Fundamentalism Revised: A Conceptual Critique of Secularism and Religious Pluralism in the Public Sphere of Ambon Post-Conflict

*1Muhammad Farid
1Universitas Islam Internasional Darullughah Wadda'wah Pasuruan
1mfarid@uiidalwa.ac.id

Abstract:
One of the reasons for the development of religious studies was the emergence of religious absolutism through a number of terror attacks in the name of religion. Absolutism stigmatized as the main cause of global society falling into a medieval black hole. On the other hand, secularism and pluralism offer a learning process between secularists and religious people who are open and respectful of each other in the public sphere. Pluralism assumes the unification of religions as a solution to religious conflict, based on the claim of having a "unified source of truth." In fact, secularization hides the trap of secularism, which leads to nihilism. And pluralism is also unable to save religious adherents from relativism. Nihilism and relativism are extreme-left poles in the religious ideology dichotomy. However, efforts to reject secularism and pluralism can also lead to the extreme-right pole, namely absolutism and religious fundamentalism. The research results actually found that fundamentalism actually offers a new color in the market for religious ideologies. In Ambon, a fanatical and ethnocentric society is actually a "good image" of a religious person. By having all the prerequisites to be called fundamentalists, Ambon residents are actually able to avoid nihilism and religious relativism and are even able to survive in peace together between different religions in a dialogical public sphere.

Keywords: Public Sphere, Secularism, Pluralism, Fundamentalism, Ambon Post-Conflict

Introduction

The privatization of religion through secularization makes many people predict that it will erase religion in the public sphere. However, various terror incidents in the name of religion in America and Europe that have shaken the world public in the past two decades seem to convey that religion still exists. Starting from the big bomb that brought down the World Trade Center in USA 2001, the train bomb in Madrid on March 11, 2004, the suicide bombing on London subway trains on July 7, 2005, the Oslo terror bomb by Anders Behring Breivik which attacked a youth camp in Norway on July 22, 2012, and the shooting of a teacher and his students at a Jewish school in Toulouse, France in March 2012, the shooting of a person identified as a French citizen against four people while on a trip to the Jewish Museum in Brussels on May 24, 2014, shootings at synagogues and cafes in Copenhagen, Denmark, on February 14, 2015, a series of attacks occurred in cafes, restaurants, concert venues, and sports stadiums in France on November 13, 2015; bombs rocked the Turkish capital, Ankara, killing at least 37 people on March 13, 2016; bombs at the airport and train station in Brussels, Belgium, on March 22, 2016; and even more most recently, there was a shooting at a Belgian-Swedish football stadium that was thought to have been affected by the Israel-Hamas war in October 2023.

After these terrors, the phenomenon of religion has become increasingly of global concern. In fact, it has become an important component of societal culture, and not just a

matter of personal beliefs and practices (Casanova, 2011), flourishing in fundamentalist or revivalist[1] movements in various parts of the world (Turner, 2010).

Indonesia, the country with the largest religious adherents in the world, actually does not have negative historical experiences so that they have to 'hate' religion like in Western Europe. Indonesia even owes a big debt to the religions that contributed to awakening the nation's nationalism for the sake of republican independence. However, for some reason, the role of religion in Indonesia has not been able to save this nation from the problem of religious radicalization in the country. Encounters between religious adherents in the public sphere often present a blurry portrait of the future of religion. To mention several cases and events that have occurred, such as the bomb case at the Istiqlal Mosque in Jakarta in 1999, the bomb at the Legian Café in Bali in 2002, the mass riots in Tanjung Priok in 2010, the most recent case of the bomb at the Makassar Cathedral Church on March 28, 2021, and the suicide bomb incident at the Astana Anyar Police Headquarters in Bandung City, on December 7, 2022. These incidents are a number of cases of conflict practiced by religious groups, or at least against certain religious groups, or between countries (elites) 'against' religious communities. The cases mentioned do not include major events that occurred dozens of years ago, such as the bloody conflict that killed hundreds of thousands of religious residents in Poso and also in Ambon.

