Introduction

With regard to the relation between the discipline and the society, being historians in Indonesia has been a kind of adventure. How is it possible? History proves to be a risky business. To be responsive to popular demand is doing good to their own society, but neglecting their own field of study. To be independent is also a wrong position, for it means doing bad to their own society and living in ivory tower. This paper is then firstly an attempt to reconcile the dilemma. Secondly, it is an attempt to solve the problem of how a historian can serve the time, without being a "betrayal of the intellectual".

Towards National Identity

The First Venture: Decolonization.

The popular demand after Independence for a national history was well responded by Indonesian historians. The search began in 1957 when a handful historians got together in Yogyakarta for a seminar on the philosophy of history. The question of decolonization of historical knowledge was the dominating theme in the seminar. It concerned with actors in history, in short a New Indo-centrism versus an Indonesian-centric question, a nationalistic historiography. As is known, textbooks written by Dutch scholars always pictured Indonesian as an extension of the Dutch (Coolhaas, 1980) and the seminar tried to debunk it (Sewunar Sejarah, 1957; Niekusanto, 1965; Reid in Reid and Marri, 1979). The seminar itself was later called Seminar Sejarah Nasional I.

There had been already an ideological historiography in the decade of 1950s, before the Seminar Sejarah Nasional I. For instance, Muhammad Yamin (re)published Sejarah Pemerangan Delapanangka: Pahlawan Kemerdekaan Indonesia (1945), 1958), Gadjah Mada: Pahlawan Perjuangan Nasional (1945, 1953), and 6000 Tahun Sang Merah-Putra (1951), M. Dinjarat Sejarah Perluangan Indonesia (1951), A.H. Nasution Tli! (1956), and Yusuf Abdulah Puur Pendidke Rheubil Melaku Selatan (1956), in short, books with the spirit of hawain and nationalism.

In 1962 John Small seemed to have moderated the quest of a nationalistic historiography when he wrote, "On the Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia", in Journal of Southeast Asian History. He offered the concept of an autonomous History by stressing the importance of indigenous dynamics, while foreign forces were only appendices (Small, 1962). The autonomous History thesis is however, only partly true. For instances, it is true in cases of the ethnic war between Makassar and Gowa, the Javanese dynastic wars, the Padri War (1821-1838) in which the Javanese rulers and the penghulu (dan leaders) were in conflict, the conflict between Aceh and Gak, and the ulee-lang i and the ulama rivalry in Aceh. But, it is certainly a gross reductionism in other cases. The coming of the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the Dutch could not be
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reduced into internal dynamics. Nevertheless it is true for the Cultivation System, the liberal policy, and the Ethical Policy.

The strains on actors was certainly there because at that time historiography was understood to be political history and military history, the only histories in fashion. The right solution must be to extend historiography beyond political history. Academically speaking, the risk of ideologization is history at the time was the narrowing scope of history as a discipline.

In addition to the demands of decolonization the search for national identity was possibly because of the facts that the intellectuals felt the menace of the leftist movement, the Indonesian revolution interpretation of the PKI (Communist Party of Indonesia). As is known, the fifth congress of the PKI (1954), the theoretical statement of the communist role in Indonesia was set up. In 1957 D.N. Aidid published Indonesian Society and Indonesian Revolution which delineated the interpretation of the PKI on Indonesian revolution (McVey in Reid and Marr, 1979). The same feeling was certainly shared by the cultural intellectuals. PKI established LEKRA (Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakjat, People Cultural Council) in 1955. With the 'Yogyakarta Rakyat' (People Cultural Concept), 'Seni untuk Rakyat' Art for the People, and 'Politik se-Lagai Pandjeh' (Politics as the Highest Command) it mobilized the masses (Miel- janto in Mieljanto and Ismail 1995: 32), intellectual activities in general including nistoriography of the crucial decade (19556), however, remained to be revealed.

The Second Venture: Social Science, The Seminar Sejarah Nasional II was held in Yogyakarta in 1977. In addition to descriptive histories (military history and political history), it showed already promising lines of use of social science in historical study. Apparently, the intellectual leadership of Sarono Kartodipo influenced many papers of the seminar. He then mastered the publication of a standards book called Sejarah Nasional Indonesia, comprised of six volumes. The first edition of the books appeared in 1975. The standard book was an exemplification of the use of social science in history, with the discursive and synchronic approaches.

An example will clarify the issue. The main contents of Sejarah Nasional Indonesia II (The Period of the Rise and Development of Islamic States) are: Chapter I "The Rise and Development of Islamic States"; Chapter II "The Response of Islamic States to the Western Penetration"; Chapter III "Sailing and Commerce"; Chapter IV "The Development of Islamic Religion and Culture"; Chapter V "The Rise and Development of Cities"; Chapter VI "The Structure of Bureaucracy" (Poepoepepoe and Nusantara, 1981/1982). The Chapter I and II are concerned with the ethnic history, while the rest are synchronic.

