

HERMAN L. BECK

The rupture of the Muhammadiyah with the Ahmadiyya

The Muhammadiyah is often mistakenly associated by outsiders with the Ahmadiyya¹ according to the writers of the *Muhammadiyah sebagai gerakan Islam*, 'The Muhammadiyah as an Islamic movement' (Kamal, Yusuf and Sholeh 1994:130-1). In this book, they want to explain to students attending the upper secondary schools of the Muhammadiyah, and also to ordinary members of the organization, what kind of organization the Muhammadiyah is and what it stands for. To define the character of the Muhammadiyah, they deal with, for example, the position of the organization in relation to other Islamic religious factions (Ar.: *firqa*) and the Islamic law schools (Ar.: *madhhab*) (Kamal, Yusuf and Sholeh 1994:126-36). The authors regard the differences between the Islamic religious factions as resulting from differences of opinion regarding essential elements of the Islamic creed (Ar.: *'aqida*). However, in their view, the differences between the various Islamic law schools are connected with divergences of opinion not affecting the basic tenets of Islamic doctrine (Ar.: *khilâfiyya*). The the authors of *Muhammadiyah sebagai gerakan Islam* mention the Ahmadiyya while discussing some other Islamic religious factions.

Three things in particular are striking in the discussion of the Ahmadiyya in this book. First, the space devoted to its discussion is considerable compared to the space devoted to other religious groups, like the Shī'a, which were much more influential and of greater importance in the history of Islam than the Ahmadiyya.² However, this is understandable both in view of the confusion over the names Muhammadiyah and Ahmadiyya that the writers of the book want to remove and because, unlike the rest of the Muslim world, the Ahmadiyya has had a much more obvious presence in Indonesia than the Shī'a.

¹ The author wishes to thank the two anonymous reviewers for providing valuable comments on the draft.

² Kamal, Yusuf and Sholeh 1994:130-3 (Ahmadiyya) versus 1994:126-7 (Shī'a).

HERMAN BECK took his PhD degree at Leiden University and is currently Professor of the Phenomenology and History of Religion Faculty of Theology, Tilburg University, the Netherlands. He is the author of *L'image d'Idrīs II, ses descendants de Fâs et la politique sharīfienne des sultans marīnides (656-869/1258-1465)*, [Asfar, volume 3]. Leiden: Brill, 1989 and *Les Musulmans d'Indonésie*, [Fils d'Abraham, volume 30] Turnhout: Brepols, 2003. Professor Beck may be contacted at: H.L.Beck@uvt.nl.

Secondly, the tolerant tone of the discussion of the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch is surprising in light of the national and international condemnation of the Ahmadiyya. A distinction must be made between its Qâdiyân branch and the Lahore branch, as non-Islamic organizations. As for the Qâdiyân branch of the Ahmadiyya, the writers agree with mainstream Sunni Islam, which generally holds the opinion that it does not belong to Islam. As for the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya, the writers state that its convictions are largely those of mainstream Sunni Islam.

However, they continue, the salient difference is that the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya sees Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad (1835-1908), the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement, as a *mujaddid*, a 'renewer' of Islam, and a *muhaddath*, a 'man who is spoken to' by God (Kamal, Yusuf and Sholeh 1994:132). As a *mujaddid*, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad is believed to be the reformer who, according to some traditions, will be sent on the eve of every new century to restore Islam to its pristine purity. In addition to his purifying task, every *mujaddid* has to devote his attention to the problems typical of the time he is living in. As a *muhaddath*, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad can be understood, metaphorically speaking, to be a prophet. God spoke to him, and he acted on God's command like all prophets, but he was never entrusted with a mission involving the introduction of a new law as prophets like Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad were.³

This is the third striking element in the treatment of the Ahmadiyya in *Muhammadiyah sebagai gerakan Islam*. Usually, in a rather oversimplified way, the determining difference between the two branches is summarized in the central belief of the Qâdiyân branch of the Ahmadiyya in Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad as a prophet, whereas the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya only acknowledges him as a reformer. This belief is one of the most important reasons for the condemnation of the Ahmadiyya. In its collection of resolutions of the Majlis Tarjih,⁴ the Muhammadiyah, too, clearly stated that there is no prophet after the prophet Muhammad. The resolution, adopted at the 18th Congress of the Muhammadiyah, held in Solo in 1929, declared everyone confessing the existence of a prophet after the prophet Muhammad to be a *kâfir*, an 'unbeliever' (*Himpunan* 1976:280-1). Although the Ahmadiyya is not mentioned by name, there is no doubt that this resolution was directed towards the Ahmadiyya.⁵

³ For the concept of *mujaddid*, see, for example, Friedmann 1989:94-101, 106-11. As for the relation between *mujaddid* and prophet, according to Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad, see, for example, Cragg 1965:157-9. For the concept of *muhaddath*, see, for example, Friedmann 1989:86-92.

⁴ The Majlis Tarjih is one of the eight councils of the Muhammadiyah. It is 'responsible for fostering the study of Islamic law and formulating religious guidance for doctrinal issues, ritual adherence and social affairs' (Saleh 2001:108-9).

⁵ Ali 1957:70. Attention should be paid to the fact that A. Mukti Ali was a prominent person in Muhammadiyah circles.

The Central Board of the Muhammadiyah concurs with Kamal, Yusuf and Sholeh regarding the Ahmadiyya, as is evident from its official approval by Djindar Tamimy (died 1996), the general secretary of the movement from 1952 until 1971 and one of its deputy chairmen from 1971 until 1990. Why, then, has the Muhammadiyah, throughout the years, adopted a moderate attitude towards the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya, despite its own condemnation of the Ahmadiyya in 1929 and despite the urgent call of the Muslim World League of April 1974 to all Muslim governments to ban all activities of Mīrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's followers and to declare the Ahmadiyya a non-Muslim minority group. Information regarding this international condemnation and its official documentation were widely spread in Indonesia at the end of 1981 by the Dewan Dakwah Islamiyah Indonesia, the Indonesian Council of the Propagation of Islam, an organization of strict modernist Muslims directed for many years by Mohammed Natsir (1908-1993).⁶

In answering this question, first some doctrinal background information on the Ahmadiyya will be given to sketch the characteristic features in which it contrasts sharply with mainstream Sunni Islam. In the second section, the coming of the Ahmadiyya to Yogyakarta will be related. Attention will be paid to the situation of the Muhammadiyah when the first Ahmadiyya missionaries of the Lahore branch arrived in Yogyakarta. In the third section, the initial cordial relationship between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya and the possible reason or reasons for it will be discussed. The fourth section will be dedicated to the first critical comments in Muhammadiyah circles on the Ahmadiyya, ending in the condemnation of the Ahmadiyya by the Muhammadiyah's Majlis Tarjih, in 1929, which meant a definitive rupture between the two organizations. The Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya will be the main focus of attention, because it was its persuasion the Muhammadiyah was confronted with in its formative period in Central Java. By way of conclusion, in the fifth section, some words will be devoted to the development of the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch in Central Java after the definitive rupture of 1929. In addition, the reasons will be discussed why the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch never became important in Central Java, as well as the reasons why the Muhammadiyah adopted a rather tolerant attitude towards this organization after the rupture.

Doctrinal background information on the Ahmadiyya

The Muslim World League based its urgent call to ban Mīrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's activities in April of 1974 on its opinion that the Ahmadiyya deviated at least in three fundamental doctrinal aspects from mainstream

⁶ *Dokumen-dokumen* n.d.:5-7. For Mohammad Natsir, see, for example, Ihza 1995.

Sunni Islam.⁷ For one, the Ahmadiyya claimed that its leader was a prophet. Moreover, it was said to change and corrupt Koranic texts. Finally, the Ahmadiyya denied the necessity of *jihad* in the sense of armed warfare against unbelievers (*Dokumen-dokumen* n.d.:5-7; Schulze 1990:364-6). These three points can be considered the characteristic features of the teachings of Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad which were the causes of the 'great chasm between orthodox Islâm and Ahmadiyyah' (Fisher 1963:35). They are interrelated and must be understood, primarily, against the background of the British colonial milieu with strong Christian and Hindu missionary activities in which Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad devoted himself to the cause of purifying and reforming Islam. In the British India of Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's time, the existing Messiah expectations among Muslims and the religious freedom at the time were the two determinant factors of his success, according to Munir Ahmed (1990:415).

The criticism of the Muslim World League regarding the Ahmadiyya's changing and corrupting of Koranic texts refers generally to its 'Christology' in particular. In this section on some aspects of the doctrinal background of the Ahmadiyya, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's doctrine of Jesus, especially, Jesus's death, will be the focus of attention. The confident attitude of the Ahmadiyya vis-à-vis the Christian missionaries was one of the results of this doctrine, and this self-confidence, which, in my opinion, was one of the reasons why the Muhammadiyah felt attracted to this Indian movement. Indeed, in a certain way, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's work can be seen as inspired by the wish to find an Islamic answer to the claims of Christian missionaries in this British colony. In their preaching of the Christian faith, they contrasted the living Christ with the deceased prophet Muhammad, as had been done in Christian polemics since the Middle Ages (Friedmann 1989:111-3). To underpin the belief in the living Christ, the Christian missionaries even appealed to the Koran. They adduced Sûra 3:55 to prove the agreement of the Koran with the Christian doctrine that Christ was alive and in heaven.⁸ On the basis of

⁷ The information in this first section relies heavily on Fisher 1963, Friedmann 1989, and Ahmed 1990.

⁸ The first part of this verse is usually rendered in English as something like: '(Recall) when Allah said: "O Jesus, I am going to bring thy term to an end and raise thee to Myself, and purify thee from those who have disbelieved."' (Bell 1960:50).

'When God said, "Jesus, I will take thee to Me, and will raise thee to Me and I will purify thee of those who believe not"' (Arberry 1964:53.)

'Remember when God said, "O Jesus, I will surely receive you and raise you up to me. I shall purify you of those who have rejected faith"' (Ayoub 1992:169.)

In his commentary on this verse, Ayoub (1992:169) mentions the difficulties in rendering the meaning of the Arabic *mutawaffika*. He chooses to render it as 'I will receive you', but he states that it is also possible to render it as 'I cause you to die'. Then Ayoub gives some examples of prominent commentators of the Koran, for example, al-Tabarsî (died 548/1153) and al-Râzî

this verse, they concluded that the living Christ was superior to the deceased prophet Muhammad. In their opinion, this implied, as a matter of course, that Islam was inferior to Christianity (Friedmann 1989:114-6).

In the early 1890s, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad, probably inspired by his controversies with Christian missionaries, put forward his doctrine of Jesus's death. With this doctrine, he took the edge off their claims and thus refuted the idea of the superiority of Christianity to Islam. Even more importantly, it supported his own assertion that he was the Messiah and *Mahdî*, the 'Messiah of the Muslims', which he had announced in the year 1891. This announcement came two years after his call to his followers and sympathizers to pledge allegiance (Ar.: *bay'a*) to him, an event which is generally taken to be the formal beginning of the Ahmadiyah movement (Smith 1960; Friedmann 1989:5; Ahmed 1990:417). His doctrine of Jesus's death, however, was based on an interpretation of the Koranic verses regarding Jesus which was contrary to its interpretation by traditional mainstream Sunni Islam.

