantageous: PSI's limited mass base proved a decisive constraint. In his own reflection, Iswan Sual observed that almost all parties appear accommodating during the campaign period but tend to become indifferent once the election is over (interview Iswan)

**Table 2.** Party Choice by Verified *Penghayat kepercayaan* Candidates: Multi-Dimensional Analysis

Candidate	Ideological Dimension	Structural Dimension	Historical Dimension	Electoral Dimension	Outcome
Muslim	Pancasila nationalism; pluralism	Extensive network; large resource base	Long-standing Sapta Darma proximity to PDI-P	Large mass base	Not elected

Candidate	Ideological Dimension	Structural Dimension	Historical Dimension	Electoral Dimension	Outcome
<b>Tony Hatmoko</b>	Religious moderation; Javanese tradition	NU-rooted moderate base	Cultural overlap with Javanese spirituality	Access to moderate Muslim voters	<b>Elected</b>
<b>Agung Masihor</b>	Openness; modernisation	Personal ties to local party officials	No historical ideological burden	Flexible candidate recruitment	Not elected
<b>Iswan Sual</b>	Pluralism; openness to minorities	New party; limited structural base	No prior engagement with <i>kepercayaan</i> communities	Small mass base (approx. 300 votes)	Not elected

Source: Authors' analysis based on field interviews (2026) and secondary literature.

### Political Platforms and Community Empowerment

Analysis of campaign platforms and public statements reveals five consistently recurring thematic pillars, embodying an attempt to construct an inclusive public ethics (Hasan, 2025) oriented toward both community-specific needs and universally resonant democratic values.

The first pillar is the strengthening of civil rights and civil registration. Muslim made the monitoring of civil registration policy a central plank of his campaign, arguing that *penghayat kepercayaan* should no longer encounter bureaucratic discrimination in accessing basic civil documents (Nalle, 2021). This pillar addresses the foundational gap between formal recognition and substantive civil citizenship identified by Marshall (1950).

The second pillar is the protection and development of *kepercayaan* education. Candidates across both elections advocated for effective implementation of Ministerial Regulation No. 27/2016, which grants *kepercayaan* students the right to receive instruction in their own belief tradition within the national school system.

The third pillar is political inclusion and minority representation. Candidates consistently contested the stigmatisation of *penghayat kepercayaan* as 'non-religion' or 'deviant streams', demanding recognition equal to that enjoyed by the six official religions. Iswan Sual's campaign centred on recognising Ada' Mappurondo/LAROMA as a constitutive element of local cultural identity and on the need for affirmative policies to protect local belief practices from the pressures of religious homogenisation.

The fourth pillar is the preservation of local tradition and cultural heritage. Agung Masihor sought dedicated regional budget allocations for the performing arts, adat rituals, and the maintenance of the cultural ecosystem of the Aluk Arat Sangihe community, noting also the untapped potential of cultural tourism (Maarif et al., 2019). Tony Hatmoko placed the preservation of Javanese belief tradition at the centre of his political agenda in Karanganyar.

The fifth pillar is economic empowerment of *kepercayaan* communities, encompassing the development of creative economies grounded in the material culture of *kepercayaan* traditions and the strengthening of community economic institutions through cooperatives (Maarif et al., 2019). Table 3 presents the platform priority matrix for the four verified candidates.

**Table 3.** Political Platform Priority Matrix: Verified *Penghayat kepercayaan* Candidates (2019-2024)

Candidate	Civil Rights & Registration	<i>Kepercayaan</i> Education	Political Inclusion	Cultural Preservation	Economic Empowerment	Cross-Sectoral Agenda
Muslim	●●●	●●	●●●	●●	●	KBB advocacy
Tony Hatmoko	●●	●●	●●●	●●●	●●	Preservation of Javanese belief tradition
Agung Masihor	●●	●	●●	●●●	●●	Cultural tourism development
Iswan Sual	●●	●●	●●●	●●●	●●	Protection of <i>Minahasa adat</i>

Key: ●●● = Primary priority; ●● = Secondary priority; ● = Supporting priority. Source: Content analysis of campaign platforms and field interviews, 2019-2026.

