

# STUDIA ISLAMIKA

INDONESIAN JOURNAL FOR ISLAMIC STUDIES

Volume 11, Number 2, 2004



---

DEFENDING THE MAJESTY OF ISLAM:  
INDONESIA'S FRONT PEMBELA ISLAM (FPI) 1998-2003

**Jajang Jahroni**

---

IN SEARCH OF AN ISLAMIC LEADER:  
MALAY PERCEPTIONS OF IBN SA'UD'S TRIUMPH AND  
THE DOMINATION OF THE WAḤḤĀBĪS IN SAUDI ARABIA

**Mohammad Redzuan Othman**

---

BEING A SHĪ'ITE AMONG THE SUNNĪ MAJORITY  
IN INDONESIA: A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF  
USTADZ HUSEIN AL-HABSYI (1921-1994)

**Zulkifli**

# STUDIA ISLAMIKA

Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies

Vol. 11, no. 2, 2004

---

## 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)*

## 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

*Lucy Rhydwen-Marett*

## ARABIC LANGUAGE ADVISOR

*Nursamad*

## 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) and sponsored by the Australia-Indonesia Institute (AII). 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).

Zulkifli

## Being a Shī‘ite among the Sunnī Majority in Indonesia: A Preliminary Study of Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi (1921-1994)

**Abstraksi:** *Sejumlah kajian berkaitan dengan posisi dan peranan komunitas Arab di kawasan Asia Tenggara, telah dilakukan, baik yang berkenaan dengan kehidupan sosial, politik dan ekonomi maupun mengenai kehidupan intelektual dan religius mereka. Akan tetapi, satu hal yang masih luput dari perhatian adalah menyangkut afiliasi komunitas Arab Nusantara dengan Syi‘ah, aliran (madzhab) Islam minoritas yang dalam berbagai aspek berbeda dan bertentangan dengan Islam Sunni. Syi‘ah sebagai aliran politik dan keagamaan dianut oleh sekitar 10 persen dari total penduduk Muslim di Dunia, dan yang terbanyak adalah penduduk Iran. Syi‘ah bahkan menjadi agama resmi masyarakat Iran sehingga terdapat kesan bahwa Syi‘ah identik dengan Iran. Aliran ini tampaknya baru menarik perhatian para sarjana, terutama di Barat, setelah kemenangan Revolusi Islam Iran 1978-1979 yang dipimpin Ayatullah Ruhullah Khomeini.*

*Keberadaan Syi‘ah di Indonesia, seperti halnya di daerah lain di luar Iran, masih belum banyak diketahui baik oleh para sarjana maupun oleh pemimpin Muslim sendiri. Padahal beberapa penulis beranggapan bahwa Syi‘ah telah masuk ke wilayah Nusantara sejak awal kedatangan Islam. Artinya, terdapat penganut Syi‘ah di kalangan penyebar Islam awal dimaksud yang ditunjukkan oleh beberapa tradisi Syi‘ah yang dipraktikkan oleh kaum Muslim di Indonesia dan adanya beberapa karya sastra yang memperlihatkan pengaruh Syi‘ah.*

*Fenomena Syi‘ah ini berkaitan erat dengan peranan kaum Alawiyiyin—yang dianggap sebagai agen yang memperkenalkan Syi‘ah di Indonesia—dalam penyebaran Islam. Bahkan, pada akhir abad ke 19 dan awal abad ke 20 terdapat sejumlah tokoh Syi‘ah dari kalangan Sayyid meskipun hanya diketahui oleh kalangan terbatas karena mereka tidak pernah, kecuali sebagian kecil saja, menampakkan diri mereka sebagai penganut Syi‘ah. Tokoh-tokoh dimaksud, antara lain, adalah Muhammad*

bin Ahmad al-Muhdar (1861-1926), Muhammad bin Aqil bin Yahya (1863-1931), Ali bin Ahmad Shahab (1864-1945), dan Aqil bin Zainal Abidin al-Jufri (1870-1952).

Sebagian figur Syi'ah tersebut, bersama-sama dengan tokoh-tokoh Arab lain, ikut ambil bagian dalam pendirian dan pengelolaan organisasi Islam pertama di Hindia Belanda, Jami'at Khair, yang berdiri pada tahun 1901 di Jakarta dan lembaga-lembaga sejenis di Pekalongan, Solo, dan Surabaya. Akan tetapi, tokoh-tokoh Syi'ah tersebut tampaknya mengajarkan dan menyebarkan ajaran-ajaran Syi'ah hanya terbatas pada keluarga, kerabat dan sahabat dekat saja. Hal ini karena penganut Syi'ah merupakan kelompok keagamaan minoritas di Indonesia.

Artikel ini mencoba melihat bagaimana cara-cara yang dilakukan oleh seorang ulama Syi'i yang berasal dari kelompok Sayyid, Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi (1921-1994), dalam memelihara dan menyebarkan keyakinannya sebagai penganut Syi'ah dan ajaran-ajaran Syi'ah lainnya di tengah mayoritas masyarakat Muslim Sunni; bagaimana pula respon kelompok Sunni setelah mereka mengetahui bahwa sang 'alim tersebut seorang penganut Syi'ah dan berusaha menyebarkan ajaran-ajarannya.

Tulisan ini lebih dari sekedar potret seorang tokoh tetapi menyangkut berbagai tokoh dan organisasi sosial keagamaan penting di Indonesia sehingga signifikansinya tampak jelas dalam rangka memahami kompleksitas dan dinamika Islam Indonesia pada umumnya and hubungan Sunni-Syi'i pada khususnya.

Yang menjadi fokus perhatian artikel adalah bagaimana Husein Al-Habsyi memperoleh pendidikan di lingkungan pendidikan Arab Indonesia, Malaysia, dan di beberapa negara di Timur Tengah dan sekaligus mengabdikan dirinya sebagai pengajar di lembaga-lembaga serupa. Di sinilah dia mengenal dan mempelajari Syi'ah. Kemudian, dia terjun ke dunia politik dengan aktif di Masyumi sehingga dapat menjalin hubungan dengan tokoh-tokoh politik.

Setelah Revolusi Islam Iran, Husein Al-Habsyi memuji revolusi dan pemimpinnya, Ayatullah Ruhullah Khumaini. Akan tetapi, penting dicatat bahwa kendati Husein Al-Habsyi—seperti terdapat dalam karya-karyanya—membela ajaran-ajaran Syi'ah, dia tetap menyatakan diri sebagai pengikut Sunni. Yang disebut terakhir ini dikenal dengan istilah taqiyyah, yakni menyembunyikan keyakinan diri guna menghindar dari bahaya dan malapetaka yang mungkin terjadi. Akan tetapi, akhirnya keyakinan sebagai Syi'ah tersebut diketahui juga oleh masyarakat Sunni di Jawa Timur. Secara umum, reaksi kaum Sunni cenderung negatif terhadap Husein Al-Habsyi khususnya, dan Syi'ah pada umumnya, sebagaimana ditunjukkan dalam berbagai tindakan *oppressive*. Sebagian pemimpin Sunni tersebut menolak kehadiran Syi'ah di Indonesia baik karena alasan teologis maupun alasan-alasan sosial politik.

## Being a Shī'ite among the Sunnī Majority in Indonesia: A Preliminary Study of Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi (1921-1994)

**خلاصة:** إن عددا من الدراسات قد أجري على الجاليات العربية في مناطق جنوب شرقي آسيا سواء فيما يتعلق بحياتهم الاجتماعية والسياسية والاقتصادية أم حياتهم الفكرية والدينية، ولكن الجانب الأهم الذي لم يلق من الدارسين أي اهتمام هو انتماءهم للشيعة وهي مذهب أقلية يختلف في كثير من الجوانب ويتعارض مع أهل السنة والجماعة، وهي مذهب يعتقد به حوالي عشرة في المائة من مجموع السكان المسلمين في العالم وأكثرهم يقطنون دولة إيران (Iran)، بل أصبحت الشيعة مذهب إيران الرسمي وصار الأمر وكأن الشيعة هي إيران؛ ولم يثر هذا المذهب اهتمام الدارسين وخاصة الغربيين إلا بعد قيام الثورة الإيرانية بقيادة آية الله روح الله الخميني ١٩٧٨-١٩٧٩م.

ووجود الشيعة في إندونيسيا كما هو الحال في المناطق الأخرى خارج إيران غير معروف لدى كثير من الدارسين وزعماء المسلمين مع أن عددا من الباحثين يعتقدون أن الشيعة قد وصلت إندونيسيا مع أول مجيء الإسلام مما يعني أن من الدعاة الأوائل من يعتقد الشيعة بدليل أن بعض التقاليد الشيعية يمارسها بعض المسلمين الإندونيسيين وأن بعض المؤلفات الأدبية متأثرة بالتعاليم الشيعية.

وهذه الظاهرة الشيعية بإندونيسيا مرتبطة بدور العلويين الذي يعتقد أنهم هم الذين أتوا بالشيعة عندما ينشرون الإسلام في إندونيسيا، بل كان هناك شخصيات شيعية من السادة الأشراف منذ أواخر القرن التاسع عشر وأوائل القرن العشرين الميلاديين إلا أنهم غير معروفين إلا لدى أوساط محدودة لأنهم لم يكونوا يريدون إلا قليلا منهم أن يلاحظ الناس بأنهم شيعة، وهؤلاء الشخصيات هم على سبيل المثال عبد الله محضر (١٨٦١-١٩٢٦م) ومحمد بن عقيل بن يحيى (١٨٦٣ - ١٩٣١م) وعقيل بن زين العابدين الجفري (١٨٧٠-١٩٥٢م).

وكان البعض منهم يشاركون مع الآخرين من الجاليات العربية في إنشاء وإدارة أولى منظمة إسلامية أنشئت في عهد الاستعمار الهولندي وهي جمعية خير عام ١٩٠١م، ومؤسسات أخرى مشابهة في كل من بيكالونجان (Pekalongan) وسولو (Solo) وسورابايا (Surabaya)، بيد أنهم فيما يتعلق بترويج مذهبهم الشيعي في إندونيسيا كانت دعوتهم قاصرة فيما يبدو على الأصدقاء والأقرباء، وذلك لأنهم أقلية في إندونيسيا.