The social science approach to history were prevalent in the Seminar Sejarah Nasional III (Jakarta, 1981), the Seminar Sejarah Lokal I (Bat, 1982), and the Seminar Seja- rah Lokal II (Meun, 1984) (Reports, various years). Are all seminars? True, the social science approach was known only by academicians. The works by academic historians, papers of seminars, students' theses, matters' essays, and doctoral dissertations used to keep in the library only. Thus in order to know the extent of the influence of social science approach one should go to the library. As is known in Indonesia publication of historical works lagged behind popular readings. The most popular nistoriography in the market for the last two decades have been military history (most important has been the voluminous works of A.H. Nasution), and biographies of military, business, or political leaders.

The social science approach in history was the timely endeavor. The question of actors in history was answered in a non-ideological terminology, in a more scientific way, by formulating "history viewed from within" (The introductory remark, Poepoepepoe and Nusantara, 1984). The social science approach had two advantages. Academically, it succeeded in the advancing historiography. Politically, it was a moral position, for it had nothing to do with the existing power holder; otherwise, historians who disapproved the regime would be considered enemies. History did not threaten
The regime, because history was far from being a social critic.

The social science approach, unlike the New Left History in America is the 1960s, was amenable to whatever power it is gaining becoming a kind of disengagement of academicians. In effect, history contributed nothing and contradicted nobody. History was dead for everybody very much like those living in an ivory tower. There was not a single sign of the martyrdom of academicians, like the one in pre-1965 when many academicians were willing to suffer on behalf of freedom. The fact that the movement against the existing power came from the side of the students proves that history (and social sciences in general) had been a lame science in the near past. We must stop the situation in which history is alienated from its society.

The Coming Vorturer: Ethics, I hardly dare to use the word "ethics", because I can imagine that many will not agree with me on the situation of history. What I mean by ethics is simply a commitment beyond one's discipline to replace the ivory tower attitude of the social science approach, a sense of purpose beyond the field of study (Tillinghast, 1972).

The ideology of decolonization of the Seminar Sejarah Nasional I (1957) meant that historians yielded to popular demand without any reserve. The non-ideology of the Seminar Sejarah Nasional II and Baratkan was the alienation of science from the rest of society. To think differently, there must be a higher state of consciousness among the historians, a state which I call ethics. The non-ideological attitude of alienation made history not responsive to the need of society, especially when it was in need of social critic. The absence of persistent social critic probably have been detrimental for the society. The New Order developmental ideology with vertical political nationalism (which in effect was just another "Patria sebagai Panglima" [Politics as the Highest Command]) policy as did the PK did not tolerate differences. With alienating itself from society, history was able to evade the influence of that day to day politics, but it was unable to contribute something in society. This kind of attitude was unhealthy for historians themselves and for the state as well as the society in general.

The new era called Reformasi Order deserves to have its own historiography. It is usual that every age has its own trend in historical scholarship. We want to make history functional to, but not influenced by its society, very much like fish in the sea which never become salty. Historians have to be responsive to the climate of opinion of the society (Biotheim, 1969). Academicians whose stipend paid for by their society must not live in an ivory tower; they have no choice other than to be together with their own society. However, they must do it in their own way. For instance, when the society was in danger of the strait by the state as in the New Order period, historians had to defend the society by revealing the danger of such an affair. Historians must have no hesitation to criticize the society. When society tends to have an hegemonic politics, the historians have to write on the value of pluralism.

In short, the Reformasi Order history should prepare itself for the most important job, to be a social critic.

Elements of the New Historiography

The new historiography comprises three elements: history as system, history as transformation, and history as social critic. History as System, The New Order paid much attention on the nation as a political and military entity. Historical consciousness of the officials and the military men had been only political and military history. This fact resulted in the oppressive policies in Aceh, Iran Jaya, and Timor Timur. Should the nation consider itself as a great system or grand with web of interrelationship—it would certainly contribute to an understanding of a more comprehensive nationalism.

In the prehistory, classical, and modern periods examples of such webs were abundant. The navigation, the commerce, the religion, and the culture composed networks of relationship. Even in the seemingly out of the webs, like Iran Jaya and Timor Timur, local systems with the nearby neighboring states and societies had to be prevailing in
Due to the religion of Islam the greater part of Indonesia had slowly become a uni-
ified culture. Many socio-cultural traits related to
religion, such as education (pesantren), leisure time activities (music, dance, literature, magic), community organization (asli brotherhood tanah lot, mosque), and bureaucracy (sultan, raja/pendgul) showed
that a common system did emerge. How-
ever, Malay was still the lingua franca only for commerce and the rest of the popu-
lations still spoke their own languages.

Other systems existed in the rest of Indonesia. In Bali Hinduism became a sys-
tem of its own. Due to the activities of the missionary works of either Catholic or Protestant many ethnic groups in Eas-
tern Indonesia and Batak lands were Chris-
tianized. They certainly formed systems of
life of their own.

