

The Polemics Between *Surya Kanta* (1925-1927) and *Bali Adnjana* (1924-1930)

How Balinese argue (in Malay)

Michel Picard

3-5 July 2015

Before dealing with the polemics between *Surya Kanta* and *Bali Adnjana* proper, allow me to delve at some length with the way I became sensitised to Balinese ways of arguing.

When Mark asked me to take part in this symposium, what first came to my mind was an event that happened in 1980, when I became aware that Balinese might not argue the way I was accustomed to. I was then doing fieldwork for my PhD and staying in a rented house in Sayan with my friend Jean-François Guermonprez. It happened that we had to go to Buleleng for a few days. So we closed our house and informed the young Balinese man who used to bring us buckets of water for our *mandi* from the river down below, that we would be away for a while. Upon our return, we were rather surprised when he claimed that we should pay him for the water he had brought to the house everyday during our absence. We thus started to argue that we could not have had the use for his water as we were away, but to no avail. We were so infuriated by what appeared like a lack of common sense that the argument started to inflame, with the result that we were eventually expelled from our house. From then on, Jean-François and I had numerous discussions on the Balinese *mentalité* and its peculiar ways of arguing...

Years later, I came across Ramanujan's famous essay titled "Is there an Indian way of thinking?" (1989), that I found to shed some light on my Balinese experiences. The author attempted to make sense of the saying: "Indians do not mean what they say, and say different things at different times". He noticed that Indians seem to have a different relationship to outside reality, compared to the one met with in the West. This is because, he claimed, Indians' behaviour abides preferably by context-sensitive rules – it tends to be particularistic, whereas the Western Judeo-Christian tradition is ideally based on a premise of context-free universalisation.

According to Ramanujan, such a pervasive emphasis on context is related to the Hindu concern with *jāti* – the logic of classes and species, of which human *jāti* are only one instance. In such a world view, each class of man has his own laws, his own proper ethic, his own *dharma*, not to be universalised. Indeed, according to Manu and the *Dharmaśāstra*, *dharma* is an exclusive and personal norm, in the sense that ethical behaviour should conform to one's *svadharma* (the conduct that is right for one's *jāti*) as well as to one's *āśramadharmā* (the conduct that is right for one's stage of life). There is not much left of a common (*sādhāraṇa*) or inclusive (*sanātana*) *dharma* which the texts speak of, if at all, only as a last resort.

It seems to me that the Balinese notion of *soroh* is comparable to the Indian notion of *jāti*, inasmuch as it refers to a group of persons, animals or things sharing similar features that characterise them as belonging to the same species. Each *soroh* defines a structure of relevance, a frame of reference enabling Balinese to decide what can or should be done in a given context. This is, I think, what the notion of *patut* is about, which indicates that what is considered proper in Bali is highly context-sensitive.

The Balinese obsession with social hierarchy implies that different kinds of people necessarily speak different kinds of languages, with distinct speech registers indexing the relative status of speaker, addressee and third parties alike. This goes a long way to explain the prevalence of what Ward Keeler calls "the pleasures of polyglossia", that depend on "keeping languages or codes apart, and then mediating among them" (Keeler 2006: 205; cf. also Maier 1993). Polyglossia is best illustrated in *pepaosan/bebasan* sessions, as well as in

wayang kulit and in Balinese theatre more generally, with what Mary Zurbuchen describes as “internal translation” (Zurbuchen 1989; see also Zurbuchen 1987 and Rubinstein 1992).

From Balinese to Indonesian

Now, following Ramanuja further, one might see the process of “modernisation” as a general movement from the context-sensitive to the context-free. This is indeed noticeable in the decline of polyglossia in Balinese theatre, with the rise of such genres as *sendratari* and *drama gong* that all but do away with the mediating function of the *panasar* – whether they are reduced to a subordinate position as retainers in *sendratari*, or on the contrary given exceptional prominence as clowns in *drama gong*, in either case the *panasar* no longer perform their role as mediators, as there is no longer any need for internal translation (Picard 1996). This decline of polyglossia is manifest not only in such “modern” dramatic genres as *sendratari* and *drama gong* but even in *wayang kulit*, with the shortening of scenes in which *kawi* speaking epic characters appear and the corresponding lengthening of those in which the *panasar* converse among themselves in vernacular Balinese.

