

STUDIA ISLAMIKA

INDONESIAN JOURNAL FOR ISLAMIC STUDIES

Volume. 14, number. 2, 2007



NEW APPROACHES IN INTERPRETING
THE QUR'AN IN CONTEMPORARY INDONESIA

Izza Rohman

SHARĪ'AH AND THE POLITICS
OF PLURALISM IN INDONESIA

Ratno Lukito

MUSLIM RESPONSES TO THE
COMMUNIST REVIVAL IN INDONESIAN POLITICS

Ahmad Suhelmi

STUDIA ISLAMIKA

Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies

Vol. 14, no. 2, 2007

EDITORIAL BOARD:

M. Quraish Shihab (UIN Jakarta)
Taufik Abdullah (LIPI Jakarta)
Nur A. Fadhil Lubis (IAIN Sumatra Utara)
M.C. Ricklefs (Melbourne University)
Martin van Bruinessen (Utrecht University)
John R. Bowen (Washington University, St. Louis)
M. Atho Mudzhar (IAIN Yogyakarta)
M. Kamal Hasan (International Islamic University, Kuala Lumpur)
M. Bary Hooker (Australian National University, Australia)
Virginia Matheson Hooker (Australian National University, Australia)

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Azyumardi Azra

EDITORS

Saiful Mujani
Jamhari
Jajat Burhanuddin
Fu'ad Jabali
Oman Fathurahman

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITORS

Heni Nuroni

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ADVISOR

Cheyne Scott

ARABIC LANGUAGE ADVISOR

Masri Elmahsyar Bidin

COVER DESIGNER

S. Prinka

STUDIA ISLAMIKA (ISSN 0215-0492) is a journal published by the Center for the Study of Islam and Society (PPIM) UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta (STT DEPPEN No. 129/SK/DITJEN/PPG/STT/1976). It specializes in Indonesian Islamic studies in particular, and South-east Asian Islamic Studies in general, and is intended to communicate original researches and current issues on the subject. This journal warmly welcomes contributions from scholars of related disciplines.

All articles published do not necessarily represent the views of the journal, or other institutions to which it is affiliated. They are solely the views of the authors. The articles contained in this journal have been refereed by the Board of Editors.

STUDIA ISLAMIKA has been accredited by The Ministry of National Education, Republic of Indonesia as an academic journal (SK Dirjen Dikti No. 23a/DIKTI/2004).

Ahmad Suhelmi

Muslim Responses to the Communist Revival in Indonesian Politics

Abstraksi: Stigma politik bangsa Indonesia terhadap Komunisme, yang menguat sejak berdirinya Orde Baru menyusul kegagalan kudeta PKI pada 1965, ternyata kembali merebak pada masa pasca kejatuhan rezim yang otoriter itu. Pada awal 2001, hanya selang tiga tahun sejak dimulainya gerakan reformasi di tanah air, muncul gerakan anti-Komunisme Baru menyusul kecurigaan bangkitnya arwah Komunisme dan gerakan politik Kiri dalam kancah politik nasional. Ditandai dengan kembalinya wacana ideologis yang berbau Kiri, dan tumbuh suburnya penerbitan buku-buku Kiri di Indonesia, fenomena ini secara politik dibaca sebagian kalangan sebagai indikasi nyata kebangkitan Komunisme dan ideologi Kiri itu. Walhasil, hal ini dianggap sebagai ancaman serius terhadap Islam dan kedaulatan Pancasila pada penghujung akhir masa kekuasaan Presiden Abdurrahman Wahid, yang selalu rawan dengan konflik kepentingan.

Puncak dari gerakan protes ini adalah pembakaran buku-buku Kiri, dan berbagai literatur lain yang dianggap ke-Kiri-kirian, serta ancaman sweeping terhadap berbagai toko buku di berbagai kota. Pada 19 April 2001 gerakan massa yang menamakan diri "Aliansi Anti-Komunis", disingkat ini, melancarkan aksi, yang merupakan kelanjutan dari gelombang anti-Komunisme yang sudah terjadi beberapa bulan sebelumnya. Tulisan ini membahas munculnya gelombang aksi anti-Komunisme mutakhir yang radikal, sebagai simbol dari pergulatan terkini antara Islam, nasionalisme dan isu Komunisme, yang tampaknya tidak kunjung berhenti menghantui politik nasional, di Indonesia.

Sebagai gerakan politik, meskipun banyak didukung puluhan kelompok Islam gerakan, AAK tidak mewakili arus besar kelompok Islam Indonesia. Hal ini terlihat dari tidak adanya hubungan langsung AAK dengan ormas Islam Indonesia yang besar seperti NU, Muhammadiyah, Persis, dan DDII. Ia juga tidak mewakili barisan muda dan aktivis partai-partai Islam yang solid seperti PKB, PAN, PBB atau Partai Keadilan. Bahkan, AAK ditengarai tidak berhubungan secara khusus dengan beberapa kelompok Islam garis keras seperti Lasykar Jihad, Front Pembela Islam (FPI), dan Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia

(MMI), ataupun Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia (HTI). Bahkan, diketahui pimpinan FPI tidak mau bergabung dengan AAK dengan alasan bahwa organisasi ini dipimpin Erico Gutierrez, seorang non-Muslim.

Penulis dengan cerdas dan konsisten menempatkan kata “buku-buku Kiri” dalam tanda petik. Sebagaimana dijelaskan, gerakan pembakaran buku-buku “Kiri” juga menunjukkan ketidakjelasan apa yang ditengarai sebagai literatur “Kiri” dan, yang terlebih penting lagi, ketidakpahaman kelompok AAK sendiri terhadap ideologi Kiri dan paham Komunisme. Sebagai contoh, hal ini diperkuat dengan proses pembakaran sejumlah buku secara pragmatis dan serampangan—baik yang benar-benar “Kiri” maupun tidak—termasuk buku-buku karya filsuf Franz Magniz-Suseno yang sejatinya merupakan pemikiran kritis terhadap pemikiran sosial Karl Marx.

Dalam artikel ini, peristiwa yang sarat dengan perdebatan ideologis—sebagaimana berbagai peristiwa sosial yang terjadi pada masa reformasi di Indonesia—ini dijelaskan dengan lugas, dengan menyoroti hubungan antara kejatuhan Orde Baru, kemunculan kelompok-kelompok paramiliter yang berbasis kelompok agama dan nasionalis. Kemudian, mencoba mereka-reka hubungan kelompok-kelompok yang disebut penulis sebagai “sempalan” dadakan ini dengan kelompok militer dan partai politik tertentu. Beragam pertanyaan tentang basis sosial politik kemunculan kembali sentimen anti-Komunisme ini dibahas dengan sangat detail dan diperkuat data-data lapangan, termasuk sejumlah wawancara yang cukup solid dengan aktivis dan pihak yang terlibat.

Penulis berpendapat bahwa menguatnya sentimen anti-Komunisme di era reformasi terjadi utamanya karena tiga hal: pertama, protes sebagian masyarakat yang didukung kelompok kepentingan tertentu terhadap kebijakan pemerintah yang mencabut TAP MPRS, yang oleh Presiden Wahid justru dianggap tidak lagi sesuai dengan rasa keadilan dan semangat reformasi. Kedua, merebaknya wacana politik Kiri yang diusung sejumlah aktivis partai politik dan kelompok pemuda yang dianggap membangkitkan kembali paham Komunisme/PKI. Sentimen ini tentu saja bukannya tidak beralasan. Beberapa partai politik dan organisasi kepemudaan baru, seperti PRD dan Forkot, acapkali memperjuangkan gagasan sosial politik yang dengan mudah dituding berideologi Kiri, sebagaimana tercantum dalam berbagai jargon politik anti-kemampuan seperti, “Potong Satu Generasi”. Dalam hal ini, apapun yang berbau Marxis, “Kiri”, dan Komunis harus ditolak. Apalagi, terlihat kesan kuat bahwa bagi kelompok-kelompok ini, tidak jelas benar apa gerangan perbedaan di antara ketiganya. Tak ayal, hal ini mendapatkan tandingan dari sejumlah kelompok Islam dan nasionalis yang menganggap cara-cara dan cita-cita politik seperti ini bertentangan dengan Pancasila.