تستهدف هذه المقالة إلقاء الضوء على حياة الأستاذ حسين الحبشي (١٩٢٩-١٩٩٩م) وهو عالم شيعي من السادة الأشراف كيف استطاع أن يحتفظ بمذهبه الشيعي ونشره تعاليم الشيعة وسط أغلبية السنة وكيف كان موقف أهل السنة عندما أدركوا أن الرجل شيعي ويروج لمذهب الشيعة في إندونيسيا.

يعد هذا البحث أكثر من مجرد سرد حياة لعالم من علماء ودعاة الشيعة في إندونيسيا وهو يتعلق بمختلف الشخصيات والجمعيات الدينية الهامة في إندونيسيا مما أكسبه أهمية خاصة من أجل فهم تعقيدات الإسلام وديناميكيته في إندونيسيا عامة وفي العلاقة بين الشيعة والسنة خاصة؛ وينصب موضوع البحث على السؤال كيف كان الأستاذ حسين الحبشي يسير في تحصيل العلوم ابتداء من بيئته العربية وسط أسرته في إندونيسيا ثم رحلته إلى ماليزيا وبعض الدول بالشرق الأوسط. بما في ذلك خدماته في مجال التدريس في نفس المؤسسات المذكورة؛ وهنا عرف الشيعة وتعلمها ثم دخل في سلك الممارسات السياسية من خلال نشاطه في حزب ماشومي؛ مما جعله يتعرف على الشخصيات السياسية الهامة في البلاد.

وفيما بعد نجاح الثورة الإيرانية امتدح كثيرا الثورة وزعيمها آية الله روح الله الخميني، ومع ذلك فمن الأهمية ملاحظة أنه على الرغم مما يقوم به دفاعا عن تعاليم الشيعة كما ظهر في مؤلفاته فإنه كان مصرا على إظهار نفسه بأنه على مذهب أهل السنة والجماعة، وهذا من تعاليم التقية المعمول به لدى الشيعة كلما تعرض أحد لخطورة قد تهدده من أجل تجنبها؛ بيد أن أمره كان مكشوفاً على الرغم من ذلك عند المجتمع. بمحافظه جاوه الشرقية، وكان رد الفعل السني على الرجل بصفة خاصة سلبيا؛ وأما موقف الشيعة عموما فكان دفاعيا وكان بعض علماء السنة يرفضون وجود الشيعة في إندونيسيا إما لأسباب عقدية وإما سياسية.

Recently there has been growing interest in researching the position and the role of the Arabs in Southeast Asia in regard to either social, political and economic aspects or their religious and intellectual life. To mention just one example, the recent publication of *Transcending Borders: Arabs, Politics, Trade and Islam in Southeast Asia* edited by de Jonge and Kaptein (2002). This book, which originates from the twelfth international workshop with the theme 'The Arabs in Southeast Asia (1870-1990)' in Leiden, 8-12 December 1997, is a compilation of articles discussing the interrelationships between aspects of political, economic and religious life within the Arab communities and the societies of Southeast Asia in general. As indicated in the title of the book, almost every essay in the book also shows the interaction between developments at local, national, and international levels (2002:4).

However, significant research on aspects of political, economic and religious life of the Arab communities in Southeast Asia still needs to be carried out, as de Jonge and Kaptein (2002:9) write: "There are still many gaps and imperfections in the data collected and many unanswered questions are awaiting an answer".

One of the important research topics related to the Arab communities in Indonesia, and in Southeast Asia in general, that is likely to be neglected is their adherence to the Shī'ah, a minority school of Islam that differs from the Sunnī majority in terms of several principal doctrines. As far as Islamic studies and social scientists studying Islam are concerned, the Shī'ah outside Iran seems to be a neglected research topic. Studies of Islam in Indonesia, like those in the Middle East, are mainly studies of the Sunnī school. Therefore, aspects of the social, political, economic and religious life of the Shī'ites in Indonesia remain unknown to scholars of Indonesian Islam as well as to Indonesianists.

It is evident that the majority of Muslims and of Arabs in this region are Sunnī but it is also a fact that some Arabs are Shī'ite and, as far as my preliminary observations are concerned, it is the Arabs, particularly the ° lawiyyīn (descendants of 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib, the first *Imām* within the Shī'ah), commonly known as *Sayyids* (Arabic, *Sādah*), who introduced the Shī'ah to Indonesian society. Therefore, the Arabs are said to have played a significant role in the development of the Shī'ah in Indonesia.

We can identify several leading Shī'ah figures from *Sayyid* families in the Southeast Asian region at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, such as Muḥammad bīn 'Aqīl bin Shahāb

(1863-1931), Muḥammad bin Aḥmad al-Muḥḍar (1861-1926), ‘Alī bin Aḥmad Shahāb (1864-1945) and ‘Aqīl bin Zainal ‘o bidīn al-Jufūrī (1870-1952) (Shahāb 1961). Some of them took part in the establishment of modern-style Arab schools, Jam‘iyyat al-Khair in Jakarta and its sister organisations in Pekalongan, Solo, and Surabaya. As members of a minority religious group, they attempted to propagate the Shī‘ite teachings exclusively to their own family, relatives and close associates. In present day Indonesia, particularly since the Iranian revolution of 1978-1979, the Shī‘ah appears to have attracted many influential Muslim intellectuals and university students. Even though the Shī‘ites are a minority religious group in this country their number is growing. They have even played a major role in the fields of education and cultural life of Indonesian society.

This essay aims to consider the position of a *Sayyid* Shī‘ite Islamic scholar (‘*ālim*, pl. ‘*ulamā*’) amongst the Sunnī majority in Indonesia. This preliminary study will analyse how Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi preserved his beliefs and the Shī‘ite teachings, propagated this school of Islam within the context of a majority Sunnī community and how the Sunnī community reacted to him and the Shī‘ah in general. At the outset a brief biography will be provided in order to understand the whole historical and sociological context of Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi’s position. This study is significant in understanding not only the complexity and dynamics of Islam in Indonesia, but also the historical development of the Shī‘ah in Indonesia and its relation to the religious hegemony of the Sunnī majority in this area.

### **A Brief Biography of Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi**

Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi, or al-Ustadz al-Habib al-Shaikh Husayn bin Abi Bakr al-Habshi, as written by Muhsin Husein (1997) in his article published in *al-Isyraq*, is one of the most famous Indonesian Shī‘ite ‘*ulamā*’ since the Iranian Islamic revolution of 1979. His name should not be confused with Husein bin Ali al-Habsyi, the leader of Ikhwan al-Muslimin of Indonesia. Born in Surabaya, 21 April 1921, Husein Al-Habsyi is the second son of an Arab family from the *Sayyid* group, the descendants of the Prophet Muhammad through his grandson Husain bin ‘Alī. Very little is known about his parents’ life. His father is believed to have passed away when he was six years old so he lived with his maternal uncle who was a prominent ‘*ālim*, Ustadz Muhammad bin Salim Baraja. This



Islamic scholar was the president of the Ḥaḍramawt school in Surabaya and an editor of the twice-monthly magazine *al-Iqbal* in the same city.

Husein Al-Habsyi began his formal education in a well-known Islamic school named Madrasah Al-Khairiyyah, a sister organisation of the pioneering Jam'iyat al-Khair of Jakarta and one of the oldest and most famous *madrasah* in Surabaya, East Java. At the age of ten Husein Al-Habsyi actively participated in regular religious gatherings (*pengajian*), which provided teachings from several branches of Islamic knowledge, such as Islamic jurisprudence (*fiqh*), Islamic theology (*tauḥīd*), and ethics (*akhlāq*). He is said to have been capable of reading Arabic books, such as al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn*, the famous books concerning ethics and Sufism used in Islamic educational institutions in Indonesia, when he was still twelve years old (Bukhori n.d:10).

However, there is no complete information about his teachers during his Islamic schooling in Surabaya. Some of his sons and students reported that alongside his maternal uncle, Ustadz Muhammad Baabud, Ustadz Abd al-Qadir Bilfaḥīh, and Habib Abu Bakr al-Saqqaf of Gresik influenced his Islamic traditionalist thought (Husein 1997:3). He also studied with a Moroccan *'ālim* named al-Sayyid Muḥammad Muntaṣir al-Kattānī and a Palestinian one by the name of al-Shaikh Muḥammad Rabaah Ḥasuna of Qalili. These two *'ulamā'* contributed Islamic knowledge as teachers in the Madrasah Al-Khairiyyah. The *madrasah* also invited some other *'ulamā'* from Ḥaḍramawt to teach its students. It is important to note here that Husein Al-Habsyi began his career as an Islamic teacher when he was only fifteen years old; he spent two years teaching at his almamater (1936-1938) (Zamzami 1999:4).

Next, Husein Al-Habsyi went with his brother Ali al-Habsyi, to continue his education in Johor Baru, Malaysia, due partly to his mother's advice. One of his influential teachers there was al-Habib Alwi bin Tahir al-Haddad, a *mufṭī* of the Johor Sultanate. In Johor, Husein Al-Habsyi also taught at Madrasah al-Attas for a long period of time. His students came from various regions in Malaysia and some of them then became prominent *'ulamā'* in Malaysia. He also reportedly visited Ḥaḍramawt (Yemen) to study Islamic knowledge before he moved to Saudi Arabia, where he stayed for about two years, though there is no information about his teachers in the two regions. Husein Al-Habsyi then pursued his Islamic learning in Iraq with some prominent *'ulamā'* such as

al-Sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm of Najaf. This took about one year (Beik 1997:14). He returned to Malaysia and married his uncle's daughter, Fatimah bint 'Abd al-Raḥman al-Habsī (Panitia 2002:1). Several of his sons from this first marriage were born in Malaysia.

