



Coping with Fundamentalism in a Tolerant Country

Suryo Ediyono; Muhammad Farkhan Mujahidin; Triyanti Nurul Hidayati ¹

¹ Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

Tolerance between religious communities is one way that religious freedom can be protected properly. Freedom and tolerance are the two inseparable things. However, what often happens is the emphasis of one of them, i.e., emphasize on freedom that ignores tolerance and attempts to reconcile by imposing tolerance through limiting freedom. To be able to compare the two, a correct understanding of religious freedom and tolerance between religious communities is important in everyday life in society. This is a quantitative research that aims to empirically examine the influence of variables of religious fundamentalism and simultaneous self-control of religious tolerance. This research is expected to provide accurate information about the influence of religious fundamentalism and simultaneous self-control of tolerance for religious people by Muslims, for the right intervention this can be undertaken to increase tolerance.

Keywords: Fundamentalism; Islam; Tolerance; Religious Freedom

Introduction

Islam as a major religion in the world, cannot be separated from political, social and economic and cultural influences which often affect its existence in the midst of society. Besides that, the understanding of different religions among its adherents also raises various kinds of differences in flow, ideology and movement which characterize its development, one of which is the fundamentalism movement which is now being talked about again, both at the level of ordinary people, politicians are often the topic of conversation at the level of countries in the world. Fundamentalism comes from the Latin fundamentum which means basic or joint. The term is used to refer to people who believe in fundamental things in religion. In accordance with this understanding, every Muslim is fundamentalist because of believing in things that are the basis or the foundation of Islam. Islamic fundamentalism is an ideology that seeks to reestablish Islam as a political system in the modern world. Islam becomes a total organic system that competes within the reach of ideologies and systems of other countries. By creating new terms and reinterpreting conventional concepts, Islamic fundamentalism creates a new paradigm consisting of theoretical and empirical elements.

The term fundamentalism is a reference to the militant conservative movement in Christianity that emerged and surfaced in the United States in the 1920s. This movement emphasizes the truth of the

Bible and rejects any findings of modern science because they are considered contrary to Christian teachings. In fact, modern science has actually brought Western society to progress. Because of that, their presence was an opposition from the Orthodox Church to modern scientific advances that were accused of damaging the fundamental foundations of Christianity. Considering its conservative character who clings to the orthodoxy of Christianity, fundamentalism is often confronted with modernism, a school that prioritizes every new one as a consequence of the development of modern science.

The term Islamic fundamentalism began to emerge after the Iranian Islamic revolution in 1979. This term began to be applied by orientalist and social scientists to study the social and political movements that emerged in Islam with the assumption that various factors of social and political movements had characteristic characteristics with symptoms of fundamentalism in the Western world. They use the term to generalize various social, political and religious movements in line with the emergence of waves called Islamic revivalism. In relation to Islam, the term fundamentalism is often used unbalancedly and is not neutral, even tends to have an established labeling and mentioning meaning of the phenomenon of movements in social, political and religious life. From several studies conducted by experts, the term tends to have a negative meaning to give a bad picture and corner the groups that are assumed to be fundamentalist movements. The negative labeling illustrates that Islamic fundamentalism as a superficial, superficial, anti-intellectual person whose thoughts are not rooted in the Koran and classical Islamic traditions, the source of chaos and mental illness which results in worse outcomes than social problems that have been there are, like liquor and drugs.

In certain cases, the stigmatization of Islamic fundamentalism towards movements that arise in Islamic societies may have a point because it departs from empirical facts that show the color of movements that tend to be puritanical, radical and extreme. But the cynicism of Islamic fundamentalism is used firmly and unchanging to generalize all the phenomena of social, political and religious movements in Islam which is clearly a false symptom. The term Islamic fundamentalism is sometimes overlapping with the term radicalism and revivalism or it can also be called a social, political and religious movement in Islam. The term Islamic fundamentalist suggests Christian presuppositions and Western stereotypes that imply monolithic threats which have never been existed in the empirical reality of Islamic societies. Nonetheless, the term Islamic fundamentalism is still used as a social, political and religious movement that has strong and fanatical ideological beliefs that they always strive to replace the order of values and systems that themselves take place. Efforts to fight for ideology is often undertaken through radical, militant and extreme actions, and even do not rule out the possibility of rude behavior against other groups that are contrary to their understanding.