Another instance of the movement from the context-sensitive to the context-free is provided by the contemporary Hinduisation of the Balinese religion, with the highly contextualised ritual traditions becoming universalised into a Neo-Hindu brand of *agama* construed as *sanātana dharma*¹ (Picard 2012). This phenomenon was rather aptly qualified by Clifford Geertz in his characteristic flowery style: “Traditional religions consist of a multitude of very concretely defined and only loosely ordered sacred entities, an untidy collection of fussy ritual acts and vivid animistic images which are able to involve themselves in an independent, segmental, and immediate manner with almost any sort of actual event. Such systems [...] meet the perennial concerns of religion [...] piecemeal [...] Rationalized religions, on the other hand, are more abstract, more logically coherent, and more generally phrased” (Geertz 1973: 172).

Among the manifestations as well as the channels of modernisation in Bali, one should pay particular attention to the general shift from Balinese to Indonesian (not to mention English) – and this not only when Balinese people have to communicate with foreigners, whether Indonesian citizens or foreign tourists, expatriates and academics, but even when they debate among themselves. Mark once remarked that “most scholarship on Bali depends on the remarkable ability of Balinese to convey their culture to the researchers in Indonesian” (Hobart 1989: 22). That might well be the case, but to the extent that they have to borrow an alien terminology Balinese are no longer the ones to set the terms of the discourse they tell about themselves. The result amounts to some sort of cognitive dissonance between what Balinese speakers “say” about their own culture and what they actually “know” but cannot articulate using Indonesian (or Western) categories (Sweeney 1987: 7). Anyone with some experience of Balinese academic *skripsi* would know what I mean...

I shall provide here a few examples of such a cognitive dissonance.

One refers to my experience of getting widely differing explanations whether I was discussing with Balinese informants in Balinese or in Indonesian. During my fieldwork, I used to visit elderly literati and to address them in Balinese (these were the days when I could hold a conversation in formal Balinese, which is unfortunately no longer the case). Then, more often than not, a younger member of the old man’s family, a son or a nephew, would step in and start rephrasing in Indonesian the words of his elder. And indeed, the message

¹ Despite its claim to be the “eternal religion”, *sanātana dharma* is as modern a construct as is Hinduism, in the sense that it emerged as a self-conscious reaction against both Christianity and the 19th-century Hindu reform movements.

would be starkly divergent, making me aware that the linguistic medium was not a neutral channel to convey information.

Another recollection refers to the reply voiced by a musician from Sebatu during a dance tour in Paris in 1972, to the question of a spectator asking the reason for the offerings presented and the incense burnt before the performance – it was, or so he claimed, to obtain the blessing of Sang Hyang Widi Wasa – a clearly Neo-Hindu reference. I doubt that such would have been his explanation had he been discussing the matter back home with his fellow villagers.

More to the point is the Balinese authorities' reaction to the performance of so-called "sacred dances" for tourists. As long as their dances were being performed in their traditional contexts, the Balinese had no need to ask themselves where ritual ended and where spectacle began. But the arrival of the tourists, by confronting them with the unprecedented situation of having to interpret their culture before a foreign audience, would compel them to mark a boundary between that which belongs to religion and that which pertains to art. These two dimensions proved difficult to differentiate for the Balinese, as testified by their inability to dissociate "sacred" from "profane" dances (Picard 1990).