### MLKI's Organisational Agenda

At the organisational level, MLKI has developed a comprehensive political agenda engaging all four dimensions of citizenship politics. On the legal-institutional dimension, it pursues legislative advocacy for the revision of discriminatory statutes and monitors implementation of the Constitutional Court ruling. On the participatory-political dimension, it supports candidates' electoral bids and conducts voter education programmes. On the religious governance dimension, it maintains dialogue with the Ministry of Religious Affairs and advocates for formal parity with the six official religions. On the discursive-cultural dimension, it conducts public campaigns repositioning *kepercayaan* as a component of Indonesia's national cultural heritage. MLKI has also cultivated international legitimacy through engagement with the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief (Bagir et al., 2015).

### Why *Penghayat kepercayaan* Failed in the 2019 and 2024 Elections

Five interlocking barriers explain the failure of most candidates. The most fundamental is the hierarchical structure of citizenship produced by Indonesia's religious governance regime (Bagir, 2018). The stigma of 'non-official religion', actively produced through state policy since 1965, continues to shape voter perceptions, bureaucratic practices, and party gatekeeping. Wiratraman's (2022) framework illuminates the limits of legal victory without political consolidation: implementation has been contested and uneven across regions.

The second barrier is the intensification of religious identity politics in electoral competition since the mid-2010s. Mietzner (2020) documents authoritarian innovations through which democratic procedures are used to narrow the political arena and marginalise minorities. Warburton (2019) traces the polarising effects of religious identity on democratic quality. In this environment, Hefner's (2009) democracy paradox operates acutely: the persistence of the '*aliran sesat*' label functions as an electoral liability whose magnitude is proportional to the intensity of religious identity mobilisation in a given constituency.

The third barrier is the multi-dimensional deficit in political capital characteristic of candidates from historically marginalised communities. As a group systematically disadvantaged by religious governance, *penghayat kepercayaan* communities generally lack access to the donor networks, party financing, and organisational infrastructure available to well-resourced candidates (Isin & Nielsen, 2008).

The fourth barrier is differentiated citizenship: the condition in which formal equality before the law coexists with a structural absence of political leverage. Because *penghayat kepercayaan* do not constitute a numerically significant electoral bloc, mainstream politicians face no meaningful electoral consequence from ignoring their interests. The corrected data reinforce this point: the sole post-ruling electoral success was achieved in a context of local cultural salience and party-community alignment, not through any systemic change in political incentive structures.

The fifth barrier is path dependency within the institutional architecture of religious governance (North, 1990). Indonesia's religious governance system has been institutionalised over more than five decades, and bureaucrats socialised within it tend to apply templates designed for official religions to questions involving *penghayat kepercayaan*. Decentralisation compounds this problem: implementation quality varies enormously across approximately 500 regencies and cities, making the electoral viability of *penghayat kepercayaan* candidates substantially dependent on geography. Table 4 summarises the five barriers.

**Table 4.** Barriers to Electoral Success in Citizenship Politics Perspective

Barrier	Citizenship Dimension Affected	Mechanism	Theoretical Grounding
<b>Citizenship hierarchy from religious governance</b>	Legal-institutional	Stigma of 'non-official religion' shapes voter perception and party gatekeeping	Bagir (2018); religious governance theory
<b>Democracy paradox: identity politics as exclusion</b>	Discursive-cultural	Majoritarian religious mobilisation raises electoral cost of minority candidacy	Hefner (2009); Mietzner (2020); Warburton (2019)
<b>Deficit of political capital</b>	Participatory-political	Historical marginalisation limits financial, organisational, and network resources	Isin & Nielsen (2008); Wolbrecht & Hero (2005)
<b>Differentiated citizenship; absent electoral incentives</b>	Participatory-political	Numerical smallness removes accountability pressure on mainstream politicians	Wolbrecht & Hero (2005); Marshall (1950)
<b>Path dependency in religious governance institutions</b>	Legal-institutional	Implementation of the Court ruling is uneven; bureaucratic inertia persists	Wiratraman (2022); North (1990)

Source: Authors' analysis integrating empirical data with the four-dimensional citizenship politics framework.