First, fundamentalists take a radical stand against resistance which is seen as threatening the existence of religion. Second, they reject hermeneutics or a critical attitude towards the text and its interpretation. The text of the scriptures must be understood in literacy as they are because reason is seen as incapable of giving proper interpretation. Third, rejection of the development of history and sociology. Fundamentalists have the view that historical and sociological developments have brought people further away from the literal doctrine of the scriptures.

Discussion

Fundamentalism Movement

Fundamentalism is a global fact and appears in all beliefs in response to the problems of modernization. There is fundamentalist Judaism, fundamentalist Christianity, Hindu fundamentalists, fundamentalist Sikhs, and even fundamentalist Confusion (Armstrong, 2002, p.193). Karen Armstrong gave his view that the fundamentalist movement did not just appear as a spontaneous response to the

coming of modernization which was considered too far out. All religious people try to reform their traditions and integrate them with modern culture, as do Muslim reformers. When moderate methods are considered unhelpful, some people use more extreme methods, and that's when the fundamentalist movement is born (*ibid*).

The West often controls public opinion that one of the most contradictory religious models known as 'fundamentalism' is only in the Islamic phenomenon. Speaking of the term fundamentalism, many scholars recognize that the use of the term 'fundamentalism' is problematic and inappropriate. This term, as William Montgomery Watt noted, is basically an ancient English term for Protestants which is specifically applied to people who hold the view that the Bible must be accepted and interpreted literally. The closest equivalent term in French is integrism, which refers to the same tendency but not in the sense of the same tendency among Roman Catholics. Sunni fundamentalists accept the Qur'an literally, even in some cases with certain conditions, but they also have different sides. The Iranian Shiites, who in a general sense are fundamentalists, are not bound to the literal interpretation of the Qur'an. Watt defines that Islamic fundamentalist groups are a group of Muslims who fully accept the traditional worldview and wish to maintain it in its entirety (Watt, 1997, p. 3-4).

James Barr in his book *Fundamentalism* criticizes the definition that says that fundamentalists are groups that interpret scriptures literally. According to him the definition is far from right. He put forward the characteristics of (Christian) fundamentalism as follows: a very strong emphasis on Bible inerrancy that the Bible does not contain any form of error; Deep hatred of modern theology and the methods, results and consequences of the study of modern criticism of the Bible; A guarantee of certainty that those who do not share in their religious views are not 'true Christians' (Barr, 1991, p.1).

Fazlur Rahman does not seem to like the term fundamentalism; he prefers to use the term revivalism. As in his book *Revival and Reform in Islam*, Rahman, who is classified as a neo-modernist thinker, further argued that the movement of pre-modern social reforms revived the meaning and importance of al-Qur'an norms at all times. They are a pre-modern group of "fundamentalist-traditionalist-conservatives" who rebel against the interpretation of al-Qur'an which is driven by religious tradition, as an opposition to interpretation which is based on the hermeneutics of the Qur'an between texts (inter-textual). According to Rahman, in his vocabulary list, true 'fundamentalists' are people who are committed to reconstruction or rethinking projects (Rahman 2000, p. 14). Fazlur Rahman uses the term orthodoxy revival for the emergence of Islamic fundamentalism movements. This orthodoxy has risen in the face of the destruction of religion and the imbalance and moral degeneration that is evenly distributed in Muslim societies throughout the provinces of the Ottoman Empire and in India. He pointed to the Wahabi movement which is a revival of orthodoxy as a movement that is often labeled as fundamentalism (Rahman, 1997, p.286).