I refer here to the *Seminar Seni Sakral dan Provan Bidang Tari* that was convened in 1971 with the aim of working out criteria to separate *tari sakral* from *tari provan*, in order to distinguish between the dances which might be commercialised for the tourist market and those which should not. The task proved to be a delicate one, to judge from the confusion of the participants, a select group of Balinese officials and academics solicited to write a paper on the subject. Their predicament was hardly surprising, given that neither the Balinese nor the Indonesian languages have at their disposal the terminology that would permit their speakers to articulate the conceptual opposition between the sacred and the profane. As a result, the organisers had to resort to neologisms borrowed from Latin by way of Dutch for the very wording of the problem to be resolved. This semantic borrowing resulted in uneasy attempts on the part of the participants to forge a distinction that was alien to them. Instead of framing the problem they had to resolve as a matter of discriminating between two domains which had hitherto been undifferentiated, several of the participants ended up speaking of *tari sakral dan provan* as one and the same category, thus conferring upon the very same dances the attributes of both "sacred" and "profane" (Projek 1971b).

Such is the challenge that tourism has thrown up to the Balinese. Not only are they called upon to slice into the living flesh of their culture, to draw a dividing line where they knew only a continuum, but on top of that they are compelled to think in a borrowed terminology that visibly makes no sense to them. In their perplexity, they see no other recourse than to look for rescue in the language of their former colonisers. And so they are reduced to searching within a foreign mode of thought for the concepts that are supposed to help them protect the most inalienable of their cultural values from the threat wrought by the presence of foreign tourists on their territory.

The discourse of Cultural Tourism

At any rate, this is how I became interested in Balinese discourse during my work on Cultural Tourism in Bali. The way I construe it, following both Foucault and Bourdieu, a discourse is performative, being at once a body of cultural assumptions about reality and a set of social practices that establish and validate that reality, according to the authority of its authors. Thus, unlike Mark, who has been working with Balinese villagers, I dealt mostly with Balinese public intellectuals and opinion leaders, whom I subsumed under the label "Balinese authorities".

Those I call the “Balinese authorities” are not limited to the personnel of the Indonesian state in the province, but include the Balinese who are authorized to speak in the name of their island and who are thus in a position to monopolise legitimate discourse on Bali – academics, journalists, artists, bureaucrats, professionals, and so forth. These opinion-makers are the active culture-producing people who formulate, debate, propagate and explain contemporary issues and emerging ideas to the rest of the population. As such, they make up an “intelligentsia” (*cendekiawan*), distinguished from the “literati” (*sastrawan, seniman alam*), who are custodians of a traditional knowledge that is specifically Balinese. Whereas the literati remain entrenched in the village sphere whose world view and values they uphold, these intellectuals function as mediators between two worlds – traditional and modern, rural and urban, local and global, Balinese and Indonesian. In this ambivalent position, they ensure the articulation between the village and the state by speaking on behalf of Bali to Jakarta and simultaneously by conveying the instructions of the capital to the province. By shifting from one discursive position to another, they are in a position to affirm their Balinese identity while furthering at the same time the integration of Bali within the Indonesian nation-state. It is to these public intellectuals that I refer when I speak of “the Balinese” without further qualification.

From the start, the Balinese authorities evinced an ambivalent attitude toward tourism, which they perceived as a “challenge” (*tantangan*), at once fraught with danger and filled with the promise of prosperity. On the one hand, the artistic and religious traditions that had made Bali famous worldwide provided its main tourist attraction, thus turning Balinese culture into the most valuable resource for the island’s economic development. But on the other hand, the invasion of Bali by foreigners was seen as a threat of “cultural pollution” (*polusi budaya*). To deal with this challenge, the doctrine of “Cultural Tourism” (*Pariwisata Budaya*) was meant to reconcile the conflicting interests of culture and tourism, by capitalising on culture to develop tourism while using tourism to promote Balinese culture (Projek 1971a).

The ambivalence of the discourse of Cultural Tourism can be assessed as a tentative denial of the conflicts aroused by tourism – among the Balinese themselves, as well as between Bali and Jakarta. It is in this capacity that Cultural Tourism is presented by the Balinese authorities as a *kebijaksanaan*, a term commonly translated as “policy” but which must be understood as a position that is wise, judicious and prudent, aiming to satisfy all the parties involved. Indeed, it is precisely in its aptitude to reconcile contradictions and attain a consensus that the formula of Cultural Tourism proves its “power” (*kekuasaan*) and attains a quasi-sacred status. Thus one must consider the contradictions harboured by the discourse of Cultural Tourism not as a logical incoherence, but as the proof of its capacity to conciliate contradictory positions.

