

Ambivalensi Abdurahman Wahid dalam Wacana Keislaman Postkolonial dan Implikasinya Bagi Dialog Antara Islam dan Barat

Hawasi¹, M. Ridho Syabibi²
Universitas Gunadarma¹, UIN Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu²
hawasijasidi@gmail.com¹, ridho@mail.uinfasbengkulu.ac.id²

Received: 1 Juni 2024

Revised: 18 Juni 2024

Accepted: 29 Juli 2024

Abstract

These Western thoughts and ideologies Gus Dur contextualized with his Islamic discourse. When majority of muslim intellectuals and ulamas tend to be resistant to the West, Gus Dur even eclectically accept the development of Western thoughts and ideologies, like humanism and democracy as complementary elements to develop Islamic discourse. By using Bhabha's postcolonial reading and Ricoeurian hermeneutic method this article found a hybrid identity between Islam and the West in Gus Dur's postcolonial Islamic discourse. The hybrid identity owned by Gus Dur was used to build his postcolonial Islamic discourse which is compatible with democracy. Islamic discourse developed by Gus Dur was practiced in his struggle to strengthen Pancasila democracy and humanism in Indonesia. Gus Dur's postcolonial Islamic discourse respects to plurality of Indonesian people in ethnic, culture, and religion. The respect of Gus Dur to plurality was built by his cosmopolitan thought and made him open minded with the hybridity of identity. The hybridity process of Gus Dur's Islamic discourse resulted an ambivalence between mimicry and mockery attitudes as found in his writings on philosophy, democracy, literature, and language. Therefore, all hybrid ideas initiated by Gus Dur are relevant to bridge a global dialogue between Islam and the West which was also voiced by him in some international forums.

Keywords: postcolonial Islamic discourse; Islam and the West; hybridity; ambivalence; mimicry; mockery;

Abstrak

Dalam karya-karya tersebut Gus Dur nampak sebagai ulama-intelektual yang berpikiran terbuka dan liberal dalam menerima dan merespons pemikiran dan ideologi Barat. Pemikiran dan ideologi Barat tersebut dikontekstualisasikan oleh Gus Dur ke dalam wacana keislamannya. When majority of muslim intellectuals and ulamas cenderung resisten terhadap Barat, Gus Dur justru secara eklektik menerima perkembangan pemikiran dan ideologi Barat. Dengan menggunakan pembacaan postkolonial dan metode hermeneutic Ricoeurian artikel ini menemukan identitas hibrida antara Islam dan Barat dalam wacana keislaman yang dikembangkan Gus Dur. Identitas hibrida yang dimiliki Gus Dur digunakan untuk membangun wacana keislaman postkolonialnya yang kompatibel dengan demokrasi. Wacana keislaman postkolonial yang dikembangkan Gus Dur dipraktikkan dalam perjuangan memperkuat demokrasi Pancasila dan humanism di Indonesia. Wacana keislaman postkolonial Gus Dur respek terhadap pluralitas masyarakat Indonesia dalam suku, budaya, dan agama. Respek Gus Dur terhadap pluralitas dibangun oleh pemikirannya yang kosmopolitan dan membuatnya terbuka terhadap hibriditas identitas. Proses hibriditas wacana keislaman postkolonial Gus Dur menghasilkan ambivalensi dalam bentuk peniruan terhadap (mimicry) sekaligus cemoohan (mockery) terhadap Barat yang ditemukan dalam tulisan-tulisannya tentang filsafat, demokrasi, sastra, dan bahasa. Oleh karena itu, gagasan hibrida Gus Dur relevan untuk menjembatani dialog global antara Islam dan Barat yang juga ia suarakan dalam forum-forum internasional.

Kata Kunci: wacana keislaman postkolonial; Islam dan Barat; hibriditas; ambivalensi; peniruan (mimicry); cemoohan (mockery);

INTRODUCTION

Postcolonial era like today is a moment for muslim world which ever colonized by Western countries to search its own identity. the search for identity of muslim world is based on the belief of Islamic resurgence. The struggle for manifesting Islamic resurgence can be different form one muslim country to other country. But sometimes they have the same feeling that Western identity

should be rejected and changed totally (Esposito, 1996: 24). Even, for defenders of “authentic Islam” modernization is identical with colonial heritage. And a muslim supporting modernization is claimed as the figure who is influenced by, in the words of Esposito, “westoxification” (Esposito, 1996: 25). Such extreme views can be found in Hassan al-Banna, Sayyid Quthb, and Abul A’la Mawdudi to mention some defenders of “Islamic authenticity”. They reject to borrow from the West in the name of Islam. Western colonialization over their countries made them resistant to any value from the West.

What shown by them is unhistorical because the process of borrowing between Islam and the West was done in the spirit of science development. Historically Albert Hourani (1996: 14-15) said that when Islam reached the triumph of science, the West borrowed Islam by learning Arabic language texts to master science developed by muslim scientists and philosophers. Since sixteenth century, between muslim and Western scientists had cooperation in science development in some European universities to study Arabic language sources. Therefore, Arabic language as the language of science at that time, became a primary subject in European universities, such as College de France, Cambridge University, Oxford University, and Leaden University. Then, the cooperation emerged modernization, mainly in science and technology in the West. This great historical fact does not continue smoothly because of ideological and political factors seen today.

Abdurrahman Wahid, then called Gus Dur, is one of the Indonesian muslim intellectuals who tries to continue civilization dialogue between Islam and the West. Now days the civilization identified by modernization process of science and technology is handled by the West. Therefore, Gus Dur realizes that the condition of muslim community is left behind in many sectors. The way to overcome the decadence of muslim community is by increasing consciousness to learn from what the West has today. For this purpose, Gus Dur emphasizes the importance to have open minded attitude:

“..., pengembangan kebudayaan Islam di Indonesia harus memiliki arah yang jelas. Pengembangan itu harus ditujukan kepada sikap keterbukaan antarbudaya, di mana antara Islam dan paham yang pemikiran lain dan sistem budaya lain berlangsung proses saling mengambil dan saling belajar. .. tanpa tercabut dari akar kesejarahan masing-masing” (Wahid, 2001: 207).

To actualize his ideal, Gus Dur has to deconstruct the way of thinking believed by majority of muslim community in Indonesia. This way is not without risk and sacrifice that he realizes before. Therefore, Mohammad Sobary categorizes Gus Dur as a controversial intellectual. For the majority, Gus Dur’s ideas and actions are considered difficult to understand. Two examples of Gus Dur’s controversy were happened when he rejected to support and join ICMI (Indonesia Muslim Intellectuals Association) and his initiative to form Forum Demokrasi (Democracy Forum) were surprising , particularly for majority of Indonesian Muslims. Gus Dur more endorsed Forum Demokrasi than ICMI because he felt Forum Demokrasi could provide democratic aspiration from various background of intellectuals without being limited by primordial identity (Sobary in Malik and Ibrahim, 1998: 19). Gus Dur’s goal is one as described by As’at Said Ali that Gus Dur tries “... meramu berbagai perbedaan-perbedaan dengan silaturahmi dan semangat perdamaian.” (Ali in Wahid, 2005; xvi). For this goal, Gus Dur is ready to get aspiration from any source, from Islam as well as non-Islam.

Concerning how to combine some differences can be found in Gus Dur’s ideas on Islam and politic, tradition and modernity as well as pesantren and nonpesantren discourse (Marijan in Wahid, 1999: 7-8). Some different thoughts and values that Gus Dur learns make his thought hybrid as well as marginal (Kersten, 2018: 43) among majority of Indonesian normative-literal as well as traditional (an sich) Muslim figures. Therefore, Gus Dur passes over traditionalist Aswaja (Ahlussunnah wal Jama’ah) or NU (Nahdlatul Ulama) because of his search for intellectuality outside of traditional Islam milieu (Kersten, 2018: 87). In socio-religious level in Indonesia, three periods of Gus Dur’s leadership has been successful in changing NU image as inclusive, modern, and moderate religious institution (Ma’arif and Nadjib in Suaedy and Abdalla (Eds.), 2000: 4). It

cannot separated from Gus Dur's ideas and actions in various forums and activities of religion, culture, and non-governmental organization.

In one side, Gus Dur's effort In struggling tolerant Islam and democracy seems to be controversial . But form other side, his ideas and actions are futuristic to make muslim community Indonesia adaptive with modernity (Ali in Wahid, 2005: xvi). For Gus Dur Islam should be understood as an open system to make a dialogue with other values. What Gus Dur does, in the words of As'at Said Ali is "... ingin menjelaskan bahwa antara Islam dan paham pemikiran lain atau budaya lain berlangsung proses saling mengambil dan saling belajar. ..." (Ali in Wahid, 2005: xxiii). Various background of thoughts and values colours Gus Dur's Islamic discourse, particularly in Indonesia. Some studies concerning Gus Dur's Islamic thought were done as the following:

1. The article of Yani Fathur Rohman (2020) entitled "Memaknai Kembali Pemikiran Gus Dur Studi pada Komunitas Gusdurian Sunter Jakarta" studied about the impacts of Gus Dur's thought on Gusdurian. Rohman found there were three impacts of Gus Dur's thought. The first was the impact on religious moderation and democracy. The second was the impact on humanity. And the third was its contribution to humanistic education. The research found that Gusdurian was capable to transform Gus Dur's thought on humanistic Islam in society. The research was a case study approach by using observation and interview methods. Unfortunately, the research did not use a new approach and method yet. Gus Dur's humanistic view has been discussed by many researchers. but so far, discussing Gus Dur's thought from postcolonial perspective is not used yet
2. The article of Ahmad Zainur and Luqman Al-Hakim entitled "Pemikiran Gus Dur dalam Kehidupan Pluralitas Masyarakat Indonesia" (2021) studied about Gus Dur's thought on pluralism. The research found that Gus Dur's thought was based on his humanistic-pluralistic thought. It was derived from Gus Dur's interpretation of Islam which is inclusive. For Gus Dur Islamic teaching is humanistic and pluralistic. Therefore, Islam is compatible with Pancasila and plurality of Indonesia society. This article also only studies the idea of Gus Dur's pluralism from historical perspective through literature study. This research does not touch Gus Dur's pluralism which is derived from broad interaction between Islam and external sources, mainly from Western culture. As the country which was colonized by the West, pluralism idea brought by Gus Dur cannot be separated by global interaction with all thoughts and values that form his postcolonial identity.
3. The article of Libertus Syukur Iman Gea, Subaryana, and Anggar Kaswati entitled "Pemikiran Gus Dur tentang Nasionalisme dan Multikulturalisme serta Pengaruhnya terhadap Kehidupan Sosial-Politik di Indonesia" (2022) studied Gus Dur's idea on nationalism and multiculturalism. The research found that Gus Dur's idea on nationalism was firstly inspired by Islamic teaching spirit. It is manifested in Nahdlatul Ulama's tradition, the sosio-religious institution where Gu Dur actively involved. In NU doctrine loving and defending the nation is one of obligations to be a good muslim. A part from that Gus Dur rejected a muslim who has narrow minded view of nationalism. Gus Dur taught Indonesian people, particularly muslim community have cosmopolitan view of Islam. By this they can respect to all differences as a nation. Here, Gus Dur succeeded in transforming a paradigm of multiculturalism in Indonesian people. This article used historical perspective through literature study. But it also does not discuss about the factors how Gus Dur got his nationalism and multiculturalism ideas. The factors can be answered if the research tries to use a burning perspective, like postcolonialism. By postcolonialism perpective the complexity found in Gus Dur's thought, particularly his Islamic discourse, can be traced more comprehensively. Gus Dur's belief with the importance of "mengambil" (borrowing) and "membuang" (throwing away) indicates his effort to open dialogue with all cultures, particularly, the West.