Must be acknowledged, that all of the events above are casuistic, or have unique root problems and unique solutions. Generalizing about all cases is a very wrong thoughts, if not called intellectual stupidity. However, of course, this article will not examine the specifics of the background to these events but will try to see them in a larger frame regarding the existence of religion in the public sphere in facing global challenges.

If we look closely, almost all cases of violence with religious nuances in the country are faced with two types of criticism: first, regarding the religious public sphere, which is prone to conflict. Second, regarding radical and exclusive religious attitudes. These two things are considered to be one source of conflict, which originates from the principle of claims of truth in each religion. To minimize the vulnerability of conflict in the public sphere, religious communities must try to be religiously neutral. This means that all religious statements must be removed when appearing in public areas. Religious people must be able to sort and choose language and attitudes that do not have religious nuances in the public domain. Religious adherents must open themselves to learning from secular people about their attitudes and thoughts in order to be able to live side by side. On the other hand, secular people are required to start respecting and learning about the attitudes and beliefs of religious adherents (Hardiman, 2018). This is a new interpretation of secularization. In the context of the state, the performance of elite officials is required to be able to manage religious communities fairly in the public sphere. State policy should not be nuanced, let alone favor certain religions.

As for 'saving' religious communities from truth claims, which are suspected of triggering conflict, religious adherents are encouraged to make new interpretations of their religious doctrines so that they are willing to accept the truth of other religions within the framework of religious pluralism. Pluralism is the keyword for the ideal of living together. It

---

[1]In the American South, Africa, and Southeast Asia, religion in the form of Pentecostalism, fundamentalism, charismatic movements, and revivalism flourished. Religion has also been relatively revived under the contemporary-liberal government policies of China and Vietnam. Even in Europe and North America, minority religious communities are also increasingly thriving and changing the cultural map that is actually dominated by secular society (see Turner, 2010).

is even considered an absolute solution for efforts to save religious life from fundamentalism, which is often equated with radicality and exclusivity.

The offer of secularization and pluralism looks draw attention. However, it cannot be denied that secularization has a trap, namely secularism. On the other hand, rejection of secularism and pluralism also carries risks, which, if not careful, will invite the presence of religious absolutism, which is just as dangerous for a peaceful life between religious communities?!

This problematic confronts religion with critical-existential questions: Can religion and its people survive facing global secular challenges? Is there a solution to dealing with the plurality of religions without having to harm faith? Can a religious public sphere be created that assumes mutual understanding for the future of harmony between religious adherents? At the end of this article, we will also highlight the religious phenomenon in the city of Ambon as a case study.

Criticizing Secularism

Etymologically, secularization is taken from the Latin saecularis, which means "worldly." It was Max Weber (1930) who first coined this term, although Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim also implicitly mentioned it. Weber proposed the concept of disenchantment of the world, which summarizes what happens in secularization, namely the separation of the world here and the world there, which William Swatos and Kevin Christiano interpret as a two-sided process: human rationalization and world desacralization (Swatos Jr & Christiano, 1999). But of course, a word or term does not just appear without being influenced by the socio-cultural conditions of an era.

According to John L. Esposito, secularism, or the process of secularization, originates from European historical experience. It was a process of gradual separation in almost all aspects of life and thought from clerical associations and aims, a process that developed later in England in the sixteenth century with the shift of political power from the religious arena to the state and in legal cases from the judiciary from the religious to the secular (Esposito, 2001).

However, the phenomenon of religious radicalism at the beginning of this century made the Western world rethink its idea of secularization. Various terrors with religious nuances were then considered a failure of the West-Secular in managing religious life (Turner, 2010). What appears on the surface is just pseudo-tolerance, or the practice of pseudo-tolerance by the secular West towards religion, or even just using religion for one's own interests. To overcome this, it is necessary to reinterpret secularization. Jürgen Habermas, the modernist figure, said, "We are entering an era of 'post-secular society' in which secularization must be interpreted anew as a process of mutual learning between secular thought and religious thought." According to Habermas, post-secular society is a condition of shared life where secular citizens must be willing to listen to the contributions of their religious colleagues because perhaps their particular understandings contain more general truths. Furthermore, believing citizens must also learn from secular citizens or other believers to direct all their absolute but particular reasons towards public rationality (Habermas, 2014).

