

STUDIA ISLAMIKA

Indonesian Journal for Islamic Studies

Volume 2, Number 3, 1995

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Harun Nasution
Mastubu
M. Quraish Shibab
A. Aziz Dablan
M. Satria Effendi
Nabilab Lubis
M. Yunan Yusuf
Komaruddin Hidayat
M. Din Syamsuddin
Muslim Nasution
Wabib Mu'thi

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:

Azyumardi Azra

EDITORS:

Saiful Muzani
Hendro Prasetyo
Johan H. Meuleman
Nurul Fajri
Badri Yatim

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITOR:

Arief Subhan
Heni Nuroni

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ADVISOR:

Judith M. Dent

ARABIC LANGUAGE ADVISOR:

Fuad M. Fachruddin

COVER DESIGNER:

S. Prinka

STUDIA ISLAMIKA (ISSN 0215-0492) is a journal published quarterly by the *Institut Agama Islam Negeri* (IAIN, The State Institute for Islamic Studies) Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta. (STT DEPPEN No. 129/SK/DITJEN/PPG/STT/1976) and sponsored by the Department of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. It specializes in Indonesian Islamic studies, 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.

© Copy Right Reserved

*Editorial Office: STUDIA ISLAMIKA, Gedung Pusat
Pengkajian Islam dan Masyarakat, Jl. Kertamukti
No. 5, PO Box 225, Ciputat 15401, Jakarta,
Indonesia. Phone: (021) 7492648, 7401925, 7401606, Facs:
(021) 7401592.*

*Account: 0027793001 Bank Negara Indonesia 1946,
Kebayoran Baru/LAIN, Jakarta.*

*Subscription rates: Rp 50.000 (\$ 25.00), one year;
Rp 100.000 (\$ 50.00), two years. Order for single copies
must be accompanied with prepayment of Rp 12.500 (\$
7.00). For orders outside Indonesia, add \$ 8.00 per copy
for airmail delivery; for special postal delivery or other
special handlings, please contact STUDIA ISLAMIKA for
correct rate.*



*All subscription orders, single copy orders and change-of-
address information must be sent in writing to the
STUDIA ISLAMIKA Subscription Dept. Gedung Pusat
Pengkajian Islam dan Masyarakat, Jl. Kertamukti No. 5,
PO Box 225, Ciputat 15401, Jakarta, Indonesia.*

Printed in the Republic of Indonesia by INIS.

Contents

- 1 **Greg Barton**
Neo-Modernism: A Vital Synthesis of Traditionalist and
Modernist Islamic Thought in Indonesia
- 77 **Iik Arifin Mansurnoor**
Historiography and Religious Reform in Brunei during
the Period 1912-1959
- 115 **Martin van Bruinessen**
Muslims of the Dutch East Indies and the Caliphate Ques-
tion
- 141 **Saifullah AS.**
Dawr Jam'iyah al-Talabah al-Islâmiyyîn fî Harakah
al-Jayl 66 al-Indûnîsî
- 173 **Didin Syafruddin**
Mahmûd Yûnus wa Ittijâhâtuhu fî Tajdîd Ta'lim al-Lughah
al-'Arabiyyah bi Indûnîsiyâ
- 199 **Azyumardi Azra**
Melacak Pengaruh dan Pergeseran Orientasi Tamatan
Kairo

Neo-Modernism: A Vital Synthesis of Traditionalist and Modernist Islamic Thought in Indonesia

Abstraksi: *Tulisan ini merupakan eksplorasi atas tahapan-tahapan gerakan pembaruan pemikiran Islam Indonesia yang dikenal sebagai gerakan neo-modernisme Islam. Gerakan pemikiran ini merupakan upaya yang sungguh-sungguh untuk mensintesiskan cita-cita liberal yang progresif dengan keyakinan keagamaan yang mendalam. Ini dapat dilihat dalam pemikiran-pemikiran yang dikembangkan Nurcholish Madjid, Djohan Effendi, Ahmad Wahib dan Abdurrahman Wahid. Kecuali Ahmad Wahib yang meninggal di usia muda, semuanya memandang bahwa neo-modernisme merupakan istilah yang pas untuk menunjuk pada pemikiran dan gerakan yang mereka lakukan. Mereka memandang perlu menggunakan istilah tersebut untuk membedakan diri dari gerakan pemikiran yang dikembangkan kaum modernis sebelumnya. Mereka, berbeda dengan kaum modernis, berusaha untuk melakukan ijtihâd seperti halnya kaum modernis, tapi ijtihâd ini ditempuh dengan tetap berpijak pada tradisi yang telah dibangun dalam peradaban Islam. Namun demikian, mereka berbeda dengan kaum tradisionalis karena memasukkan agenda-agenda yang menjadi cita-cita modernitas ke dalam ijtihâd mereka.*

Neo-modernisme Islam sebagai gerakan pemikiran yang menawarkan pendekatan baru atas ijtihâd diperkenalkan oleh Fazlur Rahman, profesor pemikiran Islam asal Pakistan. Ia mulai dikenal di Indonesia ketika ia pertama kali berkunjung ke Indonesia 1974, dan sejak itu kontak

reguler Rahman dengan intelektual Indonesia terus berlangsung. Nurcholish sendiri mendalami Islam di bawah bimbingannya. Di samping lewat kontak pribadi seperti ini pemikiran Rahman dikenal luas di kalangan intelektual Muslim Indonesia lewat karya-karyanya. Kebanyakan karyanya telah diterjemahkan ke dalam bahasa Indonesia, suatu respons yang berlawanan dengan masyarakat Pakistan di mana ia berasal.

Penulis berpendapat, pemikiran-pemikiran neo-modernis Rahman ini telah mendapat sambutan kalangan intelektual Indonesia, terutama pada tokoh yang empat tersebut. Pemikiran Rahman mendapat sambutan di kalangan intelektual yang tumbuh dari lingkungan modernis karena ia mengandung agenda-agenda pemikiran yang progresif, yang merupakan tuntutan masyarakat modern. Tapi agenda-agenda ini dibangun di atas tradisi keislaman hingga pemikiran yang dikembangkan harus mengapresiasi tradisi. Ini membuat gerakan pemikirannya bersentuhan dengan kalangan intelektual yang hidup dan dibesarkan dalam lingkungan tradisional. Tidak heran kalau keempat intelektual yang jadi fokus studi ini punya pandangan-pandangan yang pada dasarnya sama. Dengan ungkapan-ungkapan yang berbeda-beda, mereka memandang perlu untuk membedakan antara yang ukhrawi dengan yang duniawi, di mana yang pertama bersifat abadi sedangkan yang kedua bersifat sementara, selalu dalam proses perubahan. Menurut mereka, penerapan yang abadi dalam konteks duniawi tidaklah sama dengan yang abadi itu sendiri. Kebenaran di dunia adalah sesuatu yang harus terus dikejar, bukan sesuatu yang sudah jadi dan selesai.

Nurcholish pada awal tahun 70-an banyak menggunakan konsep-konsep seperti sekularisasi atau desakralisasi. Tapi pada tahun 80-an ungkapan-ungkapan ini tidak lagi banyak digunakan karena dianggap telah menimbulkan kesalahfahaman di kalangan umat. Namun demikian secara substansial ia tidak meninggalkan gagasan-gagasan yang telah dikembangkannya tersebut. Sementara itu, Djohan dan Wahib terlihat lebih "progresif" dalam mengungkapkan gagasan-gagasan mereka dibanding Nurcholish, meskipun tidak berarti mereka berbeda. Nurcholish lebih hati-hati karena ia public figure. Sementara Abdurrahman Wahid lebih banyak menggunakan ungkapan dinamisasi, bukan sekularisasi atau desakralisasi. Namun konsep ini mengacu pada tujuan yang sama, yakni tuntutan bagi perubahan umat sebagai respon atas tantangan modernitas dengan tetap berpijak pada tradisi Islam.

التجديد الحديث أسلوب حي للفكرة الإسلامية التقليدية والتجديدية في إندونيسيا

خلاصة: هذا المقال عبارة عن اكتشاف مراحل حركة تجديد الفكرة الإسلامية الإندونيسية المعروفة كحركة التجديد الإسلامى الحديث. هذه الحركة الفكرية تمثل المساعى الجادة التكثيف للآمال الحرة المتقدمة بإيمان دينى عميق. يمكن رؤية هذا من الأفكار التى أنارها نور خالص مجيد، وجوهن أفندى، وأحمد واهب، وعبد الرحمن واحد ماعدا أحمد واهب الذى توفاه الله. هم يرون أن التجديد الحديث يمثل اصطلاحا مطابقا للإشارة إلى الفكرة والحركة اللتين يقومون بهما، إنهم يجدون من الضرورة استعمال هذا الاصطلاح للفرقة بين هذا الاصطلاح وذلك الذى أناره المجددون من قبل. فهم يتميزون عن المجددين الآخرين، فى القيام بالاجتهاد مثل ما يقوم به المجددون أنفسهم، ولكن هذا الاجتهاد يقومون به مستندين دائما على التقاليد التى انبتت عليها الثقافة الإسلامية. رغم ذلك، أنهم على خلاف مع التقليديين لأنهم أدخلوا البرامج التى هى آمالهم التجديدية فى اجتهادهم.

التجديدى الإسلامى الحديث كحركة التفكير التى تعرض التقارب الجديد المبني على الاجتهاد الذى تقدم به فضل الرحمن، أستاذ التفكير الإسلامى من الباكستان. وقد عرف لدى الإندونيسيين فى أول زيارته إلى إندونيسيا سنة ١٩٧٤. ومنذ ذلك الوقت استمرت علاقاته المنتظمة مع المثقفين الإندونيسيين. ونورخالص مجيد نفسه تعمق فى الإسلام تحت قيادته وريادته. بجانب تلك العلاقات الشخصية مثل هذه فتفكير فضل الرحمن عرف بتوسع فى وسط المثقفين الإندونيسيين عن طريق مؤلفاته، وأكثر مؤلفاته قد ترجمت إلى اللغة الإندونيسية، وهى أجوبة على معارضة المجتمع الباكستانى تلك البلدة التى هو منها.

الكاتب يرى أن الأفكار التجديدية الحديثة الفضل الرحمانية هذه قد لاقت الترحاب من وسط المثقفين الإندونيسيين، ولاسيما هؤلاء الأربعة المذكورة أسماؤهم. أفكار فضل الرحمن لقيت الترحاب من كل المثقفين التابعين للوسط التجديدي، لأن رأى فضل الرحمن يتضمن برامج الأفكار التجديدية، التى هى مطالب المجتمع الحديث، ولكن هذه البرامج مبنية على التقاليد الإسلامية. حتى أصبحت هذه الأفكار هى التى يطورها لزوماً للتقدير التقليدى. هذا هو الذى جعل حركة تفكيره تلمس المثقفين التقليديين. فلا غرو إذا كان هؤلاء المثقفون الأربعة هم أصحاب التركيز الدراسى، والذين آراؤهم واحدة غير متباينة. بطريقة مختلفة رأوا ضرورة التفرقة بين الأمور الأخروية والأمور الدنيوية، إذ الأولى خالدة بينما الثانية مؤقتة، ودائماً فى التغير. وحسب رأيهم أن إبداء الأشياء الأبدية فى الأمور الدنيوية ليست فى المستوى الذى عليه الأمور الأبدية تلك. فالحقيقة فى الأمور الدنيوية هى تلك التى يجب أن نجري وراءها للحصول عليها فليست تلك التى وجدت وجهزت تلقائياً.

فنور خالص فى أوائل السبعينات كثيراً ما يستعمل التشايع الإسلامية وكأنها علمانية أو عدم قداسة الأشياء، ولكن فى الثمانينات هذه البيانات لم تستعمل كما كانت مستعملة فيما سبق للاعتقاد بأنها تظهر سوء التفاهم بين المجتمع. غير أنه لم ينجح جوهرياً من تلك الأفكار التى نشرها، بينما جوهن وواهب تورطا فى أكثر تقديمها فى إعلان تلك الآراء من نور خالص نفسه، وهذا لا يدل على أنهم على خلاف. فنور خالص أكثر حرصاً وتحفظاً لأنه شخصية شعبية. بيد أن عبد الرحمن واحد أكثر استعمالاً للإثارة، ليست بالعلمانية وعدم القدسية للأشياء. بل هذه الفكرة تتجه إلى الهدف المشترك، وهو مطلب تغيير الأمة كإجابة التحدى للتجديد الدائم الاستناد على التقليد الإسلامى.

The first and altogether fundamental step has been the gradual recognition of what was altogether true in principle, but was not always grasped; that the study of religions is the study of persons. Of all branches of human inquiry, hardly any deals with an area so personal as this. Faith is a quality of men's lives. All religions are new religions every morning. For religions do not exist up in the sky somewhere, elaborated, finished, and static; they exist in men's hearts.¹

This paper is concerned with exploring the early stages of a new movement in Islamic thought in Indonesian society referred to by some as Islamic *neo-modernism* by focusing upon the lives and writings of the four seminal neo-modernist thinkers in Indonesia: Nurcholish Madjid, Djohan Effendi, Ahmad Wahib and Abdurrahman Wahid.² Whilst the later work of these intellectuals, particularly Nurcholish and Abdurrahman, is reasonably well known the extent to which their current liberal, progressive thought reflects their convictions of two, or more, decades ago is not well understood. An examination of their writing from the 1970s reveals a striking consistency in their thought and suggests that their Islamic liberalism is deeply rooted.

The Historical Background to the Emergence of Neo-Modernism

There has arisen in Indonesia in the past twenty five years a new Islamic intellectual movement that, whilst having clearly arisen out of the well established tradition of Islamic modernism in Indonesia, is sufficiently different in its conception and application of ideas that it represents a distinctly new approach, an intellectual movement that deserves to be studied in its own right. Moreover this new movement of thought represents a genuine attempt to combine progressive liberal ideals with deep religious faith. This movement represents, in one sense, a new phase of Islamic modernism, but to describe it as such and go no further is to largely miss its significance. Yet it is hard not to do otherwise, for want of suitable terminology with which to describe it.

In matters such as this nomenclature is of more than minor importance, for to name something is to recognize that it exists as a unique entity, and such recognition is the indispensable first step towards understanding it. Fortunately, for a variety of reasons a very apposite conceptual model or paradigm exists to describe this kind of new modernism that has come to the fore in Indonesia since 1970.

For this rapidly evolving new school of Islamic thought conforms very closely with the sort of intellectual movement described by the late Pakistani-American Islamic intellectual, Fazlur Rahman, in his four part paradigm of Islamic revivalist movements, as *neo-modernism*.³

Rahman was reasonably well known in Indonesia. He first visited Indonesia in 1974 and since that time was in regular contact with a number of Indonesian Islamic intellectuals there. Furthermore one of Indonesia's leading neo-modernist thinkers, Nurcholish Madjid, completed his doctoral studies under Rahman's supervision at the University of Chicago in the early 1980s. Equally as important as these personal links is the fact that Fazlur Rahman's writings are widely read throughout Indonesia, most of his works being available in translation (this being entirely the opposite of the case in the Arab world or even in his native Pakistan).

As a result of this general familiarity with Rahman's thought, his conception of a new kind of Islamic modernism, to which he gave the label neo-modernism, is well understood within certain circles in Indonesia and has in fact long been used to describe the kind of new modernist thinking being described here. This is not to say that the term is well understood or well received by all Islamic intellectuals within Indonesia. Indeed there are a number of important Islamic thinkers such as Dawam Rahardjo, Jalaluddin Rakhmat and Masdar Farid Mas'udi whose thought is very much influenced by, or in the case of Jalaluddin and Masdar can even be considered a part of, this new modernism but who might not generally use the term neo-modernist to describe themselves.

Nevertheless the thinkers at the fore of this intellectual movement, Djohan Effendi, Nurcholish Madjid and Abdurrahman Wahid consider the term neo-modernism as being the only term suitable to properly describe their position.⁴ They make the point that it is important to distinguish their position from that of earlier modernism, for they argue for a new approach to *ijtihad*, or hermeneutics that is at once an extension of that employed by the earlier modernists in Indonesia and is also, particularly in its use of classical Islamic learning, an entirely fresh and unfettered approach to *ijtihad* such as has not previously been seen in Indonesia. In this regard the term neo-modernism, although not entirely ideal, provides a means of delineating this intellectual movement and distinguishing it from both

traditionalism and Islamic modernism whilst also alluding to its origins in the ideas of the earlier modernist movement.

To a large extent the reason for the new depth and thoroughness evident in the approach of these Indonesian scholars to *ijtihad* is due to their combining classical Islamic scholarship with modern, or western, analytical methods. It is note-worthy that all the figures mentioned above, with the exception of Dawam Rahardjo, have had the benefit of having both a classical or traditional Islamic education, revolving around the study of the Qur'ân and classical Arabic texts, and a modern western style education.

In this regard the example of Abdurrahman Wahid graphically illustrates the unique nature of this new modernist, or neo-modernist, movement for, as we shall see below, he represents in his person the resolution of half a century of antagonism between modernists and traditionalists in Indonesia. As the chairman of Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) since December 1984, the leading traditionalist Islamic organization in Indonesia with perhaps as many as 35 million followers, and as the grandson of Hasjim Asy'ari, the founder of NU, and son of Wahid Hasjim, a greatly respected leader of NU, he has impeccable traditionalist credentials. Yet his extensive reading of all manner of literature, western, Middle Eastern and Asian, his writing on a diverse range of matters, and his enormous range of thought defy the limitations of the term traditionalist.

In a very real sense these thinkers represent the first generation of Indonesian intellectuals to have enjoyed such an education, for traditional Muslims in the past have generally not had access to a western style education, and relatively few modernists have had a real command of either literary Arabic or the classical texts. Arising directly out of this new attitude and approach to *ijtihad* in particular, and learning in general, is a non-exclusivistic attitude—an embracing of pluralism in society. Linked with this acceptance of, even welcoming of, pluralism is the strongly held conviction that party-political activity in the name of Islam is both counter productive for the Islamic *ummah*, or community, and, in as much as such activity gives rise to sectarianism, is unhealthy for society at large.

Furthermore, as an outgrowth of earlier modernism, neo-modernism is essentially religious in nature and is motivated primarily by concern for the progressive development of Islam and the Islamic community in Indonesia. Also, it is concerned with the formulation

of a consistent and universal methodology for Qur'anic exegesis, exegesis that is rational and sensitive to the historical and cultural contexts of both the original scriptures and the modern societies that now seek their guidance. Along side, and undergirding, these aspirations is an approach and attitude which is positive, progressive and forward looking, and reflects the bold and hopeful conviction that, in this 14th century of Islam, the best is yet to come, that the golden age lies not in the distant past but in the not too distant future. Moreover this positive, progressive attitude is not confined to the community of *santri*⁵ Muslims, nor even Muslims in general. Rather more generally it is argued that the neo-modernist thought of Nurcholish, Wahib, Djohan and Abdurrahman is of great significance because it represents a movement of thought that combines progressive, liberal convictions with strong religious faith.

Thus it is argued that *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*, or Indonesian Islamic neo-modernism, was and is, contrary to the assertions of some critics, not just an opportunistic reaction to a changed political reality. This is not to say that neo-modernist Islam is of no political consequence. On the contrary, as Islam in general represents one of the most significant and potent ideological forces in New Order Indonesia, and as neo-modernism represents the most virile and creative of movements within Indonesian Islam, it is, potentially at least, of enormous consequence. Against this it must be noted, that neo-modernist Islam represents a movement away from the old style party-political behavior of groups like Masyumi and Nahdlatul Ulama during the 1950s. The point being made here however, is more profound than that. Neo-modernist Islamic thought, it is argued, is fundamentally and essentially religious and not simply a rather opportunistic reaction to the political realities of New Order Indonesia. One way of describing the essential ideas of neo-modernism is to speak of them as being bound up with the concept of pluralism; for in a limited sense neo-modernist Islam can be described as being a movement towards increased pluralism both in the world of Islamic thought and in society in general. As such neo-modernism would appear to be very much a part of the cultural milieu of New Order Indonesia, and indeed such an impression is not mistaken.

