Jurnal Iman dan Spiritualitas
eISSN: 2775-4596, Vol 6, No 4, 2026, pp. 1723-1736
https://doi.org/10.15575/jis.v6i4.56122

Religious Fundamentalism and State Politics in the Modern Era: A Critical Analysis of Jeffrey Haynes's Thought

Siti Marlida
Bandung Muhammadiyah University, Bandung, Indonesia
marlidayusuf@umbandung.ac.id

Asep Abdul Sahid
UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia
asepsahid@uinsgd.ac.id

Tata Sukayat
UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia
tata.sukayat@uinsgd.ac.id

Suggested Citation:

Marlida, Siti; Sahid, Asep Abdul; Sukayat, Tata. (2026). Religious Fundamentalism and State Politics in the Modern Era: A Critical Analysis of Jeffrey Haynes's Thought. *Jurnal Iman dan Spiritualitas*, Volume 6, Number 4: 1723–1736. https://doi.org/10.15575/jis.v6i4.56122.

Article's History:

Received June 2026; *Revised* September 2026; *Accepted* November 2026.
2026. journal.uinsgd.ac.id ©. All rights reserved.

Abstract:

The rise of religious fundamentalism in various countries is a phenomenon that can be understood as a response to the development of modernity, particularly secularization and liberalization. In its development, fundamentalist movements are not only related to religious issues but also interact with the social and political dynamics of the state. Their presence in the public sphere can give rise to tension, conflict, and debate regarding the position and role of religion in state life. This article aims to analyze Jeffrey Haynes's thoughts on religious fundamentalism and state politics, as discussed in his work Religion and Politics. This research uses a qualitative approach with library research methods through conceptual-descriptive analysis. The study focuses on the dynamics of the relationship between religious fundamentalism and state politics and the factors that drive the emergence of fundamentalist movements in various countries. The results show that the relationship between religion and politics is dynamic, complex, and reciprocal. Religion can influence political orientation, the formation of public policy, the legitimacy of power, and the mobilization of collective identity. Conversely, state policies and political structures can also influence the development of religious movements. According to Jeffrey Haynes, the rise of fundamentalism is influenced by three main factors: the failure of modernity to meet social needs and the meaning of life, the political marginalization of religious groups, and globalization, which reinforces the issue of religious identity. Thus, secularization and liberalization do not completely eliminate religion, but can encourage the emergence of new forms of religious involvement in the public and political sphere.

Keywords: fundamentalism; politics; modernity.

INTRODUCTION

Following the rise of secularization in various parts of the world, the view emerged that religion would gradually lose its relevance in human life. The development of modernity, rationality, science, technology,

and the differentiation of social institutions were seen as pushing religion increasingly into the private sphere. From this perspective, the progress of modern society was assumed to reduce human dependence on religion as a source of values, a guide to life, and a basis for building social order. However, the development of contemporary society shows a reality that does not entirely align with this prediction. Religion remains deeply rooted in social life and continues to play a role as a source of moral orientation, identity, social solidarity, and a provider of meaning to human life (Salzman, 2008). The relevance of religion remains evident even amidst the increasingly rapid development of information technology. Technological progress does not necessarily eliminate the human need for religion. Conversely, rapid social change can give rise to various new problems, such as social uncertainty, identity crises, changing values, inequality, and anxiety about the future. In such situations, religion can again be seen as a source of stability, moral orientation, and meaning in life. This condition shows that the existence of religion is not only determined by the level of technological development or modernity of a society, but is also related to human needs for a value system that provides direction in facing changes in life.

The resurgence of religion in social life has given rise to various forms of religious movements. One such movement is religious fundamentalism, which emerged as a response to social change, modernization, secularization, and globalization. Fundamentalist movements essentially seek to reaffirm the importance of religious teachings in the lives of individuals and society. From the perspective of their adherents, the development of modernity that goes too far can displace religious values, necessitating efforts to restore religion to a stronger position in social life. Therefore, fundamentalism is not only concerned with issues of religious belief and understanding but can also develop into social and political movements. In a political context, some fundamentalist movements seek to promote greater influence of religious values and principles on the governance of society and the state. These efforts can be realized through demands for the application of religious values in public policy, the establishment of social norms, or changes to political systems deemed inconsistent with religious beliefs (Kinnvall, 2004). It is at this point that fundamentalism interacts directly with state power. When the demands of fundamentalist groups conflict with the principles or political interests of the government, the relationship between religious movements and the state can develop into a tense one.

In the political history of various countries, these tensions can be seen in the form of restrictions on religious organizations, political conflict, repression, mass mobilization, and even violence. However, it is important to understand that fundamentalism is not always synonymous with violence. Fundamentalism can take various forms and strategies, ranging from educational activities, preaching, community formation, political participation, to more confrontational movements. Its form and intensity are greatly influenced by political conditions, social structures, government policies, and the historical experiences of society in each country. Therefore, fundamentalism needs to be understood as a complex phenomenon and cannot be simplified as a movement rejecting modernity or a threat to the state. Fundamentalism has also developed as a global phenomenon, emerging in various religious and political contexts. Its development can be found in societies with different religious backgrounds, political systems, and histories. The emergence of these movements is related, among other things, to the perception of some groups that modernization and secularization have brought changes that threaten religious identity and authority. Changes in family structure, social morality, education, culture, and political life can be perceived as signs of the diminishing influence of religion in the public sphere. In such conditions, fundamentalism can be a means to maintain religious identity while reaffirming the role of religion in communal life.

One important issue related to this phenomenon is the changing position of religious institutions in modern society. In the process of secularization, religion, in a number of contexts, experiences differentiation from political, educational, economic, and public life institutions. As a result, religion's authority in determining social norms and public policy can change. For fundamentalist groups, this change can be seen as a threat to the sustainability of religious values. They then seek to return religion to the public sphere and make it one of the foundations for building social and political order (Ciftci et al., 2016). However, the relationship between secularization and fundamentalism cannot be understood simply as a cause-and-effect relationship. Secularization does not always produce fundamentalism, nor does fundamentalism emerge solely because of secularization. The emergence of fundamentalist movements is also influenced by various other factors, such as dissatisfaction with the government, social and economic inequality, identity crises, cultural change, political marginalization, globalization, and the failure of state

institutions to meet societal expectations. Thus, fundamentalism is more accurately understood as a phenomenon formed through the interaction between religious factors and broader socio-political conditions.