## CONCLUSION

This research concludes that the political participation of *penghayat kepercayaan* in Indonesia's post-2016 electoral arena is characterized by a profound disjuncture between formal constitutional recognition and substantive democratic inclusion. The political platforms advanced by *penghayat* candidates reflect a sophisticated attempt to construct an inclusive public ethics spanning civil rights, education, cultural preservation, and economic empowerment. However, five interlocking barriers explain the failure of most candidates: the hierarchical citizenship structure produced by Indonesia's religious governance regime; the weaponization of religious identity politics in majoritarian democracy; multi-dimensional deficits in political capital; the structural absence of electoral incentives for mainstream politicians; and deep institutional path dependency. Together, these constitute a system of differentiated citizenship in which formal legal equality coexists with structural political inequality. The findings affirm that constitutional recognition is a necessary but insufficient condition for democratic inclusion; substantive inclusion requires simultaneous transformation across legal-institutional, participatory-political, religious governance, and discursive-cultural dimensions of citizenship politics.

## REFERENCES

- Aritonang, J. S., & Steenbrink, K. A. (2008). *A history of Christianity in Indonesia* (Vol. 35). Brill.
- Bagir, Z. A. (2018). The politics and law of religious governance. In R. Hefner (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of contemporary Indonesia* (pp. 284-295). Routledge.
- Bagir, Z. A., Maarif, S., Munjid, A., Vanderbilt, G., Ahnaf, M. I., & Laksana, A. B. (2015). *Studi agama di Indonesia: Refleksi pengalaman*. Program Studi Agama dan Lintas Budaya.
- Bagir, Z. A., & Sormin, J. (2022). *Politik moderasi dan kebebasan beragama: Suatu tinjauan kritis*. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Bieber, F. (2008). Introduction: Minority participation and political parties. In F. Bieber (Ed.), *Political parties and minority participation*. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- de Tocqueville, A. (2000). *Democracy in America* (H. C. Mansfield & D. Winthrop, Trans.). University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1835)
- Fossati, D., Aspinall, E., Muhtadi, B., & Warburton, E. (2020a). Ideological representation in clientelistic democracies: The Indonesian case. *Electoral Studies*, 63, 102111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2019.102111>
- Fossati, D., Aspinall, E., Muhtadi, B., & Warburton, E. (2020b). Ideological representation in clientelistic democracies: The Indonesian case. *Electoral Studies*, 63, 102111.
- Fraser, N. (2020). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. In S. Seidman & J. C. Alexander (Eds.), *The new social theory reader* (pp. 188-196). Routledge.
- Greenaway, Christopher. (2025). *Parliamentary Discourse Quality Index*. University of Toronto (Canada).
- Hakim, Lukman, Kolopaking, Lala M., Sjaf, Sofyan, & Kinseng, Rilus A. (2025). Assessing village democracy and welfare in rural Indonesia: an index-based correlation analysis. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1622507.