Gus Dur seems to agree with Hassan Hanafi concerning the need of selection and dialogue between Islam and the West:

“... Dari kebutuhan melakukan seleksi dan dialog konstruktif dengan peradaban Barat itu, yang memiliki kelemahan-kelemahan serius, lahirlah kebutuhan untuk mengenal dunia Barat dengan setepat-tepatnya. Upaya pengenalan itu sebagai unit kajian ilmiah, berbentuk ajakan kepada ilmu-ilmu kebaratan (Al-Istighrab, Oksidentalisme) sebagai imbalan bagi ilmu-ilmu ketimuran (Al-Ishtisraq, Orientalisme). Oksidentalisme bermaksud mengetahui peradaban orang Barat sebagaimana adanya, termasuk kekuatan-kekuatan dan kelemahan-kelemahan yang dimilikinya. Dari pendekatan seperti inilah lalu akan muncul kemampuan mengembangkan kebijakan (policy development) yang diperlukan kaum muslimin dalam jangka panjang.” (Wahid in Shimogaki, 1997: xviii).

Besides its advancement Western culture also contains serious problem. And this problem is known by Gu Dur. It is reflected in Gus Dur's statement “... peradaban Barat itu, ... memiliki kelemahan-kelemahan serius,...”). By this statement Gus Dur wants to show that his discourse cannot be controlled by the West. He confidently borrows from the West what is needed by muslim community. But, at the same time, he critically rejects what is considered dangerous for Indonesian muslim. Capitalistic system of America is one of Western economic ideology which is contradictory with economy of Pancasila. Komaruddin Hidayat tries to unveil the irony and paradox of the West:

“Di balik prestasi sains dan teknologi serta advokasi kemanusiaan yang ditawarkan oleh gerakan demokratisasi serta hak asasi manusia, kita melihat berbagai ironi dan paradox peradaban, yaitu munculnya fenomena global tribalism pada skala dunia... Gedung Putih yang merasa dirinya sebagai the center of the world telah mengecilkan suara-suara yang berbeda. ...” (Hidayat in Santosa (Ed.), 2007: 158).

In the eye of the West, Middle East and Islamic world in general should be controlled and hegemonized (Aschroft, et.al, 1998: 173). The West positions itself as the ‘Self’ which is superior and Islamic world as the ‘other’ which is inferior. In fact, what the West considers as the ‘other’ also can resist and reject to be defined by the ‘other’. Gus Dur is the figure who positions in such ambivalence which is mimicry and mockery found. His ideal is to see Indonesian muslims develop rationality, modernity, and democracy (which he borrowed from the West). In other side, he wants Indonesian muslims substantially live with their religious identity which is different from secular identity. It is relevant with Barton's opinion concerning Gus Dur's position in the contestation of Islam and the West:

“..., pemikiran Abdurrahman Wahid sebagian besar merupakan respons terhadap modernitas; respons dengan penuh percaya diri dan cerdas. Sembari tetap kritis terhadap kegagalan-kegagalan masyarakat Barat modern, Abdurrahman secara umum bersikap positif terhadap nilai-nilai inti pemikiran liberal pasca pencerahan, walaupun dia juga berpendapat hal ini perlu diikatkan pada dasar-dasar teistik. ...” (Barton in Suaedy and Abdalla (Eds.), 2000: 89).

Islam and Orientalism

According to Edward Said in his work, *Covering Islam* (1981) writes that Islam in the eye of the West, particularly orientalists is still seen in monolithic point of view. The orientalists consider Islam as something inferior as a part of the world represented hostility and fear for the West. The emergence of extreme ideas and actions of certain group in Islamic community is claimed by the West as a mere religious problem in Islam. Therefore, Said clarifies that psychological and political reasons should be considered to understand Islamic world as representation of the Orient. Muslim fundamentalism emerges and becomes a threat for the West, Said adds, is not only derived from internal factor of fundamentalists' miss interpretation of Islamic teachings but also external factor of the West for its hegemony to muslim world. Said shows that when the West, particularly America, reports about Islam the information published tends to be bias and reductive. Here, hegemony of Western media succeeds in representing Islamic threat to the West. Said writes:

“A very serious consequence is that Americans have scant opportunity to view the Islamic world except reductively, coercively, oppositionally. The tragedy of this is that it has spawned a set

of counterreductions here and in the Islamic world itself. “Islam” represents a resurgent tivism, which suggests not only the threat of a return to the Middle Ages but the destruction of what is regularly referred to as the democratic order in the Western world. ...” (Said, 1981: 51).

Then, Said claims that construction of knowledge and coverage of Islamic world cannot be ideologically separated from geopolitic and economic interests by America through massive scale of knowledge production (Said, 1981: 145). Therefore, Said comes to conclusion that discussing knowledge means discussing interpretation. And America, as representation of the West, use its hegemony to produce knowledge of Islamic world which is bias and reductive. For Said, to face America’s hegemony of knowledge production is by counter culture knowledge based on intellectual criticism, community, and ethical consciousness. So far, the Orient, including Islam, is always treated as what Spivak calls subaltern that cannot equally speak with the West. Islam is seen by the West as object not subject. Said insists the Orient, in this case muslim intellectuals to counter bias knowledge of the West which is too closely tied to conquest and domination. Therefore, orientalism contributes to emerge critical school of thought called postcolonial studies (Ratna, 2008: 35). Postcolonial studies open a new perspective in understanding postcolonial conditions of the countries which were colonized and their search for identity after colonial imperium. According to Aschroft et.al (2003) Indonesia is one the countries which has the most dominant text, mainly found in literary texts, concerning postcolonial conditions. Indonesia was so long colonized, particularly, by the Dutch that hegemony of the West and Indonesia’s response to counter the hegemony. The hegemony of the West over Indonesia during colonial era can be found in a Dutch orientalist’s work, Snouck Hurgronje. In his works Hurgronje positions Islam in Indonesia as an object of study for Dutch colonialist’s political interest. Indonesian muslim’s experience during and after colonialism surely coloured Islamic discourse emerged in postcolonial Indonesia. How muslim community resists, mimics, and mocks related to the West. Therefore, a theme related to religion, particularly Islam, is interesting object to study in light of postcolonial theory (Ratna, 2008: 95). That is why this article elaborates postcolonial Islamic discourse offered by Abdurrahman Wahid (Gus Dur). It is important to study Gus Dur’s Islamic discourse in order to understand how he borrows and throughs out all elements related to the Western culture and ideology. Another purpose is to explain how Gus Dur puts all elements considered ‘the West’ in his Islamic discourse.

Islam and Orientalism

Generally, orientalism studies were introduced by Edward Said with his wellknown work, Orientalism. In his introductory writing concerning the reason why he writes Orientalism Said writes: “My idea in Orientalism is to use humanistic critique to open up the fields of struggle, to introduce a longer sequence of thought and analysis to replace the short bursts of polemical, thought-stopping fury that so imprison us.” (Said, 2010: xxiii). At least, postcolonial approach used by Said in his Orientalism can change the West’s minset over Islam. Besides that, Islamic world also can internally learn why Islamic world only becomes an object by the West. After that, both of them can share their weaknesses and strengths harmoniously.

From the statement above Said believes that there is no isolated culture in this world. Therefore, polarization between the West (the Occident) versus the Orient (Islam) is not relevant any more, particularly in mondial world. The polarization must be deconstructed and be finished by intellectual and moral responsibility. But Said also shows that Islamic world experiences intellectual and moral decadence. And in this case, Islamic world cannot blame the West as the main factor. Internal problem of Islamic world which is left behind in science and technology over the West. Said gives the reason:

“... Hilangnya tradisi ijtihad dalam dunia Islam secara bertahap juga menjadi salah satu bencana kebudayaan saat ini. Akibatnya, upaya umat Muslim untuk berpikir kritis dan bergulat dengan masalah-masalah dunia modern nyaris memudar. Sebaliknya, ortodoksi dan dogma agama muncul di mana-mana.” (Said, 2010: xxviii).

Said (2010: 110) also explains that historically Islamic world ever experienced a golden age when Islam interacted with Greek philosophical tradition. At that time, Islam was able to creatively borrow from Greek and also Christian traditions to develop scientific, military, as well as political advancement. But the golden age of Islamic World does not continue until today because of hegemonic orthodox Islamic theological teaching. This condition makes muslim world left behind in all aspects of life. A narrow minded thinking experienced by muslim world is getting worse which is supported by dogmatic approach in understanding Islam. It is true what Said writes that dogmatism or orthodoxy of Islam is a cultural disaster.

Muslim modernists suggest that the cultural disaster experienced by Islamic world can be finished if only Islamic world chooses rational approach in understanding Islamic discourse in order to be able to dialogue with rational-secular discourse. The openness of Islamic world to science and technology cannot be postponed any more. Therefore, muslim modernists urge to open ijtihad to overcome the decadence of science and technology in Islamic world. Esposito (2010: 170-171) calls them as Islamic reformers who, by their braveness to use ijtihad, emphasize the importance of flexible and open minded views when they dialogue with the West and its modernity in science and technology. Esposito (2010: 188) shows that muslim modernists are the pioneers who eclectically not only want to purify Islam as previous time but also try to face recent and future problems of muslim by reinterpreting Islam in the light of modern realities.

Said, by his Orientalism, is the representation how to bridge between Islam and the West. He knows more about how the West's imagination toward Islam tends to be bias and reductive. In other hand, as a critical intellectual, he also tries to know more about Islamic world and positions it as a subject. He is able to differ Islam as an absolute religious truth from God and a muslim as embracer of Islam who has relative truth. Again, in Orientalism Said's objective perspective can be found:

“Islam adalah agama yang hidup dan vital, yang memikat hati, pikiran, dan kesadaran berpuluh-puluh dan berates-ratus juta orang, yang memberikan mereka standar untuk hidup secara jujur, sederhana, dan bertakwa kepada Tuhan. Islam sebenarnya tidak membeku. Yang membeku justru rumusan-rumusan ortodoksinya, teologi sistematisnya, dan apologetika sosialnya. Di sinilah letak dislokasi tersebut, sehingga sebagian dari para penganutnya yang paling terdidik dan cerdas merasakan ketidakpuasan terhadap Islam.” (Said, 2010: 438).