After living in Malaysia for several years, Husein Al-Habsyi and his family returned to Surabaya, his hometown. The exact reasons for his return are not known, though one of them was probably that Malaysia was still under British colonial rule whilst Indonesia had reached independence. This is closely tied to Husein Al-Habsyi's interest in political practice, alongside his teaching at Al-Khairiyah and Islamic propagation activities (Panitia 2002:1).

Husein Al-Habsyi began his political career through participation in the Masyumi (Majelis Syuro Muslimin Indonesia or Consultative Council of Indonesian Muslims). This participation made him known not only to the influential Masyumi leaders such as Dr. Mohammad Natsir, Mr. Kasman Singadimedjo and Mr. Sjafrudin Prawiranegara, but also to other political leaders in Indonesia. He was then selected as a member of Konstituante (the Constituent Assembly) at the eighth Masyumi conference in Bandung from 22 to 29 December 1956. He is said to have become the head of the Human Rights Commission within the Constituent Assembly (Panitia 2002:1).

Although he was active in political practice, Husein Al-Habsyi paid a great deal of attention to the development of Islam. He tended to preserve the traditionalist ideology of Islam in response to the reformist movements in Indonesia. In this respect, he was involved in polemics with one of the most prominent reformist leaders in Indonesia, Ahmad Hasan of Persatuan Islam (d. 1958), who in April 1956 wrote a treatise entitled *Risālah al-Madḥhab* which argues that to follow a school of law like Shāfi'ite jurisprudence is forbidden. He also wrote *Halalkah Bermadḥhab?* In response to the treatises, Husein Al-Habsyi in the same year wrote a critical paper, *Lahirnya Madḥhab yang Mengharamkan Madḥhab-madḥhab* (the Formation of a School of Law that Forbids Schools of Law), which strongly rejects Ahmad Hasan's opinion that following a particular school of law is unlawful. Ahmad Hasan then wrote a refutation of Husein al-Habsyi's criticisms and published it in *Pembela Islam* (January 1957).

In April 1957 Husein Al-Habsyi wrote another critical treatise, *Haramkah Orang Bermadḥhab II?* (Is it Forbidden for One to Follow the School of Law II?). In the polemics both writers accused the

other of having insufficient knowledge of Islam and omitted views that did not support their arguments (Minhaji 2000:105-107). The argument was likely to continue. Both sides agreed to carry out an open debate on the matter in order to achieve a true answer to whether it is lawful to follow a certain *madhhab* in Islam. But the debate never took place. Ahmad Hasan's side accused Husein Al-Habsyi of avoiding participation in the debate whilst the latter claimed that he was prepared for it, but Mohammad Natsir, another Persatuan Islam leader and a close associate of Husein Al-Habsyi in the Masyumi, suggested to him that the debate not be carried out so as to avoid religious conflict and disunity in the Muslim community (Minhaji 2000:107). Hashem (2002:8-9) also points out the same reason as Husein Al-Habsyi's.

Husein Al-Habsyi had a very negative attitude towards the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), in line with the perspective of the majority of Masyumi leaders, both at the time of his participation in the Masyumi and after the dissolution of the party in 1960. It is important to note that this attitude may have become a reason for the dissolution of the Masyumi by Sukarno because of the latter's close relation to the Indonesian Communist Party. This is closely linked to the fact that there was enmity between the Masyumi leaders and Sukarno, as they were opposed his guided democracy and became involved in PRRI (the Revolutionary Government of Indonesian Republic) (Ricklefs 2001:325). In the 1950s Husein Al-Habsyi, together with Hasan Aidit and Ainul Rofiq, was said to have participated in the establishment of the Front Anti Komunis (Anti-Communist Front), which played a major role in foiling the Communist movement with its widespread and diverse activities throughout the country during the Old Order period (Zamzami 1999:6).

Upset with the political developments and the political leaders after the dissolution of the Masyumi, Husein Al-Habsyi ceased all political activities. He seemed to change his worldview from one of political struggle to Islamic education and proselytisation. For him, the development of Islam cannot be achieved through political practice but can only succeed through the fields of education and proselytisation. On his return to Surabaya he continued to teach at Al-Khairiyyah and his name was closely tied to the famous *madrasah*. It is likely that he paid a great deal of attention to the development of the *madrasah* while he was active in political activities. Quitting politics, Husein Al-Habsyi concentrated on the

development and progress of Al-Khairiyyah, in addition to Islamic propagation. Due to his Islamic knowledge and managerial ability he was then entrusted to lead another Madrasah, Al-Khairiyyah, located in Bondowoso, East Java.

During the period of his withdrawal from political activity post-1960s, Husein Al-Habsyi's worldview was strongly influenced by the ideology of Ikhwan al-Muslimin (Muslim Brotherhood) of Egypt, led by Hassan al-Banna. He even became a member of the so-called fundamentalist movement and established good relationships with its prominent leaders in the Middle East. He travelled to the Middle East not only to visit but also to learn about the movement's ideology from Hasan al-Banna and his colleagues. Furthermore, he made contacts with other high ranking '*ulamā*' in the Middle East, such as Mawdūdī, Nadawī, Tilmāsam, Yūsūf Qardawī and Muḥammad Ghazālī. His trips to Middle Eastern countries such as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Kuwait, Libya, Iraq and Iran were also an opportunity to collect donations from individuals as well as Islamic organisations, to be used for the development of Al-Khairiyyah and the Muslim community at large (Husein 1997:5).

In the field of Islamic proselytisation, Husein Al-Habsyi had, during his life, routine schedules to preach in mosques in Bangil, Surabaya, Gresik, Jember and other towns, in addition to non-regular religious activities. He was known as being very good at delivering sermons and preaching. As an excellent orator he could enthral his audiences, not only because he applied accurate communication strategies, but also due to the fact that he had mastered various branches of Islamic knowledge and knew about western thought and actual world developments (Beik 1997:14-15).

In addition to his activities in the fields of education and proselytisation, in 1961 Husein Al-Habsyi joined an Islamic foundation called Yayasan Penyiaran Islam (YAPI), or the Islamic Propagation Foundation, which was established by a number of young Muslim activists and intellectuals, such as Omar Hashem, Muhammad Hashem, Hadi A. Hadi, Dr. Masduki Sulaiman, Dr. Muhammad Suherman and Sa'ad Nabhan (Hashem 2002:12). Several social and religio-intellectual activities, such as workshops and producing publications, were carried out by the foundation. One of its publications is a translation of the Barnabas Gospel by Husein Al-Habsyi himself. Since the 1980s the foundation has published a

large number of Shī'ite works, mainly translations from English. Through the foundation the young Muslim activists and intellectuals established contacts with such international Muslim figures and 'ulamā' as boxing champion Mohammad Ali and al-Shaikh Ja'farī of Najaf (Iraq) (Husein 1997:4). This foundation later inspired the establishment and naming of Husein Al-Habsyi's famous *pesantren*, Yayasan Pesantren Islam, which is also abbreviated to YAPI.

Following the ideology of Ikhwan al-Muslimin, along with his negative attitude towards secularism and all Western worldviews, Husein Al-Habsyi attempted to apply its values within the educational system of Al-Khairiyyah, free from Western influences. To achieve this, strict discipline and rules were enforced on the students as well as the teachers at the *madrasah*. As a consequence, the majority of *madrasah* teachers, who strongly upheld traditionalist views, were likely to refuse his fundamentalist approach. This inevitably led to conflict between Husein Al-Habsyi and the majority of *madrasah* teachers as well as '° *lawiyyīn* 'ulamā' in Bondowoso, a conflict which caused him to leave Al-Khairiyyah and Bondowoso. But the *madrasah* teachers did not imagine that when Husein Al-Habsyi left for Bangil he would be followed by many of his qualified students as a result of their close relationship with him and their agreement with his ideas. The *madrasah* party must have regretted their actions, even though the relationship between the two sides later became relatively close again (Husein 1997:5).

To realise his ideals of Islamic education and proselytisation, Husein Al-Habsyi founded his own Islamic educational institution, called Yayasan Pesantren Islam (YAPI). He initially set up the *pesantren* in Bondowoso in 1971 but about five years later the *pesantren* moved to its present location, Bangil, East Java where it grew and developed in a relatively rapid way.

Forced to leave Bondowoso, Husein Al-Habsyi was offered a large house by a rich man in Bangil, which became a centre of Islamic learning that later developed into a famous *pesantren*. In this house, with limited facilities, he taught the students who had followed him. Husein Al-Habsyi made a great effort to realise his ideals in the field of education, particularly in his desire to develop and expand the *pesantren*. To this end he made his second trip to several Muslim countries in the Middle East so as to get financial support. With this funding and an area of land granted to him Husein Al-Habsyi could build a relatively large building, which

functioned as both a dormitory and a classroom. With these adequate facilities, YAPI of Bangil could house more students from different areas of Indonesia and provide them with a more comprehensive learning process. As a result, the *pesantren* and its leader became more and more well known, not only to the *kyai* ('*ulamā*') in Indonesia, but also to several prominent '*ulamā*' throughout world, as Husein Al-Habsyi continued to establish contact with them.

Once the YAPI for male students had been relatively well organised Husein Al-Habsyi intended to establish a centre of Islamic education for females. He was able to afford an area of land situated in the village of Kenep, Beji sub-district, about three kilometres south of Bangil, and with the assistance of his students he built *pesantren* facilities in this location. This then became the YAPI for male students while the previous location was provided for female students. He also founded a kindergarten in Bangil.

His approach to Islamic education still followed the Ikhwan al-Muslimin model, which emphasised strict discipline and rules and an anti-western attitude. He upheld this as the best approach to achieving his Islamic educational ideals. As the head of his *pesantren* Husein Al-Habsyi devoted himself to its detailed development and progress. Not only did he manage the institution but he also carried out teaching and learning processes in several fields of Islamic knowledge, particularly Arabic, Quranic Exegesis (*Tafsīr*), and Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence (*Fiqh*). In addition, his main task in regard to his Islamic educational ideals was to form cadres and consciousness among his students in order to revive their spirit in the struggle for Islam and the Muslim Community (Panitia 2002:2).