In the study of religion and politics, the term fundamentalism itself has various meanings. Scholars differ in their views on its origins, characteristics, factors of emergence, and relationship to modernity. Some view fundamentalism as a movement that re-emphasizes the basic teachings of religion and upholds the authority of sacred texts. Meanwhile, other perspectives place it within the context of social and political change, particularly as a response to modernization, secularization, globalization, and the marginalization of certain groups. These differing perspectives demonstrate that fundamentalism is a multidimensional phenomenon that cannot be explained from a single perspective. One scholar who has devoted significant attention to the relationship between religion and politics in modern society is Jeffrey Haynes. He is an academic and researcher who has extensively studied the relationship between religion and politics, democracy, globalization, international relations, and the development of fundamentalism in various societal contexts (Haynes, 2020a). Haynes's thinking is important because he does not position religion as a separate phenomenon from the dynamics of modern politics. Instead, religion is understood as a social force that continues to have the ability to influence identity, political behavior, the legitimacy of power, conflict, and the process of social change.

Several of Haynes's works, such as Religion and Politics in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa, An Introduction to International Relations and Religion, and The Routledge Handbook of Religion and Politics, demonstrate a strong interest in the dynamics of the relationship between religion and politics in various regions. Through his thinking, the phenomenon of fundamentalism can be analyzed not only as a theological issue but also as a response to the social, political, and global changes taking place in modern society (Haynes, 2021). Therefore, this study aims to examine Jeffrey Haynes's thoughts on religious fundamentalism, particularly in relation to the development of modernity, secularization, globalization, and state politics. This study is crucial for understanding why religion continues to hold a significant position in political life even as society has entered the modern era and the advent of information technology. Furthermore, this study seeks to examine how fundamentalism emerged as a form of religious response to socio-political change and how the relationship between religious movements and the state develops in the modern political context. Through Haynes's perspective, fundamentalism can be understood more comprehensively as a phenomenon that exists at the intersection of religion, identity, modernity, and political power.

METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach that aims to deeply uncover the relationship between religious fundamentalism and state politics in the modern era through an analysis of Jeffrey Haynes's thought. This approach was chosen because the research focuses on understanding the meaning, ideas, arguments, and theoretical constructs that have developed in studies of the relationship between religion and politics. The descriptive nature is used to systematically describe how fundamentalism is understood, positioned, and interacts with modern political structures based on Haynes's perspective. Data collection was conducted through library research by examining various sources relevant to the research focus. Primary sources were obtained from Jeffrey Haynes's works discussing the relationship between religion and politics, fundamentalism, secularization, globalization, and the dynamics of modern politics. Meanwhile, secondary sources were obtained from books, scientific journal articles, and various relevant academic literature and used to strengthen the interpretation and analysis of Haynes's thought. All of these sources were critically reviewed to gain a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of religious fundamentalism and its relationship to state politics (Creswell, 2016).

Data analysis used the Miles and Huberman interactive analysis model, which includes three main stages: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing and verification. In the reduction stage, data relevant to the research focus is selected and grouped by theme. Next, the data is presented systematically to facilitate the interpretation process (Miles et al., 2014). The final stage is carried out by drawing conclusions and verifying the research findings. This study uses the theory of religious fundamentalism developed by Marty and Appleby, which views fundamentalism through characteristics such as claims to absolute truth, a tendency to return to sacred texts, efforts to build a socio-political order based on religion, and resistance to the currents of modernity. Through this framework, the study analyzes fundamentalism as a response to secularization and modernity while also examining how modern states respond to the emergence and development of religious fundamentalist movements.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Religious Fundamentalism

The word "fundamentalism" comes from the Latin "fundamentum," meaning base. The term "fundamentalism" originally emerged in American Christian circles in the early 20th century, referring to a group of Christians who fought to uphold the basic teachings of Christianity according to their understanding of the Bible. However, today, the word "fundamentalism" has become a trademark applied to all religions (Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and others) that strive to maintain their fundamental teachings in a conservative manner, where the texts of Scripture tend to be understood literally without considering the context. Christian followers' resistance to state domination over society, which has marginalized the role of religion as a result of secularization, then developed into an ideology and spread massively, especially in parts of the Islamic world. The implications of this ideological spread have affected the country's religious, political, and economic relations. Etymologically, fundamentalism derives from the word "fundamen," meaning "basis." The term fundamentalism is often replaced by the terms "revivalism, militancy, resurgence, activism, and reconstruction" (Dekmejian, 1985).

Meanwhile, terminologically, fundamentalism is a school of religious thought that tends to interpret religious texts rigidly and literally. According to Bassam Tibi, fundamentalism is an ideological phenomenon that emerged in response to the problems of globalization, fragmentation, and the clash of civilizations. However, in subsequent developments, fundamentalist agitation resulted in chaos, not only in the Islamic world, but throughout the world. According to Jeffrey Haynes, religious fundamentalism is a response to modernity and secularization with the main characteristics of literal interpretation, exclusivism, and the politicization of religion. Bealey argues that fundamentalism is a strong belief in and adherence to the foundations of religion. Marty and Scott Appleby concluded the following definition of religious fundamentalism, namely they are people who have a series of strategies, in which believers who are besieged try to preserve their distinctive identity as a nation or a group (Haynes, 2020b).