By quoting Gibb's statement Said agrees with Gibb that the emergence of Islamic modernists can answer the serious problem of Islamic decadence. In the hands of Islamic modernists Islam can be reformulated and reinterpreted contextually. Of course, what stated by Said and also Gibb are not sterile from bias of Westerner's way of thinking. However, Western identity is still more prominent as mostly experienced by some orientalists in viewing Islam and Islamic world. Therefore, Said insists Islamic world and the West always reconstruct their identity each other dynamically. Said believes that: “Identitas “diri” (self) atau “yang lain” (other) tidak berada dalam proses yang statis.” (Said, 2010: 519). All cultures and civilization, including Islam and the West, actually do live in isolated sphere but spirit of hybridity in forming their identity (Said, 2010: 541). Said is optimistic that through endless efforts to bridge between Islamic and Western identity can be manifested harmoniously. In other hand, omitting politic of domination done by the West who treats Islam as “the other” must be deconstructed in this postcolonial and postmodern era as written by Said in his Orientalism.

Said's calling to initiate a dialogue between Islam and the West is meant as humanistic work to enlighten all people in Islamic world and the West. By humanistic spirit Said insists Islamic world and the West can learn each other in the era which is supported by cyber democracy. In the era of cyber democracy society is easy to be global citizen supported by information technology. Finally, Said hopes that his humanistic project as written in Orientalism can resist with opposition power against humanism in the persons of Osama bin Laden, Ariel Sharon, and George W. Bush. Laden was a representative of Islamic fundamentalist who manipulated Islam for ideology of

terrorist. Meanwhile Sharon was the profile of Israel Zionist who used his power to kill Palestine people. And Bush was the representative of American hegemony to Islamic world for economic and political interests. They were the examples of figure who ideologically manipulated identity monolithically. The result was conflictual world separated into Islam versus the West.

Postcolonial Identity between Islam and the West

Postcolonial theory includes in critical theories tradition which elaborates postcolonial condition, particularly the condition of the colonized country and its relation to the colonizer after colonialization (Barker, 2014: 211). In postcolonial theory identity problem becomes main study because speaking about problem of identity becomes complex. Experience under and after colonialization coloured colonized society to find their changing identity. All experiences during interaction with the colonizer are brought to the formation of new independent country in postcolonial era. Society who ever experienced colonization tries to narrate their identity which is always distorted and disabling (<http://athena.english.vt.edu/~carfisle/identity.html>). The identity expressed by this new postcolonial society, however, cannot be purely taken from their cultural heritage. They should borrow what the colonizer's identity has by negotiating (resistance and adaptation) with the colonializer's identity. Meanwhile, former identity of the colonializer also has been coloured by the West imagination and interpretation as found in its orientalism research project. Therefore, what the colonized claims that it has own identity is not too simple to formulate because:

“Colonial discourse tends to exclude, of course, statements about the exploitation of the resources of the colonized, the political status accruing to colonializing powers, the importance of domestic politics of the development of an empire, all of which may be compelling reasons for maintaining colonial ties. Rather, it conceals these benefits in statements about the inferiority of the colonized, the primitive nature of other races, the barbaric depravity of colonized society, and therefore the duty of imperial power to reproduce itself in the colonial society, and to advance the civilization of the colony through trade, administration, cultural and moral improvement. Such is power of colonial discourse that individual colonizing subjects are not often consciously aware of the colonizing subject as much as the colonized.” (Ashcroft, et.al., 1998: 43).

Therefore, postcolonialism, as suggested by Simon During, should be placed for a reconciliation between the colonized and the colonizer (During in Parry, 2004: 4). Problem of postcolonial identity is so complex that the colonized should negotiates with the colonizer to represent its identity. Bhabha seems to agree with During's suggestion and tries to describes postcolonial identity as condition which is: “... in the emergence of the interstices – the overlap and displacement of domains of difference – that the intersubjective and collective experiences of nationness, community interest, or cultural value are negotiated.” (Bhabha, 1994: 2). The negotiation in postcolonial era cannot be avoided because society living in it should adapt with what Manuel Castelle calls as network society. One society should interact and learn each other with other society globally. In this mondial condition domination from one country to other country is hard to do totally. Therefore, they should negotiate their culture each other because as stated by Bhabha that: “... Cultures are never unitary in themselves, nor simply dualistic in the relation of Self to Other.” (Bhabha, 1994: 36). Then, the process of mimicry should be done as the form of negotiation. In the process of cultural negotiation takes place an acceptance and rejection which is called by Bhabha as ambivalence between mimicry and mockery. Bhabha (1994: 153) describes that the presence of the colonizer makes the colonized ambivalent which is always split between its appearance as original and authoritative. It is articulated by repetition and difference. Then, Bhabha explains that ambivalence can take place in:

“... area between mimicry and mockery, where the reforming, civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double, that my instances of colonial imitation come. What they all share is a discursive process by which the excess or slippage produced by the ambivalence of mimicry almost the same, but not quite does not merely ‘rupture’ the discourse, but becomes

transformed into an uncertainty which fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’ presence. By ‘partial’ I mean both ‘incomplete’ and ‘virtual.’” (Bhabha, 1994: 86).

Mimicry and mockery cannot be avoided as the consequence of complex interaction between the colonizer and the colonized. The interaction between them is transformed by the colonized in the form of hybrid cultural identity. Of course, the process of hybrid cultural identity requires sacrifice to face a problem which is called by Childs and Williams as: “a ‘nervous condition’ of fantasy and desire, a violent, neurotic relation for different from the civilizing ambitions of colonial government, society, and missionaries.” (Child and Williams, 1997: 123). This condition should be passed over to seek, in the words of Bhabha, as the “third space”, the space, even the spare in between. It means that cultural transformation in the “third space’ or the “third spare” produces a hybrid cultural identity which is similar but not like.

Problem Limitation

This research limits its problem found in some Gus Dur’s essay works as the following:

1. Muslim di tengah Pergumulan published by Leppenas in 1983.
2. Mengurai Hubungan Agama dan Negara published by Grasindo in 1999.
3. Melawan Melalui Lelucon: Kumpulan Kolom Abdurrahman Wahid published by Pusat Data dan Analisa Tempo in 2000.
4. Pergulatan Negara, Agama, dan Kebudayaan published by Desantara in 2001.
5. Gus Dur Bertutur: Esai-Esai Abdurrahman Wahid dalam Harian Proaksi published by Harian Proaksi and Gus Dur Foundation in 2005.
6. Islamku Islam Anda Islam Kita: Agama, Masyarakat, Negara, Demokrasi published by The Wahid Institute in 2006.
7. Gus Dur Menjawab Kegelisahan Rakyat, published by Kompas in 2007.
8. Tuhan Tidak Perlu Dibela, published by Saufa in 2016.

METHOD

The method used in this article is hermeneutic method from Paul Ricoeur. Ricoeur puts interpretation as sentral text in his hermeneutics. Ricoeur considers that text is “any discourse fixed by writing” (Ricoeur, 1982: 145). By “discourse” he means as a language refered to event which discussing something and use it in the event of communication. By using hermeneutics circle Ricoeur unites between explanation and understanding. In the process of interpetation between explanation and understanding cannot be separated each other. Explanation means analytical and empirical which discussing amount of observable events and their parts. Meanwhile, understanding means synthetical which discusses amount of hole interpretation. The process of interpretation starts from distanciation and ends to personalization which produces plural interpretation (Bleicher, 2003: 376).

To avoid a bias interpretation, dichotomy between objectivity and subjectivity of interpretation is solved by decontextualization to keep authonomy of text. After that, interpreter returns again to the text interpreted (recontextualization) to see the background of the text. The circular Ricoeur’s hermeneutic method aims to reflectively unveil the hidden intension of the text, not the author of the text (Hardiman, 2015: 245). It means that understanding a text is reflecting the text which is existentially meaningful.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Gus Dur believes that formation of Islamic civilization in history is eclectic in its character (Wahid, 2010: 134). Islamic civilization absorbs other elements of culture outside of Islam. The first identity that Gus Dur has is pesantren world view as found in his first article, Pesantren sebagai Subkultur (Pesantren as Subculture) (Abshar-Abadalla im Wahid, 2000: xviii). But it is does not limit

his intellectual journey to know more about Western thoughts. Even Gus Dur's mastery of Western thoughts matures his Islamic discourse to be more cosmopolitan. For Gus Dur to search scientific knowledge cannot be separated with parochial or sectarian bands. Searching scientific knowledge is an obligation in Islam, even to Chinese country. This wellknown Prophet Muhammad's saying is strongly kept by Gus Dur. Therefore, Gus Dur insists muslim community to seek scientific knowledge in order not to be left behind by other global communities. Muslim community, particularly in Indonesia should move on transforming Islam form identity to substance.

Further more, Gus Dur states that the importance is not the form of Islam or the amount of Muslim community but how Islamic value is manifested in a society (Malik and Ibrahim, 1998: 58). The problem of muslims is still the same, that is the weakness of literacy. Therefore, they face cultural shock when seeing social changes. To answer this problem, Gus Dur gives an example in internal organization he leads, Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) and how NU community are educated to be flexible to accept something new from other cultures. Therefore, they are more adaptable to face social changes in contemporary Indonesia (Wahid, 2010: xi). NU, in the process of Indonesia history, can adapt with modernity not to be westernized. It can be happened because: "Kemampuan untuk mengembangkan respons yang positif terhadap perubahan-perubahan modernisasi ini bertumpu pada ajaran-ajaran inti NU dalam menahan pengaruh pembaratan masyarakat secara penuh" (Wahid, 2010: xiii).

Different from NU which is more inclusive in embracing Islam, the group of "Islamist" who try to force "Islamization of society" formally is more radical even extreme to external culture. The external culture, mainly derived from the West is considered as a threat for Islam. By this phenomenon, Gus Dur sharply criticizes this hardline muslims or the "Islamist". The "Islamist" ideal to form Islamic state in Indonesia makes Gus Dur worried. The "Islamist" ideal can be contraproductive with consensus that Pancasila is final as democratic system accepted by Indonesian people. Indonesia is a country with plurality in culture, language, ethnic, and religion. Therefore, Pancasila is compatible to equally protect all citizens without seeing their various background. In this context, Islam can give its role as complementer, together with other religions. For Gus Dur Islam can inspire this country for maturity of democracy. Therefore, Islam is compatible with democracy because their goal is one (Wahid, 1985, Wahid, 1992). The goal of Islam and democracy is the same, that is to creat just and prosperous society.

Gus Dur's belief with democracy shows that he mimics by borrowing the Western political system. Gus Dur considers that in the Western modern democracy, particularly developed in America can inspire muslim community in Indonesia. Eventhough Gus Dur faces ambivalence in his attitude to democracy. As an ulama and intellectual he knows that in Islam also can be found the spirit of democracy in the expression of "musyawarah" and it was as exemplified by the Prophet Muhammad in practice. How to operate 'musyawarah' in political system was not explained by the Prophet. It means that the Prophet opens many possibilities to apply Islam contextually. For Gus Dur, modern democracy which ruled by 'trias politica'; executive, legislative, and judicative is compatible with Islam which emphasizes the importance of check and balance in political power. Of course, not all Western modern democracy elements are compatible with Islam. Gus Dur critically rejects liberal democracy which is secular and not based on divine spirit. As a solution, Gus Dur agrees with Pancasila democracy which is based on oneness of God. Gus Dur's rejection to liberal and secular democracy is a form of his resistance as well as mockery to the Western hegemony.

