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INTRODUCTION

In this chance, the integration is discussed in the context of UIN Syarif Hidayatullah in some important points, those are, what UIN has and wants as well as where UIN will take its development of institution with this integration of knowledge. Referring to the book Integrasi Keilmuan UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Menuju Universitas Riset (2006), the understanding of knowledge integration is framed in the meaning of dialogue interaction in which knowledge, science, and religion are proportionally and openly positioned for coexistence and interaction. When the book of Scientific Integration was written, UIN’s vision and mission were directed to develop Research University. Meanwhile, the next direction of development up to now continues the previous wisdom by promoting its wish to the level over it; that is, leading to World Class University. In fact, the developmental core of the two aspirations is the same; that is, to increase the research tradition at UIN Jakarta. New identity formulation through scientific integration formulation and new aspiration formulation actually constitutes the institutional endeavors to fill ruh (spirit) over the process of transformation and new institutional existence; that is university. The capital which UIN has right now is good enough if seen from side of facility, human resources especially teachers, networking with domestic and foreign institutions, or from the side of its developmental direction. What possibly needs more attention is the culture which underpins all the developmental programs. Scientific culture and working culture actually constitute the important prerequisite not to say very important in the efforts of increasing and developing something including the development of university. One of the complicated problems is the trapping of scientific development in the working culture for bureaucracy and project. From year to year the scientific institutional performance operates in organizational system which ensures the certain adaptations and, or more apprehensively, the “traditionalism” of State organizational mechanism “is used” to non-institutional interests. This is the homework which needs to acquire shared interests and persistence as well as consistency with its improvement efforts.

With the capital it has, UIN Jakarta in other big challenges to become a competitive and excellent university either inside or outside the country feels or
perceives another chance from side of identity and representation as Islamic university. The hopes are to determine attitude, to formulate and to strive for the quality of correlation between religion, knowledge, and science which eventually positions UIN Jakarta as one of the institutions which makes Muslims proud and is well accepted in scientific society in general. Realizing that discussion about scientific integration held by Faculty of Syariah and Law has been enforced for many times and to avoid repetition. So, in this chance I am trying to share some points. The key words have been discussed beforehand: religion, knowledge, and science.

A. Terminology: Religion, Knowledge, Science, and Scientific Integration

Before further discussion, some key words need touching upon in advance to avoid confusion. Indeed, at first all knowledge was derived from philosophy, but in its growth the existing knowledge burgeoned in many ways up to the limit of independence. The existing knowledge has now been differentiated in many ways, and in certain ranks it operates respectively as well as in other ranks it interacts in diverse forms because the needs ensure so. In the context of present discussion, it is necessary to position the basic understanding of each terminology and how the relation is. Religion and theology are two things which relate to each other. Religion with dogma sources, like the Qur'an which is divined and revealed, is the accumulation of dogma which consists of norms, laws, systems, guidance, and information about pedigree of humans and nature, their natures, their existences and their final purposes. All the information is approached with the enthusiasm of faith (keimanan) actualized in many ways. For instance, Dale Cannon mentioned six ways of being religious: holy rite, right deed, fidelity, shamanic mediation, mystic/Sufism, knowledge.¹

Science is equivalent from knowledge, namely: information and accumulation of knowledge, which have been systematized to become the separate construct as knowledge. Information of the religion and theology lies in the area of science and knowledge, since they constitute the accumulation of knowledge, and or the accumulation of knowledge, which is systematized and constructed through the certain reasoning. Meanwhile, science as part of knowledge whose basic operation focuses on empiricism is considered to be different from religion and theology as well as is different from other knowledge like the humanities. Science also uses the mind (akal) with its own way; that is, focusing very much on empirical data. In other words, the mind or the rationality in science is used along based on the empiricism, because science bases itself on the test of repetition and validity empirically, or objectivity. On the object of science which is difficult to be measured generally by empirical repetition and validity, the smallest particle like compound or wide object

like black hole science uses rationality but with empirical enthusiasm. The enthusiasm of science is to strive for the construction of knowledge as objective as possible. In this enthusiasm of objectivity, science is actually differentiated, say with the humanities. Besides appreciating the objectivity, the humanities also accept the knowledge, which is measured by significance and relevance.

Besides objectivity, the construction of science is also built by subjectivity. In its procedure, besides being influenced by external factors, like empirical aspects or objectivity of something and rationality of something, subjectivity is very much affected by researchers’ own personality as agents mediating and determining choices of all the processes of knowledge construction. In this matter, researchers’ sense or intuition also becomes part of the process of knowledge construction. In science, the influence of subjectivity is stressed as minimum as possible, while in other knowledge, like art and culture, it is given the spaces so as to contribute positively in its knowledge construction. For instance, productive construction of knowledge is intended to seek significance or relevance.