The goal of fundamentalism is to maintain the foundations of belief and to combat attempts to reinterpret the Bible and theology in light of modern knowledge. Christianity is considered an adequate religion as stated by the Church Fathers (Mudhofir, 1996). Fundamentalism that emerges in any religious tradition is not a monolithic phenomenon. Its emergence can be caused by the religious understanding held by a group of religious adherents regarding the doctrines of sacred texts, but it can also arise as a reaction to social, political, and even cultural depression that alienates the values of religious spirituality, even uprooting religious values from the modern life scene with a pile of Occident-centric isms. Subjectivist and objectivist approaches to understanding the constructions that shape and are shaped by the reality of religious fundamentalism are also used in it.

Characteristics of Religious Fundamentalism

It is well known that every religion has fundamentalist groups that certainly have different characteristics and traits from one another. However, they still share the same basic essence of the movement as an effort to purify religion. In general, the characteristics of religious fundamentalism include literal interpretation of sacred texts, rejection of pluralism, deprivatization, and intolerance. According to Jalaluddin Rahmat, fundamentalism can be viewed from four perspectives. First, fundamentalism is seen as a movement of imitation (taqlid). Second, fundamentalism is seen as a reaction to modernism. Third, fundamentalism is seen as a reaction to modernization. Fourth, fundamentalism is seen as a belief in a religion as an alternative ideology. Meanwhile, according to Amin Rais, fundamentalism is, first, a movement within a religious community that wants to return to the original basic principles or foundations of religion. Second, it is a movement based on a sense of religious fanaticism that is arbitrary and anti-modernization (Rais, 1986). In line with other thinkers, George M. Marsden describes three basic characteristics of the fundamentalist movement. First, the movement opposes modern understanding or thinking. Second, it views secular culture negatively. Third, be uncompromising and, if necessary, be radical in upholding fundamental beliefs (Marsden, 2006).

In the context of Islamic fundamentalism, according to Martyn E. Marty, it can be identified by four characteristics. First, fundamentalism is "oppositionalism." Islamic fundamentalism calls on its followers to oppose perceived threats or enemies, including modernity, secularization, liberalization, and Western values in general. Second, hermeneutics is rejected. For Islamic fundamentalists, the text of the Quran must be understood literally, or taqlid, that is, imitating or following authorized interpretations. They disagree with a critical and rational approach to interpreting the Quran, or ijtihad, because human reasoning is unable to determine the essential

meaning of the Quran. Third, fundamentalists reject religious pluralism because this principle contradicts the values of the Quran as God's final revelation and confuses one's faith. Fourth, fundamentalists reject historical and sociological developments because they distract spiritual attention from adhering to literal doctrine and understanding the scriptures.

Jeffery Haynes, a scientist and expert in the field of religious and political relations, explains that religious fundamentalist movements can be recognized through the following characteristics:

1. The desire to return to the basics of religious traditions and get rid of unnecessary additions.
2. An aggressive rejection of Western secular modernity.
3. The identity of the opposition minority group is maintained exclusively and militantly.
4. An attempt to reclaim public space as a space of religious and moral purity.
5. Patriarchal and hierarchical order between the sexes.
6. Being harsh towards fellow religious believers who they believe are too lax in upholding religious obligations.
7. Social conservatism.
8. Positioning his group as a “just” group against the “unjust” ruling party.

Differences between Traditionalism and Fundamentalism

Traditionalism and fundamentalism are two religious movements viewed by the general public as displaying a rigid facade and resistance to the liberalizing currents of modernity. In reality, however, these two movements have distinct characteristics, based on opposing epistemologies, perspectives on social change, and interpretations of religious texts. Traditionalism views religion as a teaching integrated with social, customary, and cultural practices, thus tending to uphold religious values passed down through generations in society. Fundamentalism, on the other hand, seeks to restore the literal purification of religion based on sacred texts, as practiced by earlier generations of adherents, and views modernity as a threat to religious authority. It is crucial for the public to understand the differences between these two movements in order to objectively view and assess them. Understanding the difference between traditionalism and fundamentalism is a form of socio-religious literacy essential for modern society. Without this understanding, society will easily become trapped in black-and-white polarization, easily incited against each other, and lose its compass in distinguishing between groups that are maintaining peace (traditionalists) and those that are forcing ideological uniformity (fundamentalists).

A different opinion comes from Martin Riesebrodt, who states that traditionalism is part of fundamentalism. Martin Riesebrodt identifies three typologies of fundamentalism: radical traditionalism, culturalism, and mobilization of the common people. It is called radical traditionalism because fundamentalism arises from the tension between tradition and modernity. Various changes resulting from industrialization and secularization continue to force traditionalist communities to maintain tradition and resist change. Meanwhile, the most prominent characteristic of this typology is the ability of fundamentalist communities to mobilize the masses, not only in terms of numbers but also in terms of militancy (Sirry, 2003).

Table 1. The differences between traditionalism and fundamentalism

No	Aspects of Difference	Traditionalism	Fundamentalism
1	Attitude towards History	Appreciating history as a heritage that must be preserved is part of the social process and religious practices.	Rejecting history because the best history was in the early golden age phase
2	Attitude towards Culture	Caring for & preserving culture as part of social processes & religious practices	Viewing culture as a threat and rival that can pollute the purity of sacred texts
3	Attitude towards politics	Tends to be adaptive and supportive of legitimate authority	Politics as an ideological tool to change the system & state structure according to sacred texts
4	Attitudes Towards Technology	Be alert, selective and slow to respond	Be open as a media to spread their understanding more widely.
5	Attitudes Towards Liberalism & Secularism	Rejected because it was seen as damaging the social order	Rejected because it was seen as disobeying God's law

Factors Causing the Emergence of the Religious Fundamentalism Movement

Advances in science and technology have driven the flow of modernization across various aspects of human life. The aspects of modernization that have occurred and brought about changes in society include urbanization, industrialization, secularization, democratization, education, and media participation. All of these aspects have given rise to changes in social structures that have significantly impacted the existence of religion. Religion, which initially served as a system of life guidance, social values, and human morality, has been eroded when modernization was accompanied by the virus of secularization, which separated religion from the state, politics, economics, education, and public space. Secularization is a phenomenon of shifting perspectives on the relationship between God, humanity, and nature: is it transcendent or immanent in human life? The phenomenon of secularization can be seen in almost all aspects of human life, such as education, politics, social life, culture, and religion. Secularization is a complex and global social phenomenon. As a religious movement, religious fundamentalism has a strong strategy in strengthening its mission: restoring religion as the foundation of individual life and state governance. In the view of fundamentalists, the negative impacts of secularization and modernity pose a major threat to the survival of religion and the state.