Habermas's conception of post-secularism is actually oriented towards his basic concept of public sphere, namely an inclusive, 'rational space', in which non-coercive interaction relationships are established and individual rights are protected from attacks by the state (Habermas, 2014). In the context of the relationship between religions in the public sphere, the 'Public Sphere' must be 'free of certain religions'. So on that basis, public regulations that have certain religious nuances definitely violate the principle of publicity. Shared norms, if they still use the 'home language' of a particular religion, will remain foreign

to the ears of adherents of other religions because, in the res publica, religious adherents are not people or congregations but rather citizens (Hardiman, 2018). This means that, for the sake of a public principle, followers of religions must be willing to abandon their religious language and all their religious statements in the public sphere.

If examined closely, Habermas's new interpretation contains confusion, precisely from within his own conception of public sphere. Because if this shared space is assumed to be a space open to all elements within it, which is rational and without coercion, then the proposal to abandon religious language and all religious expressions in the public sphere is contradictory. If the religious origin is removed, where is the uniqueness of the religious personality? This is just another word for subtle coercion and is clearly irrational. If, from the start, there is coercion against one party, how is it possible to create an ideal public sphere for society?

In Indonesia, the Muslim scholar Nurcholish Madjid also offered the idea of secularization, which then became booming, was responded to by many intellectual audiences, and was criticized endlessly[2]. Nurcholish Madjid remains adamant that secularization will not necessarily lead to the extreme pole of secularism. Secularization is even considered a solution for the future of religious life in the country. Because according to Madjid, secularization means "making worldly values that should be worldly and freeing Muslims from the tendency to make them secular." It was later discovered that the thinking of this intellectual, who had a big influence in Indonesia, was identical to the work of Harvey Cox in his book *The Secular City* (Cox, 2013).

Even though Nurcholish rejects secularism and prefers secularization, in essence, secularization is the fetus (embryo) of secularism. A serious problem in Nurcholish thinking, as cited by many experts, is that he was too bold in transferring Western terms that were simply poured into the treasures of Islamic sciences, which had a clearly different socio-historical background. Fazlurrahman (1970), in his criticism of a number of modernist Muslim ideas, said that the failure of modern Muslim intellectuals lies in their efforts to blindly import Western ideas to answer the problems of Muslim countries (Hidayah & Maghribi, 2022; Rahman, 1970).

A more specific response was given by Syed Naquib al-Attas in his big idea about the Islamization of present-day knowledge, emphasizing the importance of three main foundations regarding religious understanding, scientific understanding, and educational understanding to understand the reality of the world (Al-Attas, 2005). According to him, one of the main problems of Islamic civilization and its society is "mistakes and errors regarding scientific understanding, which ultimately lead to a loss of manners in society. "Misunderstanding of science and manners then gives birth to false leaders in every field". That is, the tendency of Muslim communities to choose Western sciences rather than referring to Islamic treasures makes Muslims lose their grip, uprooted from the roots of their own traditions.

Uncovering Pluralism

---

[2] One of them is Prof. Rasjidi (1972), who criticized Cak Nur in his book, Corrections to Nurcholish Madjid on Secularization. According to Rasjidi, Cak Nur's main mistake lies in the term secularization, which was grafted onto the concept of monotheism in Islam, which according to him is a completely wrong generalization. Apart from Rasjidi, there is Ahmad Wahib, who also criticized the same thing as Rasjidi. See Rasjidi's work, Correction of Drs. Nurcholish Madjid on Secularization, and Wahib's work. Ahmad Wahib's notes.

Another challenge of modernity to religion is the notion of religious pluralism, which is claimed to be a 'new path' for the future of religions. Moving on from the reality of the plurality of world religions, which often experience conflict, it is deemed necessary to have the best formula that can encompass all religious beliefs into one harmonious living unity.

Pluralism comes from the English root word plural, which means 'plural', or 'more than one'. In the history of ancient Greek metaphysics, the term pluralism is the opposite of monism, which holds that nature was created by one entity. Meanwhile, pluralism rejects this view and believes that nature is formed by two or more entities (Gunton, 1993). In the history of Western philosophy, the term pluralism was first used by a pragmatic philosopher, William James, in his work entitled The Pluralistic Universe. The term pluralism was originally used in political, cultural, ethical, moral, and religious contexts (Ibrahim, 2011).