According to Richard Nixon, former President of America, fundamentalists (Islam) are; they are driven by their great hatred towards the West, those who insist on restoring past Islamic civilization by arousing the past, those who aim to apply Islamic law, those who campaign that Islam is religion and state, and even though they see the past, but they make the past a guide for the future. They are not conservatives but are revolutionaries (Imarah, 1999, p.21). Muhammad Imarah uses the word *ushuliyah* for fundamentalism as in his book *Al-Ushuliyah Bain al-Gharbi wa al-Islam*. Muhammad Imarah found a clear difference between the understanding and understanding of the term 'fundamentalism' as known by Western Christians, through understanding this term in the legacy of Islamic thought, as well as in the past, modern, and contemporary Islamic schools of thought (Bellah, 2000, p.35).

Figures who are generally classed as modernists and neo-modernists use the term fundamentalism nuanced with cynicism. Fazlur Rahman, for example, calls fundamentalists 'superficial and superficial people, 'anti-intellectual' and his thinking 'does not derive' from the Qur'an and traditional Islamic

intellectual culture. 'The term fundamentalism is used negatively to refer to movements Islam is 'hard-line' like in Libya, Algeria, Lebanon and Iran. As a result of the term used by the mass media, the notion of "Muslim fundamentalism" now tends to be interpreted as an Islamic group that strives to achieve its goals by using violent means. "Islamic fundamentalism" for Western media means nothing but "cruel Islam", "backward Islam and so on" (Mahendra, 1999, p.6). Groups that lack sympathy, call it the term *muta'ashibun* (fanatics) or even *mutatharrifun* (radicals). The Indonesian government specifically uses the term "extreme right" to refer to fundamentalists. This group is accused of wanting to replace the state of Pancasila with an Islamic state. In Malaysia, the term "puak palampau" (extreme people) or "puak pengganas" (aggressors) has been commonly used by the mass media to replace the term fundamentalist. According to Leonard Binder, as a religious sect "fundamentalism" is "the flow of a romantic pattern to the early period of Islam." They believe that the Islamic doctrine is complete, perfect and includes all problems. The laws of the God laws are believed to have governed the entire universe without any problems that escaped his attention (Mahendra, 1999).

For Allan Taylor, Patrick Bannerman, Daniel Pipes, Bassam Tibi and Bruce Lawrence, fundamentalists are groups that carry out rigid and literalist approaches. According to Bannerman, fundamentalists are rigid and orthodox groups *ta'ashub* which aspire to uphold the religious concept of the seventh century AD, namely the Islamic doctrine of classical times (Mahendra, 1999, p.17). According to M 'Abid al-Jabiri, the term "fundamentalist" was originally coined as a signifier for the Salafiyah movement of Jamaluddin Al-Afghani. This term was triggered because European language did not have the right equivalent term to translate the term Salafiyah. Even Anwar Abdul Malik also chose the term as a representation of the term Al-Afghani Salafiyah, in his book *Mukhtarat min Al-Adab Al-Arabi Al-Mu'ashir* with the aim of facilitating the understanding of the world about it in terms that are quite familiar: fundamentalism (al-Jabir, 1990, p.32-34). Similar opinion was also expressed by Hassan Hanafi. The Cairo University philosophy professor argues that the term 'fundamentalist Muslim' is a term to refer to the Islamic revival movement, Islamic revivalism, and contemporary Islamic movements / groups, which Western researchers often use and are often used by many thinkers (Hanafi, 1990, p.23). The term '*ushuliyah*' (fundamentalism) with the meaning which is popular in the world of mass media, was from the West, and contains an understanding of Western typology as well. Meanwhile in the world of mass media, is from the West, and contains an understanding of Western typology as well. Meanwhile '*ushuliyah*' in Arabic and in the discourse of Islamic thought, it has different meanings than what is understood by Western thought discourse that is currently used by many people.