This fact is the main factor causing the emergence of fundamentalism. Other factors that encourage the increasingly massive development of Islamic fundamentalists are poor governance, high levels of unemployment, the failure of the current of modernization, the negative implications of the globalization project [westernization], Western hegemony and imperialism [Europe and America], urbanization, limited industrialization, and the growth of a class of citizens who are disappointed [with the performance of the regime]. According to Jeffery Haynes, there are three factors that cause the rise of the religious fundamentalist movement, namely:

1. The Failure of Modernity
   In the fundamentalist view, secular ideology and liberalism lead to instability in the provision of social justice and a shift in the meaning of life, leading to a more materialistic society and a crisis of religiosity. This is a driving force behind the failure of modernity.
2. Globalization & Religious Identity
   The flow of information, social, cultural and economic changes in the West were seen as a threat to local cultural sovereignty, thus triggering a longing for a more stable religious identity.
3. Political Marginalization
   Marginalized community groups who do not have the right to make decisions, whose justice and welfare are neglected by the secular ruling elite, use religion as a tool for mobilizing systemic political change in the country.

Relationship Dynamics Religion & State Politics

Religion and state politics are two important elements that influence the policies of rulers and religious scholars in determining the structure of state governance and social order. According to Émile Durkheim, religion is a system of beliefs and practices related to sacred matters that unite its adherents into a moral community (Durkheim, 1912). The function of religion is as a source of values and spirituality that regulates the relationship between humans and God, humans with each other, and humans with the universe. Furthermore, religion is often used as a tool of legitimacy to consolidate power and political mobilization based on group identity. Its positive side is strengthening solidarity, but its negative side sometimes triggers social polarization that gives rise to radical actions, such as intolerance, violence, and intergroup or interreligious conflict. In some countries, religion serves as the basis for legitimacy for state policy. For rulers, religious symbols and teachings are used to gain public trust and strengthen state authority. Likewise, society uses religion as a moral force and a means of control against abuse of power by those in power.

State politics is the process of managing power within a country to determine public policy and regulate the lives of its people. Harold D. Lasswell defined politics as "who gets what, when, and how," that is, the process of determining who obtains what, when, and by what means (Lasswell, 1936). State politics functions as a mechanism for governing that regulates order, justice, and the welfare of society. State politics includes the implementation of laws, the distribution of power, and the resolution of various legal, social, economic, and cultural issues faced by society. History has shown that the relationship between religion and state politics in various countries is not always harmonious. Sometimes the two go hand in hand and support each other, but sometimes they also conflict. In the era of modernization, the relationship between religion and state politics has become increasingly important due to the emergence of various phenomena such as secularization, the

rise of religious fundamentalism, identity politics, and globalization. Jeffery Haynes emphasized three models of the relationship between religion and state politics, namely:

1. Integral Model
   The integralist model is one in which religion and the state act as a complementary whole. Religious law serves as the legal basis for the state, and political leaders are also considered religious leaders. An example of this model can be found in Iran.
2. From the Secular Model
   The secular model is one in which the roles of religion and state politics are strictly separated from public life. The state maintains a neutral stance toward religion and does not base public policy on any particular religious doctrine. France is an example of a country that implements the principle of laïcité.
3. Symbiotic Model
   The symbiotic model is one in which religion and state politics are mutually dependent and share roles in running the nation. Religion provides moral legitimacy, while the state guarantees freedom and protection for religious life. Indonesia is a prominent example of this model because the state is not based on a particular religion but still recognizes the role of religion in public life.

The Development of Christian, Islamic & Jewish Fundamentalism

The increasingly widespread development of modernization throughout the world has influenced the dynamics of religious life and become one context for the emergence of fundamentalist movements. Initially expected to drive social, economic, and political progress, modernity has, in some circumstances, been unable to fully resolve the various problems facing society. Social inequality, economic problems, political crises, and a weakening of value orientations are factors that can give rise to disappointment with the modern system. These conditions then encourage some religious groups to seek a more solid foundation of values through strengthening religious teachings. In addition to modernization, globalization and industrialization have also brought about major changes in societal patterns. These changes not only provide technological and economic advancements but also raise concerns about shifts in religious norms and values. Some groups view various social phenomena, such as abortion and promiscuous sexual behavior, as forms of deviation that contradict religious moral principles. This perception of change then gives rise to a more assertive and resistive religious response. It is in this context that various fundamentalist movements have developed within the Christian, Islamic, and Jewish traditions, including in Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, the United States, Israel, and Saudi Arabia (Al-Anani, 2019).

According to Jeffrey Haynes, Christian, Jewish, and Islamic fundamentalism share a common basic orientation: the effort to place religion in a stronger and more optimal position in social and political life. However, these three forms of fundamentalism developed within different historical backgrounds and socio-political conditions. Christian fundamentalism initially developed in response to the emergence of liberal interpretations of religion, which were seen as diminishing the authority and truth of religious doctrine. Therefore, this movement reaffirmed the importance of the basic doctrines of faith and the authority of scripture, understood literally. Over time, Christian fundamentalism emerged in various Western countries through forms of religious conservatism, political evangelicalism, and moral movements that opposed liberal tendencies in social life. Meanwhile, Islamic fundamentalism developed within the context of socio-political issues, such as poverty, injustice, failed development, and low public trust in government. Jewish fundamentalism, on the other hand, is closely linked to efforts to maintain religious identity, as well as the political dynamics and territorial conflict between Israel and Palestine. Thus, despite their similar orientations, the emergence of fundamentalism in these three religious traditions was influenced by different historical and socio-political contexts.