Akhirnya, penulis berkesimpulan bahwa, di tengah-tengah perang ideologis terbuka seperti ini, telah terjadi politisasi atas stigma politik bangsa Indonesia terhadap Komunisme oleh segelintir kalangan yang berakhir dengan aksi ekstrem pembakaran buku-buku “Kiri” tersebut. Atas sejumlah aksinya ini, AAK dan gerakan anti-Komunismenya menimbulkan polemik dan mendapatkan sorotan tajam dari publik.

Muslim Responses to the Communist Revival in Indonesian Politics

الخلاصة: يتضح أن الموقف الراض للشعب الإندونيسي من الشيوعية الذى كان قويا منذ ظهور الطريقة الجديدة على أثر انقلاب الحزب الشيوعى الفاشل فى عام ١٩٦٥ يعود مرة أخرى بعد سقوط النظام المستبد المذكور. فى بداية عام ٢٠٠١م أى ثلاث سنوات بعد ظهور الحركة الإصلاحية فى البلاد، خرجت حركة "ضد الشيوعية" إلى الوجود خوفا على عودة الشيوعية واليسارية إلى ساحة سياسية قومية فى البلاد. هذا الخوف مبنى على عودة فكرة السياسة اليسارية وانتشار كتبها ومؤلفاتها فى إندونيسيا التى يراها البعض دليلا واضحا على عودة الشيوعية وايدولوجيته اليسارية. ويعتقد أنه يمثل خطرا واضحا على الإسلام والسيادة "بنشاشيلا" فى أواخر مهمة رئيس عبد الرحمن وحيد التى تؤدى كثيرا إلى صراع المصالح. قد وصل الموقف الراض للحركة إلى أقصاه بإحراق الكتب اليسارية وبعض المؤلفات الأخرى فى نفس الاتجاه وتهديده بالبحث عنها فى أى مكتبة ومدينة فى البلاد. قد قامت فى ١٩ أبريل ٢٠٠١ حركة تسمى بـ "جماعة ضد الشيوعية" (AAK) بالأنشطة التى تمثل تطورا من التطورات الراضة للشيوعية التى حدثت قبلها بشهور. يتناول البحث على ظهور تطور جديد لحركة ضد الشيوعية المتشددة تمثل صراعا حديثا بين الإسلام والقومية وقضية الشيوعية الذى لم يتوقف خطره على السياسة القومية فى إندونيسيا. رغم من حصولها على تأييد عشرات من حركات إسلامية، لكنها (AAK) لم تمثل اتجاهها سائدا فى الحركات الإسلامية فى إندونيسيا. والدليل على ذلك عدم وجود العلاقة المباشرة بينها بين التنظيمات الإسلامية الكبرى فى البلاد مثل جمعية نهضة العلماء (NU) والمحمدية (Muhammadiyah) و"برسيس" (Persis) ودار الدعوة والإرشاد (DDII)، كما أنها لم تمثل عناصر شبابا وناشطى الأحزاب الإسلامية القوية مثل حزب نهضة الأمة (PKB) وحزب الأمانة القومية (PAN) وحزب الهلال والنجم (PBB) أو حزب العدالة الرفاهية (PKS). بل ليست لها علاقة خاصة مع الجماعة الإسلامية المتشددة مثل "لاسكار جهاد" وجبهة الدفاع عن الإسلام (FPI) ومجلس المجاهدين الإندونيسيين (MMI) أو حزب التحرير الإندونيسي (HTI). بالإضافة إلى رفض رئيس (FPI) للانضمام إليها مبررا لأن رئيس الحركة "إيريكو غوتيريز" غير مسلم.

يظهر ذكاء الباحث والتزامه بوضع علامة التنصيص على الكلمات "الكتب اليسارية"، لأن إحراق الحركة الكتب اليسارية تم بدون تحديد ما هي المؤلفات اليسارية، بل أنها لم تفهم ما هي ايدولوجية اليسارية والشيوعية. على سبيل المثال ما حدث في إحراق الكتب الذى تم بدون تمييز بين يساريتها وغيرها وتشمل على مؤلفات المفكر "فرانز ماغيز سوسينو" التى تنتقد على آراء "كارل ماركس" الاشتراكية.

يشرح البحث قضية مليئة بالجدال الايدولوجى الذى يحدث فى عصر الإصلاح بإندونيسيا ويبدأ بالنظر إلى العلاقة بين سقوط نظام "الطريقة الجديدة" (Orde Baru) وبين ظهور الجماعة شبه العسكرية التى تنتمى إليها جماعة دينية ووطنية. ويحاول على النظر فى العلاقة بين الحركات الهامشية الطائفة بين الجماعة العسكرية والحزبية. هناك التساؤلات حول خلفية لعودة الشعور ضد الشيوعية التى يحاول الباحث إجابتها بالتفصيلات الدقيقة والدلائل الميدانية التى منها الحوار مع الناشطين والجهات المشتركة.

يرى الباحث أن شدة الشعور ضد الشيوعية فى عصر الإصلاح ترجع إلى ثلاثة أسباب منها الاعتراض من الناس الذين تؤيدهم عناصر لهم مصالح معينة ضد الحكومة على إلغاء قرار المجلس الاستشارى المؤقت بشأن حظر الشيوعية، وبرره الرئيس عبد الرحمن وحيد بأنه غير متفق مع العدالة وروح الإصلاح. والثانى : يبدأ انتشار فكرة السياسة اليسارية التى يؤيدها أعضاء الحزب السياسى والجماعات الشبابية الذى يراها البعض تمهيدا لعودة الشيوعية أو حزب الشيوعية الإندونيسى (PKI). وظهر هذا الشعور لم يكن بدون مبرر. هناك أحزاب سياسية وتنظيمات سياسية جديدة مثل PRD و Forkot تكافح كثيرا من أجل تحقيق فكرة اشتراكية وسياسية يراها البعض بالسهولة أنها من ايدولوجيا اليسارية كما ظهر أيضا فى حملاتها السياسية المختلفة ضد الثبوت مثل "قطع جيل واحد" وغيرها. على كل حال يجب أن يرفض أى اتجاه الماركسية الشيوعية واليسارية. بالإضافة إلى ما يدل عليه أن أنصار هذه الحركة لم يفهموا الفرق بين ثلاثة الاتجاهات المذكورة. على ذلك يعترض عليها أنصار الجماعات الإسلامية المتعددة والوطنية الذين يرون أن ما فعلت هذه الحركة من وسيلة وأهداف سياسية يخالف مبدأ "بنشاشيلا" المعترف قوميا.

يستخلص الباحث آرائه فى آخر مقالته أن فى وسط الحرب الأيدولوجية المفتوحة هذه قد تم استغلال سياسى على الموقف الراض لشعب إندونيسيا من الشيوعية من قبل الحركة التى أحرق أنصارها الكتب اليسارية المذكورة. وتثير أنشطة الحركة AAK وأنصارها إلى الجدل والانتقادات الشديدة من المجتمع.