This has to do further with the fact that in Indonesia social problems tend to be treated as moral problems. Hence a preference for a normative approach, expressed through the recurrent use of injunctions, such as *harus, mesti, perlu, harap, hendak, moga-moga, mudah-mudahan, jangan*, and so forth. Hence also a taste for incantatory maxims and mottoes, which seem to be acquiring a life of their own, as if the situation would be under control once it has been labelled. In this respect, Cultural Tourism functions as a discourse without authors, as a mantra, giving the assurance that outside reality will coincide with that which one says about it. This might explain why such a discourse seems to hold its authority not from the truth of what it says nor even from the prominence of those who propound it, but from the simple fact of its very enunciation.

Be that as it may, the focus on Cultural Tourism has rendered the Balinese self-conscious about a thing they possess called “culture”, something precious and perishable

which they perceive at once as a capital (*modal*) to be exploited and as a heritage (*warisan*) to be cared for (Picard 1995). And so it is that their culture became reified and externalized in the eyes of the Balinese, by turning into an object that could be detached from themselves in order to be displayed and marketed for others – but also, consequently, of which they risked becoming dispossessed. As it was being thus appropriated by the tourism industry, their culture has become not only a source of profit and pride, but also a cause of anxiety for the Balinese people, who started wondering whether they were still authentically Balinese. Hence, for the Balinese, the touristic emphasis on culture provoked an overriding concern about their identity – about what they call their “Balineseness” (*Kebalian*).

By and large, when debating the issue of *Kebalian*, Balinese intellectuals tend to agree that as long as they are aware of the primordial unity of *agama* (“religion”), *adat* (“tradition”) and *budaya* (“culture”), their identity would not be at risk. Now, my purpose was not to assess the veracity of such a claim but to elucidate how the Balinese have come to formulate their identity in these very terms – all terms of foreign origin, which they had to appropriate and reinterpret according to their own cultural values and political concerns. Indeed, far from expressing a primordial essence as its present proponents would have it, this conception of *Kebalian* is in fact the outcome of a process of semantic borrowing and conceptual recasting which the Balinese had to make in response to the colonisation, the Indonesianisation as well as the touristification of their island.

The polemics between *Surya Kanta* (1925-1927) and *Bali Adnjana* (1924-1930)

Since the foundational works of Edward Said (1978) and Ben Anderson (1991), and the ensuing vogue of post-colonial studies, we are aware that colonial domination manifested itself not only through the imposition of military force and administrative measures, but also by means of the introduction of new ideas and values. In a Gramscian fashion, one could say that the colonial hegemony was established through an epistemic domination whereby the consciousness of colonised peoples was fashioned by the discourse of the colonial power. The problem with this approach is that it tends to overlook the self-representations of the colonised subjects, as if they had no agency of their own in the matter. Yet, numerous studies corroborate that indigenous peoples tended to engage in a process of self-identification following their incorporation into a colonial state (Cohn 1987, Keesing 1989, Dirks 1992, Sahlins 1993, Thomas 1994).

In Bali, the dominance of colonial discourse has been further compounded by the images elaborated by philologists and anthropologists, to the point of denying the Balinese the status of subjects of their own history (Hobart 1997). Specifically, before colonial administrators started to deal with Balinese society, it had been imagined by orientalist as a “living museum” of Hindu-Javanese civilisation, the only surviving heir to the Hindu heritage swept away from Java by the coming of Islam (Raffles 1817, Crawfurd 1820, Van Hoëvell 1848, Friederich 1849-50, 1959).

By looking for the singularity of Bali in its Hindu heritage, while conceiving of Balinese identity as formed through an opposition to Islam (and, later on, to Christianity), Dutch orientalist established the framework within which the Balinese were going to define themselves. Furthermore, by restoring its privileges to the nobility, while consolidating its command over the population after having undermined the foundations of its authority, colonial administrators sowed the seeds of a conflictual situation on the island.