In short, Husein Al-Habsyi's attempts to lead his *pesantren* and educate his students were relatively successful. Some of the YAPI alumni were able to pursue their education in such diverse countries of the world as India, Pakistan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Qatar (Husein 1997:5). This was the result of his good relationships with '*ulamā*' in those regions and possibly with Mohammad Natsir, the leader of the Indonesian Council for Islamic Propagation (DDII), who established networks with the international '*ulamā*'. After the victory of the Iranian revolution many of them pursued their studies in Iran. After several years of studying there, they then became teachers in Islamic schools and foundations in various areas of Indonesia.

While continuing to head his *pesantren*, Al-Habsyi began to pay attention to the development of Islam in several remote areas of the outer islands, such as Irian Jaya, East Timor, and Maluku (Panitia 2002:2). In these areas his chief programmes were preaching activities in mosques and prayer places and making contacts with teachers to discuss social and religious problems that were faced by the Muslim community in the region. In some of these areas he set up *pesantren*, which began as branches of YAPI and later separated into independent Islamic institutions. One of them is Nurul Tsaqalain, located in Hila, Central Maluku. It was founded in 1989.

A few years before his death Husein Al-Habsyi assigned his son-in law, Ustadz Zahir Yahya, to carry out the leadership of YAPI, while he continued his guidance. His main activity was to continue the propagation of Islam in various regions, including Malaysia, until he passed away on 14 January 1994. Not only did he leave YAPI and his students scattered throughout Indonesia but he also bequeathed his literary works on several branches of Islamic knowledge.

### Husein Al-Habsyi as a Shī'ite 'Ālim

There is no exact information about when Husein Al-Habsyi "converted" to the Shī'ah. The information that was developed by his students and children suggests that Husein Al-Habsyi became a Shī'ite after the Iranian Islamic revolution of 1979, attracted attention from many Muslim leaders throughout the world, including Indonesia. However, we cannot ignore the possibility that he had become a Shī'ite before the Iranian revolution.

One source (Husein 1997:6) suggests that Husein Al-Habsyi's interest was first sparked by a desire to understand the nature of Islamic revival in Iran, which was led by Imam Khoumeini and succeeded in demolishing the powerful Shāh who had been supported by the USA. According to the source mentioned above, it was this victory that first attracted him, not the Shī'ite doctrines that were, and still are, adhered to by the majority of the Iranian community. One should, however, bear in mind that his interest in the victory of the revolution may have led him to more deeply understand the revolution's ideology, which was basically rooted in the Shī'ite doctrines of the imamate, the central doctrine within the Twelver Shī'ah, to which the majority of Iranian's subscribe.

In order to understand the Shī'ite teachings, according to this source, Husein Al-Habsyi attempted to obtain some books on the

subject and thus made contact with the Iranian embassy in Jakarta and with 'ulamā' in Iran. It is evident that the Iranian embassy in Jakarta used to distribute books and its magazine, *Yaum al-Quds*, for free to the Islamic foundations, as well as to individuals who requested them. Husein Al-Habsyi's knowledge of the Shī'ite teachings and the development of the Shi'ites became more extensive as a result of these books and magazines, as well as through his personal communication with Shi'ite figures in Iran. Additionally, he was frequently invited to participate in meetings with the Shi'ite 'ulamā' in Iran.

From the early 1980s Husein Al-Habsyi frequently praised the Iranian revolution and paid his high respects to its leader, Imam Khomeini, in his Islamic proselytisation activities in mosques in East Java, including in Surabaya, Malang and Bangil, with the aim of reviving Islamic spirit and the religiosity of the Muslim community. In response to this, the majority of the Muslim population in the region, particularly the Muslim youths, respected him and regarded him as an ideal 'ālim' and Muslim leader. Amongst these Muslim youths was Ja'far Umar Thalib, the former leader of Lasykar Jihad, a famous paramilitary organisation in Indonesia that dissolved in October 2002. Ja'far Umar Thalib once wrote that Husein Al-Habsyi mastered several fields of Islamic knowledge and enthusiastically defended Islam and the Muslim community (Thalib 1993:13-14), though he later strongly criticised Husein Al-Habsyi after he discovered that the latter was a Shī'ite.

Muhsin Husein (1997:6) argues that what made Husein Al-Habsyi more attracted to learning the Shī'ah was the attitude and conduct of a number of Sunnī leaders in Indonesia who were hostile towards the Shī'ites, and the Sunnī views that recognised the Shī'ites as disbelievers. Husein Al-Habsyi attempted to defend the Shī'ite teachings and followers by emphasising that the Shī'ah is a true school of Islamic thought and practice and that its adherents are Muslims. This controversial view inevitably startled the majority of Sunnī leaders in Indonesia who upheld the opposing position.

One should bear in mind, however, that he must have acquainted himself with the Shī'ite doctrines long before the Iranian revolution. Several facts indicate this probability: two of the founders of Al-Khairiyah were Shī'ite; Sayyid Muḥammad bin Aḥmad al-Muḥḍar (d.1926) (Husein 1997:3) who was known to have taught Shī'ite doctrines in Indonesia and Sayyid Aḥmad bin 'Abd Allāh



al-Saqqāf (d.1949). Therefore, it is quite possible that some aspects of the Shī'ite doctrines spread amongst teachers and students at the *madrasah*, including Husein Al-Habsyi.

Furthermore, Husein Al-Habsyi used to study Shī'ite teachings with a prominent Shī'ite 'ulamā' and independent jurist (*mujtahid*) named Ayatullah al-'Uzma Sayyid Muḥsin al-Amīn in Najaf, Iraq. In addition, the Madrasah Al-Khairiyyah was frequently visited by Middle Eastern 'ulamā' who discussed various Islamic teachings, including Shī'ite teachings, with the *madrasah* teachers and students. To give an example, Hamzah, a famous Shī'ite teacher in Bondowoso, told of two Shī'ite 'ulamā' coming to visit Al-Khairiyyah in the early 1960s, during which such important Shī'ite teachings as the position of Abū Hurairah as a transmitter of Prophetic traditions were discussed. The discussion, Hamzah said, took place over four days. It is important to note that this teacher, who "converted" to the Shī'ah in around 1969, also became a teacher at the YAPI in Bondowoso, which was founded by Husein Al-Habsyi in 1971 (interview 15 October 2002). Husein Al-Habsyi also participated in the discussion, which may have influenced his thoughts on the Shī'ah. This in turn facilitated his "conversion" to the Shī'ah, if he was not already a Shī'ite at the time.

It is important to pinpoint characteristics of the Shī'ah in Indonesia prior to the Iranian revolution. The first was its exclusiveness. As Jalaluddin Rakhmat (1995) points out, the Shī'ites in Indonesia tended to state their Shī'ite beliefs only for themselves or for their close relatives. From their outward appearance, they were adherents of the Sunnī school of Islam, but they upheld the Shī'ite beliefs whilst practising Shāfi'ite Islamic jurisprudence. In addition, they did not have a missionary zeal to proselytise the Shī'ite teachings to the community. As mentioned before, one can find Shī'ites amongst the Indonesian Arabs who continued to preserve the Shī'ite teachings. Husein Al-Habsyi was educated and trained in an Arabic educational environments and it is quite probable that he too had the above characteristics. The victory of the Iranian revolution just revived the consciousness and spirit of the Shī'ites.

It is evident that although he defended the Shī'ah in all of his preaching and dialogue, Husein Al-Habsyi never stated publicly that he was a Shī'ite. He always admitted that he was a follower of the Sunnī school of Islam, commonly known as *ahl al-sunnah wa al-jamā'ah*. In his response to a group of students from Gajah Mada

University and the Indonesian Islamic University, Yogyakarta, who during a dialogue in Solo asked him to explain matters related to the Shī'ah, Husein Al-Habsyi (1991a:6) stated: "But what a pity because I myself am not a Shī'ite, so it is more accurate if you ask these questions to those who declare that they are Shī'ites". Not only did he admit that he was a Sunnī but he also used Sunnī arguments to support the validity of the Shī'ite teachings. This, he writes, was done so that "attacks directed towards the Imāmiyyah Shī'ah can be terminated because there are no differences in terms of principal matters between the two schools of Islam" (1991a:3). According to my observations, it is not unusual for Shī'ites to defend Shī'ite teachings in this way, particularly within the framework of *taqiyyah*, that is, the dissimulation of one's belief in order to protect one's life and family from trouble and danger. It is appropriate to conclude, therefore, that Husein Al-Habsyi had already become a Shī'ite but practised *taqiyyah* (religious dissimulation). Within the Shī'ah, this teaching is permitted, especially when the Shī'ites live under the Sunnī majority, as was the case for Husein Al-Habsyi.

There was another indication of his being a Shī'ite. In the early 1980s Husein Al-Habsyi began to send students, mainly YAPI alumni, to pursue their education in Qum, one of the holy cities in Iran. This programme continued until his death in 1994. Thus, Husein Al-Habsyi was known as the Indonesian 'ālim who sent the most students to study in Qum. It is important to note that after several years studying in Qum, these students returned to their homeland and became Shī'ite teachers. Some founded Islamic foundations while others, in very small numbers, established *pesantrens*. For example, Ustadz Ahmad Baragbah is a Qum alumnus who was one of the first students sent by Husein Al-Habsyi in 1982. Today he is a prominent Shī'ite 'ālim in Indonesia who founded and leads a famous Shī'ite *pesantren* called Al-Hadi in Pekalongan, Central Java.