The scope of knowledge which is influenced by the modern science is at least divided into two global parts: the science and the humanities. Knowledge in the understanding of science consists of natural sciences such as: biology, chemistry, physics, its sciences of derivation and social sciences such as: sociology, anthropology, history, and its sciences of derivation. Secondly, the humanities are made up of philosophy, language, literature and art, as well as its sciences of derivation. Whereas, some others do not recognize dichotomy or separation, there are only the grouping and the sorting.

Another thing which also needs explaining here is the difference between science and scientism. One of the complexities in the correlation between religion and science is because the understanding of science and its belief system have been amalgamated. Science is “the organized knowledge, especially obtained through observation and the testing of facts about physical world, law of nature, and society,…”;4 while, scientism is “the belief that knowledge is the only one trustworthy demand to the truth.”5 In its practice, some people amalgamate both of them. According to Haught, the amalgamation is problematical, as the science is not the same as the scientism. Science is the systematic and measureable way to know how something operates or to make something operate, while scientism is “a supposition that science is the only one precise way to reach the whole truth.”6

---


B. The Scientific Integration of UIN Jakarta: Drafting of scientific models

The scientific integration of UIN Jakarta has characteristic of open dialogue which can be shortly summarized into two expressions of actualization: consistency and interaction. The consistency expects appreciation which proportionally operates and the developing of a variety of knowledge respectively, while interaction expects correlation between knowledge, theology, and science positively. Expression of interaction can strive for Islamization, scientification, and universalization. The Islamization is positioned in interaction because although its enthusiasm corrects the existing scientification, especially science, in its scientific construction it is not released from the existing scientification; those are, scientific principles. Islamization tries to correct the secular scientification from ontological side in which the element of divinity is interpolated, epistemology whose construction includes besides the empiricism and the mind, its axiology stresses the basis of scientific ethics from both side of doers, objects and the side of scientific use. The scientification is an attitude that Islam is not contradictory to knowledge; even it is the sources of knowledge and science in which the construction of knowledge can be deducted from, for instance, the Qur’an by using the sets of science and the humanities. Finally, the universalization assumes there to be no dichotomy between theology and general knowledge, both of them accord with scientific principles and can interact to each other by borrowing and using each other. Coexistence and interaction of theology and general knowledge can be illustrated as seen in figure below:

C. The Scientific Integration: The Correlation between Science and Theology

1. Scientific Coexistence

The scientific coexistence means contiguous life between a kind of knowledge and other kinds of knowledge, between science and theology with open attitude and respect with one another. Being open means that the coexistence of science and theology is proportionally positioned to operate in keeping with its respective traditions. In its respective uniqueness, either science or theology requires the
operating of scientific devices possessed by each of it. Respecting each other means that the coexistence of science and theology is actualized in operationalization of scientific mechanism in accordance with its respective proportion. The operationalization of science and theology is proportionally meant to avoid the totally scientific coexistence. Totality of operationalization between science and theology respectively will get trapped on a deadlock, as both of them require interaction on the certain rank. Although both of them have different ontology and epistemology, where both of them seek the different things on the certain topics, the difference in extreme ranks opens the certainty (keniscayaan) to interact positively because there is necessity to interact objectively, and the certainty to interact is another part of the correlation between science and theology which will be discussed in the next passage.

Realizing that knowledge has already burgeoned in many ways, besides needing with one another, a lot of knowledge also grows respectively in an established way. In the need and the sufficiency of using its own scientific devices, so knowledge, either science or theology operates with basis of ontology and its epistemological devices respectively. Science tends to answer the question how something works, and religion tends to answer the question why something exists or is needed; science seeks cause-effect, while religion seeks the meaning; science tries to find out the mechanism of nature, while religion tends more to investigate “the last anvil of the nature.” In other words, science tends to work in positivism domain or explanation domain, while theology tends to work in domain of interpretation of meanings. In scientific division in Western tradition, both of them tend to be separated, that is, science in science while theology in the humanities. Although this division is criticized in its practice, this tradition is still dominant including in scientific tradition in Indonesia, including at PTAIN (Institutes for Islamic studies), but with enthusiasm of coexistence and interaction. At UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, the faculties of science were founded in the understanding of positivism such as, Faculty of Science and Technology, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, and so forth. The enthusiasm also operates in the process of learning and teaching, and its scientific development is based on its own principles of empiricism, experiment, measurement, and objectivity. Likewise in theologies, religious faculties such as, the Faculty of Ushuluddin and the Faculty of Syariah and Law operate in religious scientific tradition. The faculties in which there is theology and general knowledge, coexistence also becomes one of the scientifically-operating ways which exists at the faculties like Faculty of Syariah and Law. Besides coexistence, interaction is certainly also enabled as long as needed, let alone if the theology and the general knowledge are in one faculty, like in Faculty of Syariah and Law. In other words, the operationalization of one kind of scientification and other