The Development of Christian Fundamentalism in America

Fundamentalism initially emerged in the United States, originating from Protestant Christian groups around the 1910s. They believed that the Bible was absolute truth governing humankind in matters of faith in Jesus Christ, morality, and social life. This Protestant Christian group strongly opposed the development of Darwin's theory of evolution, which concluded that humans were not created from the ground, as recorded in the Bible. Rather, according to Darwin's theory, humans evolved from the lowest creatures (such as apes) to the perfect form of humankind. The world was also not created in six days, as recorded in the Book of Genesis in the Old Testament of the Bible, but rather this universe evolved to its

present form and is still undergoing an evolutionary process (Darwin et al., 2023). Darwin's theory shook the faith of the Protestant Church in America and triggered a schism.

In the early 1940s, evangelicals and fundamentalist Christians began to disagree over whether to separate from modern culture (the fundamentalist approach) or engage with it. One organization that leaned heavily toward separation from modernity was the American Council of Christian Churches, founded in 1941 by Reverend Carl McIntire. Another group, aimed at conservative Christians seeking cultural engagement, was the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), founded in 1942 by Harold Ockenga. Until the 1970s, Christian fundamentalists in the United States were often apolitical, in some cases even isolating themselves from the public sphere. Over time, however, many of them began to realize that withdrawing from the world was self-defeating, as they could not hope to change what they saw as deeply undesirable developments intrinsically linked to modernization and secularization. In recent years, Christian fundamentalists in the United States have become increasingly vocal and influential political constituents. Besides America, Christian fundamentalism is growing in other countries such as Nigeria, Africa, and Latin America. Among the driving forces of Christian fundamentalism are Bob Jones, J. Gresham Machen, and William Jennings Bryan (Bermanis et al., 2004).

Christian fundamentalists are characterized by a strong, firm, and militant commitment to a number of fundamental principles of faith. These principles serve as the primary foundation for maintaining their religious identity and beliefs. First, they believe in the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible as the authoritative source for determining the truth of faith. Second, they believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ and His virgin birth. Third, they believe that Christ's death was a substitutive sacrifice and atonement for humanity. Fourth, they believe in Christ's bodily resurrection after death. Fifth, they believe in Christ's second coming as an essential part of Christian eschatological doctrine. In addition to adhering to these five principles, Christian fundamentalism is also characterized by what has been called a "separatist mentality." This attitude refers to the tendency to establish strict religious boundaries with individuals or groups perceived as not accepting or committed to these fundamental principles. Thus, religious identity is maintained through the affirmation of doctrine and separation from views deemed contradictory (Simms, 2002).

The Development of Islamic Fundamentalism in Egypt

Islamic fundamentalism first emerged in Egypt around 1928 through the Muslim Brotherhood, founded by Imam Hasan Al-Banna. This organization was committed to rejecting Western cultural influences and highlighting the moral decline following the fall of the Ottoman Caliphate. Following its founding, the Muslim Brotherhood underwent five phases of development that drove the organization's transformation, from a da'wah movement to an influential political organization in Egypt. The first phase was the founding and da'wah phase (1928–1930). The movement focused on fostering the community through education and the construction of mosques, schools, and social activities. During this phase, the Muslim Brotherhood experienced rapid growth, especially in large cities (Leon, 2014).

The second phase was the political and confrontational phase (1940–1950s). In this phase, Sayyid Qutb, a key figure in the Muslim Brotherhood, introduced a new ideology, modern jahiliyyah, which described the human condition at that time when it no longer accepted the authority of Allah SWT, but accepted man-made laws. In Sayyid Qutb's view, when humans accepted man-made laws, they had deified others and committed shirk. In 1948, members of the Muslim Brotherhood assassinated Egyptian Prime Minister Mahmud Fahmi Al-Nuqrashi. A year later, Imam Hasan Al-Banna was assassinated by government agents. The third phase was the repression and underground movement phase (1950–1970s). In this phase, President Gamal Abdul Nasser banned the Muslim Brotherhood from operating and imprisoned thousands of its members. They were tortured and executed, including Sayyid Qutb. Many Muslim Brotherhood figures fled abroad and spread their ideas globally (Juergensmeyer, 2010).

The fourth phase is the political reintegration phase (1970–2010). During this phase, Egypt was led by President Anwar Sadat. He released members of the Muslim Brotherhood from prison to stem socialist influence and provide opportunities for Muslim Brotherhood members to preach and participate in politics. Then, during the leadership of President Hosni Mubarak, Muslim Brotherhood members were allowed to participate in elections. The fifth phase is the peak-and-decline phase (2011–present). In 2011, the Muslim Brotherhood founded a political party called the Freedom and Justice Party. In 2012, the Muslim Brotherhood won the democratic election and installed Mohamed Morsi as President of Egypt. However, his leadership only lasted one year because Mohamed Morsi was overthrown by the military led by Abdel Fattah al-Sisi (Friedland, 2011).

The Development of Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel.

Just as Christian fundamentalism and Islamic fundamentalism reject the currents of modernization and secularization in their countries, so too has Jewish fundamentalism emerged as a movement that strongly opposes modernization and secularization. Since the establishment of the State of Israel as a homeland for the Jewish people in 1948, there has been a fierce controversy in the country over whether it should become a modern, Western-style state—that is, one in which religion is largely privatized—or a Jewish state with Jewish law and customs taking precedence over secular rules (Glendinning & Bruce, 2011). The fundamentalist impulse in Israel has its roots in events that occurred long before the establishment of the state in 1948. Since the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 CE (see Jerusalem, Temple), most Jews have lived in the Diaspora, that is, scattered far from the land of Israel promised to the Jewish people by God according to the Hebrew Bible. During their prolonged "exile" (Hebrew: *galut*), Jews throughout the world prayed daily for the coming of the Messiah, who would lead them back to Israel and free them from their non-Jewish oppressors (Moro, 2005).