Gus Dur gives an Germany experiment how Christian religion only becomes inspiration of the country. What colour the German people is not its formality but its values in daily life. Gus Dur stresses:

"Hal-hal seperti ini seharusnya menjadi tekanan bagi gerakan-gerakan Islam dalam membangun bangsa. Bukan malah mementingkan formalisasi ajaran-ajaran agama tersebut dalam kehidupan bernegara, yang tidak menjadi kebutuhan utama masyarakat. Jika penampilan dari

agama Islam terwujud tanpa formalisasi dalam kehidupan beragama, maka agama tersebut menjadi sumber inspirasi bagi gerakan-gerakan Islam dalam kehidupan bernegara, seperti Negara ini.

Dasar perjuangan seperti inilah yang sebenarnya mengilhami juga lahirnya partai-partai CDU (Christian Democratic Union), Uni Demokratik Kristen, di Jerman dan sejumlah Negara lain.” (Wahid, 2006: 24).

From the statement above Gus Dur also agrees that Indonesia needs Islamic values in people’s life. Islam, together with other religions and beliefs, can contribute to realize a just and prosperous society (Wahid, 2006: 33). The good experience of CDU parties in Germany can stimulate Indonesia to make Pancasila democracy, with its religious spirit, transformed. Therefore, he rejects when Islam is formalized in Indonesia because of its plurality in beliefs. Some muslim groups insisting Islam as a formal state ideology, according to Gus Dur, threat Pancasila which was democratically chosen by consensus.

Gus Dur chooses the experience of Germany as a good example of mutual relationship between religion and state. In the eye of postcolonialism, Gus Dur acknowledges the success of the West in implementing modern democracy in secular country. Germany is the representative of the West advancement and Christian Democratic Union can be interpreted as a representative of religion in the West. It cannot be denied that for people in the East, particularly muslim community Christian religion is identical with the West. Here, Gus Dur tries to say that muslim community will be modern if they mimic the experience of Christian religion in Germany as one of the symbols of Western advancement in democracy.

And the other hand, Gus Dur mocks the decadence of muslim community in understanding democracy. He acknowledges that majority of muslim community are still illiterate with substantial democracy. It needs a long process to reach maturity in democracy. Therefore, he gives an insight that to realize independently democratic society in Indonesia the first step is by accepting secular concept (Ramage in Fealy and Barton (Eds.), 2010: 315-316). In secularization non-religious and religious communities can offer their morality in public space and sphere. For this, Gus Dur gives the reason:

“..., kalau dalam masyarakat sekuler Barat ada moralitas non-agama dalam kehidupan politik, di Negara-negara berkembang yang belum memiliki tradisi mapan, moralitas ditegakkan melalui dasar-dasar agama. Dalam pandangan penulis, ukuran-ukuran ideologis-agama tetap tidak memperoleh tempat dalam kehidupan bernegara, karena sifatnya yang seisi dan hanya khusus untuk kepentingan para pemeluk agama tersebut. Di sinilah terletak perbedaan antara moralitas dan ideologi, walaupun sama-sama berasal dari wahyu yang satu.” (Wahid, 2006: 55).

Therefore, Wahid adds that in Indonesia context some general religious morality should be developed, such as honesty, work ethos, and responsibility (Wahid, 2006: 55). But, the way how to enhance religious morality, for Gus Dur, cannot be gained from a narrow minded religious dogmatism teaching. Religious community needs to develop rationality as suggested by Gus Dur. So moral values found in all religious teachings can be contributed in public sphere if religious community has ethical consciousness. The problem faced by religious community, particularly in Islam is the weakness, even absence of ethical consciousness. Gus Dur, however, should respect to the development of non-religious morality in the West. Indonesian muslim community should learn from what happens in the West. Mimicry over secular morality in the West done by Gus Dur shows his respect to the maturity of non-religious morality. By maturing religious morality of Indonesian muslim Gus Dur hopes that political interest to use religion as ideology can be avoided.

Gus Dur comes to the understanding that religious morality is compatible with politic but not with religious ideology. Eventhough, Gus Dur critically emphasizes that not all secularistic values are suitable with Islam which integrates between religion and state (Wahid, 1983: 91). Positive secularistic values, such as respect to human equality and freedom are needed to build democracy.

For Gus Dur these values become milestone to realize a true democracy. Secularism brings an open politic without depending on primordialism of religion and race. All background of people are the same before the law. They have the same rights. And its is also the spirit of Islam taught by the Prophet who struggled for social justice. John L. Esposito, in *Unholy War: Terror in the Name of Islam*, writes his opinion about Gus Dur's Islamic discourse:

“Wahid believes that contemporary Muslims are at critical crossroad. Two choices are paths confront them: to pursue a traditional, static legal-formalistic Islam or to reclaim and refashion a more dynamic cosmopolitan, universal, pluralistic worldview. In contrast to many “fundamentalists” today, he rejects the nation that Islam should form the basis for the nation-state’s political or legal system, a nation he characterizes as a Middle Eastern tradition, alien to Indonesia. Indonesian Muslims should apply a moderate, tolerant brand of Islam to their daily lives in a society where “a Muslim and a non-Muslim are the same”, a state in which religion and politics are separate. Rejecting legal-formalism or fundamentalism as an aberration and a major obstacle to Islamic reform and to Islam’s response to global change, Wahid has spent his life promoting the development of a multifaceted Muslim identity and a dynamic Islamic tradition capable of responding to the realities of modern life. Its cornerstone are free will and the right of all Muslims, both laity and religious scholars (ulama) to “perpetual reinterpretation” (ijtihad) of the Quran and tradition of the Prophet in light of “ever changing human stations.” (Esposito, 2002: 140).

What needed in postcolonial Indonesia era today, according to Kuntowijoyo, is a kind of intellectual ulama not in social ulama category (Kuntowijoyo, 2018: 33). And Gus Dur can be categorized as the real intellectual par excellence. Concerning the ideal of Islamic state Gus Dur, by showing Ali Abdel Raziq’s theses, rejects the initiative to build Islamic state. Gus Dur is in line with Raziq that there is no concept of Islamic state found in Al-Qur’an. For Gus Dur it is useless to claim that Islam has state concept (Wahid, 2000: 58). Gus Dur’s empirical experience interested and involved in Islam as ideo-political movement coloured his Islamic discourse. In one of his articles Gus Dur shares his interest in Ikhwanul Muslimin which is later rejected by him:

“Semula, penulis mengikuti mengikuti jalan pikiran kaum ekstrimis yang menganggap Islam sebagai alternatif terhadap pola pemikiran “Barat”, seiring dengan kesediaan penulis turut serta dalam gerakan Ikhwanul Muslimin di Jombang, dalam tahun-tahun 50-an. Kemudian, penulis mempelajari dengan mendalam Nasionalisme Arab di Mesir pada tahun-tahun 60-an, dan Sosialisme Arab (al-isytirakhiyyah al-‘arabiyyah) di Baghdad. Sekembalinya di tanah air, di tahun-tahun 70-an penulis melihat Islam sebagai jalan hidup (syari’ah) yang saling belajar dan saling mengambil berbagai ideologi non-agama, serta berbagai pandangan dari agama-agama lain.” (Wahid, 2006: 66).

From the statement above, Gus Dur, in certain period of his life, ever had an extreme idea concerning the West. Ikhwanul Muslimin was well-known as Islamic hard line movement against the West’s policy over Islamic world, particularly in Middle East. Psychologically as well as sociologically, Gus Dur experienced a moment of total resistance to the West. In this phase, Gus Dur hated all values from the West as a threat for Islam. He mocked the West with its all values, as an enemy for Islam. This attitude was derived from his readings on an extreme movement written by Hassan al-Banna, Sayyid Quthub, etc. So, at the short moment of his life Gus Dur ever became a fundamentalist Islam. But it was changing when he read books concerning other ideologies, Arab socialism as well as secular ideologies from the West. Here, he converted his idea from extreme Islam to moderate even liberal Islam. After knowing the danger of Islam as political ideology of Ikhwanul Muslimin Gus Dur comes to the conclusion that Islam should be put as social ethics only not ideology of politic. Therefore, Gus Dur insists a muslim to understand empirical Islam comprehensively by studying classical history and culture, economic history, political and administrative history of Islam, etc. By this way, a muslim is able to know the picture of Islam and its weakness as well as strength (Wahid, 1983: 13). At the same time, a muslim should realize that

Islamic teaching should be ready to face and answer the recent as well as future challenge of contemporary life (Wahid, 1983: 17).

Gus Dur's reading on Western novels, such as Faulkner, Hemingway, Kafka, Tolstoy, Pushkin, Gide and also Poe's and Donne's poetry inspired him to understand more about Western people characters (Barton, 2018: 86). even Gus Dur criticizes a poet, Naipaul who stigmatizes Islam as 'angry' religion. Naipaul believes that Islam is intolerant religion and pesantren is symbol of Islamic decadence. Naipaul's claims, according to Gus Dur, are wrong because he just observes the life of Muslim society in Indonesia partially not comprehensively. Naipaul's short observation only catches one or two negative facts. Therefore, he fails to see Islam and its social context comprehensively. Therefore, Gus Dur criticizes Naipaul that: "... Naipaul seharusnya ... menggali lebih mendalam dari kehidupan pesantren yang sedang memulai upaya besar untuk mengubah struktur kehidupan bermasyarakat secara mendasar tanpa menggunakan kekerasan dan tanpa mengajukan protes apa pun." (Wahid, 2000: 131).

From the statement above Gus Dur mocks Naipaul as the tendency of Western people in seeing Islam unproportionally. Then, Gus Dur shows the basic fallacy of Naipaul's argumentation concerning modernity versus traditionality that: "... ia mengukur modernitas dari penolakan terhadap yang tradisional, mengukur kemajuan dari penghancuran keyakinan semula" (Wahid, 2016: 41). Naipaul's over generalization to Islam shows that orientalism project of the West over the East, particularly Islam is based on colonial mentality. Colonial mentality experienced by the West tends to hegemonize the East and Islam. Feeling superior of the West over the East and Islam closes the West to accept the East and Islam equally. This can be found in the prototype of Naipaul. Naipaul's bias understanding is produced and spread out to all over the world with America which claims as "the world police".

The solution that Gus Dur offers is not by an angger and extreme action as done by some terrorists but spreading moderate Islam as he exemplifies with some dialogues on interfaith tolerance among religions and humanism in international level. He brings Islam to abroad in cultural approach not ideological sentiment. What Gus Dur brings and offers to the West is a counter culture of Islam in a soft way. He wants to show Islam as a rational and peaceful religion. Gus Dur wants to counter the West's understanding on Islam as religion of sword. In the eye of the West Islam is assumed as religion which endorses irrationality and primitive. Some American films release the negative assumption on Islam and its society. Literary work written by Naipaul is one of the bias images about Islam in the West. Here, Gus Dur shows that Islam as he understood is Islam which compatible with rationality, democracy, and humanism.