The traditional mainstream Sunni view on Jesus departs from Sûra 3:55 and Sûra 4:157-159: the Jews neither killed Jesus nor crucified him, but God raised him to heaven. At the day of resurrection, Jesus will play a role as a witness regarding the people of the Book.⁹ The words of Sûra 3:55, 4:159 and 43:61 (where Jesus is called a 'Sign for the Hour',¹⁰ related to some traditions according to which, at the end of times, Jesus will play a role quite similar to the expected Mahdî,) have led to the popular association and, sometimes, identification of Jesus with the Mahdî (Attema 1942:26, 131, 167; Anawati 1978). Thus, according to the traditional mainstream Sunni view on Jesus and the more popular image of him, both of which depart from the Koranic belief that he is alive in heaven from which he will descend, to appear again before the end of time.

(died 606/1209) who indeed preferred the meaning 'I will cause you to die'. It is revealing that Christian missionaries never made use of Sûra 4:157: '[T]hough they did not kill him and did not crucify him, but he was counterfeited for them [...]. Nay, Allah raised him to himself.' This verse denies the crucifixion of Jesus and his death on the cross with all its implications.

⁹ Bell 1960:89: 'And for their saying: "We killed the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the Messenger of Allah," though they did not kill him and did not crucify him, but he was counterfeited for them; [...] Nay, Allah raised him to Himself, [...], and on the day of resurrection, he will be regarding them a witness.'

Arberry 1964:95: '[A]nd for their saying, "We slew the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, the Messenger of God" – yet they did not slay him neither crucified him, only a likeness of that was shown to them. [...] God raised him up to Him; [...] and on the Resurrection Day he will be a witness against them.'

¹⁰ However, see also Bell 1960:495: 'Verily it is knowledge for the Hour'.

In a note, Bell comments on the pronoun 'it': 'Probably the Qur'ân or the message. On the assumption that the passage is continuous, the pronoun is usually taken as referring to Jesus, whose second coming is one of the signs of the Hour. Hence '*alam* "mark" is sometimes read instead of '*ilm* "knowledge".'

Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad, for his part, presented a doctrine of Jesus's death which was based on a different rendering and interpretation of the Koran verses cited above.¹¹ Besides, some Western scholars think that it is very likely that Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad was influenced by the discussions on Jesus's life, the so-called *Leben Jesu Forschung*, which were very popular in Western Europe, especially in German, theological circles in the nineteenth century. One of the themes in these discussions was that Jesus did not die at the cross, but remained alive and that, in one way or another, his activities can be connected with India (Mintjes 1985). Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's teachings regarding Jesus's death may be summarized in the following way. Jesus was crucified, but did not pass away at the cross. After some time, he was taken from the cross in a state of unconsciousness. He was taken care of, his wounds were treated with a potent balm, he recovered and, after three days, he was able to attend a secret meeting of his disciples. Then he left for India,

¹¹ I will give the translation of the three Koran fragments according to the rendering of Muhammad Ali, the leader of the Lahore branch, because it is this branch with which the Muhammadiyah was confronted in Central Java.

Sûra 3:55 (Ali 1935:159): 'When Allah said, "O Jesus! I will cause you to die and exalt you in My presence and clear you of those who disbelieve [...]"''. In a note to this translation of *mutawaffika*, he refers to Bukhârî and Sûra 39:42 to prove that '[N]o other significance can be attached to the words when thus used'. Fisher (1963:71) mentions that the Qâdiyânîs 'add their own gloss, "I will cause thee to die a natural death"'. Therefore it is also useful to mention the exegesis of *mutawaffika* by al-Zamakhsharî (died 538/1144), as quoted by Ayoub (1992:175), 'I will complete the term of your life, that is, I will protect you from being slain at the hands of the rejecters of faith. I will give you instead respite to a specific term which I have decreed for you. Then will I cause you to die a natural death; you will not be slain by them. I will purify you of the evil company of those who have rejected faith.'

Sûra 4:157 (Ali 1935:241-2): 'And their saying, Surely we have killed the Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, the apostle of Allah; and they did not kill him nor did they crucify him, but (the matter) was made dubious to them, [...]'. In his comment on the word 'crucify', Muhammad Ali states, 'The word does not negative Jesus's being nailed to the cross, but it negatives his having expired on the cross as a result of being nailed to it. That he died a natural death is plainly stated in 5:117: "And I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when Thou didst cause me to die, Thou wert the watcher over them"'. In his comment on Sûra 5:117, Muhammad Ali (1935: 285) says, 'This verse is a conclusive proof that Jesus died a natural death, and is not alive in heaven, according to the theoretic belief of the Christians and the supposition of many Muslims'.

Sûra 43:61 (Ali 1935:950): 'And most surely it is a knowledge of the hour'. Muhammad Ali's comment, 'The *hour* signifies the hour of departure of prophethood from the house of Israel. [...] Prophethood had long remained in the house of Israel, and, as history shows, Jesus was the last prophet of the Mosaic dispensation. Is it not strange that a nation in which prophet after prophet had appeared should witness such an entire change with the advent of Jesus, after whom no single prophet appeared? It is in this sense that Jesus is a knowledge of the hour, for the *hour* signifies the doom of a people, and in this case it was the doom of the Israelites.'

Compare also Sûra 3:144 (Ali 1935:182): 'And Muhammad is no more than an apostle; the apostles have already passed away before him'. In his comment, Muhammad Ali says, 'This verse affords a conclusive proof that Jesus Christ was also dead'.

where he died a natural death in Srinagar, Kashmir, aged 120 years. His grave can still be visited there.

Thus, Jesus died a natural death and he was not raised to heaven. Therefore, he could not be the one whose second coming is to be expected at the end of time. Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad attacked the doctrine of the crucifixion and resurrection, a doctrine which was the core of the Christian faith. Thus, he is believed to have refuted the claims of the Christian missionaries, and he had also cleared the way for his own claim to be the Messiah and the Mahdî who had come to restore peace and justice on earth (Ahmed 1990:420). However, although Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad could deny Jesus's death at the cross, his ascent, and second coming by a different reading and interpretation of Koranic verses, he could by no means deny Jesus's prophethood. Should this imply an inferior status of Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad in comparison with Jesus? The sheer possibility of Jesus's superiority to Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad due to his prophethood had to be invalidated (Fisher 1963:39). Besides, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad had already received revelations from God.

Gradually, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad developed his claim of prophethood. In his earlier writings, he still rejected a prophetic status but, by 1894, he announced that he was entitled to the status of *muhaddath* and finally, in 1902, he declared he was a prophet of God (Friedmann 1989:134-8). As scriptural proofs of his claim, he pointed to Jesus's promise of the future coming of the Comforter referred to in John 14:16 and 16:7, and the Messenger called Ahmad in Sûra 61:6.¹² Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad, probably in contrast to the Islamic doctrine of Muhammad as the 'seal of the prophets', founded on Sûra 33:40, gave an interpretation of his prophethood that differed from the traditional conception. He understood his prophethood to be 'a shadow of the prophethood of Muhammad'. Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad explained this in the following words: 'In my view, a person upon whom divine speech, including (knowledge of) the hidden, descends with certainty and in abundance is called a prophet. Therefore Allâh called me a prophet, but without a law. The carrier of the law, until the Day of Judgment, is the Qur'ân.' (As cited by Friedmann 1989:134.) Despite the highly personal interpretation of Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's prophethood, his doctrine of being a non-legislative prophet was both the major breaking point with mainstream Sunni Islam and

¹² Bell's translation (1960:577) of Sûra 61:6: 'And when Jesus, son of Mary, said: "O Children of Israel, I am Allah's messenger to you, confirming the Torah which was before me, and announcing the good tidings of a messenger who will come after me, bearing the name Ahmad."'

Fisher (1963:37-9) mentions the fact that this is the Qâdiyân interpretation of the Biblical and Koranic verses. Lahore and mainstream Sunni Muslims understand these verses as referring to the Prophet Muhammad. This is especially clear from the commentary note of Muhammad Ali (1935:1071-2) to Sûra 61:6.

the cause of the split between the Qâdiyân and Lahore branches in 1914.

The third point for which Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad was severely criticized was his reinterpretation of the classical doctrine of *jihad*, predominantly translated as 'holy war'. Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad was convinced of the necessity to reinterpret the concept of *jihad* in order to pacify the critics of Islam who saw it as an aggressive and intolerant religion because of its doctrine of *jihad* (Friedmann 1989:173). He defended an understanding of *jihad* as a defensive act only. In this, he and many modernist Muslims, for example, his compatriot Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khân (1817-1898) were of one mind. The latter had developed the view that, even if a Muslim country was ruled by an infidel foreign government, Muslims were not allowed to revolt against this rule as long as their religious freedom was guaranteed and they were able to observe their religious duties (Friedmann 1989:170; Peters 1979:125-30).

Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's reinterpretation of the concept of *jihad* as a spiritual effort through voice and pen, however, was not only motivated by his wish to change the negative attitude of his opponents towards Islam for its doctrine of an aggressive 'holy war', but it also served his image of the Mahdî. The Mahdî, who was none other than Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad himself, would carry out his assignment by means of peaceful and rational persuasion and not by way of a violent *jihad* in which, eventually, all unbelievers would be killed by force of arms (Friedmann 1989:175-80). His interpretation of *jihad*, which went against the classical doctrine, relieved Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad of the obligation to fight against the British colonial government. On the other hand, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad could benefit from the religious freedom the British colonial power allowed its subjects, as long as they did not jeopardize the peace or law and order, for the propagation of his religious ideas. In fact, Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad apparently held the value of religious freedom in such great esteem that he recognized the legitimacy of the British rule over India and expected his followers to be loyal to the government (Friedmann 1989:177). Loyalty to the ruling government became one of the characteristics of the Ahmadiyya when it spread around the world. It was also one of the reasons why the Ahmadiyya was strongly criticized and, often, accused of collaborating with oppressive unbelieving colonial rulers.

Mainstream Sunni Islam criticises Ahmadiyya teachings on other points: the refusal to perform *salât* behind a non-Ahmadî imâm, the view of non-Ahmadî Muslims as *kâfir*, and the ban on Ahmadî women marrying non-Ahmadî Muslim men (Pijper 1950:249-52). However, the criticism of Indonesian Muslims about the Ahmadiyya corresponds, for the greater part, with the three doctrinal aspects of Ahmadiyya teachings presented in this section. Therefore, in the next two sections, attention will be paid to the coming of the Ahmadiyya to Yogyakarta and its relationship with the Muhammadiyah which, in the beginning, was quite cordial.

