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Abstract: Al-Irshād is an organization formed by the Arabs in present-day Indonesia in 1914, which advocates Islamic reform. This article examines its educational activities in the Dutch colonial period, elucidating the thoughts of its founder and leader, Ahmad Sūrkatī, and the process of the integration of Arabs into the host society. Sūrkatī’s thought is distinguished from other Arab reformists for its emphasis on “egalitarianism” and its lack of a tendency towards Arab nationalism. From early on, he attempted to adapt the al-Irshād schools to the colonial education system in order to attract indigenous (pribumi) students, as well. In the late 1920s, he began to be locally oriented, with a focus territorially limited to Indonesia. The educational activities of al-Irshād in the 1930s also indicated the weakening of Ḥaḍramī/Arab-orientation. By the late 1930s, the opinion of al-Irshād was decisively inclined toward integration within the host society.
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A l-Irshād (spelled Al-Irsyad in present-day Indonesian) is the most prominent organization formed by Arabs in Indonesia. It can also be counted as one of the leading advocates of Islamic reformism in Indonesia, along with Sarekat Islam, Muhammadiyah, and Persis (Persatuan Islam). Al-Irshād has operated mainly in the educational field, opening and managing modern-style Islamic schools across the country. This paper examines the educational activities of this organization in the Dutch colonial period, focusing on the thoughts of its founder and leader, Ahmad ibn Muḥammad Sūrkatī (1875/6–1943), the Sudanese ʾālim (traditional Islamic scholar).

The Arabs in Indonesia occupied a unique position in society, especially during the Dutch colonial period. Based on racial division, the government of the Dutch East Indies categorized them, together with Chinese and other Asian minorities, as “Foreign Orientals” (vreemde oosterlingen). Each group was governed by different laws and separate systems, and prevented from having a common will, but the Arabs shared a common religion with the vast majority of “natives” (inlanders), locally called the pribumi. Their economic and legal superiority to pribumis, as well as their religiously noble origin, helped them to exercise considerable influence on the local Muslim population. Arabs had been active in maritime Southeast Asia since at least the eighteenth century (Ho 2006, chap. 6). As is well known, they played an important role, especially in the beginning of the Islamic reform movement in early twentieth-century Indonesia (Noer 1973, 56–69; Steenbrink 1986, 58–62). Therefore, an investigation into their activities provides important insights into the relationship between the Islamic movement and social integration in the emerging Indonesian state.

Recent studies, however, describe al-Irshād too simply as a Ḥaḍramī organization with a separatist character. Ḥaḍramīs, meaning immigrants from Ḥaḍramawt (a region of South Arabia) and their descendants, have composed the vast majority of the Arabs in maritime Southeast Asia. Natalie Mobini-Kesheh, who investigates the activities of al-Irshād in the Dutch colonial period, argues that the early twentieth century for Arabs was the period of “nahdah Hadramiyah,” that is to say, the awakening of a distinctive Ḥaḍramī identity (Mobini-Kesheh 1999). She explains the role that the educational activities of al-Irshād played in forging Ḥaḍramī identity based on the discussion in Imagined
Communities by Benedict Anderson. According to Anderson, the Dutch colonial education system brought into being a common experience among prībumis from all over the Dutch East Indies. This common experience facilitated a sense of belongingness to the territory, helping to create an Indonesian identity (Anderson 2006, chap. 7). On the other hand, Mobini-Kesheh argues, the system of al-ʿIrshād schools (or, rather, almost all of the Arab schools) was entirely separate from the colonial education system, due to the division of the population. The school system was intended to prepare students for further education in the Middle East, mainly in Cairo. As a consequence, the graduates from the al-ʿIrshād schools came to identify themselves as Ḥaḍramīs above all, different from Indonesians (Mobini-Kesheh 1999, chap. 4).

This view fails to account for two important points concerning al-ʿIrshād. The first is its identity as an Islamic reformist organization. This oversight is notably reflected in the fact that the role that the founder and leader of al-ʿIrshād, Sūrkatī, though non-Ḥaḍramī, played in the activities of the organization is not considered. He has been regarded as one of the pioneers who introduced the discourse of the Islamic reformists of the Arab Middle East, represented by Muḥammad ʿAbduh and his disciple Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā, to the Indonesian archipelago (Hamka 1961, 30–34; Riddell 2001, 209–10). It has been pointed out, however, that the roots of modern Islamic reformist influence from the Middle East have been vaguely attributed to ʿAbduh and Riḍā, and the difference in individual reformers has almost been disregarded (Feener 2007, 29, 65; Laffan 2003, 9). The peculiarity of Sūrkatī’s thought should be clarified, considering its relation to the Ḥaḍramī organization.

The second point concerns the process of integration of the Irshādīs (members or supporters of al-ʿIrshād) into Indonesian society. Recent studies tend to emphasize the distinctive identity of Arabs, especially of Irshādīs, in the early twentieth century, and differentiate them from the development of prībumi Muslim society. Michael Laffan, although he underscores the importance of Islam in the early development of Indonesian nationalism, treats the activities of the Arabs (Ḥaḍramīs) as “a foreign movement within the bilād al-jāwa” (Laffan 2003, 189–195). His discussion focuses only on prībumi, just like other studies on Indonesian nationalism, neglecting the social bond based on shared religion across the different categories of the population.
As for the integration of Arabs into Indonesian society, much attention has been paid to the Persatoean [Partai] Arab Indonesia (Indonesian Arab Union [Party]; PAI) (Haikal 1986, chap. 5; Jonge 2004, 2009; Mobini-Kesheh 1999, chap. 7). Established in 1934 by peranakan (locally born) Arabs, the PAI advocated Indonesian nationalism, and this led to serious conflict with Irshādis and other Arabs who regarded Ḥaḍramawt as their homeland. Nevertheless, it is fallacious to discuss the whole process of the integration of Arabs only from the perspective of the PAI. Recent works by Ismail Alatas examine how the ‘Alawīs, another Arab group, have formed and strengthened the social bond with Indonesian Muslim society, utilizing their religious practice in the post-colonial period (Alatas 2011, 2014). Because most of the Irshādis chose to remain in Indonesia after independence, we should consider the process of their integration, too.

