Examining the Ideologies of the State and Religion to Understand their Relationships: A Conceptual Review

Harpani Matnuh[1], Susan Fitriasari[2], Sardjana Orba Manullang[3]

Abstract

This paper examines ideologies of the state and religion to establish and understand, their relationships, more so in creating stability in the worldwide management structure of countries. Studies have revealed a very significant relationship between religion and state. Religion and the state are 'twins', to those who promote their side-by-side existence, where religion is considered a foundation, while the state is the guardian of the religion is peaceful existence. The concept of the state and religion's co-existence is based on the argument that something without a foundation can easily collapse and also noted that an unguarded foundation can easily disappear. In this paper, it is therefore emphasized that the existence of a state is a necessity for world order, world order is a necessity for religious order, and religious order is a necessity for the achievement of welfare in this world and the hereafter. Through literature, it is established that countries that ignore morals and moral ethics have gradually experienced destruction. For this reason, it is concluded that there should be sincere interdependence towards happiness through a combination of science with religion, comprised of general morals and political morals, which have roots in region.

Keywords: *Humanity, Ideological Concepts of Human Existence, Morals and Ethics, Nation-sate, Religion.*

Introduction

The discussions surrounding the concepts of the state and religion are classic ones and interesting phenomenons (Quilter, 2002), since they are about the constructed worldwide structures affecting the daily lives of the people in society (Meyer, Boli, Thomas and Ramirez, 1997). It is important to note that these discussions regarding the state and religion are old issues, which are ongoing and still under discourse analysis (Sasson, Tabory and Selinger-Abutbul, 2010). Although it has been the subject of discussion for centuries, as admitted by Madjid (1995), the issues of religion and nation-state have never been completely resolved (Logan, McRant, Jordan and Clyburn, 2014), because the worldwide nation structures originate from varying cultural, social, political and religious backgrounds (Nagel, 1994; Meyer and Jepperson, 2000; Williams, 2007; Kılınç, 2014). When religion and state are discussed, the question that arises is that of whether religion is an integral part of the state or whether the state is part of religious dogma (Al-Ghazali, 1975).

[1] Department of Citizenship Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan, Indonesia, harpanimatnuh@hotmail.com

[2] Citizenship Education Study Program, Faculty of Social Sciences Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, West Java, Indonesia

[3] Faculty of Law, Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Indonesia

There are several types of relationship patterns recorded in human history (Borgman, 2015; Foley, 2016; Vanderburg, 2016; Grajetzki, 2020) which include: firstly, a relationship that tends to be based on rivalry and antagonism (Hedi, 1992) between the two, where each side seeks to destroy the other. Secondly, the mutually supportive relationship between religion and state (Krindatch, 2006; Chan and Hu, 2015; McGaughey and Cochrane, 2017). Wahid calls this latter type of relationship as a symbiotic mutualism relationship (Wahid, 1996). Meanwhile, Hemiptera calls it a collaborative relationship (Hemiptera, 1993). According to Ismatullah and Syahid (2007) the study of the relationship between religion and the state has contributed to the birth of four schools of thought, which are:

Theocracy, the view that assumes or states that there is a significant relationship between state and religion (Al-Atawneh, 2009). In other words, religion and state are believed by this school of thought to be inseparable (Buckley, 2015). Religion is united with the state because government is run based on religious values and principles (Barro and McCleary, 2005). All systems of life in society, nation and state are carried based on the religious principles and guidelines (Maussen, 2014). Theocracy itself is divided into two, namely direct theocracy and indirect theocracy (McGuire, 2018). The first view holds that government is believed to be God's direct authority (Khalid, 1972). It is belived that the existence of any give nation in this world is directly dependent on God's will. The second understanding believes that it is not God himself who governs the government and the state, but the state or the head of state who has authority in the name of God (Kreisel, 2015). In other words, the head of state is believed to rule because of God's will.

Secularism, a school of thought that considers religion and state to have no relationship with each other. This understanding separates and differentiates between religion and state (Buckley, 2016). In this understanding it is believed that the state is purely a matter of the relationship between human beings or a worldly affair (Bronk, 2012), while religion is purely a matter of the relationship between humans and God (Fout, 2015).

Communism, a school of thought which holds that the relationship between religion and state is based on the materialism-dialectical and historical materialism philosophies (Aronowicz, 2021). In other words, understanding communism is an ideology that negates the role of God (Gomel, 2004). Communism, looks at man to man cooperation than the relationship between man and God.

Moderation, a school of thought that was born as a synthesis of theocratic and secular understandings (Bahri, 2012). This understanding assumes that religion and state do not have a relationship like the relationship believed by theocracy. This understanding also disagrees with the secular notion that separates and differentiates religion from the state (Shapiro, 2014). Moderation views that in religion there are good values, such as justice, morals and a system of order (Seok, Chang and Kim, 2019). The state has a power system to embody state goals (Backer, 2008), such as the value of the welfare and convenience of citizens (Wayne, 2003). Thus, from this point of view, the relationship between state and religion is linked by common values and systems.

Religion and State Relationships

Most of the times, people worldwide tend to identify themselves with religion as one of the communal and national identities in society (International IDEA, 2017). Defenders of religious inclinations have gone an extrac inchi of seeking for recognition through the constitution (International IDEA, 2017). According to Al-Ghazali (1975) in his theory of statehood, just like other political scientists, he argues that human beings are social creatures, whose living together as a society is crucial. This means that human beings as God's creatures are meant to live with others and cannot live alone, they need to be with other creatures of their kind (Al-Ghazali, 1975). However, though Al-Ghazali's Argument is based on religion, it has been established that there are at least two factors that make human beings unable to live alone. The two factors are: firstly, the need for offspring as a

way for the survival of mankind and continuity of the human race. Secondly, dependence on one another for basic provisions such as food, clothing, shelter and education (Sjadzali, 1993).

According to Al-Ghazali (1975) the goal of human beings in society and as a state is not merely to fulfill biological and material needs, but it is more than that, that is to prepare themselves for a prosperous life in the hereafter through the experience and true appreciation of religious teachings and values. However, this cannot be possible without the harmony of worldly life (Ismatullah and Syahid, 2007). Al-Ghazali (1975) emphasizes that the world is a field to attain provisions for the afterlife in form of deeds. He believes that the world is a vehicle for seeking God's pleasure to those who consider it a vehicle and a bridge, and not a permanent place to stay, is only to be used as a place for striving to achieve the heavenly goal (Al-Ghazali, 1975), something that is only possible, if there is order, security and prosperity that is evenly distributed in the world (Newman, 2001). For this reason, there is need for a leader and manager of the state who is trusted and with dignity, can distribute duties and responsibilities to each citizen basing on competences (Al-Ghazali, 1975). In otherwords, is able to assign the citizens with tasks most suitable for each of them, and manages all state affairs justily (Sjadzali, 1993).

Al-Ghazali (1975) further notes that from an Islamic religious perspective, the obligation to appoint a Head of State or State Leader is not based on ratio, but it is based on religious necessity. This Al-Ghazali argument, originates from the belief that the preparations for the welfare of the hereafter must be carried out through the correct experience and appreciation of religious teachings (Wilde, 2016). This is only evident in an orderly, safe, and peaceful world (World Conference on Religion and Peace Proceedings, 1969; Kumar, 1989). For that, we need a leader or head of state who is obeyed. In this context, Al-Ghazali analogized religion and the state as 'twins' (Al-Ghzali, 1975). Religion is the foundation, while the state is the guardian (Ghannouchi, 2013). Something without a foundation will easily collapse and a foundation without a guard will be lost (Hannesson, 2021). The existence of a state is a necessity for world order, world order is a necessity for religious order, and religious order is a necessity for the attainment of welfare in the hereafter (Sjadzali, 1993).

Those who promote religion as an integral part of the state (Leustean, 2005), point out that there should be a parallel relationship between state and religion (Montemaggi and Schwartz, 2014), as exemplified in the parallelism of the prophet and the state (Akhtar, 2009). According to Al-Ghazali (1975) if God sent prophets and gave them revelations, then He had also sent states and given them "divine powers". Both have the same goal, to address the problems of human life (Syamsuddin, 2000). Due to several challenges faced by nations, studies have emphasized that the state needs a number of elements that guarantee its existence in peace and harmony (Lavie, 2017). The elements referred to are human activities, such as agriculture for food security; industrial production to ensure added value of a country's raw materials and all other community development programs, political, economic and social, which lead to cooperation between citizens to ensure common interests, disputes resolution and protection of both internal and external threats and dangers (Nelles, 2001).

In the political field, according to Al-Ghazali (1975) the state needs several tools, which include: land surveyors-to establish the size of the people's land and its fair distribution, the military to maintain national security and defense; the judiciary to resolve disputes between citizens; and the laws that maintain public morals which the masses must obey, such that there are no disputes and violations of rights, and compliance to God's law in the perspective of muamalah (translated as human relationship in social interaction basing on Sharia). To regulate all this, a head of state is required to manage all the affairs of the people and the State (Nelson and Nolan, 2017) equally and justily without discrimination.

The powers of the heads of state or kingship, according to Al-Ghazali (1975) does not come from the people as Al-Mawardi argues, but from Allah which is given only to a small number of chosen servants who in most cases are reffered to as "elites" (Suara Muhammadiyah, 2016). Therefore, the power of the Head of State is muqaddas (which is translated as holy) representing all people in a given country. To be elected as head of state according to Al-Ghazali (1975) there are at least ten conditions that must be fulfilled, which include: adulthood; healthy mind, being upright in thinking; free and not a slave; male; have healthy hearing and vision; can exercise power justily; able to provide guidance and leadership; embrace changes based on knowledge; and pure with a clean record. In otherwords, one can restrain self from engaging in forbidden acts by the Creator (Ismatullah and Syihad, 2007).

The Concept of Moral- State and the Interdepence of the Human Nature

Al-Ghazali (1975) offers five basic concepts of a moral state, which are: interdependent towards happiness; unity of knowledge with religion and morality; political morality; moral leadership; and morality in international relations and deeds. The basic concepts of a moral state, are founded on the assumption that the main motive for humans to live in association and relation to one another is constructed based on communal values (White, 2013) which is described as moral values. The various needs of life are what cause people not only to get along, but depend on one another (Hossain and Ali, 2014). According to Al-Ghazali (1975) the need of people living in association and gathering together with others is for two reasons, namely: the need to have offspring to continue the human race in the world, of course, this requires gathering together as a family consisting the mixing of the male and female. Secondly, need for help from others to access and aquired basically, the basic needs of life require a supply chain which is only complete when people live and work together. Therefore, it is impossible for a human to live alone, because he desperately needs to live together and gather with others (Ahmad, 1975).

There are three elements according to Al-Ghazali (1975) which makeup the world, namely objects that exist, human beings have a part in them, and these human beings work to build these objects. According to Al-Ghazali (1975) it is wrong to think that people who are affected by worldly issues (earthly matters) are wrong, and it is wrong for people to think that world objects are there to be left on their own, if they are not associated with other third party, namely human beings who must work to build them, either for their interests, as well as for common interests, then such objects are rendered useless, since man was created as a vicegerent on earth (Idris, 1990). However, this is not enough, if the human being does not realize the "goal" pursued by all three, which includes satisfaction based on religious values and communal interests (Anshel, 2010; Elegido, 2013).

Al-Ghazali (1975) has strong reasons for his theory of "interdependence", because he believes that the word of God found in the Qur'an in QS. Al-Ma'idah verse 2, mentions that the content of the verse commands human beings to help one another for virtue and piety, because of the interdependence nature of the human creature. However, God forbids man to help one another to commit crime and enmity (Farnsworth, 2002; Badawy, 2009), because they destroy the spirit of mutual dependence. Besides basing the argument on the verses of Qur'an, Al-Ghazali (1975) also bases his theory on two hadiths of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) these hadiths their translations are:

Prophet (PBUH) said: "People are equal like the teeth of a comb", and also in another saying, the Prophet (PBUH) said: "A believer to another believer is like a building whose different parts enforce each other."

This means, that humans are commended to be one, without divisions because of humanism nature of human creation, equality as man is equal as it appears in the hadith, and personality, which basically focuses on individual capacity and competences (Ansari, 2021) which are requirements for survival in society. The theory of Al-Ghazali (1975)

based on the adoption of these two hadiths, if related to the context of development was recognized and called the "theory of interdependence". It this conceptual paper we conclude that this theory is much more advanced than the "social contract" theory, which is associated to the Greek theory about human as a social creature known as "the Aristotelian doctrine of the social nature" (Kraynak, 2018).

Al-Ghazali's theory of interdependence concludes that it is not just association, and not just a social contract, but humans are interdependent with one another (Al-Ghazali, 1975). This dependence is not only person to person, but also of one country to another (McShane, 2018). Because human motivation drives individuals to strive to get the necessities of life that must be worked out every moment and every day through collaboration with others. Because human needs are not only associating, but more closely the need of dependence on one another (Lawson, 2003). The ultimate goal of Al-Ghazali's theory of "interdependence" is how dependence on one another can produce complete happiness (Al-Ghazali, 1975). It means that the final goal of the interdependence nuture of humanity is happiness (Seymour, 2016), and its for this reason that a state is formed based on popular views expressed through struggles which are full of blood shed and loss of lives (Nájera, 2009). The end purpose of integrating religion and the states is happiness" (Haller and Hadler, 2006). In other words, the goal of a nation-state formation is the citizens being happy (Lepenies, 2019).

Creation of a Knowledge State based on Moral Values

A fundamental question asked by Al-Ghazali (1975) is that of how important it is to combine knowledge with religion and morality. This question is not only important for every human being who has to live with that knowledge, but it is also very necessary for the Nation's growth, established as an entity bringing together human beings. According to Al-Ghazali (1975) is of the view that knowledge without charity is crazy and that charity without knowledge is not valid. Knowledge alone does not keep away from deeds of sin and evil, nor does it draw near to obedience and goodness (Berg, 2013), while living in this world, knowledge should be accompanied by good intentions and of purpose to humanity (Dakubu, 1987). From a religious moral perspective, knowledge is not able to free human beings from the punishment of hell, if not put to use properly during one is earthly life time. This means that acquired should be used for goodness in this world, hence knowledge is for piety and morality alone.

Al-Ghazali (1975) further asserts that a state needs truthful and since knowledge, which combines three main elements, namely: scientific values, religious values and morality being. When this unity is ignored or let go, until the three elements fall apart, it can cause a great catastrophe to humanity. The catastrophic fire will lick more and more not only will it burn the human self, but it will be able to burn the whole country, it may even lead the whole world to end up catching international fire, such the first world war and second world war and currently, the Russian and Ukrainian war which is the verge of the causing the third war, if not well handled (Mankof, 2022).

Political-Morals and the State

Al-Ghazali (1975) stance is in line with the opinion of Greek philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle, who said that morals and politics are twins that cannot be separated (Demuijnck, 2015). Where morals are needed by the society to determine the good and bad values or right and wrong of every action and desire of everyone in society (Waligorski, 1990), while politics is needed to regulate society in accordance with moral rules accepted by members of society (Kresse, 1998). However, according to Al-Ghazali (1975) morals and politics are not only twins that cannot be separated, but both are one that cannot be divided. Al-Ghazali (1975) was not willing to mention "moral and political", but consistently he said with one similar compound word, namely "moral-politics" or "politico-moral", which is mentioned in Arabic "Siyaasatul Akhlaq".

With unanimous conviction, Al-Ghazali (1975) emphasizes that the moral-political or political-moral stance is the establishment of Islam, or in other words it is called Islamic ideology, where all Islamic teachings are directed towards this stance, namely the realization of political-moral and the achievement of political-moral. On this basis, Al-Ghazali concluded that the State needs a moral-political or moral politics (Ahmad, 1975). The moral-politics referred to by Al-Ghazali are morals based on religion.

Moral-politics based on religion in the guidance of Al-Ghazali (1975) is about inculcating the spirit of Sufism, which in the Western sense is called "mysticism". According to Al-Ghazali (1975) every human character or what is called moral or ethical behavior has a deep source in the human soul, namely the "heart", and that heart has two doors, namely: first, the outer door which is accepting all external influences and which emit all actions that determine human morals; and second, the inner door which receives revelation --- for every Prophet --- and inspiration --- for all other human beings --- from God who guides his life, both spiritual and physical.

The outer door receives all directions from all the outer realms (Al-Ghazali, 1975), either through education (Hirsh and Killion, 2009), association with others (Heyman, 2008), training or through the five senses plus the sixth sense, namely the mind (Knoll, Fuhrmann, Sakhardande, Stamp, Speekenbrink and Blakemore, 2016). The knowledge that comes from this exodus is called by Al-Ghazali (1975) the science of mu'amalah" meaning the knowledge acquired from people-to-people interaction. The inner door from the heart receives guidance from a source that is clear, and clean, namely revelation or inspiration from God (Al-Ghazali, 1975). This second source of knowledge is called "mukasyafah science", which means knowing the hidden. This source of knowledge cannot possibly be opened, if it has not been through continuous practice. According to Al-Ghazali (1975) from the Islamic perspectyive, it is only by having these two sources of knowledge or scientific understanding, comprising of the knowledge of muamalah and science of mukasyafah, is when human hearts can attain and achieve the noble morals as taught by the Prophet Muhammad (PHBUH),

This is where Al-Ghazali (1975) sees the soul of sufism into moral-politics perspective which is based on religious values. By bringing the "heart" into the political struggle in addition to the "mind" which makes regular calculations, is the morality meant by Al-Ghazali (Ahmad, 1975). With that, Al-Ghazali is considered a Sufi-Politician, namely a politician who hears his inner voice which is Sufism or mystical (Ahmad, 1975).

Morality in Leadership for the Head of State

On this point according to Al-Ghazali (1975) 'religious aspects' that can be linked to the caliphate as head of state, are not a matter of descent, nor a matter of "sanctity", but the most important point to note is the concern of all parties, that is to say by both the candidates for state leadership and the people, especially those with the power to elect or appoint the right leadership from the many candidates to head the state as determined by the ideal criteria established in the existing structures. The knowledge aspect should be taken in consideration as the main area that should receive special attention, where according to Al-Ghazali (1975) and Ahmad (1975) the knowledge aspect consists of some concerns, which include: first, the need to know that humans must be aware of why and what purpose they exist in this world. According to the teachings of Islam, this world is not a place to stay forever for human beings, but it is a place for one's way to the eternal life, which is referred to as the hereafter.

Second, it must be known that fearing God is a command to follow by each soul born in this world (Ahmed, 2016). Both the head of state and the people at large must be devoutes by heart to save their lives, in this world (in other words live happily) and live eternal life in the hereafter.

Third, in the Islamic context, humans are Allah's representatives on earth (Dakake, 2017). In order to narture the world population properly, the head of state (God's representative) must have sufficient ability to narture human values (Martin, Maris and Simberloff, 2016), which must start from himself, extend to his family, continue to his citizens and to other races the worldover, peacefully. It means that as leaders, heads of state must always, think of saving humanity (John, Dayal and Lal, 2018). It should be noted that there are two categories of power, which consist of the holy power from God to His Angels and the lower power given to us human beings (Al-Ghazali, 1975). The holy power of angels leads to good morals, and human power most of the time leads to arrogance, greed and immorality. The best example of human power, which maybe poorly used is war, for instance the war declared by the Russian leadership on Ukrain (Mankof, 2022). In relation to the Russian-Ukrainan war, there are varying views (Beauchamp, 2022) which leave many confused on what power is all about in leadership of the world today.

Al-Ghazali (1975) proposes something tod be done by sincere leadership. The proposal is regarded as the criterion for good leadership. The criterion list should be implemented in actions and attitudes depending on the daily situation. Al-Ghazali (1975) mentions 11 attitudes that must be possessed by every head of state, which are presented as in the table below:

Table 1. List of Attitudes as a Working Guide for Choosing a Righteous Head of State
- *feel the hardships and bitterness of other people's lives;*
- *should be thirst for the advice of scholars;*
- *should not look down on those who need his help;*
- *must stay away from the royal nature and live a life of idealness;*
- *have plenty of time to devote themselves to God;*
- *be gentle, do not be rude to anyone;*
- *seek the pleasure of the people and their love, in accordance with the Divine pleasure;*
- *the pleasure of the people must be sought to fulfill the teachings of religion, because obedience to the ruler is as long as the ruler walks according to the pleasure of God.*
- *should be aware that the position of the Head of State is a big issue;*
- *the rulers must be close to the scholars; and*
- *the rulers must be concerned about the nature of forgiveness, restraining anger and so on.*

From the table above, we see the values comprising of points such as putting one'self in the situation of others, mostly those led. Leadership being virtuous, a leader is expected to seek for knowledge on a daily basis for proper governance. In general, a leader should be a person who takes care of all the people he leads, without segregation and discrimination.

Morals in International Relations and Actions

Studies have revealed that for long states have been held responseible for moral development among citizens of each country the worldwide (Williams, 1923). Morality is important in politics because it is the foundation of conscience which inter-relate with power, and it is the ethical mind and coerciveness nature of human beings (Amstutz, 2019) that makes people to cooperate and workout compromises with easy. Being morally right is a necessity for all people.

Since, religion is about teaching good and prohibiting the wrong (Shaw, 2011), the function of man as God's vicegerent on earth (Glaser, 1998), means there should be improvement and building human character in a positive direction (Guorong, Moeller and Meyers, 2016). Immoral leadership has no capacity of helping its people to grow socially, morally, economically, culturally neither politically in this world (Duggan and Piper, 2013), and it is not enough to develop citizens, yet they are unable to repair their households. Because development must start by repairing one's heart and controlling his desires (Tomlinson and Mayer, 2009). As for people who are not able to build themselves and have a great desire to build others, they just deceive themselves (Al-Ghazali, 1975). According to Al-Ghazali (1975) international moral principles are meant to create:

A world of Eternal Peace-Individual peace is the lowest foundation for a lasting peaceful world. It is impossible for world peace to occur, if the state is not peaceful, it is impossible to achieve a peaceful country, if a family is not peaceful, and in the end, it is impossible for family peace to occur, if peace is not first cultivated in the souls of each individual. The spirit of peace should be fostered and carried out continuously through education and awareness creation, so that it permeates the conscience of every person, especially into the conscience of state rulers, who in essence are absolute representatives of the people.

Mutual Respect for Religious and Ideological Beliefs- This mutual respect for each other's religious beliefs is what Al-Ghazali (1975) refers to as the second foundation for international morals. Mutual respect is a requirement, for international cooperation.

Brotherhood and Friendship- in the association between nations, the spirit of brotherhood and friendship is very much needed, as is the case in human interaction in people's daily lives. A familiar feeling, not mutual suspicion, but instead mutual trust between one nation and another, which is a moral necessity in international relations. Furthermore, Al-Ghazali emphasized that the spirit of brotherhood and friendship creates reciprocal rights between siblings in 8 respects. The eight things are:

Table 2. Shows Aspects of Life which Strengthen Brotherhood and Friendship
- *Assist with material things or property;*
- *Help oneself, to the sacrifice of the soul;*
- *Keeping all secrets of friends and aquittences with silence;*
- *Verbally talk about something needed;*
- *Forgive all mistakes;*
- *Pray for safety;*
- *Be honest and sincere; and*
- *Lighten up and do not be burdensome nor show any objection*

Mutual Cooperation from the Economic Needs Perspective

Interdependence between nations requires the spirit of 'mutual cooperation' (that is working together to achieve coveted results), which in the language of Al-Ghazali (1975) is called "ta'awun".

Good Neighborly Politics and Defensive Weapons

Just as the relationship between humans includes a "neighbor" relationship by virtue of living together, so it is with the state-state relationship. This neighborly relationship entails rights that must be respected. Each country must regulate the politics of a good neighbor to other countries. As for the basis of good neighbor politics, according to Al-Ghazali is brotherhood and friendship. Therefore, there is no place for the character of fear and jealousy, let alone the nature of disturbing and attacstate other countries for their own benefit.

It is through this understanding that the meaning of war is laid. Warfare should not be aggressive and hostile, but warfare should be merely defensive. Al-Ghazali (1975) considered that war was only an attempt to defend friendship and brotherhood from the disturbance of aggressiveness, and to restore good neighborly politics. Based on this opinion, united neighborly politics with the principle of deffensive weaponry is a neccessity. This means that countries should not make weapons with the intention being aggressive to others, where such weapons can end up being used badly against other countries deemed weak. It must not be used as an arsenal for an evil race driven by fear or suspicion (Boyd-Judson, 2005).

Based on the above it is impossible to abolish warfare altogether and completely disarm a country, as long as humans are humans, they have good qualities and bad qualities. But those wars and weapons can only be prevented, reduced and limited, if each country adheres to good neighborly politics both on the basis of brotherhood and friendship.

Conclusion

Based on the review of literature, it is clear that religion and state have a very significant relationship. The Ghazalian school of thouth describes religion and state as 'twins', where religion is the foundation, while the state is the guardian of peace and prosperity of a nation. It has been concluded, that a state-religion relationship is vital because without a foundation of this nature, there can be easily collapse of a state and a foundation without a guardian can be easily lost, this is the reflection of religion. The existence of a state is a necessity for the world order, world order is a necessity for religious order, and religious order is a necessity for the achievement of welfare in this world and the hereafter. The extraction from the discussion presented based on litertuer leaves the authors with a belief that a country that ignores morals and ethics will gradually experience destruction or extinction. For this reason, the concept of and ideal state is vital and a fundamental ideology.

References

Ahmed, S. (2016). Six Questions about Islam. In What Is Islam?: The Importance of Being Islamic (pp. 5–110). Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc77krt.6.

Ahmad (1975). Konsepsi Negara Bermoral: menurut Al-Ghazali (Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.

Akhtar, S. (2009). The Institution of Ḥisbah and Demand for its Revival. Policy Perspectives, 6(1), 89–104.

Al-Ghazali, A. H. (1975). Ihya` 'Ulum al-Din. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.

Al-Atawneh, M. (2009). Is Saudi Arabia a Theocracy? Religion and Governance in Contemporary Saudi Arabia. Middle Eastern Studies, 45(5), 721–737.

Amstutz, M. (2019). The Role of Morality in International Politics. Retrieved from https://providencemag.com/2019/10/role-morality-international-politics/.

Anshel, M. H. (2010). The Disconnected Values (Intervention) Model for Promoting Healthy Habits in Religious Institutions. Journal of Religion and Health, 49(1), 32–49.

Ansari, R. (2021). "People Are Equal Like the Teeth of a Comb": Humanity, Equality, and Individuality in Classical Philosophy. Retrieved from https://renovatio.zaytuna.edu/article/people-are-equal-like-the-teeth-of-a-comb.

Aronowicz, A. (2021). Communism. In Self-Portrait, with Parents and Footnotes: In and Out of a Postwar Jewish Childhood (pp. 26–46). Academic Studies Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1z3hkrr.5.

Backer, L. C. (2008). Global Panopticism: States, Corporations, and the Governance Effects of Monitoring Regimes. Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies, 15(1), 101–148. https://doi.org/10.2979/gls.2008.15.1.101.

Badawy, T. (2009). Towards a Contemporary View of Islamic Criminal Procedures: A Focus on the Testimony of Witnesses. Arab Law Quarterly, 23(3), 269–305.

Bahri, T. bin R. N. (2012). Understanding Islamic Moderation: The Wasatiyya Imperative. Counter Terrorist Trends and Analyses, 4(9), 18–20.

Barro, R. J and McCleary, R. M. (2005). Which Countries Have State Religions? The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 120(4), 1331–1370.

Berg, S. (2013). Ben Sira, the Genesis Creation Accounts, and the Knowledge of God's Will. Journal of Biblical Literature, 132(1), 139–157. https://doi.org/10.2307/23488241.

Beauchamp, Z. (2022). 9 big questions about Russia's war in Ukraine, answered. Retrieved from https://www.vox.com/22989379/russia-ukraine-war-putin-zelenskyy-us-nato-explainer-questions.

Borgman, C. L. (2015). Data Scholarship in the Humanities. In Big Data, Little Data, No Data: Scholarship in the Networked World (pp. 161–202). The MIT Press.

Bronk, A. (2012). Secular, Secularization, and Secularism: A Review Article. Anthropos, 107(2), 578–583.

Buckley, D. T. (2015). Beyond the Secularism Trap: Religion, Political Institutions, and Democratic Commitments. Comparative Politics, 47(4), 439–458.

Buckley, D. T. (2016). Benevolent Secularism: A THEORY OF THE RELIGIOUS POLITICS OF DEMOCRACY. In Faithful to Secularism: The Religious Politics of Democracy in Ireland, Senegal, and the Philippines (pp. 9–41). Columbia University Press.

Chan, S and Hu, R. W. (2015). East Asia's Enduring Rivalries: Ripe for Abatement? Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs, 2(2), 133–153.

Dakake, M. M. (2017). To Be Khalīfa: The Human Vocation in Relation to Nature and Community. In L. MOSHER & D. MARSHALL (Eds.), God's Creativity and Human Action: Christian and Muslim Perspectives (pp. 101–118). Georgetown University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1trkk09.11.

Dakubu, M. E. K. (1987). Creating Unity: The Context of Speaking Prose and Poetry in Ga. Anthropos, 82(4/6), 507–527.

Demuijnck, G. (2015). Universal Values and Virtues in Management Versus Cross-Cultural Moral Relativism: An Educational Strategy to Clear the Ground for Business Ethics. Journal of Business Ethics, 128(4), 817–835.

Duggan, J. R and Piper, H. (2013). Interrupting the Immoral Panic Around Child Abuse and Professional Touch: Thinking About Impact. International Review of Qualitative Research, 6(3), 440–459. https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2013.6.3.440.

Elegido, J. M. (2013). Does It Make Sense to Be a Loyal Employee? Journal of Business Ethics, 116(3), 495–511.

Farnsworth, W. (2002). The Economics of Enmity. The University of Chicago Law Review, 69(1), 211–261. https://doi.org/10.2307/1600354.

Foley, R. A. (2016). Mosaic evolution and the pattern of transitions in the hominin lineage. Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 371(1698), 1–14.

Fout, J. A. (2015). What Do I Fear When I Fear My God? A Theological Reexamination of a Biblical Theme. Journal of Theological Interpretation, 9(1), 23–38.

Ghannouchi, R. (2013). The state and religion in the fundamentals of Islam and contemporary interpretation. Contemporary Arab Affairs, 6(2), 164–171.

Glaser, I. (1998). Roles and relationships: reflections on the khalifah and the image of God. Transformation, 15(1), 18–23.

Gomel, E. (2004). Gods like Men: Soviet Science Fiction and the Utopian Self. Science Fiction Studies, 31(3), 358–377.

Grajetzki, W. (2020). The Predynastic and Early Dynastic Periods. In The People of the Cobra Province in Egypt: A Local History, 4500 to 1500 BC (pp. 51–84). Oxbow Books. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv138wt1s.7.

Guorong, Y., Moeller, H.-G., & Meyers, C. A. (2016). Human Capacities and a World of Meaning. In The Mutual Cultivation of Self and Things: A Contemporary Chinese Philosophy of the Meaning of Being (pp. 69–111). Indiana University Press.

Haller, M and Hadler, M. (2006). How Social Relations and Structures Can Produce Happiness and Unhappiness: An International Comparative Analysis. Social Indicators Research, 75(2), 169–216.

Hannesson, R. (2021). THE 200-MILE ZONE: A SEA CHANGE. In The Economics of Fishing (pp. 117–134). Agenda Publishing. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1mvw90r.8.

Hemiptera, E. (1993). Agama dan Negara: Aspek Spiritual, Moral dan Etika dalam GBHN.

Hedi, B. A. (1992). A Variation on the Theme of Violence and Antagonism in V. S. Naipaul's Fiction. Caribbean Studies, 25(1/2), 49–61.

Heyman, G. D. (2008). Children's Critical Thinking When Learning from Others. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17(5), 344–347.

Hirsh, S and Killion, J. (2009). When Educators Learn, Students Learn: Eight Principles of Professional Learning. The Phi Delta Kappan, 90(7), 464–469.

Hossain, F. and Ali, M. (2014) Relation between Individual and Society. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2, 130-137. doi: 10.4236/jss.2014.28019.

Idris, J. S. (1990). IS MAN THE VICEGERENT OF GOD? Journal of Islamic Studies, 1, 99–110. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/26195669.

International IDEA. (2017). Religion–State Relations: International IDEA Constitution-Building Primer 8. Retrieved from ttp://www.idea.int.

Ismatullah, D and Syahid, A.A.G. (2007). Ilmu Negara dalam Multi Perspektif. Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia.

John, K. M., Dayal, J and Lal, V. (2018). Human Rights and Freedom of Religion—The Ground Experience: Interviews with Dr. John Dayal and Rev. Vijayesh Lal. In R. S. Shah & J. Carpenter (Eds.), Christianity in India: Conversion, Community Development, and Religious Freedom (pp. 179–197). 1517 Media. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv550c8n.13.

Khalid, D. H. (1972). THEOCRACY AND THE LOCATION OF SOVEREIGNTY. Islamic Studies, 11(3), 187–209.

Kılınç, R. (2014). International Pressure, Domestic Politics, and the Dynamics of Religious Freedom: Evidence from Turkey. Comparative Politics, 46(2), 127–145.

Knoll, L. J., Fuhrmann, D., Sakhardande, A. L., Stamp, F., Speekenbrink, M and Blakemore, S.-J. (2016). A Window of Opportunity for Cognitive Training in Adolescence. Psychological Science, 27(12), 1620–1631.

Kraynak, R. P. (2018). The Origins of "Social Justice" in the Natural Law Philosophy of Antonio Rosmini. The Review of Politics, 80(1), 3–29.

Kresse, K. (1998). Izibongo. The Political Art of Praising: Poetical Socio-Regulative Discourse in Zulu Society. Journal of African Cultural Studies, 11(2), 171–196.

Kreisel, H. (2015). Maimonides' God: The God of Abraham or the God of Aristotle? In Judaism as Philosophy: Studies in Maimonides and the Medieval Jewish Philosophers of Provence (pp. 3–18). Academic Studies Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt21h4xpc.4.

Krindatch, A. D. (2006). Changing relationships between Religion, the State, and Society in Russia. GeoJournal, 67(4), 267–282.

Kumar, V. R. (1989). STRATEGIES FOR WORLD PEACE: PEACE RESEARCH AND PEACE MOVEMENTS. India Quarterly, 45(2/3), 135–153.

Lavie, L. (2017). The Idea of the Civil State in Egypt: Its Evolution and Political Impact following the 2011 Revolution. Middle East Journal, 71(1), 23–44.

Lawson, T. (2003). Institutionalism: On the Need to Firm up Notions of Social Structure and the Human Subject. Journal of Economic Issues, 37(1), 175–207.

Lepenies, P. (2019). Transforming by Metrics that Matter – Progress, Participation, and the National Initiatives of Fixing Well-Being Indicators. Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung, 44(2 (168)), 288–312.

Leustean, L. N. (2005). TOWARDS AN INTEGRATIVE THEORY OF RELIGION AND POLITICS. Method & Theory in the Study of Religion, 17(4), 364–381.

Logan, S. L. M., McRant, J. A., Jordan, V. E and Clyburn, J. E. (2014). Making the Impossible Possible: Building Alliance between Religion and Politics. In S. L. M. Logan (Ed.), The Spirit of an Activist: The Life and Work of I. DeQuincey Newman (pp. 47–62). University of South Carolina Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv6wgf6p.10.

Madjid, N. (1995). Islam Agama Kemanusiaan: Membangun Tradisi dan Visi Baru Islam Indonesia. Jakarta: PARAMADINA.

Mankof, J. (2022). Russia's War in Ukraine: Identity, History, and Conflict. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/russias-war-ukraine-identity-history-and-conflict.

Martin, J.-L., Maris, V and Simberloff, D. S. (2016). The need to respect nature and its limits challenges society and conservation science. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 113(22), 6105–6112. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1525003113.

Maussen, M. (2014). Religious Governance in the Netherlands: Associative Freedoms and Non-Discrimination After "Pillarization." The Example of Faith-Based Schools. Geopolitics, History, and International Relations, 6(2), 37–63.

McGaughey, D. R and Cochrane, J. R. (2017). LIFE OVER DEATH: THE DYNAMISM OF SPIRIT. In The Human Spirit: Groundwork (1st ed., pp. 93–109). African Sun Media.

McGuire, S. F. (2018). Between Rationalism and Theocracy: Plato, the Mysteries, and F. W. J. Schelling's Analysis of the Modern State. In D. E. TABACHNICK, T. KOIVUKOSKI, & H. M. TEIXEIRA (Eds.), Challenging Theocracy: Ancient Lessons for Global Politics (pp. 38–58). University of Toronto Press.

McShane, P. J. (2018). The non-remedial value of dependence on moral testimony. Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition, 175(3), 629–647.

Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M and Ramirez, F. O. (1997). World Society and the Nation-State. American Journal of Sociology, 103(1), 144–181. https://doi.org/10.1086/231174.

Meyer, J. W and Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The "Actors" of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency. Sociological Theory, 18(1), 100–120.

Montemaggi, V and Schwartz, R. (2014). ON RELIGION AND LITERATURE: TRUTH, BEAUTY, AND THE GOOD. Religion & Literature, 46(2/3), 111–128.

Seymour, V. (2016). The Human–Nature Relationship and Its Impact on Health: A Critical Review. Front. Public Health 4:260. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2016.00260.

Shaw, J. E. (2011). THE ROLE OF RELIGION IN NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY SINCE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001. Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep11805.

Suara Muhammadiyah. (2016). Al-Mawardi: Peletak Dasar Ilmu Politik. Retrieved from https://suaramuhammadiyah.id/2016/01/29/al-mawardi-peletak-dasar-ilmu-politik-syaifullah/.

Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture. Social Problems, 41(1), 152–176. https://doi.org/10.2307/3096847.

Nájera, L. G. (2009). Transnational Migration, Conflict, And Divergent Ideologies Of Progress. Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development, 38(2/3/4), 269–302.

Nelles, W. (2001). MEETING BASIC NEEDS, EMBRACING THE WORLD AND PROTECTING THE STATE: BALANCING HUMAN AND TRADITIONAL SECURITY IN THE NEW MONGOLIA. Asian Perspective, 25(3), 207–245.

Nelson, T. P and Nolan, S. A. (2017). The Case for Federal Preemption of State Mortgage Satisfaction Notice Laws: Navigating the Dodd-Frank Waters. The Business Lawyer, 72(4), 959–980.

Newman, E. (2001). Human Security and Constructivism. International Studies Perspectives, 2(3), 239–251.

Quilter, J. (2002). Moche Politics, Religion, and Warfare. Journal of World Prehistory, 16(2), 145–195.

Sjadzali, M. (1993). Islam dan Tata Negara; Ajaran, Sejarah dan pemikiran. Jakarta: UI Press.

Sasson, T., Tabory, E and Selinger-Abutbul, D. (2010). Framing Religious Conflict: Popular Israeli Discourse on Religion and State. Journal of Church and State, 52(4), 662–685.

Shapiro, R. E. (2014). Can Moderation Give Us Justice? Litigation, 40(2), 56–58.

Seok, S., Chang, A and Kim, D. (2019). Varieties of Politically Moderate Groups in South Korea: Social Identity, Morality, and Political Attitude. Journal of Asian Sociology, 48(1), 139–168.

Syamsuddin, D. (2002). Etika Agama dalam Membangun Masyarakat Madani. Jakarta: PT. Logos Wacana Ilmu.

Tomlinson, E. C and Mayer, R. C. (2009). The Role of Causal Attribution Dimensions in Trust Repair. The Academy of Management Review, 34(1), 85–104.

Vanderburg, W. H. (2016). Culture and History. In The Growth of Minds and Culture: A Unified Interpretation of the Structure of Human Experience, Second Edition (pp. 265–300). University of Toronto Press.

Wahid, A. (1999). Mengurai Hubungan Agama dan Negara. Jakarta: Grasindo.

Waligorski, C. P. (1990). The Good Society: Justice, Morality, and Community. In The Political Theory of Conservative Economists (pp. 126–151). University Press of Kansas. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1p2gktw.9.

Wayne, M. (2003). The State: Regulating the Impossible. In Marxism and Media Studies: Key Concepts and Contemporary Trends (pp. 87–117). Pluto Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt18fs5mq.8.

White, F. J. (2013). Personhood: An essential characteristic of the human species. The Linacre quarterly, 80(1), 74–97. https://doi.org/10.1179/0024363912Z.00000000010.

Wilde, A. (2016). The Order of Things in Eighteenth-Century Chronicles. In What is beyond the River?: Power, Authority, and Social Order in Transoxiania 18th-19th Centuries (pp. 451–680). Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Williams, R. H. (2007). The Languages of the Public Sphere: Religious Pluralism, Institutional Logics, and Civil Society. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 612, 42–61.

Williams, B. (1923). State Morality in International Relations. The American Political Science Review, 17(1), 17–33. https://doi.org/10.2307/1943790.

World Conference on Religion and Peace Proceedings. (1969). Contemporary Religions in Japan, 10(3/4), 204–315. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/30233040