Initially, the term religious pluralism was understood as an attitude of respect for the diversity of different and distinctive religions, a purely sociological understanding having nothing to do with theological matters. Raimundo Panikkar (1973) terms this attitude 'parallelism' or the ability to maintain clear boundaries on the one hand and present constant updates of a religion on the other (Panikkar & Panikkar, 1999). Parallelism means a response to the recognition of the plurality of religions without going beyond the boundaries of each religion itself. In line with Panikkar, Karl Rahner (1979) also defines theological pluralism in the context of a plurality of different theological languages, methods, directions, and environments. For Rahner, such differences in religion actually make it impossible for any single theological-philosophical language to summarize them (Rahner, 1972).

Hans Kung (1976) also has a similar opinion: that religious pluralism is essentially a theological reflection of religious communities on religious plurality towards one goal: interreligious dialogue. And to achieve this dialogue, it requires 'theological consensus' or some kind of standard for assessing the validity of a theological reflection while still respecting the diversity of each religion (Küng & Tracy, 1989).

David Tracy (1977) even offers a 'new hermeneutical study' in responding to religious plurality for the purpose of inter-religious dialogue. In his book entitled Blessed Rage for Order: The New Pluralism in Theology, Tracy proposes a model of dialogue that he calls "revisionist theology," meaning a theological attitude that helps prevent theological chaos on the one hand and avoids the tendency to limit theological diversity on the other (Tracy, 1977).

However, subsequently, the term religious pluralism increasingly moved away from its sociological realm, even penetrating into the heart of the essence of theology itself. Religious pluralism then becomes synonymous with the meaning of 'unification of religions', not just 'unification' at a dialogue level, but actually leads to the most essential thing in religion: the unification of divinity. I call it Liberal-Pluralism[3]. John Hick (1987) states that religious pluralism is an understanding that justifies various religious truth claims as something relative, not absolute (Hick, 2005). Charles Kimbal (2002) even calls religions that still hold claims to absolute truth 'evil religions' or Lethal (Kimball, 2011). Alister McGrath also stated that in religious pluralism, no religion is superior to other religions because all are considered equally valid paths to God (McGrath, 2016).

---

[3] The term liberal-pluralism is used by the author to differentiate it from the meaning of sociological-pluralism. On the liberal spectrum, pluralism is interpreted as the unification of religions at a theological-philosophical level. As for the meaning of sociological pluralism, it means that recognition of the plurality of religions in the context of dialogue and human relations is not aimed at 'injuring' the religious essence, which is the theological-philosophical basis of a religion. Recognition of religions is carried out with an orientation towards the goal of inter-religious dialogue. The term 'sociological pluralism' emphasizes that recognizing various beliefs and religions is a purely sociological matter.

In Indonesia, several Muslim scholars and intellectuals also appear to be involved in the definition of religious pluralism as a justification for relative religious truth claims. Some of them base their 'pluralist' views on the conception of religion in perennial philosophy (Hidayat, 2003), as do several other world modernist Muslims. The essence of this view is to liken God to a 'wheel'; the center of the wheel's rotation is God, and the spokes of the wheel are the paths (religion) to God. If you look closely, this understanding is so `confused as to interpret the concept of divinity in each religion, the facts of which are different. Not only does the doctrinal meaning differ, but also the philosophical meaning. Can we assume the unification of the concept of the Oneness of Allah SWT in Islam with the concept of the Oneness of Allah the Trinity in Christians? Of course, the two religious communities will prepare a ton of arguments for long, endless debates!

It is clear that the development of the concept of religious pluralism has metamorphosed into a radical form, namely that it is no longer merely aimed at uniting religions in a dialogue context but has an implied mission to unite the essence of religions as a whole. In fact, there is an impression of an attempt to "dismantle" the beliefs of each religion for the sake of one goal: religious unity!