Nurcholish Madjid, and with him the *Pembaruan* movement, shot to prominence in the public eye with uncomfortable speed in 1970, following a controversial address on the 2nd of January.⁶ Nurcholish

Madjid spoke out candidly for the first time about the necessity of profound reform in modernist Islamic thought in Indonesia. Perhaps he was too candid, for his paper was leaked to the newspaper *Indonesia Raya* (the Socialist past of this newspaper made matters all the more scandalous) and gained for Nurcholish and *Pembaruan Pemikiran* a sudden infamy. His paper entitled "The Necessity of Renewing Islamic Thought and the Problem of the Integration of the Ummat", spoke candidly about "secularization", "desacralization", "liberalism" and "socialism". Perhaps a similar paper from somebody else would have attracted little public attention but in 1970 Nurcholish, even though a bare thirty years old and therefore still a youth (*pemuda*) in the eyes of Indonesian society, enjoyed a high profile in modernist circles and was therefore something of a public figure. Nurcholish was at the time the chairman of HMI, easily the largest student group, and one of the most important Islamic groups, in Indonesia.⁷ What is more he was perhaps the most important of all HMI chairman, having been elected 1966 as the first HMI chairman from an Islamic tertiary institute (IAIN), and then re-elected in 1970 thus becoming the first HMI chairman to serve two terms of office. He was widely touted as a 'Young Natsir' who, following in the footsteps of former Masyumi chairman Mohammad Natsir, would lead a new generation of Islamic activists to victory in the political arena. In his January 3rd paper Nurcholish was judged to have executed a 180 degree turn in his previously conservative trajectory. With his bold and dangerous talk of reform of Islamic thought based on the implementation of secularization, it seemed clear that this was the beginning of something new. 'Something new' was indeed underway but it did not begin with Nurcholish's January 3rd address. Rather its origins, in a substantial form, go back several years before that address to the middle of 1967, with the formation in Yogyakarta of a small study group, the "Limited Group", as it was known. At another level the essence, or spirit, of *Pembaruan Pemikiran*, however, can be traced back to a point long before this period, right back in fact to the formation of HMI in 1947.

The Yogyakarta study group, composed of the students Ahmad Wahib, Djohan Effendi and Dawam Rahardjo amongst others⁸ met in the home of H.A.Mukti Ali. Several years before Nurcholish first articulated his thesis on *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*, in 1970, Djohan Effendi and Ahmad Wahib, using the study group at Mukti Ali's house

as a forge in which to hammer out their ideas, had begun to formulate a strikingly similar set of reformist ideas. That the *Pembaruan Pemikiran* movement is generally regarded as having its origin in Nurcholish's 3rd January address is entirely understandable. These earlier stages in the development of *Pembaruan Pemikiran*, or neo-modernism, escaped not only the attention of the public at the time, but also that of critics and observers of neo-modernism ever since.⁹

Perhaps one reason why this prior, or at least parallel, development of reformist ideas in Yogyakarta during the late 1960s has been so little discussed is that, until the publication of Ahmad Wahib's diary and private writings in 1981, there had been little in print to document what might be called the genesis of neo-modernist Islamic thought in Indonesia. Ahmad Wahib died tragically after being struck by a motor cycle in 1973 and was thus denied by providence the opportunity to become the key neo-modernist figure that he would undoubtedly have otherwise become. Djohan did of course go on to become a major intellectual force in Indonesian neo-modernism, but always in that quiet unassuming way that his reserved personality dictates, just as Nurcholish, by dint of his personality, became the leading spokesman for Islamic neo-modernism. Dawam Rahardjo also went on to become a major figure in Indonesian neo-modernism, but he too tended to play a 'behind the scenes' role as an organizer *cum* activist rather than an Islamic thinker. All of this has had the unintended effect of obscuring the general public's understanding of the origin of neo-modernism.

With the public release of Wahib's personal writings in 1981 a remarkable window was opened on the formation of neo-modernist thought in Indonesia. Intended, apparently, for personal reflection only and not for publication, Wahib's observations are frank and honest, and it is these qualities as much as the subject matter that provoked amazement when they were published in 1981, even after a decade of neo-modernist thought being in the public arena. A similarly frank and revealing insight to the genesis of neo-modernism is provided in Nurcholish's 1979 article "The Issue of modernization among Muslims in Indonesia: From a Participant's View".¹⁰ The title of the paper and the approach it takes strongly suggest that in this article Nurcholish was seeking to respond to the critical conclusions drawn by Kamal Hassan in his 1975 Columbia University Ph.D. thesis entitled *Muslim Intellectual Responses to "New Order" Moderniza-*

tion in Indonesia.¹¹ The tone of Nurcholish's paper is positive but strongly defensive, and sets forth not only Nurcholish's view of the emergence of neo-modernism in Indonesia but also something of his own personal development as a Muslim intellectual. Together these two papers, supplemented by more standard sources, allow a reasonably satisfactory reconstruction of the developments that led up to the bombshell that was Nurcholish's address of January 3rd 1970.¹²

In its initial stages, in the late 1960s, neo-modernism developed separately and simultaneously in two major urban centres in Java, Jakarta and Yogyakarta. In Yogyakarta the key individuals were Djohan Effendi and Ahmad Wahib, supported by Dawam Rahardjo. Both Djohan and Wahib were active figures within HMI (Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam —The Association of Islamic Students—Indonesia's largest and most important Islamic student organization) but they were clearly outside the HMI mainstream. Both had received instruction in Arabic and other aspects of traditional Islamic learning and Djohan was a student at the Yogyakarta IAIN (Islamic University). This sort of background was somewhat unusual for HMI members at that point in history, for HMI was regarded as being basically a modernist organization. They were further distinguished by the fact that neither of them were very happy with the political and policy directions being advocated by HMI's leadership, despite the fact that Djohan was active in its leadership and training circles. In particular they objected to what they saw to be the double standards employed by HMI, at least in the Yogyakarta chapter, in its efforts to rehabilitate Masyumi, the modernist Islamic political party banned by Sukarno in 1960 during the previous "Old Order" regime. Both had joined HMI rather reluctantly in the mid 1960's and by 1969 both were ultimately so disenchanted with HMI's policy directions and senior leadership that within a twenty four hour period they both, without consulting each other, submitted official letters of resignation to the HMI executive.

Both Djohan and Wahib were possessed of an extraordinary level of intellectual curiosity. Whilst their Islamic faith was clearly deeply rooted and their basic convictions unwavering they desired above all else to be intellectually honest in their search for truth, being convinced that the beliefs, attitudes and practises of their peers and seniors were frequently not in accord with the true spirit of Islam. They were certain that they could only begin to approach a more satisfac-

tory expression of Islam in 20th century Indonesia through the ongoing application of *ijtihâd*, and that what was required was a process of ongoing rational inquiry unfettered by the restrictions of taboo or dogmatic custom. To this end they, together with Dawam Rahardjo and several other core members, began meeting for open and unrestricted exchange and debate in a weekly study cell they referred to as the "Limited Discussion Group". The group met in the on-campus house of IAIN lecturer (and later Minister of Religious Affairs) Mukti Ali. In addition to the regular core members a wide variety of intellectuals, students and activists, Muslim and non-Muslim, dropped in for "closed door" discussions on religious, moral and philosophical issues. Through these times of frank discussion, and their broad reading, Djohan and Wahib arrived at conclusions that were years ahead of their time. They came to the realization, for example, that the interests of the Islamic ummah, and of the broader society, would be better served by the ummah turning away from party political activity and embracing the non-sectarian state philosophy of Pancasila, fifteen years before it became popular, or even acceptable, to express such thoughts.

Meanwhile in Jakarta the national leader of HMI, Nurcholish Madjid, was privately formulating very similar ideas. He too, despite being twice elected as chair of HMI, was an atypical figure in HMI circles. Unlike the vast majority of HMI members, and certainly unlike any previous chair, he was a student at IAIN Syarif Hidayatullah in Jakarta rather than the University of Indonesia or one of the other secular institutions where HMI was strong.

Nurcholish's sudden and complete fall from favor came when he questioned the sacred cow of Islamic politics and mooted something that sounded suspiciously like secularism. This happened when Nurcholish delivered a paper entitled 'The Necessity of Reform of Thought and the Problem of the Integration of the Islamic Community' (*Keharusan Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam dan Masalah Integrasi Umat*) at an *Idul Fitri* or post *Ramadân* (fasting month) gathering of the four leading Islamic student organizations¹³ on January 2nd 1970. Nurcholish's cover was blown.¹⁴ The erstwhile "favorite son" of the Masyumi old guard had been revealed for what he truly was a thorough going intellectual reformer in the spirit of early modernism. Unfortunately, or at least unpleasantly for Nurcholish, this meant he was a 'dangerous young radical' (ironically the Young Natsir was

very much like the real young Natsir but not at all like the old Natsir, or so it seemed) in the eyes of the ex-Masyumi leaders. Islamic thought in Indonesia had entered a new era.

Nurcholish Madjid

Nurcholish is undisputedly a thinker at the cutting edge of Islamic thought. In a number of areas he clearly breaks new ground, in others he masterfully synthesizes ideas and combines the best of otherwise divergent traditions. In this he has few, or no, antecedents. Whilst men like Mukti Ali, Deliar Noer and Harun Nasution, can be considered in certain ways to be early pioneers of the sort of thinking found in Nurcholish's Pembaruan thought the gap between them and Nurcholish is nevertheless considerable. It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that Nurcholish's thought somehow arose *ex nihilo*, as it were, and was not derived from earlier thought and shaped by earlier thinking.

In fact his thought was significantly influenced by the likes of Mukti Ali, Deliar Noer and Harun Nasution, and by the leading thinkers of Masyumi, including Mohammad Natsir. But to find the most important formative influences for Nurcholish's thought one needs to look closer to home. Very close in fact, for one of the primary influences upon his thought, and certainly the most important formative influence, is found in the person of Haji Abdul Madjid, a simple farmer from Jombang, Nurcholish's father.

Kiai Madjid occupied an unusual position in Islamic society, one that cost him dearly. He was a lay teacher very much of the NU tradition but refused to join the ranks of the '*ulamâ*' and he refused to join NU, remaining instead a member of Masyumi until the bitter end, long after most traditional thinkers had left. At the same time he was attacked, often viciously, by the modernists for being a recalcitrant supporter of NU. Nurcholish recounts that many times Abdul Madjid stood crying in his fields (*menangis di sawah*) deeply hurt by the personal nature of the attacks upon him. Not surprisingly when Nurcholish came under fierce attack from conservative modernists in the early 1970s his father, was a source of strong emotional support.

Nurcholish was born in the small community of Mojoanyar, Jombang, East Java, on the 17th of March 1939. Like his father before him he attended the local Sekolah Rakyat [Public Elementary School]

in the mornings and a madrasah in the afternoons. Nurcholish obtained his SR IV from Sekolah Rakyat Bareng, Jombang, in 1953 and in the same year completed his basic religious education at his father's madrasah, Madrasah Al Wathaniah. Then, at the age of 14, Nurcholish went to study at Pesantren Darul-'Ulum Rejoso in Jombang (a pesantren affiliated with NU). Here he won a number of prizes for scholarly achievement, but after only two years Nurcholish broke off his studies at this school. Whilst he had enjoyed considerable academic success there he had also suffered many taunts due to his father's political stance. It was partly for this reason that Abdul Madjid moved his son to the acclaimed progressive pesantren Pondok Modern Gontor in Gontor (near Ponorogo), East Java.¹⁵

After the influence of his father, Nurcholish's time in Gontor was probably the next most important formative influence in his intellectual development. He was 16 when he arrived at Gontor and continued his studies there until he was 21. After his graduation in 1960 Nurcholish remained on in Gontor for a further year to teach.¹⁶ By contemporary standards the style of education that Nurcholish experienced at Gontor in the late 1950s would be regarded as merely reasonably progressive. By the standards of that decade, however, the style of *pesantren* education then being pioneered at Gontor was nothing short of revolutionary. Gontor's curriculum represented a liberal synthesis of classical Islamic learning with modern western-style education that manifested itself just as much in a didactic approach as it did in content. Arabic language and literature, for example, an integral part of the curriculum at any traditional *pesantren*, were also foundational elements in the Gontor curriculum but were taught using modern language teaching methods, then a virtually unheard of approach in the *pesantren* environment. Moreover students were required to master not only classical Arabic but also English, on the grounds that this was the contemporary language of learning. And mastery meant full verbal fluency, with students being encouraged to communicate in amongst themselves in either Arabic or English but not in Javanese or Indonesian.¹⁷

Nurcholish was Chairman of the National Executive of HMI (Ketua Umum PB HMI) for two consecutive terms from 1966 to 1969 and from 1969 to 1971. He was also President of the Union of South-east Asian Islamic Students (Persatuan Mahasiswa Islam Asia Tenggara - PEMIA T) from 1967 until 1969. Later, from 1968 to 1971, Nurcholish

was Assistant Secretary General and founder of the International Islamic Federation of Students Organizations (IIFSO).

From 1971 to 1974 Nurcholish maintained a reasonably high public profile. This was a matter he had little choice in for his January 3rd 1970 paper had catapulted him into the public arena in no uncertain manner, and once there he found the exits barred. His critics clearly felt it their moral duty to continue to remind the public of his errors. The move to publicly refute Nurcholish's ideas took on a life of its own, and an almost continuous flood of articles critical of *Pembaruan Pemikiran* ideas meant that he was seldom out of the spot light of public attention.

Nurcholish adopted a policy of not replying to his critics publicly. In any case he was more interested in encouraging the growth of new Islamic thought than he was in defending his own position. During this period he was an active participant in several influential study groups. The most important of these groups was Yayasan Samanhudi [Samanhudi Foundation] where he met with Djohan Effendi, Ahmad Wahib, Dawam Rahardjo, Syu'bah Asa and, on occasion, Abdurrahman Wahid. In effect this group has continued its existence to the present day, forming the basis of the so-called *Reboan* (i.e.. Wednesday) meetings of the 1980s and the 1990s. It was through the essentially informal activities of this and other discussion groups that the *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* movement, as it was then known, grew and developed. Not surprisingly Nurcholish played a leading role in the life of these study groups and discussion forums. From 1974 to 1976 Nurcholish was the director of the Lembaga Kebajikan Islam Samanhudi [the Samanhudi Islamic Institute for Virtues] in Jakarta. And from 1973 to 1976 Nurcholish was Assistant Director I of the Lembaga Studi Ilmu Kemasyarakatan [Institute for the Study of Humanities] in Jakarta.

There were, however, a number of other somewhat more formal activities associated with the *Pembaruan* movement. One of these was the production of the provocative Islamic magazine *Mimbar Jakarta*. Nurcholish headed the *Mimbar Jakarta* team for three years from 1971 to 1974. Through endeavors such *Mimbar Jakarta*, *Pembaruan* ideas reached an ever expanding audience.

It is clear from Nurcholish's later comments that at the time he found the criticism directed towards him from his former mentors, the Masyumi generation, very painful. In later years, particularly af-

ter his return from doctoral studies at the University of Chicago, Nurcholish attempted, where ever possible, to avoid direct confrontation with his peers and seniors within the *ummah*. In the early 1970s, however, he clearly felt that he had no choice but to quietly stand his ground. Ironically, though he had not envisioned it being so rapidly realized, Nurcholish had clearly predicted in his January 3rd 1970 paper the divisions within the *ummah* that must surely follow the emergence of new Islamic thought.

In 1973 Fazlur Rahman and Leonard Binder made a visit to Indonesia (their first), partly because they were looking for suitable participants for a lengthy seminar/workshop program at the University of Chicago, sponsored by the Ford Foundation. Initially they had intended to invite Rasyidi, the foremost public critic of Nurcholish's *Pembaruan* thought, but ultimately he was considered to be 'too old'. Binder pushed for Nurcholish, who despite his youth was admitted to participate as an 'observer' at the six month long seminar/workshop program held at the University of Chicago in 1976. Rayburn Smith, a Ford Foundation official based in Jakarta at the time, joined with Binder in pushing for Nurcholish to be admitted to the program. To comply with Ford Foundation guidelines Nurcholish was required to become a public servant, consequently he was hurriedly inducted into the ranks of researchers working for LIPI (and has retained an official relationship there ever since).¹⁸ Up until this point in time Nurcholish had no contact with Rahman and knew nothing of his work.

Having enjoyed his period at Chicago, Nurcholish made it clear to Binder that he wished to return as a student. This he did in due course, but first he returned to Jakarta to take part in the 1977 election campaign program, he returned to Chicago in March 1978 where Rahman persuaded him to undertake research in Islamic studies (under his supervision) rather than political science (under the supervision of Binder) as he had initially planned.

With the 1977 elections over Nurcholish was free to take up his position in Chicago. In March 1978 he entered doctoral studies at the University of Chicago, graduating *Cum laude* in 1984. The title of his dissertation was "Ibn Taimiya on Kalam and Falsafah: A Problem of Reason and Revelation in Islam".

The Necessity of Renewal on Islamic Thought and the Problem of Ummah Integration

Nurcholish began his January 3 1970 paper by describing what he saw to be the dilemma of the Indonesia *ummah*. This is that on the one hand Indonesia Islam must strike out in new direction, but on the other hand to do so means risking the present unity of the *ummah*.¹⁹

Indonesian Islam, he argues has gone stale intellectually and needs to obtain new vitality and fresh ideas; even if that quest for intellectual vitality leads, as history suggests it will, to a degree of disunity within the Indonesian Islamic community or *ummah*.

In support of this he further argues that whilst Islam has grown and spread in its influence throughout Indonesia the quality of this growth is uncertain. Allied with this is the issue of whether people are actually attracted to Islamic organizations. "Islam Yes - Partai Islam [Islamic Party] No!", Nurcholish argues, has become the collective catch cry of the vast majority of the *ummat*. Why should Islamic organizations have fallen out of vogue at a time when Islam as a religion, a constellation of ideas, is progressing? If Islamic organizations represent the vessels (*wadah*) or vehicles for Islamic ideas, why is it, Nurcholish asks, that people are not attracted to Islamic organizations? The reasons, he argues, are obvious. Islamic organizations are no longer attracting the kind of mass support that they once did firstly because the very nature of the thought that these organizations represent and actively disseminate has become stale. And secondly, because Islamic parties and their leaders have lost credibility in the eyes of the public. Summing-up what he feels to be the feelings of the Islamic public Nurcholish writes:

The answer to that question can be found by placing the following question: to what extent are they interested in Islamic parties and organizations? Except a little, they are not interested at all: Islam, yes, Islamic party, no! Thus, if an Islamic party is regarded as the vessel of ideas in the Islamic struggle, these ideas are obviously becoming unpopular. In other words, Islamic parties fail to build positive and sympathetic images on these ideas, and they even construct the opposite images. (The reputation of some Muslims in corruption, for example, is increasingly high).²⁰

Leaving aside questions about the corporate behavior of Islamic organizations and the individual integrity of various Islamic leaders,

for such questions are not the main concern of Nurcholish here (although the fact that they were raised at all must have disturbed many of his critics), Nurcholish moves his argument forward to address that which concerns him most, the reform of Islamic thought.

Stability is all very well and so is quantitative growth, he argues, but dynamic ideas are required if the Indonesian *umat* is to become dynamic. In support of this he quotes Lenin:

But, is it possible to implement unity dynamically and change it to be a dynamic power in the absence of dynamic ideas? (no revolutionary movement without the revolutionary theories of Lenin). Dynamism is however demanded more than statism, although the latter constitutes the majority of human beings.²¹

The paralysis of Muslim today is caused, among others, by the fact that they tightly close their eyes from the handicaps found in their bodies, so it legitimates the necessity of the idea of a renewal movement to expel these shortcomings.²²

It was the unwillingness of Indonesian Muslims to recognize the existence of the flaws and failings that so weakened the *ummah*, as much as anything else, that necessitated a movement for the radical reform of Islamic thought. Just how radical this reform or renewal (*pembaruan*) must be Nurcholish spells out by quoting Andrea Beufre:

Our traditional lines of thought must go overboard, for it is now far more important to be able to look ahead than to have a large scale of force whose effectiveness is problematic.²³

Returning to the dilemma of choosing between stability and unity with no change, or dynamism and change with instability he argues that the latter is clearly preferable, for even a very small band of reformers can achieve more than a stable, but mire bound, mass. Despite his whole-hearted support for change in this paper, even if it came at the expense of the unity of the *ummah*, it is clear that Nurcholish did not treat the matter lightly. He goes to great lengths in the paper to show why reform must be pursued at all costs. He did not of course, expect that it would be this very paper that would precipitate heated debate and divide the *ummah*. But when he quoted Beufre's words "Our traditional lines of thought must go overboard,..." Nurcholish meant what they said absolutely:

... Based on these statements, we would like to draw an understanding that renewal has to begin from two connected steps: abandoning traditional values and constructing future-oriented values. Nostalgia, or excessive yearning for the past, has to be replaced by future orientation. Therefore, it deserves a process of liberalization, which pertains all the available "Islamic teachings and insights".²⁴

In his paper Nurcholish was setting before his peers (or so he thought) a program for intellectual reform that was prepared to overturn any doctrine, hobby horse or tradition that stood in its way. This reform program would involve, he said, three interrelated processes: (i) secularization, (ii) intellectual freedom, (iii) 'the idea of progress' and an open-minded attitude (*sikap terbuka*).