---

scientifications generally keeps up with ontology and epistemology of the kind of respective scientification. For instance, Faculty of Science and Technology in the process of teaching, application of knowledge and technology, or the research operates in the principles which develop in science. This is committed because of the certainty of disciplines or because both of them have respective duty as touched upon above.

One thing needs emphasizing here. Coexistence does not mean to contrast both of them as explained by John F. Haught identifying that the contrast of science and theology is less appropriate. According to Haught, what actually happens is that “a statement shows that there is no serious contradiction, since religion and science give responses to very different problems.”

Haught identifies some of the scholars who contrast the science and the religion seen from the starting point of the knowledge mechanism, while the coexistence here is more interpreted as an open attitude and to respect each other the working of science and theology proportionally. Explained so, the correlation between science and theology is unlimited on the coexistence but on the possibility of interacting.

2. Scientific Interaction

Another part of the correlation between science and theology is its probability to interact. There are at least three possibilities of interacting between theology and science: Islamization, scientification, and universalization.

2.1 Islamization

The Islamization of knowledge is an international intellectual movement emerging in 1980s, responding to negative impacts of the development of modern science. Two of the central figures proclaiming this movement are S Naquib Alatas and Ismail Raji al-Faruqi. The basic assumption which needs the movement of knowledge Islamization is the existence of prejudice that the development of modern knowledge inspired by science increasingly keeps away from religion and brings destructive negative impacts. Islamization is required to give epistemological alternatives to bring knowledge closer again to religion and to diminish the destructive impacts from application of knowledge and technology created by human beings. Some of the offers are the existence of tauhid (unity of God) or unity of knowledge (leading to the only one truth), unity of life (nullification of knowledge which is full of values and value-free knowledge) and unity of history (knowledge must serve the Muslims and mankind). In other words, the Islamization of knowledge is the movement bringing back the knowledge to tauhid with the direction starting from context to text, so that the knowledge is not released from the faith.

---

The possibility of knowledge Islamization which is done can be traced from the side of difference of its knowledge theories (epistemology). For Islamization bearers, the difference lies on the fact that knowledge cannot at all be free from scientists’ subjectivity. Therefore, knowledge becomes plural and cannot be claimed for only one of the nations, for instance the Western. Thereby the Islamization of knowledge becomes possible. Mulyadhi Kartanegara thinks that the existence of knowledge Islamization is necessary, because the modern knowledge has brought about serious problems either theologically or scientifically. Theologically, knowledge has kept human beings away from their God. While practically, the limitation of modern science over its knowledge object is only to the objects which are by the five senses considered problematical. It is because of limiting another knowledge object which can be caught by mind and intuition. Although the mind in Western scientific tradition is appreciated, in development of scientific tradition, production of knowledge through the mind is criticized, for its element of speculation and knowledge production through intuition is criticized, because it is just like hallucination.

In Kartanegara’s view, the Islamization of knowledge which is developed in responding to the existing knowledge dichotomy should be directed to the movement of holistic knowledge integration based on tauhid. Taking the conception of wahdat al-wujud Mulla Sadra, Kartanegara bases the ontological basis on his scientific integration. Mulla Sadra explains that:

“All the existing forms (wujud) – with their shapes and characters – are essentially one and same. What distinguishes one from the others is only its gradation (taskik al-wujud) which is caused by the distinction in its essence. Because they are basically one and same, any forms we know – whether they are spiritual or material – surely have the ontological status which is equally forceful and real. Therefore, all the levels of form may become the valid objects for knowledge, since their ontological realities have been fixed.”