Regarding the practice of *taqiyyah*, it is interesting to note a translation of a personal letter to someone in Iran whose name is unrecognised that was published in *Aula*, a famous magazine of Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), the largest traditionalist Muslim organisation in Indonesia, titled "a Letter to Someone in Iran". The *Aula* editorial board (1993:59) notes that it received a number of phone calls, letters and records regarding the Shī'ah and its figures in East Java and the board considers it important for the NU community to read the contents of the letter. In the letter the writer

used the term "my Master" to address the person in Iran. The original Arabic letter was considered to be written by Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi, although some objections were directed to the *Aula* editors because, as Abdullah Beik wrote, it could not be proven that the letter was written by Husein Al-Habsyi. In legal terms, therefore, Husein Al-Habsyi could have brought a case against the magazine for defiling his good reputation. Beik further stressed that the personal letter should neither be read nor be published in the mass media without the owner's permission. Finally, according to Beik, it was not prohibited to send a letter to the Islamic Republic of Iran, provided the letter did not discredit the state or disrupt peace and stability (*Aula*, December 1993:7).

The central purpose of the letter was to respond to the master's suggestion to the writer that he leave the practice of *taqiyyah* and instead declare that he was a Shī'ite. In the letter the writer provided several reasons for his practising *taqiyyah*:

First, I thank you for your correct suggestion to me, which has been a consideration on mine for long time, that is, since Imam [Khoumeini] defeated the Shah. Although I have postponed it I do not doubt at all the truth of the *ahl al-bayt* branch of Islam, and this delay is not because I fear people and if I leave *taqiyyah* it will not be in order to get praise from people. Not at all. However, I now consider my surrounding situation. The Sunni fanaticism in general is still strong.

To approach them, I want to appear like a Sunnī. Because if I show my own beliefs and respond to attacks from their *nawāsib 'ulamā'* (anti-Shī'ah) they would say: a Shī'ite defends the Shī'ah. I have succeeded in approaching a significant number of their '*ulamā'*' so that they understand the virtues of the *ahl al-bayt* school of thought and practice. I think it is a step forward in our struggle (*Aula* November 1993:60).

It is quite possible that the writer was Husein Al-Habsyi and therefore it is clear from the above quotation that he had practised *taqiyyah* long before the Iranian revolution occurred, and he even believed that he had to stop practising it at the time of the victory of the revolution. This also means that, contradictory to the opinion of the previous source, Muhsin Husein, it was not the Iranian revolution that made Husein Al-Habsyi 'convert' to the Shī'ah. He concealed his own belief as a Shī'ite because he was living among the Sunnī majority, who tended to be hostile to wards the Shī'ites.

*Taqiyyah* is practised to protect the Shī'ah so that it does not fade away, particularly when the Shī'ites do not have the ability

to preserve the Shī'ite teachings in the face of those who are eager to abolish them. Under these circumstances the Shī'ites are allowed to dissimulate their beliefs (Al-Habsyi 1991a:95).

The second argument that the writer put forth for his practising *taqiyyah* was that he required good strategies and procedures in order to prepare Shī'ite teachers, this included the need for him to master all the Shī'ite teachings. For him, this was the most important element because he would be an '*ulamā*' to whom the Shī'ite community would refer when problems needed solving. Related to this was the preparation of other Shī'ite teachers capable of substituting teachers in the *pesantren* who would leave if conflicts between the Sunnī and the Shī'ite erupted. In this regard, the writer's children in Qum, Iran, still required a period of schooling before they could become well-prepared teachers (*Aula*, November 1993:60-61).

The writer then described a situation in which some of his students spread sayings that shocked and annoyed the Sunni community. In relation to this he wrote: "enemies in Surabaya and Malang spread the sayings to criticise us. Consequently, there arose strong reactions from the community against us" (November 1993:61). In order to calm the situation down the writer contacted Ahmad Baragbah in Pekalongan, asking him to take some of the writer's students. However, when he visited Pekalongan to attend Ahmad Baragbah's wedding ceremony he found a high level of tension between the Sunnī and the Shī'ite in the community. He was successful in mediating an agreement by the two conflicting groups to stop cursing each another. The writer stated further that he frequently responded to the question of whether the teachers in Qum suggested their students curse Bukhārī and Muslim, the two most important transmitters of Prophetic Traditions within the Sunnī branch of Islam, by emphasising that the Imām [Khoumeini] disliked cursing and by advising them to read the authoritative Shī'ite books.

Afterwards, the writer stated that he would send his Shī'ite friend, Asmawi Abdul Ali, to visit the master. Asmawi Abdul Ali, like him, also practised *taqiyyah* and other appropriate approaches to the point where he successfully influenced a number of '*ulamā*' and university students in his region. For all of the above reasons the writer expected the master to let him continue his propagation of the Shī'ite teachings. Then he wrote:

Do not trust people who say: "if Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi declares his school of Islam, people will follow him". My master, by God there is no God but Him. If only it were true I would not doubt, for the sake of propagating my belief. And God will curse those who lie.

On the contrary, as far as I know, if I declare it I will be engaged in bitter fighting with Sunnī, both in writing and speaking, and the accursed government will interfere by attenuating my party. Moreover, the Nahdlatul Ulama has declared the apostasy of the Shī'ites from Islam and a Catholic General gave a speech in front of the followers of Nahdlatul Ulama reminding them of the danger of the Shī'ah (*Aula*, November 1993:62).

In addition to Husein Al-Habsyi's explanation of the reasons for practising *taqiyyah* (religious dissimulation) the letter also mentioned several facts that may have been experienced by Husein Al-Habsyi, such as his close relationship with Ahmad Baragbah, who did not practise *taqiyyah*; conflicts between the Sunnī and Shī'ite in Pekalongan and other areas; and his children who were still studying in Iran. It is also a fact that he had close connections with a number of 'ulamā' in Iran.

It is widely acknowledged that in his teaching, preaching and dialogue, Husein Al-Habsyi continued to emphasise the extreme importance of Islamic brotherhood between the Sunnī and the Shī'ite. It is not important, he suggested, whether one is a Sunnī or Shī'ite, especially if the differences create social and religious conflicts that inflict a loss upon the Muslim community at large. Instead, one has to uphold the true teachings of Islam, which are based on the Qur'ān and the Hadīths and which are practised in every aspect of life. Additionally, according to Husein Al-Habsyi, the Muslim community needs Islamic brotherhood in order to solve all the social and economic problems that are faced (Al-Habsyi 1991a:9-10).

That Husein Al-Habsyi was a Shī'ite can be scrutinised in some of his writings. Although he never admitted to adhering to Shī'ite teachings, one might interpret it in the framework of practising *taqiyyah*. Husein Al-Habsyi (1991b) wrote a 34-page book on the Qur'ānic exegesis of Sūrah 'Abasa: 1-10 which then became one of the most controversial books in regard to the Sunnī-Shī'ite relationship in Indonesia. Its title is *Benarkah Nabi Bermuka Masam? Tafsir Surah Abasa* (Did the Prophet Frown? A Commentary on Sūrah 'Abasa). Its controversy lies in its contents, which strikingly contrast with the Qur'ānic commentary books widely read in Indonesia and with the views of the majority of Sunnī 'ulamā' in the coun-

try. The central idea in the book is a criticism of the widespread views that the Prophet Muhammad frowned and turned away when ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm came to his meeting with the Quraish elite. For Husein Al-Habsyi, it was impossible that the Prophet, who was immune to both minor and major sins, frowned and turned away when ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm, a Muslim who believed in God and his prophets, came to the meeting. Instead, it was al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah, a Meccan tyrannical infidel, who frowned and turned away.

Below is a complete translation of the Sūrah ‘Abasa: 1-10, which can be compared with Husein Al-Habsyi’s Qur’ānic commentary. This translation was produced by the Department of Religious Affairs, which represents the dominant view of the interpretation of the Surah (1989), particularly upheld by the Sunnī ‘*ulamā*’.

1. He (Muhammad) frowned and turned away
2. Because there came to him the blind man
3. But what could tell thee that he might purify himself (from sins)
4. Or that he might receive admonition, and the teaching might profit him?
5. As to one who regards himself as self-sufficient
6. To him dost you attend
7. Though it is no blame on thee if purify himself not (believe)
8. But as to him who came to thee striving earnestly (to receive admonition)
9. And with fear (of Allah)
10. Of him wast thou unmindful.

In Husein Al-Habsyi’s Qur’ānic interpretation, the Sūrah ‘Abasa contains a dialogue between three social structures in the history of mankind, represented by three people, namely the Prophet Muhammad, al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm (the blind man). In his view, the Prophet Muhammad represents the first social structure, that is the prophets of God sent down to remind human beings of their existence. All prophets, according to Husein Al-Habsyi, attempted to remedy the misdirection of human development in all facets of life. In their duties the prophets always faced the elite as well as the poor and the oppressed. The second social structure, the elite and the oppressor, is represented by al-Walīd bin al-Mughīrah towards whom this Sūrah was directed. This social group tends to seek and pre-

serve power for the sake of their own interests, and in order to fulfil this desire they tend to implement various forms of oppression. The third social structure is symbolised by 'Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm, a blind man who believed in God and the Prophet Muhammad and submitted fully to Him. Husein Al-Habsyi notes that the blind man, representing the oppressed, had a close relationship with the Prophet (Al-Habsyi 1991b:11-13).

Husein Al-Habsyi (1991b:17-23) goes on to argue that the views of Qur'ānic commentators who pinpoint the Prophet in the *Sīrah* 'Abasa are contrary to the Prophet's immunity because more than ten *Sūrah* of the Qur'ān that were revealed before the *Sūrah* 'Abasa clearly stated the Prophet's excellence. For example *al-Qalām*: 4 means: "And thou (standest) on an exalted standard of character" (Ali 1991:1506). On the other hand, it is generally agreed among Qur'ānic commentators that several verses of *Sūrah al-Muddathir* and *al-Najm* are directed towards *al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah*. *Sūrah al-Muddathir*: 21-22 states: "Then he looked around. Then he frowned and scowled" and *Sūrah al-Najm*: 33 means: "Seest thou one who turned back" (Ali 1991:1382). Therefore, like these two *Sūrah*, *Sūrah* 'Abasa: 1-10 refers to *al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah*.

According to Husein Al-Habsyi, there was no motive for the Prophet, as an infallible person, to behave like the Qur'ān describes. However, *al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah* wanted to establish an exclusive elite clique and thus objected to commoners, let alone blind men, joining his meeting (1991b:31-32).