Discussion of these three processes occupies most of what remains of his paper, beginning with discussion of the concept that more than any other concept, or idea, was to cause him trouble in the hands of his critics, that is the concept of *sekularisasi*. *Sekularisasi* is defined by Nurcholish in contradistinction to *sekularisme*, the latter term being employed to designate the atheistic system of thought, or world view, that is commonly intended by use of the term secular humanism. *Sekularisasi* he defines as being a process rather than a belief system. The process of *sekularisasi*, he explains, involves transforming beliefs and practises in two directions. The first direction of transformation is downward and involves the desacralizing (*'menduniawikan'* - literally the "bringing down to earth" i.e. recognizing as mundane) that which was previously regarded as sacred. The second direction of transformation is upwards and involves the sanctification (*'mengkukhrawikan'* - literally declaring as transcendent) that which is truly transcendent, eternal and sacred (*ukhrawi*). In short *sekularisasi* is the process of re-evaluating all that pertains to religious thought and practise:

Therefore, secularization is not intended to apply secularism and change Muslims to be secularists. It is intended to profanize every thing profane, and free the Muslims from the tendency of sacralizing the profane. The willingness to always reevaluate a truth-value before material, moral, or historical conditions, should be the very attitude of Muslims.²⁵

To further clarify what he means by *sekularisasi*, Nurcholish introduces a second term *desakralisasi* (i.e. desacralization). This concern for intellectual reform Nurcholish saw as having very profound

roots, as is illustrated by his linking of *desakralisasi* with the concept of *tawhîd*, or the uniqueness of God. A direct outcome of the doctrine of *tawhîd*, he argues, is the rejection of all forms of idolatry, even, he stresses, orthodox religious idolatry in the form of human tradition becoming 'sacred':

Basically, as a reflection of *tawhîd* (monotheism), Muslims have to possess insight to look at the world and its constituent problems as they are. Transcendental absolutization towards God must reveal desacralization towards others i.e the world, its problems, and all the values attached. Sacralizing something other than God is basically *musbrik*, the opposite of *tawhîd*. Therefore, secularization gains its concrete meaning in the desacralization towards everything, except the ones that constitute transcendental values.²⁶

To stress the extent of the full implications of the doctrine of *tawhîd* being applied to the realm of ideas, Nurcholish quotes not just Muhammad Iqbal but Karl Marx as well. His intention is to stress to his listeners that nothing should be sacred but God Himself and that which He, and not man, has made things sacred. The result of *tawhîd* then, he argues is "Bolshevism plus God":

The ones subject to desacralization are all worldly objects, moral and material. Moral pertains values, while material is concerned with objective things. The statement that Islam is Bolshevism plus God (Iqbal), means Muslims possess similarities in looking at the world and its problems with the communists (realistic, objective, and do not make excessive valuations regarding objective materials); the difference lies in the fact that Islam holds a world-view (*weltanschauung*) which correlates the existence of God and the universe as such; to quote Marx, it is a kind of body with its head on top and its feet underneath, means belief in God becomes the foundation of the way of looking at the universe, and not the other way round such as found in dialectic materialism.²⁷

With the benefit of hindsight it is clear that Nurcholish would have been better understood had he confined himself to using the term *desakralisasi*, for this term lacks the negative emotive impact of *sekularisasi* but conveys virtually the same intention. What *desakralisasi* arguably fails to convey of course, is the upward transformation, or sanctification, of concepts previously regarded as temporal or mundane. The inclusion of this upwards process of sanctification in the concept of *sekularisasi*, however, appears to have more to do with a concern for intellectual neatness and completeness, and a concern to

be seen to be balanced, than it does with real demands. Clearly what Nurcholish had in mind with *sekularisasi* and with *desakralisasi* was the need to rid Islam of the accretions of outmoded human tradition and all that stood in the way of rationality.

Clearly what Nurcholish had in mind was change of a radical kind, hence his quoting Lenin. Equally clear is that Nurcholish was speaking candidly here in the manner of someone who thought that they were addressing like-minded peers in a “closed doors” gathering, which is indeed what Nurcholish later claimed.²⁸ This distinction is important because it alerts us to the fact that we are being presented here in this paper with a ‘behind the scenes’ view of Nurcholish’s thought.

Once again about Secularization

The strongest reactions to the 1970 working paper, writes Nurcholish in this 1972 paper, came from those who disagreed with the use of the term ‘*sekularisasi*’. Whilst what was intended by the use of the term ‘*sekularisasi*’, was secularizing or desacralizing without ‘*sekularisme*’ many have claimed that *sekularisasi* without *sekularisme* is impossible, he says. This objection, he argues, is based upon a misunderstanding of *sekularisasi* or secularization.

We can gain a clearer understanding about the process of secularization, Nurcholish argues, from examining the history of religion leading up to the revelation of Islam. For secularization is not confined to the realms of theological debate, he suggests, rather its presence can be easily discerned in each chapter in the unfolding drama of human history:

Islam says that the first people (Adam and Eve) were taught a true faith. Certainly, this teaching must have been simple in conformity with human (capacity) understanding. Hence, this teaching was gradually improved along with the coming of the prophets in the following periods. Apart from bringing more sophisticated teachings, these prophets were also sent to save the people who had violated the previous teachings. Finally, came the Prophet Muhammad. He is the final Messenger of God with complete and universal duties.²⁹

Secularization then, Nurcholish concludes, is nothing more than the ongoing process of Islamization —part of the same process that turns pantheists into monotheists, and turned Hindu-Buddhist Indonesians into Muslims.

What did the coming of Islam and its central doctrine of *tawhîd* mean for the animist who received it? Previously everything, whether animate and inanimate, in the world around him or her was filled with religious significance. There was no separation between the spiritual world and the material world and every act and thought was bound up in the realm of the religious and the spiritual.

Animists regard almost all material objects as having some kind of spiritual significance. Islam, Nurcholish writes, rejects such an understanding and sets the animist free from manifold fears and acts of bondage to the material world around him. The coming of Islam and the encounter with the uncompromising truth of *tawhîd*, Nurcholish asserts, changed everything:

Now, Islam is revealed by its strict monotheism. It enables an animist to look at an object as it is: he is able to look at it as an objective material, understand it, use it, or manipulate it. The extent to which he is able to value this object will depend on his intellectual capacity rather than the frequency that he conducts religious rituals. Monotheism, then, reveals a radical secularization process in the mind of the animist. An object, which was previously worshipped and regarded to constitute eschatological or spiritual values, is now dumped on the ground and placed alongside other materials. The object is therefore profanized or desacralized. Now, he is becoming to be a thinking being. He contemplates the object: its genesis, laws, and the means of using and manipulating it. Within this process of contemplation, he does not rely on religious rituals anymore: they are free. His knowledge about an object is free and independently constructed knowledge, which is located outside spiritual boundaries. Sutan Takdir Alisyahbana explains this problem concisely in his book (English version).³⁰

Thus conversion to Islam, Nurcholish postulates, can in fact be said to be a process of secularization through coming to terms with Islam's uncompromising monotheism. This understanding is by no means strange or unique, Nurcholish suggests, Sultan Takdir Alisyahbana having said exactly the same in his well known book *Indonesia: Social and Cultural Revolution*.

The very form of the "*kalimat syahadat*" [statement of faith], Nurcholish continues, with its initial negation of all divinity, represents an acknowledgment that mankind is prone to worship and sacralize, many material objects and worldly matters, assigning them a spiritual status that is by no means rightfully theirs. This being so, then, how he asks, by what process can somebody come to a position of true knowledge and true faith? Simply, he asserts, by recog-

nizing the reality that divinity belongs to God alone, all else is mundane:

The only way is to free people from this chain: they have to reevaluate their belief that the world cannot be uncovered by using their power alone. It is a radical change that human beings have the authority to understand the world. The only impossibility to understand God, the Creator of the world. Therefore, He entitles us to worship. Apart from Him, everything in the universe, has to be disclosed, understood, manipulated and utilized. The Prophet says, "Think of the universe and do not think of God, the Creator."³¹

Having recognized the world for what it is, Nurcholish argues, we have both a right and an obligation to master this mundane material reality through discovering and understanding the rules which God has set in place for its operation. Thus "success" in the material realm, Nurcholish asserts, is not dependent on religious practise or ritual but rather on the application of the human intellect. To expand upon Nurcholish's point we could say that piety will not, as it were, fix an automobile nor will faith produce an understanding of atomic physics. Direct intervention by God aside from piety and faith, he suggests, have nothing to do with worldly success. For man to profit from the material he must first understand its basic laws and employ rationality to turn them to his advantage. Thus the material world is particularly the realm of rationality or *ilmu* [knowledge, science], for rationality is the key to unlocking its riches just as faith or *îmân* is the key which unlocks the riches of the spiritual realm and the hereafter. Leaving aside the issue of divine providence, it is fair to say that *îmân* has no bearing upon the domain of *ilmu*. Thus a neat but profound dichotomy exists between the realm of *îmân* and that of *ilmu*, between that which is '*duniawi*' [worldly] and that which is '*ukhrawi*' [heavenly]. *Sekularisasi* then, is the process of transforming belief and practise so that they conform to absolute reality."

Human intellectual ability, Nurcholish argues, is a not simply a gift from God, but an *amânah*, or trusteeship, from our Creator, one for which we are held responsible.³² This *amânah* is given to us, Nurcholish continues, in the context of our having been given the divine mandate of being made *khalifah*, or sovereign representatives of God, upon this earth.³³ In a limited sense, Nurcholish argues, we have been given the privilege and responsibility of acting in God's

stead in managing the affairs of this mundane realm. To fulfil this high calling, he argues, we must make full use of the faculty for rational enquiries and deduction that God has given us.

Ultimately, Nurcholish asserts, to live as God wants us to live requires that we employ our faith (*imân*) and our intellect-cum-knowledge (*ilmu*) in equal proportions. Not to do so is to lead a sub standard life that does not meet with the approval of God.³³ We can only do so, however, when, Nurcholish implies by the context of his argument, we recognize the bounds of the sacred and the mundane, in other words, when have properly desacralized that which is in fact not sacred but mundane.

Djohan Effendi³⁴

Djohan Effendi was born in October 1939 in the small city of Kandangan, South Kalimantan. His mother and father were Banjarese and worked in Kandangan as small scale traders. Djohan was raised in a *santri* household and was encouraged at an early age to learn to read the Qur'ân and to master the classical Arabic in which it is written. Like many of his peers from similar backgrounds, he began to study the Qur'ân and learn classical Arabic even before entering formal schooling, being taught by his grandmother. When he was 10 years old, in addition to studying in the mornings at the local government primary school at Kandangan, he began taking afternoon classes at a local Sekolah Arab (literally: Arabic School). This provided the means for him to properly learn Arabic and gain the rudiments of a classical Islamic education. After studying at this school for three years Djohan moved on to a Religious Teacher's Training (Pendidikan Guru Agama) program at Banjarmasin at the National Institute for Islamic Legal Education (Pendidikan Hakim Islam Negeri) where he undertook a further four years of study.

Having shown a good of academic aptitude from an early age Djohan was encouraged to undertake higher studies. Partly because of the limited range of opportunities open to him in South Kalimantan and partly because of his personal inclination in 1957, at the age of seventeen, he elected to undertake basic studies in Islamic law at the National Institute for Islamic Legal Education in Yogyakarta. Three years later after graduating he returned to South Kalimantan to work as a court clerk (*Panitera Pengadilan*) at the Islamic Court in Amuntai, 200 kilometers or so up the Negara River, deep in the heart of the

province. Having thus gained some basic professional experience, and in the process earning the praise and attention of his superiors, he was sent back to Yogyakarta in 1963 by his employer, the Department of Religious Affairs, (as a *mahasiswa tugas belajar* - on what was in effect a contracted scholarship) to undertake a degree at the Sunan Kalijaga IAIN in the Faculty of Syarī'ah (Islamic Law).

At this point, as a promising young cadet in the Department of Religious Affairs, Djohan's future success seemed assured. And indeed in time he did go on to a brilliant career in the department, but not before events and his natural curiosity conspired to give him a further decade of education, both formal and informal, with the latter serving to shape his thought in a decisive fashion. His studies in philosophy during his early years at IAIN Sunan Kalijaga, Djohan recalls, almost broke his faith. At one point, reflecting upon the polemic between Ibn Rushd and al-Ghazālī, Djohan reached a crisis point as he teetered on the verge of agnosticism. It was at this point that he met Muhammad Irsjad, a leading light in Yogyakarta's small Ahmadiyyah Lahore community. This encounter served both to rescue his faith and spark off a life long interest in Ahmadiyyah thought.

When he was in his second year of studies an event occurred that was ultimately to have a profound effect on Djohan's education and the development his thought. On the 10th October 1963 Saifuddin Zuhri,³⁵ NU leader and the then Minister for Religious Affairs, paid a visit to the Sunan Kalijaga IAIN to be met by a group of staff and students protesting at what they saw as the NU-isation of the institution. As a result of this protest Saifuddin Zuhri launched an investigation into the extent of anti-NU sentiment at Sunan Kalijaga which finally resulted in a sizeable proportion of the academic staff being transferred out of IAIN Sunan Kalijaga, creating a vacuum in the ranks of the staff. To fill this vacuum junior members of staff were promoted to lecturing positions. This changed the character of teaching at the IAIN, and in Djohan's eyes the standards plummeted over night as many of those newly appointed to lecture were, he felt, ill-equipped to do so. As a result he stopped attending the majority of his classes and instead spent his time in reading and private study in the several reasonably well-equipped libraries (such as the National, the Islamic and the Hatta Libraries) that the small university city was renowned for. In addition he sought out alternative forms of teaching including a Sunday morning class run by Muhammad Irsjad. Amongst other

aspects of Islamic studies, Irsjad taught *tafsîr*, or Qur'ânic hermeneutics, a subject of special interest to Djohan.

This 'alternative' education obviously left a strong impression on him for there is much in his latter writing that reflects Lahore Ahmadiyyah influence, not so much in matters of doctrine but in terms of a general approach to the Qur'ân, to the tasks of *tafsîr* and *ijtihad*. In fact Djohan has remained an avid student of Ahmadiyyah thought (both the Lahore and Qadyan sects) right up until the present, and he is undoubtedly the foremost expert on Ahmadiyyah thought in Indonesia.³⁶ A similar statement can also be made about Djohan's interest in, and knowledge of, the writings of Muhammad Iqbal, whose writings he also began to study seriously at this time. Indeed at one point, Djohan recalls, he was so impressed with Iqbal's thought that he used to refer to himself as being a "Iqbalian".³⁷ At this point in Indonesia's history, for a student to show deep interest in the writings of Iqbal was not quite as unusual, or more accurately, as suspect, as displaying serious respect for the teachings of Ahmadiyyah. Nevertheless it was indicative of goodly measures of open mindedness and intellectual curiosity, not to mention boldness, to pursue such interests at a time when Indonesian Islamic modernism was increasingly being locked into a defensive, if not a reactionary, standpoint.

It would be wrong however to give the impression that Djohan had become a follower of Lahore Ahmadiyyah or of Muhammad Iqbal, even though he was an avid student of both schools of thought. Rather it was already manifestly clear that Djohan, even as a young student, was committed, in fact vigorously committed, to the free and frank exchange of ideas. This is reflected, as shall be seen below, in his later writing, a constant theme of which is the high value and responsibility of reason. A reoccurring sentiment in his writing is the view that it is incumbent upon all Muslims to actively and strenuously exercise their God given *ra'yu* or *akal* [intellect], their powers of reasoning, to pursue knowledge and increase their understanding of both their faith and of the universe in general, stressing too that the essential concomitant of being committed to reason is maintaining an open mind. For Djohan openness to new ideas and fresh ways of seeing was an indispensable and inescapable requirement for the rational development of Islamic thought.

It is debatable as to whether or not Djohan would have eventually become involved with HMI to the extent that he did were it not

for the PKI attacks upon it throughout 1964 and 1965. What is clear though is that this involvement with HMI was critical in the evolution and maturation of his thinking. This was not so much because of any particular quality possessed by HMI *per se* but because of the intensive nature of his involvement, the urgency of the circumstances and the collegial character of the environment in HMI Central Java's elite ranks. Djohan sees the period as being one in which he was forced to think in an extended manner about the problems facing Islam in Indonesia:

My activities in HMI intensifies me in thinking about the condition of the Muslims. My friendship with Dawam, and closeness with Mansur Hamid and especially Wahib, involves me in discussions about Islam and Muslim problems. We give presentations by turns about Islam, HMI and the problems of Muslim. Our discussion is very valuable in broadening our insight so that our speech at HMI training are not presented repeatedly.³⁸

Aware of the need for a fresh, new approach to understanding Islam in the context of Indonesian society in the twentieth century, an approach that was authentic and intellectually honest rather than being merely a normative restating of old opinions, Djohan and his colleagues scoured the world's major ideologies and philosophies for fresh insights. In particular they studied Marxism, not simply, as it were to understand the enemy, but to see what they could usefully learn from Marxism.

In mid 1967 the Lingkar Diskusi Limited Group, or Limited Discussion Group formed and began meeting every Friday at the home of Mukti Ali. Within a short period of time the three core members of the group, Djohan, Wahib and Dawam³⁹ had reached some agreement about the political position that the *ummah* should take in the future. Not only were they convinced of the need to embrace Pancasila and hence secure a well established non-sectarian ideological base, they also wished to see HMI officially accept Pancasila as soon as possible:

Finally, we conclude that Pancasila should be the political ideology of Indonesian Muslim. This conclusion motivated us to place Pancasila within the constitution of HMI at the Malang Congress. Our idea was refused, but, in the following congress, in Palembang, it was then accepted.⁴⁰

By October 1968 Dawam was doing his best to make the groups position on political ideology clear when, at the Solo meeting of the

leaders of HMI Jawa Tengah, he lambasted the former Chairman (*Ketua Umum*) of Masyumi, Prawoto Mangkusasmito, with questions about his formulation for an Islamic state. This sort of approach did not go unrewarded and in September 1969 HMI Jakarta was attacking the “radicals” in Yogyakarta, accusing Djohan and Wahib of being the Socialist Party link in Central Java (“link PSI di Jawa Tengah”). Wahib responded on the 30th of the month with a *Memorandum Pembaruan*, a statement calling for reform. The next day Djohan and Wahib both submitted letters of resignation (*statemen pamitan*) without each other knowing. In late November, Nurcholish, who was re-elected as Chairman of HMI at the Malang conference that year wrote a confidential letter to Djohan and Wahib revealing his private support for their stance. Then a little over a month later came the news of Nurcholish’s bombshell 3rd January paper “Keharusan Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam dan Masalah Integrasi Umat”. Dawam, having recently graduated from the Faculty of Economics at Gadjah Mada and moved from Yogyakarta to Jakarta in August 1969, sent Nurcholish’s paper to Wahib and Djohan, who then copied it and circulated it around Yogyakarta. The era of *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* had begun, from now on it was a matter for public debate, no longer the preserve of quiet discussions behind closed doors.

When Djohan stepped down from his HMI office in October 1969 he was finally free to resume his studies uninterrupted. Up until his resignation he had been working in a virtually full time capacity for HMI. Djohan had in any case already re-enrolled for the final dissertation section of his IAIN degree. His dissertation topic was, appropriately enough, on *tafsir*, or Qur’anic hermeneutics. Following his graduation in 1972, Djohan moved to Jakarta, joining Nurcholish, Dawam and Wahib, and began working as a member of the private staff of the Secretary General of the Department of Religious Affairs.

Almost immediately after he moved to Jakarta he became involved with a series of discussion groups, both formal and informal. He and Wahib would often meet with Nurcholish and Dawam in their homes for discussion. To facilitate more formal discussions with a wider group Yayasan Samanhudi, a special purpose *yayasan* or foundation, was established, the first of many. Initially the members of Yayasan Samanhudi met frequently for wide ranging and serious discussions related to the central topic of *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*. By the

mid 1970s the group was meeting less often, with the most intensive period of activity taking place during the month of *Ramadân*, when the group met several times a week.

In 1973 Djohan was promoted to become a member of the private staff of the Minister of Religious Affairs, a post which he occupied until 1978. In 1976 he was also made Head of the Sub-directorate of Religious Higher Education, an office he continued to hold until 1981. From 1981 until 1983 he was Head of the Bureau of Religious and Social Research. Finally, in 1987, he was made Assistant Aid to the Minister/Secretary of State for Special Duties in the Field of Research and Development, a post that he continues to hold.

During this period Djohan also held a number of other teaching and research positions. As early as 1974 he began to lecture in the field of Islamology at the Catholic Driyarkara Institute for Higher Studies in Philosophy, and has continued to do so until the present.