The coming of the Ahmadiyya to Yogyakarta

There is hardly any reliable information on the beginnings of the Ahmadiyya movement in Indonesia and its motive to come to Yogyakarta. The story told in Muhammadiyah circles holds that the first two Ahmadiyya missionaries arriving in Yogyakarta had actually set out for Hong Kong, China, or Manila.¹³ Sometimes it is stated that when Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig and Maulanâ Ahmad, both missionaries of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya, were staying in Singapore on their journey to Hong Kong, they heard of the powerful Christian missionary activities in Indonesia. Upon hearing about the activities of the Christians, they decided to change their destination and head for Indonesia.¹⁴ Another story tells of the two missionaries becoming stranded in Java on their way to China because they lacked money. In Java, they were confronted with the strong proselytism of Christianity. After asking permission of the Lahore headquarters to counterbalance the Christian efforts, Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig and Maulanâ Ahmad started to work in Java.¹⁵ A third version mentions the Lahore headquarters as having taken the initiative of sending missionaries to Java. However, this reading was thought up by Abdul 'Alim Siddîq al-Qâdirî, a learned Indian Muslim who, in 1927, warned the Muhammadiyah and the Nahdlatul Ulama against the Ahmadiyya (Blood 1974:25).

Whatever and whoever may have prompted the Ahmadiyya to come to Indonesia, it is important to note that all sources stress the anti-Christian disposition of the first Ahmadiyya Lahore missionaries in Java (see also Van der Plas 1934:262). It is the self-confident attitude of the Ahmadiyya Lahore missionaries towards Christianity and their fight against the latter which, in particular, might have appealed to the Muhammadiyah.¹⁶ Of course,

¹³ Pijper (1950:251): China; Soedewo (1937:93): China; Zulkarnain (1990:5): China; *Ahmadiyyah* (1974:45): Hong Kong; Blood (1974:25): Manila. Blood's source of information is the article 'Muhammadiyah terhadap Ahmadiyah', a personal communication by the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah sent to Blood to set out the Muhammadiyah's attitude towards the Ahmadiyya in past and present. Unfortunately, I was not able to consult this article. I would like to thank Iskandar Zulkarnain (IAIN Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta) for making Margaret Blood's thesis available to me.

¹⁴ *Ahmadiyyah* 1974:45. Mailrapport 327 x/24, (Nationaal Archief (NA), The Hague) mentions that, according to *The Light*, a missionary periodical of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya, a third missionary was staying with Maulanâ Ahmad and Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig in Singapore. His name was Hâfiz Muhammad Hasan. The three of them were destined to work in China and the Malayan countries.

¹⁵ This version of the coming of the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch is given by Soedewo (1937:93; also by Pijper 1950:251 and Blood 1974:25). Soedewo (1906-1970) was one of the prominent Ahmadiyya Lahore leaders in Central Java. He is especially known for his many translations of Ahmadiyya Lahore texts into Dutch, for example, his Koran translation of 1934 and his translation of Maulana Muhammad Ali's *The religion of Islam* of 1938.

¹⁶ Van der Plas 1934:262; Ali 1957:72. However, Mukti Ali, himself closely involved in the Muhammadiyah, does not support his hypothesis with evidence.

other reasons explaining the initial popularity of the Ahmadiyya among Muhammadiyah members also have to be taken into account, but they are of minor importance. Thus, the fact that 'the Lahore Ahmadiyah sided with the Nationalist movement in Indonesia' is mentioned as one of the reasons of the initially cordial relation between prominent members of the Muhammadiyah and the two missionaries of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya.¹⁷

The many similarities between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya might also, in the beginning, have led the former to consider the latter as an attractive ally to realize its ideals. Indeed, both organizations wanted to prove Islam to be a religion compatible with modernity, with its stress on rationality, science, and technology (Blood 1974:15). To that end, both organizations devoted a great deal of attention to the central role of the principle of *ijtihad* in Muslim thinking and to the question of the extent to which Western education and Western educational methods should be introduced at Muslim educational institutions. The two organizations shared the defensive understanding of *jihad*, which concept was primarily seen as a spiritual effort.¹⁸ The two organizations also had in common their aim to purify Islam by opposing various innovations and superstitions which had crept in and which were held responsible for the backwardness of the Muslim world. Thus, the Ahmadiyya ban on magical, mystical, and saint-worshipping practices concurred with Muhammadiyah's own struggle against innovation and superstition (Blood 1974:15).

The many similarities and bonds of friendship between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya were experienced by outsiders as a sign that the two organizations would soon merge. Thus, the *Javabode*, a Dutch-language Javanese journal, of 9 January 1925, published an article on the Ahmadiyya movement, its leadership, aim, and prophet. The import of the article was that the Muhammadiyah was about to merge with the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya. Louis Frederik Dingemans (1874-1955), the Resident of Yogyakarta (1924-1927), who, according to some Muhammadiyah leaders, was inclined to favour Christianity over Islam, was strongly alarmed by the newspaper article. He summoned the leaders of the Muhammadiyah and Hendrik Kraemer (1888-1965), a Dutch missionary with the Nederlandsch Bijbelgenootschap (Dutch Bible Association) who was active in Indonesia, and especially in Java, from 1922 to 1928 and 1929 to 1935 (Hoekema 1994:87).

The Muhammadiyah was represented by H. Muchtar (1881-1963), a batik trader living in the Kauman area of Yogyakarta, who was its second vice-

¹⁷ Pringgogidgo 1950:111; Ali 1957:71. Again, a foundation of this hypothesis is not given by the authors.

¹⁸ A good expression of the Muhammadiyah's interpretation of *jihad* is given by Djarnawi Hadikusuma (1923-1993), a son of Bagus Hadikusuma, who became the first secretary of the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah in 1956 (Hadikusuma 1974:38).

chairman and a younger brother of K.H. Hisyam (1879-1944), chairman of the movement from 1932-1936, and H. Machruf, because K.H. Ibrahim was ill and H. Fachruddin was out of town.¹⁹ H. Muchtar denied the rumour that the Muhammadiyah would unite with the Ahmadiyya. With his denial he apparently succeeded in convincing both Resident Dingemans and Hendrik Kraemer that such a development was absolutely out of the question (Blood 1974:28; Alfian 1989:230).

Hendrik Kraemer held the view that the Ahmadiyya was one of the important factors for the change in the Muhammadiyah's tolerant attitude towards Christianity into a hostile one.²⁰ He seems to have feared the threatening prospect of the combination of two anti-Christian organizations. Kraemer may have wanted to alert the colonial authorities to the danger this combination could imply for the Dutch law-and-order policy. His presence being requested by Dingemans may prove that the latter shared his anxiety and set great store by his judgement regarding the explanation of the Muhammadiyah leaders.

However, the appeal which the critical and confident attitude of the Ahmadiyya towards Christianity held for members of the Muhammadiyah is beyond dispute and can be illustrated by a remark by Djojosoegito. He stated in a letter that he felt attracted to the Ahmadiyya for its zeal and courage in propagating the Truth of Islam and the Message of its Prophet in Christian countries which, so far, always had been hostile to Islam by oppressing it and competing with it because they were not aware of the beauty of this religion.²¹ Djojosoegito was one of the key figures in the early history of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya in Yogyakarta. He may have been the one who took the first step towards inviting the Ahmadiyya to Yogyakarta, for he revealed, in the letter just mentioned, that he had already been informed about this organization in the years 1921 and 1922 (Aboebakar 1957:127). Unfortunately, this statement cannot be proved by further documentary evidence.

There are several reasons for the particular appeal in the early 1920s for the Muhammadiyah of the critical and confident attitude of the Ahmadiyya towards Christianity. The general backdrop is the economic depression in Central Java since 1921 which had caused a sharp recession. There was great social and political unrest which, every now and then, exploded into mass strikes, like those of the pawnshop workers which began on 11 January 1922, and of the state railway workers on 9 May 1923 (Shiraishi 1990:234, 241; Van

¹⁹ Mailrapport 89 x/25, NA.

²⁰ Alfian 1989:209; Shihab 1995:286. Kraemer was not the only one to hold this opinion. The Dutch Protestant missionary F.L.O. Bakker (1925:167) presented the same view in a lecture on April 1925.

²¹ Aboebakar 1957:127. Aboebakar cites a letter by Djojosoegito with a retrospective character, dated 'Jogjakarta 8 Desember 1956'.

Miert 1995:210-2, 235). Nationalist feeling, both within and outside movements and organizations, made itself increasingly felt (Van Miert 1995).

After the ban on the evangelization of the Javanese which had already been abolished in 1889 and the introduction of the so-called Ethical Policy in 1901, Muslims had become deeply suspicious of the colonial government (Ricklefs 1988:143-4; Shihab 1995:49, 242). The moral responsibility that the Dutch suddenly felt as Christians towards their subjects in the Netherlands East Indies expressed itself in an obvious abandonment of the policy of religious neutrality. The most explicit expression of this political transformation in religious affairs was a statement attributed to A.W.F. Idenburg (1861-1935), the governor-general of the Dutch Indies from 1909 to 1916. He is believed to have said, in 1910, that he would not leave the Dutch Indies before it had been transformed into a Christian nation.²² Muslims attributed the preferential policy towards Christianity over Islam to Dingemans, the Resident of Yogyakarta during the mid 1920s, whose colonial career is said, finally, to have come to an end due to this policy (Dingemans 1973:15).

The Muhammadiyah considered the intensifying Christianization activities of Christian missionaries in Central Java as a result of the altered Dutch policy on evangelization. The zeal of the Protestant missionaries in this period²³ resulted in, for instance, the establishment of a new Protestant theological training institute in Yogyakarta in 1925, as suggested by the Javanese nobleman R.S. Nimpoeno. The institute aimed at the education of native ministers who would also have access to the Javanese nobility (Hoekema 1994:96-8). Furthermore, Samuel Zwemer, an American missionary who visited Java in 1922, had advised actively spreading Christian reading matter among the Javanese, and missionaries took this up more systematically. Hendrik Kraemer was appointed the chairman of the committee responsible for this Christian reading evangelization (Hoekema 1994:103).

As for the contents of the Christian evangelization, there can be no doubt that the theme of the living Christ as opposed to the deceased Muhammad was one of the central teachings of the missionary propagation of the Christian faith. For example, in the Dutch translation of the book by the prominent German missionary G. Simon, which was much read, consulted and put into practice by Dutch missionaries in the Netherlands East Indies, Jesus is contrasted with Muhammad. Time and again, Jesus is portrayed as the victor

²² It is noteworthy that Idenburg's statement of 1910 was cited again by the Muslim journal *Medan Muslimin* of 10 January 1925 (Shihab 1995:259). For Idenburg's Christian conviction and his inclination to make a real effort to support Christian missionaries in the Dutch Indies, see, for example, his letters to A. Kuyper dated 26-6-1910, 9-10-1910, and 18-1-1911 (Bruijn and Puchinger 1985:202, 212, 228).