In his Qur'ānic commentary, Husein al-Habsyi cites *Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī*'s works, *al-Durr al-Manthūr* and *al-Itqān* in order to support his argument. His commentary thus has strong logical arguments and it is in accordance with the basic ideals of Islamic teachings in general, and with the Islamic teachings on the virtual excellence of the Prophet Muhammad in particular.

In his epilogue Husein Al-Habsyi (1991b:33-34) concludes that even though the main aim of his work is to criticise a misleading interpretation of the *Sūrah* 'Abasa, this work is essential because an accurate interpretation of this *Sūrah* in turn results in a correct understanding of social philosophy and the formation of society. A view that disparages Islamic teachings and the Prophet will inevitably humiliate the Muslim community at large and the Islamic teachings of piety, love, and justice and so on will have no meaning.

As for the ideas of Islamic brotherhood, Husein Al-Habsyi (1992b) wrote a well-known book entitled *Sunnah-Syi'ah dalam Ukhuwah Islamiyah* which, as shown by the sub title, criticises 'Alī Nadwī, who had distorted the Shī'ite teachings in his book. But the book is also directed towards those who have made the same mistakes. In this respect, Husein Al-Habsyi points out some of the weaknesses in the writings of Sunnī 'ulamā' and intellectuals in relation to the Shī'ah. First, he says, the works do not reflect an appropriate and deep understanding and they in fact contain many serious misunderstandings. Their criticisms do not deal with matters that are agreed upon by the majority of the Shī'ite 'ulamā'.

Husein Al-Habsyi argues that their second weakness is that they quote only parts of the Shī'ite sources with which they agree. The third weakness is their own interpretations without reference to the interpretations of the Shī'ite *mujtahid* (independent jurists). He concludes that the interpretations of Shī'ite teachings made by the majority of the Sunnī 'ulamā' and intellectuals are mainly based on their passion and hatred (1992b:12-13).

Instead of distorting the Shī'ite teachings and defaming and judging the Shī'ites as a group deviating from the true teachings of Islam, the Sunnī 'ulamā' and intellectuals are advised to carry out workshops or conferences in which both Sunnī and Shī'ite 'ulamā' participate. Through these workshops the Sunnī 'ulamā' may address various matters on which they frequently criticise the Shī'ah and have the opportunity to ask the Shī'ite 'ulamā' to explain the matters based on the rational argumentation and the authoritative doctrinal sources that they uphold (1992b:228-229).

There can be no more doubt that the Shī'ite 'ulamā' will always be prepared to participate in all such meetings in order to prove and present their arguments about the truth of their school of Islam. Through these meetings they can satisfy, and be satisfied by, their Sunnī fellows with regard to the basic aim of having a strong and united Muslim community. We strongly expect the realisation of this approach and demand unification rather than disintegration (Al-Habsyi 1992b:229-230).

If such expectations are fulfilled, Husein Al-Habsyi wrote, both the Sunnī and Shī'ites can live side by side, in an environment of tolerance and mutual cooperation in which the minority groups do not fear the Sunnī majority, who will in turn protect them, not oppress them (1992b:229). However, as Husein Al-Habsyi experienced, this expectation was never realised.



## Responses of the Sunnī

Even though Husein Al-Habsyi admitted that he was a follower of Sunnī school of Islam and used various Sunnī arguments when defending the Shī'ite teachings, some of the Sunnī 'ulamā' and leaders acknowledged that he was practising *taqiyyah*. The majority of them had negative reactions to Husein Al-Habsyi in different forms and levels of intensity; very few had a sympathetic attitude.

Among the prominent Sunnī 'ulamā' and leaders sympathetic to the Shī'ah as well as the Shī'ites in Indonesia is Abdurrahman Wahid, commonly known as Gus Dur. He stresses the sustainability of the Sunnī community itself. Below is a quotation from a discussion in Surabaya between two representatives of the Al-Bayyinat Foundation and Abdurrahman Wahid after he presented a speech at a thanksgiving for the Tījāniyyah Order. In his speech Abdurrahman Wahid mentioned and praised the last two *Ṣūfī* saints (*walī*) of the twentieth century, Sayyid Muhammad Alawi al-Jazairi and Sayyid Ayatullah Ruhullah Khoumeini. During the discussion Abdurrahman Wahid answered all questions, including a rumour about his being a Shī'ite and one about the abuse of his name in the propagation of the Shī'ah in Indonesia.

Al-Bayyinat: Indeed, we are already in good manner. But they (Ustadz Husein and his son-in law) do not care for our invitation. Therefore, there are then a religious gathering of *ahl al-bayt* and that of *ahl al-sunnah wa al-jamā'ah*. Even, we have cooperated with military authority. We have given the authority the data on them. We got the data because we smuggled our people to their place. They pretended to study there. We cooperate with the military in order that they fear.

Gus Dur: (Listening to the explanation Gus Dur looked regret and shed tears), *abki akhi, abki akhi, abki akhi* (I am crying, my brother; I am crying, my brother; I am crying, my brother). To solve religious problems, why did you cooperate with the military authority? You have even given the data to the authority. This is the same as that you want to kill our own brothers. It is like in the Dutch colonial era that many 'ulamā' died because of action of their own brothers (*Aula*, September 1993:18-19).

Abdurrahman Wahid then advised them not to bring religious problems to the military authorities but to instead solve them by consulting with the 'ulamā' and Muslim leaders. Another approach is to write and publish books, in a scientific and modest manner, about the Shī'ite teachings (1993:19).

Another indication of Abdurrahman Wahid's sympathetic attitude towards the Shī'ites is that he allows the Shī'ites to use his

mosque in Ciganjur. Greg Barton (2002:174) points out four reasons for Abdurrahman Wahid's support of the Shī'ites. First, by nature he tends to help wronged and oppressed minorities. Second, he opposes anything that impinges upon the freedom of faith and principle. Third, for him Shī'ite scholarship, which contains an on-going tradition of *ijtihād* and metaphysical philosophy, can profitably be explored by all Muslim intellectuals. Fourth, he argues that many NU rituals and approaches to Sufism are rooted in Persian Shī'ah and thus it is suggested that NU scholars understand the Shī'ah so that they can comprehend the nature of Sunni Indonesian Islamic traditionalism.

In contrast to Abdurrahman Wahid's sympathetic attitude, the majority of the Sunnī '*ulamā*', particularly in East Java, tend to be hostile towards the Shī'ah. An initial strongly negative reaction came from Husein Al-Habsyi's own colleagues. As soon as he became widely known as a Shī'ite, several of the prominent YAPI teachers who were alumni of the *pesantren* in Sidogiri, Langitan, and other areas in Central Java, left the *pesantren*. Some of them did it on their teacher's command. No doubt this one-sided decision shocked Husein Al-Habsyi and his students and created some difficulties in carrying out the *pesantren*'s activities. Fortunately, his thorough preparations enabled him to solve the problem. Some of his senior students replaced the former teachers and continued to conduct the *pesantren* activities.

There were several other negative reactions, both major and minor, to Husein Al-Habsyi after the Sunnī community heard of his being a Shī'ite. These reactions were in the form of threats directed towards him and his family through mysterious letters, telephone calls and pamphlets. Faeces and dead mice were sometimes thrown at his house and its front fence once had "*kāfir*" (infidel) written on it. He was also excluded from several social and religious activities by the community and his relatives. His being forbidden to preach and teach at the Great Mosque of Bangil, despite the fact that he had been a regular preacher in the mosque for several years, was another fierce reaction. What annoyed him more was a conspiracy that tried to dissolve the YAPI *pesantren*. Some visited the students' parents in various areas of Indonesia to persuade them to withdraw their children from YAPI and enrol them in other *pesantrens* that certainly taught Sunnī lessons. One day several youths from various Muslim groups in the town, equipped with tools, prepared to destroy the YAPI facilities, even

though the unexpected destruction was avoidable (Husein 1997:7; interview 5 October 2002).

His life was becoming more difficult when a number of fanatics defamed him and reported him to the government as having been involved in discrediting the government and subversion of the state (Husein 1997:6-7). He was libelled as being linked with the Malang Bombings (24 October 1984), the Borobudur attack (21 January 1985), and the explosion on the Bali-bound Pemudi Ekspres night-bus (16 March 1985) because, as the commander of the East Java Military command Major-General Soelarso stated, these attacks were linked to an international Shī'ite network. Soelarso even mentioned a Shī'ite named Husein Ali al-Habshi and warned Muslim leaders in East Java of an extremist Shī'ite movement that had gained influence in the province (Tapol 1987:81-82). Even though there was no proof, Husein Al-Habsyi was arrested for several days during the investigation process. He had such experiences several times during his life. It is reported that when he was in jail no 'ulamā' or Muslim leaders from any organisation visited him.

Closely related to the Sunnī response to the Shī'ites was the high level of tension between the Sunnīs and the Shī'ites in Bangil, a multi-religious town in East Java. Two opposing religious gatherings were carried out. One was a religious gathering of *ahl al-sunnah*, which consisted of representatives from Nahdlatul Ulama, Persis, Muhammadiyah, and the Al-Bayyinat Foundation and was supported by hundreds of participants. During this forum the group not only learned the teachings of *ahl al-sunnah* but also criticised the teachings of the Shī'ah. The other forum was the religious gathering of *ahl al-bayt*, which was headed by Ustadz Zahir Yahya (Husein Al-Habsyi's son-in law) and Ali Al-Habsyi (his son) (*Aula*, September 1993:12-13). These two forums clearly represented not only the two schools of Islam in Bangil but also the two prominent leaders of each school of Islam, who bitterly opposed each other, namely M. O. Baabdullah, a Sunnī figure associated with Al-Bayyinat Foundation and Manarul Islam Mosque, and Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi. It is important to note that both of them were Arab descendants.