Thus, to a certain extent, the fictions created by the colonial state have become realities. Yet, as Marshall Sahlins reminds us, one should refrain from crediting the colonial masters with the exclusive power of making history, as if “the main historical activity remaining to the underlying people [was] to misconstrue the effects of such imperialism as their own

cultural traditions” (Sahlins 1993: 6). Rather than viewing the colonial encounter in terms of foreign impact, one should identify the active agency of the colonised peoples as they engaged with and accommodated colonial impositions, thereby redefining the terms of that confrontation for their own purposes.

If it is true that the Balinese “were not allowed to participate in Western discourses about themselves” (Schulte Nordholt 1994: 119), in the sense that they were not asked for their opinion, some of them did write and even published, so that we are in a position to elucidate how they perceived and interpreted what was happening to their world. The fact is that, despite the Dutch attempt to insulate Balinese society from disturbing foreign influences, Bali actually underwent rapid and profound changes as a result of increasing interference in native affairs by the colonial state (Boon 1977, Schulte Nordholt 1994, Robinson 1995, Vickers 2012). In particular, the requirements of a modern administration were instrumental in the emergence of a Balinese intelligentsia, since the colonial state needed educated natives to mediate between the population and their European masters. This intelligentsia strove to make sense of the changes brought about by the opening up of their island to the advent of “modern times” (*zaman modern*).

Not only did the emerging Balinese intelligentsia have to face the disruption of the familiar references which ordered and gave meaning to their lives, but furthermore they were confronted with alien discourses telling them who they were and how they should conduct themselves. So much so that, while the upheaval inflicted by the colonial occupation of their island was compelling the Balinese to question the foundations of their identity, the inquisitive gaze of foreigners in their midst impelled them to explicitly account for the definition of what it meant to be Balinese in terms comprehensible to non-Balinese.

It was in Singaraja that an intellectual élite composed mostly of school teachers and civil servants founded the first Balinese modern organisations². These organisations started publishing periodicals, a complete novelty for Bali, though already occurring elsewhere in the Indies at that time (Adam 1995). Written in Malay, these publications were devoted chiefly to issues pertaining to religion and social order. The use of Malay – profusely interspersed, moreover, with Dutch terms – rather than Balinese, to address thoroughly Balinese topics destined to an exclusively Balinese readership, indicates that the emerging Balinese intelligentsia were already conscious of being an integral part of a larger entity, due to the incorporation of their island into the colonial state. Thus, the same process which prompted the Balinese to question their identity was dispossessing them of their own words, by inducing them to think about themselves in a language which was not their own but that used both by their fellow countrymen and by their colonial masters. Such a linguistic substitution indicated a reflexive distancing from the Balinese universe of reference, which was becoming decontextualised, relativised and homogenised in the process.

The history of the foundation (and disbanding) of successive or concurrent organisations in the 1920s is rather confused. The first of these modern organisations, *Setiti Bali*, had been founded in 1917 by I Goesti Bagoes Tjakra Tanaja, the *punggawa* of Sukasada, to counter the Javanese Islamic association *Sarekat Islam*, which had recently opened a branch in Singaraja. It lasted until 1920 and was succeeded the following year by a short-lived organisation called *Soeita Gama Tirta*, founded by I Ktoet Nasa, the principal of

² These organizations can be qualified as “modern”, in the sense that they were voluntary associations of likely minded people with wide-ranging purposes and highly formalized structures, complete with an elected board, statutes, written regulations, and membership fees. In this respect they differed from the various customary organizations regulating Balinese social relations, such as kinship affiliation groups (*dadia*), temple congregations (*pamaksan*), neighbourhood associations (*banjar*), irrigation societies (*subak*), and cooperatives formed for specific tasks (*seka*).

the primary school in Bubunan, and presided by I Goesti Poetoe Djlantik, member of the *Raad Kerta* in Singaraja and a descendant of the *raja* of Buleleng. In 1923, members of a savings and credit cooperative society (*seka jongkok*) founded the *Santi* association under the leadership of Poetoe Djlantik, Tjakra Tanaja and Ktoet Nasa. On the 1st January 1924, the association started publishing its own journal, *Santi Adnjana*.