The sudden reappearance of Marxist-Communist literature following the downfall of Soeharto's New Order regime was a concerning development for many Muslim groups in Indonesian, especially those in the so-called *Aliansi Anti-Komunis* (the Anti-Communist Alliance, or AAK). Members of the Alliance reacted by burning Leftist books on April 19, 2001 and demanded that all Marxist-Communist literature found in bookshops throughout the country be removed over the following days. Some social groups within Indonesia reacted positively to the book burning arguing that it was in accordance with the constitution, while opponents viewed it as anarchic and extreme.

This article discusses the AAK's reaction to the purported Communist threat with particular reference to the burning of the leftist literature.

The Making of the Anti-Communist Alliance (AAK)

Following the fall of the New Order regime, dozens of paramilitary organizations came into being.¹ While some of these paramilitary organizations – both Islamic² and nationalist³ – are independent, most of them have organizational links to political parties, and in many cases, to certain factions of the military elite.⁴ Although most political parties had previously denounced militarism, it now appears that they hold such paramilitary organizations in high regard. The paramilitary organizations serve a variety of purposes. Political parties use them as the “guardians” of the parties’ political interests, while certain military elites have been using them as “military instruments” to interfere in civil politics.

AAK is one of the most radical groups in responding to the Communist revival. Its origins lie in a meeting of Muslim activists held on April 2, 2001. The meeting was led by H. Amir Tanjung, the chairman of Lasykar Merah Putih (the Red-White Militia), who invited about fifty Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to discuss the dangers and threats of Communism to the nation and Islam. It was then decided that they form a well-organized and militant anti-Communist group. On April 18, 2001, it was agreed that the General Chairman of the group would be Abdul Muis, the ex-66 generation activist, while the Secretary-General would be Naufal Dunggio, a chairman of Hizbullah. The decision to appointment Muis as the General Chairman of the AAK was based on his long history of fighting PKI and the Communists since the 1960's.⁵

The declaration of AAK's establishment was made at the headquarters of Gerakan Pemuda Islam (GPI, Islamic Youth Movement) in Central Jakarta. The declaration was attended by more than thirty mass Islamic and nationalist groups⁶ representing various elements of society. The majority of the groups that joined together to form AAK were groups with strong Islamic ideological leanings and radical action-oriented groups. The most active ones were, among others, Pembela Islam Untuk Tanah Air (Islamic Movement for the Father Land, or PINTAR), GPI, and Front Hizbullah (the Hizbullah Front, or FH). Others were groups with strong nationalist and ethnic inclinations such as Forum Angkatan 66 (The Generation 66 Forum), Front Anti Komunis Banteng (Buffalo's Anti-Communist Front), Front Pemuda Betawi (Batavian Youth Front), Front Pembela Merah Putih (Red-White Defender Front), Banteng Muda Indonesia (Indonesian Youth Buffalo), and Lasykar Ampera (Ampera Militia). In all, the *Aliansi* simply represented a minor political force in present-day Indonesian politics; it was a splinter political group from the mainstream of the present Indonesian Islamic movement.

The AAK, however, did not include the major Indonesian Muslim political forces such as the major Islamic parties or Muslim mass organizations such as Nahdatul Ulama (NU), Muhammadiyah, Persatuan Islam (Islamic Unity), Dewan Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia (DDII, Indonesian Islamic Propagation Council), Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa (PKB, National Awakening Party), Partai Amanat Nasional (PAN, National Mandate Party), Partai Bulan Bintang (The Crescent Star Party), Partai Persatuan Pembangunan (United and Development Party), or Partai Keadilan (Justice Party). Interesting also is that AAK seemed to have no special links with such radical Islamic movements such as Darul Islam (DI), Lasykar Jihad, Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia (Council of Indonesian Islamic Fighters, or MMI), Ikhwanul Muslimin (the Muslim Brotherhood), Hizbut Tahrir (HT) or Front Pembela Islam (Islam Defenders Front, or FPI).⁷

According to Muis, the *raison d'être* of AAK was a widely-held belief that the high standards set out under the Pancasila were being forgotten. Thus, the establishment of AAK aimed at revitalizing the implementation of Pancasila (Five Principles) in state affairs. Muis also suggested that the motivation of the AAK members to establish the organization was their concern over the revival of Communist groups. Muis explained:

In our analysis, those were alien theories (the Communist theories) that came from Cambodia and China. We believed that Cambodia had returned to square one. And the people's justice came from China, and this is just like when the New Order was destroyed. Isn't it a revolution instead of reform? In a reform, what is wrong is made explicit, and what is right is also made explicit. In a revolution, the old values are destroyed, replaced with new ones. What they were demanding was a revolution. We should prevent reform from turning into a revolution.⁸

According to Alfian Tanjung, General Chairman of PINTAR, the determining factor that gave rise to the birth of the AAK was the shared feeling that Communism was the enemy of Islam and the Republic; this point united almost all the members of the AAK to take a common stand against the Communists.⁹ The majority of Indonesian people, including the Muslim population, the military and the government officers, he further maintained, were not aware that the Communist cadres were then attempting to consolidate their power. They had, for some time, forgotten this issue. The problem of Communism had become more serious, Tanjung argued, because the Communist cadres had systematically infiltrated almost all aspects of Indonesian society at the time. The Communist cadres infiltrated the movements of the working class and those of peasants, the university students, and the military units.¹⁰ This problem of Communism could not be anticipated by a single Islamic group. Therefore, regardless of their ideological character and interests are, they need to be united and to organize themselves under a single alliance or front. This "self consciousness", according to Tanjung, spurred Muslims to join the AAK.¹¹

According to Suaib Didu, the General Chairman of GPI, the real threat of Communism stemmed from the fact that the Communist cadres have occupied positions in almost all strategic social and political institutions. At that time, they believed, Communists had infiltrated the presidential palace and influenced the policies of President Abdurrahman Wahid.¹² To Didu, his membership in the AAK is also motivated by his concern to make Indonesia a prestigious and respected nation. It is not the organization of the AAK which Didu was interested to join in, but his obsession to fight for the nation. His obsession, he claimed, was similar to the ideals of the AAK: "Thus, we joined hands with Eurico Gutierrez, as he also had the same motivation. We are all patriots, the youth, ready for the nation's future. This unifies us in the organization."¹³

The establishment of radical anti-communist groups such as the AAK is not a new phenomenon in modern Indonesian political his-

tory. The genealogy of anti-communist groups can be traced back to the 1950's. At the time, the mushrooming of anti-Communist movements was triggered by the rapid development of the PKI which was revived after its almost total destruction in the wake of the Madiun Affair of 1948. Among the anti-communist groups which existed in the 1950's was the Anti-Communist Front under the leadership of K.H Isa Anshary.¹⁴ Prior to the abortive coup of the PKI in 1965, the GP Anshor and Banser (Barisan Serba Guna), a militia wing of the Nahdatul Ulama, had been extremely active in exterminating the communists throughout Java. Under the leadership of K.H Yusuf Hasyim, Subchan Z.E and Chalid Mawardi, GP Anshor launched serious attacks on the Leftist hubs in Java. Thousands of the PKI members and its sympathizers were massacred by the Banser and GP Anshor of NU during the political catastrophe of 1965-1967.¹⁵

The Burning of Leftist Books

The burning of Leftist books by AAK was the culmination of the protests from various social groups, particularly anti-communist Muslim groups and those opposed to President Wahid. The burning was preceded by waves of anti-communist protests which took place from February to the middle of April 2001.¹⁶

In Solo, Central Java, thousands of protesters, dubbed the Anti-Communist Front Surakarta, held a *tabligh akbar* (mass religious gathering). Amien Rais and Mudrick Sangidu together with PPP figures attended the gathering. They denounced groups of Democratic Socialists, PRD in particular, which, in their view, have been anarchists, holding the principle of "the end justifies the means". They also accused them as striving for national disintegration. On March 23, about two hundred members of FPI militia launched protests in front of the Istiqlal Mosque, Jakarta and the Palace against the Leftists and Zionists. During the action, the protestors issued an ultimatum that they would take firm action against those who subscribed to Communism, Socialism or Zionism. In Semarang, the Students Movement for Brotherhood – an alliance of a number of students' organizations - called on all Indonesian citizens to be watchful of the latent threat of communism.¹⁷

On April 16, sixteen elements of the Yogyakarta community assembled in the name of FORMAT (Forum Masyarakat Taqwa),¹⁸ and declared war against Communism, the Neo-PKI and Communist-affiliated organizations. Similar action was taken by FPI, led by the

group's leader Habib Rizieq Shihab, on April 18, 2001. FPI carried out a long march from Petamburan (West Java) to Hotel Indonesia Roundabout (Central Java) and distributed stickers that read "Let's Crush Communism." At the end of the action, they burned the PKI emblem, sickle and hammer flag, and slaughtered a sheep which symbolized the communists. The next day, April 19, about one hundred supporters of FRAK demanded that President Wahid ban movements with communist characteristics.

From February until April 2001, anti-communist paramilitary groups in various regions carried out activities designed to obstruct the revival of communism in Indonesia. Command Posts (*posko*) and anti-communist organizations were set up in West Java, Central Java and Banten. The establishments of these organizations were generally masterminded by local Muslim elites. The number of command posts was not more than 30 units.¹⁹ What is important is that the effort to form command posts was motivated by a desire to contain burgeoning Leftist forces. Fuad Hilmi Mutaqien, who instigated the establishment of the command posts, said that communist preaching had destroyed the building blocks of society, culture, politics and security within the nation, saying, "In fact, they now seek to revoke the regulations that banned their existence, by asking government to revoke the MPR decree on it."²⁰ Another prominent figure of the anti-communist command, Eddy Hartawan, said that the nation had suffered from the ruthlessness of communism and that, "If we are negligent, communism will again stand firm in this mother land. We therefore have to declare that communism must be demolished."²¹

The establishment of anti-communist *Posko* was supported by 116 NGOs. A number of *Posko* displayed anti-communist and PKI banners. In their actions, the anti-communist *Posko* targeted the eradication of communism in their respective areas. As such, they conducted sweeps and demolished locations alleged to be the renowned recruitment areas for communists in Indonesia.

On the morning of 19 April, 2001, AAK members gathered around the headquarters of the GPI to declare the establishment of the organization. According to Naufal, the ultimate goal of the gathering was just to declare the formation of the AAK. However, there was a spontaneous idea of burning "Leftist" books and it was Naufal who initiated this idea. The entire congregation agreed to the burning. Thus, the burning took place while Eurico Gutierrez was declaring the establishment of the AAK. This then was followed by the burning of the PKI's sickle and hammer flag.

Franz Magnis Suseno's *Pemikiran Karl Marx, Dari Sosialisme Utopis ke Perselisihan Revisionisme* was one of the Leftist books that were thrown into the fire. Why Suseno's *Pemikiran Karl Marx* was chosen to be burned by the AAK is intriguing. Is this book really a Leftist, Marxist, or Communist book as was suspected by AAK members? Interviews with AAK members revealed that Suseno's work was burned for a number of reasons. First, the book was the easiest one members of the AAK could find in the bookshop nearest to the headquarters of the AAK.²² Second, the AAK had no money to buy more expensive books. Third, AAK members suspected that the author of the book is a Catholic priest who supports the theology of liberation. To AAK members, the theology of liberation is a political movement with strong Marxist-Communist ideological leanings.

There is, however, as Tanjung asserts, another more substantial reason why the AAK burned Suseno's books: the ignorance of the members of the AAK of what the Left, Marxism and Communism actually are. They also did not really comprehend the differences in the nature of Marxism and Communism.²³ The burning of Suseno's book was, in fact, a bad move, and reflects the AAK's ignorance regarding the differences between Marxism and Communism.²⁴

The burning of Leftist books was simply the beginning; it was to be followed by more serious acts, such as a plan to forcibly remove all Leftist books from bookshops and any other places where such books might be found. The main targets of the AAK operation were the bookshops that displayed and distributed Marxist, Socialist, Communist and other Leftist books, notably in Jakarta, Yogyakarta and Surabaya and other big Indonesian cities. The day of the operation was the National Awakening Day, May 20, 2001. This day was chosen by the AAK because they viewed that the day was the right one to awaken people to fight against the "national enemy," Communism and the PKI.²⁵ Didu revealed in an interview that before undertaking the operations, the AAK informed the police and government authorities why and when they would like to "sweep" the bookshops.²⁶ Rather than garner support for the alliance, however, the "sweeping" sparked controversy and only attracted criticism for the AAK. Suaib Didu defended the group's actions, saying that:

When we were burning the books, there emerged various responses... We have the list of those people. (We know) who is Communist, and who is not...Those who wrote articles in newspapers and magazines,

we know all their names. We know they may be 'pure intellectuals' or Communist supporters. I really appreciate the point of view of those who judged the burning of the book as vandalistic. The problem, however, is that there is no other way which is effective, but to provoke the Communists to come out from their nests.²⁷

The open distribution of Communist books, Didu argued, had broken the rules and regulations stipulated in the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly No. XXV/1966, the Government Regulation No. XX/1999 and the ideology of the Pancasila, notably its first principle, belief in one God. These rules and regulations, Didu contended, obviously restricted the spread of Marxist-Communist books in Indonesia. "We are obliged to follow the existing rules and regulations," he said. "It is only animals that live without rules and regulations."²⁸

The burning of the books by the AAK members had a tremendous impact on the accessibility of the Leftist books. Not long after the burning, numerous bookshops in Jakarta, Yogyakarta and other major Indonesian cities closed and did not display even a single Leftist book. The bookshop owners were scared of a repeat of the violence. Gramedia, for example, did not display Suseno's *Pemikiran Karl Marx*, Pramoedya Ananta Toer's historical novels, as well as other Leftist books. Other bookshop owners felt it was safer just to close their bookshops. Some bookshop owners showed no fear and remained open and displayed Leftist books. They believed that it was still safe to do so, and they were convinced that the police would take firm action against the "sweepers".²⁹ Generally, however, in the days following the burning, it was difficult to find works by Marx, Lenin, Aidit, Tan Malaka and other Leftist thinkers and revolutionaries.

Debates over the Burning of the Books

The burning of the books gave rise to vigorous debates and discussions among intellectuals, academics, politicians and cultural activists. Some agreed with the ideas and actions taken against the Communists and the Leftists, including the burning of the Leftist books by the AAK members. Some agreed with the basic ideas of combating Communism and the Leftists, but preferred peaceful, democratic and non-violent means. The burning of the books by the AAK was not in accordance with a peaceful and democratic way of fighting Communism. The best and smartest action of combating Communism was by fighting them through intellectual discourses.

Finally, there were others who did not agree with the ideas and actions of combating Communists and Communism; any restrictions to freedom of thought would violate human rights and democratic principles. They believed that in the reformation era any restrictions to the freedom of thought should be resisted.

Among the people who supported the burning of the books was Abdul Qodir Jaelani,³⁰ a political activist, Muslim preacher and member of the People's Representative Assembly (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, DPR). Jaelani argued that the burning of the books was acceptable because Communism was an ideology that totally conflicted with the principles of Islam. The evidence was, according to Jaelani, two rebellions and the coup of the PKI in 1948 and 1965, wherein the Muslims became the targets of Communist brutality. Thousands of Muslims, especially the *kyai* (traditional Islamic scholars) and their *santris* were butchered by PKI members during the two rebellions. The brutality of the communists was also seen in places like the Soviet Union, China and Turkmenistan. In these countries, just like in Indonesia, thousands of Muslims were massacred by the Communists. Implied in Jaelani's argument was the belief that the burning of the Leftist books by the AAK was "nothing" compared to what had been carried out by the Communists against the Muslims in other parts of the world.

The effort of writing books that counter Communism, Jaelani argued, was only one way. This he had done since his student days in the 1960's. So far, Jaelani has produced several works on Marxism and Communism. One of them is *Komunisme Musuh Islam Sepanjang Sejarah* (Communism, An Everlasting Enemy in History, 1998), which contains his critical analysis of Marxism and Communism. Regarding the burning of the books, Jaelani disagreed with those who thought that the burning had discredited the image of Islam and that it was counter-productive. He said:

The judgment that the burning of the books is good or bad depends necessarily on the people. Now, that depends on what criteria we use to judge the burning. It is sure that those people who have sympathy with Marxism would disagree with the burning. On the other hand, those people who hate Communism would say the burning is a good deed. They consider that the burning of the Leftist books is one heroic action in order to crush the Communist ideology that is antagonistic to Islam throughout history.³¹

Jaelani believed that combating Communists by destroying their power would not violate human rights because "if the Communists

look at themselves as having upheld human rights, so the Muslims at the same time could also claim that they have human rights too. Moreover, if the Communists have the right to crush the Muslims, we – the Muslims – too have the right to crush them”.³² Jaelani further believed that Leftist books could and should be countered by the publication of Islamic books.³³

Naufal, one of the key figures in the book burning, asserted that the disapproval of the book burning came from those who were Leftist or at least secular. He was deeply critical of the media, which he believed unfairly reported news on the AAK. Mass media provided more space to those who opposed the burning of Leftist books, which contributed to tarnishing the image of the AAK.³⁴ The burning of the Leftist books, Naufal maintains, is a symbol of opposition against the Communist movement and a reminder for people that the Left (Communists) still exist. Indonesians, he argued, should never forget the crimes of the Communists against Muslims and the nation in the past.³⁵

He argued further that countering the Communists cannot be through discussion, but demonstrations such as the book burning. As the Communists have resorted to violence in the past, the only way to counter their rise is to fight fire with fire.³⁶ Naufal rejected claims that such book burnings contribute to the destruction of civilizations; while he agreed that books are a significant manifestation of human civilization and that burning books should not normally be encouraged, books that bring harm to society should always be an exception. The example he provided was that of the *Satanic Verses* by Salman Rushdie.³⁷ This book, Naufal claimed, was blasphemous, defaming the good name of the Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W) and his family (*ahl al-bayt*). It was because of this book that Ayatollah Khomeini, the leader of the Iranian revolution, gave a *fatwa* calling for Salman Rushdie's death.³⁸ Naufal's main criticism of Communist writers in Indonesia is that they often purposely neglect to make any mention of the communist brutality of 1948 and 1965. Naufal argues further:

Are we allowed to write a book that may degrade and humiliate one's dignity or the honour of a group or a nation...? Or due to the tremendous freedom granted to us, we have courage to write a book that can disgrace, dishonour and humiliate a religion different from ours? Or in order to be dubbed as a democrat who upholds democratic values, are we allowed to publish a book that distorts historical facts and data where in the past we behaved like wild animals towards each other (Cannibalism or *Homo Homini Lupus*) simply because they have

different ideology with us? Or are we allowed to publish books that contradict the rules of the game of a country, say communist books which are banned from being distributed in our country...the MPRS No. 25/1966 Decree has not been revoked yet. In fact, efforts have been made to make it a Law.³⁹

For Muslims like Taufiq Ismail, a poet from Bukit Tinggi of West Sumatra, their concern and worry over the revival of the Communists is based on past experience. In the 1960s, for example, Taufiq was able to witness firsthand the terror of the Lekra activists. He observed that many young Muslims were attracted by the Leftist and Communist teachings, and in an effort to counter this, Taufiq became actively involved in seminars and symposia, and published writings concerning Communism, PKI and other related issues. In the 1990s, together with D.S Mulyanto, Taufiq launched *Prahara Budaya, Kilas Balik Ofensif Lekra PKI/Dkk*.⁴⁰ Here, both sought to demonstrate to like-minded readers the political terrorism and cultural offensives of the Lekra artists (Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat, People Art Institute),⁴¹ a cultural group under PKI. Supported by PKI, the most powerful political party at the time, the Lekra offended and discredited the anti-Communist cultural groups such as the *Manifesto Kebudayaan* groups led by Gunawan Muhammad and Rendra⁴² and accused a respected Muslim 'ulama, Hamka, of committing vulgar plagiarism. They also enforced socialist realism,⁴³ with strong Communist ideological leanings, to other non-Leftist artists and culturalist groups.

The launching of *Prahara Budaya*, according to Taufiq Ismail, was aimed at reminding the Indonesian people - notably the younger generation - of the 1990's, who had never experienced firsthand the Communist cruelties of the past, especially by the PKI in the 1960's.⁴⁴ *Prahara Budaya* exposed the writings of Pramoedya Ananta Toer, Sobron Aidit, Sitor Situmorang and other Lekra cultural activists containing their cultural offensives against non-Leftist oriented cultural groups notably the *Manikebu*⁴⁵ group.

Taufiq maintains that the communists betrayed the Republic twice: First in 1948 when the Indonesians were fighting the Dutch military aggression and second during the abortive coup of 1965. In 1948, the PKI massacred thousands of Muslims in Madiun. Many of the people massacred were *kyai* (school heads) and *santri* (students) of pesantrens.⁴⁶ Due to the betrayal of the PKI, the new born Republic of Indonesia was on the brink of precipice. In 1965, Communists killed six generals of the Indonesian army in one night

alone.⁴⁷ Similar massacres by Communists, he claims, did not only take place in Indonesia but in other parts of the world. In his later work, *Katastrofi Mendunia, Marxisma, Leninisma, Stalinisma, Maoisma, Narkoba*, Taufik shows that bloody massacres were also carried out by Communists in the Soviet Union, Cambodia and China. Pol Pot murdered more than two and a half million Cambodians, Lenin killed six million Russians and Mao caused the deaths of some 50 million Chinese.⁴⁸ This proves that Communist claims of democratic ideals and human rights are, according to Taufiq, totally false.⁴⁹

Taufiq further pointed out that the Charter of the United Nations (UN) justifies the banning of a book or an idea as long as that book or idea would supposedly harm the existence of a nation. He mentions the case of Nazism and the Nazi Party in the German Federal Republic. In this democratic state, Nazism and the Nazi Party had been formally outlawed by the government since both had jeopardized the nation in the past. This is also the case in Indonesia. The ideology of Communism and the PKI has to be formally outlawed due to the fact that the PKI has in the past caused the deaths of thousands of Indonesians.⁵⁰

Considerably more hostile responses to the book burning were launched by academics, intellectuals, cultural activists and members of NGOs incorporated within the so called Aliansi untuk Kemerdekaan Berfikir and Bersuara (Alliance for the Freedom of Thought and Speech). This group was led, among others, by Franz Magnis Suseno, Hermawan Sulistiyo, Ratna Sarumpaet and Asvi Warman Adam. Aliansi untuk Kemerdekaan Berfikir dan Bersuara strongly condemned the burning considering it as contrary to the principles of freedom of thought and speech.

Franz Magnis Suseno, widely recognized in Indonesia as a knowledgeable scholar on Marxism (as well as the philosophy),⁵¹ felt that the burning of the books, whatever the reasons, was an attack on people's freedom of expression, in a way similar to the New Order regime in the past.⁵² The New Order had distorted the ideals of democracy by limiting people's freedom of expression through the banning of Leftist books for more than three decades. What the AAK had done, according to him, was resort to "street politics" aimed at assaulting people's freedom of expression which, to some extent, is similar to that of the politics of stigmatization of the New Order regime towards the "Left".

Suseno believes that the burning of the books resulted from a misperception and ignorance of the AAK members on what Leftist

books are. His *Pemikiran Karl Marx*, he suggests, is not Leftist, Marxist or Communist, because he himself is not Leftist. Thus, the burning of his book demonstrated the failure of the AAK to make a distinction between the books by Leftists and about Leftists.⁵³

Suseno's stance on Marxism and Communism is made clear when we consider his opinions on the subject. Marxism, Suseno argues, is out of date and is no more relevant to the present situation. Despite the fact that Karl Marx had been successful in formulating the theory of class struggle, theory of surplus value, and theory of capitalism in its relation to social, economic and political development of society, Suseno argues that Marxism is full of academic fallacies and shortcomings⁵⁴ The most serious academic fallacies of Marxism are, among others, Marx's negation of political power structure (the state) following the triumph of the proletarian revolution, his theory of classless society, and the utopianism embodied within Marxism.⁵⁵ Communism, that is the synthesis of Marxism and Leninism, is also full of faults. Communism has a strong ideological obsession with terrorism, violence, coercion and assassination. According to Suseno, terrorism is something built within Communist regimes. That is why every Communist regime is barbaric. This was demonstrated by the former Soviet Union under Stalin. Not less than 50 million Russians were murdered by the Stalinist regime. This was the greatest terror that ever existed in human history and "the best example of the cruellest crime in modern history."⁵⁶ This is also exactly the case in other Communist states like China during Mao's Cultural Revolution and Cambodia under Pol Pot's rule where millions of people were massacred by the regimes.⁵⁷

Regardless of his sentiments regarding Marxism and Communism, Suseno argues that the "Communist threat" to Islam and the Republic of Indonesia as perceived by the AAK and many other anti-Communist groups is baseless. The issue of the "Communist threat", "the revival of the PKI" and the like, he notes, are nonsense since Communism, like that of the PKI, Leninism, and Stalinism, has been discredited by history. The demise of Communist states like the Soviet Union and those of Eastern Europe is evidence of this. Today there are no more powerful Communist states with the exception of following the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. Suseno further argues:

Communism in the sense of PKI Communism is obviously over....
Communist thought is over for it is no longer interesting. In terms of

ideology, communism has failed. The Soviet Union, the most important communist state, has collapsed. There is no bigger blow than the collapse of the Soviet Union.⁵⁸

Further to erroneously labelling Suseno a Marxist Jesuit and Leftist, another serious shortcoming of the AAK group (along with other anti-Communist groups) is their ignorance of the fundamental differences between Marxism and Communism. They erroneously consider Marxism as equal to Communism. It is true that Marxism is self embodied within Communism. The former is simply a part of Communism, while the latter is much more than Marxism, for Communism is the combination of Marxism and Leninism. Lenin has co-opted certain elements of Marxism, interpreted it according to his own methods, and incorporated them into new political doctrines that had never been the concern of Karl Marx. The doctrine of the struggle for power by the Communist Party and the rule by the dictatorship of the proletariat, Suseno asserts, are two examples of the new doctrine imposed by Lenin into Marxism. Such a doctrine had never been taught by Marx in his life time.

Other responses to the burning of the books by the AAK were provided by Hermawan Sulistiyo, Ratna Sarumpaet and Asvi Warman Adam. Sulistiyo, a noted social researcher at the Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI), argues that it is rather ignorant to believe that – under present conditions - Communism is capable of serving as a foundation for the formation of a political system. This is because Communism has failed and perished with the demise of the Soviet Union and Eastern European Communist political systems. Communism, Sulistiyo argues, should however be studied properly for its historical value and relation to other ideas and ideologies. Marx's ideas are related to the ideas of other social thinkers. Marx' *Das Capital*, Sulistoyo asserts, is one example of this. He was enormously influenced by the author of *Muqaddimah*, Ibn Khaldun, an outstanding Muslim sociologist of the thirteen century. Several pages of Marx's *Das Capital*, according to Sulistiyo, was a copy of Khaldun's *Muqaddimah*.⁵⁹ The Muslims, therefore, Sulistiyo argues, should not be anti-Marxist since Marx himself has derived many of his ideas from Muslim thinkers like Ibn Khaldun.⁶⁰

Ratna Sarumpaet argues that the burning of the books by the AAK violated the State Constitution and Islamic teachings. Sarumpaet asserts: "If such a threat is ever carried out, it will be remembered as an act to weaken minds, and in total contradiction to our Constitution and religious teachings. Our religious teachings

state that reading is an obligation.⁶¹ Quoting the sayings of Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W), Sarumpaet argues that Islam has obliged the Muslims to read. That is why the burning of the books is absolutely incompatible with Islamic teachings.⁶²

A noted historian of LIPI and Paris University graduate, Asvi Warman Adam, argues that the burning of the Leftist books by AAK was motivated by two factors: first, historical engineering brought about by the "remnants of the New Order regime" in regard to the issue of Communism and the re-emergence of the defunct PKI; second, various political interests behind the activities of the anti-Communist element within the Indonesian society. The AAK, for instance, was activated by Eurico Guterres, a person who is close to the military elite.⁶³

The argument of the AAK that the MPRS No. XXV/1966 Decree offers legitimate grounds to burn the Leftist books, he asserts, is groundless despite the claim that it was taken to implement the 1945 State Constitution, Pancasila, and MPRS No. XXV/1966 Decree. The 1945 State Constitution stipulates that one of the foremost concerns of the state is to intellectually enlighten Indonesians. The burning and "sweeping" of books was absolutely incompatible with this goal to educate people of the nation and incongruous with the principle of humanity and justice stated in the Pancasila ideology.

Adam argues further that the MPRS No. XXV/1966 Decree has serious shortcomings. First, the members of MPRS who formulated the decree of MPRS were not elected through general elections (by the consent of the people) but were appointed by Soeharto, President Soekarno's successor.⁶⁴ Thus, Adam asserts, the MPRS No. XXV/1966 Decree was made by an illegitimate political institution.

Second, the MPRS No. XXV/1966 Decree is discriminative in the sense that it only outlawed the PKI, but not Marxism, Leninism and so forth. The outlawing of the PKI was merely based on the accusation that the PKI was behind the abortive coup of September 30, 1965. Adam argues that the accusation is questionable because as a party, organization or institution, PKI was not involved in the coup. It was only a small number of the PKI elite like Aidit, Sam Kamruzzaman and Nyoto who plotted and masterminded the coup and the assassination of army generals on September 30, 1965.⁶⁵

The outlawing of the PKI as a party, therefore, is illegal. The Decree of the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly No. XXV/1966 is dubious and is not able to justify the banning of the PKI. Adam

suspects that the real actors behind the anti-Communist movements were Soeharto's cronies,⁶⁶ certain factions within the military, and Golkar, the "political machine" of the New Order regime. By raising the issue of Communism and the awakening of the PKI, they attempted to distract attention away from the issue of human rights abuses by the army generals and government officers' corruption. This is clearly indicated by the direct involvement of TNI (National Indonesian Army) and Golkar in the anti-Communist movement in Central and East Java. The issue of Communism was raised by Golkar because the Communists were politically weak and could easily be treated as scapegoats.⁶⁷ Adam argues:

...the anti-Communist actions, including the burning of the Leftist books by the AAK is basically part of the conflict among the elite in the context of power struggle; especially the elites of TNI and Golkar who had a vested interest in manipulating Islam and the PKI to shift the attention of the people from such issues as miscarriages of human rights perpetrated by TNI and Golkar made public by the leftists...The issue of the PKI was introduced to overwhelm it (the issue of human right miscarriages). Thus, the issue of Communism is not merely ideological but also political in nature that was exploited by the political elite. Further question may arise, to what extent the military and Golkar elites are involved in these anti-Communist actions.⁶⁸

On the question of why the AAK burned the Leftist books, Adam asserts that the AAK clearly misunderstood the nature of such books. Hermawan Sulistiyo's *Palu Arit Di Ladang Tebu* is not a Leftist book and its author is also not a Leftist. Suseno's *Pemikiran Karl Marx* is also not a Leftist book. On the contrary, according to Adam, both Sulistiyo and Suseno's works are very critical of Marxism and the Communists. Both authors demonstrated the fallacies of Marxism and Communism.⁶⁹ Hence the AAK simply burned the books that more believed – but not confirmed – to be Leftist. Adam argues further that the burning of the books clearly demonstrated the ignorance of the AAK in the understanding of the importance of Marx's ideas in the tradition of social sciences. He asserts that Marxism has to be studied since it has an enormous intellectual impact upon the existing social sciences. Neglecting Marx's ideas in the social sciences would weaken the tradition of social sciences in Indonesia.⁷⁰

Conclusion

The collapse of the New Order regime was accompanied by the flourishing of "Leftist" literature in Indonesia. The appearance of

such Leftist, many believed, was an indication of the revival of the Leftists in post-Soeharto era.

To contain the growth of Communism, several Muslim groups came together to establish the AAK (the Anti-Communist Alliance) in April 2001. In response to the rise of Communism, the AAK burned what were viewed to be Leftist books. The AAK reasoned that the distribution of Communist books had violated the Decree of MPRS NO. XXV/1966, Government Regulation and *Pancasila* ideology.

It seems, however, that the burning of the Leftist books by the AAK failed to achieve the group's main aims, that is, to combat Communism. In the eyes of the Indonesian public, especially the academics, burning the books is an action that may be interpreted as an attack on freedom of expression. In fact, the burning of the books was a blessing in disguise for the Leftists since it undoubtedly distorted the image of the anti-Communists in the eyes of the public. The books, whatever contents they may have, symbolize intellectual achievement, freedom of expression, enlightenment and dissemination of information.

Endnotes

1. Sofian M. Asgart, "The Phenomenon of Paramilitary Organizations, Case Studies of Six Organizations," *Indonesia's Post-Soeharto Democracy Movement*, eds. Stanley Adi Prasetyo, A.E Priyono et. al (Jakarta: Demos, 2003), 643.
2. For example, Lasykar Jihad (Jihad Militia), Lasykar Front Pembela Islam (FPI Militia), Lasykar Hizbullah (Hizbullah Militia) and Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia led by Abu Bakar Ba'syir. For a further discussion on these Islamic paramilitary organizations, see Zaky Mubarok, *Islam dan Politik di Indonesia, Studi tentang Gerakan Pemikiran Kelompok Islam Fundamentalis Lasykar Jihad, Front Pembela Islam (FPI), Majelis Mujahidin dan Hizbut Tarir Indonesia* (MA thesis, Program Paska Sarjana Universitas Indonesia, 2004).
3. For example, Lasykar Merah Putih (the Red White Militia).
4. For example, Pemuda Panca Marga (Youth of Panca Marga) and Pemuda Pancasila (Youth of Pancasila).
5. One of them is Generation 66 activists who – via Abdul Muis - supplied 8 million Rupiah for the AAK activities. Naufal Dunggio, personal interview, Jakarta, 8 December 2003.
6. Suaib Didu told the writer thirty three groups, while Abdul Muis estimated thirty five Islamic and nationalist groups joined the declaration of the AAK. Suaib Didu, Interview, Jakarta, 5 July 2003. Regarding Muis' estimate, see Asgart, 646.
7. In my interview, Habib Rizieq Shihab said that FPI did not join the AAK because he refused to be led by a Christian like Eurico Guterres. According to him, it is the Muslims who should lead the AAK, not a Christian, whoever he is. Interview with Habib Rizieq Shihab, Jakarta, 6 March 2003.
8. Interview with Abdul Muis, General Chairman of the AAK. Quoted in Asgart, 647.
9. Interview with Alfian Tanjung, Jakarta, 8 July 2003.
10. Suaib Didu informed the writer that the Communists have infiltrated the activities of university students including the students of State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah (formerly IAIN Syarif Hidayatullah) and University of Indonesia, Jakarta. Moreover, the Communists have also infiltrated the Indonesian Armed Forces. Didu told the writer that he obtained this information from Lieutenant-General Ryamizard Ryacudu, the Commander of KOSTRAD (Strategic Army Forces Command). Interview with Suaib Didu, 5 July 2003.
11. Interview with Alfian Tanjung, Jakarta, 8 July 2003.
12. Interview with Suaib Didu, 5 July 2003.
13. Quoted in Asgart, 647.
14. See Boyd Compton, *Surat-Surat Rahasia Boyd Compton* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 1992).
15. See Andree Feillard, *NU vis-à-vis Negara, Pencarian Isi, Bentuk dan Makna* (Yogyakarta: LKiS, 1999), 71-93.
16. See *Adil*, No. 29, 69th year, April 30, 2001, unless otherwise mentioned.
17. *Ibid.*
18. The sixteen organizations include, among others, Forum Komunikasi and ABRI (now TNI), PAN (Partai Amanat Nasional), PPP (Partai Persatuan Pembangunan), PK (Partai Keadilan), PBB (Partai Bulan Bintang), Gerakan Pemuda Ka'bah and Pemuda Muhammadiyah, FSRM (Forum Silaturahmi

- Remaja Masjid), FAKI (Front Anti-Komunis Indonesia), "Jaringan Kehormatan Partai Golkar, Pemuda Panca Marga and Gerakan Pembela Anti Komunis". See Adil, No. 29 69th Year, April 30, 2001.
19. Among others are GAKB (Gerakan Anti Komunis Banten), AAK (Aliansi Anti Komunis), FPI (Front Pembela Islam), BAKDA (Brigade Anti-Komunis dan Anarkhi), Gebukin PKI, Buistu, Gapbatari, IKBT (Ikatan Keluarga Betawi), KAK (Komando Anti-Komunis) FAKS (Fron Anti Komunis Surakarta), FAK (Front Anti Komunis, Bandung), ABANK (Anak Betawi Asli Anti Komunis), Persatuan Pemuda Anti Komunis (Yogyakarta), KAPAK (Kesatuan Pemuda Anti Komunis, Yogyakarta), GEPAKO (Gerakan Pembela Anti Komunis, Yogyakarta), and FAKI (Front Anti-Komunis Indonesia).
 20. Suara Karya, 14 April 2001.
 21. *Ibid.* For them, the fear of the revival of communism is logical since the symptoms are observable. They refer to the statement of the Commander of Military Region IV Diponegoro (Central Java), Major General Sumarsono, that his office has detected the activities of Communism in Central Java. The communists have infiltrated all walks of life to incite sentiment on class struggle or to lay one against another. The communist activities are observable particularly in the working and land sector. See Suara Karya, April 12, 2001.
 22. Interview with Alfian Tanjung, Jakarta, 8 July 2003.
 23. *Ibid.*
 24. *Ibid.*
 25. Interview with Stanley Adi Prasetyo, May 22, 2003 in Jakarta.
 26. Interview with Suaib Didu, Jakarta, 5 July 2003.
 27. *Ibid.*
 28. *Ibid.*
 29. For example, the Utan Kayu Jakarta bookshop remained open. Its director Stanley, said in an interview, that he was not afraid of the AAK action because he was sure that the security agents would protect his bookshop from vandalistic actions of the AAK. Interview with Stanley, 22 May 2003.
 30. Abdul Qodir Jaelani, "Kita Juga Berhak Menghancurkan Mereka", Tempo, 2002.
 31. *Ibid.*
 32. *Ibid.*
 33. See "Kontroversi Razia Buku Kiri", in Sabili, No. 25, VII, June 6, 2001/14 Rabiul Awwal 1422., 19.
 34. Gamma, 16-22 May 2001.
 35. The Communists' sins, according to Naufal, are the PKI revolt in Madiun in 1948 and the abortive coup of September 30, 1965.
 36. Gamma, 16-22 May 2001.
 37. Salman Rushdie is an Indian-born novelist who lives in England.
 38. To the people in the West, the reaction of the Muslims to Rushdie's Satanic Verses is uncivilized, and barbaric and difficult to understand. To Karen Armstrong, "it seemed incredible that a novel could inspire such murderous hatred, a reaction which was regarded as proof of the incurable intolerance of Islam." Karen Armstrong, *Muhammad: A Western Attempt to Understand Islam* (London: Victor Gollanz Ltd. 1991), 21.
 39. Naufal, "Buku: Antara Manfaat dan Mudharat", 3.

40. Taufiq Ismail, *Prahara Budaya, Kilas Balik Ofensif Lekra/PKDkk* (Bandung: Mizan in cooperation with Republika, 1995). "Taufiq Ismail, "Ini Baunya Adalah Bau PKI", interview with Media Dakwah Magazine, Jumadil Akhir 1419/Oktober 1998.
41. This cultural institution was established by the communist activists of PKI on August 17, 1953. Its aim was to combat the remnants of colonialism. In its later development, Lekra was affiliated to, controlled by and a part of the cultural wing of the PKI. See Hersri Setiawan, *Kamus Gestok* (Yogyakarta: Galang Press, 2003), 169-171. See also Eka Kurniawan, *Pramoedya Ananta Toer dan Sastra Realisme Sosialis* (Yogyakarta: Yayasan Aksara Indonesia, 1999), 105-115.
42. On Manifesto Kebudayaan group cultural activities and ideas, see Gunawan Mohammad, *Peristiwa "Manikebu", Kesusastraan Indonesia dan Politik di Tahun 1960-an* (Jakarta: Tempo, 1988). See also Kurniawan, *Pramoedya Ananta Toer*, 115-124.
43. Socialist realism is the ideology of Lekra.
44. Ismail, *Prahara Budaya*, 6.
45. Manikebu stands for Manifesto Kebudayaan (Cultural Manifesto). It is an organization of cultural activists established during the early 1960's with the aim of anticipating the Lekra activity (PKI). Manikebu was eventually banned by President Soekarno August, 17 1963. Setiawan, 179.
46. *Kyai* is a traditional religious scholar; *santri* is traditional Islamic student and *pesantren* is a traditional Islamic boarding school.
47. Interview with Taufiq Ismail, Jakarta, 19 September 2004.
48. Taufiq Ismail, *Katastropi Mendunia, Marxisma, Leninisma, Stalinisma, Maoisma, Narkoba* (Jakarta: Yayasan Titik Infitum, 2004).
49. Interview with Taufiq Ismail, Jakarta, 19 September 2004.
50. *Ibid.*
51. See for example Franz Magnis Suseno: *Normative Voraussetzungen im Denken des Jungen Marx* (Alber: 1975), *Etika Umum* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 1975), *Filsafat Sebagai Ilmu Kritis* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Kanisius, 1993), *Javanische Weisheit un Ethik. Studien zu einer ostlichen Moral* (Oldenbourg: 1981), *Kita dan Wayang* (Jakarta: Leppena, 1982), *Etika Jawa dalam Tantangan* (co-authored with Dr. S. Reksosusilo CM, Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 1983), *Etika Jawa, Sebuah Analisa Falsafi tentang Kebijaksanaan Hidup Jawa* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1984), *Kuasa dan Moral* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1986), *Etika Dasar, Masalah-Masalah Pokok Filsafat Moral* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 1987), *Etika Politik Prinsip-prinsip Moral Dasar Kenegaraan Modern* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1987), *Neue Schwingen fur Garuda, Indonesien zwischen Tradition un Moderne* (Peter Kindt: 1989), *Berfilsafat Dari Konteks* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1991), *Mencari Sosok Demokrasi, Sebuah Telaah Filosofis* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1995), and *Pemikiran Karl Marx, Dari Sosialisme Utopis ke Perselisihan Revisionisme* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1999).
52. Interview with Franz Magnis Suseno, Jakarta, 14 October 2003.
53. *Ibid.*
54. On Suseno's criticism of Marx's ideas, see his writings, *Pemikiran Karl Marx* (1999) and *Filsafat Sebagai Ilmu Kritis* (1992).
55. Suseno, *Etika Politik* (Jakarta: Gramedia, 1994), 271.
56. Suseno, "Marxisme-Komunisme Sudah Finish", *Kompas*, April 17, 2000.
57. Interview with Franz Magnis Suseno, Jakarta, 14 October 2003.
58. *Ibid.*

59. Kompas, 9 May 2001. Sulistiyo's assertion is supposedly true. A prominent Muslim sociologist, Fuad Ba'ali writes that Khaldun's sociological thought has tremendously influenced Western classical social theorists such as August Comte, Durkheim and Karl Marx. See Fuad Ba'ali, *Society, State and Urbanism, Ibn Khaldun's Sociological Thought* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1988).
60. Interview with Hermawan Sulistiyo, Jakarta, September 2004.
61. The Jakarta Post, May 9, 2001
62. Ibid.
63. Adam Warman Adam, "Rekonsiliasi? Pemerintah dan TNI Harus Minta Maaf," interview with Koran Tempo, October 1, 2001.
64. Interview with Adam Warman Adam in LIPI Jakarta, 31 August 2004.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid.
67. Adam Warman Adam, "Marxisme dan Leninisme tak Dilarang", Tokoh, 14-20 May 2000.
68. Interview with Adam Warman Adam in LIPI Jakarta, 31 August 2004.
69. Ibid., 3.
70. Ibid.

Ahmad Suhelmi is a Senior Lecturer in Political Science, Department of Political Science and Researcher at Selo Soemardjan Research Centre FISIP UI Depok.