In response to the development of the Shī'ah in East Java, particularly in Bangil, on 2 August 1993 the Council of Indonesian 'ulamā' of East Java held a meeting in Surabaya, and invited the 'ulamā' from various Muslim organisations such as Nahdlatul Ulama, Muhammadiyah, and Persatuan Islam, as well as the Al-Bayy-

inat Foundation, known to have bitterly criticised the Shī'ah. At first, the meeting, led by K.H. Misbach, the chief of the Council, aimed at discussing a question from the Court of East Java in regards to Husein Al-Habsyi's Qur'ānic commentary, *Benarkah Nabi Bermuka Masam? Tafsir Surah 'Abasa*. However, it then developed into a forum of judgement about the Shī'ah.

During the meeting several participants presented their views on the Shī'ah from theological perspectives while others described the development of the Shī'ah in East Java, particularly Bangil, where Husein Al-Habsyi lived and headed his famous *pesantren*. It is evident from the discussions in the meeting that the most negative views were upheld by Al-Bayyinat and Muhammadiyah figures. Muhammad Baabdullah of Al-Bayyinat of Bangil, for instance, stated that Shī'ite doctrines are more dangerous than Zionism. He argued that the Shī'ite do not have the right to live in Indonesia, which is based on Pancasila (the Five Principles that constitute the Republic of Indonesia's state ideology), because the Shī'ah is a new religion which is not recognised in this country. Similarly, Muammal Hamidy of Muhammadiyah was of the opinion that the development of Shī'ah caused restlessness and unease among the community, so its activities should be forbidden. He proposed that the Council establish a team to scrutinise the characteristics of a new religion. K.H. Rochim Noer, the head of Muhammadiyah of East Java, had the same opinion as Baabdullah's that the Shī'ites are disbelievers while, like Muammal Hamidy, he proposed the formation of a team to scrutinise the Shī'ah and the reasons for their infidelity. Finally, the Council of Indonesian 'ulamā' of East Java approved the proposal to establish a team to scrutinise the Shī'ah (*Aula*, September 1993:24-28).

Various responses to the results of the Council meeting arose. The *Aula* editors (October 1993:55) criticised the results of Council meeting as a non-progressive achievement because on 9 January 1992 the Council of Indonesian 'Ulamā' of East Java had cited and distributed the results of the 1984 Council of Indonesian 'Ulamā's national workshop on the Shī'ah. It is very clear from the recommendation that the Council of Indonesian 'ulamā' urged Indonesian Muslims who adhere to the Sunnī school to prevent themselves from being influenced by the Shī'ite doctrines because of the principal differences between two. If the national Council had formulated a clear recommendation then the provincial Council should produce more than the establishment of a team.

In his response to the development of the Shī'ah in Bangil, Muhammad Munir (1993:59), one of the committee members of a religious gathering of *ahl al-Sunnah*, stated that the Shī'ites, as a minority religious group, should be able to live in harmony with the majority Sunnī community. Yet he expected that the Sunnī 'ulamā' would be firm in their decision that Shī'ites not only follow practices that deviate from Islam but also lead Muslims astray. Therefore, they must be monitored and the Muslim community should be cautious when responding to their teachings.

Although the Shī'ite minority expected a tolerant attitude from the Sunnī majority, the Sunnī in East Java and in Indonesia in general had the opposite reaction. Some of the Sunnī leaders believed that the Shī'ites themselves should control their sayings, attitudes and conduct because they are a minority in Indonesia. Indonesia is a Sunnī country and it is common for the minority to adjust themselves within the cultural, social, and political contexts of the society (Misdi 1993:80). Misdi (1993:80) further states: "if the Shī'ites want to be free, it is not in Indonesia that they live but in Iran or in the countries where the Shī'ites are majority".

A bitter reaction to the development of the Shī'ah in East Java and in Indonesia in general was in the form of intellectual activities. In 1990 M. O. Baabdullah published a book that strongly criticised the Shī'ite teachings. For him, the Shī'ites are infidels even though they pronounce the confession of faith that there is no God but Allah and Muhammad is His messenger. He emphasises that their infidelity is clearly shown in their thoughts, which are contrary to the true teachings of the Prophet Muhammad, and that this fulfils the requirements as categorised in the Qur'ān and the Prophetic Traditions. Viewing the present development of the Shī'ah, Baabdullah (1990:83-84) points out two important indications that it is a religious current outside Islam: first, the Shī'ite theological doctrine of the changing of the Qur'ān, along with a number of other deviating principal doctrines that were formulated later, show that the present day Shī'ites are more evil than the previous ones. Second, the contemporary Shī'ites have mixed up a number of evil and dangerous currents and follow polytheism. Although this book concerns the Shī'ah in general it also includes criticisms of Husein Al-Habsyi, as Baabdullah was known to be a harsh opponent of his.

In regard to Husein Al-Habsyi's books, there were two types of negative reaction: intellectual and non-intellectual. A non-intel-

lectual response was to ban the books. Soon after Husein Al-Habsyi's commentary on the Qur'ān (1991b) was published there were serious reactions from the Muslim community. Several Sunnī 'ulamā' like K.H. Zakky Ubaid suggested the commander of Brawijaya Military Division of East Java stop the distribution of this book, along with another book by the same author, *Sunnah-Syi'ah dalam Dialog* (1991a). The reason for this, according to Zakky Ubaid, is that the two books have radical leanings and will inevitably be damaging to the unity of the Muslim community. Husein Al-Habsyi was in a position to discuss his two books and did not mind if they were banned, provided the ban was based on accurate legal rules (Surabaya Post, 25 October 1991).

Husein Al-Habsyi was also visited by two youths, delegates of a prominent 'ulamā' who participated in a meeting in Probolinggo between two hundred and fifty 'ulamā' and the commander of the Brawijaya military division of East Java. The meeting agreed to the rejection of Husein Al-Habsyi's Qur'ānic exegesis (Al-Habsyi 1992a:II). The two youths presented some critical questions, which were then answered by him in great detail.

Another reaction to the book was intellectual, namely the publications of books and articles that criticised Husein Al-Habsyi's books. Intellectual polemics arose within the Sunnī-Shī'ite relationship in Indonesia. The first critic was Ibnu Mursyid who wrote an article published in *Al-Muslimun* (January 1992), a famous periodical of Persatuan Islam in Bangil. The second was Ja'far Umar Thalib (1993) who wrote a lengthy critical book.

By presenting several arguments, Ibnu Mursyid (1992) criticises Husein al-Habsyi's commentary that states that the Sūrah was directed to al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah. *First*, if it were true it would mean that the Qur'ānic verses were revealed to al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah, a view that is certainly rejected by all Muslims. *Second*, it is impossible, Ibnu Mursyid insists, that 'Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm came to al-Walīd bin al-Mughīrah to ask for admonitions and teachings. *Third*, the events reconstructed in Husein Al-Habsyi's Qur'ānic exegesis are illogical and inconsistent. Then Ibnu Mursyid analyses Husein Al-Habsyi's commentary by providing fourteen questions and answers to prove its mistakes, illogical nature and inconsistencies. He concludes that according to the majority of Qur'ānic commentary books that derive from reliable sources from both the Sunnī school and some from the Shī'ite school, it is agreed that the Prophet Muhammad frowned and turned away, as shown

in the Sūrah 'Abasa: 1-10. However, according to some Shī'ite sources, it was someone from the Umayyah clan who frowned and turned away. "If Ustadz Husein wants to seek 'unity' as shown in his work *Sunnī-Shī'ite in Dialogue ...* he will certainly accept and approve of the fact that the Sūrah 'Abasa (80): 1-10 was directed towards the Prophet Muhammad" (Mursyid 1992:74).

In his critical book, Ja'far Umar Thalib argues that Husein Al-Habsyi is a Shī'ite '*ulamā'*' who fits into the category of the *ahl al-bid'ah* groups ('people of innovation'), and resembles the majority of the Shī'ite '*ulamā'*' in terms of motivating Muslims to refuse to hold the Sunnī books or to at least doubt the honesty of Sunnī Traditionists (*ahl al-ḥadīth*). According to Ja'far Umar Thalib, the Shī'ite '*ulamā'*' create snares, namely by arguing that Qur'ānic commentators were not immune to error so everyone may doubt the accuracy of their interpretations, and that the authority of Traditionists (*ahl al-ḥadīth*) needs researching, criticising and correcting, including their standard *ḥadīth* books. Ja'far Umar Thalib argues that these scientific activities are merely attacks and scientific betrayal (1993:33-34).

To support his arguments, Ja'far Umar Thalib (1993) starts defining the concept of 'infallibility' according to both the Shī'ite and Sunnī schools. He upholds the Sunnī view that the Prophet Muhammad was infallible in regard to the revelation of God's message but his infallibility did not make his human attributes disappear in matters unrelated to God's messages. It is on the basis of this definition that Ja'far Umar Thalib elaborates several authoritative sources with regard to the revelation of the Sūrah 'Abasa and confirms that the Sūrah was directed towards the Prophet Muhammad and this does not contradict the immunity of the Prophet. In his fierce criticism he writes that the Shī'ite '*ulamā'*' are very capable of distorting the Qur'ānic verses and the Prophetic Traditions according to their passions and worldly interests (Thalib 1993:58-59).

After elaborating his critical analysis, Ja'far Umar Thalib (1993:115-117) provides six points of conclusion. *First*, Husein Al-Habsyi and his groups refuse Sunnī commentary because they base their views on the definition of infallibility that they themselves construct. *Second*, the sources that are used by the Sunnī '*ulamā'*' in their commentary on the Sūrah 'Abasa are valid and reliable. *Third*, the Qur'ānic verses that were revealed before the Sūrah 'Abasa neither negate nor oppose the Prophet Muhammad's conduct, as shown

in the Sūrah ‘Abasa. *Fourth*, the Sunnī ‘ulamā’ have generally agreed that the Sūrah ‘Abasa was revealed as God’s correction of His messenger. *Fifth*, there are very few sources on the involvement of al-Walīd bin al-Mughīrah in the revelation of the Sūrah ‘Abasa, which cannot become a basis for accurate interpretation. *Sixth*, the Sūrah ‘Abasa does not indicate a prohibition of the propagation of Islam to disbelievers even if they refuse it. God only corrected His Prophet so that he would not give priority to disbelievers rather than the Muslims who believe in and surrender to God.