²³ The activities of Father Van Lith can be mentioned as an example of the Catholic missionaries.

because he is alive, while Muhammad is depicted as the loser because he is dead (Smit 1912:164-6, 176-8). The book inspired the missionaries in the field to confront the Muslims and convert them to Christianity with this truth.

Ahmad Dahlan, the founder of the Muhammadiyah, passed away in Yogyakarta on 23 February 1923. Although Ahmad Dahlan had been motivated to establish the Muhammadiyah to offer more comprehensive knowledge of Islam and its doctrines to the inhabitants of Yogyakarta and its environs, among other things, in order to check the progress of the influence of the Christian missionaries, he was said never to have assumed an aggressive attitude towards them. The opposite is true. He tried, by means of dialogues, to convince his Christian interlocutors of the superiority of Islam and, therefore, he invited them to join the Muhammadiyah. Some of Ahmad Dahlan's renowned discussion partners who are always mentioned in the Muhammadiyah literature on this subject are Father F. van Lith and the Protestant missionaries D. Bakker, H. Kraemer and S. Zwemer (Asrofie 1983:72-4; Alfian 1989:160-2). It is said that, for some time, he even held regular monthly meetings with the Reverend Bakker and the missionary medical doctor Offringa, who had been working at the Christian Petronella Hospital in Yogyakarta since 1912, to discuss Christianity and Islam. During his chairmanship of the Muhammadiyah, Ahmad Dahlan promoted these Christian-Muslim meetings not only to present Islam as the religion of truth, but also to continue the dialogue with the Christians so that no mutual condemnation would take place. Thus, he wanted to prevent the Muhammadiyah from becoming a fanatic anti-Christian movement (Pol 1922:120-2; Bakker 1925:163). Dahlan's tactful and dialogue approach towards Christianity, however, was not always appreciated by his fellow believers. Sometimes they labelled him an 'apostate *hâdjji*', a 'Christian *hâdjji*', or a 'Christian *kyai*'.²⁴

After Dahlan's death, the Muhammadiyah leaders chose a more aggressive approach to Christianity. Although K.H. Ibrahim (1874-1932), one of Pangulu Fadhil Rakhmaningrat's sons and the brother of Ahmad Dahlan's wife Siti Walidah, succeeded him as the chairman of the Muhammadiyah for the period 1923-1932, it was H. Fachruddin (1889-1929), the vice-chairman since 1923, who took the lead in delineating the new policy.²⁵ Ibrahim, a very wealthy man as a result of his marriage, had only become a member of the Muhammadiyah in 1920, but he was the chairman Ahmad Dahlan had in mind as his successor. The general meeting of the Muhammadiyah of 1923 complied with the wish of its founder, and Ibrahim was appointed the new chairman. Generally, howev-

²⁴ Pol 1922:121; Alfian 1989:162. *Kyai* is a 'title of respect for men learned in religious matters' (Echols and Shadily 1992, s.v. 'Kiai').

²⁵ For K.H. Ibrahim, see, for example, Hadikusuma n.d.:12-6; Salam 1965:134-6. For Fachruddin, see, for example, Hadikusuma n.d.:18-30; Salam 1965:139-41; Alfian 1989:200-2. For Siti Walidah, better known as Nyai Ahmad Dahlan, see Suratmin 1990.

er, he is considered to have played only a symbolic role as a leader of the movement, and it is sometimes said that his attractiveness for the Muhammadiyah lay in his wealth and his network of relations (Alfian 1989:199).

Vice-chairman Fachruddin energetically engaged in realizing the aims of the Muhammadiyah, the reformation and strengthening of Islam in Central Java, as had not yet been done before him (Bakker 1925:163). This apparently implied a harsh anti-colonial and anti-Christian stance. As long as Ahmad Dahlan lived, Fachruddin's anti-Christian feelings were somewhat bridled, although he sometimes gave vent to them in *Sri Diponegoro* and *Bintang Islam*, the periodicals he edited in the years 1918-1920 (Salam 1965:139; Blood 1974:28; Alfian 1989:162; Shihab 1995:283). After Dahlan's death, however, Fachruddin, member and general secretary of the Muhammadiyah since 1916, gave free rein to his aversion to Christianity. Under the direction of Fachruddin, the Muhammadiyah experienced the sharpest anti-Christian period in its history (Shihab 1995:282-4). Fachruddin was supported by his three brothers H. Sudjak (Sjoedja'), who was elected as a commission member to the Central Board in 1923, H. Zaini, and Ki Bagus Hadikusuma. All four were sons of Raden Hashim, an *abdidalem*, or court official, living in the Kauman area of Yogyakarta. It is in these circumstances that the two missionaries of the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch arrived in Yogyakarta.

The initially cordial relationship between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya, 1924-1926

Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig and Maulanâ Ahmad, the two missionaries of the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch, probably arrived in Yogyakarta at the end of March 1924. The story goes that the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah was so pleased with their coming that they were immediately invited to deliver a lecture at the movement's annual meeting which was being held at that very moment (Zulkarnain 1990:5). This annual meeting must have been the 13th Congress of the Muhammadiyah which took place in Yogyakarta from 28 March to 1 April 1924.

After K.H. Ibrahim had delivered his introductory speech as chairman of the Muhammadiyah on the first day of the congress, the floor was given to Djojosoegito, who had been elected as first secretary to the organization. In his address, he touched upon the progress of Islam in the western world owing to the efforts of the Ahmadiyya. Djojosoegito referred to the Ahmadiyya as a sister association of the Muhammadiyah. He stated that the latter was eager to co-operate with the former.²⁶ On Sunday, the second

²⁶ Mailrapport 644 x/24, NA.

day of the congress, the two Ahmadiyya Lahore missionaries were given the opportunity to give a lecture. Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig addressed the congress in English. His general account of Islam and its correspondences with Judaism and Christianity left most members of the audience unimpressed, but this could have been caused by the poor translation of his English into Javanese. Maulanâ Ahmad's speech in Arabic, on the other hand, was widely applauded by those who attended of the congress. On the basis of passages in the Old and New Testament, he refuted the doctrines of Jesus's godhead and his being God's son, without, however, offending the respect paid by the Koran to the prophet Jesus.²⁷ Maulanâ Ahmad's lecture was translated into Javanese by H. Hadjid, a commission member of the Central Board. It is interesting to note that the Muhammadiyah member, Ki Bagus Hadikusuma, concurred with Maulanâ Ahmad's words condemning the Jews for insulting and vilifying the prophet Jesus, and those reproaching the Christians for misjudging and defaming the prophet Muhammad.²⁸

Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig and Maulanâ Ahmad were warmly welcomed in Muhammadiyah circles in Yogyakarta. Maulanâ Ahmad, however, whose knowledge of Arabic became so well known that many people came to consult him on the Koran and its exegesis, left Yogyakarta on 5 June 1924, and returned to India for health reasons.²⁹ Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig stayed in Yogyakarta. Accommodation was offered to him in the house of H. Hilal, a son-in-law of Ahmad Dahlan by his marriage with Dahlan's daughter Djohanah and, after her death, with her sister Siti Aisyah.³⁰ H. Hilal was a Muhammadiyah member living in the Kauman area of Yogyakarta (*Ahmadiyah* 1974:45; Blood 1974:26). Soon the place became a centre of learning for everybody wanting to deepen his knowledge of Islam and especially for those who were eager to study English. In the meantime, Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig tried to master the Malay language (Soedewo 1937:94). Students belonging to the Muhammadiyah and to the Sarekat Islam, the nationalist association founded in 1912, became his pupils. Even the Sarekat Islam's leader, H. Omar Said Tjokroaminoto (1882-1934), studied with Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig (Blood 1974:26), who increased his knowledge of Islam and, most likely, rendered him good service with his Malay translation of the Koran.

The most faithful followers of Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig, however, came from the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah. Among them were promi-

²⁷ Mailrapport 327 x/24, NA.

It is noteworthy to mention the Mailrapport's remark that, actually, Mīrzâ Walī Ahmad Baig was the missionary, and that Maulanâ Ahmad was to accompany him because his knowledge of Arabic would have authority in 'ulamâ' circles. This idea clearly had its advantages.

²⁸ Mailrapport 644 x/24, NA.

²⁹ Mailrapport 654 x/24, NA; Soedewo 1937:93.

³⁰ Jainuri 1990:25. It is noteworthy that Wahban Hilal, the son of H. Hilal and Ahmad Dahlan's daughter Djohanah, became a member of the Ahmadiyya (Blood 1974: 27).

ment members like Djojosoegito and Mohammed Husni, the first and second general secretary, respectively, of the Muhammadiyah since 1923 (Blood 1974:27; Zulkarnain 1990:6; Hadikusuma n.d.a:14). Another well-known Muhammadiyah member studying English with the Ahmadiyya Lahore missionary was Bagus Hadikusuma (1890-1954), one of Fachruddin's brothers, who led the organization as its chairman during the turbulent years of 1942-1953 (Hadikusuma n.d.b:10). The Central Board of the Muhammadiyah had such high hopes of the Ahmadiyya education that four young members, namely, Ma'sum, Sabit, Jundab, and Jumhan, were sent abroad to study Islam and its propagation methods in Lahore.³¹ Jundab was a son of H. Muchtar, and Jumhan was a son of Ahmad Dahlan himself.

Unfortunately for the Muhammadiyah, neither the hope of its Central Board nor the fear of the Christian missionaries and the Dutch Resident in Yogyakarta were realized, for none of the four was to become of any use to the organization (Bakker 1925:168). Perhaps one of the reasons for this was the Muhammadiyah's breach with the Ahmadiyya in 1929; there was also a more personal reason. Twenty-year-old Jundab, who had arrived in Lahore on 3 July 1924, wrote a letter on 16 August 1924 to the Dutch consul-general in Calcutta asking permission to return to Java. He complained that the training at the Ahmadiyya school in Lahore was too difficult. Together with Ma'sum, Jundab came back to Java on 10 February 1925.³² Under the influence of Ahmad Hassan (1887-1958), one of the leading lights of the radical modernist movement Persatoean Islam, Ma'sum left the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya and became a member of the Persatoean Islam, which had only recently been founded at the initiative of K.H. Zamzam (1894-1952) and H. Muhammad Yunus in Bandung, on 12 September 1923.³³ Several decades later, however, Ma'sum joined the South Sulawesi branch of the Darul Islam movement under the command of Kahar Muzakkar (1919-1965).³⁴ Sabit associated with the Partai Komunis Indonesia, the Indonesian Communist Party. Jumhan, finally, indeed became a *muballigh*, a missionary preacher, but one propagating Ahmadiyya doctrines and not those of the Muhammadiyah (Van der Plas 1934:263; *Ahmadiyah* 1974:46). This son of Ahmad Dahlan and Siti Walidah was born in 1905 (Asrofie 1983:22). After having been sent to Lahore, he studied at the local 'Muslim College' for six years. During his stay in India, his name Jumhan was changed into Erfan Dahlan. When he was found to be

³¹ Mailrapport 654 x/24, NA.

³² Mailrapport 160 x/25, NA.