History as Transformation. "History is above all the science of change," said Marc Bloch (Bloch, 1976: xxv). For Indonesian historiography the change can be seen in any text book. Though certainly there is no even development in the whole Indonesia, the usual chronology of transformations will be (1) from prehistory to Hinduism-Buddhism, (2) from Hinduism-Buddhism to Islam, (3) from Islam to colonialism, and (4) from colonial to national authority. This paper is discussing also the transformation during the period of national authority.

Prehistory to Hinduism-Buddhism: Tra-
ditional Society to Statehood. Western Indo-
nesia was exposed to Hinduism-Buddhism in an earlier period than was Eastern Indo-
nesia. The fourth-fifth century is considered to be a transformational era in Western Indonesia and certainly later for Eastern Indonesia. In some parts of the hinterlands of Irin Jaya even until recently the process of change was still going on. In Irin Jaya the transformation was directly from prehis-
tory to modern period, due to the influence of Christianity or the Dutch administration. In many places of East Timor it was Portu-
guese Catholic mission and administration which introduced modern culture and islamic state into to the tribal societies.

Hinduism-Buddhism to Islam. The Con-
cept of Dewa-Raja to Khalifah. The thir-
teenth century is considered to be the Ear-
ly Islamic period in Indonesia. The first Islamic state dated back to the thirteenth century was found in Samudera, a harbor state in North Sumatra. It took three to four centuries for Islam to be able to serve as base of the new system of
religion in the whole Indonesia. The new Islamic states then emerged not only in the coastal areas but in the hinterlands, too.
existence of Islamic kingdoms, though evidences may show that Islamitic communi-
ities did exist before the thirteenth century. The most significant change was the trans-
formation of the concept of kingship, from the concept of dava-rajah (Gad-kings) to the concept of sultan (viceroyalty). In Java, the concept changed but the practice remai-
ned the same. Outside Java, the Islamic concept of kingship introduced new ter-
mology, i.e. the word adat (just) for power holder.

In addition, Islamisation disjued Indone-
sia into two kinds of Islam, The orthodox (santri) and syncretism (abang). Outside Java orthodox Islam was more popular, while Java—beside the enclaves—was syn-
cretic. The two Islamic trends influenced politics, culture, and bureaucracy. The trends have always been manifested in political life, even until nowadays.

Islam to Colonialism: Aristocracy to Meritocracy. The Islamic bureaucracy rested on the traditional elite, an upper layer of the society, with genealogical privileges. The king had the last word for all appoint-
ments for high offices through favoritism. As a rule, however, the appointment for bureau-
cratic posts always gave privileges to members of the ruling class, the santri. Colonial authority continued to use the genealogical consideration, but with additional criterions, the expertise. Due to enlargement of colonial bureaucracy the meritocratic appointment was completely applied for new offices in education, health, service, and many newly opened ones (such as opium seller and pawn shop keeper). Those served in the colonial bureaucracy were collectively called the priyai, regardless of the position.

Colonial to National Authority: Social Mobility. The change was manifested in the social mobility of the native. The highest bureaucratic posts formerly reserved only for the Dutch was then opened for the native. The public education was becoming the means to social mobility. Though the Japanese colonial interregnum favored the traditional santri, this sector of the popula-
tion did not enjoy social mobility due to qualification as general social mobility en-
joyed by the native with abangan learning, especially in the years following the inde-
pendence.

Researchers paid no attention on the problem of social stratification as the cause of compromises, resistances, and rebellions of the santri. The usual approach in ex-
plaining Indonesian political history of post-
independence is by the endemic tension be-
tween the santri and the abangan culture.

National Authority: Social and Political Transform-
ation. At the bottom of the Indonesian society, the problem of social mobility is still the haunting question, some times the social mobility influences politics sometimes does not. The case of the rise of ICMI (Association of All-Indonesia Muslim Intellectuals) could be seen as a pheno-
menon of the upward mobility of the santri middle class (Hefer, 1995).

Meanwhile, at the highest level the pro-
blem is always politics, i.e. the question of democracy. The transitions from parliamen-
tary democracy to the Guided Democracy, the Guided Democracy to the New Order, and the New Order to the post-New Order (the so-called Reformasi Order) are all the problems of democracy. Nevertheless, the last transition must be caused by the dissatisfaction of the middle-class to the existing state of democracy. The problem here is both social as well as political.

History as Social Critic. The task of history as system and "history as trans-
formation" is the reconstruction of the past for understanding the past. "History as social critic" has somewhat different task. It is the reconstruction of the past for understanding the present and projecting, the future. Bio-
graphy and memoir are the most usual tools for exposing the past events in order to memorise, to criticise, and to correct history, especially the contemporary history. Many books have been recently published in order to criticise, for instance, the New Order. The New Order government had accordingly reacted by legally prohibiting the circulation of many books considered to be dangerous to the regime. The use and abuse of historiography for political purpose was much realised by the PKI in the past. Likewise, the government published book about the PKI's rebellion in 1965 (Sekre-
tariat Negara, 1994).
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