Kartanegara makes Mulla Sadra’s conception of tauhid as the basis of knowledge integration from side of objects, sources, classifications, and methods of knowledge. With this perspective of the tahid of knowledge, the scientific research can be unlimitedly done not only to the objects of tajribi (experimental) research, but also to burhani (demonstrative or aqli), and ifrani (intuitive/gnostic). The variety of knowledge objects, whether it is physical, mathematical, or metaphysical, requires the kind of certain knowledge even though all forms of knowledge are essentially the

---

same. Physical objects require the kind of knowledge fitting them, for example, mineralogy for mineral things.\textsuperscript{17}

The Islamization of knowledge is by Kartanegara interpreted as integration of knowledge. The integration of knowledge is constructed by positioning the basis of knowledge to the absolute reality or God, so that all the existing knowledge is derived from Him. The difference between certain knowledge and the other is not separation or dichotomy, but it is only the grouping or the sorting. In its consideration, integration can be done on objects, metaphysical field, mathematics and physics, source of knowledge, human beings’ experiences, scientific methods, scientific explanations, and theoretical and practical knowledge.\textsuperscript{18}

2.2. Scientification

Scientification is the reverse of the previous intellectual movement starting not only from contexts to texts, but it is the intellectual movement starting from texts to contexts as well. One of the movements in Indonesia was pioneered by Kuntowijoyo. He called this movement as demystification. The purpose of this movement is to present Islam as the religion inspiring the making of scientific theories, both on physical aspects, social environment, symbolism, and on historical environment. The interaction between religion and knowledge here is done by digging the theories from Islamic sources.\textsuperscript{19} He constructed his efforts by positioning the Qur’an as paradigm or mode of thought or mode of inquiry, inspired from the term made by Thomas Kuhn. The production from application of certain paradigm is mode of knowing. This is the separate mode called by Kuntowijoyo as the process of scientification. Scientification or formulation of theory deducted from the Qur’an is by him called paradigm of the Qur’an. He formulates “a construction of knowledge which enables us to understand the reality as understood in the Qur’an.” By positioning the Qur’an as paradigm, Kuntowijoyo tries to give axiology and epistemology typically from the Qur’an. In his viewpoint, the Qur’an consists of concepts and historical stories or \textit{amtsal}. Concepts contain ideal type about something or value or certain norm, while stories and \textit{amtsal} contain arch-type about \textit{hikmah} or certain wisdom. The formulation of the Qur’an paradigm is related to Muslims’ main duties in the world. By referring to Q. Ali Imran:110, emphasizing that Muslims are the best mankind sent for duties of doing goodness (\textit{amar ma’ruf dan nahi mungkar}). This is the prophetic duty for every Muslim; that is, doing humanization, emancipation, and transcendence.\textsuperscript{20}

Kuntowijoyo positions \textit{wahyu} (apocalypse) as transcendental structure or “genuine idea,” so that the subject of knowledge construction in his viewpoint is to seek the universal and transcendental Qur’an’s messages. In this way, the Qur’an’s

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{17} Kartanegara. 2003. \textit{Integrasi Ilmu}, p. 20-21.
    \item \textsuperscript{18} Kartanegara. 2003. \textit{Integrasi Ilmu}.
    \item \textsuperscript{19} Kuntowijoyo. 2004. \textit{Islam sebagai Ilmu}, p. 10-11.
    \item \textsuperscript{20} Kuntowijoyo. 2004. \textit{Islam sebagai Ilmu}, p. 11-16.
\end{itemize}
messages can be directed to “mankind’s benefits.” As admitted by him, the construction of the Qur'an scientification borrows analytical devices from the Western tradition. The borrowing is by him regarded as something usual, for the knowledge is basically open, and its offer of Qur'an paradigm is open, too. He called his approach as transcendental structuralism for the purpose of not understanding Islam, but of an effort “how to apply social tenets in the old text on the present social context without changing its structure.” Analytical identification of the transcendental structuralism is on two levels: outer structure and inner structure, for the purpose of disclosing its innermost meaning or inner structure. He illustrates in a sketch which positions tauhid as power of structural formation:

\[ 
\text{Tauhid} \xrightarrow{\text{the Power of Structural Formation}} \text{Akidah} \xrightarrow{\text{Ibadah}} \text{Akhlaq} \xrightarrow{\text{Syari'ah}} \text{Muamalah} \xrightarrow{\text{Inner}} \\
\text{Structure} \xrightarrow{\text{Belief Structure}} \text{Worship} \xrightarrow{\text{Moral/ Normative Everyday}} \text{Outer} \\
\text{Fast Ethics Behavior Behavior} \xrightarrow{\text{Tithe/Pilgrimage}} 
\]