All these organisations had been opened to *Triwangsa* and *Jaba* alike, but tension appears to have been rife between the two groups, the *Jaba* objecting to various privileges claimed by the *Triwangsa*. A conflict soon opposed the leaders of each faction (and joint editors of *Santi Adnjana*), Tjakra Tanaja and Ktoet Nasa, and sometime in 1924 the publication of the journal was taken over by Tjakra Tanaja, who changed its title to *Bali Adnjana*. The conflict escalated until a split between *Jaba* and *Triwangsa* grew inevitable. This happened through a dispute over the name of the Balinese religion during a meeting of the members of *Santi* in May 1925. In October 1925, Ktoet Nasa started publishing his own journal, *Surya Kanta*, and the following month he established an eponymous organisation whose membership was restricted to the *Jaba*. The president was Ktoet Sandi, the *punggawa* of Singaraja, the vice-president Ktoet Nasa and the secretary Nengah Metra, a young teacher at the *Hollandsch-Inlandsche School* in Singaraja. Meanwhile, the membership of *Santi* was dwindling, as most of the *Jaba* were joining *Surya Kanta*. In July 1926, *Santi* held its last meeting and it appeared to cease its activities by the end of the year.

The situation became even more confused after May 1926, with the foundation in Klungkung of an organisation named *Tjatoer Wangsa Derja Gama Hindoe Bali* (shortened in *Tjwadega Hindoe Bali*). Professing to reconcile the interests of all “four castes” (*caturwangsa*) – and discreetly backed by the colonial government, anxious to defuse the rising tension – this new organisation was in fact controlled by the *Triwangsa* and used *Bali Adnjana* as its mouthpiece³. Shortly afterwards, a *pedanda* association named *Setiti Gama Siwa Boeda* was founded in Karangasem, under the patronage of I Goesti Bagoes Djlantik.

The authors who have commented on these organisations have tended to stress the conflict which opposed the *Jaba* to the *Triwangsa*, while construing that conflict in terms of a contest between “modernist” and “traditionalist” factions, which could be explained by reference to the familiar struggle between the forces of progress and those of reaction (Vickers 1996: 34)⁴. True, the polemics between *Surya Kanta* and *Bali Adnjana* concerned mainly (but not exclusively) “caste” (*kasta*) privileges, which had been aggravated by the colonial policy and which the *Jaba* wanted to abolish in the name of “progress” (*kemajuan*). Yet, one should be wary of focusing too much on this so-called “caste conflict” (*pertentangan kasta*), at the risk of losing sight of what these organizations had in common. Even if they diverged in their respective ideological orientations, on most fundamental questions their leaders shared the same presuppositions⁵.

³ The president was the *negara-bestuurder* of Karangasem, I Goesti Bagoes Djlantik, the vice-president Tjokorda Gde Raka Soekawati and Tjakra Tanaja was the delegate from Buleleng.

⁴ The formation and development of these modern organisations in Bali, as well as the contents of their publications, have only been only occasionally mentioned in foreign publications: Korn (1932: 46-47, 124-125), Kraemer (1933: 48-50), Goris (1933: 33-36), Bakker (1993: 39-44), Robinson (1995: 33-36), Parker (2000: 52-53), Vickers (2000: 90-94, 2012: 212-214, 220-221), Liem (2003: 130-166). Balinese authors have been more prolific: Bagus (1969, 1972, 1975, 1996), Putra Agung (1972, 2001), Kutoyo (1977-78), Padmawati (1982), Atmadja (2001), Ari Dwipayana (2001), Wijaya (2007, 2009), Putra (2011).