The difference in understanding and substance in using the same term is something that often occurs in many terms used by the Arabs and Muslims, and is also used simultaneously by the West, even though both have different meanings in seeing the same term. This has caused a lot of misunderstandings and errors in contemporary cultural, political, and mass media in which the communication devices mix many different terms, the same terms, but different meanings, backgrounds and influences. Al-Asymawi historically shows that fundamentalism originally meant Christians who tried to return to the first principle of Christian teaching. The term then developed. Then pinned on every hard and rigid stream in adhering to and carrying out the formal teachings of religion, as well as extreme and radical in thinking and acting. Until the Islamic community with such characteristics is affected by the impact of being called fundamentalists, and the term Islamic fundamentalism emerges (al-'Asymawi, 1987, p.129). The core thoughts of fundamentalist Muslims are *Hakimiyyat Allah*. That is, recognition of God's authority and His Shari'a is only on Earth, and human submission is only to Him (Quthub, 1992, p. 10-11 & 67). The basis of this thinking is in the form of a sentence of monotheism *la ilaha illa Allah*. Which means; there is no god but Allah, and there is no authority and shari'a except Allah's Shari'a and authority (Ibid, p.29). Thus, in that way it has an epistemological implication for the restoration of all that is open from God and not from God, and has epistemological implications for the labeling of polytheists, infidels, wicked and wrongdoers for anyone who does not love other than Allah and His Shari'a. The core thoughts of fundamentalist Muslims are *Hakimiyyat Allah*.

History of the Development of Indonesian Fundamentalist Thought

Fundamentalism did not appear just like that. As Karen Armstrong said, the author of *The Battle for God* above, fundamentalism is a symptom of every religion and belief, which represents a rebellion against modernity. According to him, only a small group of fundamentalists were committing acts of terrorism. While Bassam Tibi, in the book *The Challenge of Fundamentalism: Political Islam and the New World Disorder*, as quoted by Alfian M., a researcher from the Catalyst Foundation, views Islamic fundamentalism as just one type of a new global phenomenon in world politics, where the issue in each case is more about political ideology (www.islamlib.com). This group believes, the West has failed in organizing the world. Therefore, it needs to be replaced with a new order based on their version of Islamic political interpretation. However, so far, this has only been limited to rhetoric. They can design terrorism and chaos. However, Tibi reminded, in fact Islamic fundamentalism is diverse and competing with each other. Thus, it is difficult to imagine that they can create a new, comprehensive economic, political and military order (Tibi, 1998, p.2).

The radical thoughts and actions of the Muslim fundamentalist movement can arise due to suppression or oppression. This can be seen from the rise of Indonesian Muslim fundamentalism movements after the reformation. In the Soeharto era in power, the Muslim fundamentalist movement could be considered lonely. Because, this regime adheres to a single principle and applies subversion laws. So that the voices that 'deviated' from Pancasila were cut down. And actions that shake national stability are crushed. At the end of the Soeharto government, Indonesia experienced a fairly acute multidimensional crisis. The economic, socio-political and ethical fields are all severe. So that the community is restless and trustworthy to the government and the system disappears. But after the wheel of reform rolled, the fundamentalist Muslim movement began to bust. Those who had been restrained in the Soeharto era, began to dare to show their teeth simultaneously. By establishing political parties, NGOs, Muslim assemblies, etc. And selling ideas to the public. This phenomenon of Muslim fundamentalists can also be concluded that it often appears in unstable socio-political conditions. This is also felt by fundamentalist Muslims. Thus, after the reform was declared and freedom of grouping was wide open, they came out of hiding. Established camps, then shouted campaigning for the application of Shari'a as a solution to the crisis.