This paper aims to elucidate the reformist thought of Sūrkatī, how it developed in Indonesian society, and what role it played in the educational activities of al-Irshād. In this respect, it also demonstrates the process through which Irshādis oriented themselves toward the host society. To consider the relationship between Ḥaḍramī Irshādis and Sūrkatī, it would be helpful to contradistinguish the school (madrasah) of al-Irshād and the association (jam‘īyah) of al-Irshād. This paper also uses carefully and differently the words “Ḥaḍramī” and “Arab,” because it focuses on the non-Ḥaḍramī Arab Sūrkatī. The primary sources used in this paper are contemporary Arabic periodicals and brochures of al-Irshād. Although Sūrkatī did not write much, we can find his articles, records of interviews, and speeches in those materials.4

Sūrkatī’s Early Career

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Sūrkatī (or al-Sūrkatī, Sūrkittī) al-Anṣārī was born on the Island of ‘Arqū, near Dongola, North Sudan, in 1292/1875–6, although the date and the place are debated (Abushouk 2001, 59; 2002, 204).3 As his last name indicates, he descended from one of the Anṣār, named Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr. His family had produced many scholars, like his grandfather and father, both of whom had studied in Cairo. After receiving a basic education from his father, Sūrkatī attended several Qur’anic schools in the Dongola region. He intended to continue his studies at al-Azhar in Cairo, as his father did. However, it is said that the troubled situation in North Sudan, caused
by the Mahdist movement, did not allow him to achieve this goal. He chose the Hijaz as an alternative location to study and traveled there in 1314/1896–97. He first stayed in Madinah, and then moved to Makkah, spending fifteen years in total there, studying under several scholars, and later teaching. In 1908, Sūrkatī succeed in obtaining al-shahādah al-‘ālimiyah (certification to teach at al-Masjid al-Ḥarām) (al-Anwār 1943, 9–12).

Seemingly, it was in the Hijaz that he was first influenced by modern Islamic reformist thought. He is said to have read the works of Ibn Taymiya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, two medieval scholars who were very influential on the modern reformist movement, and also to have acquired ’Abduh’s writings and Riḍā’s journal, al-Manār (Bluhm-Warn 1997, 303; Noer 1973, 64; Pijper 1977, 110). In addition, although he had received only a traditional Islamic education, he came into contact with the trend of modern Islamic education in Makkah. When his Sudanese friend, Abūd-dūlāh Ḥamdūh, opened his Qur’anic school, he asked Sūrkatī to work with him. Compared with traditional schools, this school had new features, such as dividing students into grades and teaching arithmetic (’ilm al-ḥisāb). In 1330/1911–12, this school was transformed into a modern-style Islamic school named Madrasat al-Falāḥ (Duhaysh 1986, 19–20; al-Jabbār 1982, 165).

Sūrkatī worked at the Madrasat al-Falāḥ only for a short term, because a major turning point in his life occurred. In 1911, an Islamic organization in Indonesia named Jamʿiyyat Khayr (Benevolent Society) offered him a teaching position at its school. Founded by Ḥaḍramī merchants around 1901 in Batavia, the Jamʿiyyat Khayr operated modern-style Islamic schools in Batavia and Buitenzorg (Bogor). Sūrkatī accepted this offer and arrived with two other teachers from Makkah, Muhammad al-Tayṣīb al-Maghribī and Muhammad ibn Abūd al-Ḥamīd al-Sūdānī. Appointed as the headmaster of a school in Pekojan (an Arab district in Batavia) and the inspector of all schools, Sūrkatī succeeded in promoting the educational activities of the Jamʿiyyat Khayr. As a result, its leaders entrusted him to seek more teachers from abroad. He invited four Sudanese ’ulamā’, including his own brother, Abū al-Faḍl al-Sāṭṭī Sūrkatī in 1913 (Nājī n.d., 32).

Soon, however, severe dissension arose between Sūrkatī and the leaders of the organization. It was caused by the difference of opinion on the position of the descendants of the Prophet Muḥammad, generally
called sayyid or sharif. In Ḥaḍramawt, a clan of the descendants of Prophet Muḥammad, named ‘Alawī (or Bā ‘Alawī), traditionally had high social status. In Southeast Asia, they tried to preserve their authority and initiated the foundation of Jamʿiyat Khayr. The ‘Alawīs had enjoyed some privileges in Ḥaḍramawt society. For example, the marriage of a daughter of an ‘Alawī, called sharifah, and a man other than a descendant of Prophet had been strictly prohibited. This restriction was justified on the account that such a marriage did not fulfill the kafā’ah (suitability) of the groom to the bride with regards to nasab (pedigree) (Bujra 1967; Serjeant 1957). Nevertheless, some Arabs in Southeast Asia began to disregard this restriction on marriage. In 1913, when Sūrkatī traveled to Surakarta (Solo) during school holidays, he was asked at a certain meeting about the legality of such a marriage. He answered that the marriage could be legal, refuting superiority based on pedigree. This statement caused the ‘Alawīs of Jamʿiyat Khayr to resent him. Sūrkatī tendered his resignation.

Sūrkatī’s view on the problem of marriage was later compiled in a booklet titled Ṣūrat al-Jawāb (Form of the Answer). In it, Sūrkatī declared that Islam assures the equality of all believers:

As for the Islamic religion, as known by everyone who is acquainted with its lofty dogmas and noble principles, it is the religion of justice and equality (din al-ʿadl wa al-musāwāh). It is the religion in which reason (ʿaql) can consent to its regulations without any suppression, compulsion, or threat. […] It is the religion in which a child is not blamed for the parent’s sin, and the parent is not blamed for the child’s sin. It is the religion whose lawgiver [i.e. Muḥammad] publicly stated that, “there is no superiority of an Arab over a non-Arab (aʿjāmi), nor that of a non-Arab over an Arab except by God-fearing (taqwā), nor that of a black man (aswād) over a white man (aḥmar), nor that of a white man over a black man except by God-fearing.” (Sūrkatī 1915, 15–16)

In his opinion, because all Muslims are to be treated equally in Islamic jurisprudence, the suitability of pedigree is not a condition that must be taken into consideration in a legal marriage. The sole condition of legal marriage between two Muslims, Sūrkatī argued, was the woman’s consent, if she was adult, or the approval of her guardian(s), if she was still a minor. He maintained that what determines the superiority of a person is not “the innate quality of one’s blood and flesh (dhāt damuhu wa laḥmuhu),” like pedigree or race, but “the acquired qualities (al-sifāh), marks (al-āthār) and good education (husn al-tarbiyah)” (Sūrkatī
Among these qualities, Sūrkatī emphasized the importance of education, saying, “Education is the foundation of every progress, the beginning of every glory, and the principal reason for every success in the world” (Sūrkatī 1915, 26).

It must be noted here that an emphasis on equality among all Muslims is not particular to Sūrkatī’s thought, but is commonly shared by modern Islamic reformists. Rashīd Riḍā, for example, had already stated the same opinion on the marriage problem. In 1905, when a sharīfah in Singapore and an Indian Muslim were married, a controversy arose. Because the authenticity of the groom’s pedigree was questionable, although he claimed himself to be descended from the Prophet, the ‘Alawīs objected to the marriage. In reply to a question proposed by a reader of al-Manār of Singapore, Riḍā answered that the marriage could be legal regardless of the groom’s pedigree. Like Sūrkatī, Riḍā stated that, because “the Islamic law is a law of justice and equality (shari'at 'adl wa musāwāh),” all believers are basically equal in its jurisprudence. Modern Islamic reformism strictly denounced the practices that they considered to be related to shirk (polytheism), while emphasizing tawhīd (the unity of God) and insisting that all Muslims are in the same position in front of the one and only God.