Husein Al-Habsyi attempted to respond to some criticisms directed towards his commentary. He provided detailed explanations of the questions presented by the two youths as mentioned above and analyses of the questions and answers provided by Ibnu Mursyid. One of Husein Al-Habsyi’s sons, Musa Husein Al-Habsyi, wrote a lengthy critical chapter in the book (1992a), refuting Ibnu Mursyid’s article as well as Ja’far Umar Thalib’s critical book.

In his refutation of Ibnu Mursyid’s reconstruction, Husein Al-Habsyi (1992a:42-47) provides his translation and commentary on the Sūrah ‘Abasa: 1-10 :

1. He (al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah) frowned and turned away
2. Because there came the blind man to him (the Prophet)
3. But what could tell thee (al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah) that he (‘Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm) might purify himself (from sins)
4. Or that he (‘Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm) might receive admonition (listened from the Prophet in your meeting), and the teaching might profit him?
5. As to one who regards himself as self-sufficient (like Abū Jahl and other Quraysh elites)
6. To him dost thou (al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah) attend
7. Though it is no blame on thee (Oh al-Walīd) if he (‘Abd Allāh ibn Ummi Maktūm) purifies himself not
8. But as to him who came to thee (your meeting Oh al-Walīd) striving earnestly (to receive admonition and knowledge from the Prophet)
9. And with fear (of Allah)
10. Of him wast thou (Oh, al-Walīd) unmindful.

Finally, Husein Al-Habsyi asks a rhetorical question: what makes some people eager to force others to agree with their views that “the Prophet Muhammad frowned and turned away”? “Clearly,



as long as the problem concerns the historical background of the revelation let us be free to hold the 'ulamā's views most suitable to our taste. Don't force others to take a view that is said to contain peculiarity and impropriety" (Al-Habsyi 1992a:53).

In response, Ja'far Umar Thalib then claimed that his book sold well and the publisher received numerous requests for it from the Muslim community. It is said that he got Husein Al-Habsyi's refutation in that he invited "his son, who was only to play marbles, to refute" (Thalib 1993:15). In his view, Husein Al-Habsyi does not actually defend his views but only declares his Shī'ite beliefs. For him, Husein Al-Habsyi was an Indonesian Shī'ite 'ulamā' who became a spokesperson for the Shī'ites in their spreading of hate and spite towards the Companions of the Prophet and the Successors (*tābi'in*). In his book, Ja'far Umar Thalib insists that Husein Al-Habsyi shows his cynical attitude towards the Sunnī interpretation of the Sūrah 'Abasa, particularly in his commentary, which uses sources from Aisha. However, Ja'far Umar Thalib did not respond to Musa Husein Al-Habsyi's rational refutation except to say that Musa was too young to participate in the polemics. He wrote a lengthy preface to the second edition of his book, claiming that Husein Al-Habsyi was at a loss and thus very emotional in defending his views. He could have written another more polite and scientific refutation rather than mocking Husein Al-Habsyi, as this showed his boorish attitude when upholding a refutable stance.

The intellectual polemics on the Qur'ānic interpretation of the Sūrah 'Abasa came to an end without closure. Husein Al-Habsyi did not respond to Ja'far Umar Thalib's preface to his second edition book before his death on January 1994. Nor did his sons, students or other Shī'ite 'ulamā' write on the matter of the polemical commentary. Along with the fact that Ja'far Umar Thalib did not present additional information or arguments, it seems that they believe the argument is finished and that one is not allowed to compel a particular point of view on others.

## Conclusion

Husein Al-Habsyi was an Indonesian Shī'ite Sayyid 'ālim who became acquainted with Shī'ite teachings when was educated within the Arab education system. As a Muslim scholar and teacher, he played a prominent role in the development of Islamic education and propagation in the Muslim community. In addition to writing several books, he also founded the famous Yayasan Pe-

santren Islam located in Bangil, which has attracted students from throughout Indonesia. This *pesantren* has played a significant role in the spread of Shī'ite teachings in Indonesian society, particularly through its alumni who become Shī'ite teachers.

This study has also shown how difficult it was for Husein Al-Habsyi, as a Shī'ite *'ālim*, to preserve his beliefs among the Sunnī majority in Indonesia. It is unknown when he became a Shī'ite, but it is evident that from early on he practised *taqiyyah*, which is lawful within the Shī'ite teachings, in order to protect him and his family from the hostility displayed by the Sunnī community. In some of his teaching and preaching activities and his written works he even attempted to promote the importance of Islamic brotherhood, particularly between the Sunnī and Shī'ite adherents, in solving the political and socio-economic problems that are faced by the Muslim community. However, the fact that he practised *taqiyyah* was acknowledged by the Sunnī *'ulamā'* and leaders.

Negative responses arose in response to the Shī'ah in general and Husein Al-Habsyi in particular, and these ranged from minor to major in their intensity. Most Sunnī *'ulamā'* tended to reject the existence of the Shī'ites in Indonesia, for theological, social and political reasons. Not only did the Sunnī *'ulamā'* judge the Shī'ites as disbelievers but they also accused them of disturbing the peace within Indonesian society and of threatening the stability of the country. The majority Sunnī community was inclined to enforce its own points of view in terms of religious interpretation, as well as social norms, upon the Shī'ite minority in Indonesia. In short, for the Sunnī *'ulamā'* in Indonesia the Shī'ites are disbelievers, and because Indonesia is a Sunnī country there is no place for them here.

## Bibliography

- Ali, Abdullah Yusuf, 1991, *The Meaning of the Holy Qur'an*, New Edition with Revised Translation and Commentary, Brentwood, Maryland: Amana Corporation.
- Aula*, September, November and December 1993.
- Baabdullah, M.O., 1990, *Fatwa dan Pendirian Ulama Sunni terhadap Aqidah Syi'ah*, Bilingual edition, Bangil: Ma'had 'Aly ilmu Fiqh dan Da'wah, Masjid Manarul Islam.
- Barton, Greg, 2002, *Gus Dur: the Authorized Biography of Abdurrahman Wahid*, Jakarta-Singapore: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Beik, Abdullah 1997, "Husein Al-Habsyi: Ulama Lintas Mazhab" *Al-Isyraq: Media Pencerahan Umat*, Majalah YAPI Bangil, 5,1:14-16.
- Bukhori, M. Imam nd, "Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi: Profil Ulama Kontemporer" *KSAF: Untuk Pencerahan Pemikiran dan Kebeningan Hati*, Jurnal kelompok Studi agama dan Filsafat YAPI Bangil: 5-19.
- Departemen Agama RI, 1989, *Al-Quran dan Terjemahnya*, Semarang: CV. Toha Putra.
- Al-Habsyi, Husein 1991a, *Sunnah Syi'ah dalam Dialog: Antara Mahasiswa UGM dan UII Yogya dengan Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi*, Solo: Yayasan Ats-Tsaqalain.
- 1991b, *Benarkah Nabi Bermuka Masam: Tafsir Surab Abasa*, Bandung: Al-Jawad.
- 1992a, *Nabi SAW Bermuka Manis Tidak Bermuka Masam*, Jakarta: Al-Kautsar.
- 1992b, *Sunnah-Syi'ah dalam Ukhuwah Islamiyah: Menjawab "Dua Wajah Saling Menentang"* Karya Abul Hasan Ali Nadwi, 2nd edition, Malang: Yayasan Al-Kautsar.
- 1993, *Agar Tidak Terjadi Fitnah: Menjawab Kemusykilan-kemusykilan Kitab Syi'ah dan Ajarannya*, Malang: Yayasan Al-Kautsar.
- Hashem, O., 2002, *Syi'ah ditolak Syi'ah dicari*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Jakarta: Al-Huda.
- Husein, Muhsin, 1997, "Ustadz Husein: antara Gagasan dan Tantangan", *Al-Isyraq: Media Pencerahan Umat*, Majalah YAPI Bangil, 5, 1: 3-7.
- De Jonge, Huub and Nico Kaptein (eds), 2002, *Transcending Borders: Arabs, Politics, Trade and Islam in Southeast Asia*. Leiden: KITLV.
- Misdi, Muhammad, 1993. "Syiah Hendaknya Mawas Diri" *Aula*, December 1993:79-84.
- Munir, Muh, 1993, "Syiah Sesat dan Menyesatkan: Sebuah Tanggapan" *Aula*, November 1993:56-59.
- Mursyid, Ibnu, 1992, "Nabi Pernah Bermuka Masam: Koreksi atas Tafsir Ustadz Husein al-Habsyi", *Al-Muslimun* 262: 67-74.
- Panitia, 2002, "Biografi Al-Marhum Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi: Pendiri Yayasan Pesantren Islam YAPI Bangil", a paper read at the 9th Celebration of Husein Al-Habsyi's death (*haul*), 9 September 2002.
- Rakhmat, Jalaluddin, 1995, "Dikotomi Sunni-Syi'ah Tidak Relevan lagi", *Ulu-mul Quran* 6,4:92-103.
- Ricklefs, M.C., 2001, *A History of Modern Indonesia since C.1200*, 3rd edition, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Shahab, Muhammad Asad, 1961, *Al-Shi'a fi Indonesia*, Chicago: the Open School.
- Thalib, Ja'far Umar, 1993, *Nabi SAW Memang Pernah Bermuka Masam: Jawaban terhadap Buku: Benarkah Nabi SAW Bermuka Masam? Tafsir Surat Abasa*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Jakarta: Pustaka Al-Kautsar.

Tapol, 1987, *Indonesia: Muslims on Trial*, London: Tapol.

Zamzami, Abdul Mukmin, 1999, *Konsep Pendidikan oleh Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi*, Dibagikan dalam Rangka Haul ke 6 Al-Marhum Al-Ustadz Husein Al-Habsyi.

---

Zulkifli, *PhD candidate at the Leiden University*, is a lecturer at the Faculty of Adab in IAIN Raden Fatah, Palembang.