In Indonesia, some religious circles feel uneasy with this pluralist-liberal idea. We know that the MUI has firmly issued a fatwa that is haram for pluralism. Catholic religious intellectuals, such as Franz Magnis, also do not agree with the notion of pluralism, which desires to unify these theologies. According to Frans Magnis, "this matter (pluralism) is not funny and not serious. This is an insulting attitude, even if it means well. True tolerance means accepting other people, other groups, and the existence of other religions. Tolerance is not assimilation. We need to respect their existence in their otherness" (Suseno & Magnis, 2001).

In Islam, there is the concept of tasamuh, which means 'giving' and also 'taking'. This means not just expecting one party to give and the other to be considered negative. However, it is a formulation of an attitude of openness to hearing different views, namely expressing and accepting views, without eliminating each other's religious beliefs within the scope of mutual understanding (Awang et al., 2021).

The desire to live together is actually the dream of all religious believers, but without having to sacrifice their respective beliefs. Jesus' doctrine of love and the concept of tasamuh in Islam are essentially to be practiced in the context of the diversity of unique religions. Pluralism, which emphasizes the unification of religions, is actually a contradictory term (contradictio in terminis), because on the one hand it recognizes diversity (plurality), but on the other hand it emphasizes unification (unity).

Revising Religious Fundamentalism

If secularism and pluralism cannot be a solution for the future of religions and the world, then what about concerns about the threat of religious absolutism presented in the Fundamentalist movement? I need to provide some clarification regarding the following terms: absolutism and fundamentalism.

Religious absolutism refers to an ideology or world system that is total religion, with its symbols attached to political power as the holder of interpretive control over individuals for their safety in the world and the hereafter. This religious absolutism had concrete evidence in medieval Europe in the form of the absolute power of the Church. Fundamentalism, in Gellner's (1996) view, is a basic idea about a particular religion that is held firmly in a literal and unanimous form, without compromise, softening, re-interpretation, or reduction (Azra, 1996). A similar thing was stated by David Ray Griffin in his book God and Religion in the Modern World: that fundamentalism is a school or ideology

that adheres strictly to the basics of religion through a rigid and literalist interpretation of the holy scriptures (Griffin, 1989).

Historically, the term "fundamentalism" is an attribute given to Protestant sects that consider the Bible to be absolute and perfect in the literal sense, so that questioning one word in the Bible is considered a major and unforgivable sin. Fundamentalism always appears in every major world religion, not only Christianity and Islam; fundamentalism is also found in Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, and Confucianism. In fact, according to Roger Garaudy, fundamentalism is a phenomenon that is not limited to religion but also exists in the political, social, and cultural fields (Garaudy, 1993). The understanding between the two terms absolutism and fundamentalism becomes confused when the two are always understood hand in hand, as if they were one interconnected whole. Even though that's not the case, Religious absolutism is clearly the ghost of modernity, even anti-modernity, and has long since become extinct. Fundamentalism is actually able to collaborate with modernity, and it will always exist as an alternative force in the contemporary era.

According to Richard T. Antoun (2001), in his article Fundamentalism, the real problem of fundamentalism is the problem of how to define it (Turner, 2010). And to overcome this problem, Antoun put forward several basic understandings of the following characteristics of fundamentalism: First, "Scripturalism" is a literal belief that is 'certain' or infallible because it is considered to be fundamentally unchanged from the scriptures and seeks legitimacy and authority by referring to the scriptures. This understanding means seeking purity and piety in a world that is seen as pure, or a willingness to see the relevance of sacred traditions to contemporary issues. Second, "totalism" is a rejection of the separation between sacred and profane and instead an affirmation of the relevance of religion for all areas of life. And third, "activism" involves confrontation with the secular world, by violent means if necessary, and a worldview that understands the modern world in terms of an endless struggle between good and evil.

Based on the current understanding of fundamentalism, it will be difficult to identify modern fundamentalists with absolutists as opponents of modernity. Fundamentalism is a 'selective-protest' movement against a number of aspects of modernization (Turner, 2010). In fact, contemporary fundamentalism has been able to emerge with a strong bargaining position in the midst of modernity. But, of course, it is not an ideal offer. But only as an alternative amidst the current current of modern ideologies.