Dualism within the Organization

After his resignation from the Jam‘iyat Khayr, Sūrkatī opened a private school in Batavia, named Madrasat al-Irshād al-Islāmīyah (Islamic School for Guidance) in September 1914. This is the beginning of the al-Irshād schools. The name “al-Irshād” is said to have been derived from the Madrasat al-Da’wah wa al-Irshād (School for Propagation and Guidance), established by Riḍā in 1911 in Egypt (Pijper 1977, 109). In order to raise funds for this school, supporters of Sūrkatī, who consisted mainly of Ḥaḍramīs, formed a new association, called Jam‘iyat al-Iṣlāḥ wa al-Irshād al-‘Arabīyah (Arab Association for Reform and Guidance), namely the association of al-Irshād. It must be pointed out that we can find some significant differences between the school and the association.

The association of al-Irshād was distinguished by its Arab/Ḥaḍramī identity. Its first constitution, published in 1915, stated the purposes of its activities, such as “to promote the customs of the Arabs (al-‘awā'id al-‘Arabiyah) that accord with the religion of Islam” and “to
educate the Arab community (al-ummah al-'Arabiyah) in reading and writing” (Qânûn Jam‘iyat al-Iṣlâm wa al-Irshâd al-’Arabiyah: Al-Asâsî wa al-Dâkhîli 1919, 12–13). Its membership was opened to all male Muslims, aged eighteen and over, who were living in the Dutch East Indies (Qânûn Jam‘iyat al-Iṣlâm wa al-Irshâd al-’Arabiyah: Al-Asâsî wa al-Dâkhîli 1919, 13). Thus, unlike the ‘Alawis, a descendant group, any Muslims who accepted the ideal and purpose of al-Irshâd could become Irshâdis, regardless of their origin. Yet, in practice, the core members of the association consisted of non-‘Alawi Ḥaḍrami. During the Dutch colonial period, no one else became members of the central executive of the association. Even Sûrkatî, although he was regarded as the founder and leader of al-Irshâd, was no exception (Mobini-Kesheh 1999, 58–67). He exerted influence on the association mainly through the education of future cadres.

Moreover, the association clearly displayed an anti-‘Alawi character. Al-Irshâd received assistance from some ‘Alawis who agreed with the association’s Islamic reformist ideas, especially in its early period. For instance, ‘Abdullâh ibn ‘Alawi al-‘Aṭṭâs made significant contributions to the al-Irshâd schools, and ‘Abdullâh ibn Abû Bakr al-Ḥabshi presided over the first committee of the al-Irshâd schools (Mobini-Kesheh 1999, 63; Noer 1973, 64). Nevertheless, the constitution of the association included the sentence, “no one from the sayyids (sâda) is allowed to become a member of the central executive” (Qânûn Jam‘iyat al-Iṣlâm wa al-Irshâd al-’Arabiyah: Al-Asâsî wa al-Dâkhîli 1919, 14). When the constitution was drafted, arguments among the Irshâdis occurred over this sentence; Sûrkatî opposed it most harshly. Finally, however, the matter was settled by vote, ending up with the stipulation of the sentence (al-Anwâr 1943, 100–101). It is reasonable to consider that this anti-‘Alawi character also reflected the Ḥaḍrami identity of the association. For some of the Ḥaḍrami Irshâdis, al-Irshâd was formed to compete against the traditional leadership of the ‘Alawi within the Ḥaḍrami community (cf. Bujra 1967, 356).

In contrast to the association, the al-Irshâd school was less restricted to Arabs or Ḥaḍrami, and rather marked by openness to all Muslims. Because the Sudanese teachers whom Sûrkatî had invited to the Jam‘iyat Khayr moved with him, non-Ḥaḍrami Arabs occupied a significant proportion of the teaching positions in the al-Irshâd school in Batavia (Junus 1960, 267). Moreover, not only Arab or Ḥaḍrami
students, but also many pribumi Muslim students, entered the school. In 1917, the al-Irshād school of Batavia enrolled seventy Arab students, while pribumi students numbered eighty.\textsuperscript{13} Considering the ratio of the population, the proportion of Arab students was fairly high. Yet, the number of pribumi students was never said to be inconsiderable. It should be added that the al-Irshād schools turned out quite a few leading pribumi Muslims, among whom were Junus Anies and Moehammad Faried Ma’roef (leading figures of Muhammadiyah), Mohammad Rasjidi (the first Minister of Religious Affairs), and M. Hasbi Ash Shiddlegy (lecturer of Institut Agama Islam Negeri). It is said that al-Irshād had an agreement with Muhammadiyah to train the cadres of the latter (Bluhm-Warn 1997, 307; Nājī n.d., 122–24).

There is one other thing that differentiates the school from the association: even ‘Alawīs were entrusted with important positions. A former student of the Jam’īyat Khayr school, ‘Abdullāh ibn Sālim al-‘Arūf, transferred to the al-Irshād school along with Sūrkatī. After graduation, he became a teacher of the al-Irshād school in Surabaya, and was later even appointed its head teacher (Nājī n.d., 121).\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, when Sūrkatī moved the main school of Batavia to the Mangga Besar area in 1924, he recruited Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh al-‘Arūf, an ‘Alawī who had studied in Istanbul and Europe on a scholarship from the Ottoman government. Appreciated as “one of the most advanced Arabs” (\textit{‘arqā ‘Arabī}), Muḥammad al-‘Arūf was in charge of secular subjects such as English, Dutch, bookkeeping, and chemistry (Noer 1973, 34; Sūrkatī 1924).

These differences between the association and the school can be attributed mainly to the difference between Sūrkatī and the Ḥaḍramī Irshādīs. Obviously, a part of the latter did not fully agree with, or did not understand, Sūrkatī’s reformist thought. This disagreement was clearly manifested in the issue of \textit{madhhab} (Islamic schools of law). Modern reformist Muslims, in general, rejected uncritical \textit{taqlīd} (mere imitation of opinions of previous ‘ulamā’), calling for exercising \textit{ijtihād} (individual effort in arriving at legal decisions). As a consequence, the authority of each of the established \textit{madhhab} was relativized and ultimately discredited. In the early twentieth century, a harsh controversy occurred among Indonesian Muslims over adherence to the Shāfi‘ī \textit{madhhab}, which had been dominant in Southeast Asia (Feener 2007, 10, 25–26).
In this respect, Sürkatı clearly took the reformist position. In his booklet, named *al-Masā'il al-Thalāth* (Three Questions) and published in 1925, he maintained the following:

It is understood from the whole that the blind taqlīd that we are conforming to at present is not permissible, except for a simple ordinary person (āmmī basīt) who does not have any understanding (fahm), any knowledge (ʿilm), any preparation (istiʿād), nor any reason (ʿaql). Ijtihād to understand the Qurʾān and the Sunnah (practice of the Prophet Muḥammad) is an obligation for every person who possesses understanding, if allowed the opportunity, in every time and at every place, according to one’s ability (Sürkatı 1925, 18).

