

当報告の内容は、それぞれの著者の著作物です。

Copyrighted materials of the authors.

タイトル: International Workshop on Islam and Cultural Diversity in Southeast Asia (共同研究課題「東南アジアのイスラームと文化多様性に関する学際的研究 (第二期)」平成 28 年度第 2 回研究会)

日時: 2015 年 9 月 27 日 (日) 14:00~18:05

場所: Meeting Suite 5 (Level 6), Le Meridien Kota Kinabalu (Malaysia)

使用言語: 英語

コタキナバル・リエゾンオフィス (KKLO) および共同研究課題「東南アジアのイスラームと文化多様性に関する学際的研究 (第二期)」主催による国際ワークショップがコタキナバルにて 18 名の参加者を集めて行われた。ワークショップでは 4 編の報告がなされ、その後全体討論が行われた。4 編の報告要旨は以下のとおりである。討論では、オマル、シャムスル両報告が扱ったマレーシアにおける複数の宗教・民族の共存について、評価する意見が出される一方、「共存」という視点が表層的であるとする批判も出された。また、小林報告で扱われたインドネシア、錦田報告で扱われた中東の事例との比較も含めて、活発な質疑が行われた。

## 報告 1

### **The 33rd Congress of the Nahdlatul Ulama: The AHWA and the Rais Aam**

Yasuko Kobayashi (Nanzan University)

The Nahdlatul Ulama (Revival of the Religious Scholars), the largest Muslim association in Indonesia, held its national congress (*muktamar*) in early August 2015, Held in its birthplace, Jombang (East Java), the congress rather turbulent and even chaotic, and almost all energy was devoted to the AHWA (*ahlul hali wal aqdi*) problem, that is, how to elect the supreme leader (*rais aam*).

Since 1989 (the 29th congress), a voting system had been applied to choose two top leaders, that are, *rais aam* and *ketua umum* (chair of the central executive board). However, a new system, AHWA, was going to be introduced for the *rais aam* election in order to avoid slander and vote buying. The AHWA, a team of respected *ulama* with powers to decide on important matters, would select the leader. This proposal caused furious opposition of many local branches. Behind this problem, there was a conflict between the incumbent chair Said Aqil

Sirodji and the former chair Hasyim Muzadi. Said's group tried to introduce the AHWA system in order to stop Hasyim from becoming *rais aam*. Besides this internal power struggle, external interference was involved. Additionally, the central board led by Said had poor communication with local branch elite, and many of them still supported Hasyim. The congress was in chaos from the outset and faced deadlock.

In the midst of the crisis, senior *ulama* found a solution which could be accepted by both sides. The acting *rais aam*, Gus Mus, gave an impassioned speech which changed the course of the congress. The AHWA chose Gus Mus as *rais aam*, however he did not accept that position, mentioning that the AHWA system was created as a tool by one of the competing groups. By doing so he showed moral rectitude of an *ulama*, and helped reassert the weakened authority of senior *ulama*.

## 報告 2

### **The Dynamics of Inter-religious co-existence in Penang**

Omar Farouk (Universiti Sains Malaysia/ILCAA Joint Researcher)

Penang appears to be a microcosm of Malaysia in many ways. It has most of the characteristics that exist in other Malaysian states yet it is not really a replica of any other. Although it is commonly perceived to be a Chinese-dominated state, not just demographically but also politically, commercially, culturally, ethnically and economically, it is actually far more diverse than is often imagined. It is unique in many respects and its uniqueness is mainly a function of its long history of continual exposure to the different cultures and civilizations, and its own customs and traditions which creatively blend local and foreign elements. In many ways the growth of Penang as a settlement or state was planned and managed by the authorities but the people themselves had a lot of leeway to participate in the process and phenomenon. Its own civil society has been vibrant. Inter-religious co-existence has been a distinctive feature of communal life in Penang for the greater part of its history although there have also been minor ethnic conflicts not only in its recent past but also distant history. Ethnic and religious prejudices exist but it was common sense that invariably prevailed. This paper is a preliminary attempt to explain the dynamics of inter-religious co-existence in Penang through an analytical survey of religious institutions.

### 報告 3

## **Division and Connection by Islamic Insurgent groups- from cases of Hamas and Islamic State**

Aiko Nishikida (ILCAA)

This paper dealt with the division and connection between the Islamic insurgent groups – especially Hamas and Islamic State – and pointed out the recent transactions among them. The analysis lead to the understanding of varieties of Islamic insurgent groups and gave suggestion about the future development. The term “Islamic insurgent groups” was used in this paper indicating those who make insurgent attacks in order to achieve or appeal their political or religious aims. Western countries often call them “terrorist organizations,” however, the term includes labeling effect denouncing their act simply as bad and horrible one. Also the linkages between those organizations are often used for political purposes. Israel considers that “all the Islamic parties are threats,” for example, and both of the two dimensions of attacks by Hisbullah in the north and Hamas in the south are considered in the same category. In these days, Islamic State is added to this category of threats. As a matter of fact, though, Islamic State has a unique character because since its inception till the end of June 2015, it had never denounced Israel as occupying forces of Jerusalem: the third significant Islamic holy city in the world. It was quite rare phenomenon compared to the other preceding radical organizations or leaders in the Middle East such as Al-Qaid, Saddam Hussein (former President of Iraq), and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (former President of Iran). Because of this, there had been even rumor calling “Islamic State is an ally or decoy of Israel.” In June 2015 such denounce finally appeared, however, Islamic State also denounced Hamas, a representative Islamic group of Palestine. The reason raised against Hamas was “being insufficiently stringent about religious enforcement.” In other words, this appeal pointed out tacit contribution of Hamas for Israel in stabilizing the situation in the Gaza Strip. The above mentioned political categorization points out the intentional connection of several Islamic insurgent groups and its improperness. To the contrary, there is significant difference between Hamas and Islamic State: Regionality of Hamas and Globalism of Islamic State. The purpose of their activities and target of geographical range differs with each other. Hamas works only for the sake of Palestinian cause, not for emancipation of Muslims as a

whole. In contrast, Islamic State denies “nation-states” imposed by Europeans at the end of WWI and tries to overcome it by establishing Caliphate state. In other words, its ideal expands far beyond one nation-state or one region. Considering this difference and the recent development, possibility of cooperation between Hamas and Islamic State is very low. They would struggle over the control of the Gaza Strip and Sinai desert, and the gap between them seems to be hard to overcome in short period of time.

#### 報告 4

#### **Conceptualizing diversity and its traits: The empirical case from Malaysia**

Shamsul A. B. (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia/ILCAA Joint Researcher)

Making sense of diversity hence differences is not a simple task but not a difficult one either to achieve if we put our minds together to resolve it. This paper argues that the effort must begin with a clear conceptualization of the concept diversity that has empirically proven three significant traits, namely, positive, negative and moderate. These traits are not separated and often exist next to one another or enmeshed into a complex web of daily relations. However, they are often treated and analyzed separately as if they are mutually exclusive, when they are not. This has led to a general confusion in the academic and non-academic circles. This paper presents the experience of Malaysia in understanding and misunderstanding of what diversity is and the struggle Malaysian scholars and policy-makers have had in that process.