Ambon Post-Conflict As A Case Study

Ambon[4] is an interesting locus for examining the existence of religious public spheres. Moreover, religious adherents in Ambon experienced a conflict with religious nuances 15 years ago, which lasted almost 4 years, resulting in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people (Farid, 2016).

In the context of public sphere, how complex is religious life in Ambon? The strong cohesion between religious adherents and the high escalation of conflict have made many experts doubt whether Ambonese religious communities can live in peace. Looking at the

---

[4] Ambon is a region that is more modernized structurally and culturally compared to other Maluku regions. Its status as the capital of Maluku province makes this region a meeting place for various ethnicities, tribes, races, and religions. The 1999 Maluku conflict, which lasted 3 years, started in the city of Ambon. In the author's opinion, the appropriate locus for gaining an adequate understanding of religious relations in Maluku should focus more on the characteristics and development of Ambonese society (which is modernized), which of course has significant differences from the characteristics of the Maluku region and society elsewhere.

offer of secularism to the people of Maluku as a solution for public life seems impossible to accept. Because in Maluku, there is no difference between 'private space' and 'public sphere'. This means that all religious expressions appear dominant in the private as well as the public sphere. Even though the new style of secularism offers a more 'friendly' interpretation of overcoming radicalism through understanding and a joint learning process, it seems that it will still be difficult for the Maluku people to put into practice. For Maluku society, abandoning religious symbols is the same as abandoning all their beliefs.

As for the offer of pluralism as a path to peace among religions, it may be accepted if the meaning of pluralism is understood as a tolerant attitude towards other religions without having to sacrifice one's own beliefs, especially as it aims to generalize that all religious statements are the same or even unimportant. This liberal style of pluralism is not only impossible for religious communities in Maluku to accept; it could even trigger new conflicts between religious communities. Like the problem of secularism above, the religious fanaticism of the Ambonese actually 'exists' not only in the private sphere but is also vulgar in the public sphere. The offer to strip someone of their faith may be seen as an unfunny joke among the religious community in Ambon. Because if the offer of secularization to abandon the 'home language' and religious symbols is impossible, how can the Ambon people accept the offer to abandon their faith?

My research findings in 2016 regarding the peaceful relations built by Ambonese Muslim ex-combatants showed several facts: their understanding of a Christian before the 1999 Maluku conflict was always personified as a good neighbor, friend, and even relative or brother (*basudara*). This memory forms a very positive rational and relational awareness and helps frame their daily lives together.

However, when the conflict occurred in January 1999, it challenged all the established thoughts and actions of Muslim ex-combatants. It shook their rational and relational awareness very badly because they had to witness brutal violence before their eyes. Such a situation puts so much pressure on their minds and beliefs, and even threatens themselves and their families, that they have to take action to defend themselves as the only way to be taken. The decision to become a combatant to attack, kill, and burn became something that seemed "rational" at the time. There are no other "choices," because that is their only requirement for survival. This means that long before becoming a "killer," the Muslim ex-combatant had actually been "at war" against his own inner self.

After the Ambon Conflict, where lives were no longer threatened and their faith was no longer disturbed, Muslim ex-combatants tried to reflect on the meaning of their actions towards "others" or non-Muslim individuals. Reflection on meaning then influences all of his daily attitudes and actions, turning him into a person who is able to socialize, embrace, and want to live with other people. This process of change can be explained through Schutz's concepts regarding "stock of knowledge", "typification", and "recipes" (Schutz, 1972), where all notions of Christian individuals as "enemies" are first typified into figures who must be treated well. From this type of understanding, he then forms recipes for actions that he considers appropriate and meaningful for other people who lived at the same time (contemporaries). From there, the Muslim ex-combatants slowly tried to open up, building relationships with their old "enemies.".

As religious individuals, Muslim ex-combatants open up the possibility of relationships with "others" (Christian individuals), although with very unique relationship patterns. In cognitive awareness, other people are perceived as friends, colleagues, or even their own siblings. However, due to the past conflicts that plagued his life, other people, including Muslim ex-combatants, are still viewed subjectively negatively as "individuals who are difficult to trust" or who have the potential to "take action against him." However, this

subjective assumption does not necessarily make him look down on other people or even behave anti-socially towards them. It's just that Muslim ex-combatants doubt that any form of cooperation between them can be established for a long time.