Gus Dur himself acknowledges that the relationship between religion and culture is ambivalent (Wahid, 2001: 79). It means that in one site religion needs transforming. Culture is like "fashion" for religion. Divine message found in religion must be manifested in the form of culture. Mechanism how to transform religious value is cultural value. But in practice it is so simple that is imagined. In one side religious doctrine sometimes fails to anticipate the development of culture. Here, religion (religious interpretation) should be contextual with the development. In other side culture needs religion to give spiritual guidance in order to avoid the emergence of materialistic oriented culture). If religion and culture do not have such kind of understanding the tension between them will emerge. Therefore, to find mid-way to overcome the tension between religion and culture is the solution. Gus Dur (2001: 90) believes that the tension can be overcome by deep reflection and dialogue between religion and culture dialectically.

As a Muslim intellectual Gus Dur internally criticizes Orde Baru's policy on economic based developmentalism (economic growth orientation) which marginalized tradition. The negative impact of this policy makes culture lost its philosophical root under state domination and hegemony (Arif, 2010: 28). Western capitalistic domination to Indonesia's economic development during Orde Baru (New Order) made Indonesia dependent on the West, particularly America. New Order government under Soeharto had inferior position over the West. And, according to Gus Dur,

it was a problem of attitude of leadership for a country like Indonesia which has richness of natural sources. For this context, Gus Dur said that: "Sikap menghamba kepada 'orang luar' tanpa memikirkan kerugian orang banyak adalah sikap yang sangat sempit, yang didasarkan pada ketakutan pada pihak asing itu sendiri." (Wahid, 2006: 211).

Gus Dur tries to mock the West interest through capitalistic investment policy of foreign countries in Indonesia. To realize its goal the West used Soeharto and his New Order to be instrumentalized as an agent of Western capitalism. New Order's inferior feeling over the West, in the eye of Gus Dur, was a bad attitude and narrow minded. New Order only served the Western economic policy for what Gus Dur said as profit maximalization (2006: 212). It was done by New Order as a form of inferiority over Western capitalists' force. It can be said that Gus Dur's position is ambivalence when speaking the West. In one hand, Gus Dur appreciates the West with its democratic tradition. But in the other hand, Gus Dur sharply criticizes Western capitalism ideology under America which is exploitative to developing countries, like Indonesia. It was Gus Dur's position to Soeharto's "developmentalism" project which failed to realize a just and prosperous society as mandated by Pancasila and UUD 1945. Gus Dur rejected "developmentalism" project runned by Soeharto because it was an arm of the West, particularly America. It was factual that during New Order Pancasila economy through Koperasi (Cooperation) initiated by Mohammad Hatta was shut down. Gus Dur who defends Ekonomi Kerakyatan (people economy) through Koperasi was disappointed with Soeharto's policy. Soeharto's policy of "developmentalism" was more beneficial for conglomeration of global capitalism than Indonesian people.

In Indonesia Islamic discourse Carol Kersten categorizes Gus Dur, together with Nurcholis Madjid (Cak Nur), as Indonesian Muslim intellectuals who successfully bridge a gap between traditionalist versus modernist (Kersten, 2018: 38-39). They are able to speak and meet various angles of Islamic thought . Gus Dur eagers to see a muslim reformer who is responsive with modernity without discontinuing with his past time tradition or in Gus Dur's words: "... pencarian yang tak berkesudahan akan sebuah perubahan sosial tanpa memutuskan sama sekali dengan masa lampau. ... (Wahid, 2001: 38). He is able to bridge and unite two elements that seem to be contradiction, that are tradition and modernity.

In line with Kersten, Yudi Latif writes concerning Gus Dur:

"Gus Dur sangat berbeda dengan pendahulunya yang demi mengagungkan tradisi kerap menolak unsur kemodernan, yang pada akhirnya membuat pondok pesantren sedikit terlambat mengantisipasi kemajuan. Gus Dur berani melakukan pengembaraan hingga ufuk terjauh filsafat, pengetahuan, dan peradaban Barat.

Namun, dia sangat berbeda dengan pengembara lain yang cenderung melupakan asalnya sehingga, menurut Harry J Benda, adalah suatu perkecualian kaum intelegensia Indonesia yang mengenyam pendidikan Barat akan menjadi pembela dan juru bicara dari kelas asalnya. Gus Dur diibaratkan kacang yang tak pernah melupakan kulitnya. Sejauh apa pun ia mengembara, ia selalu ingat jalan kembali ke rumah tradisi, dengan menjangkarkan kemodernnan pada akar jati diri dan mensenyawakan universalitas keislaman dengan lokalitas keindonesiaan. .. (Latif in Choirie et.al.: 126).

Latif shows that Gus Dur is cosmopolitant ulama and intellectual, is formed by hybrid elements from Islamic thought and non-Islam, mainly Western modern thought. However, his reading of Western thought opens his cosmopolitant insight and horizon. Abeggebriel (in Wahid, 2007: xiii) , further, tries to point out three aspects of big stream of culture and civilization that influence Gus Dur. The first is pesantren culture which is hierarchical, closed minded, and full of formal ethic. The second is Middle East culture which open minded and hard in character. The third is Western world which is liberal, rational, and secular. These three aspects are passed over by Gus Dur. Gus Dur's effort by choosing hybrid intellectual journey is meant to develop and fresh Islamic law and not to change it. A fresh approach to Islamic law makes it more sensitive to human needs in recent and

future condition and situation without reducing its transcendental values from Allah (Wahid, 2007: 62). In his article, “Perubahan Struktural Tanpa Karl Marx”, Gus Dur seems to be ambivalent. In one side, he criticizes Marx’s materialistic approach. But in other side, Gus Dur appreciates structural approach introduced by Marx to understand social injustice (Wahid, 2016: 191-193). Gus Dur seems to agree with Marx that structural change is more important than cultural change. Gus Dur tries to see social problem philosophically to identifying structure of power which makes social injustice happened in grass root without being a Marxist. Here, Western thought as shown by Marx is borrowed by Gus Dur as methodology.

Gus Dur and the Influence of Western Thought

Gus Dur’s cosmopolitanism firstly starts from his skill in the mastery of some foreign languages making him an access to various Western cultures as Barton chronologically writes:

“... Ketika di Magelang, ia mulai membaca tulisan-tulisan ahli-ahli teori sosial Eropa yang terkemuka, kebanyakan dalam bahasa Indonesia dan bahasa Inggris, walaupun tidak jarang juga dalam bahasa Prancis dan kadang-kadang dalam bahasa Belanda dan Jerman. ... Sebagai seorang remaja, ia mulai mencoba memahami tulisan-tulisan Plato dan Aristoteles, dua orang pemikir penting bagi sarjana-sarjana mengenai Islam zaman pertengahan. ...” (Barton, 2018: 53).

Gus Dur’s mastery of some foreign languages is also a kind of mimicry. By these foreign language Gus Dur seems to be similar with the West. To know the West is to read. It is the dictum of the West because of the West is the superior in science, technology, literature, and arts. The West is the only authority to define knowledge in Western version. The East (the colonized) is positioned as the inferior. Like or dislike the East has to follow global convention that English, French, and Russian should be used as global communication. Gus Dur is in the inferior position, however, he has to master foreign languages to know the global knowledge controlled by the West. There is no discourse which does not involve the West. In short, the West is hegemonic over the East and Islam. In the eye of the West, Islam is assumed by the West as antirationality and antiscience. Islam is considered as religion of decadence. Therefore, Gus Dur tries to mimic the West through imitating its languages.

In the process of imitating the West or mimicry Gus Dur is not totally controlled by the West’s mindset and interest. Gus Dur tries to master foreign languages in order to know Western culture with other interest which is not related to Western interest. Gus Dur just borrows Western identity through its languages to build his own identity as a muslim. Again, in one side, Gus Dur is similar with the West but not quiet, when using foreign languages. In other side, he resists to Western agenda because his main goal is to build his cosmopolitan thought, particularly his Islamic discourse. Here, Gus Dur is the representative of what Bhabha calls similar but not quiet. In Gus Dur can be found modern character and traditional character. Modernity represents the West, meanwhile the tradition represents the East, particularly traditional Islam (NU).

Further, the representative of the West, as the example of Bhabha’s similarity, can be traced in Gus Dur. Gus Dur’s interests were familiar with book, music, and film. Loving book, music, and film is identical with modern man. Modern man is familiar with these products. Besides that, when Gus Dur was in Egypt to study he was inspired by socialism thought as implemented by Gamal Abdul Naser. Socialism thought was not strange for Gus Dur because when he was a teenager Karl Marx’s thought on Socialism in *Das Capital* was one of the book he ever read. In Egypt Gus Dur also broaden his insight by reading the books written by Emile Durkheim, Ortega Y. Gasset, Oswald Spengler, Lenin, Antonio Gramsci, etc. when visiting Cairo library (Malik and Ibrahim, 1998: 83). These are also represent Gus Dur in the fashion of the West. Philosophy or thought needs abstract thinking which is closed to the activity of modern man. Rationality is the tool used in the process of logical thinking.

Gus Dur is a few of Indonesian intellectual who have intellectual tradition. Intellectual tradition is identical with Western tradition. To increase intellectual capacity, reading philosophy books is a

must to deepen his abstraction. In this context, Gus Dur does not only mimic the West by his reading hobby on philosophy but also he mocks the West for his intellectuality. In the eye of the West, Gus Dur shows his capacity as a muslim to think abstractly which is not imagined by the West. Phenomenon of Gus Dur, with his multiple intelligence, is surprising as acknowledged by Greg Barton. In the eye of the West and also mostly Indonesian muslim, what is surprising in Gus Dur is that he reads many secular thoughts from the West but he is able to synthesize them as what Bhabha calls 'the third space'; integration between Western and Islamic thoughts become one single entity as a religious as well as liberal thinker in a broad sense as written by Barton: "Abdurrahman's explanation of what motivates, or at least directs, his liberal humanitarian concern is often repeated but at heart is profoundly simple; Abdurrahman is first and foremost a religious thinker: Islam provides the grand template of his thought and Islam, for him, is fundamentally liberal." (Barton, 1996: 226). For Gus Dur, his liberal thinking becomes the way to breakthrough dogmatism and ideology which imprison a human being to have free thinking. For Gus Dur, the world of thinking is independent from any ideological interest. Here, again Gus Dur learns from the West, particularly liberal humanism which has universal values as also developed by Islam.

Gus Dur's experience of ambivalence in searching identity. In one side, he respects to Western idea of socialism. Here, he mimics to the Western that not found in Indonesia. But in other side, he also does mockery by rejecting what he thinks as the weakness of socialism as well as capitalism because of their materialistic tendency. It can be found in one of Gus Dur's statement:

"... 'Das Kapital' penulis baca bersamaan sejumlah karya agung lainnya, seperti manifesto politik Karl Marx dan Friedrich Engels, bahkan bersama-sama dengan karya-karya Berjrosa Richard dan Adam Smith, dan Luxemburg Dyayef. 'Bacaan gado-gado' itu akhirnya membentuk pandangan penulis tentang ekonomi. Penulis menolak, anggapan sementara orang bahwa kita harus berpandangan sosialistik penuh, atau kapitalistik penuh. Inilah yang membuat mengapa ada yang tidak percaya kepada penulis." (Wahid, 2005: 5).