³³ Djaja n.d.:119. For Persatoean Islam, see Federspiel 2001.

³⁴ For Kahar Muzakkar (Van Dijk 1981:155-217).

It is noteworthy that the Darul Islam movement apparently held great attraction for members of the Persatoean Islam. Mohammad Natsir (1908-1993) is perhaps the most famous member of the Persatoean Islam who supported the Darul Islam (Ward 1970:13-4; Ihza 1995:127-8).

well-versed in the Ahmadiyya doctrines, he was ordered to work as a missionary in Thailand, where he spent the rest of his life.³⁵

Meanwhile Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig continued his activities in Yogyakarta, among which he considered the struggle against Christianity as one of his main tasks. He devoted himself to deepening and strengthening his students' knowledge of Islam so that they would be able to resist the dangers of the times, by which he had in mind, in addition to Christianity, the ideology of materialism (Soedewo 1937:94-6). Though it may be a mere coincidence, it is remarkable that, in these few years that the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah was on friendly terms with Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig, it openly expressed a less favourable opinion on Christianity and it publicly took up a less compromising position against Christianity than it had ever done before, and would rarely do afterwards.

The less lenient position towards Christianity was especially perceptible during the 14th Annual Congress of the Muhammadiyah, held in Yogyakarta from 12-17 March 1925.³⁶ The congress breathed an anti-Christian spirit. Again, K.H. Ibrahim acted as the chairman, although K.H. Fachruddin was actually in command of the affairs. The two of them were sitting behind the board table together with first secretary Djojosoegito and commission member H. Sudjak, who was also in charge of the Muhammadiyah's poor relief. It is notable that Tjokroaminoto and Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig were sitting close to the board table.

In his speech as the first secretary, Djojosoegito spoke highly of the Ahmadiyya, which he held responsible for the flowering of Islam in Europe because it showed that this religion was perfectly compatible with reason. The first secretary of the Muhammadiyah also dwelt upon the recent tendency of the Dutch colonial policy to grant complete freedom to the Christian mission. To his great indignation, he had observed that some *priyayi*, people belonging to the upper classes, supported the mission. This remark of Djojosoegito's can be interpreted as criticism of the Javanese nobleman R.S. Nimpoeno, mentioned above. Djojosoegito warned against the possibility that Muslim children attending a missionary school might become Christians. Thus, according to Djojosoegito, it was not the Muhammadiyah threatening the Christian mission, as suggested by the Reverend Bakker, but it was the other way around: the Christian mission constituted an enormous danger for Muslims in general and for the Muhammadiyah in particular.³⁷

³⁵ Soedewo 1937:94; *Ahmadiyah* 1974:46. I could not find any confirmation of Jainuri's claim (1990:25, 1992:13, note) that Irfan Dahlan 'joined the Qadiyani Ahmadiyah movement'.

³⁶ The report of this congress (Mailrapport 467 x/25, NA) was made by R.A. Kern. Peacock (1978:47) describes it as 'excellent first-hand observations' recounting 'the public events of the Congress with an attention to culturally-relevant facts that equals standards of modern ethnography'.

³⁷ Mailrapport 467 x/25:7ff, NA.

The purport of several other addresses held during the public meetings of the 14th Congress of the Muhammadiyah was also clearly anti-Christian. Fachruddin's brother Sudjak, who was a commission member of the Central Board and chairman of the Muhammadiyah's poor relief, fulminated against the halving of the subsidies by Yogyakarta's sultan to Muhammadiyah's poorhouse and clinic. He blamed Resident Dingemans for having influenced the decision of the sultan, whom Sudjak accused of probably giving a hundred times more to the Christian hospital Petronella than he gave to the poor house and clinic of the Muhammadiyah.³⁸

R.A. Kern, who reported on the congress to the governor-general of the Dutch East Indies, made a noteworthy comment on Sudjak's accusation, saying that the sultan had set up his own 'beggars' colony'. As a result, he intended to withdraw all subsidies to the Muhammadiyah. Resident Dingemans succeeded in convincing the sultan to change his mind and to continue paying at least half of the subsidy.³⁹ The Muhammadiyah, however, remained convinced that subsidies were cut because of the more favourable climate for Christianity – which was unfavourable to Islam (Alfian 1989:210) – in Yogyakarta since Dingemans's arrival.

Hadjid delivered the third fierce anti-Christian speech, another commission member of the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah. He exhorted his co-religionists not to convert to Christianity, which he called the lowest religion on earth. Christians used a Bible that had been tampered with. They did their utmost to have this counterfeited scripture adopted all over the world and to convert everybody to this corrupted religion. Not only Muslim children attending Christian schools were poisoned by Christian books, but the Christian reading matter was inundating the whole Muslim world. Consequently, Hadjid urged the Muhammadiyah to write, publish, and spread books on Islam to counterbalance the Christian activities.⁴⁰ Hadjid's argumentation can be seen as one answer to the Christian activities among the people which had been stepped up at Zwemer's advice.

Just as at the previous congress of 1924, Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig was given the opportunity to speak during one of the public meetings of the 1925 congress. He dished up a propagandistic talk on the efforts of the Ahmadiyya.⁴¹ Kern noted that the speech of Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig failed to make any impression on the listeners because of its lack of political commitment and for its being an Ahmadiyya sales pitch only. Kern also observed that in fact there was hardly any co-operation between the Muhammadiyah

³⁸ Mailrapport 467 x/25: 11, NA. Compare Alfian 1989:209-11; Shihab 1995:284-6.

³⁹ Mailrapport 467 x/25:26, NA.

⁴⁰ Mailrapport 467 x/25:21, NA. Compare Shihab 1995:252, 284.

⁴¹ Mailrapport 467 x/25:15, NA.

and the Ahmadiyya, the latter only being interested in winning young intellectuals over to its cause.⁴²

The first critical comments and the definitive rupture

It is unknown when the first critical comment on the Ahmadiyya was given in Muhammadiyah circles. Hamka, in several of his publications, attributed the role of catalyst to his father Hadji Rasul. In 1925, Hadji Rasul went to Pekalongan to visit his eldest daughter Fatimah, his grandson Anwar and his son Hamka. Around 1920 or 1921, Ahmad Rasyid Sutan Mansur, Fatimah's husband, had established himself in this town because of the batik trade (Vuldy 1987:190 gives as the year 1920; Hamka 1974:13 gives the year as 1921). Sutan Mansur had become a prominent member, and even the chairman, of the Muhammadiyah branch in Pekalongan (Vuldy 1987:190). During his stay in Pekalongan, where he arrived in Sha'bân 1343/March 1925 (Puar 1989:84), Hadji Rasul took the opportunity of visiting Solo and Yogyakarta (Hamka 1974:135). He arrived in the latter city after the 14th Congress had already ended.⁴³ Hadji Rasul's fellow villager Marah Intan, who was living in Yogyakarta and who was a Muhammadiyah member, introduced him to Fachruddin and other leaders of the organization. He also met Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig and, in Fachruddin's presence, a debate ensued. Hamka stated that it was his father who had opened the eyes of the Muhammadiyah leaders. Hadji Rasul revealed the errors of the Ahmadiyya. Only then did Muhammadiyah understand that it did not share the religious concepts of the Ahmadiyya. This debate was the beginning of the exclusion of the two Muhammadiyah leaders who had been too greatly influenced by the Ahmadiyya, namely, Djojosoegito and Mohammad Husni (Hamka 1952:35, 1967:135, 1974:14-6).

Hadji Rasul's critical attitude towards Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig, attributed to him by his son Hamka, as a result of which the Muhammadiyah began to move away from the Ahmadiyya, might be based on fact, but no other sources known to me confirm it. On the contrary, the sympathetic articles on the Ahmadiyya still contained in the *Almanak Moehammadijah*, the Muhammadiyah yearbook of the year 1345/1926-1927, seem to contradict Hamka's opinion. Ahmadiyya publications were still printed and published by the Muhammadiyah printing house Taman Pustaka (Malkhan and

⁴² Mailrapport 467 x/25:29, NA.

⁴³ Puar 1989:84 stated that Hadji Rasul arrived in Pekalongan in the month Sha'bân 1343 (25 February-26 March 1925) and stayed here for twenty days. The 14th Congress of the Muhammadiyah had ended on 17 March 1925. When Hadji Rasul came to Yogyakarta the congress had thus already ended.

Sukrianta 1985:25; Blood 1974:28). The Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya still presented a united front to the Christian missionaries and the Dutch government in Yogyakarta. However, it cannot be denied that, in the circles of the Muhammadiyah, Hadji Rasul was one of Ahmadiyya's fiercest opponents, especially of its Qâdiyân branch, which entered Java by way of Sumatra.

Although a break between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya still seemed out of the question in 1926, it is noticeable that, in this year, Djojosoegito consulted Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig on whether it would not be better to establish an autonomous local branch of the Ahmadiyya Lahore movement. Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig, who did not intend to establish his own branch, rejected the proposal. His mission was to guide the Muslims and to arm their hearts against the dangers threatening Islam, such as materialism and Christianity (Soedewo 1937:94-6). What could have led Djojosoegito to make this suggestion?

Initially, Raden Ngabehi Hadji Minhadjurrahman Djojosoegito had been a faithful follower of Ahmad Dahlan. He accompanied the founder of the Muhammadiyah on many a mission, especially, in the field of education (Salam 1965:62-4). Djojosoegito was a qualified teacher at the teacher training college of Yogyakarta. He was therefore considered the educational specialist of the Muhammadiyah in its formative years and he was involved in almost all its schooling activities. Djojosoegito was appointed the chairman of the Majlis Pimpinan Pengajaran Muhammadiyah, the central schooling council of the Muhammadiyah, which was founded on 14 July 1923, in accordance with the decision made at the 12th Muhammadiyah Congress held in Yogyakarta, from 30 March to 2 April 1923 (Salam 1965:99).

Djojosoegito was a second cousin to K.H. Hasyim Asy'ari (1871-1947) (Aboebakar 1957:128). K.H. Hasyim Asy'ari, together with K.H. Abdul Wahab Hasbullah (1888-1971), founded the traditionalist Nahdlatul Ulama in Surabaya on 31 January 1926, partly as a defensive reaction to the rise of all kinds of modernist and reformist organizations in Indonesia. Did the initiative of his great-uncle and the spirit of the time in which diverse interest groups were established inspire Djojoesogito? Did he want an independent Ahmadiyya association to prevent getting stuck between the Muhammadiyah and the Sarekat Islam of H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto, who was one of his students? Or did he have a premonition about the impending breach between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya, because of the critical debate of 1925 between Hadji Rasul and Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig, and Hadji Rasul's publication of *Al-Qawl al-sahîh*, a refutation of the Ahmadiyya which was published in a Latin transliteration in Yogyakarta in 1926?

Whatever the motives of Djojosoegito's proposal to Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig might have been, the years after 1926 were characterized by a deterioration of the relationship between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya.