In another article of the same period, he mentioned that all schools of thought (madhāhib, mashārib) should be unified ultimately into one madhhab. This new madhhab would be based on only the Qurʾān and the Sunnah, being free from “innovations (bida), superstitions (khurāfāh), national partiality (ahwāʾ qawmīyah), and racial fanaticism (ʿaṣabīyah jinsīyah).”

Nevertheless, and despite their leader’s vision, there was strong, persistent adherence to the Shāfiʿī madhhab among the Irshādis. The bylaws of the association, published in 1919, stipulated that “the official school of thought (al-madhhab al-rasmī) of the schools that belong to this association is that of al-Imām al-Mujtahid Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Shāfiʿī as for the jurisprudence (al-īqh)” (Qānūn Jamʿīyat al-Iṣlāḥ wa al-Irshād al-ʿArabīyah: Al-Asāsī wa al-Dākhilī 1919, 15). It must be noted that the persistent adherence to the Shāfiʿī madhhab in al-Irshād was derived from its Hadramī identity. This is obvious from the fact that some Irshādis attempted reconciliation with the ‘Alawīs based on the Shāfiʿī madhhab. For example, in 1928, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Saqqāf, a renowned ‘Alawī ʿālim of Ḥaḍramawt, came to Surabaya in order to mediate the controversy (al-Bakrī 1936, 336–38). In 1932, ʿUmār Manqūsh, one of the central figures in the formation of al-Irshād, negotiated with ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ḥusayn al-ʿAydarūs for reconciliation. In both of the attempts, the adherence to “the madhhab of Ḥaḍramīs,” that is to say, the Shāfiʿī madhhab, was stated as one of the terms of settlement. Although neither of the attempts was successful, a certain number of Irshādis gave their assent to them. On the other hand, Sürkatı, although he himself was active in the settlement of the controversy, never agreed with any reconciliation based on the Shāfiʿī madhhab.
Not to mention the rejection of adherence to one of the established madhhab, the openness to all Muslims in the al-Irshād schools also can be attributed to Sūrkatī’s reformist thought, that is to say, its emphasis on the equality of all believers. It is obvious, therefore, that his reformist thought potentially could have conflicted with Arab/Ḥaḍramī identity within al-Irshād. Let us discuss the development of the educational activities of al-Irshād, focusing on this difference.

Adaptation to the Colonial Education System

Soon after its formation, al-Irshād began to expand its activities beyond Batavia. In the late 1910s, its branches and schools were established one after another in Tegal (1917), Pekalongan (1918), Cirebon, Bumiayu and Surabaya (1919) (Nājī n.d., 115–17). With the growth of the organization, Sūrkatī felt it necessary to systematize the educational activities, considering the developments in both Indonesian society and the outer Muslim world. Interestingly enough, his remarks on education from the 1910s to the mid-1920s reflected two different viewpoints.

In 1919, Sūrkatī submitted a reform plan for the al-Irshād school system to the central executive of the association (al-Anwār 1943, 138–41). Its contents included the appointment of a supervisor of the schools, unification of curriculums and textbooks, compilation of textbooks suitable for students of Indonesian society, establishment of a library, publication of a religious magazine, establishment of a counsel committee composed of delegates of every branch office, and clarification of the responsibilities of teachers. As for this proposal, what is most pertinent for this study was the introduction of “the program of the government elementary schools” (barūjrām madāris al-ḥukūmah al-ibtidā’īyah). In summary, Sūrkatī intended to adapt the al-Irshād schools to the colonial education system. According to the proposal, Islamic and Arabic subjects would also be taught.

The reason that he stated for this was to meet the needs of pribumi Muslim students. He explained that they had to acquire an equivalent qualification to those who received the colonial education, so that they could find employment after graduation:

When they [pribumi students] present themselves to any governmental or commercial places, certainly, they will request diploma (al-shahādah al-madrasīyah) from them [Irshādis]; they will only recognize the government's
diploma (shahādah al-ḥukūmah). If the first generation to graduate from the al-Irshād schools fails to make a living, al-Irshād will earn a bad reputation among the pribumis. They [pribumi students] will turn away altogether from al-Irshād schools, and they will regret approaching them and wasting time (al-Anwār 1943, 141).

In the early twentieth century, the government of the Dutch East Indies expanded the Western-style public education system as part of the so-called “Ethical Policy” (Ethische Politiek). In consequence, more and more of the local population regarded access to colonial education as crucial for upward social mobility (Shiraishi 1990, 28–30). Leaders of the Islamic movement did not remain indifferent to this situation. A pioneering reformist in West Sumatra, Abdullah Ahmad, transformed his Islamic school, Sekolah Adabijah, into a Dutch-Native school (Hollands-Inlands school) in 1916 (Steenbrink 1986, 38–40). In the 1920s, Muhammadiyah eagerly worked on the establishment of schools of the same type. In 1923, its first Dutch-Native school opened in Batavia. Afterwards, the number of Muhammadiyah schools that accorded with the colonial education system increased rapidly and numbered about sixty in 1927 (Salam 1965, 98–99).

Sūrkatī’s proposal, however, was not accepted by the central executive of the association. It is reasonable to consider that the main reason was a strong aversion to Western education among the Arabs. Generally speaking, they were very reluctant to enroll their children in schools of the colonial education system, because they regarded them as “Christian schools,” whose education had a pernicious effect on the Islamic faith of their children (Algadri 1984, 19; Berg 1886, 130). Indeed, when the government proposed to establish a Dutch-Arab school (Hollands-Arabische school), analogous to a Dutch-Native school, in 1916, the Arabs in Batavia rejected the proposal, because the program did not include Islamic and Arabic subjects. We should add one other reason. Because most Arabs ran their own businesses, and their children were supposed to succeed them, opportunities for upward social mobility provided by the colonial education system might have been less attractive to them (cf. al-Bakrī 1936, 242; Mobini-Kesheh 1999, 82).

It was only in the late 1920s that Sūrkatī’s proposal began to be carried out. In 1927, the congress of the teachers of al-Irshād, held in Batavia and presided over by Sūrkatī, decided to change the al-Irshād school system. According to the plan, its four-year elementary schools
would be divided into two types: one that would continue to use Arabic as its language of instruction, and the other that was equivalent to the link school (schakelschool) of the colonial education system. In the latter type of school, instruction was given in Dutch, and Arabic and Islamic subjects would be taught in addition. The graduates of link schools were as qualified as those of Dutch-Native schools, and could proceed to secondary education.

This decision of al-Irshād can be considered a reflection of the changing attitude of the Arab community as a whole. In the 1920s, even the Arabs began to show higher interest in colonial education, especially its elite elementary education. Because at that time no Dutch-Arab school had opened, the main options for Arab children were Dutch-Native schools or link schools. The proportion of “the Arabs and other Foreign Orientals (excluding Chinese)” in Dutch-Native schools hovered around 0.1% from 1912 to 1921. It greatly increased, however, in the 1920s, counting 0.24% in 1923, 0.75% in 1925, and reaching 0.86% in 1927 (Hollandsch-Inlandsch Onderwijs-Commissie 1930, 29).