However, the origin of Gus Dur was firstly started from pesantren world. Pesantren worldview, particularly pesantren derived from NU teaches inclusivity in its fiqh teaching combined with tasawuf (esoteric Islamic aspect). Therefore, how liberal Gus Dur is finally he returned to his root: Islam with its locality in Indonesia. His interest in Ikhwanul Muslimin movement did not convert his moderate even liberal view in understanding Islam. Ikhwanul Muslimin was established in Egypt by Hassan al-Banna. Islamic movements in Egypt and also in Middle East tend to bring more ideological than cultural. Azyumardi Azra points out that the tendency of Islamic root in Middle East is extreme which is different from Islam in Indonesia. Different from Islam in Middle East which ideological Islamic root in Indonesia adapts "local tradition" which is able to experience indigenisation or contextualization with Indonesia local wisdom (Azra, 2010: 45).

Islamic interpretation in Gus Dur's hand, does not only absorb "local tradition" but also global modernity. Islam becomes mondial and contextual in Gus Dur's Islamic discourse. Islam, in Gus Dur's point of view, should learn from other ideologies. Gus Dur believes that Islam is eclectic in its character (Wahid, 1999: 90). Even, in one aspect the influence of Western ideologies in Gus Dur's idea tends to be liberal. It is done by Gus Dur for ideal Indonesia which respect to human equality without discrimination. He believes that liberalism has humanistic spirit needed in building Pancasila democracy. In an article Gus Dur writes:

"Namun, liberalisme tidak hanya menampilkan diri dalam politik serba kontradiktif yang dibawakan oleh demokrasi liberal belaka. Ia juga adalah filsafat hidup yang mementingkan hak-hak dasar manusia atas kehidupan. Ia juga adalah keyakinan akan perlunya secara mutlak ditegakkan kedaulatan hukum. Ia menghendaki perlakuan yang sama atas semua warga negara, tanpa memandang asal-usul etnis, budaya, dan agamanya. Ia bahkan melindungi mereka yang berbeda dari pendapat mayoritas bangsa. Dengan kata lain, liberalisme memiliki nilai-nilai yang mendukung

peradaban yang tinggi. Bahkan secara jujur harus diakui ia menyimpan tujuan-tujuan mulia dan nilai-nilai luhur yang dianut Pancasila juga!

Kita dapat saja menjadi Pancasilais dan sekaligus berpandangan liberal. Kedua pandangan ini tidak harus dipertentangkan, walaupun keduanya menghasilkan budaya politik yang tidak identik. Dengan sendirinya, kesimpulan yang logis adalah bagaimana mendudukan hubungan yang matang antara Pancasila dan paham-paham seperti liberalisme itu. ketidakcocokan dalam satu aspek bukannya berarti pertentangan total antara Pancasila dan paham-paham tersebut. ... Eksklusivisme berbahaya bagi kelanjutan hidup Pancasila itu sendiri, karena akan menjadikan ideologi yang otoriter dan anti demokrasi” (Wahid, 2001: 66-67).

Gus Dur undoubtedly believes that ontologically Islamic principles are perfect but operationally it has to match with contemporary cultural development (Wahid, 1999: 273). Gus Dur explains that:”... Islam mengajukan untuk mencari keunggulan dari orang lain sebagai bagian dari pengembangannya.” (Wahid, 2006: 266). Pancasila democracy is one of the examples of seeking state formation from various ideological models which Islam is one of them. In forming Pancasila, Islam contributes to give religious inspiration without rejecting other constructive ideology of modern democracy. Here, Gus Dur wants to show that Islam is compatible with democracy.

Therefore, Gus Dur insists:

“Di abad modern ini, mau tidak mau Islam harus berinteraksi dengan sederetan fenomena yang secara global disebut “Negara bangsa” (nation state). Tidak mudah bagi kaum muslimin untuk mencernakan keharusan historis untuk berinteraksi itu, dan kesulitan inilah yang sebenarnya melandasi kegaduhan dialog intern dalam Islam dewasa ini.” (Wahid, 1999: 71).

In running Indonesia as a nation state Islam can function as social ethic in public sphere not as a form of state (Wahid, 1999: 75). By social ethic means Islam can guide the social order under respect to human dignity and equality without differentiating the religion, ethnic and social status. For Gus Dur when government is able to create justice, democracy, and equality the government substantially creates Islamic society (Wahid, 2010: 70). It can be transformed in plural society if Islamic identity is not seen monolithically and exclusively as Gus Dur writes:

“..., kecenderungan monolitik untuk menegaskan kembali nilai-nilai Islam hanya akan mengalienasi gerakan-gerakan ini dari jaringan koalisi nasional warga Negara yang lebih luas. Bila terisolasi dari koalisi-koalisi itu, gerakan Islam akan tampak menciptakan perasaan tak diikutkan (sense of exclusion), sehingga melahirkan sektarianisme factual, bila bukan separatisme palsu. Tantangan pada saat ini adalah menemukan identitas yang bisa membangun rasa memiliki pada Islam dan juga memelihara rasa memiliki itu pada jaringan kelompok yang lebih besar dan luas yang dimotivasi oleh ideologi-ideologi dunia, keimanan-keimanan yang lain, dan keprihatinan global” (Wahid, 2010: 95-96).

Besides the factors mentioned above, Gus Dur (2006: 302) states that psychological factor also influences muslim communities because of long colonialism and imperialism. Internal vested interests of some muslim communities also weaken muslim human resource quality. Gus Dur criticizes some Indonesian Muslims whom tend to focus on mere rites and physical development neglecting social morality. Gus Dur insists Muslim community to close Islam in social involvement. For this purpose, muslim society should be awakened from their irrational elements of traditionalism to rational values. Gus Dur agrees that, however, religion should be rational in its character (Wahid, 2007: 15). Therefore, the revitalization of religious traditionalism has to be done by nurturing rational elements in it. For enhancement of his rationality Gus Dur, no doubt, is ready to learn from Western thoughts. In the words of Barton Gus Dur is an Indonesian muslim intellectual who can: “... mengkombinasikan sintesis yang canggih dari apa yang terbaik di dalam nilai-nilai modernitas dan komitmen terhadap rasionalitas dan keulamaan maupun kebudayaan tradisional. ...” (Barton in Fealy and Barton (Eds.), 2010: 241). In one of his articles Gus Dur criticizes artificial solidarity and tendency to spread phobia toward the West in dakwah done by some

muslim group by spreading: "... ketakutan pada serangan kebudayaan modern dan sejumlah bahaya lain yang dianggap akan menghancurkan keyakinan agama" (Wahid, 2016: 29). Such attitude gives negative image of Islam in international world. According to Gus Dur muslim should have open minded thinking by maximizing their rationality.

"Karena itu, sejak dahulu penulis menolak penggunaan terorisme untuk "mempertahankan Islam". Tindakan seperti itu justru merendahkan Islam di mata budaya-budaya lain, termasuk budaya modern di Barat yang telah membawakan keunggulan organisasi, pengetahuan, dan teknologi. Islam hanya dapat "mengejar ketertinggalan" itu, jika ia menggunakan rasionalitas dan sikap ilmiah. Memang, rasionalitas Islam sangat jauh berbeda dari rasionalitas lain, karena kuatnya unsur identitas Islam itu. Rasionalitas Islam yang harus dibuktikan dalam kehidupan bersama tersebut, berintikan penggunaan unsur-unsur manusiawi, dengan segala pertimbangannya ditunjukkan kepada "sumber-sumber tertutup" (adillah naqliyyah) dari Allah, seperti ungkapan-ungkapan resmi Tuhan dalam al-Qur'an dan ucapan Nabi (al-Hadits). Karena itu, pengenalan tersebut tidak memerlukan tindak keekrasan apa pun, yang hanya akan membuktikan "kelemahan" Islam saja. Karena itulah, kita harus memiliki sikap jelas mengutuk terorisme, siapa pun yang melakukannya. Apalagi kalau hal itudilakukan oleh mereka yang tidak mengerti perkembangan Islam yang sebenarnya." (Wahid, 2006: 307).

But, when debating with Huntington, Gus Dur (2006: 338-339) criticizes Huntington's over generalization of Islamic threat over the West as written in his book, *The Clash of Civilization*. Gus Dur gives an rational argument to Huntington that many young muslims come to Europe and America to study in any discipline, including Islamic studies. It is a new spirit of young muslim intellectuals to be good muslims in moderate thinking. So, certain small case which involves some radical muslims in terrorism actions cannot be judged that Islam is religion of violence. Here, Gus Dur tries to resist to hegemony of Western interpretation as represented by Huntington. Gus Dur mocks the West because it cannot give an objective argumentation but over generalization over Islam.

Internally Gus Dur also sharply criticizes the emergence of orthodoxy in Islam. The colour of dogmatic and escapic religiosity as mentioned by Gus Dur above is difficult to accept some values considered as outside of Islam. But Gus Dur hopes that mindset or the way of thinking of some muslim thinkers would change someday. Today progressive Islamic discourse initiated by Gus Dur becomes true by the emergence of progressive young muslim thinkers particularly found in Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) and Muhammadiyah. The progressive young muslim thinkers who, in Gus Dur's words,:

"... tidak akan ketakutan pada ideologi-ideologi yang bersumber pada filsafat besar-besar (seperti Marxisme yang berlandaskan dialektis yang bercorak materialistis-deterministis). Siapa tahu eksistensialisme, lawan bebuyutan legal-formalisme dalam berpikir, suatu ketika akan dapat diserap juga oleh pemikiran keagamaan Islam" (Wahid, 2016: 53-54).

In postcolonial era today Indonesia actually has great chance and opportunity to learn form other nations all over the world. Islam, in Gus Dur's view, should adopt professional approach as developed in Western countries. All ideas and values that Gus Dur learns, then he filters what ideas and values relevant for postcolonial Indonesia. Gus Dur can integrates any idea and value to make him a hybrid intellectual ulama. Gus Dur's pluralistic and multicommunal character in understanding Islam seems to be progressive even liberal in responding modernity as Greg Barton writes (Fealy and Barton (Eds.), 2010: 241). Gus Dur's ideas to relate Islam to Marxism and existentialism are a brave initiative and controversial for majority of muslim in Indonesia. Here, Gus Dur is not afraid of borrowing Western philosophy, like Marxism and existentialism. He believes that by dialoguing these thoughts with Islam, moslem intellectuals can get a new horizon to approach Islam philosophically. Gus Dur aknowleges that mostly muslim world, like Indonesis is weak in philosophical tradition. Now days, philosophical tradition is identical with the West. And philosophy is considered by majority of Indonesian muslim as something secular and atheistic. This

stigma emerges because of dogmatism and orthodoxy of Islam in muslim world as mentioned by Edward Said.

He sharply rejects any effort to bring Islam exclusively as found in the birth of ICMI (Indonesia Muslim Intellectuals Association) (Wahid, 1999: 272-279). For Gus Dur ICMI makes Islam setback and parochial. Islam which reduced by ICMI can loss its relevance to answer human future problems. Sectarian tendency of ICMI makes Gus Dur rejects to join the institution. He claims that ICMI reduces Islam as religion of humanity as he promotes. Gus Dur only endorses Islam which is not restricted by primordial institution as he writes: "... Islam yang saya impikan, nggak bisa disekat-sekat dengan lembaga" (Mufid AR, 2005: 93). Gus Dur seems to position as the defender of cultural Islam rather than structural Islam. His idea about Pribumisasi Islam (Wahid, 2001: 117-136) is one of the examples of cultural Islam. Pribumisasi Islam is Gus Dur's Islamic discourse to counter massive tendency of Arab Islam in Indonesia today.

Various activities done by Gus Dur also shows his confidence to dialogue with the West. He confidently introduces Islam in international level with different fashion, that is rational Islam which can be accepted by all religious believers. Gus Dur was accepted by other religious believers when he were President of World Council for Religion and Peace (WCRP), member of Simon Perez Institute, and also Advisor of International Dialogue Foundation on Perspective Studies of Syariah and Secular Law in Den Haag. These humanistic activities brought him to get Magsaysay Award in Philipines (Al-Brebesy in Wahid, 1999: 36). In Gus Dur can be found a religious -humanist figure that equality among human beings is a must (Ridwan, 2019: 52). In Islamic context, Barton categorizes Gus Dur as a prominent Indonesian Muslim intellectual who initiates three important elements of *Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam* which are: "... his positive response to the challenge of modernity, his commitment to pluralism and his passion for humanitarian." (Barton, 1995). Even, liberal humanitarianism becomes dominant theme in Gus Dur's writings on Islam and contemporary problems (Fealy and Barton (Eds.), 2010: 281-282). Gus Dur's futuristic thought seems to be more prominent when he tries to relate Islam to contemporary problems.

In his other writing Barton comes into conclusion that: "..., pemikiran Abdurrahman merepresentasikan sintesis cerdas pemikiran Islam tradisional, elemen modernism Islam, dan kesarjanaan Barat modern, yang berusaha menghadapi tantangan modernitas baik dengan kejujuran intelektual yang kuat maupun dengan keimanan yang mendalam terhadap kebenaran utama Islam." (Barton in Suaedy and Abdalla (Eds.), 2000: 90). With the combination of cultural and intellectual capacity Gus Dur becomes different from other NU prominent figures. Djohan Effendy (2010: 120) points out that Gus Dur successfully combines Islamic knowledge tradition and modern ideologies. These strengths are supported by his authority as a leader of NU. It also gives positive impact structurally because Gus Dur opens intellectual freedom, generally for Indonesian muslims and particularly for young NU intellectuals to express and respond socio-political issues without repression.

Finally, a historical argument can be given here that Gus Dur is a cosmopolitan muslim intellectual who successfully synthesizes all elements considered by many people contradictory. He is able to filter an element from the West which is relevant to take. At the other hand, he also critically rejects the Western element which is contradictory with the spirit of Islam. This must be done by Gus Dur because he has futuristic goal that Islam should be relevant with the space and time; that is contemporary era. For this valuable task Gus Dur tries to eclectically combine any element from the West considered valuable to develop Islamic discourse.

Implication for Dialogue between Islam and the West

Hybrid identity found in Gus Dur's Islamic discourse gives argumentation about the necessity of accepting a new value needed from outside of Islam to revise or complete Islamic discourse. At the same time, Islamic discourse is in the making process. It means that Islamic discourse, as the realm of thought, is not sterile from weaknesses. Therefore, some values which are old fashioned

should be thrown away. Old fashioned thinking in interpreting Islam should be fresh and dynamic as Iqbal said that there is no finality in philosophical thinking. Therefore, on going dialogue between Islam and the West is urgent in this global era.

History shows that there is no any value system can sustain without knowing and understanding other values. Therefore, borrowing and giving are a necessity. In this context, Islam, which is majority embraced by people in developing countries still live under undemocratic cultural politic and underestimate to human freedom. Indonesia, which is still in the phase of procedural democracy, needs to learn from other developed countries who experience substantial democracy. It does not mean that this borrowing is a kind of Westernization because in Islam spirit of “musyawarah” is an inspiration. The next task is how to transform “musyawarah” in the context of modern system when muslim people live. Here, Western tradition of democracy is more established than in muslim countries. Gus Dur claims that respect to plurality of thinking is more appreciated in the West as one of prerequisites in building democracy.

Gus Dur ‘s effort to struggle democracy in Indonesian muslim society is a breakthrough in order to dialogue democracy and islam. Western experience in democracy, particularly in America inspired Gus Dur to borrow some elements of modern democracy which are relevant with Islam and Pancasila. Finally, Gus Dur believes that Islam is compatible with democracy. The flexibility of Islamic teaching in absorbing any elements shows that Islam can dialogue with other ideologies, including modern democracy.

Other muslim intellectuals who borrow Western concepts Nurcholis Madjid (Cak Nur) by his ideas of secularization and “Islam Yes, Partai Islam No.” Kuntowijoyo’s prophetic ethics also, in certain aspects, borrows from Western concept. It can be found in Kuntowijoyo’s three elements in prophetic ethics: humanization, liberation, and transcendence. Further, international muslim thinker like Hasan Hanafi, with his “Islamic Left”, borrows Marxist approach to criticize social injustice in Islamic world. Mohammed Arkoun’s “Deconstruction of Tradition”, also cannot be produced without inspiration from, a postmodernist philosopher, Jacques Derrida with his deconstruction theory. But, the process of borrowing from the West should be done carefully. The borrowing process should be based on rationality that all perspectives from any source are not absolute. If Islamic thought and methodology are mature enough in muslim world it will be used to equally judge and criticize the strengths and the weaknesses of Western methodology. It is in the hope that Islamic thought and methodology can be used as an alternative social science (Alatas, 2010: 216). Further more, the captive mind of muslim world to the dependence of Western thought can be avoided.

Thereby, the relevance of Gus Dur’s Islamic discourse is very clear. By his hybrid idea, Gus Dur invites us to realize that the process of borrowing and throwing out in forming better Islamic discourse is something natural and necessary. A Muhammadiyah intellectual, M. Syafi’i Anwar, in his introductory words of Gus Dur’s book, considers Gus Dur as a figure who succeeds in bringing NU to be wellknown and cosmopolitan insight through: “... menembus dan membebaskan batas-batas orientasi, visi, dan wawasan tradisionalisme NU untuk masuk ke wacana modern, liberal, dan cosmopolitan sambil tetap menjaga kelestarian tradisi klasik Islam. ...”(Anwar in Wahid, 2006: xiii). Here, Gus Dur substantially contributes his thought in colouring Islamic discourse, particularly in NU and generally in Indonesia.

The opinion mentioned above can be traced that to be a muslim with cosmopolitan insight as found in Gus Dur is a long process. Gus Dur is formed by his education, his various readings and experience. By this he becomes a cosmopolitan muslim intellectual who is able to filter which element is taken and which one is thrown away eclectically without inferiority toward the West. Therefore, muslim intellectuals should enthusiastically borrow something beneficial eventhough it is derived from outside of Islamic tradition. Then, muslim intellectuals also should be humble to accept a novelty for Islamic advancement. At the same time, muslim intellectuals should be brave to throw away any tradition which obstructs the advancement of Islamic civilization. Finally, one

important thing is that Islamic discourse is in the realm of thought. The Islamic thought itself is based on human interpretation who is potentially subjective and limited. To be dynamic it needs criticizing, and even if needed it should be deconstructed. By dialoguing and contesting with other ideologies Islamic discourse can be matured. In forming a better Islamic discourse the process of borrowing and throwing out should be done even more in the globalization era. Dialogue between Islam and the West is an effort to create a new global order without conflict.

CONCLUSION

Gus Dur's Islamic discourse is formed from various elements derived from internal as well as external aspects. From the internal he learns various Islamic thought from traditionalism of NU, fundamentalism of Ikhwanul Muslimin, socialism of Gamal Abdel Nasser and Hassan Hanafi to Islamic postmodernism of Mohammed Arkoun and Mohammed Abed al-Jabiri. From the external elements, he learns Greek philosophy, modern Western philosophy, and contemporary philosophy, to mention some of them. All elements inspire Gus Dur to build his hybrid Islamic discourse.

In the process of building his thought, Gus Dur undoubtedly borrows Western thought and ideology as methodology to explain contemporary problems of Islamic community. Gus Dur believes that Islamic community lives in modern era that needs a new and fresh approach. The complexity of modern life cannot be solved by isolating muslim community with dogmatic view in understanding Islam. Islam should speak about democracy, humanism, and liberalism. Islam should be compatible with global issues. By this Islam participates with other religion and belief to create peaceful world nationally as well as internationally without releasing its fundamental identity. Gus Dur's borrowing act over the West does not make him westernized. This ambivalent condition experienced by Gus Dur has to pass over a mimicry as well as mockery in the process of borrowing the West. It must be done by Gus Dur to reach "the third space" which is not purely the West and not purely the East. "The third space" reached by Gus Dur is what Barton categorizes as a "liberal" Islam thinker.

In this postcolonial era, Gus Dur is the representative of a muslim intellectual who brings Islam in moderate and even liberal sense. He confidently believes Islam is compatible with democracy. Islam and democracy have the same goal: respecting to equality and humanity. By borrowing Western terms and methodology are not meant that Gus Dur feels inferior to the West. He should borrow the Western discourse to introduce Islamic discourse in light of modern terms. What struggled by Gus Dur is relevant with Habermas' suggestion to religion communities to use the terms which are understandable by non-religion communities in public sphere. Exclusive theological doctrine of religion should be interpreted by modern terms with ethical spirit to live together with plural ideologies.

REFERENCES

- Abegebriel, Agus Maftuh (2007), "Mazhab Islam Kosmopolitan Gus Dur", in Abdurrahman Wahid, *Islam Kosmopolitan: Nilai-Nilai Indonesia & Transformasi Kebudayaan*, Jakarta: The Wahid Institute, pp. v-xxxiii.
- Abshar-Abdalla, Ulil (2000), "Pada Mulanya Gus Dur adalah Seorang Santri", in Wahid, Abdurrahman *Melawan Melalui Lelucon: Kumpulan Kolom Abdurrahman Wahid di Tempo*, (Jakarta: Pusat Data dan Analisa Tempo), pp. xviii-xxi.
- Al-Brebesy, Ma'mun Murod (1999), "Biografi Abdurrahman Wahid", in Abdurrahman Wahid, *Mengurai Hubungan Agama dan Negara*, Grasindo: Jakarta, pp. 17-41.
- Ali, As'at Said (2005), "bukan?-nya Seorang Gus Dur", in Wahid, Abdurrahman (2005), *Gus Dur Bertutur: Esai-Esai Abdurrahman Wahid dalam Harian Proaksi, Harian Proaksi dan Gus Dur Foundation*: Jakarta, pp. Xiii-xxv.