Although the Muhammadiyah itself claimed that the visit of 'Abdul 'Alim Siddîq al-Qâdirî in October-November 1927 and his speeches on its heretical teachings opened his eyes vis-à-vis the Ahmadiyya, the deterioration might also have been partly connected with Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig's contacts with H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto, the leader of the Sarekat Islam. Until 1926, the relationship between the Muhammadiyah and the Sarekat Islam seemed quite cordial, but, starting in this very year, the differences and tensions between the two organizations were growing (Noer 1973:235-7). Tjokroaminoto attended the meetings of the Muhammadiyah, whereas, on the other hand, some prominent Muhammadiyah members, such as Ahmad Dahlan himself, Fachruddin, and Mas Mansur, held high positions within the Sarekat Islam (Shiraishi 1990:73, 75, 105, 108, 112, 238).

Dual membership of both the Muhammadiyah and the Sarekat Islam was not unusual. It was even reported that, in May 1920, the leaders of the organizations agreed on a kind of the division of labour between the two of them: the Muhammadiyah would handle the religious, educational, and social fields, while the Sarekat Islam would manage the political interests of the Muslim community in Central Java (Alfian 1989:217; Shiraishi 1990:219). However, the expansion of the Muhammadiyah, since 1920-1921, beyond the borders of the Yogyakarta area, and the Sarekat Islam's growing criticism of the Muhammadiyah in general and some of its leaders in particular gradually drew them apart, culminating in the Sarekat Islam's decision to discipline the Muhammadiyah.⁴⁴ Muhammadiyah members who also were members of the Sarekat Islam were forced to choose. The leaders of the Sarekat Islam no longer tolerated dual membership. This disciplinary action against the Muhammadiyah was taken in the spring of 1927 and meant the definitive split between the Muhammadiyah and the Sarekat Islam, although the latter's leader, H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto, on a personal level, kept in touch with the Muhammadiyah.

Although the Muhammadiyah and the Sarekat Islam had broken up, Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig continued to be on good terms with the Sarekat Islam and H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto. Baig's attendance of its congresses and his addresses to its meetings testified to his continuing friendly relationship with the Sarekat Islam. He supported, for example, H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto in defending the latter's translation of the Koran at the congress of the Majelis Ulama, the council of authoritative religious scholars, in September 1928, and

⁴⁴ Alfian 1989:222-6. However, it should be noted that the Muhammadiyah was not alone in being the object of the Sarekat Islam's party sanctions. It was forcefully used against communists in Semarang in 1921 and later against certain members of the Persatoean Islam in 1931 (Blumberger 1931:73; Federspiel 2001:89-90). I would like to thank one of the two anonymous reviewers who suggested adding this information.

he was invited to deliver a speech on the excellence of Islam at a congress of the Sarekat Islam in West Java in August 1929 (Blumberger 1931:324, 328).

The congress of the Majlis Ulama, an association closely affiliated to the Sarekat Islam, was of special importance. The central issue discussed during this congress, which took place on 27-30 September 1928, was Tjokroaminoto's translation of the Koran. Parts of the translation had been published in the Islamic periodical *Fadjar Asia* and had provoked severe criticism. In spite of the unfavourable reception of Tjokroaminoto's translation at both the Islam Congress of January 1928 and the 17th Muhammadiyah Congress of February 1928, this congress of the Majlis Ulama did not object to the translation. However, it was decided that the council would keep a watchful eye on the rest of this translation (Blumberger 1931:324).

At the Islam Congress, held in Yogyakarta on 26-29 January 1928, Tjokroaminoto had to justify his translation of the Koran and its commentary. He then explained that he had become acquainted with the translation of the Koran and its commentary by Muhammad Ali, the then president of the Ahmadiyya Lahore branch, through Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig, who had been introduced to him by the leadership of the Muhammadiyah. He also stated that Muhammadiyah leader Fachruddin, for one, had contributed to the translation of Muhammad Ali's commentary. Nevertheless, he was bitterly attacked for his rendering of Muhammad Ali's Koran translation and commentary.⁴⁵

Both orthodox and modernist Muslims blamed Tjokroaminoto for his lack of knowledge of Islam for which he was, in their opinion, completely dependent on Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig. The congress made devastating criticism of the Ahmadiyya's metaphorical Koran interpretation for this peculiar subject was discussed under the chairmanship of Mas Mansur, a leading figure in the Muhammadiyah. The congress considered the Koran exegesis of the Ahmadiyya, which was characterized by new explanations of Koranic texts seemingly incompatible with logic and physics impermissible; moreover, these explanations were not readily acceptable to most members of the congress. Neither Tjokroaminoto nor Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig were able to counter the criticism.⁴⁶ However, only a few days after the Islam Congress,

⁴⁵ Blumberger 1931:323. For different responses to Muhammad Ali's Koran translation and commentary, see Ichwan 2001.

⁴⁶ Mailrapport 141 x/28:2ff, NA. This Mailrapport was written by Ch.O. van der Plas who was an official in the service of the Adviser of Indigenous Affairs.

The example of a metaphorical interpretation given at the meeting by Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig was the translation of Sûra 2:60 and 7:160 and their commentary. The words *idrib bi-'asâka al-hadjara* in the verse on Moses's searching water for his people are translated by Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig as 'trekt met Uw gemeente de bergen in (waar dan de bronnen gevonden zouden zijn)', that is, 'move into the mountains together with your people (where the springs would be found)'. Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig explained that *daraba* not only had the meaning of 'to hit; to

Tjokroaminoto aired his grievances in the *Fadjar Asia* of 4 February 1928. In his opinion, he was, on the one hand, the victim of the deteriorating relationship between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya owing to the appearance of 'Abdul 'Alim Siddîq al-Qâdirî in October-November 1927. On the other hand, Tjokroaminoto suspected some critics who feared competition from his translation, which had been partly published only recently, opposed him because they were working on a translation of the Koran themselves (Blood 1974:43-5).

Two weeks after the Islam Congress, the Muhammadiyah opened its 17th Congress which took place from 12 to 20 February 1928, in Yogyakarta. At this congress, Yunus Anis (Joenoës Anies), the new first secretary of the Central Board, stated in a speech that the Muhammadiyah regretted the decision of the Sarekat Islam, which, since 1923, had manifested its political character by changing its name into the Partai Sarekat Islam, to discipline the Muhammadiyah. He informed the congress that the Muhammadiyah regretted not being able to approve of Tjokroaminoto's Koran translation. He explained that its interpretation followed the allegorical views of the Bâtiniyya, which mainstream Sunni Islam considered heretical because it stressed the priority of the hidden inner meaning of a word over its evident meaning (Hodgson 1960). Accordingly, the translation was contrary to the prophetic tradition to which the Muhammadiyah adhered.

Yunus Anis also dwelt upon the Muhammadiyah's relationship with the Ahmadiyya. He credited 'Abdul 'Alim Siddîq al-Qâdirî with the role of revealing the Ahmadiyya's true character.⁴⁷ When 'Abdul 'Alim Siddîq al-Qâdirî toured Java, in October-November 1927, to warn the Muslims of the false teachings of the Ahmadiyya, the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah

strike', but also 'to travel; to move into'; *hadjar* had the meaning of both 'stone; rock', and 'inaccessible mountain area'; *asâ* had the meaning of both 'stick; staff', and 'religious community' (Mailrapport 141 x/28:3, NA).

Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig is following Muhammad Ali's translation (1935:34-5): 'Seek with your staff a way into the mountain', and the latter's explanation in a note '*idrib bi-'asâka al-hadjara* is ordinarily translated as meaning *strike the rock with your staff* or *rod*, but I have adopted a different significance, while another possible significance is: *Strike a way into the mountain with your people*'.

Usually, Sûra 2:60 is rendered in the following way: 'When Moses sought water for his people, and We said, "Strike the stone with thy staff". Then there gushed out from it twelve springs, all the people already knowing their drinking-places' (Bell 1960, 1:9); or, 'And when Moses sought water for his people, so We said, "Strike with thy staff the rock"; and there gushed forth from it twelve fountains; all the people knew now their drinking place' (Arberry 1964:7-8); or, 'Remember when Moses sought water for his people to drink. We said, "Strike the rock with your staff"; then twelve springs of water gushed forth from it. Thus every tribe reckoned their own source of drinking water' (Ayoub 1992:60.)

⁴⁷ Mailrapport 400 x/28:4-6 (Algemeen Rijksarchief, The Hague). This mailrapport was written by Ch. O. van der Plas.

convened a public meeting in which al-Qâdirî informed the persons present of the deviations of the Ahmadiyya (Zulkarnain 1990:8). In the official publications of the Muhammadiyah, such as the *Almanak Moehammadijah* of the year 1347/1928, the members of the organization were acquainted with the incompatibility of the Muhammadiyah's understanding of the Islamic faith and the teachings of the Ahmadiyya (Malkhana and Sukrianta 1985:56).

On 5 July 1928, the Central Board of the Muhammadiyah issued a declaration which was sent to all its branches. One of its messages was that, from now on, it was forbidden to teach any knowledge or view of the Ahmadiyya in circles of the Muhammadiyah. Muhammadiyah members following the teachings of the *mujaddid* Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad had to choose between rejecting his teachings or leaving the organization (Zulkarnain 1990:8-9; *Ahmadiyah* 1974:47). The rift between the Muhammadiyah and the Ahmadiyya might already have been visible, but the decision, made at its 18th Congress, held in Solo in 1929, meant the definitive rupture between the two organizations. The congress acted on the advice of its Majlis Tarjih which had formulated the opinion that anyone believing in a prophet after the prophet Muhammad was considered an 'unbeliever' (*Himpunan* 1976:280-1). Although it was not explicitly stated, everybody knew that this opinion was directed towards the Ahmadiyya (Ali 1957:71).

After the 1929 rupture

The Central Board of the Muhammadiyah had only just decided to issue the declaration against the Ahmadiyya when the first anti-Ahmadiyya measures were taken. The archives of the Muhammadiyah's secretariat, which were stored at the house of Mohammed Husni, the second general secretary of the movement since 1923, were abruptly removed. Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig and his students became objects of ridicule and insult. Djojosoegito, who had become the chairman of the Muhammadiyah branch at Purwokerto in Central Java, was discharged and, at the same time, deprived of his function in the Central Board. Other Muhammadiyah members sympathizing with or adhering to the teachings of the Ahmadiyya were exposed to the same kind of treatment (Zulkarnain 1990:9).

In these circumstances, Djojosoegito, after having consulted with kindred spirits, resumed his former plans of establishing an Indonesian branch of the Ahmadiyya. Apparently, this time Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig agreed to this idea. In Indonesia an autonomous branch of the Ahmadiyya Lahore under the name of *De Indonesische Ahmadiyah-beweging*, the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement, had already been established by Djojosoegito on 10 December 1928. The organization applied for the right of association on 28 September

1929, which was granted by governmental decree on 4 April 1930 (Blumberger 1932:10-1; Van der Plas 1934:263; Zulkarnain 1990:9). In the application for the right of association, Djojosoegito was mentioned as its chairman, Mohammed Husni as its first secretary, and Erfan Dahlan as a member of its board (Blumberger 1931:342-4). It is surprising that Erfan Dahlan was entered as a member of the board for, as far as it is known, he never returned to Indonesia. Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig acted as an adviser of the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement, until he left Indonesia in 1936 (Pijper 1950:253).