Djohan's most important official duty is one that is not however reflected in his various job titles and position descriptions. That task is speech writing. Within a short time of his being employed at the Department of Religious Affairs in Jakarta it was discovered that he wrote extremely well, and what is more that he wrote extremely good speeches. Before very long he was writing speeches for his Minister, and within a short space of time his speeches were noticed by the President himself. And so a new phase in his speech writing career began. He continued to write speeches for the Minister of Religious Affairs but he was also increasingly asked to assist Moerdiono (even before the latter became a Minister) in researching ideas for the President's speeches.

Lastly it should be pointed out that Djohan's involvement in small discussion groups has continued almost unabated up to the present time. Whenever one discussion group has run its course and died a natural death another has replaced it. Furthermore Djohan has generally been simultaneously involved in a multitude of discussion groups, some with his peers, some with younger Islamic intellectuals and some with people of other faiths. When the Samanhudi discussion group slowly petered out in the late seventies Djohan began a new group meeting at his house in Jalan Proklamasi in Central Jakarta, which quickly became known as the "Proklamasi Group". A visit to any one of a number of prominent progressive Islamic NGOs active around Jakarta at the present time elicits words of praise for Djohan

on the part of many young intellectuals on account of their participation in the Proklamasi Discussion Group or in some other such group led by him.

It should not be imagined that Djohan's influence is limited to NGO circles either, for he, together with several others including two particularly progressive Ministers of Religious Affairs, Mukti Ali and Munawir Sjadzali, has been responsible for significant *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*, within the Department of Religious Affairs itself.

Building Religious Life within the Framework of a Pancasila Society

It would be easy to be cynical about any conference paper presented in the late 1970's with the word "Pancasila" in the title, let alone one completely devoted to praising the virtues of Pancasila. Yet there is every reason to take this paper at face value. Djohan, it will be remembered, was a firm advocate for Pancasila as long ago as 1969, if not earlier –long before such an advocacy was popular. Moreover this paper sets forth a number of clear reasons for championing Pancasila, reasons which concur exactly with what we already know of Djohan's convictions.

The first reason Djohan gives for supporting the Pancasila is that it represents Indonesia's best option. In searching for a state ideology Indonesia could have gone in either of two directions. It could either have become a religious state or it could have become a completely secular state. Either of these options, it is suggested, would have had serious problems. Given this situation, it is understandable that Djohan should use strong language in praising the ingenuity of the doctrine of Pancasila:

It is an historical and ingenious decision that the forefathers of our independence pioneers reached an agreement to establish Pancasila as "the state philosophy" and "national ideology", to serve as the basis of our national and social lives. This wise and future-oriented decision has solved, though not fully, the ideological problem concerning the relationship between religion and state, because, it is as if there is no other alternative for a nation that does not choose either a religious state or a secular state. Should a state be religious, its governmental system has to be based on a particular religion, or at least, place a certain religion as the official one; conversely, should a state be secular, its government has to abandon itself from any religious matters and ignore the religions of its people. However, based on the decision of our predecessors, we have decided something different. Indonesia is neither a religious nor a secular state. Indonesia is a Pancasila state, which acknowl-

edges "the freedom of religion" and fulfills the religious demands of its people.⁴¹

Clearly one of the chief virtues of Pancasila, from Djohan's point of view, is the fact it that separates religious and state apparatus – although, he adds, not quite sufficiently! This virtue might be described as a preventative one, in that it provides a way out and prevents having to choose between two evils. But Djohan also sees Pancasila as conferring a number of positive benefits in the way it provides the structure for a new non-sectarian Indonesian identity that draws upon the best of a variety of traditions:

As the state philosophy and national ideology, Pancasila itself becomes: (i) an "ideological framework" which constitutes the ideals of the society growing within the history of our national struggle for independence; and (ii) a "cultural framework" that functions as the filter for old Indonesian cultural heritage and against the influence of foreign culture. Therefore, the development of Indonesian culture becomes a genuine idiom and a new national identity, without losing our noble values of national identity.

More specifically the creation of a theistic secular state through the doctrine of Pancasila confers a useful guiding role upon the state in religious matters. A guiding role that the state might otherwise have had difficulty in justifying or implementing if its ideology was entirely secular. In particular Pancasila provides the conceptual framework for directing behavior and attitudes in a religiously plural society. Put simply it is a way of formalizing the need for good will amongst all faiths and people.

Maintaining a harmonious relationship among all faiths is to create situations of: (a) mutual restraint towards other teachings, beliefs, and traditions, which may differ from one's own; (b) mutual respect for the rights of others to hold and implement their religious teachings; and (c) mutual trust on the positive willingness of other religious adherents.

In concluding, a final reason for Djohan's support of Pancasila becomes evident: to build religious life within the framework of Pancasila society, Muslims have to abandon certain thoughts, which differentiate the interest of "ummah" and the interest of "nation", between the interest of "government" and the interest of "society."

Muslim efforts to develop religious life have as well to cover the attempt to socialize Pancasila within the state and national lives. Basi-

cally, Pancasila is “*kalimah sawâ’ baynanâ wa baynakum*”, [O people of the Book, come to the common terms between us and you —the Qur’ân 3:64].

In summary then, it can be said that Djohan’s support for Pancasila is related to his commitment to pluralism, for at its best the Pancasila ensures, in as much as any state ideology can ensure anything, a broader societal commitment to pluralism.

Ahmad Wahib

From a technical or methodological point of view the inclusion of a section on the thoughts of Ahmad Wahib may seem somewhat incongruous, for one is confined to examining a couple of papers and three years of diary entries, and all that was twenty years ago. With the other figures studied here, Nurcholish, Djohan and Abdurrahman, more than two decades of intellectual output bears witness to the profundity of their works. Even when attention is limited to work from just the first half of this period, as is the case with this study, the fact that it is possible to trace the development and maturation of these thinkers over more than two decades allows a sense of perspective not possible in the case of a writer who wrote for little more than three years. This is not to say that Wahib’s writing does not bear any comparison with that of the thinkers being studied here, it is just that the comparison is unequal. The comparison is unequal for two reasons, the first being that unlike that of his peers, his writing, being for the most part diary entries, was not meant to be read by anyone other than himself. *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam* does, it is true contain several draft articles but they were just that, drafts, and not fully complete and prepared for publication.⁴² The second reason why comparison of Ahmad’s writing with that of Nurcholish, Djohan and Abdurrahman is unequal is that Wahib is seen in his writing as a young man still in the initial stages of formulating his thought. Born in November 1942 Wahib was barely 31 years old when he was fatally struck down by a motor cycle one afternoon in March 1973. Quiet and unassuming by nature and several years younger than Djohan, Nurcholish and Dawam, he did not seek the spotlight and unlike his friends was not the subject of public attention, especially after he had left HMI and Yogyakarta and moved to Jakarta. Evidently he was though on the verge of becoming a more public writer, and certainly his private writing showed enormous potential. And

yet of course Wahib's potential, like his youth, lies tragically frozen in time.

So why study Wahib? One reason is because of the quality of his ideas and the worthiness of his observations. Rough diamonds perhaps, as he wrote for himself, swiftly and frankly, and not for an audience, but his short notes and occasional papers are of great value none the less. The publication of *Pergolakan Pemikiran; Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* [the Restlessness of Islamic Thought: the Diary of Ahmad Wahib], in 1981 caused quite an uproar, even though the writing was a decade old. Perhaps because they were expressed with the frankness and honesty that is the genre of a diary, Wahib's ideas and observations excited and shocked readers of the book in a way that surprised even Djohan Effendi, the main editor of Wahib's notes. To date the book has been through at least four printings.⁴³

In Djohan's view, however, there is second and possibly more important reason for studying Wahib's work, and that is in order to understand the contribution that he made to the development of neo-modernist thought and thus in turn to better understand neo-modernism in Indonesia. In writing a foreword to the first edition in 1981 Djohan makes a curious, but very telling, comment:

... Wahib, who in the renewal group tends to be a "behind the screen" or "intellectual" actor, is not publicly well-known. Because the Islamic renewal emerges from the HMI, the leader of the HMI thus becomes more popular. As a young intellectual, who turned up in limited forums, Wahib is not remembered. Even years after his death, people never relate the process of Islamic renewal to Wahib. I think, with regard to the ongoing process, the diary of Ahmad Wahib has a significant meaning. This diary is important in connection with the investigation of religious problems and social changes in our country. Besides that, I would also like to mention two foreign scholars who have written about Islamic renewal. They are Professor Boland of Holland and Dr. Kamal Hassan of Malaysia. It is regretted that Wahib is not mentioned in their thick descriptions.⁴⁴

What is curious about Djohan's comment is not so much his opinion that Wahib was a vital and influential 'behind the scenes' figure in the development of neo-modernism (for he sets his argument out in such a way as to make that opinion appear entirely reasonable). Rather the odd or curious thing about Djohan's comment is his surprise that foreign students of Indonesian Islam, such as B.J. Boland, were not aware of Wahib's importance. Yet it was hardly surprising that

Wahib's contribution was completely overlooked prior to the publication of his diary. That Djohan should have understood Wahib's contribution to be so self evident, even before any of his writings were available in print, speaks volumes about the contribution that Wahib made to the intellectual development of those around him, firstly in Yogyakarta, and later in Jakarta. Fortunately the publication of *Pergolakan Pemikiran* makes it possible to finally recognize the work of Ahmad Wahib.

Ahmad Wahib was born on the 9th November 1942 in the town of Sampang on the south coast of the island of Madura.⁴⁵ The people of Madura are renowned for the degree to which Islam forms part of their expressed sense of local identity. It is perhaps not particularly surprising then to learn that Wahib grew up in a strongly religious communal and family environment. Even by Madurese standards, however, Wahib's family was considered to be exceptionally religious. Wahib's father, Pak Sulaiman, was respectfully regarded as being one of the spiritual leaders of the region. Consequently, whilst Wahib did not have opportunity to formally undertake studies in a *pesantren* he was no stranger to the *pesantren* life. The fact that he did not undertake *pesantren* studies is in itself noteworthy for it points to the broad mindedness of his father, a theme frequently touched upon in his diary entries. Rather than sending him to the local *pesantren* Wahib's father allowed him to study science, firstly at high school in the nearby city of Pamekasan where he graduated in 1961, and then at Gadjah Mada University in Yogyakarta.⁴⁶

Freedom to Think (Kebebasan Berpikir)

The key to understanding Ahmad Wahib's thought is his conviction that free thought is not just a right but a duty. Whereas in 1967, when he first began to mix with Djohan, he felt somewhat disturbed by the notion of 'free ranging thought that sets itself no limits' by July 1969, when this the entry being discussed here was written, he was convinced that God demanded nothing less. His conviction was based on the premise that as God is supremely rational, and that He made humankind in his image to be rational creatures, then it was ridiculous to claim that God would be upset when his creatures sought to find Him out by means of exercising their rationality:

Some people ask me to think within the limits of *tawhîd*, as it is the conclusion of the global teachings of Islam. This is ridiculous, why should

thinking be confined? Is God afraid of reason, which was created by Himself? I believe in God, but God is not a zone forbidden to reasoning. God's "existence" is to be thought about? God's existence is not immune from criticism. Basically, one who believes in God, while refusing critical thinking, means insulting the rationality of God's existence. He insults God, because he pretends to believe in Him.⁴⁷

An Islam that limited freedom of thought, he went on to say, was not an Islam that he wanted to be a part of. If indeed Islam did set limits on what was permissible to think then, he argued, he would have no choice but to become an infidel (*kâfir*), or at best a half hearted Muslim. The Islam of some people may be like that, he seemed to argue, but not the Islam of God. By now, in what ever areas Wahib might have had doubts, this was not one of them; he was by now utterly convinced that God was pleased when His people tried to think, and search Him out by the means that He had given them to do so:

... However, until this time I still think that God does not restrict me, and God will be proud of my reason such that always I question about Him. I believe that God is fresh, live and not frozen. He does not want to be frozen.⁴⁸

God was even pleased, he was sure, when believers, in their sincere efforts to understand Him and His ways, sometimes make mistakes. This sort of rationality, he argued, was not without its dangers, but it was not something that one could pull back from. Fear of failure was not a sufficient excuse not to think:

I think that a creative thinking person, though he may be wrong, is still better than those who make mistakes because they never think. I do not understand why many people so afraid of free thinking. Is not the material only to act as a translation? Although it constitutes negative effects, its positive values are even greater. Those who are afraid of free thinking will suffer from their hidden feelings of uncertainty and pretence. He feels uncertain to say that there is something he hides in his sub-consciousness. In fact, free thinking will enable people to know more about themselves. People will know more about their humanity. Perhaps, some people believe that free thinking will drive people to be atheists. Is this true? One who never thinks can certainly be an atheist as well! It is better to be an atheist because of thinking rather than not at all. Yes, even though both are not appropriate choices.⁴⁹

Wahib, then, was absolutely committed to the course of rational enquiry. This was, he believed, what God desired of man, and the reason that He had given him the gift of intelligence. Moreover to declare God to be a “no thinking zone” (*daerah terlarang bagi pemikiran*) was both without basis and an insult to God. Did this mean then that Wahib had complete confidence in the sufficiency of human reasoning? Not at all. Human reason was most certainly limited, he argued, but this was not a good reason for artificially placing bounds on where it could and could not go. Rather, human reasoning should be left to find its own bounds:

I do not mean to worship the strength of reason as though it is absolute. Indeed, the power of reason has limits; once again, has limits! But, who knows this limit? Reason itself is never able to decide beforehand. The limit of reason will only be recognizable as our activity of thinking comes to certain points, in which we fail to solve problems. Therefore, the statement of “the limit of reason” is a useless or even wrong statement. Reason will never exceed its limits. If so, why should we be occupied with limits, if the area outside the limit goes beyond reason’s capacity?⁵⁰

There was however one further factor which Wahib clearly accepted but saw no reason to mention here. This was after all a private journal entry and not an academic paper, and Wahib had no need to remind himself of any unspoken given factors or prior assumptions. For this reason, readers of *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam*, both in Indonesia and in the West, but particularly in the West, might easily misunderstand passages such as this, especially if they are read in isolation. Wahib was a keen student of philosophy, and it might be thought that he was operating on the basis of the same assumptions as the majority of modern Western philosophers. He most clearly was not, as a thorough reading of the whole of *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam* makes clear. Rather, Wahib took as a fundamental prior assumption the veracity of the Qur’ân as a revelation from God. He frequently doubted the various interpretations of the Qur’ân, including his own, but he never, at least in any prolonged or enduring way, doubted that God had revealed himself to humankind and that the Qur’ân was a part of that revelation. As such he had, in an absolute sense, no lasting doubts about the veracity and worth of Islam as God’s ordained way for humankind to live.

Nevertheless, Islam was claimed to be many things by many people, and in as much as human fallibility was the cause of many

false assertions about Islam, he was not afraid to attack those false understandings. Moreover when those false understandings arose through no better cause than the failure to think he felt justified in denouncing them as being against the true cause of Islam. For Wahib then, freedom of thought was part and parcel of Islam, but so too was the bowing of human intellect to God's revelation as a basis for that freedom.

For Wahib, freedom to think was not just an aspiration that must be pursued, or a right that must be championed, but rather an essential concomitant of intellectual honesty. Wahib's demand for freedom to think arose out of a profound understanding of what it meant to be human.

An entry from earlier that year (March 28th 1969) helps clarify how Wahib resolved the evident tension in his mind between believing in divine revelation and yet doubting religion:

I do not yet understand, what Islam really is. What I know is Islam according to HAMKA, Natsir, Abduh, previous 'ulamâ', Djohan and Subki, and Islam according to others. Frankly speaking, I never feel content with what I know. What I have been looking for is yet to be found: Islam according to God, the Creator of it. How? Straight to the Qur'ân and the Sunnah? I will try. Nevertheless, other people will also say that this is the kind of Islam according to me. It does not matter, the important thing is my belief in my common sense that this kind of Islam is Islam according to God. I must be certain of that!⁵¹

Modernity and Renewal (Modernitas dan Pembaruan)

We have seen that Wahib like, it must be said, many other modernist Islamic intellectuals, believed the reasons for why the many obvious inadequacies in Islam, as it is practised in modern time, lay with human fallibility and consequent false understanding about the true teaching of Islam. Where Wahib, along with Djohan, stood apart from many of his modernist peers was in his assessment of the severity of the problem. But that was not the only distinction. Wahib was by now convinced that the problem was a systemic one related to the poor state of development of Islamic philosophy:

Although we acknowledge to ourselves that we are the adherents of Islam, our minds do not necessarily operate in the way of Islam. We often think in different styles. This is because of the static progress of Islamic philosophy. Thus, we only become emotional Muslims.⁵²

Several years earlier he had observed that Djohan and Mansur stood apart from other reform minded leaders in HMI in their assertion that it was Islamic thought, and not just Islamic political strategy, that needed reform.⁵³ As was touched upon earlier, this conviction shocked him at first but he rapidly came to share it himself, and through the Limited Study Group, his friendship with Djohan, and own his reading in philosophy, the parameters and scale of the reform required became increasingly clear.

Wahib was equally clear about the problems facing reformists in the various sections of the ummah. Writing in his dairy on the 6th June 1970, Wahib argued that attitudes representing some of the largest obstacles to reform were to be found not in the supposedly *kolot*, or old fashioned, traditionalist organization Nahdlatul Ulama but rather in the modernist organization Muhammadiyah. Why should Muhammadiyah, an organization started by reformers concerned to see the ummah equipped to face modernity, be the source of anti-reformist attitudes? Wahib sees the answer as lying partly in the historical background, or lineage, of Muhammadiyah. Muhammadiyah, he argues, has a clear spiritual line of descent from the 18th century Wahhâbî reform movement in (what is now) Saudi Arabia. Consequently, he writes, it is essentially a conservative movement whose main reformist objective is purifying Islam of the non-Islamic accretions of culture and custom, what Muhammadiyah calls *bid'ah*.⁵⁴ In practise, Wahib argues, NU's willingness to recognize and exploit the potential of cultural innovation meant that it was far more adaptable to change than was Muhammadiyah. It also meant that NU was generally more appreciative of culture than was Muhammadiyah:

The important thing is from which side NU creates heresy (*bid'ah*). The first possibility comes from different sources of reference, and the second from the notion that change may be useful and appropriate. When the latter is to be the cause, this means that NU is more appreciative towards culture. It recognizes the very existence of change! The content of change may be right or wrong; the conservative attitude (refusing change) is indeed the safest way to avoid mistakes. If the attitude of NU is covered with democracy, honesty, and strong character, it can be predicted that the future of this organization will be more promising than Muhammadiyah.⁵⁵

Wahib goes on to argue that NU's appreciation of culture also made it inherently more open to creative ideas whereas the reverse is true of Muhammadiyah. Two weeks later (June 23rd 1969) Wahib

returned to this theme once more in a brief entry in which he argued that Muhammadiyah had proved that it could destroy “un-Islamic” culture but it could not create “Islamic” culture:

... Muhammadiyah struggles without holding any cultural supremacy and fights without bringing a “clean” cultural plurality. Muhammadiyah tends to be anti-culture.⁵⁶

On other occasions when Wahib wrote about the need for reform he did not always mention the established modernists by name, but they were nevertheless clearly very much in his mind as he wrote. This was undoubtedly the case with the extract that follows, taken from an entry written on the 6th of March 1970. In this entry Wahib writes earnestly of his conviction that *pembaharuan*, or reform, must be unceasing. To pause, even for a moment, he argues, is to fail. *Pembaharuan* must dominate one’s thoughts and control one’s actions at all times, there is no middle ground, to allow other concerns to intervene is to yield control to them. Strong words indeed - clearly these sentiments did not arise simply as a result of an abstract scenario, and it is fair to say that Wahib had groups such as Muhammadiyah and Masyumi in mind.

Whatever the case Wahib was also articulating a profound principle in this journal entry. *Pembaharuan*, he argued, arises out of the ceaseless questioning that manifests itself in an honest and open intellect. It arises out of the restless (*gelisah*) mind that will not give up asking, a mind that is never satisfied with what has already been achieved but rather wants always to be pressing on. As it is for the individual, so too it is for the organization:

When a renewal organization stops seeking and questioning, content with existing ideas, does not make criticisms of them, no creative anxiousness and restlessness, no argumentation and dialectic reasoning, this means that the initial organization stops being a renewal. Thus, a “shocking” is demanded to revitalize, or else different organization has to be born.⁵⁷

It was not only the modernists that Wahib was critical of though. Whilst the traditionalists might have been more open to cultural innovation, and therefore to demonstrate creative adaptation to societal change, he argued (in an entry dated March 29th 1970), their present practice fell well short of societies’ needs. Society, he suggested, was undergoing rapid and significant change. The day was

approaching when even Muslim leaders would need to speak the language of a “secular” society. To date however, the language of the ‘ulamâ’ remained the language of the past:

I think secularism will definitely enter the Muslim world. To make Islam understandable and influential among those secularists, its ‘ulamâ’ have to interpret Islamic teachings by using secular language. If the ‘ulamâ’ do not make such a preparation, Islam will be left by people, and we can only be able to blame the era.