In the late 19th century, some Jews, particularly secular intellectuals such as Theodor Herzl (1860–1904), a Viennese journalist and playwright, concluded that the age-old problem of anti-Semitism could only be resolved by the establishment of a Jewish state. Zionism, the movement to establish a Jewish state in Palestine, thus represented a secularization of traditional messianic themes. Rather than waiting for God and the Messiah to lead the Jews back to the land of Israel, Zionists argued that Jews should take the initiative to return there themselves (Köhrsen, 2012). For Herzl and his closest associates, the messianic aspect of this "gathering of the exiles" was irrelevant; the key point was to create a state where Jews would no longer be subject to Gentile rule. Jewish fundamentalism in Israel flourished. At least three Jewish fundamentalist groups dominated the public and political spheres. First, the militant Zionists. Second, the ultra-Orthodox Ashkenazim (Jews from Western Europe) and the ultra-Orthodox Sephardim (Jews from the Middle East), represented by the Shas Party. These three groups desire the enactment of strict Jewish laws and the observance of morality as outlined in Jewish sacred texts, such as the Torah and Talmud. They agreed to establish a Jewish state (Ciftci et al., 2016).

The idea of establishing a state based on Jewish identity has been strengthened in Israeli political developments, particularly through the policies of the Benjamin Netanyahu government and the enactment of the Basic Law: Israel – The Nation State of the Jewish People in 2018. This development affirms Israel's position as a nation-state for the Jewish people and further strengthens the Jewish identity dimension in state life. This situation indicates a significant shift in the debate over the character of the Israeli state, which since its inception has faced a tug-of-war between the principles of modern democracy, equality of citizens, and demands to maintain the state's Jewish character. This strengthening of religious and national identity also has implications for the dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Policies that place Jewish identity as a central element in state construction are seen by some as narrowing the political and social space for Palestinian society. In the context of the long-running conflict, these issues relate not only to religion but also to territory, citizenship, political rights, economic access, and the issue of Palestinian sovereignty. Thus, Jewish fundamentalism is closely linked to the political dynamics and territorial conflicts in the region (Turner, 2001).

The research findings show that religious fundamentalism is a phenomenon that cannot be understood solely as a matter of literal religious understanding, but must be placed within the context of social, political, cultural, and global change. The development of fundamentalism demonstrates the response of some religious groups to changes they perceive as threatening their authority, identity, and fundamental religious values. In this context, fundamentalism can be understood as a form of religious articulation that emerges when some members of society feel that modernity, secularization, liberalization, and globalization have brought about changes that deviate too far from the religious principles they believe in. Historically, the term fundamentalism originated in the Protestant Christian environment in the United States in the early 20th century. Its emergence was related to efforts to defend a number of basic Christian doctrines from the influence of liberal theology and the development of modern thought. This issue demonstrates that fundamentalism has had a close relationship with social and intellectual change from the beginning. This means that fundamentalism is not simply a form of religiosity that emerges spontaneously, but rather a response to certain situations perceived as threatening to the beliefs and identity of the group (Kinnvall, 2004). Subsequent developments show that the term fundamentalism is used to describe various religious movements in other religions, although their character and background are not always the same.

From Jeffery Haynes' perspective, fundamentalism can be understood as a form of religious response to modernity and secularization. Characteristics such as a tendency to return to religious fundamentals, a rejection of certain aspects of secular modernity, identity exclusivism, and efforts to restore religion to the public sphere demonstrate that fundamentalism has strong social and political dimensions. Therefore, fundamentalism cannot be sufficiently explained through a theological approach. Analysis of this phenomenon requires attention to the underlying societal conditions, including issues of injustice, political marginalization, cultural change, and identity crises. Research findings support this view. Fundamentalism emerges not only from a desire to maintain the purity of religious teachings, but also from changes in social structures that create uncertainty for certain groups (Salzman, 2008). Modernization through urbanization, industrialization, technological development, democratization, education, and the media has transformed patterns of social life. These changes generate various opportunities, but can also create inequality, alienation, and feelings of loss of identity. In such circumstances, religion can function as a source of stability and collective identity.

Marty and Scott Appleby's perspective on fundamentalism as a strategy for a group of believers who feel "besieged" to maintain their distinct identity is relevant in explaining this phenomenon. Feelings of threat can arise from various factors, such as cultural threats, political pressure, moral change, or the dominance of a particular group (Losurdo & Hedges, 2026). Therefore, fundamentalism is essentially not only about what a group believes, but also about how that group maintains the boundaries of its identity when faced with changes in the social environment. One important characteristic found is the tendency to understand sacred texts literally. Literal interpretation serves as a mechanism to maintain doctrinal certainty. In facing a modern society characterized by value relativism and diverse interpretations, fundamentalist groups tend to position religious texts as the final source of truth. This attitude provides a sense of certainty because the meaning of religion is not entirely left to the changing times. However, the consequence is limited space for contextual interpretation of religious texts.

The next characteristic is the rejection of pluralism. From a fundamentalist perspective, religious pluralism or a particular ideology can be seen as a threat to the purity of belief. The problem becomes more complex when these beliefs are brought into the public sphere and used to determine how society should be governed. At this point, fundamentalism has the potential to transform from a religious orientation into a socio-political project. Religion is no longer merely a personal guideline, but becomes the basis for shaping the order of societal life. This relates to the concept of the deprivatization of religion. Fundamentalism demonstrates that religion does not always accept a position as a private matter, as assumed in some secularization theories. Fundamentalist groups instead seek to bring religion back into the public sphere, including in matters of morality, law, education, public policy, and politics (Kindermann et al., 2024). This phenomenon serves as evidence that the relationship between religion and modernity is complex. Modernization does not automatically eliminate religion, but can encourage the emergence of new forms of religious involvement in the public sphere.