From this, it is understood that the relationship that is built between Muslim ex-combatants and Christian individuals, although conflictual, opens up the possibility of a relationship between them as long as they are not the object or intervene. Even though the presence of Christian individuals is always assumed to be a threat to themselves or that they do not want their presence, this view actually triggers their moral responsibility to act well towards Christian individuals and not vice versa, to hate them.

In the context of his freedom, the figure of the Muslim ex-combatant is similar to a Sartrean consciousness that longs for its freedom and refuses to be disturbed by its existence. Muslim ex-combatants even hate all forms of oppression of their existence. Because the reality of his past has taught him a lesson, that his idealism about existential freedom is just a dream; His freedom has been restricted, his rights manipulated, his presence unwanted by others, even almost eliminated. However, this past event did not make him paranoid about other people. On the contrary, his self-awareness is never separated from others. His self-awareness is always shared with his friends, even with strangers. The figure of a Muslim ex-combatant, no matter how exclusive he is, still allows friendship with his "old enemy," as long as he is not an object or intervenes.

The figure of a Muslim ex-combatant is a person who lives his life with determination on the one hand but fragility on the other. He wants existential freedom, but anxiety always haunts him. Anxiety about bad realities that could suddenly appear. Anxiety about his future, the downturn in his life, as well as the fate of his family and children. His fullness is only present if "others" want to understand him. As Schutz also acknowledged, the individual's basic anxiety is death, considering that this always haunts the individual because of his various unfinished hopes as long as he is faced with the ultimate reality, namely the hope of living in harmony with other people, his friends.

Brotherhood for Muslim ex-combatants is not just a narrow biological unity but also a cultural and humanitarian unity. If siblings are only defined as "satu darah", this will negate individuals who are not "blood." According to Muslim ex-combatants, the "famous" concept of satu darah in Maluku is actually problematic. Especially when faced with the social reality of Maluku, which is ethnically and religiously diverse. The diversity of Maluku will actually be reduced by divisions of heredity and culture alone. A friendship that is so rich will become poor in meaning. Universal brotherhood becomes smaller and narrower. For Muslim ex-combatants, friendship and brotherhood will be much more meaningful within the framework of human unity, where every human individual is assumed to have the affection to see, hear, feel, and unite himself with other individuals around him as brothers (Awang et al., 2018).

Pela brotherhood for Muslim ex-combatants does not promise any peace. Various failures resulting from pela agreements during times of conflict are clear evidence that pela is difficult to rely on. The ex-combatants chose to be skeptical of these cultural ties. This is because the reach of the *pela* rite is only limited to a small number of villages in the Maluku archipelago. Thus, its cohesive power is very limited. If pela brotherhood is the only solution to the Maluku conflict, then what about other traditional and cultural communities that live in Maluku and are not "reached" by *pela*?

In the peaceful post-conflict conditions in the city of Ambon, the Muslim ex-combatants responded in a cautious mood. The peaceful attitude displayed is a form of "guarded peace," considering that relations between individuals of different religions take place in an attitude of "guarding" each other's feelings, words, and actions, solely for the

purpose of harmony. If we refer to Johan Galtung's theory of positive peace, the practice of making peace among Ambonese Muslim ex-combatants is significantly different, especially regarding a number of principles in "positive relations," which Galtung claims are prerequisites for peace (cooperation, freedom from fear, free will, absence of exploitation, freedom of action, and pluralism). On the contrary, what was experienced by the Ambonese Muslim ex-combatants, although they were open to "others" (non-Muslims), still had feelings of worry and misgivings. about the current situation. They are willing to cooperate, even though justice and equality have not been felt. They are able to "make friends with old enemies," but they will never forget their past. He displays a peaceful attitude by "guarding" and limiting feelings, words, and actions, solely for the sake of harmony.

Ambonese Muslim ex-combatants are also reluctant to enter into the religious rituals and beliefs of "other people" and even firmly reject the principles of religious pluralism, which equalize the truth of all religions. According to them, this kind of understanding is very risky because it assumes a unified path to one God or even does not consider the various "paths" important. In the end, religious practices developed across religions tend to underestimate the uniqueness of each religion, so that what occurs is no longer tolerance but rather the assimilation of many religions.