Nevertheless, the attempt to incorporate link schools into the al-Irshād school system did not turn out well. Although the Surabaya branch established a link school in 1927, the school closed after a short time. Most of the students soon left the school, because they felt apprehension about their studies of Arabic and Islamic subjects. In 1929, the Surabaya branch drew up a renewed plan for a link school, but only failed again in its implementation. It is obvious that even in the 1920s, although a certain number of Arabs felt a necessity for access to the colonial education system, stiff opposition to Western education remained in their community.

On this point, we should remember that there were two different standpoints within al-Irshād. While Sūrkatī, as mentioned above, actively sought to attract pribumi students, some Ḥaḍramī Irshādīs thought that the al-Irshād schools should primarily serve Ḥaḍramī children. In the late 1920s, when a certain Ḥaḍramī called in at the al-Irshād school of Batavia, he asked Sūrkatī about the number of students and the proportion of the Arabs to pribumis (al-jāwīyūn). Sūrkatī replied, saying, “They are all Muslims and Muslims are brothers. We never differentiate any one of them.” But this Ḥaḍramī was not satisfied, insisting on knowing the number. Eventually, Sūrkatī confessed that
the proportion was 30%. Although the proportion of Arab students declined from 1917, it still remained high, in relation to the proportion of the population in Batavia. Yet this Ḥaḍramī was shocked to hear the answer, lamenting the indifference of “our people of Ḥaḍramī” (sha’bnā al-Ḥaḍramī) toward education. Ḥaḍramī Irshādīs, like him, who regarded al-Irshād primarily as a Ḥaḍramī organization, did not seem willing to approve of Sūrkatī’s plan, which would have fulfilled the needs of pribumi students.

It must be noted that the plan to adapt al-Irshād schools to the colonial education system was proposed as early as 1919, and began to be realized in the late 1920s. Sūrkatī took the leading role in this plan, because he intended to attract not only Arab or Ḥaḍramī students but also pribumi students. This view was apparently based on egalitarianism. It did not, however, come into line with the Arab/Ḥaḍramī identity of the association of al-Irshād. The Arab community, in general, was still reluctant to provide its children with a Western education. In consequence, Sūrkatī’s intention was hampered, and took a long time to be realized.

Plan for an Educational Institution in the Arab Region

It is very interesting to note that, when Sūrkatī attempted to adapt the al-Irshād schools to the colonial education system, he also suggested another educational plan oriented toward the Middle East. He stated the plan in his treatises on the caliphate, published in 1924. The caliphate was the subject of heated debate in the Muslim world at that time. Influential Muslim intellectuals, such as Rashīd Riḍā and Abul Kalam Azad of India, wrote about it (Haddad 1997; Willis 2010). Immediately after the caliphate was abolished in Turkey in 1924, Sharīf Ḥusayn of Makkah proclaimed himself the new caliph, and ‘ulamā’ of Azhar announced a plan for an international conference in Cairo to discuss the future of the caliphate (Kramer 1986, chaps. 7, 8). As a response, Indonesian Muslims established a Caliphate Committee (Comite Chilaafat) and addressed this issue in a series of Al-Islam Congresses of the Indies (Congres Al-Islam Hindia) (Bruinessen 1995).

In his treatises, Sūrkatī suggested that, as one of the roles of the new caliphate, it would send qāḍīs (judges) and muftīs (deliverers of a legal opinion, fatwā), who would serve as the caliph’s deputies in each region. This required an educational institution affiliated to the caliphate:
As for [the training of] the qāḍī’s and the muftīs of Islamic law, Muslims must designate proper persons from every Islamic region and establish an adequate educational institution (madraṣah kābirah kāfīyah) in an Arab Islamic country for them; the expense will be borne by all Muslims.26

There is no doubt that Sūrkatī had envisaged graduates from the al-Irshād schools would be sent to the institution, if the plan had come to fruition.

In fact, Irshādis worked to make the plan a reality. At the fifth Al-Islam Congress of the Indies, held in Bandung in 1926, the Surabaya branch of al-Irshād proposed that a university (universiteit) be set up in Taif, a town near Makkah.27 The content of the proposal was almost the same as Sūrkatī’s: graduates from “Islamic schools from around the world (sekolah-sekolah Islam di seloeroeh doenia)” would be able to enroll in the university. They would be trained as propagandists (propagandist) of Islam at the expense of the whole Islamic community. At that time, the Islamic World Congress (Mu’tamar al-‘Ālam al-Islāmī) was planned to be held in Makkah and delegates from Indonesia were to join in it (Noer 1973, 222–223). This proposal, thus, would not be so visionary.

Nevertheless, neither the new caliphate, nor the educational institution as Sūrkatī planned, came into being. The General Islamic Congress (al-Mu’tamar al-‘Āmm al-Islāmī), held in Jerusalem in 1931, decided to establish such a university, but this plan ended in failure (Kramer 1986, chap. 11). Cairo was where al-Azhar, Dār al-‘Ulūm (teacher’s college) and other educational institutions were located, and became the main destination of graduates from the al-Irshād schools. By the 1920s, Cairo had emerged as the hub of modern education in the Muslim world, attracting an increasing number of Southeast Asian Muslim students (Roff 1970).

There is one other important thing in Sūrkatī’s treatises on the caliphate that indicates the peculiarity of his reformist thought. The plan of an educational institution affiliated with the new caliphate was not new, in and of itself. Immediately before Sūrkatī’s treatises were published, Riḍā proposed a similar educational scheme in his articles on the caliphate.28 Presumably, many Muslims shared a vision of the renewal of the caliphate, combined with the unification of Muslim education. Nevertheless, we can recognize clear differences between Sūrkatī’s and Riḍā’s proposals.
In his writing, Riḍā indicated a clear tendency toward Arab nationalism, which could be inconsistent with the concept of egalitarianism. He argued that the new caliph must be an Arab of Quraysh descent (the tribe of the prophet Muḥammad). It might be said that he followed prevailing classical Sunni jurisprudence. Nevertheless, in connection with this qualification of a caliph, he emphasized the centrality of Arabs in Islam and their religious superiority to non-Arabs. His inclination toward Arab nationalism is also represented in his insistence on the absoluteness of the Arabic language. According to him, while Arabic is the language that could unify all Muslims, other languages would lead to “fanaticism of race” (‘aṣabīyat al-jins), causing the Islamic community to fracture. Non-Arab Muslims, he argued, could serve the community only according to the degree of their skill in Arabic. This kind of inclination toward Arab nationalism is commonly recognized among Arab reformists (Haddad 1997; Hourani 1983, chap. 11).