Tauhid is the power of structural formation, that is, oneness of God which constitutes absolute reality, hakikat or the truth. Tauhid then forms the permanent inner structure such as: akidah, ibadah, akhlaq, syari’ah, and what is interchangeable, that is muamalah. It is the aspect of muamalah which becomes the field of ijtihad (reinterpretation) to Islamic scientification. Meanwhile, in his viewpoint he thinks the transformation of other aspects has finished. So, the essence of the belief, worship, tithe etc, moral/ethics, has been considered intact from normative behavior. What needs to get attention for the digging of new construction is mu’alalah. To do it in Kuntowijoyo’s viewpoint, Muslims need to expand their awareness. At least he proposes the awareness in six points which Muslims need to possess: 1. awareness of the change, 2. Collective awareness, 3. Historical awareness, 4. Awareness of the

---

social facts, 5. Awareness of abstract society, 6. Awareness of the objectification necessity.\textsuperscript{25}

With the fulfillment of awareness in the six points is built over it the process of objectification which is by Kuntowijoyo called integralisation of knowledge and or the transformation of prophetic social knowledge. The integralistic knowledge is the process of objectification for construction of knowledge to maintain the continuity of the knowledge alone by including back the importance of religious roles. The integralistic knowledge is not contradictory to or does not change the secular knowledge; on the contrary, it proportionally positive to “be with the secular knowledge (Western and Marxist).”\textsuperscript{26} He illustrates the relationship between the secular knowledge and the Islamic paradigm like the table below:

The Islamic Paradigm: Western Knowledge (Modern) and Islamic Knowledge (Post-Modern)\textsuperscript{27}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Process of History</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Modern, Mind</td>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>Secular, autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Post-modern</td>
<td>Apocalypse, Mind</td>
<td>Humanism of Theocentrism</td>
<td>Dedifferentiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mapped in the table above, the characteristics of secular knowledge (Western) in modern period are derived from the mind. Its ethics is humanism. Its process of history starts from human centralization as a central and then separates the knowledge from religion, and its characteristics of knowledge are secular and autonomous. Meanwhile, the Islamic paradigm is put into post-modern period, positioning the apocalypse and the mind as sources because of its theocentrism attitude with ethics of humanism and theocentrism, and then strives for dedifferentiation or recombines religious and general knowledge with its integralistic enthusiasm.

On the other hand, Kuntowijoyo also proposes the second objectification movement to which he proposes the prophetic social knowledge. Objectification started from the process of internalization values, like believing the goodness of giving the tithe. The next stage from the objectification is externalization; that is, making it concrete what is believed, like us as Muslims who pay the tithe. Paying the tithe is the objectification at the level of externalization in belief that it is done to purify the wealth, and there is a part of wealth which we earn for other people; and

\textsuperscript{26} Kuntowijoyo. 2004. *Islam sebagai Ilmu*, p.251-62.
\textsuperscript{27} Kuntowijoyo. 2004. *Islam sebagai Ilmu*, p. 61.
the belief that *rezeki* (blessing) should be spent for maintenance (*dinafkahkan*). Another thing which needs noticing from the objectivity is the objective acts and the impacts of the objective acts. Objective acts are the acts which accord with universal or general principles, while the impacts of the objective acts are if felt by other people including non-Muslims as natural acts. Thereby, the objectification will keep away from the acts of domination, secularization as well as will be open for anyone, 28 or Islam becomes *rahmatan lil alamin*.

With objectification, Kuntowijoyo motivates Muslims to pay attention to the continuity in order that they do not always start from zero. As a historian, Kuntowijoyo is really aware of the importance of continuity of Islamic thoughts in Indonesian context. Here with the objectivity, he shows the relationship between period of knowledge and period of Muslims’ political history. This assumption is that Indonesia’s history is considered to be made up of separate fragments between one and another. As a matter of fact, it is not so, because there is a red thread knitting the continuity among historical fragments. The distinction of characteristic existing in Islamic history in Indonesia, for instance, can be categorized as the difference of characteristic from one unit or period to another unit or period. Knowing the periods become important because Muslims begin knowing what to do, in his language, to answer the question what is to be done? Kuntowijoyo illustrates the development of Indonesian Muslims’ periods, like in the table below:

**Periodization of Muslims’ history**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis: Islamic Values</th>
<th>Myth</th>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Way of thinking</td>
<td>Pre-logical</td>
<td>Non-logical</td>
<td>Logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Magi</td>
<td>Abstract/a priori</td>
<td>Concrete/empirical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In period of myth, the way Muslims think is pre-logical and mystical, appreciating the myth. Its characteristic is that the political movement takes many places in villages, or is local, with agrarian economy background, country people, mechanical solidarity, and mode of charismatic leadership, and also the struggle objective is colonial government. While in period of ideology, the way they think is rational but non-logical, “forming a priori knowledge about abstract values, city location, national gathering, commercial economy and small industry, trader and “private” society, organic solidarity, and intellectual leadership.” This period was marked by founding mass’ political organization or he called it *wong cilik* (little person), that is, SI 1911. If in previous period Muslims’ struggle was actualized in the form of uprising, in this period, of being actualized in the form of “mobilizing the

---

mass for peaceful purposes.” The last one is period of knowledge. It occurred since 1985 when ideology had to exchange for Pancasila. For some people this was a very big loss, and Islam was even considered to lose everything. Kuntowijoyo noticed that those who considered so pointed out the quality of thinking short. What actually happened was that the history was burgeoning to period of knowledge in which misunderstanding in various things could be clarified. The thinkers at that time had begun trying to clarify the actual circumstances and to formulate what to do, for instance, Nurcholish Madjid with his cultural movement, like motto ‘Islam Yes and Islamic Party No,’ or Quraish Shihab with the term Membumikan al-Qur’an (grounding the Qur’an). While Kuntowijoyo himself offered the Islamic paradigm and objectification. This period of knowledge was marked in the way Muslims began thinking logical by paying attention to concreteness of something and empirical things.30

Besides what is offered by Kuntowijoyo, there are actually a lot of other scholars who also offer the paradigm alternatives, scientific approach and methodology with enthusiasm of Islamic scientification. In tradition of Tafsir, the development of using the method of thematic tafsir, for instance, has enthusiasm of Islamic scientification in which the relation of text and context is analyzed to release the perspectives of the Qur’an concerning some concept. For example, the work of ‘A<ishah ‘Abd al-Rah}ma>n bintu Sha>ti> al-Qur’a>n wa Qad}a>yat al-Insa>n (19 82), or Fazlur Rahman with his Tema Pokok al-Qur’an (1983) can also be categorized into this category, as in his work he tries to present the perspectives of the Qur’an regarding a number of topics, in other fields, for example, Ilyas ba-Yunus and Farid Ahmad’s work Sosiologi Islam dan Masyarakat Islam Kontemporer (1991, cet. 1, 1988), or Hasan Hanafi with oxfordialism study, and Thahir Ibn Atsur and Jase Audah with his maqasid, et al.

2.2 Universalization

If previously the movement of thought was divided into two parts, namely: the intellectual movement from context to text and the intellectual movement from text to context. In this passage the intellectual movement treats both of them and all possibilities of other movements as part of universal scientific procedure. Among the possibilities are from context (1) - text – text (2), text (1) – context – text (2), or text (1) – context (1) – text (2) – context (2). The basic assumptions of this intellectual movement are proportionality and reverence of using the scientific principles from both tradition of science and tradition of theology. The proportionality assumes the existence of necessity to each other borrow and use the scientific devices in the different traditions as long as according with general and universal scientific principles. The reverence is meant as effort of appreciation over

the probability of application and the scientific development in independent ways or in separate scientific tradition.

The interaction in this form is mostly done by either Islamic scholars or non-Muslims. The Islamic scholars specially who are educated in Islamic and general scientific tradition have the tendency to use this scientific tradition in their research, for instance the contemporary thinkers such as Hasan Hanafi, Muhammad Arkoun, Aboe el-Fadl, Sahrur, etc. Meanwhile, many non-Islamic researchers specially for scholars who are educated in Western scientific tradition also have the tendency to openly treat Islam and Muslims’ phenomena in their research, for instance, those who are labeled orientalist such as Ignas Goldziher, M. Watt, Andrew Rippin, Arthur Jeffery, etc., or those who are considered sympathetic to Islam, Martin van Bruinessen, Barbara Freyer Stowasser, Karen Amstrong, Cantwell Smith, etc.

REFLECTION

From the discussion above, some small notes are interesting to be discussed further. Firstly, capital and model of the scientific integration of UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta with the open scientific attitude enable to develop and reinforce the Islamic scientific tradition, general scientific tradition, and develop model of interaction between both of them. From a number of possibilities which can be offered, in this chance the writer is interested in sharing, and more exactly, learning to see the possibility of developing the approach of *maqasidi syariah* which I call *manhaj maqasidi*. This approach, in what all this time has been being developed, can be made as one of the Islamic scientification alternatives. In addition, the use of this approach can also be developed to do the scientific construction beyond law domain.