The emergence of fundamentalist Muslim groups does not only arise because of ideological factors, as mentioned by fundamentalist Muslims. The social reality factor also has a big contribution in 'making it'. In fact, he may overtake ideological factors. Until no wonder Mahmud Ismail emphasized; "The crisis of radicalism was originally a crisis of reality followed by a crisis of thought (Ismail, 1993, p.97)." In other words; the emergence of fundamentalist Muslim movement is because it responds to the reality. The phenomenon of fundamentalist Muslims is often called political Islam, which is a splinter movement of Muslims who use religion as a political vehicle for the people to reach the public voice and power, then try to replace the existing system with their version of the Islamic system. For Farag Ali Faudah, this phenomenon is a political problem of the country. Because with its appearance; countries enter religious dialogue, political parties that are not based on religion for the sake of transitioning votes follow along to politicize religion, and the elite political constellation of the country is packed with political laypeople (Ali Faudah, 1994, p.8-9). In other words, this phenomenon has polluted the sacredness and religiosity of religion, and has designed a non-proportional system. Because the true Islam God wants to be a general and universal religion, it has been narrowed down by a group of muslim into a limited political hole (al-'Asymawi, 1987, p.7).

Even though this phenomenon is a political problem in the country, the author thinks he naturally appears in the name of freedom of grouping and expression. Because, if this phenomenon is suppressed, let alone suppressed, the consequences may be more fatal to people's lives. Therefore, this phenomenon

which contains its own political ambitions needs to be given free space, as long as it does not force the will, let alone threaten security and comfort. If this politics is further reviewed, the phenomenon of Muslim fundamentalism looks profane. Their ideas and actions are also the same: they are no longer based on the name of God, religion and people, but on behalf of political commodities. Because, the emergence factor is no longer a religious ideology, but a response to the socio-political reality coupled with the ambition to reach power.

Fundamentalism and Religious Violence

In his book entitled *Violence of Religion Without Religion*, Thomas Santoso notes that in the opinion of biologists, physiologists, and psychologists, humans commit violence because of innate tendencies or as a consequence of genetic or physiological abnormalities. The first group (biologists) examined the relationship of violence to human biological conditions, but they failed to show biological factors as a cause of violence. There is also no scientific evidence that concludes that humans from their nature do like violence (Santoso, 2002). The second group (physiologist), views, the notion of violence as an action related to the structure. Johan Galtung (1975) defines violence as anything that causes people to be obstructed to actualize their own potential naturally. Structural violence proposed by Galtung shows a form of indirect, invisible, static violence and shows certain stability. Thus violence is not only carried out by actors / groups of actors, but also by structures such as state apparatus (Santoso, p.2002).

Unlike Galtung, who sees a systemic and single structure, the Post-Structuralist group sees a non-systemic structure and more than one. Post-Structural Thinkers such as Frank Graziano (1992), Jacques Derrida (1997), Samuel Weber (1997), James KA Smith (1998), Robert Hefner (1999) and James T. Siegel (1999), develop attention to structural violence different from religious politics (Santoso, 2002). Graziano explained that the involvement of state structures through various ways, strategies and acts of violence, while hypocritically transferring the excesses of these actions to the people. Weber described violence as a structured way to show self-identity in self-determination efforts. Derrida offers a political investigation into violence in the name of religion or 'religion without religion' as a form of uncontrolled violence that accompanies "the return of religion" in its most rigid meaning. Hefner reminded that violence can occur because the state uses religion, or it can also use the state religion. Siegel also strengthened Derrida's argument about 'double murder' in the structure of society and the state (Santoso, 2002).

The third group (psychology experts), called violence as a network between actors and structures as stated by Jennifer Turpin & Lester R. Kurtz (1997). The assumption of this group states that is conflict is endemic to the lives of conflict communities as something that is determined), there are a number of alternative tools to express or convey social conflict, to convey the problem of violence effectively requires changes in social organizations and individuals, the problem of violence is one the main problem of modern life, there is a micro-macro level of violence and between actors (solving the problem of structural violence requires us to engage in actor violence, and vice versa), and ultimately academic specialization actually obscures the problem because it ignores a holistic approach including deep dimensions of space and time (Santoso, 2002).

Of the three groups of understanding about violence, the first and second groups tend to categorize violence studies. Violence as an actor's action emphasizes the micro aspects and ignores macro aspects, and focuses on specific forms of violence that are often limited in time and space. Instead violence as a product of structure emphasizes macro aspects and ignores micro aspects, and focusses on forms of structural violence which often negate the complexity of specific violence. Therefore, violence as a network between actors and structures that emphasize an interdisciplinary approach is the most promising way to understand violence holistically (Santoso, 2002). Equally important thing to discuss is 'why can political-religious violence occur?' The answer to this question is very relevant to Gurr's

statement that rebellious individuals must have a background in the situation, such as injustice, moral anger, and then respond with anger at the source of the cause of the anger. In addition, the masses must also feel concrete and direct situations that are the driving force for their expressions of anger, so they are willing to accept dangerous risks (Ibid).

Political-religious violence in riots is influenced simultaneously by the pressure of social structures that crush them in their daily lives due to unfair, dishonest treatment, and the personal motivation and interests concerned. Accumulation of anger and frustration in the midst of everyday life, in addition to emotional illiteracy and the inability to express emotions intelligently as well as the method taken turned out to be fruitless, has been deflected into deflected aggression against the main targets that have been determined before (precipitating factor) (Ibid, p.4). Conflict awareness is related to how severely the level of suffering of a community is compared to other groups, assertiveness of group identity (level of suffering, level of cultural differences, and intensity of conflict), degree of cohesion and group mobilization, and repressive control by dominant groups. The feeling that his religious group was marginalized by other religious groups also led to radicalization of religion. Trivial personal problems can spread into conflicts between religions or tribes (Ibid).

Religion and values reflected in it should not cause violence. However, the facts show that religion can cause violence when it relates to other factors, such as group / national interests or political oppression. Religion can be misused and misdirected both externally and internally. From the external side, prophetic religion (prophethood) such as Islam and Christianity tends to commit violence as soon as their identity is threatened. Internally, prophetic religion tends to commit violence because it feels confident its actions are based on God's will. Therefore, understanding religion or how religion is interpreted is one of the reasons underlying political-religious violence. The politics of religion which is prevalent in the newly independent country, which struggles to determine its national identity and the existence of minority groups that assert their rights, result in religion playing a greater role. Lithuania, Armenia and Azerbaijan are some examples of them. The authorities regard violence, terror and absolute authority as prerogative rights that cannot be separated from power. Religion has been manipulated for political purposes as an attempt to free itself from moral obligations if it feels its existence is threatened. Violence has been framed 'religion' as an expression of the desire to neutralize sin. Violence is legitimized by the state to maintain power. The outbreak of violence in the New Order era with the emergence of radical Islamic groups, the Tanjung Priok massacre, the destruction of places of worship was the government's engineering to marginalize Islamic groups and to maintain power. Thus, the emergence of radical Islamic groups is more caused by the interests of certain groups by using religion as a tool of legitimacy (Ibid, p.8).

Violence is also often identified with terrorism which means scaring. The word comes from Latin *terrere* (causes fear), and is used generally in political terms as an attack on the civil order during the Terror regime during the French Revolution in the late XVIII century. In this case, the public response to violence as a result of terrorism is part of the meaning of the term. Madeline Albright, made a list of the thirty most dangerous terrorist organizations, more than half of them religious. They consist of Jews, Muslims and Buddhists, Warren Christopher, stating that terrorist acts of religion and ethnic identity have become "one of the most important security challenges we face in connection with the rise of the Cold War (Juergensmeyer, 2002, p. 5)". The problem that breaks the concentration of some anthropologists, religious analysts — among them Emile Durkheim, Marcel Muss, and Sigmund Freud, is why religion seems to require religious violence and violence, and why God's mandate to do harm is received with such conviction by some believers. According to Francois Houtart, every society has an element of violence. Apologetically it is too easy to claim that the content of religion is basically not violent (has an element of violence) and that it is human beings both individually and collectively, deflecting from their true meaning. In reality, the roots of violence can be found directly in religion, and that is why religion can easily become a vehicle for violent tendencies (Houtart, p.11).