After its recognition by the colonial government, the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement transferred its seat, in the course of 1930, to Purwokerto where Djojosoegito was living and working. In this Central Javanese town, the first mosque of the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement was built (Soedewo 1937:98). It became the centre from where the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement developed its missionary activities, however, without ever becoming a successful mass movement.

Several reasons are given to explain why the Ahmadiyya failed to become important. The disintegration of the relationship between the Ahmadiyya and the Partai Sarekat Islam can be taken as an example confirming the reasons mentioned by Pijper. He stated that its Indian origin, and the cooperative attitude and loyal obedience of both the Lahore and the Qâdiyân branches of the Ahmadiyya towards the Dutch colonial government were among the factors which prevented it from becoming really popular in Indonesia (Pijper 1950:254). The political policy of non-co-operation with the Dutch colonial government that the Partai Sarekat Islam pursued to realize its nationalist aspiration did not accord with the Ahmadiyya's mentality not to get involved in politics (Zulkarnain 1990:17). Therefore, it is understandable that, after the Ahmadiyya transferred its seat to Purwokerto, nothing more was heard about official contacts with the Partai Sarekat Islam.

Although it considered the Ahmadiyya teachings to be in flat contradiction to the Islamic faith of the Ancestors (Ar.: *salaf*), because of its acknowledgement of Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad as a *mujaddid* and/or prophet and its extreme Koran exegesis, the Muhammadiyah rarely made any negative public statement about the Lahore branch after its 1929 declaration regarding the Ahmadiyya (Bakry 1958:53; Lubis 1993:80). After 1929, whenever the Muhammadiyah supported anti-Ahmadiyya measures, such as the anti-Ahmadiyya *fatwa* issued by the Majelis Ulama Indonesia on 8 March 1984, in accordance with which Ahmadiyya adherents were declared non-Muslims, primarily, the Qâdiyân branch was concerned (Mudzhar 1993:84/73, 133/115). How can the tolerant attitude of the Muhammadiyah towards the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya be explained?

After the 1929 rupture, the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement, known as *Gerakan Ahmadiyah Lahore Indonesia* (abbreviation: GAI) since December 1973,

seems to have been a marginal group only. Although the Muhammadiyah lost some members to the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement, it was the Muhammadiyah which continued to grow, while the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement just managed to keep afloat. Especially after the relationship of the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement with the Partai Sarekat Islam was dissolved, there was no longer any reason to fear the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement as a real competitor in the religious, social, or educational fields which were focuses of both organizations. When this had become clear to the Muhammadiyah, the family and former membership relations that existed between Muhammadiyah members and members of the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement in the formative years of both organizations made the Central Javanese board of the Muhammadiyah more inclined to tolerate the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement.

Another reason for the Muhammadiyah's tolerant attitude towards the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement could be because the latter distanced itself from the doctrine of the prophethood of Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad as defended by the Qâdiyân branch. It expressly rejected any responsibility for the activities of the Qâdiyân branch (Zulkarnain 1990:18). With regard to the development process of the Lahore branch in general, Wilfred Cantwell Smith (1979:369) once stated that it 'has grown increasingly liberal, and has approached nearer and nearer to ordinary liberal Islam. It belittles its connection with Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, whose prophethood in a literal sense it explicitly repudiates; and it has been gradually obliterating the distinction between itself and the general middle-class Muslim community.' Smith's statement also holds true for the history of the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement.

In combination with the reasons mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, the *fatwâ* of Mahmûd Shaltût (1893-1963) on 'the exaltation of Jesus's (Ar.: *raf' 'Îsâ*) might also have contributed to a more tolerant attitude of the Muhammadiyah towards the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement (Shaltût 1980:59-65).⁴⁸ Shaltût was the Shaykh al-Azhar in Cairo from 1958 until his death and his *fatwâs* enjoyed great fame in the Sunni world. After having been consulted by an Indian Muslim, Shaltût issued his *fatwâ* on the question of 'the exaltation of Jesus's in 1942.'⁴⁹ Departing from Sûra 3:55, 4:157, and 5:117, he reached the conclusion that on the basis of the Koran and the Sunna, it could not be decided that Jesus had been raised bodily to heaven, where he was alive and from where he would descend to earth at the end of times. A Muslim who did not believe Jesus was raised bodily to heaven where he was alive and from where he would descend to earth at the end of times, was

⁴⁸ I would like to thank Sjoerd van Koningsveld of Leiden University for making the text of this *fatwâ* available to me.

⁴⁹ Shaltût 1980:59; Schumann 1975:140-2. Schumann stated that the Indian Muslim was an Ahmadi.

therefore not to be considered an apostate. He was still a Muslim belonging to the community of believers (Shaltût 1980:65). Shaltût's conclusion, by which he joined the interpretation of such scholars as al-Tabarsî (died 548/1153) and al-Râzî (died 606/1209), became well known in Muhammadiyah circles and certainly contributed to its tolerant attitude towards the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement.⁵⁰

If it is understandable why the Muhammadiyah tolerated the Indonesian Ahmadiyya movement after its 1929 declaration, what reasons could be found to explain its initial enthusiasm about the coming of missionaries of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya to Yogyakarta in the first place? The explanation is that the Muhammadiyah was convinced that it and the Ahmadiyya shared the same aim of purifying the faith and modernizing Islam. The aim was to be attained with activities in the religious, social, and educational fields. As the Ahmadiyya was generally known at that time both for developing an Islamic educational system that was compatible with modern Western education, and its zealous, anti-Christian mission all over the world and in Western Europe in particular, the Muhammadiyah considered it the ideal partner to co-operate with in Central Java with its underdeveloped Muslim educational system and its Christian colonial government.

The Muhammadiyah was not acquainted with the true character of the Ahmadiyya for two reasons. First, the missionaries of the Lahore branch of the Ahmadiyya, initially, did not reveal their own religious status, nor the characteristic doctrines of their persuasion. This criticism was given by Bagus Hadikusuma, who stated that as soon as Mîrzâ Walî Ahmad Baig's secret faith was discovered he was forced to leave Yogyakarta (Hadikusuma n.y.c:10). In the course of the history of the Ahmadiyya in Indonesia, missionaries and members of the organization were frequently blamed for concealing their true faith (Hariadi 1992:44).

A second reason for Muhammadiyah's initial enthusiasm about the Ahmadiyya was the Muhammadiyah's lack of thorough theological knowledge. The Muhammadiyah in Central Java was not, and still is not, interested in profound theological issues. It was Hadji Rasul, a man from Minangkabau who sympathized with, but never became a member of, the Muhammadiyah, and the Indian 'Abdul 'Alim Siddîq al-Qâdirî who opened the Muhammadiyah's eyes to the Ahmadiyya's deviant theological teachings. The Muhammadiyah's lack of thorough theological knowledge is also evident from the fact that it took note of Shaltût's *fatwâ* on 'the exaltation of Jesus's, but never pursued its consequences. Shaltût's *fatwâ* not only

⁴⁹ Zulkarnain 1990:37. I agree with one of the anonymous reviewers of my contribution that it would be interesting to compare Rashîd Ridâ's *fatwâ* of 1926 on the Ahmadiyya with the *fatwâ* of Shaltût (Ichwan 2001).

demolished the barrier between the Sunni orthodoxy and the Ahmadi heterodoxy, but it cleared the way for Mîrzâ Ghulâm Ahmad's claim of being the Messiah and, eventually, for his claim of being a prophet (Schumann 1975:141). The lack of interest in theological matters compared to its great concern for ritualistic observances might almost be called a feature of the Muhammadiyah. Another conclusion that may be drawn from this article is that it seems a characteristic of the Muhammadiyah in Central Java that it becomes quite tolerant towards fellow Muslim groups as soon as they turned out not to be formidable competitors in the field of religious, social, or educational activities.

References

- Aboebakar, H.
1957 *Sedjarah hidup K.H.A. Wahid Hasjim dan karangan tersiar*. Djakarta: Panitia Buku Peringatan Alm K.H.A. Wahid Hasjim.
- Ahmadiyah
1974 'Ahmadiyah; Sebuah titik yang dilupa', *Tempo* (21 September):44-50.
- Ahmed, Munir D.
1990 'Ahmadiyya: Geschichte und Lehre', in: Annemarie Schimmel (Hrsg.): *Der Islam III. Islamische Kultur, zeitgenössische Strömungen, Volksfrömmigkeit*, pp. 415-22. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer. [Die Religionen der Menschheit 25, 3.]
- Alfian
1989 *Muhammadiyah; The political behavior of a Muslim modernist organization under Dutch colonialism*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Ali, A. Mukti
1957 The Muhammadiyah movement; A bibliographical introduction. [MA-Thesis, Montreal.]
- Ali, Maulvi Muhammad
1935 *The Holy Qur-ân*. Containing the Arabic text with English translation and commentary. Lahore: Ahmadiyya Anjuman-I-Ishâat-I-Islam.
- Anawati, G.C.
1978 "Îsâ", *The encyclopaedia of Islam*. New edition. Vol. IV: Iran-Kha, edited by E. van Donzel, B. Lewis and Ch.Pellat, pp. 81-6. Leiden: Brill. [Under the Patronage of the International Union of Academies.]
- Arberry, Arthur J.
1964 *The Koran interpreted*. London: Oxford University Press. [The World's Classics 596.]
- Asrofie, M. Yusron
1983 *Kyai Haji Ahmad Dahlan, pemikiran dan kepemimpinannya*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta Offset.