At first, *manhaj maqasidi* was developed in Islamic law tradition. In its development, many scholars have made use of this approach to understand and interpret the sources of Islamic tenets specially the Qur’an, like Rashid Rida (w. 1354 H/1935 M), Al-Tahir ibn Ashur (w. 1325 H/ 1907 M), Mohammad al-Ghazaly (w. 1416 H/ 1996 M), Yusuf al-Qaradawi (1345/1926 - ), Taha al-Alwani (1354/1935 - ), etc. such use is enabled because the genuineness of the concept of *al-maqasid* enables to maintain the significance of Islam for human beings. This concept covers the *fiqh* hermeneutic area which basically means deciphering or understanding, for example, understanding Allah’s messages to be used for the goodness of human beings and universe. The basic principle is maintaining the Qur’an’s universal messages to answer speciality and difference of problems faced by human beings. At first the conception of *maqasid* was based on three basic considerations, namely: *darūrāt* (certainties), *hājiyyāt* (needs), and *tahsiniyyāt* (luxuries), in which the first basic consideration becomes the starting point which is traditionally based on preservation of five things: faith, soul, wealth, mind, and
offspring, and some people add on honor. Yet, in its development, the use of the concept of maqasid is not only based on individual considerations, but its basic principle dimension is also expanded by the consideration of universal values, that is, universal maqasid, in which the proses of tafsir and ijtihad is based on the universal bases which lie in Islam specially in the Qur’an. Jasser Auda formulates it as multi-dimension structure which considers the area of meaning and target, level of value which is made as the basis, and generality of meaning. In the understanding, the understanding of maqasid goes through a transformation to a wider, more general, and more universal direction. For instance, Al-Tahir ibn Ashur proposes the expansion of the maqasid consideration basis on keeping and maintaining orderliness, equality, freedom, facilitation, and preservation of fitrah (natural quality of the mind and humans’ characteristics).

The sides of universal values which are interpolated into new dimension of the maqasid are freedom, justice, equality, and human rights. With the consideration, Islamic scholars acquire new ammunition to respond to age challenges. Yusuf al-Qaradawi categorizes the responses into three approaches of tafsir maqāsīdī: literalis or zhahirriyyah stressing interpretation based only on redaction of the Qur’an, liberalis stressing the interpretation of essence in spite of having to leave the hints which are textually laden, and moderat considering the goodness from two previous approaches by focusing on keeping the Qur’an’s global messages.

In Indonesian context, the use of method of tafsir such as thematic, tahlili, and ijtima’i is the in-thing, including the type of tafsir maqasidi. Despite having yet to explicitly specialize in the use of concept of maqasidi, most of the Indonesian Islamic thinkers and interpreters use the concept of maqasidi as term of reference in responding to various modern problems, including women’s agency problems. For instance, Husein Muhammad in formulating his thoughts regarding the gender justice bases his formulation on principles of maqasidi, that is, universal humanity purpose with four dimensions of meaning: benefit, justice, mercy, and wisdom. In keeping with Muhammad, M. Quraish Shihab also bases the discussion about gender and particularly women on universal basic principles. In one writing he, for example, discusses the women from side of genesis, rights, positions, and women’s roles. The use of the terms indicates that the author is doing the efforts of Islamic relevance

with modern era by seeing from perspective of Islamic sources and relating it to the terms which are usually used in modern scholarship. Another example is Muhammad Yusuf’s writing which identifies the use of approach of al-masālaḥah al-mursalah in the process of formulating MUI’s fatwa (instructions) concerning marriage in different religion. In his writing, Yusuf positions the concept of al-masālaḥah al-mursalah as part of the mechanism of maqasid syariah in his classical understanding where three bases of –darūra>t, hā>jiyya>t, and tahsī>niyyat are made as the measure of concept application. The first example is the application of tafsir maqasid with enthusiasm to seek after interpretation alternative with gender judicature, while the second and the third ones are the examples of application which keep the meaning of established gender relation.

From the clarification above, there are at least two ways of using maqsid syari’ah. Firstly, the approach of maqsid syari’ah is discussed in perspective of Islamic law. It can be understood because syariah itself is more meant as tasyri. So, if we call maqasid syariah, then what is meant is deduction of Islamic law by considering the general purposes of syariah. Secondly, maqasid syari’ah is in the understanding as manhaj of religion.