The distinction between traditionalism and fundamentalism is also an important finding in this study. While both can uphold religious values and demonstrate resistance to certain changes, they have different orientations. Traditionalism tends to maintain religious continuity with inherited history, customs, culture, and social practices. Meanwhile, fundamentalism emphasizes the purification of religion based on basic principles and sacred texts and tends to view some modern developments as threats to religious authority. Therefore, not all groups that are conservative or maintain tradition can be categorized as fundamentalists. Martin Riesebrodt's view provides a different nuance to this dichotomy. Traditionalism can become a form of fundamentalism when it transforms into a mobilization movement that actively opposes modernity and seeks to change the socio-political order. This means that the line between traditionalism and fundamentalism is not always absolute (Peels & Kindermann, 2024). Factors that differentiate the two include orientation toward change, ways of understanding religious texts, mobilization strategies, and relationships with political power.

An analysis of the factors contributing to the emergence of fundamentalism indicates three main factors, as emphasized by Jeffery Haynes: the failure of modernity, globalization, religious identity, and political marginalization. First, the failure of modernity relates to the inability of the modern system to provide adequate answers to various social and moral problems. When modernization results in social inequality, injustice, moral crisis, or alienation, some people may question the effectiveness of secular values in providing orientation to life. Second, globalization accelerates the encounter between different

cultures and ideologies. The increasingly open flow of information exposes society to intensely differing values. For certain groups, this situation can be perceived as a threat to local and religious identity. Therefore, strengthening religious identity can be a strategy to counter cultural homogenization or the dominance of values perceived as originating from the West. Fundamentalism in this context is not simply a rejection of modernity, but also an effort to maintain collective identity (Vellenga, 1994).

Third, political marginalization is a crucial factor in explaining the transformation of religion into a political force. When certain groups feel they lack fair access to power, public policy, economic resources, or decision-making processes, religion can be used as a language of resistance and a means of mobilization. At this point, religion functions not only as a belief system but also as a source of political legitimacy and collective identity. This relationship is clearly evident in the dynamics of religion and state politics. Based on Haynes's analysis, the relationship between religion and the state can be understood through integralist, secularist, and symbiotic models. The integralist model places religion and the state in a very close relationship, such that religious principles become a crucial part of the legal and governmental systems. The secularist model separates religion from the state's political structure and places the state in a neutral position toward religion (Moaddel & Karabenick, 2018). Meanwhile, the symbiotic model places religion and the state in a mutually dependent relationship, where the state provides space and protection for religious life, while religion contributes morally to public life.

These three models demonstrate that there is no single pattern of the relationship between religion and the state. Each country has a distinct history and political structure. Therefore, fundamentalism also produces different consequences depending on the political structure in which the movement develops. In closed political systems, fundamentalist movements can develop into opposition or underground movements. In more open political systems, these movements can enter elections, form parties, or use democratic institutions as a means to advance religious agendas. The development of Christian fundamentalism in the United States demonstrates a shift from a defensive stance to political engagement. Initially, some fundamentalists chose to distance themselves from modern culture and the political sphere. However, social changes, particularly related to moral issues and secularization, have encouraged some groups to enter the public sphere (Emerson & Hartman, 2006). This phenomenon demonstrates that fundamentalism is not always synonymous with isolation. When fundamentalist groups recognize that social change is influenced by political policy, political involvement can be seen as a strategy to uphold religious values.

The phenomenon in Egypt presents a different picture. The development of the Muslim Brotherhood demonstrates the movement's transformation from preaching and social activities to political involvement. The relationship between the movement and the state changes depending on the ruling regime. Repression at certain times actually encourages some movements to develop underground, while subsequent political changes open up space for political participation. This experience demonstrates that political marginalization can be a factor that strengthens religious mobilization. Meanwhile, Jewish fundamentalism in Israel demonstrates the strong link between religion, identity, nationalism, and state politics. The debate over the character of the Israeli state demonstrates that religious issues cannot be separated from questions of national identity and state structure (Haynes, 2009). Certain religious groups desire a stronger position for Jewish law and norms in state life. This demonstrates that fundamentalism can interact with nationalism and produce complex forms of identity politics.

A comparison of these three cases reveals both similarities and differences. The similarity lies in the shared efforts to strengthen religion's position in public life and respond to modern changes perceived as threatening religious identity or authority. The differences lie in historical factors, political context, organizational forms, and strategies employed. Christian fundamentalism developed within the context of theological and moral debate and later entered electoral politics. Islamic fundamentalism in Egypt developed within the context of political crisis, marginalization, and the struggle to establish a socio-political order more in line with Islamic values. Jewish fundamentalism developed within the context of national identity, land, history, and the relationship between the state's Jewish character and the modern political system (Gierycz, 2020). Thus, the research findings confirm that religious fundamentalism should not be understood simply as a rejection of modernity. Fundamentalism is a phenomenon with both theological and socio-political dimensions. It can be a response to identity crises, the failure of modernity, political marginalization, and global change. Jeffery Haynes's thinking helps explain that religious revival can actually occur

simultaneously with modernization. Modernity does not eliminate religion, but rather changes how it interacts with society and the state.

From this perspective, the relationship between fundamentalism and state politics is dynamic and reciprocal. The state can limit, open, or direct political space for religious groups. Conversely, fundamentalist groups can influence policy, political identity, the legitimacy of power, and the direction of public life. Therefore, understanding fundamentalism requires an approach that looks beyond religious doctrine to the power structures and social conditions surrounding it. Research findings ultimately show that the rise of fundamentalism is an indicator that religion remains vibrant in modern society. Secularization and liberalization do not automatically eliminate religion from the public sphere (Haynes, 2021). Conversely, when modernity is perceived as failing to provide justice, meaning, and identity, religion can again become a source of socio-political orientation and mobilization. However, religious involvement in politics has two potential consequences. On the one hand, religion can strengthen solidarity, morality, and control over power. On the other hand, when accompanied by exclusivism, claims of absolute truth, and a rejection of plurality, such involvement can increase polarization and conflict. Therefore, the main issue is not merely whether religion is present in politics, but how this presence of religion is constructed, negotiated, and managed in a pluralistic society.