For Ambonese Muslim ex-combatants, respect for the specifics of other people's religions is absolute. Each religious community must be given the freedom to express various forms of worship, but not to the point of having to cross the boundaries of other people's beliefs. The practice of friendship built with non-Muslims is a pure social relationship and does not touch on the core issues of religious belief.

References

Al-Attas, S. M. N. (2005). Islamic philosophy: An introduction. *Journal of Islamic Philosophy*, *1*(1), 11–43.

Awang, J., Farid, M., Long, A. S., Ab Rahman, Z., & Mustapa, A.-M. (2018). Interreligius peace in multicultural society: A critique to the idea of peace multiculturalism. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, *9*(9).

Awang, J., Ramli, A. F., & Rahman, Z. A. (2021). Muslim views on other religions: With special reference to Buddhism. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, *77*(4), 6608.

Azra, A. (1996). Pergolakan politik Islam: Dari fundamentalisme, modernisme hingga post-modernisme. *(No Title)*.

Casanova, J. (2011). *Public religions in the modern world*. University of Chicago press.

Cox, H. (2013). *The secular city: Secularization and urbanization in theological perspective*. Princeton University Press.

Esposito, J. L. (2001). *Ensiklopedi Oxford Dunia Islam Modern*. Penerbit Mizan.

Farid, M. (2016). Dialog dan Toleransi Beragama di Kota Ambon: Perspektif Bekas Pejuang Muslim Ambon. *Dialog*, *9*.

Garaudy, R. (1993). Islam Fundamentalis dan Fundamentalis Lainnya. *Bandung: Pustaka*.

Griffin, D. R. (1989). *God and religion in the postmodern world: essays in postmodern theology*. suny Press.

Gunton, C. E. (1993). *The one, the three and the many*. Cambridge University Press.

Habermas, J. (2014). *Religion and rationality: Essays on reason, God and modernity*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hardiman, F. B. (2018). *Demokrasi dan sentimentalitas: Dari "bangsa setan-setan", radikalisme agama sampai post-sekularisme*. PT Kanisius.

Hick, J. (2005). *Religious Pluralisme and Islam. an article*.

Hidayah, A., & Maghribi, H. M. (2022). From Modernism to Neo-Modernism: A Religio-Political Context of Muhammad Abduh and Fazlur Rahman. *SHAHIH: Journal of Islamicate Multidisciplinary*, *7*(2), 109–124.

Hidayat, K. (2003). *Agama masa depan: perspektif filsafat perennial*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Ibrahim, H. (2011). Dari kepelbagaian agama kepada pluralisme agama: sejarah perkembangan. *Jurnal Ilmu Wahyu Dan Perbandingan Agama, Universitas Islam Antarbangsa Malaysia*.

Kimball, C. (2011). *When religion becomes lethal: The explosive mix of politics and religion in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. John Wiley & Sons.

Küng, H., & Tracy, D. (1989). *Paradigm change in theology*. T & T Clark.

McGrath, A. E. (2016). *Christian theology: An introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Panikkar, R., & Panikkar, R. (1999). *The intrareligious dialogue*. Paulist Press.

Rahman, F. (1970). Islamic modernism: Its scope, method and alternatives. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, *1*(4), 317–333.

Rahner, K. (1972). Anonymous and explicit faith. *Theological Investigations*, *16*, 52–59.

Schutz, A. (1972). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Northwestern university press.

Suseno, F. M., & Magnis, F. (2001). Pluralisme Agama, Dialog, dan Konflik di Indonesia. *The Pluralisme, Konflik, Dan Pendidikan Agama Di Indonesia. Yogyakarta: Interfidei*, 71–72.

Swatos Jr, W. H., & Christiano, K. J. (1999). Introduction—Secularization theory: The course of a concept. *Sociology of Religion*, *60*(3), 209–228.

Tracy, D. (1977). Revisionist practical theology and the meaning of public discourse. *Pastoral Psychology*, *26*(2), 83–94.

Turner, B. S. (2010). Religion in a Post-secular Society. *The New Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Religion*, 649–667.