As far as I know, the ‘ulamâ’ are not well-informed with language capability in their *dakwah*, [preaching of Islam]. They are so poor in mastery language of that they cannot uncover the words of God. Their language is too dry...

The main reason of this shortcoming is that the ‘ulamâ’ do not possess high imagination; it is a struggle of our linguistic potential in order to approach the depth of people’s hearts as close as possible. Let alone imagining, these ‘ulamâs’ even tend to be suspicious of people with imagination. They absorb the words of God as formulas of positive law, and efforts to express something beyond these formulas are regarded as forbidden.⁵⁸

For Wahib *pembaharuan* was not simply an appendix to Islam, it was an integral part of Islam itself. When people failed to understand the need for ongoing renewal or reform they demonstrated a flawed understanding of Islam itself. Or put another way a failure to understand the necessity for *pembaharuan* was a failure to understand the ministry of the Prophet Muhammad.

In an entry dated June 15th 1971, Wahib suggests that we can better understand the problems besetting Islam today if we consider the attitude that many Muslims have to Muhammad’s ministry and teaching. Through failing to appreciate the context of the Prophet’s teaching, he argues, Muslims fail to understand its nature. Muhammad did not speak in a timeless language, a language that could be divorced from its context and yet still understood. He did not speak the abstract language of a philosopher precisely because it was not intended that he be a philosopher divorced from everyday reality. Rather he spoke as a man very much engaged in everyday reality and therefore what he spoke must be interpreted in the light of that temporal reality:

If by worldly profession Prophet Muhammad is a philosopher, it will be reasonable to regard his words and deeds as eternal or, at least, approaching eternity. However, since his profession is as a government leader and even an army commander, we cannot do so. These worldly duties compel him to face concrete problems of his era and society, to which he has also to provide

concrete solutions.

This may become a means to understand contemporary Islamic problems.⁵⁹

Was Muhammad then, a mere product of his social and historical setting? Not at all, Wahib asserts. Writing on another occasion (May 12th 1970) Wahib argues that, by examining the context of Muhammad's life, it is clear that he was an innovator, a reformer. The essence, in fact, of the Prophet's ministry lay in his changing, or as Wahib puts it "modernizing", of the social and intellectual world of his day. In the area of social reform, Wahib argues, Muhammad overturned the feudal structure of Arab society, and in the area of intellectual reform he overthrew the bonds of closed-mindedness and irrational superstition:

What is Muhammadiyah's contributions to the modernization of thinking?

First, it succeeds in eradicating feudal mentality and constructing a democratic attitude i.e all people have the same potential, they have to rely on themselves and not necessarily be dependent on the elite group ('ulamâ').

Second, it tends to be open-minded in adopting scientific methods from other groups i.e Christian Western society.

Third, it succeeds in constructing a more rational attitude and, at the same time, decreasing superstitious influence.⁶⁰

If the Prophet Muhammad's mission was one of reforming and advancing thought and behavior, why is it that for the past four centuries Islamic society has been so backward? Writing on 16th October 1970, Wahib argues that there are two main reasons for Islamic society's present backwardness. The first reason, he writes, a failure to appreciate that society's needs and expectations, in terms of acceptable political structure, had changed. Meanwhile the second reason lay in the failure to appreciate and maintain an on going debate in the realm of ideas. As a result *ijtihâd*, he argues, had given way to *ijmâ'*, or consensus, and fresh thought was effectively discouraged:

In my opinion, the main causes of Islamic decline in the eleventh and fifteenth centuries were due to the absence of plurality, in which the world of Islam was not necessarily to be a single kingdom or Byzantium any longer. This situation brought about a denial of local roles in politics, every struggle to build an independent state would be construed as treachery. Local societies, which were neglected by central government, thus became fertile ground for the emergence of new sects.

The second cause was the death of individuality, whereas individualism rooted in the Prophet era should have been maintained. It resulted in an unquestioning acceptance (*taqlid*), the closing of independent reasoning (*ijtihad*), and the growth of superstitious influence. Muslims became weak and fatalistic.⁶¹

Even the advent of modernism, Wahib argues (in an extract dated July 23rd 1970), was not enough to arrest this state of intellectual decline. Why? - the ummah, he argues, had imbibed the spirit of Muhammad 'Abduh and Ameer 'Alî - but that was all! Consequently Muslims today were, like 'Abduh and 'Alî, good at apologetics but little else. Sadly, he suggests, 'Abduh and 'Alî were not able to adequately point the way forward in terms of social analysis and problem solving. But even sadder still, he laments, is the fact that none had come after them:

What's going on? No new reformer has yet turned up! More than half a century modern Muslims have been lulled by 'Abduh's ideas and swallowed them just like that.⁶²

Contextual Ijtihad (Ijtihad Kontekstual)

The need for reform, not just social reform but intellectual reform, for *pembaruan pemikiran Islam*, was clear, but how was this reform of Islamic thought to proceed, where should it start? As we have already seen Wahib was convinced that the reason that Islamic thought had stagnated for so long was largely due to a misunderstanding of the Prophet's ministry. Properly understood, Wahib argued, the ministry of the Prophet was clearly one of initiating a process of ongoing reform. Proper understanding though, clearly depended on an understanding of the temporal context of Muhammad's ministry. Thus Wahib argued that the Prophet's words and actions were not those of a philosopher dealing with abstract issues but rather those of a socially engaged reformer, a community leader, dealing with specific temporal problems. What was required then, Wahib argued, was *ijtihad kontekstual*, *ijtihad* sensitive to the context of the text.

Writing in mid 1969 (July the 15th), just a few months before resigning in frustration from HMI, Wahib speaks of his annoyance with the unthinking approach to understanding the scriptures that he so often saw from those around him:

I do not agree with the way people interpret the Qur'ân. I think the reason for revelation (*asbâb al-nuzûl*) and the spirit of the era are often neglected. I do hate the tendency to rape the verses and the traditions (*hadîth*) in their usage and interpretation. Let me take my own way.⁶³

Wahib did not, of course, call into doubt the orthodox doctrine of the eternal veracity of the Qur'ân, but he did have strong views on the hadîth. This was not so much a matter of rejecting, or even doubting, the usefulness of the hadîth, but instead a matter of stressing the temporal context in which they first occurred, and in which they must be understood. For Wahib the hadîth were inextricably locked into the fabric of space and time, so much so that were the Prophet to revisit the world today he would be obliged to revise the hadîth:

I rather hold the opinion that, were the Prophet Muhammad to live again, searching the modern situation and existing conditions, he would withdraw the *hadîth*, which is interpreted literally, and replace it with new *hadîth*.⁶⁴

The hadîth gave witness to the *sunnah*, or way, of the Prophet, that is to say, his manner of living. The hadîth then, unlike the Qur'ân, Wahib argued, had a certain temporal quality that constrained the application of their specifics. Putting this point in the strongest form possible, Wahib writes on 6th May 1970 that many supposedly transcendent concepts born out of the Prophet's ministry, including such earnestly championed concepts as that of *Dâr al-Islâm*, the concept of an Islamic state, should in fact be regarded as temporal and subject to change:

In short, if today and in the future we reject on theocratic state system, it will not mean that we are violating Muhammad's ideas, which were developed fourteen centuries ago, but, on the contrary, we are accepting his thought lively and creatively. Were he to live again in our era, we are certain that he would have rejected a theocratic system, which he himself created a long time ago.⁶⁵

Ahmad Wahib is unique among the four writers being studied here in that he died just as he was entering what would probably have been the most productive phase of his life. Consequently we can only speculate about the ways in which his thought may have developed. Certainly it is a little misleading, if not unfair, to assume that the private musings of his youth, as captured in his daily journal,

represent the full potential of his thought.

Wahib's journal entries show a burning desire to search out the truth - where ever it may be found. They also occasionally show a degree of naivety regarding Islamic thought. The biographical material in the journal makes clear the reasons for both of these attributes. Wahib came from a conservative Madurese *santri* background, but he himself did not have a solid classical Islamic education. He certainly grew up in a *pesantren* environment, and was, by the standards of most Indonesians, quite learned with regard to Islam. Nevertheless his learning in Islam and was of a different order to that of Djohan, Nurcholish and Abdurrahman.

Wahib arrived in Yogyakarta a conservative young student from rural Madura, *santri* in religious orientation but not *pesantren* educated. Under Djohan's influence he became a young intellectual of exceptional earnestness and sincerity. During his years at Yogyakarta he grew both in his knowledge of Islam and of modern thought, particularly philosophy. Within several years of arriving in Yogyakarta he underwent a transition to become a bold thinker who would not retreat from any question, and was no longer satisfied with truth derived second hand. The transition was not a smooth and untroubled one. On the contrary Wahib experienced something approaching a crisis of faith as the simple received wisdom of his childhood in the village was almost violently, confronted by the claims of a dozen different faiths and non-faiths. This is the source of the apparent naivety in Wahib's writing. During the early years of his diary entries he was feeling his way forwards; rather as one caught in a blinding dust storm might do to find their way home.

Later, though, there is a readily evident maturing of Wahib's thought. By the time that he had left Yogyakarta and moved to Jakarta it had become clear that he had arrived at a well thought through system of thought. This is reflected in the sectional headings used in *Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib*.⁶⁶ Taken together, the ideas advanced in each of the five sections, i) Freedom to think, ii) Modernity and Renewal, iii) Contextual Ijtihad, iv) The Sunnah of the Prophet, v). Secularization map out areas of thought that are strikingly similar to those articulated by Nurcholish in *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*.

Were this only evident in Wahib's journal entries written after 1969, however, the congruence with Nurcholish's thought would not be entirely surprising. After all, by 1971 Wahib and Djohan were in

constant contact with Nurcholish. Even by January 1970, when Nurcholish's *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* ideas became the subject of discussion everywhere, particularly within HMI circles, one would expect to find Wahib's writing reflecting Nurcholish's ideas - which they did do. What is really interesting though, is the fact that by late 1968 and early 1969 Wahib's journal entries (reflecting, it should be remembered, not only his thought but also Djohan's) clearly contain the seminal ideas of *Pembaruan*, or we might now say, neo-modernist thought.

Abdurrahman Wahid

Abdurrahman Wahid was born in Jombang in 1940. From 1959 to 1963 he taught at the Mu'allimat Bahrul Madrasah in Tambak Beras, Jombang. Then in 1964 Abdurrahman went to the Middle East to pursue further studies, studying for two years at al-Azhar in Cairo, Egypt, and then for four years at the University of Baghdad, Iraq. Whilst studying in the Middle East Abdurrahman was Chairman of the Association of Indonesian Students in the Middle East from 1964 to 1970.

In 1970 Abdurrahman returned to Indonesia and to *pesantren* life. From 1973 to 1974 he was a lecturer and Dean of the Faculty of Theology (*Usûl al-Dîn*) at the small Hasyim Asy'ari University in Jombang. Later he was Secretary General of the Tebuireng *pesantren* in Jombang and then, after moving to Jakarta in 1978, *pengasuh* [head] of the Ciganjur *pesantren* in South Jakarta. It is not without significance that this time he was also made Chairman of the Jakarta Cultural Council (Dewan Kesenian Jakarta-DKJ); an unusual appointment for a figure from the *pesantren* world, an *'alîm*, but typical of Abdurrahman.

If Nurcholish Madjid is a good example of the coming together of classical learning with both modernity in the form of modern western style education and Islamic modernism, then Abdurrahman is a equally good, albeit quite different, illustration. Unlike Nurcholish, who went on to complete a doctorate at Chicago University under Fazlur Rahman, Abdurrahman has not had opportunity to partake of formal studies in a secular university. Instead after graduating in record time from a highly regarded *pesantren* he pursued further studies in the Middle East, firstly at al-Azhar in Cairo, where he found the intellectual atmosphere stultifying, and then at Baghdad univer-

sity. After six or so years of studying abroad, including an unsuccessful attempt to undertake further studies in Europe, Abdurrahman returned to Java and began teaching in a variety of pesantren and other educational institutions, (including teaching in a monthly training program for Protestant clergy). By the mid 1970s he was in regular contact with Nurcholish Madjid and Djohan Effendi and by 1978 he had moved to Jakarta and joined them in series of academic forums and study cells. Whilst he did not have an opportunity for formal Western style education he read widely from an early age.⁶⁷

In December 1984 Abdurrahman was elected chairman of Nahdlatul Ulama, ending the long and rather dull chairmanship of Idham Chalid who had taken over the leadership of NU when Wahid Hasyim, Abdurrahman's father, was killed in an automobile accident in 1956. Given the cultural context of the NU support base there was undoubtedly an element of messianic expectation in the election of Abdurrahman, and he has not failed to live up to the promise of significant change. Indeed in certain respects Abdurrahman's personal style very much engenders the popular perception of him as a *wâli*, or mystical saint, and he is more than clever enough to be not only aware of this perception but also to be actively employing it to his advantage. This is not to suggest that there is any sense of sham about Abdurrahman, rather he is intimately acquainted with the cultural milieu of NU and knows how to succeed in achieving reform within that milieu. And succeed in achieving reform he certainly has. His first move was to declare that NU would no longer participate as an organization in party politics, rather that it should instead return to its original charter as a social/religious organization. In this matter he enjoyed early success, but he has also largely succeeded in achieving a profound change in NU's outlook. He has demonstrated that it is to the advantage of both the organization and its people to turn away from party political activity, not only on the basis of pragmatics but also in the name of pluralism. Certainly not everybody within NU, and not all of his supporters outside of NU either, understand or share his concern that sectarianism is a serious and ever present threat to the harmony of Indonesia's very plural society. Nevertheless to a large degree Abdurrahman has succeeded in engendering a respect, even a passion, for pluralism within NU, particularly amongst the young. He has also succeeded in influencing broader Indonesian society to understand the links between pluralism and democracy as

he has tirelessly campaigned for a new maturity both in the Islamic ummah and in broader society.

In its essential core Abdurrahman's thought is very similar to that of Nurcholish and Djohan, although the personal manner and style of each is very different.

It is significant that Abdurrahman begins the forewords to both of his books by expressing how difficult it is to isolate a unifying theme or an order to his writings—not just for readers, but for himself the writer. This expression is no doubt largely simply an expression of fact, both books containing a wide range of articles written for diverse purposes and audiences. In part though Abdurrahman's initial confession of the difficulty in finding order in his collected works is part of a subtle device to modestly point the readers in the direction of where he himself sees his work leading. Thus in the second paragraph of his foreword to *Bunga Rampai Pesantren* Abdurrahman offers the following suggestion:

But, at least, a continuation can be traced in the main message covered in the written works that resulted during the years of their efforts to develop pesantren, both individually and collectively. In a broader terms, developing pesantren means the absorption of new necessary elements from outside pesantren, while at the same time maintaining the positive and useful elements of its original characters. It is a combination of two different worlds; that of the old world, in which pesantren originate, and the new world, towards which pesantren are directing.⁶⁸

Similarly in the foreword to *Muslim di Tengah Pergumulan*, after an initial self-effacing confession of difficulty in isolating a grand theme, Abdurrahman goes on to suggest a certain order and purpose:

It is not surprising, if these collected papers are hard to unite. Even two writings, which focus on the same subject and use the same method, could contradict each other should the two be written in different periods. The passing of time indeed makes us think differently on the same topic. What was previously called a renewal group, is now called modernist. What was previously regarded as a congealment, is now construed to have its own dynamics and what is called traditionalism has undergone certain qualitative changes. What was previously formulated in a dichotomic way, to describe a full conflict of two schools, is then reformulated as a complementary relationship with mutual influences.⁶⁹

Thus it is clear that the writer is rather modestly suggesting that, to a certain extent at least, the reader might find a unifying purpose

and direction to his writing. In both *Bunga Rampai Pesantren*, a book dealing wholly with *pesantren* issues, and in *Muslim di Tengah Pergumulan*, a book with much more diverse subject matters, the theme might be summed up as “responding to modernity”. A particular focus in the earlier book is the appreciation and preservation of the best of the *pesantren* subculture whilst the latter book is concerned more with illuminating the complexities of the issues involved with responding to the challenges of modernity. Nevertheless the works in both anthologies are united in their commitment to intelligent growth and progress. Not surprisingly the same is true of Abdurrahman’s numerous magazine and newspaper articles published in the late 1970s and beyond. If there is a distinctive characteristic with this third group of writings it is that, in these short popular essays, even more than in his longer and more serious articles, Abdurrahman’s fundamental humanitarianism comes strongly to the fore.

The term ‘humanitarianism’ does not, however, fully cover all that Abdurrahman is concerned with. Abdurrahman’s humanitarianism is grounded in his understanding of Islam. Throughout his work, but in the later *Tempo* essays especially, it is clear that Abdurrahman believes that the true expression of Islam is only achieved when ‘the spirit of the law’, the *hakikat* (the inner truth) is given of first importance, even, as is often the case, at the expense of conventional interpretations of the ‘letter of the law’. This conviction is closely allied with two other major themes in Abdurrahman’s thought —a profound rationality and a conviction that through ongoing rational endeavor Islam is more than able to meet the challenges of modernity. Moreover Abdurrahman is convinced that the fundamental humanitarian concern of Islam, its teachings about tolerance and concern for social harmony, make it clear that Muslims should not fear the plural nature of modern society but rather respond positively to it. Abdurrahman’s pluralistic outlook permeates his writing and is evident in a multitude of subtle ways. His breadth of vision and openness of mind are one facet of this, and manifest themselves in his broad reading and willingness to be challenged in his thinking by writers from every background and conviction. Further evidence of Abdurrahman’s pluralism, as well as his humanitarian convictions, are to be found in his passion for democratic reform, freedom of speech and liberal values in general. Where the true depth of com-

mitment of some other figures in Indonesian intellectual life might well be questioned, there is no doubting that Abdurrahman's commitment to democratic ideals is integral to his whole way of thinking.

Even so, having already examined the thought of Nurcholish, Djohan and Wahib it is clear that Abdurrahman is not alone in these convictions. Indeed they form the core ideals of neo-modernism and the common ground in the thinking of these four thinkers. None of these is very surprising but given Abdurrahman's very different personal history, as discussed above, one would expect that in certain ways Abdurrahman's thought would differ from his three ex-HMI colleagues. After all, not only was he not a member of HMI, having spent six years in Egypt and Baghdad rather than in an Indonesian university, but he also spent the best part of the 1970s living and teaching in East and Central Javanese *pesantren*.

There are in fact important differences in Abdurrahman's thought, at least that which can be seen in his writing from the 1970s, compared with that of his three colleagues. The most important difference is the attention he pays to traditional Islam and the role of *pesantren*. On another plane, discussion about the importance of *ijtihad* is conspicuous by its absence in Abdurrahman's writing. When examined more closely though, these differences would appear to have more to do with emphasis than with essential substance.

It is not surprising that Abdurrahman concentrates more on *pesantren* matters in his writings (at least in his early writings, articles from the 1980s and 1990s are by comparison rather sparing in their references to *pesantren* life), as throughout the 1970s his time was at least partly taken up with leading various *pesantren* and this continued to be the case even after he moved to Jakarta in 1978, when he became responsible for looking after Pesantren Ciganjur in South Jakarta. Given this, and the concerns outlined above, it is not surprising either that he should be particularly concerned with arguing the ability of traditional Islam to adapt to changing circumstances and respond to the challenges of modernity. All the more so when it is considered that many of the people he wrote for, and the Islamic thinkers that he mixed with were either from the modernist side of the Islamic community, and therefore knew little about traditional Islam, or were traditional '*ulamâ*', and were fearful of the changes that modernity might bring.

In this respect the difference between Abdurrahman and the other three is fundamentally one of emphasis. He wrote more often, and in greater detail, about the potential of traditional Islam but, as we have seen, all four writers came from a *santri* background albeit in varying degrees and all combined an enthusiasm for the insights and intellectual ideals of Islamic modernism with a profound appreciation of the scholarly heritage of traditional Islam. Similarly Abdurrahman's relative silence about *ijtihad* does not mean that he disregards either the importance or the validity of *ijtihad*, for his work is full of references to the business of *ijtihad* even if the term itself is seldom employed. Instead he chose to use the term *dinamisasi* (which in Indonesian literally means the dynamic nature of something, but that translation does not at capture all the nuances that Abdurrahman's use of it conjures up). He uses this to refer to the process by which the social teachings of Islam are reinterpreted (i.e. the process of *ijtihad*) in accordance with the demands of a (rapidly) changing society (i.e. in response to modernity).

Dynamization and Modernization of the Pesantren (*Dinamisasi dan Modernisasi Pesantren*)⁷⁰

Everything that Abdurrahman has done (not just in the 1970s but also in the 1980s and 1990s) has been based on the twin convictions that firstly the ideals of Islam, properly realized, can form the basis of a just, fair and humane society for all and, secondly, that the full potential of Islam in this modern age will only be realized when Islamic thought is allowed to respond creatively to the demands and challenges of modernity. In seeking to define the sort of ongoing creative response to change that is demanded of Islam in the late 20th century, one of the key terms employed by Abdurrahman is *dinamisme*. The Indonesian word '*dinamis*' (from which Abdurrahman derives the noun form '*dinamisme*') may have its origins in the English word 'dynamic'. However it has travelled considerably since leaving the English language to the point where, in Indonesian, it has come to mean not just the quality of being energetic and full of life, but it also speaks of the ability to adapt and respond creatively to difficult circumstances.⁷¹ Abdurrahman invokes all of this and more in his usage of the word, as can be seen in this quotation from an article he presented at a LP3ES conference on *pesantren* in 1973 '*Dinamisasi dan Modernisasi Pesantren*' (*Pesantren* Dynamization and

Modernization):

Before discussing the agenda, it has to be clear beforehand about the meaning of dynamization and modernization. Dynamization covers two processes that of revitalization of the available positive values, and the replacement of values towards perfection. This process of replacement is called modernization. It is clear that the meaning of modernization itself has been basically constituted in the word dynamization.

The usage of dynamization itself means "changes towards improvement" by using the available world-view and tools as its bases. It is imperative to emphasize these notions here, since there is an understanding that particular concepts unfamiliar to *pesantren* will definitely face certain challenges in the future. We believe that by understanding the *pesantren's* world-view, certain concepts will have greater impact than other concepts.⁷²

This 1973 article, it should be remembered, dates from very early in Abdurrahman's career. Yet already his conception of *dinamisasi*, a matter that is to become a cardinal element in his thought, is clearly well worked out.

The present disarray, uncertainty and upheaval evident in *pesantren* circles, he continues, has its origin in two areas. Firstly it is, to a certain extent, a reflection of the generally troubled nature of Indonesian society in transition. Secondly it arises out of an awareness that the capacity of *pesantren* to face the challenges of modernity is scarcely adequate, their structural elements are in a state of stagnation and are ill-equipped to respond to change, and on top of all of this there is great difficulty in getting traditional village communities to provide adequate financial support. In the light of these difficulties it is essential, he argues, that *pesantren* responds appropriately to the challenges of modernity. Obviously the kind of triumphalism that seeks solace in past 'golden ages' is of no help here, but neither is 'pseudo-modernism', a superficial response to modernity that affects the appearance of progress but avoids its substance:

The general manifestation of this uncertain situation in *pesantren* suits the two modes of reaction against values of the transitional situation. The first reaction emerges in a self-isolation from the development of "outer" societies, especially from activities which are regarded to threaten the purity of religious life. This isolation is conducted such that dialogues with the outer world are practically absent. *Pesantren* of this kind tends to be overwhelmed by images of the old golden age and to compel old standards onto contemporary societies. The obvious examples of this attitude are manifested in the growing process of cult-building with particular *pesantren* leaders

and in the tendency to “saint-ize” leaders with strange and awkward attitudes.

The second reaction is to intensify solidarity between *pesantren* and society. The intensification is also followed by the expression of pseudo-modernist attitude. This process of “self-modernizing” is conducted aggressively so that the impression of snobbism becomes unavoidable among *pesantren* circles of this kind. One of the examples is the adoption of modern culture within ceremonial events. *Pesantren* limited financial resources are not allocated in a proper way. They prefer to use it for so-called “loud sound microphone” events.⁷³

What is required, Abdurrahman argues, is a commitment to seeking a middle way, balancing religious tradition with the practical demands that arise in response to modernity and the need to progress. One of the keys to success in this area is the inclusion of youth in *pesantren* leadership:

If the younger generation of *pesantren* are to be involved in the leadership process, they will be able to combine practical demand of development (especially material matters) and the religious traditions they receive from previous generations. The main problem we are facing is how to involve these younger leaders in such continuous and massive processes.⁷⁴

To this Abdurrahman adds a second prerequisite—the total overhaul of *pesantren* curriculum and teaching material:

The requirement for a complete dynamization is a radical reconstruction of basic materials of religious knowledge. Old literature or “modern” books, such as the ones written by Mahmud Junus, or Hasbi Ash-Shiddieqi, have lost their driving force in developing a religious sense of belonging. From primary school up to university levels, students are compelled to digest out-dated formulas. The understanding of these formulas thus becomes marginal and does not reflect any progress. We need to reconstruct these formulas, while maintaining our religious bases which we receive from our predecessors. Mature traditionalism is much better than shallow pseudo-modernism.⁷⁵

It is significant that Abdurrahman concludes this paper and this call for *dinamisasi*, with a warning not to, as it were, ‘throw the baby out with the bath water’, not to completely discard traditional learning in the quest for renewal and reform. Not only is this understanding integral to his conception of *dinamisasi* as a process that is profound and sophisticated, a process that carefully picks up the enduring virtues and core elements of traditional scholarship and incorpo-

rates them into a modern approach to learning, but just as importantly it is reflective of his conviction that traditional Islam has never been a static thing. In other words Abdurrahman conceives of *dinamisasi* as not so much a twentieth century response to the unprecedented pressures of modernity, but rather as an expression of Islam at its adaptive, flexible, traditional best.

Current Islamic Theological Developments in Indonesia (*Perkembangan Teologi Islam di Indonesia Masa Kini*)

If the preceding articles have been somewhat vague, or at least non-specific, in the way in which they have addressed the matter of what is meant by *dinamisasi*, and the sort of changes that Abdurrahman is looking for in Islamic thought, the following article is quite the opposite. In this thirteen page seminar paper Abdurrahman spells out very clearly the need for a paradigm shift in the level of change when he discusses the emergence of a third grouping or movement, the *Pembaruan* movement, alongside the traditionalists and the earlier modernists. It is important to note here that this seminar paper was presented in June 1976, establishing clearly that, even before moving to Jakarta, Abdurrahman was already aligned with the *Pembaruan* movement. It is also important to note that this paper was prepared not for a discussion group of Islamic intellectuals but for a consultative meeting with pastors of the Protestant Christian denomination Gereja Kristen Jawi Wetan, suggesting two things. Firstly it suggests that he saw the *Pembaruan* movement emerging as a serious movement, one that observers needed to reckon with if they were to understand where Indonesian Islam was heading, and secondly that he was sufficiently enthusiastic about the potential of this embryonic movement not be able to leave it out of even a rather general discussion paper. Although to be fair to him it appears from his introduction that he was asked specifically to address the topic 'Current Theological Developments in Islam in Indonesia', and that therefore it was perhaps expected that he might touch upon what was then a very topical matter.

Whilst Abdurrahman at no point in the paper comes out and says that he is a member of the *Pembaruan* movement, it is entirely written in a very direct style that makes no effort to pretend that the views being presented are anything else but subjective and personal, and his support for the *Pembaruan* movement is unambiguous. For

this reason it is worth quoting him at length, and allowing the nuances of his analysis to speak for themselves.

After setting forth the essential defining parameters of traditional Islam, Abdurrahman makes an interesting assertion, one that certainly appears sensible, but is nevertheless rarely heard from within traditionalist circles (particularly in the 1970s) i.e. that the presence of Islamic modernism has resulted in substantial change to traditional Islam. According to Abdurrahman, the traditionalist group faces a heavy challenge in this century from the second group that of Islamic modernist movement. Within the interaction resulting from the clash between the two, the traditionalist has undergone significant transformations, even though they are still able to maintain the three teachings mentioned previously. One of the modifications is the acceptance of the private rights to make religious decisions on the basis of individual consideration. The collective character of religion is then dispersed and yet it cannot be predicted what will follow.⁷⁶

Discussion then moves to the second Islamic grouping in Indonesia, the modernists, preliminary historical notes Abdurrahman moves to an analysis of the shortcomings of modernism:

A direct investigation of these two main sources is believed to enable revitalization of religious thought. An appreciation of reason and scientific knowledge is also believed to enable Muslims, who have been in a backward condition for so long, to regain their material and moral superiority. This hyperactive attitude, which is not supported by a firm doctrine, finally results in apologetism. It takes two forms of expression:

- a. an excessive adjustment of religious verses towards reason and the latest development of science; and
- b. a polemical attitude against the big enemies of Western materialism and Christianity. It claims that the Qur'ân is an encyclopedia to cover all the principles of sciences. New modern scientific discoveries can trace their origins within the Qur'ân. This constructs an unbalanced comparison between Islamic teachings, which are considered to be complete and final, and the materialist culture of the West, as well as Christianity, which are investigated from their negative sides only.

Therefore, many aspects of life can be improved, especially social, health and educational sectors. However, there are many crucial problems unresolved, because the modernist doctrine does not possess any mechanism to do so.⁷⁷

Modernism, he concedes, has been highly influential amongst middle class urban Muslims, but it has been rather less successful in

rural areas where the vast bulk of the population are to be found, and this, he suggests, is not just because of shortcomings in the modernist movement:

However, they only constitute a minority among the whole of Indonesian Muslims. Their failure to convert the traditional Muslims is due to the capability of Islamic traditionalism to absorb their religious aspirations. Indonesian Islamic traditionalism is in fact quite responsive in catching the demands of the masses, and is very different from traditionalism in other countries. Therefore, the success of modernists in converting traditionalist adherents in this country does not compare to Egypt, for instance.⁷⁸

Discussion of Islamic traditionalists and modernists concluded, and neither group emerging with a clean bill of health, Abdurrahman devotes the remaining one third of his paper to discussing what he sees as being the source of considerable hope for Islam in Indonesia - the *Pembaruan* movement. Abdurrahman's comments here provide a clear context for his later references to *dinamisasi*, for it is fair assume that, for Abdurrahman, the *Pembaruan* movement illustrated *dinamisasi* in its fullest form. For all these reasons it is worth quoting Abdurrahman's analysis of the *Pembaruan* movement here in full:

The third group is the renewal movement which only emerged five years ago. Actually, the seed of this movement emerged quite a long time ago, but it was still limited and sporadic. In the past, the demand for the renewal of religious thought was still low, because modernism was viewed as having been able to bring about a genuine freshening.

In fact, the expectations of modernism are not fulfilled, and are even the opposite. The changes made by modernism are not more than trivial adoptions, without any attempt to systematize them into a coherent whole, and only pertain to the outer circle of religious life. The call for religious puritanism, which it is hoped is able to answer all contemporary problems, only results in a legal-formalistic attitude, so that modernism tends to be a neo-conservatism in legal system. Moreover, its criticism towards traditionalism tends to overgeneralize its negative sides without any attempt to provide alternatives. Modernism drives people to pull up all the roots they possess, and creates unending uncertainty.

This motivates a group of young people to question what has to be done. In fact the answer lies in the inability of a single method of thought - the call for purification or independent reasoning - to cover all religious teachings. Should religion be intended to answer the interests of human beings, it has to be able to accommodate various types of thought, which in turn also have to place the call for purification in proportion. Based on the complexity of religious life i.e. how to decide a departing point for religious thought, we cannot avoid not formulating a fundamental question concerning the

relationship between God and human beings. All reasoning has to depart and return to this very formula.

Nurcholish Madjid formulates this relationship as the entitlement of human beings to act as the vicegerent of God (*khalifah Allāh*) on earth. Therefore, he has full rights to make necessary decisions in order to fulfill his interests and prosperity. He has to desacralize many things, since the sacred is only valid for the principle of faith. Worldly problems have to be solved through worldly approaches, and not through spiritual approaches. This process of profanization of the profane is called secularization.

This renewal movement results in many controversies because the idea of secularization itself intends to turn the existing religious modes upside-down.

If, the previous periods, worldly matters were to be found their legitimation in the religious area, this mode of thought is now reversed. One of the manifestations of the profanization process is that they refuse the doctrine of predestination, which, according to al-Ash'ari and al-Maturidi schools, has been one of the six pillars of faith for over ten centuries.

So radical is the impact that is brought about, that it is not surprising if this movement faces harsh challenges. However, the future will be theirs, since they have brought back problems into their place i.e. by placing human being in the universal constellation of life and drawing religious thought from this core. It is not a mere trial and error of certain mechanisms within a partial frame of thought, such as those conducted by modernists, but a rearrangement of all principles for religious thought.

This movement had just began its journey. Its central doctrine has not been specified in detail and packed up like a cooked meal ready to be digested. For that reason, it appears premature to predict the direction in which it may develop. The obvious thing is that the attempt to revive religious thought gains its clarity and thoroughness from the emergence of this idea of renewal and it can be called the continuation of modernism, which is about to lose its direction.

It is evident that the situation of contemporary Muslim religious thought is still in process, and it has yet to take a definite form. It cannot be decided objectively which is the dominant stream, even though we are of the opinion that the renewal movements is the most prospective one.

However, we cannot establish any scientific conclusion merely on the basis of such a prospective prediction because historical forces often show unpredictable results over a definite and predictable process. Thus, let us see what history will tell.⁷⁹

Abdurrahman, as we have seen, is a writer much given to ranging widely over a broad territory, often within a single piece of writing. Moreover, this thought itself is usually broad in its scope and unaccustomed to being confined to one single topic, preferring instead to weave multiple strands of thought together in any one piece of work. Consequently Abdurrahman's writing is difficult to catego-

rize and just as hard to describe. Nevertheless a number of central themes thread themselves through his work and to describe these is to give a fair rendering of his chief concerns.

In his writing one can see something of Abdurrahman's affection for the *pesantren* world and learned what it is that he assesses to be its strengths. The strong sense of community to be found in a *pesantren* and the way in which a *pesantren* community can act as a sort of 'cultural broker' between its world and the community around it were clearly seen as major strengths both of the *pesantren* system and of traditional Islam. So too the way in which *pesantren* teach their *santri* to develop self reliance whilst at the same time learning to appreciate a materially modest life-style are seen as being great strengths.

Clearly, however, Abdurrahman had grave concerns about the future of *pesantren*, arguing that the entire *pesantren* tradition stood at the crossroads (at least in the 1970s when these articles were written) and was in grave danger of being steadily extinguished. This may have come about directly because of the process of modernization, Abdurrahman argued, but it was as much the result of a general weaknesses within the tradition as it was changed circumstances. Amongst the various endemic problems besetting *pesantren* were the problems that arose out of the over reliance upon charismatic leaders and the attendant problem of determining succession when a *kiai* [the head of *pesantren*] dies. Allied with this too are an all too narrow approach to long term planning and the failure to adapt adequately to the demands of a rapidly changing society. All of which contributed to *pesantren* being burdened (at the time of writing) with curriculum that were woefully inadequate to the demands of modern society.

Making this all the worse, Abdurrahman argued, was the fact that these various problems did not develop by chance but rather grew directly out of a world view that had not only failed to take into account the degree to which Indonesian society had changed in the past fifty years but also saw all such change in the most negative of terms. This view in turn was based upon a set of convictions relating to the all sufficiency of traditional Islam that constituted a dangerous self delusion. Moreover this self delusion was not just confined to traditionalists; modernists had also become caught up, Abdurrahman argued, in the rhetoric of their own shallow apologetics so they failed to appreciate the degree to which Islamic society was in

need of reform.

In Abdurrahman's writing we see something of the degree of reform that was required in his estimation and see too that he does not regard reform as being something that is merely required now and again but rather should be a continuous ongoing process. So central to Abdurrahman's thought is this concept of ongoing, continuous reform that he coined a term to describe it - *dinamisasi*. *Dinamisasi*, for Abdurrahman, describes the essential quality that enables Islam to be continuously updated and forever relevant but without which Islam becomes a dry and doctrinaire exercise in legalism that fails both to excite society and to serve it as it should. More specifically, writing in the mid 1970s, Abdurrahman made it clear that he saw the *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* movement associated with Nurcholish Madjid as showing the way forward.

When Islamic society was healthy and was enjoying the renewing of vigor that comes with *dinamisasi*, Abdurrahman argued, it would automatically become the sort of society that was more attractive to all citizens, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, for it would be a society that welcomed difference and rejoiced in its plural composition. At the heart of this view was Abdurrahman's conviction that Islam calls people to be tolerant of others and that one could not be a good Muslim without showing goodwill to all in society, whatever their background. Certainly Abdurrahman's own tolerance of others and general broad-mindedness are abundantly evident in his writings. Also arising out of this pluralistic frame of mind was a deep concern that Islamic political parties, and Islamic 'party politics', should not give rise to sectarian sentiment in society. Indeed the very notion of Islamic political parties is something which makes Abdurrahman decidedly uneasy.

Finally, in his writing we can also see something of Abdurrahman's deep commitment to liberal humanitarian concerns. His concern for equitable community development, for democratic reform and for the creation of a more tolerant society all arise out of his understanding of Islam. It is an understanding that leaves no room for mere spectating but rather demands social engagement.

Conclusion

The summary of Nurcholish's thought given above focuses upon the seminal concepts that Nurcholish introduced in his January 3rd

1970 lecture and elaborated upon throughout the early 1970s. As such it refers to an expression of Nurcholish's thought that, in certain ways, is specific to his writings in the early 1970s.

At the level of ideas it remains as valid as ever, but this is not so in the area of terminology. Nurcholish no longer, for example, employs the terms *sekularisasi* or *desakralisasi*. This is not because he has in any way rejected the concepts that lay at the centre of his usage of these terms, but rather because, it soon became evident, he was simply not being understood. In practise the terms carried with them connotations that could not easily be shaken off.

For similar reasons Nurcholish now no longer dwells quite as much upon the *ukhrawi/duniawi* dichotomy that formed a central element of his earlier writing. Nevertheless the dichotomy between the realm of the transcendent and the mundane remains a key concept in his writings. It may not always be evident on the surface of his text but it is invariably present as one of the dominant undercurrents deep within it.

A large part of the reason for the shift away from direct discussion of *sekularisasi* and *desakralisasi*, *ukhrawi* and *duniawi*, is, no doubt, that Nurcholish's work had grown beyond the need to continually restate these basic concepts. But this natural process of development is not the only reason for the shift. Nurcholish had learned some hard lessons in the early 1970s, lessons that greatly influenced his tactical approach to the task of renewing Islamic thought. Writing in 1976 whilst visiting America he reflected openly about what he had learned:

Looking back at our experiences, I wished that I had never committed such a tactical blunder as that manifest in my speech on January 3, 1970. It was socially too expensive, and we suffered almost irreparable damage to our reputation within the Muslim community. If I were able to go back in time, I would follow my previous methods, i.e., *penetration pacifique*, the "smuggling method" of introducing new ideas. This is what I did when writing the above-mentioned NDP.⁸⁰

Clearly this was a lesson that remained with Nurcholish.

In the writings of Djohan, Wahib and Abdurrahman the terms *sekularisasi* and *desakralisasi*, *ukhrawi* and *duniawi* are of peripheral importance, if they are mentioned at all. A cursory comparison of their writings from the 1970s with those of Nurcholish might suggest that this was an important point of difference. A more careful read-

ing of the works of all four writers reveals that this is not so. In fact the works of all four is deeply imbued with precisely the understanding that Nurcholish intended, in his early writings, by the use of such terms. All four write out of the deeply held conviction that the realm of the mundane is a realm of unceasing change. They do not dispute the belief that the essential elements of Islam are immutable and eternally relevant. The social application of the unchanging truths of Islam, however, are an entirely different matter, as all four writers have argued.

Once allowance is made for differences in the use of terminology it becomes clear that in every important aspect Djohan's thought closely parallels that of Nurcholish. It might be argued that Djohan's writings seem, on the whole, to be somewhat more speculative in nature than those of Nurcholish. Certainly from the evidence that we have examined here this seems to be so. Although the study of Djohan's writings is confined to but six articles, a reading of his later works from the 1980s and 1990s confirms an impression of his thought as being somewhat more liberal than that of Nurcholish. Moreover, extended interviews with the two writers on a number of occasions in the 1990s tend to bear out this observation.

In part it arises, no doubt, as a direct consequence of differences in personality, but other factors may be still more important. Whilst both men are well known Islamic intellectuals in Indonesia Nurcholish enjoys a public profile several orders of magnitude greater than that of Djohan. Nurcholish, then, is not just an intellectual but a public intellectual, and as such a kind of community leader. Every article that Nurcholish writes and every public lecture that he gives are subject to public scrutiny. Moreover as Nurcholish rebuilt his credibility as a mainstream Islamic leader/intellectual in the later half of the 1970s and beyond, he has been diligent in ensuring that he expresses his ideas in a manner that does not exceed the limits of the *ummah's* sensibility. Djohan, on the other hand, has been rather less constrained. Shy and retiring, and rather ill at ease behind a podium, Djohan is not a very public intellectual. As such he has enjoyed a degree of freedom to speculate that is unknown to Nurcholish. What is more, Djohan has focused much of his energies, both professionally and privately, in the area of inter-faith dialogue, a focus which has tended to encourage his speculative bent. Ultimately, however, these matters are more elements of nuance than substance. In its es-

sential parameters and orientation Djohan's thought is at one with the *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* thought that Nurcholish began to articulate in the 1970s.

The points made above in regard to Djohan's thought can also be made regarding Wahib's thought. In its essentials the thought of Ahmad Wahib neatly parallels that of Nurcholish Madjid.

Two important factors need to be remembered when considering Wahib's thought. Firstly, the fact that Wahib died in 1973 means that, unlike with Nurcholish, Djohan and Abdurrahman, it is not possible to view Wahib's thought in the 1970s in the context of a larger whole. With the others, observations based upon examination of their writings from the 1970s can be squared with a body of tacit knowledge derived from a familiarity with their later works. With Wahib however we are limited to observing but the beginnings of an intellectual journey, and can only speculate about the trajectory that might have been.

Secondly, and related to this first matter, is the problem of sources. On the one hand we have the benefit of a wonderfully rich and intimate collection of writing in the form of Wahib's private journal. On the other hand his journal, illuminating though it is, is completely unlike the writings, in the form of published articles, of Nurcholish, Djohan and Abdurrahman. Consequently it is difficult to know quite how to assess Wahib's writing.

In the pages of his journal Wahib emerges as an almost desperate seeker of truth. At times he seems to be rejecting every normative article of belief. At other times he seems to find refuge in certain unflinching certitude, most of all in the character and nature of God. What Wahib longed for above all was a faith that feared no question, a faith with which to face the modern world. In this ultimate ambition Wahib's thinking was like that of Nurcholish, Djohan and Abdurrahman. In its flights of speculation and bold questioning, however, his writing far outstrips even the wildest works of his fellows. Before placing Wahib's thought in a category of its own, however, two things must be considered. The first is that the private musings of a journal entry will invariably make the carefully reasoned arguments of a published paper look very conservative by comparison. Secondly, it should be remembered that even though Wahib may, like Jacob in the Genesis narrative, have 'wrestled with God' this was ultimately, as it was with Jacob, a struggle that served to strengthen

his faith. A careful reading of Wahib's journal suggests that his final position fell well within the bounds of conservative Islamic belief. Thus Wahib's bold questioning was not so much an attack upon faith as a process whereby it was refined.

Considered as a whole, Wahib's thought, as it emerges from the pages of his journal, appears to closely approximate that of Djohan, his close friend, and of Nurcholish. Clearly Wahib arrived in Yogyakarta very much the product of a conservative Madurese *santri* upbringing. His intellectual growth in the company of Djohan involved a succession of rude awakenings, but remained, nevertheless, something that he worked out for himself. His journal entries suggest that by the later part of 1969 he was in agreement with Djohan on every major point of thought about Islam. Later, particularly after January 3rd 1970, Wahib came to see that Nurcholish was articulating a line of thought that closely paralleled his own thinking.

Where Nurcholish's writing is directly discussed in the journal it is evident that Wahib both understood what Nurcholish was saying and agreed with its broad thrust. In other entries from the 1970s, entries that make no particular reference to *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* thought, it is abundantly clear that in terms of issues, approach and general tone, if not always in expression, Wahib's thought is essentially congruent with that of Nurcholish and of Djohan.

A superficial examination of Abdurrahman's writing from the 1970s might suggest that the issues that were of concern to him then were very different than those that were of concern to Nurcholish, Djohan and Wahib. Indeed at one level this is true. Abdurrahman wrote a lot of material on the subject of *pesantren* and *pesantren* life, a subject little touched upon by the other three writers. Whilst there is reason not to believe that they would have shared his appreciation of the simple virtues of *pesantren* life they certainly did not write about it in the way that he did. Nor did they write critical analyses of the challenges and problems facing *pesantren*, as Abdurrahman did at length.

Further consideration of Abdurrahman's writing reveals, of course, that there is much about his thought that parallels Nurcholish's *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* thought. Indeed he makes occasional reference to Nurcholish's *Pembaruan* ideas in a manner that clearly suggests his support for these ideas. Far more significant than these occasional direct links with *Pembaruan* thought, however, are the many

elements in Abdurrahman's thought that are congruent with fundamental elements in Nurcholish's thought. These congruent elements are evident throughout Abdurrahman's writings, including his analysis of *pesantren* issues.

The most important of these congruent elements is that of the insistence of the need for *ijtihad*. Abdurrahman does not, of course, always refer to *ijtihad* by name, but then neither does Nurcholish. The need for ongoing *ijtihad* is an issue so foundational to the thought of all four writers that they generally take it as taken for granted. Instead of talking about *ijtihad*, *per se*, they discuss instead the need for ongoing change, and the fact that truth cannot be found by standing still, but must rather be continuously pursued. In Abdurrahman's writings the key term in this regard is *dinamisasi*. The particular usage is one largely confined to Abdurrahman's works, but the concept is central to the thought of all four writers.

When Abdurrahman writes about the need for *dinamisasi* in the realm of the *pesantren*, then, what he is talking about is the need for thorough-going and applied *ijtihad*. Naturally he conceived of this *ijtihad*, or *dinamisasi*, as being something that did not simply reject earlier tradition and learning but rather drew upon it, as an intellectual resource, to move Islamic thought. A similar understanding is central to the thought of Nurcholish, Djohan and Wahib. Given the subject matter that Abdurrahman frequently dealt with, however, this respect for classical Islamic thought is particularly evident in his writings.

Other important *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* elements in Abdurrahman's thought include his positive response to the challenges of modernity, his commitment to pluralism and his passion for humanitarian reform.

Endnotes

1. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, 'Comparative Religion: Whither —and Why?', in M. Eliade & Kitagawa (eds.), *The History of Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), p.34.
2. This paper is concerned simply with the seminal ideas of neo-modernism as they emerged in the 1970s. Elsewhere I have attempted to examine something of the present political and social aspects of neo-modernism (refer to Greg Barton, "The Impact of Islamic neo-modernism on Indonesian Islamic Thought: the Emergence of a New Pluralism", in David Bourchier and John Legge (eds.), *Democracy in Indonesia - 1950s and 1990s*, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University, (Melbourne, 1994) pp.143-150, and "Islam and the Prospect of Democracy in Indonesia: The Rise of Islamic Liberalism", presented at "Democracy and Democratization in Asia" a conference at the Catholic University of Louvain Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium 30 and 31 May, and 1 June 1994 (forthcoming publication) and the social context in which neo-modernism emerged in Indonesia (refer to "The International Context of the Emergence of Islamic Neo Modernism in Indonesia", in M.C. Ricklefs (ed.), *Islam in the Indonesian Social Context*, Annual Indonesian Lecture Series #15, CSEAS Monash University, (Melbourne, 1991).
3. For a period during the 1970s the popular term used to describe this school of thought was one initially coined by Nurcholish Madjid, *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*. In fact the widespread, polemical usage of the term *Pembaruan Pemikiran* by the popular media was not the original intention of Nurcholish Madjid when he delivered his thought provoking, but supposedly private, 1970 seminar paper entitled "The Necessity of Renewing Islamic Thought and the Problem of the Integration of the Ummat" and inadvertently established the term in the public arena. Nevertheless as a name for the new intellectual movement "*Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*" remained popular throughout the 1970's and summed up well the concerns of a movement that, whilst springing directly out of mainstream Islamic modernism, is in its creative vitality very different from the modernism of organisations such as Muhammadiyah and Masyumi. Nevertheless the term "neo-modernism" is employed in this thesis to distinguish this new form of modernism from earlier modernism. This is partly because the word *pembaruan* in modern Indonesia is popularly used to refer to anything undergoing renewal or reformation (in much the same way "revolution" was used in the Old Order period), and as such the term *Pembaruan*, or even *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*, lacks precision. More importantly the use of "neo-modernism" is in keeping with the emerging trend in Indonesian publications to increasingly link this term with *Pembaruan Pemikiran* thought. Rahman's thought continues to be very influential in Indonesia despite receiving a rather cool reception from the rest of the Islamic World. The current employment of the term "neo-modernism" in Indonesia, a term Rahman used to describe his own thought, is a direct reflection of the degree to which his ideas were, and are, seen to parallel the ideas of Nurcholish Madjid et al.. Furthermore originating, as it does, from outside Indonesia this usage serves to locate what was previously known in Indonesia as "*Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam*" thought in a broader, international, context. Finally, the usage is etymologically sound - at least to the neo-modernists who firmly believe that they are fundamentally new modernists.

4. It is interesting to note here the wording of the text that appears on the back cover of Nurcholish's first anthology, *Islam, Kemodernan dan Keindonesiaan*, first published in 1987. It begins with this sentence: "It is not hard to agree that Nurcholish Madjid is a modernist Muslim thinker, or better still, a neo-modernist - to use the term that he himself frequently bandies around." I specifically raised the matter of what the most appropriate terminology was to describe their thought with Abdurrahman, Djohan and Nurcholish in separate interviews in July 1992. In each case the response was that neo-modernism remains the most appropriate and useful term, albeit one that is not universally employed.

In keeping with Indonesian convention Nurcholish Madjid, Djohan Effendi and Abdurrahman Wahid are frequently referred to in this study as Nurcholish, Djohan and Abdurrahman. This use of first names in Indonesia parallels the use of surnames in the Western World and is thus quite proper and respectful. It is the usage which is employed throughout this study. It arises from the fact that Indonesians, like many other people around the globe, until recently did not employ the convention of using surnames. Prior to the modern period individuals generally used only one name on a regular basis, although the father's name (i.e his personal name and not a family name) was often attached to give greater specificity (as indeed was the custom in European society not so long ago). Occasionally a name other than the first name becomes the name of common usage, as is the case with the late Ahmad Wahib, who was always referred to as Wahib and never as Ahmad (ie the reverse of the normal pattern).

5. The terms *santri* and *abangan* are used extensively in this thesis. The term *santri* is used to refer to Muslims in Indonesia who are orthodox and committed in their beliefs and devotional practices. Whilst this usage of the term has become the modern standard Indonesian dictionary definition of *santri*, the term originally referred to a student of a *pesantren*, a religious boarding school for the study of Islam. The term's modern usage reflects the popular acceptance of the paradigm of *santri*, *abangan* (the opposite of *santri*) and *priyayi* (referring to Javanese with aristocratic connections whose personal faith and religious practice is a combination of *abangan* beliefs and courtly high culture). This paradigm was first articulated by the American anthropologist Clifford Geertz in his influential book *The Religion of Java*. Although this paradigm has been controversial, and its accuracy the subject of dispute, it has gained widespread popular usage. Refer to Clifford Geertz, *The Religion of Java*, (New York: The Free Press, 1960), pp.126-30.
6. There is a degree of uncertainty about the exact date of Nurcholish's address. Boland (*The Struggle of Islam in Modern Indonesia*, Revised Edition, (The Hague, 1982) p.221), Hassan (*Muslim Intellectual Responses to 'New Order' Modernisation in Indonesia* (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1980), p.91) and Nurcholish himself in one place ('The Issue of Modernisation among Muslims in Indonesia: From a Participant's Point of View', in Gloria Davis, *What is Indonesian Culture* (Athens: University of Ohio, 1979), p.144 refer to it as having taken place on the 2nd January 1970. Elsewhere in his anthology (*Islam*, p.325) Nurcholish refers to the address as having taken place on the 3rd of January 1970, as does Ahmad Wahib (*Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam/Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 1988). p.166). In any case the precise timing

makes no difference in the context of this discussion. Nurcholish's paper was presented in the supposedly private context of *Halal bi halal*, or the *Idul Fitri* celebrations which had been jointly organised by the four most important organisations of young Indonesian Muslims: HMI, PII (Islamic Movement for Indonesian Secondary School Students), Persami (Indonesian Muslim Scholars Association) and GPI (Muslim Youth Movement). Significantly these four organisations were generally regarded as being the natural successors to Masyumi, although they had consistently emphasised their independence in practical political matters.

7. HMI - *Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam*, Islamic Students Union.
8. Wahib, *Catatan*, p.vii-x. Participants in this group included, according to Mukti Ali, Syu'bah Asa, Saifullah Mahyuddin, Djauhari Muhsin, Kuntowidjojo, Syamsuddin Abdullah, Muin Umar, Kamal Muchtar, Simuh and Wadjiz Anwar. Many of these went on to play very active roles in the development, or at least propagation, of neo-modernism in Indonesia.
9. Refer to Djohan Effendi's comments regarding the general lack of awareness amongst scholars of Ahmad Wahib's contribution to Islamic thought in Wahib, *Catatan Harian*, p.13. One study (based on Wahib's published journal) that pays serious attention to Wahib is: Johns, A.H., 'An Islamic System of Values? Nucleus of a Debate in Contemporary Indonesia', in William R. Roff (ed.), *Islam and the Political Economy of Meaning* (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp. 254-287.
10. Published in Gloria Davis (ed.), *What is Modern Indonesian Culture?* (Athens: University of Ohio, 1979).
11. This at least was the title used when the thesis was published in Malaysia in 1982, but it is not clear whether the same title was employed at the time Hassan submitted his thesis in 1975 (Hassan, Muhammad Kamal, *Muslim Intellectual Responses to "New Order" Modernisation in Indonesia* (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1982)). The title of Nurcholish's paper would be difficult to explain were it not for Hassan's thesis. It is also not clear whether, in writing this paper in 1976 whilst at the University of Chicago, Nurcholish had just recently read Hassan's thesis for the first time but this seems likely, and is suggested not only by the tone of his paper but also by its timing, being written just after the customary three year non circulation period (if it was applied) for Hassan's thesis would have expired.
12. Given that the above papers by both Ahmad Wahib and Nurcholish represent the work of writers who are very much emotionally engaged with the subject matter that they are dealing with, it might be argued that they should not be relied upon to present a fair account. Whilst this is a valid argument it is countered to a large degree by the fact that the factual information presented in both accounts correlates well with that presented in other studies, such as Boland *The Struggle*, Karim *Dinamika Islam*, and Samson "Conceptions of Politics", and is consistent with that presented in other writings by Wahib and Nurcholish. In Nurcholish's case support for his account of his own intellectual development is borne out by a close reading of his writing in the late 1960s, 70s and 80s, in Wahib's case the sequence and linking of events that he sets in this article correlates extremely well with other entries made in his diary over the period January 1969 - January 1972 and published in: Wahib, Ahmad, (Djohan Effendi ed.), *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam/ Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* (Jakarta: LP3ES,

- 1981).
13. HMI (*Himpunan Mahasiswa Islam*), GPI (*Gerakan Pemuda Islam*), PII (*Pelajar Islam Indonesia*) and Persami (*Persatuan Sarjana Muslim Indonesia*).
 14. It would appear that Nurcholish would have preferred to avoid this sort of controversy. Certainly he hadn't expected his paper of January 2nd to be published by the newspaper *Indonesia Raya* or even widely circulated, nor had he expected to be the main speaker at the gathering that day. Furthermore Ahmad Wahib recorded in his personal diary that just over a month before the January 2nd seminar, in November 1969, Nurcholish had written to him and Djohan Effendi confidentially acknowledging his support for their extremely progressive stand within Yogyakarta HMI circles, but requesting their understanding of his lack of public support for them (refer to Ahmad Wahib (ed. Djohan Effendi), *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam/ Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 1988), p. 166. In his first term as leader of HMI from 1966 to 1969 Nurcholish seems to have gone out of his way to avoid conflict.
 15. Most of the information regarding *Pondok-Moderen Gontor* used in the discussion here is drawn from a 1965 article by Lance Castles written after visiting the *pesantren* at Gontor and interviewing a number of students and teachers there (Castles, Lance, "Notes on the Islamic School at Gontor", *Indonesia*, No. 1, April 1966, pp. 30-45).
 16. The standard curriculum at Gontor ran for six years, the last three of which introduced classes on teaching methods. It was common for recent graduates at Gontor to remain on for at least an extra year to teach there. Indeed it seems that the economic viability of the *pesantren* was dependent upon this practise (the teachers receiving board and lodging but no more). Refer to Castles, "Notes on Gontor", p.36.
 17. Refer to Castles, "Notes on Gontor", pp. 39-40. Whilst all classes on religious topics were taught solely in Arabic (at least from the second year on) and the boys chatted mostly in Arabic, life at Gontor was not a slavish imitation of life in a Middle Eastern *madrasah*. The largely rural middle class young men who made up the majority of Gontor's student population were regarded as being rather urbane, not at all *kolot* (that is to say 'old fashioned or traditional'). Indeed they were described somewhat disparagingly by more traditional *santri* as being real 'gentlemen' (This is illustrated in a variety of ways, for example, unlike the majority of *pesantren* students of the era, the Gontor boys dressed in modern western style clothing.) Writing in early 1965 Lance Castles observed:
 There is nothing grotesquely ke-arab-arab-an about Gontor. The atmosphere is quite genuinely Indonesian, but at the same time both modern and Islamic; simple, but not harshly austere; clean, but not antiseptically so; serious and religious but not morbid or fanatical; progressive and forward-looking, but without the word "revolutionary" - which covers so much and means so little in Indonesia today - constantly on its tongue. To anyone fresh from Djakarta, with its cultural confusion, hypocritical slogans, paralyzed intelligentsia, corruption, cynicism, conspicuous consumption and uncollected garbage, Gontor seems indeed an abode of peace, and an earnest of the promise that Islamic reformism at its best may once, if no more, have held for Indonesian society. (Castles, "Notes on Gontor", pp.33-4.)
 18. In 1976 Nurcholish joined LIPI as a *Peneliti Leknas-LIPI*, as mentioned, initially

- in order to satisfy the regulations of the Ford Foundation so as to receive sponsorship to the University of Chicago. He remained there as a *Peneliti Lektas-LIPI* until his return from Chicago in 1984 when he was upgraded to become a research staff member of the Deputi IPSK-LIPI.
19. Nurcholish Majid, *Islam Kemedernan dan Keindonesiaan* (Bandung: Mizan, 1987), p.204
 20. *Ibid.* p. 205
 21. *ibid.*, p. 206.
 22. *ibid.*, p. 206.
 23. *ibid.*, p. 206.
 24. *ibid.*, p. 207.
 25. *ibid.*, p. 208.
 26. *ibid.*, p. 208.
 27. Nurcholish decries the background to this paper in his article (first given in 1976) - "The Issue of Modernisation among Muslims in Indonesia: From a Participant's Point of View", in Gloria Davis (ed.), *What is Modern Indonesian Culture?* (Athens: University of Ohio, 1979).
 28. *ibid.* p.223.
 29. *ibid.* p.225.
 30. *ibid.* p.227.
 31. *ibid.* p.227-8.
 32. *ibid.* p.228-30.
 33. *ibid.* p.231.
 34. Much of the information in this section comes from a series of interviews in Indonesia and Australia beginning in 1989 and continuing until the present, and from correspondence and telephone conversations throughout that period. In particular, though, much of the biographical information outlined here comes from notes written for me by Djohan in January 1992 in response to several sessions of interviews.
 35. Saifuddin Zuhri was Minister of Religious Affairs from March 1962 until 1967, He was generally regarded as being an honest hard working man but incurably "one-eyed" in his support of NU. Refer to Syaffi Ma'arif, *Islam dan Politik Pada Masa Demokrasi Terpimpin* and also Saifuddin Zuhri's auto biography, *Berangkat Dari Pesantren* .
 36. One indication (and a particularly significant one in the Indonesian context) of Djohan's keen interest in Ahmadiyah is that his personal library houses an extensive collection of Ahmadiyah literature.
 37. In due course Djohan developed his own position on Islamic thought and, with regard to Iqbal, by no means remained a disciple slavishly imitating his master. He never stopped being an admirer of Iqbal, however, even when he had developed an ambivalence for certain aspects of his thought.
 38. This extract is taken from the private notes referred to earlier.
 39. Mukti Ali was also a regular participant of course, but he made it clear at the outset that whilst he was willing to preside over a frank and free ranging discussion, he could not be considered to be in agreement with all that was said.
 40. *ibid.*
 41. Not, it must be admitted, that this necessarily leaves the avowed atheist in comfortable position. But then it could be argued that state hostility towards athe-

ism has more to do with the "bogey man" threat of Communism than with the religious bias of Pancasila. In any case Djohan makes no reference to the issue of atheism in this paper. Under the circumstances of the time this is an understandable omission.

42. *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam/Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* is entirely composed of edited journal entries, nevertheless it also contains a number of entries that, in terms of length and structure, are clearly articles in their own right. These articles were not published, and were perhaps not intended for immediate publication. Quite possibly they are simply private research notes, notes which were sometimes drawn upon in the course of writing published articles, which seems often to have been the case given that Wahib's journal articles frequently run parallel with his published articles - refer to *ibid.*, p.12-13. One of these journal articles, "Menyusuri Jejak Usaha Pembaruan Pemahaman Islam" (*Ibid.* p.144-174), is drawn upon extensively in this section in the study of Wahib's personal history. The titles before every entry employed in *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam* were generally added in the production of the book, in the case of the above article however, it is possible that the title was one that Wahib had himself given to the article.
43. This was related to me by Djohan in an interview in Jakarta in December 1989. The fourth edition of Wahib's *Catatan Harian*, was published in 1988, (I have not seen a later edition but it is entirely possible that one exists). Some measure of the unexpected degree of interest in this book is revealed in the printing details: the first printing was in 1981, the second in July 1981, and the third in September 1982; a pattern that by the standards of Indonesian publishing suggests a runaway success.
44. Djohan Effendi and Ismed Natsir (eds.), *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam - Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* (Jakarta:LP3ES, 1988) p.13.
45. Most of the information contained in this section is drawn from various sections of Djohan Effendi and Ismed Natsir (eds.), *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam - Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib* (Jakarta: LP3ES, 1988). For details on Wahib's early life, (and some details about his later studies in Yogyakarta) refer to *Op.Cit.*, pp.1-5.
46. Of course in sending his son on to secular studies, rather than to a pesantren for training as a religious scholar, Pak Sulaiaman was doing what many other pious Muslim fathers, including many *kyai*, were doing throughout this period. Nevertheless it accords well with Wahib's account of him as a broad minded man. There are various brief references to Wahib's father in *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam* but only one entry refers to him at length. This journal entry though, penned in April 1972, is particularly revealing:

Ayahku adalah seorang pemberontak pada zamannya. Di masa mudanya dia telah mengeritik beberapa isi kitab-kitab agama yang dinilainya tidak sesuai dengan Al Qur'an dan Hadist. Dia malah mengatakan pada kiyai-kiyai gurunya dan temannya bahwa kitab-kitab semacam Sultam and Safina perlu perombakan. Beliau juga membuang dengan terang-terangan warisan-warisan klenik dari ayahnya sendiri seperti buku-buku primbon, jimat-jimat dan peralatan-peralatan dukun lainnya. Beliau pun membuang terang-terangan benda-benda warisan yang dianggapnya akan memelihara pemikiran-pemikiran klenik seperti keris-keris, tombak bahkan lemari kuno yang dianggap bertuah. Beliau juga menentang ramalan-ramalan jelek khayali, dengan misalnya sengaja membangun rumah pada masa celaka (menurut

- perhitungan dukun). Ayahku merupakan tokoh santri pertama di Sampang yang menyekolahkan anak puterinya ke Sekolah Umum. Dan beliauah tokoh santri pertama di Sampang yang mengawinkan anaknya sekedar seperti yang diwajibkan agama, suatu hal yang saya sendiri masih mempersoalkan, tapi merupakan keberanian Ayah untuk membikin alternatif lain pada lingkungannya. Dan hal semacam ini kiranya perlu dipelajari, Ahmad Wahib, *Catatan Harian*, pp. 142-143.
47. *ibid.*, p.23,(17 July 1969).
 48. *ibid.*, p.23,(17 July 1969).
 49. *ibid.*, pp.23-4,(17 July 1969).
 50. *ibid.*, pp.24-5,(17 July 1969).
 51. *ibid.*, p.27,(15 July 1969).
 52. *ibid.*, p.19,(March 8th 1969).
 53. *ibid.*, p.149.
 54. *Bid'ah* is a difficult word to translate. Literally it means an innovation in religious custom or culture. As such it is a neutral term referring to all innovations, whether good or bad, that are neither proscribed or inferred in the Qur'an or the hadith. In Muhammadiyah circles, however, *bid'ah* generally had a negative connotation, whilst in NU circles there was greater appreciation of the complexity of ideas associated with the term.
 55. *ibid.*, p.62,(6 June 1970).
 56. *ibid.*, p.64,(23 June 1970).
 57. *ibid.*, p.78,(6 March 1970).
 58. *ibid.*, p.98,(29 March 1970).
 59. *ibid.*, p.127,(15 June 1971).
 60. *ibid.*, pp.117-8,(12 May 1970).
 61. *ibid.*, p.121,(16 October 1970).
 62. *ibid.*, p.119,(23 July 1970).
 63. *ibid.*, p.26,(15 July 1969).
 64. *ibid.*, pp.26-7,(15 July 1969).
 65. *ibid.*, p.116,6 May 1970).
 66. Admittedly these subheadings were inserted by the book's editors (possibly Djohan) and not by Wahib. Nevertheless they accurately reflect the central concerns of each of the books topical sections and echo Wahib's own phraseology.
 67. Greg Fealy (a Monash University Ph.D. candidate researching a thesis on Nahdlatul Ulama) relates his experience that a visit to the pesantren where Abdurrahman originally studied reveals that not only did he complete the rigorous classical curriculum in one third of the normal time, but also that he spent an equal amount of time reading western philosophy and social theory - a cupboard stuffed full of his books from his time at the pesantren (for the most part serious titles in English) remains untouched, a curious, but respectful, reminder of his time there.
 68. Abdurrahman Wahid, "Pendidikan Tradisional Di Pesantren" *Bunga Rampai Pesantren*, (Jombang: Dharma Bhakti, 1979), p. 3.
 69. *Ibid.*, pp.49-61.
 70. The entry under *dinamis* (*dinamisasi* is not listed in the main standard reference dictionaries) in one of the main reference dictionaries simply reads: "full of spirit and energy, being quick to respond and adjust itself to new situations and so

forth" - "penuh semangat dan tenaga sehingga cepat bergerak dan mudah menyesuaikan diri dengan keadaan dan sebagainya" - *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, Balai Pustaka, 3rd edition, (Jakarta, 1990), p.206. Whilst *dinamis* translates readily as dynamic, it is rather more difficult to find an English equivalent for *dinamisasi* - dynamisation, to coin a word, probably best conveys the meaning.

71. Abdurrahman Wahid, "Dinamisasi dan Modernisasi Pesantren", in *Bunga Rampai Pesantren* (Jombang: Dharma Bhakti,) p. 52.
72. *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55
73. *Ibid.*, p.61.
74. *Ibid.*, p.61.
75. *Ibid.*
76. See, Abdurrahman Wahid, "Perkembangan Teologi Islam di Indonesia Masa Kini", unpublished paper, 1976.
77. *Ibid.*
78. *Ibid.*
79. *Ibid.*
80. See, Nurcholish, "The Issue of Modernization among Muslims in Indonesia: from a Participant's Point of View", in Gloria Davis, *Ibid.*

Bibliography

- Ali, Fachry and Effendy, Bahtiar (eds.), 1986, *Merambah Jalan Baru Islam/Rekonstruksi Pemikiran Islam Masa Orde Baru*, Bandung: Mizan.
- Amal, Taufik Adnan, 1987, *Metode dan Alternatif: Neomodernisme Islam*, Bandung: Mizan.
- 1990, *Islam dan Tantangan Modernitas*, Bandung: Mizan.
- Amal, Taufik Adnan and Panggabean, Syamsu Rizal, 1989, *Tafsir Kontekstual al-Qur'an*, Bandung: Mizan.
- Anderson, Benedict R. O'G., 1977, "Religion and Politics in Indonesia Since Independence" in *Religion and Social Ethos in Indonesia*, Melbourne: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies Monash University.
- 1992, "Rewinding 'Back to the Future'", (unpublished paper) presented at the Conference on Indonesian Democracy in the 1950s and 1990s, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia, December 17-20, Australia: 1992.
- Aziz, Abdul, Imam Tholikhah and Soetarman (eds.), 1989, *Gerakan Islam Kontemporer di Indonesia*, Jakarta: PT Temprint.
- Bagir, Haidar (ed.), 1986, *Satu Islam Sebuah Dilema*, Bandung: Mizan.
- Bahasoan, Awad, 1984, "Gerakan Pembaharuan Islam: Interpretasi dan Kritik," *Prisma Ekstra*, Jakarta.
- 1985, "The Islamic Reform Movement: An Interpretation and Criticism," *Prisma*, No.35, March 1985.
- Greg Barton, 1991, "The International Context of the Emergence of Islamic Neo Modernism in Indonesia", in M.C. Ricklefs (ed.), *Islam in the Indonesian Social Context*, Annual Indonesian Lecture Series #15, Melbourne: CSEAS Monash University.
- 1994, "The impact of Islamic neo-Modernism on Indonesian Islamic thought - The emergence of a new pluralism", *Indonesian Democracy - 1950s and 1990s*, Melbourne: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies Monash University.
- Boland, B.J., 1973 "Discussion of Islam in Indonesia Today," in *Studies on Islam*, Amsterdam.
- 1982, *The Struggle of Islam in Modern Indonesia*, Revised Edition, The Hague.
- Castles, Lance, 1966, "Notes on the Islamic School at Gontor", *Indonesia*, No. 1, Jakarta, April.
- Crouch, Harold, 1992, "Democratic Prospects in Indonesia (The Rise of the Bourgeoisie, the Changing Role of the Army and Other Topics)," (unpublished paper) presented at the Conference on Indonesian Democracy in the 1950s and 1990s, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia, December 17-20, 1992, Australia.
- Effendi, Djohan, 1983, "The Contextual Understanding of the Holy Qur'an", Jakarta: Iqbal Society For The Development of Religious Thought.
- 1985, "Islam and the Industrial & Post Industrial Era", Jakarta: Iqbal Society For The Development of Religious Thought.
- 1985, "Men's Limitations, Freedoms and Responsibilities. A review of the Question of 'Takdir' from an Islamic Perspective," *Prisma*, Jakarta, March.
- 1986, "Towards a Theology of Harmony", Jakarta: Iqbal Society For The Development of Religious Thought.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1960, *The Religion of Java*, New York: The Free Press.

- 1972, "Religious Change and Social Order in Soeharto's Indonesia," *Asia*, No.27, Autumn.
- 1972, "The Politics of Meaning," *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, Claire Holt et al. ed., Ithaca: Cornell University.
- 1984, "Culture and Social Change: the Indonesian Case," *Man: The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, New Series, Vol.19, No.4, December.
- Hassan, Muhammad Kamal, 1982, *Muslim Intellectual Responses to 'New Order' Modernisation in Indonesia*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Hefner, Robert W., 1987, "Islamizing Java? Religion and Politics in Rural East Java," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 46, No.3, August.
- Johns, A.H., 1987, "An Islamic System of Values? Nucleus of a Debate in Contemporary Indonesia", in William R. Roff (ed.), *Islam and the Political Economy of Meaning*, London: Croom Helm.
- Karim, M.Rusli (ed.), 1985, *Dinamika Islam Indonesia: Suatu Tinjauan Sosial dan Politik*, Yogyakarta: Hanindita.
- Lawrence, Bruce B., 1987, "Muslim Fundamentalist Movements: Reflections Toward a New Approach," *The Islamic Impulse*, Kent: Mackays.
- Liddle, R. Williams, 1988, *Politics and Culture in Indonesia*, Ann Arbor: Center for Political Studies Institute for Social Research: The University of Michigan.
- Madjid, Nurcholish, 1980, "More on Secularization," in M.Kamal Hassan, *Muslim Intellectual Responses to 'New Order' Modernisation in Indonesia*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 1980, "Reinvigorating Religious Understanding in the Indonesian Muslim Community," in M.Kamal Hassan, *Muslim Intellectual Responses to 'New Order' Modernisation in Indonesia*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 1980, "The Issue of Modernisation among Muslims in Indonesia: From a Participant's Point of View," in Gloria Davis, *What is Indonesian Culture?*
- 1980, "The Necessity of Renewing Islamic Thought and the Problem of the Integration of the Ummat," in M.Kamal Hassan, *Muslim Intellectual Responses to 'New Order' Modernisation in Indonesia*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 1980, "The Perspective of Renewal of Thought in Islam," in M.Kamal Hassan, *Muslim Intellectual Responses to 'New Order' Modernisation in Indonesia*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- 1984, *Khazanah Intelektual Islam*, Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- 1985, "An Islamic Appraisal of the Political Future of Indonesia", *Prisma*, March 1985 No.35, pp.11-26
- 1987, "Modernisasi ialah Rasionalisasi bukan Westernisasi", reprinted in Nurcholish Madjid, *Islam Kemodernan dan Keindonesiaan*, Bandung: Mizan.
- 1990, "Indonesia in the Future: Sophisticated and Devoutly Religious," *Prisma*, No. 49., June.
- Mahasin, Aswab, 1990, "The Santri Middle Class," *Prisma*, No. 49, June.
- Mas'udi, Masdar F., 1991, *Agama Keadilan: Risalah Zakat (Pajak) dalam Islam*, Jakarta: Pustaka Firdaus.
- Mc Vey, Ruth, 1983, "Faith as an Outsider: Islam in Indonesian Politics," in James Piscatori (ed.), *Islam in the Political Process*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Muzaffar, Chandra, Abdullah, Taufik and Siddique, Sharon (eds.), 1986, "Islam and Society in South East Asia," *Islamic Resurgence: A Global View*, Singapore:

- Institute of Southeast Asia Studies.
- Noer, Deliar, 1978, *The Rise and Development of the Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia (During the Dutch Colonial Period: 1900 -1942)*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- 1983, *Islam Pancasila dan Asas Tunggal*, Jakarta: Yayasan Perkhidmatan.
- Rahardjo, M. Dawam, 1985, "Islam, Sailing Between Two Reefs: Socialism and Capitalism," *Prisma*, No.35, March.
- 1985, *Pergulatan Dunia Pesantren: Membangun dari bawah*, Jakarta: Media Pratama Offset.
- 1986, "A Critical Islamic View of the State," A paper prepared for the Asian Peace Research Association Conference: *Reversing the Dynamics of Militarization in Asia and the Pacific*, Sydney University, August.
- 1986, *Sari karangan terpilih tentang pengkajian Islam dan masalah kemasyarakatan*, Jakarta: PT Intermedia.
- 1988, *Pesantren dan Pembaharuan*, Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian.
- 1989, *Perpektif Deklarasi Makkah: Menuju Ekonomi Islam*, Bandung: Mizan.
- 1990, "Critical Islamic View of the State," *Mizan*, VOL.III No.2.
- Rahman, Fazlur, 1965, *Islamic Methodology in History*, Karachi: Central Institute of Islamic Research.
- 1979, *Islam*, 2nd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1979, "Islam: Past Influence and Present Challenge," in *Islam: Challenges and Opportunities*, Edinburgh: University Press.
- 1980, *Major Themes of the Qur'an*, Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica.
- 1982, *Islam and Modernity: Transformation of an Intellectual Tradition*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rais, M. Amien, 1985, "International Islamic Movements and their Influence Upon the Islamic Movement in Indonesia," *Prisma*, No.35, March.
- 1987, *Cakrawala Islam: Antara Cita dan Fakta*, Jakarta: Mizan.
- 1988, *Islam di Indonesia: Suatu Ikhtiar Mengaca Diri* (Jakarta: CV. Rajawali, 1986). "Kekuatan Politik Islam International masih lemah," in *Serial Media Dakwah*, Jakarta, November.
- Rakhmat, Jalaluddin, 1985, "Islamic Fundamentalism: Myth and reality," *Prisma*, March.
- 1986, *Islam Alternatif: Ceramah-Ceramah di Kampus*, Bandung: Mizan.
- 1988, *Ijtihad Dalam Sorotan*, Bandung: Mizan.
- 1989, *Epistemologi dan Aksiologi Ilmu Perspektif Al Quran*, Bandung: CV Rosda.
- Ricklefs, M.C., 1979, "Six Centuries of Islamization in Java," in Nehemia Levtzion (ed.), *Conversion to Islam*, New York: 1979.
- 1984, "Islamization in Java: An Overview and Some Philosophical Considerations," in Raphaeli Israeli and Anthony H. Johns (eds.), *Islam in Asia Vol. II*, Jerusalem.
- Sjadzali, H. Munawir, 1988, *Polemik: Reaktualisasi Ajaran Islam*, Jakarta: Pustaka Panjimas.
- Van Bruinessen, Martin, 1987, "New Perspectives on Southeast Asian Islam?" in *Bijdragen*, Deel 143, Afl. 4e.
- 1990, "Indonesia's Ulama and Politics: Caught between Legitimising the Status Quo and Searching for Alternatives," *Prisma*, No. 49., June.
- Vatikiotis, Michael R.J., 1987, "A Propagation Problem," *Far Eastern Economic Re-*

- view, 31 December 1987, Jakarta.
- 1987, "Thoroughly Modern Muslims," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 10 December.
- 1988, "One Code for All Courts," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 22 September.
- 1990, "A Surge in Muslim Activity Despite Extremist Scares: Faith Without Fanatics," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 14 June.
- Wahib, Ahmad, (edited by Djohan Effendi and Ismed Natsir), 1988, *Pergolakan Pemikiran Islam/Catatan Harian Ahmad Wahib*, Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman, 1979, *Bunga Rampai Pesantren*, Jakarta: CV Dharma Bhakti.
- 1983, *Muslim di Tengah Pergumalan*, Jakarta: Leppenas.
- 1985, "The Islamic Masses in the Life of State and Nation," *Prisma*, Jakarta.
- Ward, Ken E., 1977, *The 1971 Election in Indonesia: An East Java Case Study*, Melbourne: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies Monash University.

Greg Barton is a lecturer at Deakin University, Australia.

حقوق الطبع محفوظة.

عنوان المراسلة:

STUDIA ISLAMIKA, GEDUNG PUSAT PENGAJIAN ISLAM DAN MASYARAKAT
JL. KERTAMUKTI NO. 5, PO BOX 225 CIPUTAT 15401, JAKARTA, INDONESIA
TLP. (021) 7492648/7401606/7401925
FAX. (021) 7401592

BANK NEGARA INDONESIA ٠٠٢٧٧٩٣٠٠١ رقم الحساب:

BANK NEGARA INDONESIA/LAIN JAKARTA

قيمة الاشتراك السنو في أندونيسيا:

لسنة واحدة (٤ اعداد): ٥٠,٠٠٠ روبية (٢٥ دولارات امريكية)

لسنتين (٨ اعداد): ١٠٠,٠٠٠ روبية (٥٠ دولارات امريكية)

قيمة العدد الواحد: ١٢,٥٠٠ روبية (٧ دولارات امريكية)

وفي البلدان الاخرى يضاف الى قيمة العدد مبلغ ٨ دولارات امريكية
للارسلان بالبريد الجوي. اما الارسلان بوسائل خاصة فيرجى قبل ذلك الاتصال بالمجلة.

للاشتراكات وفي حالة تغيير العناوين يرجى الاتصال كتابيا بقسم التوزيع مجلة ستوديا اسلاميكا.

طباعة:

INTIS, JAKARTA, INDONESIA



ستوديا إسلاميكا

مجلة اندونيسية للدراسات الإسلامية

السنة الثانية، العدد ٣، ١٩٩٥

هيئة الإشراف على التحرير:

هارون ناسوتيون

مسطوحوه

قريش شهاب

عبد العزيز دحلان

محمد ساتريا أفندي

محمد يونان يوسف

مسلم ناسوتيون

قمر الدين هداية

دين شمس الدين

واهب معطى

نييله لوبس

رئيس التحرير:

أزيوماردي أوزرا

المحررون:

سيف المزائي

هيندرو براسنيو

يوهان هيندريك مولمان

نور الفجر

بدرى يتيتم

سكريتير التحرير:

عارف سبحان

حين نورنى

تصميم الغلاف:

س.برنكا

تصميم ومراجعة اللغة العربية:

فؤاد محمد فخر الدين

تصميم ومراجعة اللغة الإنجليزية:

يوديث م. دينط

ستوديا إسلاميكا (ISSN:0215-492) مجلة دورية تصدر أربع مرات في العام عن جامعة شريف هداية الله الإسلامية الحكومية جاكرتا (STT/DEPPEN NO. 129/DITJEN/PPG/STT/1976) برعاية وزارة الشؤون الدينية بجمهورية إندونيسيا، وتخصص للدراسات الإسلامية في إندونيسيا، بقصد نشر البحوث والمقالات التي تبحث في القضايا الأخيرة. وتدعو المجلة العلماء والمتقنين الى أن يعثوا إليها بمقالاتهم العلمية التي تتعلق برسالة المجلة. والمقالات المنشورة على صفحات هذه الدورية لاتعبر بالضرورة عن ادارة التحرير أوللهيات ذات الارتباط، وإنما عن آراء الكتاب.

ستوديا اسلاميغا