CONCLUSION

Based on an analysis of Jeffrey Haynes's ideas in Chapter 11 of the book Religion and Politics, it can be concluded that while the currents of modernity—particularly secularization and liberalization—influence state politics, religion remains present and plays a significant role in shaping political orientations, legitimizing power, and mobilizing collective identities in the public sphere. The rise of religious fundamentalism represents a socio-political response to the developments of modernity, secularization, and globalization. Haynes asserts that the process of secularization in modern states has not succeeded in entirely removing religion from the political arena; indeed, in various contexts, secularization can actually trigger stronger forms of religious resistance, such as fundamentalist movements. This situation demonstrates that the relationship between religion and state is dialectical and mutually influential, constantly evolving in response to the surrounding social, economic, and political contexts. Consequently, fundamentalism in modern politics should not be viewed solely as a threat to the state order; it can also be understood as a form of critique regarding issues perceived to stem from modernity—particularly those concerning justice, identity, and the search for life's meaning. Thus, Haynes's insights offer a crucial contribution to understanding the complex relationship between state politics and religion in the modern era—a relationship that is continually subject to negotiation within the exercise of power and contemporary public life.

REFERENCES

Al-Anani, K. (2019). The Inclusion-Moderation Thesis: Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University PressNew York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1332

Bermanis, S., Canetti-Nisim, D., & Pedahzur, A. (2004). Religious fundamentalism and the extreme right-wing camp in Israel. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *38*(2), 159–176. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313220410001692358

Ciftci, S., Nawaz, M. A., & Sydiq, T. (2016). Globalization, Contact, and Religious Identity: A Cross-National Analysis of Interreligious Favorability*. *Social Science Quarterly*, *97*(2), 271–292. https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12221

Creswell. (2016). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Darwin, D., Rafli, Z., & Lustyantie, N. (2023). Theory-Based Mandarin Learning Anthropolinguistics in Indonesia. *International Journal of Language Education and Cultural Review*, *9*(1), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.21009/ijlecr.v9i1.32933

Dekmejian, H. (1985). *Islam in Revolution: Fundamentalism in the Arab World*. Syracuse University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1912). *The Elementary Forms of The Religious Life*. George Allen & Unwin.

Emerson, M. O., & Hartman, D. (2006). The Rise of Religious Fundamentalism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *32*(1), 127–144. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.32.061604.123141

Friedland, R. (2011). The Institutional Logic of Religious Nationalism: Sex, Violence and the Ends of History. *Politics, Religion & Ideology*, *12*(1), 65–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/21567689.2011.564403

Gierycz, M. (2020). Religion: A Source of Fundamentalism or A Safeguard Against It? *Religions*, *11*(3), 104. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11030104

Glendinning, T., & Bruce, S. (2011). Privatization or Deprivatization: British Attitudes About the Public Presence of Religion. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *50*(3), 503–516. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2011.01582.x

Haynes, J. (2009). Religion and secularism in Israel: between politics and sub- politics. In *Religion and Politics in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa* (pp. 89–106). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869482-12

Haynes, J. (2020a). Introductory thoughts about peace, politics and religion. *Religions*, *11*(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11050242

Haynes, J. (2020b). Introductory Thoughts about Peace, Politics and Religion. *Religions*, *11*(5), 242. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11050242

Haynes, J. (2021). Religion and International Relations: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It? *Religions*, *12*(5), 328. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12050328

Juergensmeyer, M. (2010). The global rise of religious nationalism. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, *64*(3), 262–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357711003736436

Kindermann, N., Peels, R., Liefbroer, A. I., & Schoonmade, L. (2024). Mapping the concept of fundamentalism: a scoping review. *Politics and Religion*, *17*(4), 648–673. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755048324000385

Kinnvall, C. (2004). Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security. *Political Psychology*, *25*(5), 741–767. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00396.x

Köhrsen, J. (2012). How religious is the public sphere? A critical stance on the debate about public religion and post-secularity. *Acta Sociologica*, *55*(3), 273–288. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699312445809

Lasswell, H. D. (1936). *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. McGraw-Hill.

Leon, N. (2014). Ethno-religious Fundamentalism and Theo-ethnocratic Politics in Israel. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, *14*(1), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/sena.12067

Losurdo, D., & Hedges, I. (2026). Fundamentalism. *International Critical Thought*, *16*(1), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/21598282.2026.2618002

Marsden, G. M. (2006). *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. York:Oxford University Press.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods*. Jakarta : Pustaka Firdaus.

Moaddel, M., & Karabenick, S. A. (2018). Religious Fundamentalism in Eight Muslim-Majority Countries: Reconceptualization and Assessment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *57*(4), 676–706. https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.12549

Moro, R. (2005). Religion and politics in the time of secularisation: The sacralisation of politics and politicisation of religion. *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions*, *6*(1), 71–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/14690760500099796

Mudhofir, A. (1996). *Kamus Teori [Theory Dictionary]*. Aliran dalam Filsafat & Teologi,(Yogyakarta,GajahaMada University Press.

Peels, R., & Kindermann, N. (2024). What are fundamentalist beliefs? *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *29*(3), 492–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2022.2138294

Rais, M. A. (1986). *Islam di Indonesia [Islam in Indonesia]*. Raja wali.

Salzman, M. B. (2008). Globalization, religious fundamentalism and the need for meaning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *32*(4), 318–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.04.006

Simms, R. (2002). “Islam is Our Politics”: a Gramscian Analysis of the Muslim Brotherhood (1928-1953). *Social Compass*, *49*(4), 563–582. https://doi.org/10.1177/0037768602049004007

Sirry, M. A. (2003). *Membendung Militansi Agama: Iman danPolitik dalam Masyarakat Modern [Containing Religious Militancy: Faith and Politics in Modern Society]*. Erlangga.

Turner, B. S. (2001). Cosmopolitan Virtue: On Religion in a Global Age. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *4*(2), 131–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310122225046

Vellenga, S. J. (1994). Tussen orthodoxie en modernisering: over fundamentalisme en de evangelische beweging in Nederland. *NTT Journal for Theology and the Study of Religion*, *48*(2), 104–116. https://doi.org/10.5117/NTT1994.48.002.VELL

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