- Anwar, M. Syafi'i (2006), "Islamku, Islam Anda, Islam Kita: Membingkai Potret Pemikiran Politik KH Abdurrahman Wahid", in Abdurrahman Wahid, Islamku, Islam Anda, Islam Kita: Agama, Masyarakat, Negara, Demokrasi, Jakarta: The Wahid Institute, pp. xi-xxxiv.
- Arif, Syaiful (2010), Refilosofi Kebudayaan: Pergeseran Pascastruktural, Jogjakarta: Ar.Ruzz Media.
- Ashcroft, Bill et. al (1998), Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies, London and New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, Bill, et.al (2003), Menelanjangi Kuasa Bahasa: Teori dan Praktik Sastra Postkolonial, Yogyakarta: Qalam.
- Azra, Azyumardi (2002), Menggapai Solodaritas: Tensi antara Demokrasi, Fundamentalisme, dan Humanisme, Jakarta: Pustaka Panjimas.
- Barton, Greg. (1995). Neo-Modernism: A Vital Synthesis of Traditionalist and Modernist Islamic Thought in Indonesia. In *Studia Islamica* (Vol. 2, No. 3).
- Barton, Greg.(1998). The Liberal, rogressive Roots of Abdurrahman Wahid's Thought. In Greg Barton and Greg Fealy (Eds.). *Nahdlatul Ulama, Traditional Islam and Modernity in Indonesia*, Australia: Monash Asia Institute, p. 226.
- Barton, Greg.(2000). Abdurrahman Wahid dan Toleransi Keberagamaan. In Ahmad Suaedy and Ulil Abshar Abdalla (Eds.). *Gila Gus Dur: Wacana Membaca Abdurrahman Wahid*, Yogyakarta: LKiS, pp. 84-120.
- Alatas, Syed Farid. (1996). Diskursus Alternatif dalam Ilmu Sosial Asia: Tanggapan terhadap Eurosentrisme. Transl. Ali Nur Zaman. Bandung: Mizan.
- Barker, Chris. (2014). Kamus Kajian Budaya. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Barton, Greg.(2003). Biografi Gus Dur The Authorized Biography of Abdurrahman Wahid. Trans. Lie Hua, Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Barton, Greg. (2010). Liberalisme: Dasar-Dasar Progresivitas Pemikiran Abdurrahman Wahid. In Greg Fealy and Greg Barton (Eds.). *Tradisionalisme Radikal: Persinggungan Nahdlatul Ulama – Negara*. Yogyakarta: LKiS, pp. 241-282.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Binder, Leonard. (1988). *Islamic Liberalism*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London.
- Blecher, Josef. (2003). *Hermeneutika Kontemporer*. Transl. Ahmad Norma Permata. Yogyakarta: Fajar Pustaka.
- Childs, Peter and Williams, R.J. (1997). *An Introduction to Postcolonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Choirie, A. Effendy et.al. (2010). *Sejuta Gelar untuk Gus Dur*. Pensil-324: Jakarta.
- Dhofier, Zamakhsyari. (1982). *Tradisi Pesantren: Studi atas Pandangan Hidup Kiai*. LP3ES: Jakarta.
- Effendy, Djohan. (2010). *Pembaruan Tanpa Membongkar Tradisi: Wacana Kegamaan di Kalangan Muda NU Masa Kepemimpinan Gus Dur*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Esposito, John L. (1996). *Ancaman Islam: Mitos atau Realitas?*. Trans. Alwiyyah Abdurrahman and MISSI. Bandung: Mizan.
- Esposito, John L. (2002). *Unholy War: Terror in the name of Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Esposito, John L. (2010). *Islam the Straight Path: Ragam Ekspresi Menuju "Jalan Lurus"*. Transl. Arif Muftuhin. Jakarta: Paramadina and Dian Rakyat.
- Gea, Libertus Syukur Iman et.al. (2022, August). Pemikiran Gus Dur tentang Nasionalisme dan Multikulturalisme serta Pengaruhnya terhadap Kehidupan Sosial-Politik Indonesia. In *Tjantrik Jurnal Sejarah dan Pendidikan Sejarah* (Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 57-69).
- Hardiman, F. Budi. (2015). *Seni Memahami: Hermeneutik dari Schleiermacher sapaai Derrida*. Kanisius: Yogyakarta.

- Hidayat, Komaruddin. (2007). Ideologisasi Agama. In Kholid O. Santosa (Ed.). *Islam Menjadi Kuda Tunggalan*. Bandung: Segarsy, pp. 155-163.
- Hourani, Albert. (1998). *Islam dalam Pandangan Eropa*. Transl. Imam Baihaqi and Ahmad Baidlowi. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Kersten, Carool. (2018). *Berebut Wacana: Pergulatan Wacana Umat Islam Indonesia Era Reformasi*. Trans. M. Irsyad Rafsadie. Mizan: Bandung.
- Kuntowijoyo. (1991). *Paradigma Islam: Interpretasi untuk Aksi*. Mizan: Bandung.
- Kuntowijoyo. (1997). *Identitas Politik Umat Islam*. Mizan: Bandung.
- Kuntowijoyo. (2018). *Muslim Tanpa Masjid: Mencari Metode Aplikasi Nilai-Nilai al-Qur'an pada Masa Kini*. IRCiSoD: Yogyakarta.
- Latif, Yudi dan Ibrahim, Idi Subandy (Eds.). (1996). *Bahasa dan Kekuasaan: Politik Wacana di Panggung Orde Baru*. Mizan: Bandung.
- Latif, Yudi. (1994). Kekerasan Spiritual dalam Masyarakat Pasca-modern. In *Ulumul Qur'an*, No. 3, Vol. v.
- Latif, Yudi. (2010). Dengan Mati, Gus Dur Abadi. In A. Effendy Choirie et.al. (2010), *Sejuta Gelar untuk Gus Dur, Pensil-324: Jakarta*, pp. 125-128.
- Maarif, Ahmad Syafi'i and Nadjib, Muhammad. (2000). Upaya Memahami Sosok Kontroversial Gus Dur. In Ahmad Suaedy and Ulil Abshar Abdalla (Eds.). *Gila Gus Dur: Wacana Membaca Abdurrahman Wahid*, Yogyakarta: LKiS, pp. 1-11.
- Malik, Dedy Djamaluddin and Ibrahim, Idi Subandy. (1998). *Zaman Baru Islam Indonesia: Pemikiran dan Aksi Politik Abdurrahman Wahid, M. Amien Rais, Nusrcholis Madjid, dan Jalaluddin Rakhmat*. Zaman Waca Mulia: Bandung.
- Marijan, Kacung. (1999). Gus Dur dan Kontemplasi Teoretisnya. In Abdurrahman Wahid. *Mengurai Hubungan Agama dan Negara*. Jakarta: Grasindo, pp. 3-13.
- Mufid AR, Achmad. (2005). *Ada Apa dengan Gus Dur*. Yogyakarta: Kutub.
- Parry, Benita. (2004). *Postcolonial Studies: A Materialist Critique*. London: Routledge.
- Ramage, Douglas E. (2010). Demokrasi, Toleransi Agama, dan Pancasila: Pemikiran Politik Abdurrahman Wahid. In Greg Fealy and Greg Barton (Eds.). *Tradisionalisme Radikal: Persinggungan Nahdlatul Ulama – Negara*. Yogyakarta: LKiS, pp. 283-318.
- Ratna, Nyoman Kutha. (2008). *Postkolonialisme Indonesia: Relevansi Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ricouer, Paul. (1982). *Hermeneutics and The Human Science Essays on Language, Action, and Interpretation*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ridwan, Nur Kholik. (2019). *Ajaran-Ajaran Gus Dur: Syarah 9 Nilai Utama Gus Dur*. Noktah: Yogyakarta.
- Rohman, Yani Fathur. (2020, July-December). Memaknai Kembali Pemikiran Gus Dur: Studi pada Komunitas Gusdurian Sunter Jakarta. In *Sangkep Jurnal Kajian Sosial Keagamaan* (Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 169-184).
- Said, Edward W. (1981). *Covering Islam: How Media and Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Antheon Books.
- Said, Edward W. (2010). *Orientalisme: Menggugat Hegemoni Barat dan Mendudukkan Timur sebagai Subjek*, Transl. Achmad Fawaid. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sobary, Mohammad. (1998). Kata Pengantar: Para Tokoh dan Problem Kepemimpinan Umat. In Malik, Dedy Djamaluddin and Idi Subandy Ibrahim, *Zaman Baru Islam Indonesia: Pemikiran dan Aksi Politik Abdurrahman Wahid, M. Amien Rais, Nusrcholis Madjid, dan Jalaluddin Rakhmat*. Bandung: Zaman Waca Mulia, pp. 13-20.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (1983). *Muslim di Tengah Pergumulan*. Jakarta: Leppenas.

- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (1985). Agama dan Demokrasi adalah Satu. In Komunikasi Ekaprasetia Pancakarsa (Vol. 4, No. 40).
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (1992). Islam, Politics and Democracy Indonesia in the 1950s and 1990s. A paper presented in Conference "Indonesian Democracy 1950s and 1990s. Melbourne, Australia: CSEAS. Monash University.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (1991, March). Intelektual di Tengah Eksklusivisme. In Prisma (Vol. 3, pp. 69-72).
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (1997). Hassan Hanafi dan Eksperimentasinya. In Kazuo Shimogaki. Kiri Islam Antara Modernisme dan Postmodernisme: Telaah Kritis Pemikiran Hassan Hanafi. Trans. M. Imam Aziz and M. Jadul Maula. LKiS: Yogyakarta, pp. xi-xix.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (1999). Mengurai Hubungan Agama dan Negara. Grasindo: Jakarta.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2000). Melawan Melalui Lelucon: Kumpulan Kolom Abdurrahman Wahid di Tempo. Jakarta: Pusat Data dan Analisa Tempo.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2001). Pergulatan Negara, Agama, dan Kebudayaan. Depok: Desantara.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2005). Gus Dur Bertutur: Esai-Esai Abdurrahman Wahid dalam Harian Proaksi. Jakarta: Harian Proaksi dan Gus Dur Foundation.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2006). Islamku, Islam Anda, Islam Kita: Agama, Masyarakat, Negara, Demokrasi. Jakarta: The Wahid Institute.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman (2007), Islam Kosmopolitan: Nilai-Nilai Indonesia & Transformasi Kebudayaan, Jakarta: The Wahid Institute.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2007). Gus Dur Menjawab Kegelisahan Rakyat. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2010). Tabayun Gus Dur: Pribumisasi Islam, Hak Minoritas, Reformasi Kultural. Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman et.al. (2010). Islam Tanpa Kekerasan. Yogyakarta: LKiS.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman (2010). Pengantar. In Greg Fealy and Greg Barton (Eds.). Tradisionalisme Radikal: Persinggungan Nahdlatul Ulama – Negara. Yogyakarta: LKiS, pp. ix-xiv.
- Wahid, Abdurrahman. (2016). Tuhan Tidak Perlu Dibela. Yogyakarta: Saufa.
- Zainuri, Ahmad and Al-Hakim, Luqman. (2021, December). Pemikiran Gus Dur dalam Kehidupan Pluralitas Masyarakat Indonesia. In Islamika Inside Jurnal Keislaman dan Humaniora (Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 167-197).