Meanwhile, it is hard to find any tendency toward Arab nationalism in Sūrkatī’s treatises; they were more consistent with egalitarianism. He did not require Quraysh descent, or even Arab origin, for a legitimate caliph, but instead insisted that it is not necessary to consider races (ajnās) or tribes (qabā’il). In his view, a caliph should be chosen from men who exceed in “Islamic knowledge” (al-’ulūm al-Islāmīyah), “social knowledge” (‘ulūm al-ijtimā’), “sensory ability” (sa’at al-madārik), and “the goodness of morality” (aḥāsin al-akhlāq). He even spoke of his conviction that it was desirable that a caliph appear from “the most trivial family of Muslims” (absaṭ buyūtāt al-Muslimīn), in order to encourage competition among talented Muslims and demonstrate “the justice of Islam” (‘adl al-Islām). As one of the suitable persons for a new caliph, he mentioned Abul Kalam Azad, an Indian Islamic scholar and activist, who was not of Quraysh descent, nor Arab.

Additionally, unlike Riḍā, Sūrkatī recognized the relative importance of languages other than Arabic. Of course, he never devalued Arabic as the language of the Qur’ān and as the common language of all Muslims. He stated that its diffusion would be one of the duties of the new caliph. Yet, it is worth noting that, according to his proposal, the educational institution would instruct “languages necessary for mission” (lughāt darūriyah li al-tablīgh). In the case of Indonesia, these languages were Dutch and Malay. In fact, Sūrkatī had some of his works translated into these languages.
The educational institution in the Arab region that Sūrkatī planned seems inconsistent with his attempt to adapt the al-Irshād schools to the colonial education system. Nevertheless, both of the ideas were considered to be based on egalitarianism; all Muslims, whether Arabs or pribumis, were equal members of the Islamic community, regardless of their origins. At this period, therefore, the scope of Sūrkatī’s view was directed to the borderless Islamic community, although he indicated some tendency towards integration with the host society.

**Sūrkatī’s Changing Views**

In 1928, Sūrkatī made a pilgrimage to Makkah, and then visited several Middle Eastern countries: Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and his native Sudan. It was after returning to Indonesia that he changed his view on educational activities; he began to show a negative attitude towards sending students abroad. At the end of that year, during an interview with a reporter of an Arabic journal, *al-Dahnā’,* he was asked for his opinion on the necessity and destination of “educational delegations” (*al-ba’athāt al-‘ilmīyah*). It was a topic that was eagerly discussed among the Arabs in Indonesia at that time, because they had come to feel that their communities were seriously lagging behind in education.

While Sūrkatī admitted to the benefit of such delegations, he answered as follows:

> Nevertheless, in my opinion, the Ḥaḍramī community should never send an educational delegation abroad, except in the case of emergency. When the members of the delegation would return here (to Java), they would bring with them much knowledge useful to the community. They, however, would relinquish their fundamental principle (*mabda’uhum al-aṣlī*), and rather bring with them fatal social epidemics (*awbi’ah ijtimā’iyah fattāka*).

If the Ḥaḍramīs insisted on sending students abroad, Sūrkatī argued, a supervisor (*murāqib*) needed to accompany them. If the students could study in the same way in Indonesia, they should never go abroad. What did Sūrkatī mean by the terms “their fundamental principle” and “fatal social epidemics”? In a speech of the same period, he spoke of the critical situation of the Muslim world, which had begun in Turkey. According to him, some young Turks, who had studied in Europe, had lost “the traditions of their ancestors (*taqālīd aslāīhim*), the nature of Orientals (*sharqīyatuhum*) and even their religion (*dīnuhum*).” As a
consequence, “an intellectual revolution against Islam and Muslims” (thawrah fikriyah didd al-Islām wa al-Muslimīn) had occurred in Turkey, and its influence was spreading to other regions.\(^3^7\) We can be fairly certain that “their fundamental principle” signifies the traditional character of Orientals, especially their religion, and that “fatal social epidemics” signifies Western-influenced, anti-religious thought or “secularism.”\(^3^8\) To summarize, Sūrkatī opposed sending students abroad because he was apprehensive that they would be influenced by secularism.

Then, would there be any problem if the students went to study in Eastern Muslim countries? In another speech, Sūrkatī criticized education in Egypt, the main destination for Ḥaḍramī students. He admitted that Egypt was one of the most developed Eastern countries, equipped with an organized education system and various levels of educational institutions. Nevertheless, he pointed out that the country was still virtually ruled by foreigners, and Egyptians were yearning for freedom (ḥurrīyah) and independence (istiqlāl). He explained the situation by comparing knowledge (ʿilm) to a sword (sayf). Just as a sword is useless, except when it is seized by a strong hand (yad qawīyah), knowledge is meaningless without good education (tarbiyah).\(^3^9\) Seemingly, he said that Muslims from Indonesia studied in Egypt only to obtain superficial modern knowledge.

It is wrong to assume here that he intended to diminish the education system in Egypt, in particular. Rather, he attempted to dissuade Irshādīs from studying outside Indonesia. In the same speech, he praised the situation of education in the Hijaz under the rule of Ibn Saʿūd. However, he never recommended study in Makkah or Madinah. The focal point of his speech was the need to develop educational activities within Indonesian society. In his opinion, the al-Irshād schools were better than those in Egypt with regard to primary schools. Yet, in terms of the school system as a whole, al-Irshād still fell behind. Therefore, Sūrkatī called on Irshādīs to establish a secondary school (madrasah thānawīyah) first of all.\(^4^0\)

It can be presumed that this secondary school would have been one that accorded with the colonial education system. In the interview mentioned above, Sūrkatī stated that, in the secondary school that al-Irshād hoped to establish, Ḥaḍramī youth should study modern sciences and, above all, economics:
Economics (‘ilm al-iqtiṣād), or commerce (stijārah), is among the most important sciences in the view of these [active and diligent] communities. After economics come agriculture, jurisprudence, and other sciences which they [Ḥaḍramīs] need in order to defend their community’s honor and to heighten its reputation in the face of other communities, by taking part in the Volksraad (majlis al-‘umūm, People’s Council) and other governmental assemblies.\footnote{41}

Moreover, Ṣūrkatī emphasized the importance of learning foreign languages:

These [Ḥaḍramī] youth are very much in need foreign languages, especially Dutch because they live on a Dutch island. […] If the Ḥaḍramī community wishes the progress (taqaddum) completely, it must obtain much knowledge. This can only be done through the understanding of foreign languages.\footnote{42}

Studying these subjects with the intention of creating upward social mobility would necessitate a school that was comparable to the schools of the colonial education system.

Here, we note that Ṣūrkatī gave a different reason for the introduction of the government curriculum. In his proposal for educational reform in 1919, he stated that it was necessary in order to meet the demands of pribumi Muslim students. On the other hand, he now asserted that the Ḥaḍramī students also had to receive a colonial education, so that they could catch up with the progress of Indonesian society. We may say that he came to consider it inevitable for the Ḥaḍramīs to adapt themselves to the host society.

Ṣūrkatī’s statement, however, provoked a harsh backlash from the Irshādīs. As mentioned above, at that time, young Ḥaḍramīs were planning to send students to more advanced countries, especially to Egypt. Ṣūrkatī was accused of hindering the progress of the Ḥaḍramīs. In the end, he retracted his remarks, conceding to sending students abroad.\footnote{43} Yet, he seemingly tried to entrust his students to a reliable supervisor. Mohammad Rasjidī went to Egypt in 1931 after graduation from the al-Irshād school in Lawang (East Java), where Ṣūrkatī moved his school for a short period. Rasjidī was given a letter of recommendation by Ṣūrkatī and visited a famous reformist scholar, al-Taṅtāwī al-Jawḥarī, in Cairo, who took care of Rasjidī (Ananda 1985, 14; Rasjidī 1972, 89).\footnote{44}

There is one further point that is important in Ṣūrkatī’s statement during this period. He was apprehensive of the threat of secularism,
not only to Islam in general, but also to the position of the Arabs in Indonesia. He persuaded them to cooperate more closely with pribumi Muslims. In his opinion, young Muslims, or Orientals in general, who lost their morals due to European influence, came to contend against their brethren. The Arabs were also about to be separated from pribumis by their enemies. Nevertheless, they did not recognize that critical situation and even helped their enemies.

Sūrkatī appealed, based on a Quranic verse (5:2), that “the duty of the Arabs is to mingle and come to terms with pribumis. We never succeed without alliance and mutual help with them in piety and God-fearing.” In this regard, he emphasized their equal position:

We must not disregard our fraternal pribumis, who are spending money and time to serve Islam. The degree of pribumis’ 'ulamā’ (al-'ulamā’ al-Jāwīyūn), who are serving Islam, is not defective, even when we consider that of active and sincere Arabs. Islam has no particular racial character (jinsīyah khāṣṣah).

Sūrkatī named not only members of reformist groups, such as Muhammadiyah and Sarekat Islam, but also kyai (al-kiyāyāt), or local traditional Islamic scholars, as fraternal pribumis who served Islam. This statement leads to the interpretation that he came to attach greater importance to the unity of Muslims in Indonesia, than to the rivalry with traditionalist Muslims.45

It should be noted that Agoes Salim, one of the leaders of Sarekat Islam, shared the same view on education as Sūrkatī. In the late 1920s, a young Muslim activist from West Sumatra, Hamka, was staying in Makkah after the pilgrimage. He was debating whether he should remain there to pursue the academic path or return to Indonesia. Salim, who then visited Makkah, admonished him to return home (Hamka 1951, 104). Furthermore, in the early 1930s, Salim, commenting on the educational activities of al-Irshād, advised that it was more beneficial to invite a teacher from Egypt than to send five or ten students to that country at the same cost.46 It is highly likely that the change of Sūrkatī’s view on educational policies was partly related to his intention to cooperate with pribumi Muslims.

It can be said that Sūrkatī began to assume a “local-orientation” in the late 1920s.47 This view was apparently distinguished from his previous ones, in that the scope was limited geographically to Indonesia. Opposing sending students abroad, he admonished the Irshādis to
confining their educational activities to Indonesia, and emphasized the necessity for close cooperation between Arabs and pribumi Muslims. This change was caused by his apprehension of secularism that was spreading throughout the Muslim world. Indeed, a secular nationalist movement seriously threatened the position of the Arabs in Indonesia at that time.

**Competing Orientations within al-Irshād**

The concept of Indonesian nationhood, which was based on pribumi consciousness, had gained ground in the Indonesian political movement by the late 1920s. This concept excluded Europeans and Foreign Orientals, even if they were born in Indonesia (Elson 2008, 78; Suryadinata 1978, 11–12). Moreover, among those non-pribumi groups, Arabs were strongly disliked especially by secular nationalists, such as members of the Partai Nasional Indonesia (Indonesian National Party). They regarded Arabs with hostility, because some of them had taken an arrogant attitude toward pribumis, adhered to a sense of racial superiority and their own language, and practiced usury even though it is against Islam (Plas 1931, 176–77). As Sūrkatī warned, the Arabs were about to be separated from pribumis.

At the same time, the Arab community began to be polarized according to their sense of belonging. On one hand, the Ḥaḍramīs in Southeast Asia expressed stronger concern for Ḥaḍramawt as their homeland than ever before. In particular, the two Ḥaḍramawt Reform Congresses held in 1927 in Ṣifr (a coastal town of Ḥaḍramawt) and in 1928 in Singapore gave impetus to the ambition to improve the poor conditions of their homeland (Mobini-Kesheh 1999, chap. 6). On the other hand, there was an increasing number of *peranakan* Arabs who attached more importance to the land where they had been born and grown up. This group established the PAI in Semarang in 1934. Its founder and leader was Abdul Rahman Baswedan, a *peranakan* Arab born in Surabaya. He studied at several schools in Surabaya and Batavia, including the al-Irshād school where Sūrkatī taught. Although he once joined in the Surabaya branch of al-Irshād, he quit, as he was no longer satisfied with its activities (Haikal 1986, 365–72). He declared that the homeland of *peranakan* Arabs was Indonesia, not Ḥaḍramawt, which was only the homeland of their fathers and ancestors. The PAI attempted to support and join in the Indonesian nationalist movement.
In that period, Some Irshādīs displayed a strong orientation towards Ḥaḍramawt and Arab countries. They tried to establish modern-style schools in Ḥaḍramawt, and harshly disputed the problem of identity with members of the PAI (Mobini-Kesheh 1999, chaps. 6, 7). Moreover, as mentioned above, quite a few graduates from the al-Irshād schools aspired to continue their studies in Arab countries. Some Ḥadramīs, who were closely connected to al-Irshād, established a committee for the delegation of students in Surabaya in 1929. This committee began to send students to Cairo from 1931. According to Sālah al-Bakrī, who was sent by this committee to Cairo after graduation from the al-Irshād school in Batavia, around forty Ḥadramīs, apparently including Irshādīs, were studying there in the middle of 1930s (al-Bakrī 1936, 345–46; 1992, 177).

Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked that, even at that time, al-Irshād continued its attempt to adapt its educational activities to the colonial education system. It opened a Dutch-Arab school in Batavia in 1932 and a Dutch-Native school in Tegal by 1938. Moreover, graduates from these schools succeeded in proceeding to the secondary level of the colonial educational system. In 1938, six students from the school in Batavia acquired “diplomas of the government” (shahādah ḥukūmiyah), three of whom entered a MULO school (corresponding to junior high school) managed by Muhammadiyah, and one of whom enrolled in a commercial school (a kind of secondary technical college). The other two continued to study at the evening secondary school, teaching in Arab schools during the day.

It can be said that, in one sense, the Ḥadramī/Arab identity gradually weakened in the educational activities of al-Irshād. What is notable is that the al-Irshād Congress, held in 1931, decided to erase the stipulation of the Shāfi‘ī madhhab from the bylaws. This reflects the fact that Sūrkatī’s reformist thought began to gain predominance over Ḥadramī identity, which adhered to the madhhab. Moreover, in the late 1930s, the central executive of al-Irshād advertised the openness of its education to all Indonesian Muslims and emphasized the importance of cooperative relationships with pribumi Muslims. In a brochure published in 1938, it was stated that the al-Irshād schools were not restricted to Arab children, but willingly accepted Indonesian Muslim children (anak Indonesia-Islam) in general (Mabādi’ al-Irshād wa Maqāṣiduhā: Tadbkir wa Irshād wa Naṣā’iḥ 1938, 6). In fact,
Indonesian children (*Indonesische kinderen*) accounted for 80% of the students in the Dutch-Arab school in Batavia around the same year.\(^{55}\) The same brochure proposed a plan to establish a secondary school that accorded with the colonial education system. It stated that if it was impossible to carry out the plan by al-Irshād alone, a concerted effort should be made with one of the indigenous Islamic associations (*iḥdâ min jam‘iyât al-ahâli al-Islâmîyah*) (*Mabâdî‘ al-Irshâd wa Maqâsiduhâ: Tâdhkîr wa Irshâd wa Naṣâ‘îbih* 1938, 30).\(^{56}\)

It was the jubilee congress in celebration of the organization’s twenty-fifth anniversary, held in Surabaya in 1939, that was crucial in determining the orientation of al-Irshād in a definitive fashion. Speeches made by leading Irshādīs at this congress reflect both the Ḥaḍramî/Arab-orientation and the local-orientation. The director of the al-Irshād school in Surabaya, ‘Umar ibn Sâlim Hubayṣ, spoke on “the position of al-Irshād facing Ḥaḍramawt.” He called for Irshādīs to pay much more attention to their homeland, stating that “after a quarter of a century passed, as its big second step, al-Irshâd wants to cross the sea to Arab countries, especially Ḥaḍramawt.” On the other hand, the speech of ‘Ali ibn ‘Abd Allâh Harharah, the second secretary of the central executive, was concerned with “the position of al-Irshād facing the Indonesian awakening and movements.” He asserted that al-Irshād was prepared to support any indigenous organizations, whether religious or political.\(^{57}\)

At the end of the congress, Sûrkatî delivered a speech that clarified his position; he supported the local-orientation and denied the Ḥaḍramî/Arab-orientation. First, he persuaded Irshādīs to cease their quarrel with members of the PAI and cooperate with them. For him, “most of them [members of the PAI] are graduates of the al-Irshâd schools or those who are infused with the principles of al-Irshâd and have their soul influenced by its education.” As their success would benefit also the Irshādīs, he argued, they should help them to achieve their goals. Secondly, Sûrkatî threw out the proposal that al-Irshâd expand its activities in Ḥaḍramawt. In his opinion, it was not al-Irshâd but al-Jam‘îyah al-Kathîrîyah al-Iṣlâmîyah (al-Kathîrî Reform Association) that should work to spread education in Ḥaḍramawt.\(^{58}\) He explained that he had discussed with those colleagues who wished to work for Ḥaḍramawt and agreed with them on the founding of a new organization with that purpose.\(^{59}\)
Apparently, it was the local-orientation, which Sūrkatī supported, that dominated al-Irshād in that period. The congress decided to divide the al-Irshād schools into three types: The first was a school with Arabic as the language of instruction and additional foreign language teaching (Dutch, English, or Malay). The second was a Dutch-Arab (Native) school with additional Arabic and Islamic subjects. The third was a continuation school (vervolgschool) of the colonial education system, whose language of instruction was Malay, and that had some additional Arabic and Islamic subjects. The decision to integrate schools with Malay (Indonesian) as the medium of instruction into the school system demonstrates the increasing tendency to adapt educational activities to Indonesian society.

There are two more things that are important from the congress. First, youth members of the Bondowoso branch presented a play entitled Kesadaran (Awakening). In this play, those who had not yet awakened wore kopiah (rimless caps) of various kinds, while those who had awakened wore kopiah peci, which were regarded as a symbol of national identity. That is to say, this play upheld the Indonesian nationalist movement. Furthermore, the idea of the superiority of Arabs over non-Arabs was thrown out in this play. PAI’s journal, Aliran Baroe, reacted favorably to Sūrkatī’s appeal for reconciliation, as well as to the play for its support of Indonesian nationalism. Second, the congress decided to eliminate from the constitution the clause concerning the exclusion of the ‘Alawīs from the central executive of the association (al-Anwr 1943, 101).

Around the same time, the association of al-Irshād changed its official name to Jamʿiyat al-İṣlāḥ wa al-Irshād al-Islāmīyah (Islamic Association for Reform and Guidance), exchanging the word “Arab” with “İslam.” It clearly indicates an attenuation of the Arab/Ḥaḍramī identity within it. While some Irshādīs ultimately chose to move to Ḥaḍramawt (Ingrams 1966, 36), most of them, including leading members such as ʿUmar Hubayṣ, remained in Indonesia, as exhorted by Sūrkatī.

**Conclusion**

It should be concluded from what has been said above that the most remarkable point of Sūrkatī’s reformist thought is egalitarianism. Egalitarianism, as such, should be regarded as one of the qualities shared by modern Islamic reformists in general. Nevertheless, Sūrkatī was distinguished from other Arab reformists in that he lacked a
tendency toward Arab nationalism. In the beginning, Sūrkatī’s view focused on the borderless Islamic community. In the late 1920s, however, his thoughts underwent significant change. The perceived threat of secularism, both to Islam in the entire Muslim world and to the position of Arabs in Indonesia, made him advocate the local-orientation that focused territorially on Indonesia.

We can safely say that his reformist thought played a crucial role in the educational activities of al-Irshād. The egalitarianism of Sūrkatī brought openness to all Muslims, welcoming them to the al-Irshād school. It is noteworthy that, from early on, Sūrkatī attempted to adapt the al-Irshād schools to the colonial educational system in order to attract not only Arab or Ḥaḍramī students, but also pribumi students. While contradicting the Arab/Ḥaḍramī identity within the association of al-Irshād, his intention was gradually achieved throughout the Dutch colonial period. The educational activities of al-Irshād, thus, were never separated from the colonial education system.

Furthermore, Sūrkatī’s reformist thought was pivotal in the process of the integration of Arabs into the host society. From the late 1920s, Sūrkatī called on the Irshādīs to limit their educational activities to Indonesian society and to closely cooperate with pribumi Muslims. At the same time, the problem of belonging arose in the Arab community. Both the Ḥaḍramī/Arab-orientation and the local-orientation can be recognized in the educational activities of al-Irshād in the 1930s. Indeed, some Irshādīs sent students to Egypt and established schools in Ḥaḍramawt. On the other hand, the attempt to adapt the al-Irshād schools to the colonial education system continued. By the late 1930s, around the jubilee congress in 1939, the opinion of al-Irshād swung in favor of the local-orientation. It can be concluded that al-Irshād denied, or at least weakened, the Arab/Ḥaḍramī character, choosing to be integrated into the host society.

Al-Irshād continues its activities as one of the main Indonesian Islamic organizations. Seemingly, the general integration of the Irshādīs and Arabs into the host society succeeded after independence. However, this study was limited to analysis of the Arab community. It was one thing for the Arabs to decide to become Indonesians, and quite another for pribumis to accept them as fellow citizens. A further study should be conducted on the integration of Arabs within a broader context, considering the perceptions of the pribumis.
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