- Attema, D.S.
1942 *De Mohammedaansche opvattingen omtrent het tijdstip van den jongsten dag en zijn voorsteekenen*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.
- Ayoub, Mahmoud M.
1992 *The Qur'an and its interpreters*. Vol. I. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bakker, F.L.O.
1925 'De opleving van den Islam in Djokja', *De Macedoniër* 29:161-70.
- Bakry, Hasbullah
1958 'Perbandingan agama; Jahudi, Nasrani, Bali, Ahmadijah, Animisme'. Lecture notes, IAIN Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta, 1 August.
- Bell, Richard
1960 *The Qur=ân*. Translated, with a critical re-arrangement of the Surahs. Edinburgh: Clark. Two vols. [First edition 1937-39.]
- Blood, Margaret
1974 *The Ahmadiyah in Indonesia; Its early history and contribution to Islam in the archipelago*. [Honours Sub-thesis, Australian National University.]
- Blumberger, J.Th. Petrus
1931 *De nationalistische beweging in Nederlandsch-Indië*. Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink.
1932 'Ahmadyah', *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, VI:10-11
- Bruijn, J. de and G. Puchinger
1985 *Briefwisseling Kuiper-Idenburg*. Verzorgd, ingeleid en toegelicht door - . Franeker: Wever.
- Cragg, K.
1965 *Counsels in contemporary Islam*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dingemans, H.H.
1973 *Bij Allah's bureu*. Rotterdam: Donker.
- Dijk, Cornelis van
1981 *Rebellion under the banner of Islam; The Darul Islam in Indonesia*. The Hague: Nijhoff. [KITLV, Verhandelingen 94.]
- Djaja, Tamar
n.d. *Riwayat hidup A. Hassan*. Jakarta: Mutiara.
- Dokumen-dokumen
n.y. *Dokumen-dokumen resmi dan keputusan Konperensi Islam Internasional tentang Ahmadiyah*. Jakarta.
- Echols, John M. and Hassan Shadily
1992 *Kamus Indonesia-Inggris; An Indonesian-English Dictionary*. Jakarta: Gramedia. [First edition 1961.]
- Federspiel, Howard M.
2001 *Islam and ideology in the emerging Indonesian state; The Persatuan Islam (PERSIS), 1923 to 1957*. Second revised edition. Leiden: Brill. [Social, Economic and Political Studies of the Middle East and Asia 78.] [First edition 1970.]

- Fisher, Humphrey J.
1963 *Ahmadiyah; A study in contemporary Islâm on the West African coast.* London: Oxford University Press. [Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research.]
- Friedmann, Yohanah
1989 *Prophecy continuous; Aspects of Ahmadi religious thought and its medieval background.* Berkeley: University of California Press. [Comparative Studies on Muslim Societies 3.]
- Hadikusuma, Djarnawi
n.y.a *Matahari matahari Muhammadiyah. Jilid 1: Dari K.H.A. Dahlan sampai dengan K.H. Mas Mansur.* Yogyakarta: Persatuan.
n.y.b *Derita seorang pemimpin; Riwayat hidup perjuangan dan buah pikiran Ki Bagus Hadikusuma.* Yogyakarta: Persatuan.
n.y.c *Derita Seorang Pemimpin; Riwayat hidup perjuangan dan buah pikiran Ki Bagus Hadikusuma.* Second edition. Yogyakarta: Persatuan.
1974 *Risalah Islamiyah.* Yogyakarta: Persatuan.
- Hamka (pseud. Haji Abdul Malik Karim Amrullah)
1952 'H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto membukakan mataku', in: Amelz (ed.): *H.O.S. Tjokroaminoto: Hidup dan perjuangannya*, pp. Djakarta: Bulan Bintang.
1967 *Ajahku; Riwayat hidup dr. Abd. Karim Amrullah dan perjuangan kaum agama di Sumatera.* Tjetakan ke-3. Djakarta: Djajamurni. [First edition 1950.]
1974 *Muhammadiyah di Minangkabau.* Jakarta: Yayasan Nurul Islam.
- Hariadi, Ahmad
1992 *Mengapa saya keluar dari Ahmadiyah Qadiani.* Bandung: Yayasan Kebangkitan Kaum Muslimin (originally: 1988).
- Himpunan
1976 *Himpunan putusan Tarjih.* Cetakan ke-3. Yogyakarta: Pimpinan Pusat Muhammadiyah. [First edition 1967.]
- Hodgson, M.G.S.
1960 'Bâtiniyya', *The encyclopaedia of Islam.* New edition. Vol. 1: A-B, edited by H.A.R. Gibb, J.H. Kramers, E. Lévi-Provençal, J. Schacht, B. Lewis and Ch. Pellat, pp. 1098-1100. Leiden: Brill. [Under the Patronage of the International Union of Academies.]
- Hoekema, Alle Gabe
1994 *Denken in dynamisch evenwicht; De wordingsgeschiedenis van de nationale protestantse theologie in Indonesië (ca. 1860-1960).* Zoetermeer: Boeken-centrum. [PhD thesis, State University Leiden.]
- Ichwan, Moch Nur
2001 'Differing responses to an Ahmadi translation and exegesis: *The Holy Qur'ân* in Egypt and Indonesia', *Archipel* 62:143-61.
- Ihza, Yusril
1995 'Combining activism and intellectualism; The biography of Mohammad Natsir (1908-1993)', *Studia Islamika* 2:111-47.
- Jainuri, Achmad
1990 *Muhammadiyah; Gerakan reformasi Islam di Jawa pada awal abad kedua puluh.* Surabaya: Bina Ilmu. [First published 1981.]

- 1992 The Muhammadiyah movement in twentieth-century Indonesia; A socio-religious study. [MA thesis, McGill University, Montreal.]
- Kamal, Musthafa B., Chusnan Yusuf and A. Rosyad Sholeh
1994 *Muhammadiyah sebagai gerakan Islam*. Untuk SMTA dan warga persyarikatan. Cetakan ke-VII. Yogyakarta: Persatuan. [First edition 1971.]
- Lubis, Arbiyah
1993 *Pemikiran Muhammadiyah dan Muhammad Abduh; Suatu studi perbandingan*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Malkhan, Abdul Munir and Sukrianta Ar (eds)
1985 *Perkembangan pemikiran Muhammadiyah dari masa ke masa; Menyambut Mukhtamar ke-41*. Yogyakarta: Dua Dimensi.
- Miert, Jacobus Johannes van
1995 *Een koel hoofd en een warm hart; Nationalisme, javanisme en jeugdbeweging in Nederlands-Indië, 1918-1930*. Ph.D. Thesis Leiden.
- Mintjes, H.
1985 'De Ahmadijja beweging', in: *Islamitische stromingen in Nederland*, pp. 58-76. Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij. [Religieuze Bewegingen in Nederland 11.]
- Mudzhar, Mohamad Atho
1993 *Fatwa-fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia; Sebuah studi tentang pemikiran hukum Islam di Indonesia 1975-1988/Fatwas of the Council of Indonesia Ulama; A study of Islamic legal thought in Indonesia 1975-1988*. Bilingual edition. Jakarta: INIS. [INIS Materials 17.]
- Noer, Deliar
1973 *The modernist Muslim movement in Indonesia, 1900-1942*. Singapore: Oxford University Press. [East Asian Historical Monographs.]
- Peacock, James L.
1978 *Purifying the faith; The Muhammadiyah movement in Indonesian Islam*. Menlo Park, California: Benjamin/Cummings. [Kiste and Ogan Social Change Series in Anthropology.]
- Peters, Rudolph
1979 *Islam and colonialism; The doctrine of jihad in modern history*. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton.
- Plas, Ch.O. van der
1934 'Medeelingen over de stroomingen in de Moslimsche gemeenschap in Nederlandsch-Indië en de Nederlandsche Islampolitiek', *Indisch Genootschap*, vergadering van 16 februari 1934, pp. 253-72. 's-Gravenhage.
- Pol, D.
1922 *Midden-Java ten Zuiden*. Utrecht: Zendingstudieraad, 's-Gravenhage: Algem. Boekhandel voor Inwendige en Uitwendige Zending. [Onze Zendingsvelden 4.]
- Pringgodigdo, A.K.
1950 *Sedjarah pergerakan rakjat Indonesia*. Tjetakan ke 3. Djakarta: Pustaka Rakjat. [First edition 1949.]
- Puar, Yusuf Abdullah
1989 *Perjuangan dan pengabdian Muhammadiyah*. Jakarta: Pustaka Antara.

- Pijper, G.F.
1950 'De Ahmadiyah in Indonesia', in: *Bingkisan budi; Een bundel opstellen aan Dr. Philippus Samuel van Ronkel door vrienden en leerlingen aangeboden op zijn 80e verjaardag 1 Aug. 1950*, pp. 247-54. Leiden: Sijthoff. [Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.]
- Ricklefs, M.C.
1988 *A history of modern Indonesia c. 1300 to the present*. Hampshire – London: Palgrave.
- Salam, Solichin
1965 *Muhammadiyah dan kebangunan Islam di Indonesia*. Djakarta: Mega.
- Saleh, Fauzan
2001 *Modern trends in Islamic theological discourse in 20th century Indonesia; A critical study*. Leiden: Brill. [Social, Economic and Political Studies of the Middle East and Asia 79.]
- Schumann, Olaf H.
1975 *Der Christus der Muslime; Christologische Aspekte in der arabisch-islamischen Literatur*. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- Shaltût, Mahmûd
1980 *Al-Fatâwâ; Dirâsa li-mushkilât al-Muslim al-mu'âsir fî hayâtih al-yatomiyya wa 'l-'âmma*. Al-tab'a al-'âshira, Al-Qâhira: Dâr al-Shurûq.
- Schulze, Reinhard
1990 *Islamischer Internationalismus im 20. Jahrhundert; Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Islamischen Weltliga*. Leiden: Brill. [Social, Economic and Political Studies of the Middle East 41.]
- Shihab, Alwi
1995 *The Muhammadiyah movement and its controversy with Christian mission in Indonesia*. [PhD thesis, Temple University, Philadelphia PA.]
- Shiraishi, Takashi
1990 *An age in motion; Popular radicalism in Java, 1912-1926*. Ithaca NY/London: Cornell University Press. [Asia East by South.]
- Smit, G.
1912 *Mohammedaansche propaganda en christelijke zending in onze Oost*. Utrecht: Ruys. [Adaptation of G. Simon, *Islam und Christentum im Kampf um die Eroberung der animistischen Heidenwelt; Beobachtungen aus der Mohammedanermission in Niederländisch-Indien*, Berlijn: Warneck, 1910.]
- Smith, Wilfred Cantwell
1960 'Ahmadiyya', *The encyclopaedia of Islam*. New Edition. Vol. 1: A-B, edited by H.A.R. Gibb, J.H. Kramers, E. Lévi-Provençal, J. Schacht, B. Lewis and Ch. Pellat, pp. 301-3. Leiden: Brill. [Under the Patronage of the International Union of Academies.]
- 1979 *Modern Islam in India; A social analysis*. New Delhi: Usha. [Reprint of the second revised edition 1946.] [First edition 1943.]
- Soedewo
1937 *Asas-asas dan pekerdjaan Gerakan Ahmadiyah Indonesia (Centrum Lahore)*. [Lahore]: Gerakan Ahmadiyah Indonesia.

- Suratmin
1990 *Nyai Ahmad Dahlan, pahlawan nasional; Amal dan perjuangannya*. Yogyakarta: Pimpinan Pusat 'Aisyiyah.
- Vuldy, Chantal
1987 *Pekalongan: Batik et Islam dans une ville du Nord de Java*. Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales. [Études Insuliennes Archipel 8.]
- Ward, K.E.
1970 *The foundation of the Partai Muslimin Indonesia*. Ithaca NY: Modern Indonesia Project, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University. [Interim Report Series.]
- Zulkarnain, Iskander
1990 'Laporan penelitian Gerakan Ahmadiyah Lahore Indonesia (Studi tentang pola pemikiran keagamaan)'. Report, Balai Penelitian, IAIN Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta.