



Strategies to Strengthen Interfaith Families to Respond to the Hegemony of Prohibiting Interfaith Marriage in Indonesia

Danu Aris Setiyanto¹(✉), Sekar Ayu Aryani², and Sri Wahyuni³

¹ Faculty of Sharia, Raden Mas Said State Islamic University Surakarta, Surakarta 57168, Indonesia

danuaris07@gmail.com

² Faculty of Ushuluddin and Islamic Thought, Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Sharia and Law, Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia

Abstract. The hegemony of banning interfaith marriage has always been attached to families of different religions in Indonesia. Interestingly, the existence of a family community is even stronger. This article focuses on answering academic problems, namely what are the arguments for the existence of family communities of different religions; and what is the strategy of family communities of different religions as a form of counter-hegemony of prohibiting interfaith marriage? This article explores the reasons for the interfaith family community, and the strategy of the family community of different religions as a form of counter-hegemony banning interfaith marriage. We conducted interviews with initiators of different religious family communities, religious leaders, and couples of different religions. Then, the data are analyzed with a social approach and with a theory of hegemony. The results showed that the existence of family communities of different religions is due to the hegemony of prohibiting interfaith marriages, sharing space for experiences, and efforts to find solutions. This community strategy in strengthening families of different religions is through information, education, consultation, and advocacy.

Keywords: interfaith marriage · interfaith family · Indonesia · strengthening families · counter-hegemony

1 Introduction

Marriage of different religions (hereinafter abbreviated as IRM) in Indonesia has long been a debate in religious discourse and national regulations. [1] Indonesia as a plural nation has the potential for its population to perform interfaith marriages relatively large [2]. IRM in Indonesia continues to occur and even continues to grow every year. However, marriages performed by couples of different religions have not been fully accepted by plural societies. Some people think that IRM is an act that is prohibited by religion and

the state. The hegemony of the IRM ban resulted in discrimination in the fulfillment of civil rights as citizens.

Interfaith marriages do not fully receive the blessing of several religious institutions, religious leaders, and marriage registration institutions in Indonesia. The stages of recording IRM are carried out in various ways and are relatively not easy. Some IRM officials must be willing to change their religious status on their Identity Card (hereinafter referred to as KTP) or marriage abroad or apply in court and can find a religious figure until they get a marriage certificate. The bureaucratic space for marriage registration is colored by considerations between religious matters that are considered to prohibit IRM and the regulation of civil rights of citizens. This consideration occurs because there is a hegemony of banning IRM and meeting the needs of the civil service, especially marriage registration.

Faith-based community organizations in Indonesia disagree with the ban on IRM. The Indonesian Ulema Council (commonly called MUI) is one of the Muslim institutions that consistently rejects the existence of IRM. [3] Some of the Protestant Christian Churches refused to bless their worshippers who performed the IRM. The canonical law of catholicism gives marriage permission of different religions but with strict requirements. [4] Buddhism views that marriage is the right of mankind itself, there are no rules specifically governing marriage of these different religions. [5] In Hinduism, IRM is a prohibited act. [6] The Khonghucu religion views that marriage is man's choice to continue civilization and there is no specific prohibition on interfaith marriage [7].

Some religious figures agree with and support IRM for anthropocentric reasons, tolerance, mates are a mystery, and love comes from God. Abdurrahman Wahid (commonly known as Gus Dur) said that learning tolerance is best precisely from the family. [8] Gusdur's thinking was not easily accepted by some Indonesian citizens. IRM's support is considered a liberal act that comes out of the true religious teachings by some muslims. [9]–[11] Research studies conducted by Jana Van Niekerk & Maykel Verkuyten on attitudes towards IRM among the world's Muslims. The research shows that the relationship between Muslims and Christians becomes polarized when responding to IRM in several countries. Muslims in certain countries who can be positive about IRM. This suggests that attitudes towards IRM depend on the national context and religious beliefs of the individual [12].

Researchers have conducted a lot of research on interfaith marriage debates with various points of view. The debate started from the fiqh side of IRM [13] to the perspective of Human Rights [14, 15], the interpretation of scripture verses or interpretations, the interpretation of laws on marriage [16, 17], the regulation of the administrative registration of the population [18], and others that are normative [19] or sociological in nature. However, we have not found any research on the attitudes of the IRM family community towards the hegemony of the IRM ban.

Research conducted by Ayse Elmali Karakaya shows that some Muslim women of Turkish immigrants in the UK who do IRM face the challenges of theological and social problems. The strategy carried out to deal with these problems is to discuss theological issues and reduce conflicts. Turkish civil law does not prohibit Muslim women who commit IRM. However, turkish muslim women's families do not accept IRM on religious law grounds. [20] Meanwhile, research conducted in Manado shows

that interfaith marriage is acceptable. Marriage is considered a matter of man with man and religion is the problem of man with his God. The people of Manado consider that all human beings are equal and there are no religious symbols in communicating that interfere with family harmony. The principle of the Manado community is *torang samua basudara* (we are all brothers) [21]. Research on the identity of different religion families was conducted by Mashuri and Helmi in Toraja. Interfaith families in Toraja place religious identity on a personal-based social placed horizontally and the identity of the congregation in place as a collective identity placed vertically. This dual identity is used in an effort to achieve a harmonious interfaith family and to align their differences from the perspective of social identity [22]

Setyowati's research mentions that IRM in Indonesia is called legal smuggling. [23] The same term was coined by Sri Wahyuni in Yogyakarta. [24] This is because IRM is carried out through marriage abroad, marrying by two methods, namely according to the religion of each spouse, and subjugating religion to one of the spouses. Kadriah and his friends mentioned the term legal vacuum because there is no specific arrangement in the Marriage Act. The state fills a legal vacuum on IRM through the Population Administration Act. [25] Ermi Suhasti stated that there had been legal uncertainty in the IRM arrangements in Indonesia. The court's ruling has been inconsistent in the acquisition of the IRM. The inconsistency of obtaining IRM is motivated by the existence of multiple interpretations of marriage laws and the Compilation of Islamic Law [26].

This research is different from previous research, does not discuss normative legal debates, court rulings, IRM practices in certain areas, and focuses on the IRM community. The existence and counter-hegemony of the IRM community is the main concern of this study. The presence of this community provides evidence that IRM couples have both theological and legal reasons, communicate with each other with the communication media, they share experiences, and reinforce each other.

As for the academic anxiety in this article two things. First, why did the IRM couple community form? secondly, what is the strategy for counter-hegemony about IRM? The first question is important because to ensure that the community occurs because of hegemony in society towards couples of different religions. In fact, the Indonesian state, which has a plurality of differences of opinion and beliefs, is a fairness that should be accepted unless there is a violation of the law and disturbs public order. The second question is an important question because the public's reaction to IRM always comes pros and cons. While the pro-couple positions are different religions are in minority positions and they do counter hegemony with certain strategies. The counter-hegemony strategy of banning interfaith marriage is carried out so that the civil rights of different couples are fulfilled and various IRM problems can be solved. The strategy of the IRM couple community in counter-hegemony is important to know because of their position in a democratic and pluralistic state.

This article explores the reasons for forming a family community of different religions, and the strategy of the family community of different religions countering the hegemony of the IRM ban. This research shows that the implementation of marriage law in social systems has resulted in there being hegemony between groups in society. Groups that ban IRM as a majority group have given hegemony to groups that perform interfaith marriages. This research is expected to increase the space for discussion about marriage

law in Indonesia and become a consideration for further research. Relevant parties from government agencies, religious leaders, and the public can make this article a policy reference, and a reference for dialogue on the civil rights issues of citizens. Therefore, we use research methods that will be described in the following sub-discussion.

2 Method

The community of IRM is the focus of this research. The IRM community is important to research because this community group is related to the fulfillment of civil rights and the hegemony of the IRM ban. Members of the IRM community consist of various tribes and religions in Indonesia. They are collected and connected to communication media through whatsapp and instagram. The IRM community consists of couples of different religions, prospective IRM spouses, community organization leaders, researchers, lecturers, and several community leaders who have an interest in IRM issues.

The data collection of this study was carried out by interviews, observations, documentation, and looking for references that were in accordance with the theme of this study. Interviews were conducted with several figures and couples of different religions. We interviewed with religious leaders, initiators of the IRM community, several couples of different religions, institutions that used to handle IRM advocacy. In addition, we also participated in discussions, and talk shows with the theme of IRM. This is a form of our efforts to obtain valid data related to the IRM community, understand IRM problems, and help answer IRM problems. Juga observation was made in one of the places to which there was advocacy of marriage of different religions.

This research is qualitative and uses a sociological approach. The data that has been collected by the researcher is then selected and classified according to the theme and objectives of the study. Analysis of research is carried out with the interpretation of data that can explain sociological symptoms. The meaning of the data provided is in accordance with what the IRM community conveys as the object of research. We analyze data that is in accordance with research objectives with research theory and try to answer academic anxiety appropriately. The conclusion technique in this study is carried out inductively, namely research that proceeds from looking at reality data in the field and is concluded theoretically.

The theory of hegemony from Antonio Gramsci is used in the analytical tools of this study. According to Gramsci, hegemony is the domination of the power of one social class over another social class. This happens when there is domination or oppression or violence and the existence of hegemony. Hegemony occurs because there is a moral and intellectual leadership role that directs the thinking or perspective of the lower group as desired by the dominant group. Gramsci's theory of hegemony emphasizes that the state consists of a political society as well as civil society. The state has a role in regulating people's lives to comply with the rules. The existing rules constitute consensus as a political basis. [27]–[29] It is important that this theory as an analytical tool so that it unravels the problems and relationships between variables from one another, for example the relationship of doctrine, state institutions or bureaucracy, court decisions, counter-hegemony processes, and others.

3 Result and Discussion

3.1 Arguments for the Existence of Family Communities of Different Religions

The IRM family community is a counter-hegemonic pair against the IRM ban. The existence of the IRM community focuses on conducting discussions on the theme of diversity in Indonesia, not affiliated with any organization or political party. Members of the IRM community are not directed to support on a particular group or on a particular political organization. The discussion in the social media group, especially WhatsApp, is only related to strengthening the IRM couple, and interfaith community activities, and several strengthening diversities in Indonesia.

The existence of communities of different religions is important to discuss. The IRM community is one of the unique communities in Indonesia because of their consistency in the hegemony of IRM banning. The emergence of this hegemony was mainly after the passage of the marriage law in 1974. Religious differences are not an obstacle and are not disputed in the context of Dutch law. However, the multi-interpretation of IRM occurred after there was Article 2 of the Marriage Law. The interpretation of marriage-related articles is further complicated because it is associated with the interpretation or understanding of diverse religious texts.

The argument for the existence of the IRM family community in Indonesia is three important things. First, the IRM pair faces the hegemony of the IRM ban. Second, the similarity of fates they experience so that they can share experiences; Third, find the solution of the problem at hand. The description of both arguments will be described as follows.

3.1.1 Hegemony of IRM Banning

The hegemony of the prohibition of IRM occurs at the level of discourse and life of the IRM couple. IRM couples have always been overshadowed by the hegemony of banning IRM in the family environment, society, religious leaders, certain religious organizations, to law enforcement (courts). This understanding arises because it can at least be seen from two sides. First, the understanding of people's religion in promoting interfaith marriage. The way people view different religions is also very dependent on the level of community literacy. Low community literacy about interfaith marriage makes people less able to accept differences and realities in society. So that the truth claim becomes a certain group that then hypes up for couples of different religions.

Some religious leaders in Indonesia stated that some religious understandings in Indonesia are open to carrying out interfaith marriages. This is because textually there is indeed a gap in interfaith marriage except Hinduism. Most religious leaders prefer to say that IRM is an emergency path taken because the issue of love is a grace from God that is mystery or cannot be foreseen or premeditated. Clerics from the Islamic religion mostly prefer to prohibit interfaith marriage. This is because IMR is feared to give rise to madharat related to faith. [30] This opinion is only one of the opinions and there are other opinions. There are other scholarly opinions that say that IMR is allowed on condition (i.e., with ahlul kitab), and opinions that say that IMR can be without any strict requirements.

Protestant Christianity and Catholic christianity have differences in providing marriage laws of different religions. Protestant Christianity is different from other religions because the ability and not of imr depends on the policies of each church. Each protestant church has its own policy of determining whether to bless their congregations in the case of IRM. Eiben's study of church documents in several churches shows that churches have a variety of theologies and understandings. [31] Whereas, aCatholic gama stipulates that marriage is a sacred marriage. ACatholic gama teaches that marriage is performed once in a lifetime. The ideal marriage in Catholicism is also done with a marriage that is with a person who is Catholic. [4] But in contrast to other religions, the understanding in Catholicism that interfaith marriage can be facilitated by Catholic dispensation. Dispensation in Catholicism does not happen easily because there are some requirements both administrative and some things that need to be done. Imr couples who are going to have a marriage are required to have a document that they have never had a marriage. Pre-marital education is also mandatory for them to follow to ensure that they are ready to have performed a marriage is a mandatory condition that will perform IRM. In addition, they promised that the child they gave birth to would be educated from childhood about Catholicism with all their might [4, 24, 32, 33].

Interfaith marriage in Hinduism is a difficult thing to do. Hinduism cannot accept marriages of different religions. A person who is not Hindu and wants to perform a marriage with a Hindu must perform the ritual of sudi wadani. This ritual is a form of readiness for a person to follow the teachings of Hinduism. If in the future after the marriage, there is a party of the IRM couple who quit Hinduism or returned to their previous religion. So, this, then it is a form of strategy for couples of different religions in obtaining the convenience of conducting IRM marriages. Those who quit Hinduism are considered to be violating the pledge of allegiance to Hinduism [6, 7].

Buddha and Khonghucu religions are more accepting of interfaith marriages in Indonesia. Both religions better understand that marriage is an atropocentric (humanitarian) issue. Buddhism chooses to argue that whether a person performs marriage or does not perform a marriage is the choice of everyone's personal rights. So marriage is not a sacred matter in Buddhism but is a life choice. [5, 7] Whereas Khonghucu Religion views that marriage is not a religious institution but is an attempt by man to shape civilization by producing offspring. So obviously the confucian religious teachings do not restrict their spouses from having to be one religion [7].

From the explanation above, there is a gap in interfaith marriages in various religions in Indonesia except Hinduism. Even then, it is still possible to smuggle the law with the strategy of converting to Hinduism first and then returning to the previous religion. But this is not the best option because it is considered to violate the oath, he made to be faithful to the teachings of Hinduism itself. Hinduism emphasizes the equality of religious traditions and the equality of beliefs as a condition of undergoing marriage. This shows that marriage in Hinduism is a sacred matter and becomes invalid when performed by a pair of human beings of different religions.

Second, an understanding of the interpretation of a number of laws and regulations related to marriage. At this level, the prohibition of different religions refers to article 2 paragraph (1) of the marriage law. This understanding of prohibition is based on marriage must be in accordance with their respective religions or beliefs. Even though this is only

one of the interpretations regarding interfaith marriage in Indonesia. This claim refers to several things, including religious interpretation, the history of the formation of marriage laws, and the strengthening of law enforcement and state apparatus which tends to make it difficult to register interfaith marriages.

The above interpretation of the prohibition of different religions is corroborated by several religious organizations that prohibit interfaith marriage. The Islamic religious organization that prohibits IRM is the Indonesian Ulema Council. MUI Fatwa No. 4/MUNAS VII/MUI/8/2005 clearly states that interfaith marriage is haram. [19, 34, 35] The policy of the Protestant Church as well as part of religious institutions does not always bless the IRM to its congregations. [36] Catholic teaching also has a very strict policy as explained above. Buddhist and Confucian institutions although quite loose in granting interfaith marriage permits [7] but in their application will deal with the power or bureaucracy of the state. In fact, the state bureaucracy depends on the religious experience of officials related to IRM.

The Union of Churches in Indonesia (usually abbreviated as PGI) is of the view that it obeys the rules of the state in terms of marriage. However, PGI has the right to make corrections to the regulations on marriage applied by the state if it is then interpreted that there is a ban or is prevented from occurring interfaith marriages. This is considered not to meet the element of justice because the civil registry institution is only in administrative duty to carry out records and should not intervene in the validity or not of marriage because it is the duty of religion. This view is not far from the view of the Indonesian Waligereja Conference (usually abbreviated as KWI). KWI argues that there is a legal flaw in Article 2 of the marriage law. This is because the state is considered to have limited the meaning of religion and belief, giving rise to discrimination in the civil rights service as citizens. Even in practice the state then forces citizens to convert to a particular religion or is forced to believe beliefs justified by the state. Walubi (Representative of Indonesian Buddhists) also argues that in principle Buddhists obey the rules of the Marriage Law. But Walubi did not emphatically say that marriage in the Buddhist ummah should be done with fellow Buddhists [37].

State hegemony in interfaith marriages often occurs through bureaucratic agents and legal power. Civil registry offices do not all want to register interfaith marriages even though they have been declared valid by certain religious leaders or religious institutions. Discrimination often occurs within the realm of citizens when requesting that their marriage registration rights not be granted. This condition then pushes citizens in an uncertain position to obtain their civil rights. Some couples choose to submit to one of the spouses by force for their marriage to be registered. This is not done for couples of different religions who have a good economy class. They chose to do IRM abroad and their record keeping became easier. Even the officials from the village also partially discriminated and gave blasphemy to prospective spouses of different religions which should not have happened. Some government officials or employees from the village level also make it difficult or even do not provide certain letters needed by couples of different religions. This shows that the state hegemony is very visible in forcing that IRM is prohibited.

The state's hegemony became apparent when an application for an article on interfaith marriage was completely rejected by the Constitutional Court in 2015. The state has

established regulations that have historically been legal products caused by the hegemony of one particular religion in Indonesia. [36] The Constitutional Court did not expressly give a ruling on the prohibition or prohibition of different religions. The impact of this indecision makes the problem about IRM often cause pro and contra in society. Whereas IRM is always increasing every year [38] and the state is unable to come up with a solution.

On the other hand, the state through a general court ruling also granted IRM's application. As happened in the District Court (hereinafter abbreviated as PN) Surabaya some time ago. [39] But there was much reaction to the verdict. The MUI asked for the ruling to be overturned because it was deemed contrary to the Marriage Act. IRM is considered something illegitimate by mui Surabaya. Meanwhile, PN Surabaya thinks that IRM is not prohibited in the Marriage Law in Indonesia. This is actually not the first time in Indonesia and a ruling like this has existed in 1986 decided by the Supreme Court [40].

The hegemony of the prohibition of different religions has become the spotlight of the Indonesian public and even the world. This problem can be solved well in several other countries. The United Kingdom, Singapore, Canada, Tunisia [41, 42] are the countries that have firmly legalized the IRM. The country is a category of states that do not exercise hegemony related to the IRM, so marriage is a civil right that is not made difficult to register.

The absence and hegemony of the state in the problem of interfaith marriage gives rise to injustice and discrimination. This condition is one of the reasons for the occurrence of the IRM community. As Gramsci said that the state hypes the country not through the path of oppression but through the path of leadership as well as morals. The state can maintain the ideology of marriage by saying that marriage is performed on couples who are fellow religions. Religious institutions or community institutions also direct people's thinking that IRM is a banned thing or at least they follow state rules. State institutions or religious institutions shape the reality of society according to the interests and ideologies of the existing dominant groups. This shows that IRM problems are assessed with a predetermined framework.

The aspirations of this IRM community are not fully implemented by the state. This is because the dominant group that prohibits interfaith marriage has always instilled its dominant ideology continuously. So that the realization that religious texts have different opinions with the existing domination has been lost. Critical awareness has also been lost because education in schools, mass media, and community religious organizations (for example the Indonesian Ulema Council) has created and instilled the ideology that IRM is a matter that is forbidden both in religious law and state law.

3.1.2 IRM Community as an Experience Sharing Space

Second, the IRM community as a space for sharing experiences on the similarities of fate as an IRM family. IRM couples have the fate of facing various challenges both pre- and post-marriage. The problems faced by IRM couples include juridical, psychological, social, and child problems. Some IRM couples have difficulty getting their parents' blessings, difficulty getting services from village offices/villages, public service discrimination in the civil registry service, insults from workmates, and others. The problem is needed during the blessing or *ijab qabul*, and some of the others are post-marriage

problems. [43, 44] The varied solutions to the problems experienced by IRM couples are experiences that can be used as solutions for others. Some couples do not cover up their problems in the community, and then the other members respond in the form of suggestions or solutions. Thus, the more problems of interfaith couples in the community are proportional to the number of solutions needed. This suggests that many experiences can be new insights and alternative options for couples of different religions.

Some IRM couples have a similar fate, which is trying to solve their problems. Members of the IRM family community experienced diverse problems and problem solving was also diverse. For example, IRM couples who have difficulty getting the blessing of their parents or family. Parental or family blessing is an initial challenge that almost all IRM couples face. Some couples admit that it is difficult to get the blessing of the husband's family, some other couples have difficulty getting blessings from the wife's side of the family, and sometimes the two husband and wife families are in a position of not agreeing. The IRM couple Andi and Ani (not their real names) have experienced that the future wife has difficulty getting the blessing of the parents and the future husband has no difficulty getting the blessing of the parents or family. The future wife is Muslim, and the future husband is Catholic. Interestingly, the parents of the future wife are also Catholic. These two future husbands and wives finally got the blessing of their parents after a long time and with a long discussion full of patience.

The same fate of the IRM couple solidified their choice with a process of religious rituals. They perform rituals aimed at ensuring that they choose the right partner. The religious rituals they perform are a form of their efforts and laughter in choosing a mate. Some IRM couples were originally ordinary workmates and did not predict that a workmate of a different religion would be a wife or husband. The IRM couple initially said, "If he is not my soul mate, then let it go away from me" The time it takes to live the spiritual journey of the IRM couple is relatively long. This is because the IRM couple did not rush to make decisions, they carried out IRM struggles, and consulted religious figures. The IRM couple is trying to convince themselves that their soul mate is the choice of God's best. Thus, some IRM couples went through their breakups and love affairs before undergoing an IRM marriage.

The experience also shared by the IRM couple was discrimination in the service of the state bureaucracy. IRM couples sometimes received insults, reproach, intimidation, and even they were advised to convert by officers or civil servants at the village level. The future wife is a relatively more frequently intimidated party from the party in the state bureaucracy. The bureaucracy thinks that interfaith marriage is prohibited. IRM is considered by bureaucratic officials to be a danger to faith, especially for future wives. Thus, the necessary bureaucratic requirements become a bit difficult or complicated. The IRM couple also shared their experiences on the solution of bureaucratic problems. In general, the solution to the complexity of bureaucracy at the village level is that the IRM couples follow administrative procedures, some of them must argue with officers, and some must give special money to facilitate administrative affairs at the village level. If the prospective spouse of IRM with all efforts does not get administrative requirements at the village level, then the IRM spouse is entitled to get a statement of the reason why the office at the Village level is not willing to provide an administrative letter and is known from the party from the sub-district.

3.1.3 Efforts to Find Solutions to the Problem of Interfaith Marriage

Third, the IRM couple needs a solution to several problems they face. This is because IRM is a marriage that is not ideal, giving rise to complex problems. The status of religious differences in IRM couples is more difficult for religious leaders and society in general to accept. Therefore, IRM couples must have mental and material readiness in facing all possible challenges.

IRM actors in the IRM community have had several experiences in dealing with several problems. The problem of each IRM couple is different from other IRM couples, both before marriage and post-marriage. Thus, IRM couples need a variety of IRM problem solutions that are shared in the community. The solutions offered in the IRM couples' community are based on personal experience and several IRM couple experiences. The experiential variation of the IRM pair is part of the solution needed for the IRM couple.

One of the solutions needed by IRM couples is the selection of the location of marriage registration. Marriages performed by men and women are different religions with religious status not Islam, so marriage registration is carried out at the Civil Registry Office (hereinafter abbreviated as KCS). However, the IRM conducted under the condition of the religious status of one prospective bride of the Muslim religion resulted in the selection of two options of choice of institutions. Couples who are one of the brides are Muslims must choose their place of marriage at the Office of Religious Affairs (hereinafter abbreviated as KUA) or at KCS.

The choice of marriage registration site is often an interesting discussion or consideration in the IRM couple community. Marriage registration carried out in the KUA results in one of the spouses who are non-Muslims having to be temporarily subject to Islamic law. Prospective IRM spouses who are not Muslims must be willing to change their ID card status to Muslim. In practice this method is only considered a temporary solution and is considered ineffective. Marriage registration in the KUA using Islamic law has several disadvantages. If the party who converts to Muslimism returns to non-Muslim religion as before marriage. Thus, there are consequences that must be the burden of the IRM couple, that is, they can be said to be apostates and can be the reason for the divorce in the Religious Courts.

Members of the IRM community consisting of various tribes and locations in Indonesia make it easier for couples to get support. The problem of IRM pairs with the same region has a higher degree of similarity. Members of the IRM community with the same domicile can potentially meet and communicate in person more easily. Thus, IRM couples with the same region can more easily share experiences, strengthen each other, and find solutions to IRM problems. The location of the IRM couple is related to customs, community assumptions, and the attitude of officials responding to IRM.

People's customs and assumptions about IRM are related to the problem of psychological pressure on IRM couples. In a society that is easily receptive to the IRM pair, the hegemonic pressure of the IRM ban is lower. For example, people in Bali are different from people in Aceh in response to IRM. Balinese people are more open about IRM as an understandable thing to happen. However, for the people of Aceh, the hegemony of the IRM ban is relatively stronger because it is a society based on Islamic law.

The regional similarities of prospective IRM spouses are also related to the habits of marriage registrars and religious figures who are willing to marry or bless their marriages. According to the experience of the IRM couple that some KCS in a particular region are relatively easier in recording IRM. However, KCS is a state agency that carries out regulations and profiles of the experience of relevant officials [45, 46]

The IRM community considers the location of the IRM couple's domicile important because it is related to solutions regarding the bureaucracy of marriage registration and religious figures. In certain areas, for example, most of them are in the Province of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, and Salatiga City, it is more considered more open by the IRM couple in the civil registration management. IRM couples can potentially find it difficult to get religious figures who are willing to marry or bless marriages in certain areas. So in this community of IRM couples share with each other from their regional origins.

IRM couples get solutions through telecommunications media when asking the IRM community group or asking directly personally. Questions from one of the members of the IRM couple were then answered by from another member. The answer that appears is usually an offer of a solution and is not one thing to do. This is because the problems of IRM pairs are complex and unique (each problem is not the same). Thus, the experience or answers of an IRM spouse from an IRM community member can be a note worth considering.

3.2 Interfaith Marriage Family Community Strategy as Counter Hegemony Banning IRM

The IRM community strategy is a function of the IRM community itself. The IRM community has 4 four strategies as counter-hegemony to the banning of IRM, namely through information, education, consultation, and advocacy. The four IRM couple community strategies aim to have the existence of the IRM family considered in state policy and counter-hegemony forms of IRM banning. Counter-hegemonic measures against the banning of IRM need to be carried out so that the IRM family has family resilience.

First, the information strategy in the IRM community as a form of counter-hegemony prohibiting interfaith marriage. Information is provided from community members through the IRM community group media. The types of information that fall into the IRM community have two different types of information. The information received in the IRM community can be divided into two types. The first type is information that is directly IRM-themed in the form of news, court decisions, judicial reviews, or the latest articles from a news web or article. The second type of information is information related to activities that have an IRM or diversity theme. For example, information about seminars, televesi discussion events about IRM, talk shows with IRM, diversity-themed events, and other information.

Some of the information that has been shared with the IRM community is viral news. The news that went viral was mostly related to legal remedies to the Constitutional Court, and the request for the determination of the IRM from the general court. A number of other information shared in the IRM community include about IRM couples who went viral in Semarang, submission of judicial review of marriage law, submission of judicial review of the Population Administration Law, petition for IRM support to be legally

allowed, PN Surabaya granting IRM application, MUI rejection of IRM, request of the Indonesian Movement for All (usually abbreviated as PIS) to the Constitutional Court granting IRM ratification application, and so forth.

The dissemination of information about IRM in the IRM couple community is relatively updated and fast. This updated information condition causes the IRM pair to become faster, more precise, and ready to face the hegemony of the IRM ban. The attitude of the IRM couple is relatively polite and does not comment with angry emotions when there are negative comments on social media towards the IRM couple. The IRM couple in the IRM community responded to negative comments on social media with positive comments i.e., sharing their experiences during their time as an IRM family. The IRM couple is also relatively patient with the various negative comments given to the IRM couple. For them hegemony always happens to them, and it must be responded to with a positive attitude.

Second, the function of education in the IRM community as a form of counter-hegemony banning IRM. The IRM community provides education or knowledge to IRM members by sharing articles and information on studies or activities. Educational articles shared related to IRM regulations in Indonesia, Islam views IRM, IRM polemics, people who get mandatory wills, interfaith marriages can be valid with court determinations, material on marriages of different religions between regulations and religious views, court determinations, and others. Articles shared in the IRM community are expected to add literacy to IRM couples. The wealth of literacy in the IRM community became a capital of being prudent in the counter-hegemonic position of the IRM ban.

The educational function is carried out by the IRM community by conducting online meetings and online studies during the Covid-19 pandemic. The online meeting was held by the founder of the community by presenting speakers from lecturers and religious leaders. The speakers came from members of the IRM community itself because the members of the IRM community were partly academics and researchers. The IRM community talks about IRM with a legal perspective, IRM in religious studies, and shares the experiences or problems of IRM couples.

Information about study activities with the theme of IRM also colored the IRM community. Study activities within the IRM community vary in form. Some of the activities about IRM are national seminars, talk shows, public discussions on national television, and other things. Although, the activities come from outside the IRM community, information on these activities can be known quickly by members of the IRM community. The speed of obtaining information on IRM-themed activities is supported by several factors. One of the factors of information speed is that the speakers of activities are usually from the IRM community, technological advances, and the extensive network of IRM members.

Some of the educational activities of IRM and shared in the grop community of IRM are Catholice TV activities. Katolikana TV through its YouTube channel with live broadcasts held a talk show with the theme of different religions. Catholicana TV holds nine times five times every Monday. The Catholicana TV talk show series discusses the dynamics of the marriage community of different religions, somersaults towards marriage, the challenges come from the state, measuring the results of research on IRM, and so on. The content of this activity is an education that can be followed free of charge

by members of the IRM community so that the counter-hegemony attitude of banning IRM is even better.

Educational activities on several national televisions discussing IRM are often informed in the IRM community. Some of the shows in the television program containing IRM education are on the Note of Democracy event or at the Indonesia Lawyers Club event, Hati Pena's chat about IRM with the perspective of religious and legal interpretation. The discussion about IRM as an education is related to various legal perspectives, IRM facilitator institutions, IRM research results, the experiences of IRM couples in living their households, the pros and cons of IRM, the IRM community and others.

Third, consultation is a function of the IRM community as a counter-hegemony of the IRM ban. Some of the problems of couples of different religions were consulted in the IRM community. There are couples of different religions who worry about not getting the blessing of their parents, some are worried that they will be bullied in their extended family, some give certain strategies to convert while as a strategy to get the marriage recorded, they also tell about changing religious status on the KTP, they also consult how difficult it is to take care of the recording of the IRM so that they have to obey the interests of the bureaucracy rather than the faith, and others.

For example, members of the IRM community get a solution to a bureaucratic problem in two ways. First, couples of different religions can apply for IRM registration in the district court. Second, couples of different religions are advised to change the religious status on the Identity Card for the time being. Both are difficult choices by prospective IRM spouses. Conversion to religious status is considered by the IRM community to have an element of coercion and a form of state hegemony in matters of state civil rights. Maka, the change of ID card status should not be equated with a change of one's faith. The method of changing religious status on the KTP is a method that is sometimes recommended by civil registry employees so that it seems as if there is no interfaith marriage. Thus, the civil registry can say that there was no conversion but only conversion in KTP.

Currently, the marriage record in KCS is centralized and systemic. The recording of IRM is no longer dependent on the head in the respective City/Regency. The system in KCS if there are Muslims who want to do IRM, it is rejected by the system and it is recommended that marriage registration be carried out by the KUA. The community is directed to meet the needs of the IRM administration that the state and the state want with a change in religious status on the KTP. The state chose the IRM's rigid civil service by ignoring differences in beliefs. The bureaucratic strategy with the change of religious status on the KTP is not considered to reduce a person's faith. This shows that the state prioritizes the interests of the administrative system, and the state plays a role in the hegemony of the prohibition of religious differences.

Fourth, advokation of the IRM pair as a counter-hegemony of the IRM ban. The advocacy in question is consultation, mentoring and facilitation of IRM couples. Direct assistance, for example, related to religious figures who want to marry IRM, religious transfer documents for status changes on ID cards, and various other problems. At the advocacy stage as a counter-hegemony of the IRM ban, prospective IRM spouses are explained the preparations and risks faced if they carry out IRM. The solutions offered

from IRM members are optional. For example, a prospective spouse of IRM is given the option of performing a marriage by a court order, changing the religious status on the ID card, or other optional. IRM couples are also offered by nongovernmental organizations (it can be called NGOs) or religious leaders or community leaders who usually struggle with IRM problems. NGOs that are accustomed to dealing with IRM problems, for example, are the Indonesian Conference on Religion and Peace (commonly called ICRP) and Percik in Salatiga. NGOs advocating for IRM have never claimed to be a marriage institution. Marriage registrars in Indonesia only through KCS or KUA. The IRM community exists as an emergency exit to advocate for IRM couples.

Based on the explanation above, it is known that the form of counter-hegemony carried out by the IRM community is to continue to carry out and provide honest information, consultations that help IRM couples' problems, IRM advocacy that solves their problems, and continue to provide education. Information shared within the IRM community to find out about developments about IRM. Counter-hegemony with education emphasizes that marriage must be carried out with mental, spiritual, and material preparation. Given that, IRM is a marriage that is relatively challenged by tougher challenges. Consultation is needed to get the solution that the IRM couple is facing. Finally, advocacy is the assistance of IRM couples if they need facilitation.

4 Conclusions

It turns out that the IRM's community occurs because of the similarity of fate that families of different religions are in the hegemony of prohibiting interfaith marriage, as a space for sharing experiences, and there is a common interest in finding solutions. Hegemony prohibits the different religions of the family. The surrounding community, and state officials or government employees are the social realities they must face. Interfaith families form IRM communities formed to share experiences and strengthen families of different religions with each other. This community is also a space for them to find solutions to several interfaith marriage problems in Indonesia.

The cons of hegemony carried out by the IRM community are in four ways. They provide information, education, consultation, and advocacy. Information is provided with news that can open new discourses related to IRM. Education about IRM is also always provided so that attitudes and actions in dealing with cases or information about IRM are more careful. This is done to counter-hegemony based on data, empirical experience, and arguments that are in accordance with the rules in religion and marriage law. Consultations within the IRM community are also carried out to solve real problems faced by members of the IRM community. They often must face hegemony which is manifested in the form of discrimination from both families, society, and civil registration employees. This of course must be faced and in a position of counter-hegemony, consultation is important. Finally, advocacy or mentoring for IRM couples. Advocacy in a broader scope is to accompany, including consulting. Advocacy for an IRM couple is a mentoring that can happen before, during and after marriage.

This article has limited discussion in terms of the impact of the IRM community. We do not explain how effective the IRM community is in countering hegemony and the impact it has on policymakers. The policy of state and religious leaders to respond to

the IRM community has not been detailed in this article. The dialogue that takes place between families of different religions, religious leaders, and the state has not been presented in this article. Follow-up studies that dialogue the cons and pros of IRM and the level of effectiveness of the IRM community in influencing policy can be a better source of knowledge and social structuring.

References

1. H. Richmond, "Interreligious Marriages Between Muslims and Christians in Indonesia," *Gema Teol.*, vol. 33, pp. 131–163, 2009, [Online]. Available: <http://journal-theo.ukdx.ac.id/index.php/gema/article/view/28>
2. Noryamin Aini; Ariane Utomo; Peter McDonald, "Interreligious Marriage in Indonesia," *J. Relig. Demogr.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 189–214, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/2589742x-00601005>.
3. Majelis Ulama Indonesia, "Fatwa MUI Perkawinan Beda Agama," *Majelis Ulama Indonesia*, vol. 2, no. 2. pp. 472–477, 2005.
4. DO, "Interview with Catholic Religious Leaders," Indonesia, 2022.
5. SRT, "Interview with Buddhist Religious Leaders," Salatiga, 2022.
6. RW, "Interview with Hindu Religious Leaders," Salatiga.
7. Katolikana TV, "Pernikahan Beda Agama: Iman yang Terancam? [Interfaith Marriage: A Threatened Faith?]," Indonesia, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://youtu.be/yVKxf_Jn-nk
8. S. Kamalia, S. Indartono, and R. Islamiah, "The Role of Families on Internalization of the Tolerance Values for Millennial Generation to Decrease the Potential of Intolerant Conflict and Radicalism Behavior within the Multi Religion Society," vol. 323, no. ICosSCE 2018, pp. 316–325, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2991/icosce-icsmc-18.2019.57>.
9. L. Z. Rahim, "Discursive Contest between Liberal and Literal Islam in Southeast Asia," *Policy Soc.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 77–98, 2006, [Online]. Available: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1449-4035\(06\)70091-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1449-4035(06)70091-1)
10. A. B. Leeman, "Interfaith Marriage in Islam: An Examination of the Legal Theory Behind the Traditional and Reformist Positions," *Indiana Law J.*, vol. 84, p. 9, 2009, [Online]. Available: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/6fdc35b99083525651d34b44289804e15a534011>
11. A. Yaqin, "Pernikahan Beda Agama: Proyek Liberalisme dan Deislamisasi [Interfaith Marriage: The Project of Liberalism and Deislamation]," *Hidayatullah.com*, 2022. <https://hidayatullah.com/artikel/tsaqafah/read/2022/03/09/226190/pernikahan-beda-agama-proyek-liberalisme-dan-deislamisasi.html>
12. J. Van Niekerk and M. Verkuyten, "Interfaith Marriage Attitudes in Muslim Majority Countries: A Multilevel Approach," *Int. J. Psychol. Relig.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 257–270, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508619.2018.1517015>.
13. Erwin Setyo Nugroho, "Marriage of Different Religions in Indonesia in the Interfaith Fiqh Perspective (Building a Pluralist Inclusive Perspective)," *Indones. J. Islam. Law*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.126.1.78>.
14. R. Bukido, E. Gunawan, and R. Mantu1, "Law Analysis Towards Judicial Review of Interfaith Marriage," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.25-10-2019.2300544>
15. R. Çiğdem, "Interfaith marriage in comparative perspective," *Acta Orient.*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 59–86, 2015, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1556/AOrient.68.2015.1.4>.
16. F. Hedi, A. G. Anshori, and Harun, "Legal policy of interfaith marriage in indonesia," *Hasanuddin Law Review*, vol. 3, no. 3. pp. 263–276, 2017. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v3i3.1297>.

17. C. A. Harludi, Rosmini, S. Kotijah, and K. Lizwary, "Ratio Decidendi of The Supreme Court Verdict Number 1400KPdt1986 about Interfaith Marriage in Islamic Law Perspective Reviving and strengthening Islamic Law As a Living .pdf," 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://repository.unmul.ac.id/handle/123456789/1605>
18. A. A. Mangarengi and Y. A. Hanza, "The Position of the Marriage Law on Interfaith Marriages Abroad," *SIGN J. Huk.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 65–83, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v3i1.127>.
19. R. C. L. Yasin, "The Fatwa Of The Council Of Indonesian Ulama On Inter-Religious Marriage," *Jure, J. Syariah dan Huk.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 51–61, 2009.
20. H. Jawad and A. Elmali-Karakaya, "Interfaith Marriages in Islam from a Woman's Perspective: Turkish Women's Interfaith Marriage Practices in the United Kingdom," *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, vol. 40, no. 1. pp. 128–147, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602004.2020.1737415>.
21. R. Bukido, E. Gunawan, D. Usup, and H. Hayat, "Negotiating Love and Faith: Interfaith Marriage in Manado, Indonesia," *Wawasan J. Ilm. Agama dan Sos. Budaya*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 67–76, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.15575/jw.v6i1.11299>.
22. M. F. Mashuri and A. F. Helmi, "Tongkonan Social Identity: Families Harmonization on Interfaith Marriage in Toraja," *ETNOSIA J. Etnogr. Indones.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 115–126, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31947/etnosia.v4i2.6450>.
23. Setyowati, "Legal aspects of interfaith marriage in indonesia," *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, vol. 19, no. 5. pp. 142–144, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ijbel.com/previous-issues/august-2019/vol-19-august-2019-issue-5/>
24. S. Wahyuni, *Perkawinan Beda Agama di Luar Negeri: Kajian Filosofis, Yuridis, Prosedural, dan Sosiologis [Interfaith Marriage Abroad: Philosophical, Juridical, Procedural, and Sociological Studies]*. Yogyakarta: SUKA-Press, 2014.
25. K. Kadriah, T. Saiful, and M. N. Hidayat, "Interreligious Marriage According to Indonesian Legislation," *Proc. 1st Int. Conf. Law Hum. Rights 2020 (ICLHR 2020)*, vol. 549, no. Iclhr 2020, pp. 462–468, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210506.060>.
26. E. Suhasti, S. Djazimah, and Hartini, "Polemics on interfaith marriage in Indonesia between rules and practices," *Al-Jami'ah*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 367–394, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2018.562.367-394>.
27. Antonio Gramsci, *Selection from The Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, 1st ed. New York: International Publisher, 1971.
28. Warsono, *Gus Dur, Intelektual Organik-Tradisional Wacana Politik Kyai pada Era Pemerintahan Gus Dur [Gus Dur, Organic-Traditional Intellectual of Kyai Political Discourse in the Era of Wahid's Reign]*. Surabaya: MaBes Printing Surabaya, 2016.
29. M. Fakhri, *Jalan Lain Manifesto Intelektual Organik [Other Avenues of Organic Intellectual Manifesto]*, 3rd ed. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2022.
30. M. Z. Islam, "Interfaith Marriage in Islam and Present Situation," *Glob. J. Polit. Law Res.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 36–47, 2014.
31. K. Grit, "Interfaith Marriage. A Study of Contextual Church Polity in the Religiously Plural Context of Indonesia, written by Trimargono M. Ebenheser," *Brill*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 85–86, 2022, [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1572543X-20221621>
32. Katolikana TV, "Pernikahan Beda Agama: Toleransi dari Ruang Pribadi [Interfaith Marriage: Tolerance from Private Space]," Indonesia, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://youtu.be/eEe dbZRyYnM>
33. ES, "Interview with Catholic Religious Leaders," Yogyakarta, 2022.
34. M. Ali, "Fatwas on Inter-faith Marriage in Indonesia," *Stud. Islam.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1–33, 2002, doi: <https://doi.org/10.15408/sdi.v9i3.658>.

35. P. M. Siregar, "Relevance of The Fatwa of The Indonesian Ulema Council to The Renewal of Islamic Family Law in Indonesia (Study of MUI Fatwa Number: 4/Munas VII/MUI/8/2005 on Marriage of Different Religions)," *J. Ilm. MIZANI Wacana Hukum, Ekon. dan Keagamaan*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 85, 2021, doi: <https://doi.org/10.29300/mzn.v8i1.4865>.
36. Trimargono Meytrias Ebenheser, *Interfaith Marriage A Study of Contextual Crurch Polity in the Religiously Plural Context of Indonesia*. Amsterdam: LIT Verlag, 2020.
37. Mahkamah Konstitusi, "Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi No. 68/PUU-XII/2014." 2016.
38. Katolikana TV, "Mengulik Hasil Riset Perkawinan Beda Agama [Reviewing the Results of Interfaith Marriage Research]," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://youtu.be/oTFpdXt-Ap4>
39. Direktori Putusan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia, "Putusan PN SURABAYA Nomor 916/Pdt.P/2022/PN Sby." PN Surabaya, Surabaya, 2022.
40. M. Agung, "Putusan Reg. No. 1400/ Pdt/ 1986." Jakarta, 1986.
41. N. Adhha, "The Human Rights and Women in the Context of Interfaith Marriage and Inheritance: A Comparative Analysis of Family Law in Muslim Countries," *SCITEPRESS – Sci. Technol.*, pp. 964–971, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5220/0009921109640971>.
42. A. Emam, "Interfaith Marriage Fatwa Feeds Debate in Egypt," *Al-Monitor*, 2020. <https://www.al-monitor.com/originals/2020/11/egypt-muslim-interfaith-marriage-al-azhar-fatwas.html>
43. AW, "Interview with IRM Community Leader from Salatiga," Salatiga, 2021.
44. Katolikana TV, "Pernikahan Beda Agama: Jungkir Balik Menuju Pelaminan [Interfaith Marriage: Somersaults Towards Pelaminan]," Indonesia, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://youtu.be/9gDkFJ2HU9A>
45. Katolikana TV, "Pernikahan Beda Agama: Tantangan itu Datang dari Negara [Interfaith Marriage: The Challenge Comes from the State]," Indonesia, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://youtu.be/Bj7XSt1teQI>
46. TME, "Interview with Christian Religious Leaders," Salatiga, 2022.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