In this thing I notice that maqasid syari’ah either in the understanding of tasyri or in the understanding of manhaj equally has potency and can be used as the approach of Islamic scientification. Firstly, it is interesting to notice Jaser Audah’s offer about systematic philosophy of the Islamic law which is built based on maqasid syari’ah. In his book, Maqa>sīd al-Shari’a: Dālī li al-Mubtadi (2011) was translated into English Maqa>sīd al-Shari’a as Philosophy of Islamic Law: a System Approach by borrowing the Western philosophical tradition formulating the offer of comprehensive law deduction based on the purposes of syari’ah but by the systematic approach to maintain the main objective of sharia which can answer the age challenges. The main consideration in doing ijtihad of interpretation returns to khasanah of Islam by making maqasid syari’ah as common ground of tasyri and the main criteria of the ijtihad.

Meanwhile, maqasid syari’ah as manhaj of religion can be used as alternative offer of the Islamic scientification in socio-cultural area. The reason built is considering the fact that the matter of law only occupies a part of the available spaces in Islam. The Qur’an itself talks more beyond the law; while the priests call the verses of law not more that 10%. It means that the area of discussion beyond the law is so wide, and this needs to get attention. All this time maqasid syari’ah dedicated is more used in the law; whereas its potency can also be used as manhaj in cultural scientific construct. In this thing, the meaning of sharia can be taken from other meanings, that is, “the place where the water flows” like in Q. Al-Maidah/5: 48, “To each Muslim among you, we give the rules (syir’ah) and the ways (minhaj).”

According to Muhammad al-Asymawi, this verse is meant that “We make the ways and the methods for each of you, or We (make) the entrance for you.”

By giving the meaning to *sharia* as the place where something goes (the flowing of water), the meaning of *sharia* is more meant as the place where the religion or *manhaj* of religion goes. The implication of this meaning is big or bigger than *tasry*. We know that Islam is present for the great purpose, that is, *rahmatan li al-alamin*, and this is the *manhaj* of Islam as merciful religion. All the constructions of doctrines, tenets, or knowledge are based on the basic principle of the *manhaj* of Islam, that is, *rahmatan li al-alamin*.

Borrowing Kuntowijoyo’s approach concerning the transcendental structuralism, I also position the *tauhid* as the power of structural formation, and it is the absolute reality or the truth itself and becomes the sources and the research objectives. Then in the inner structure, I change Kuntowijoyo’s offer with *maqasidi syari’ah*. Because the determination of characteristics of *maqasid syari’ah* has characteristic of *ijtihadi*, every thinker has the open chance to formulate by himself or to agree with other thinkers. In this chance, I will refer to what has been formulated by Tahir Ibn Atsur as discussion materials, namely: orderliness, equality, freedom, facilitation, and *fitrah* (the preservation of pure natural disposition) as mentioned above.

The next one is outer structure, namely: concepts, values, norms, and realities as well as various problems lying in life, and the relationship between both of them which is positioned as object or input where *ijtihad* or reinterpretation can be done by the approach of *maqasisi syari’ah*. In brief, it can be illustrated like this:

### The Transcendental Structuralism of the Maqasid Syari’ah as Manhaj of Religion

![Diagram](image)

---

The second one is about academic culture of the working committee at UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. As touched upon in Introduction, UIN Jakarta also deals with the same problem in academic and working culture like at other state colleges. It means that this is the shared homework. Besides the emergence of problem due to the logical consequence from State’s organizational fitrah, some of other problems from the weakness of academic and working culture are nurtured by practice and habit as well as the development of existing policy; for instance, as far as I know in its history this institute focused more on the development of human resources in terms of the teaching staffs, while the human resources from side of administration did not acquire attention like the attention given to lecturers. Many problems emerged resulting from this lameness, among others were the problems of effectiveness and efficiency. As if these two things were difficult to be increased. There is another problem which is currently being expected, that is, the matter of creativity. In short, the institute has not even been able to motivate the improvement of efficiency and effectiveness as if it ran slowly and hesitantly, let alone motivate creativity to support the good academic and working culture. Indeed, in a couple of decades there have been endeavors in increasing the management by applying some strategies such as, Result Based Management, TQM, ISO, and the last, SPI joined in offering another strategy, and we should be grateful to God, but it is all not enough yet to balance the development of human resources in terms of the lecturers who have done it far enough. Maybe it needs the strategy which is rather revolutionary particularly in the input of its human resources. That strategy is directed to network the potential human resources and is required to support the actualization of UIN Jakarta’s aspiration; that is, becoming the competitive university which achieves the world’s recognition.

Wa Allâh A‘lam bi al-Ṣawâb
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