The sacrificial element is important in most religions. Girard's theories on this subject are so well-known as paying attention to the fundamental nature of violence and the role of sacrifice as a way of escaping violence. Here sacrifice becomes something more ritualistic, which results in symbolic violence. This makes violence more abstract as other writers claim in relation to Vedic, which shows that violence does not eliminate the main effect of what is offered by an ideal offer, where people make sacrifices as well as victims. The sacralization of violence makes violence distinguishable from lawless violence, which is rejected by society. It is clear that all these things can also be found in contemporary events, such as the fact that the Algerian GIA beheaded his victim (Houtart, p.12). The conflict between good and evil is another source of violence that is strongly related to religion. This is widely described in the scriptures, both the New Testament and the Old Testament. Identification of goodness has justified much violence in the history of all religions, in history against invaders, through heretical and inquisitive internal oppression (Houtart, p.11).

Conclusion

Religion in its political journey has been mixed with violent expressions of social aspirations, personal pride, and movements for political change. Fundamentalism as a reaction to all forms of human moral and spiritual depravity, as a struggle for the liberation of a nation, eliminating hegemony and oppression, encouraging us to tolerate him or even support him, as long as the actions they do do not exceed the limits outlined by God, even though the most peaceful and benevolent way must be in the first priority so that as much as possible avoid efforts to 'eliminate violence by force' or 'justify any means of achieving goals'. Because there is nothing in Islam that justifies violence against anyone and in any form that endangers the peace of human life on this earth. It has long been known that Islam is *rahmatan lil 'alamin* which should be the basis for every Muslim group to act and act wherever and whenever.

References

- Al-'Asymawi, M. Said, (1987). *Al-Islam al-Siyasi*, Cairo: Sina li Nasy.
- Annstrong, Karen. (2002). *Islam a Short History: Sepintas Sejarah Islam*. Yogyakarta: Ikon Teralitera
- Barr, James. (1996). *Fundamentalisme*. Jakarta: PT BPK Gunung Mulia
- Bellah, Robert N. (2000). *.Esei-esei tentang Agama di Dunia Modern*. Jakarta: Paramadina
- Faudah, Farag Ali. (1994). *.Al-Tatharruf al-Siyasiy al-Diniy fi Mishr*. Tha Sin li Dirasat wa Nasyr
- Imarah, Muhammad. (1999). *Fundamentalisme Dalam Perspektif Barat dan Islam*. Gema Insani Press
- Ismail, Mahmud. (1993). *Al-Islam al-Siyasi baina al-Ushuliyin wa al- 'Ilmaniyin*. Kuwait; Muassasah al-Syira' al-Arabi.
- Al-Jabiri, M,' Abid. (1990). *Dlarurah al-Bahts 'an Niqath al-Itiqa li Muawajahah al-Mashir al Musytarak*. Cited in Hassan Hanafi & M. 'Abid Al-Jabiri, Hiwar al-Masyriq wa al-Maghrib, Beirut: Muassasah Al-Arabiyyah
- Juergensmeyer, Marx. (2002). *Teror Atas Nama Tuhan: Kebangkitan Global Kekerasan Agama*. Jakarta: Nizam Press & Anima Publishing, Website www.islamlib.com

- Mahendra, Yusril Ihza. (1999). *Modernisme dan Fundamentalisme dalam Politik Islam*. Jakarta: Paramadina
- Quthub, Sayyid. (1992). *Ma'alim fi al-Thariq*. Cairo: Dar Syuruq
- Rahman, Fazlur. *Gelombang Perubahan dalam Islam: Studi tentang Fundamentalisme Islam*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Rahman, Fazlur. (1997). *Islam*. Bandung: Pustaka
- Santoso, Thomas. (2002). *Kekerasan Agama Tanpa Agama*. Jakarta: Pustaka Utan Kayu
- Tibi, Bassam. (1998). *The Challenge of Fundamentalism: Political Islam and the New World Disorder*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press
- Watt, William Montgomery. (1997). *Fundamentalisme Islam dan Modernitas*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).