- Hasan, I. (2025). Book review: Islam and citizenship in Indonesia: Democracy and the quest for an inclusive public ethics. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, 21(3), 523-524. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17438721251327637>
- Hefner, R. W. (Ed.). (2009). *Remaking Muslim politics: Pluralism, contestation, democratization*. Princeton University Press.
- Hidayat, F. (2025a). Ada' Mappurondo, indigenous religion resurgence and state accommodation in Indonesia. *Indigenous Southeast Asian and Ethnic Studies*, 1(1), 74-94. <https://doi.org/10.32678/iseaes.v1i1.17>
- Isin, E. F., & Nielsen, G. M. (Eds.). (2008). *Acts of citizenship*. Zed Books.
- Katimin. (2012). Pertumbuhan dan perkembangan Parmalim di Sumatera tahun 1885-sekarang. *Journal Analytica Islamica*, 1(2), 190-200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30829/jai.v1i2.381>
- Kusmayanti, Hazar, & Mulyanti, Asti Sri. (2025). Women and the Sunda Wiwitan Faith: Maintaining Rights in the Legal System. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 24(1), 4671-4692.
- Ma'arif, S. (2017). Pasang surut rekognisi agama leluhur dalam politik agama di Indonesia. CRCS UGM.
- Maarif, S., Mubarak, H., Sahroni, L. F., & Roessusita, D. (2019). *Merangkul penghayat kepercayaan melalui advokasi inklusi sosial*. Laporan Kehidupan Beragama di Indonesia, Edisi II. CRCS.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mietzner, M. (2020). Authoritarian innovations in Indonesia: Electoral narrowing, identity politics and executive illiberalism. *Democratization*, 27(6), 1021-1036.
- Nalle, V. I. W. (2021). The politics of intolerant laws against adherents of indigenous beliefs or aliran kepercayaan in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 8(3), 558-576.
- Natalis, Aga. (2025). Majority bias in legal politics: discriminatory citizenship document services for local religion believers in Indonesia. *Sortuz: Oñati Journal of Emergent Socio-Legal Studies*, 15(1), 241-268.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nurlaily, Nurlaily, Minin, Agusta R., & Samararatne, Dinesha. (2025). The Substantive Justice in Regional Elections: A Philosophical and Sociological Comparison of Asian, European, And African Countries. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 13(1), 107-127.
- Ronda, D., Darmawan, I. P. A., & Diman, H. S. (2025). Churches' political participation in Indonesia: The case study of GKII. *Transformation: An International Journal of Holistic Mission Studies*, 42(3), 224-236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02653788241308728>
- Warburton, E. (2019). Polarization and democratic decline in Indonesia. In T. Carothers & A. O'Donohue (Eds.), *Democracies divided: The global challenge of political polarization* (pp. 201-227). Brookings Institution Press.
- Wiratraman, H. P. (2022). Constitutional struggles and the court in Indonesia's turn to authoritarian politics. *Federal Law Review*, 50(3), 314-330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X221107404>
- Wolbrecht, C., & Hero, R. E. (2005). *The politics of democratic inclusion*. Temple University Press.
- Greenaway, Christopher. (2025). *Parliamentary Discourse Quality Index*. University of Toronto (Canada).
- Hakim, Lukman, Kolopaking, Lala M., Sjaf, Sofyan, & Kinseng, Rilus A. (2025). Assessing village democracy and welfare in rural Indonesia: an index-based correlation analysis. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1622507.

- Hidayat, Ferdy. (2025). Ada'Mappurondo, Indigenous Religion Resurgence and State Accommodation in Indonesia. *Indigenous Southeast Asian and Ethnic Studies*, 1(1), 74–94.
- Kusmayanti, Hazar, & Mulyanti, Asti Sri. (2025). Women and the Sunda Wiwitan Faith: Maintaining Rights in the Legal System. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum*, 24(1), 4671–4692.
- Natalis, Aga. (2025). Majority bias in legal politics: discriminatory citizenship document services for local religion believers in Indonesia. *Sortuz: Oñati Journal of Emergent Socio-Legal Studies*, 15(1), 241–268.
- Nurlaily, Nurlaily, Minin, Agusta R., & Samararatne, Dinesha. (2025). The Substantive Justice in Regional Elections: A Philosophical and Sociological Comparison of Asian, European, And African Countries. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 13(1), 107–127.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).