⁵ As a matter of fact, very little is known regarding the contributors to either journal – except for Tjakra Tanaja and for the main leaders of *Surya Kanta* – as their identity was often concealed behind pseudonyms, such as *I Gatra*, *I Jaba*, *I Kolot*, *Suka Maju*, or else *Bali Totok*. Not to mention the plain fact that more often than not the precise context of their articles remains unknown.

In addition, attention has been focused mainly on *Surya Kanta*, whose positions are more easily comprehensible today, as they appear seemingly “rational” as well as more clear-cut and straightforward than those of *Bali Adnjana*, which tend to be couched in rather ambiguous and allusive terms. The general tenor of each publication is fairly different and the *Jaba*’s use of Malay reminds one of the roughness of lower Balinese, while the *Triwangsa*’s evokes the literary verbosity of high Balinese. Furthermore, *Bali Adnjana* is not as accessible as *Surya Kanta*, since the available copies of the journal are scattered, forming an incomplete set, besides being poorly stenciled. Finally, *Bali Adnjana* was published more frequently and for a longer period than *Surya Kanta*, thus its contents are more wide-ranging and its coverage of issues greater⁶.

Published under the leadership of Ktoet Nasa, *Surya Kanta*⁷ aimed to raise the position of the *Jaba* in Balinese society and to defend their rights. Most of its founders and members were young schoolteachers and petty officials. For them, Western education had been a means of social mobility. After having graduated from the *HIS* in Singaraja, where they had learnt both Malay and Dutch, those who came from better-off families pursued their studies in Java or Makassar, where they mixed with their fellow Indonesians, according to a process fittingly described by Ben Anderson (1991: 120-123). The command of Dutch, besides being a marker of status, was for them an opening to the Western world, with its values of rationalism and progress, its ideas of nationalism and democracy. Back in Bali, they either found employment as teachers in the schools which the Dutch were progressively opening in the villages, or else they filled positions in the lower echelons of the colonial bureaucracy. There, they experienced frustration from both their own and colonial society, neither of which lived up to their freshly acquired ideals⁸. In particular, they resented the fact that their access to the higher echelons of the bureaucracy was hampered by the colonial government, which favoured the *Triwangsa*.

This frustrated group of native intellectuals endeavoured to enlighten the Balinese people and prepare them to the advent of “modern times” (*zaman modern*), as they proudly announced in the sentence opening the first issue of *Surya Kanta*: “*Bahwa maksud kami mengeluarkan surat kabar ini, ialah hendak memimpin bangsa Bali yang terbilang ‘gelap’ budinya dan jauh kebelakang tentang kemajuan hidup didunia ini*” (*Surya Kanta* 1925, n°1: 1). While appearing occasionally under the guise of the predicate “modern” (rendered by the Dutch word *modern*), modernity as such is actually not dealt with explicitly in *Surya Kanta* (nor, for that matter, in *Bali Adnjana*). The most ubiquitous allusions to modernity are the references to the “changing of the times” (*peredaran zaman*), which distinguish the “present” (*zaman sekarang*) from the “past” (*zaman dahulu*). The present time is an age of “change” (*perubahan*), of “contest” (*perlombaan*) and “movement” (*pergerakan*) (Shiraishi 1990), an

⁶ *Surya Kanta* was a monthly journal, published from October 1925 to September 1927. One does not know when exactly during the year 1924 *Santi Adnjana* was replaced by *Bali Adnjana*. The latter title appeared every ten days till November 1930 (irregularly after June 1929). Issues of *Bali Adnjana* are available only after January 1925, while no copies of *Santi Adnjana* seem to have survived.

⁷ *Surya Kanta* (Skt.) refers to a crystal, the emanation of the sun’s rays. Its initiators were obviously conscious of bringing enlightenment to their Balinese brethren who remained in obscurity (*kegelapan*).

⁸ There is, of course, nothing specifically Balinese in this plight, which appears to be the common lot of the native intelligentsias emerging out of a colonial situation. Their predicament is deeply contradictory, as depicted by John Plamenatz, involving as it does a rejection, “in fact, two rejections, both of them ambivalent: rejection of the alien intruder and dominator who is nevertheless to be imitated and surpassed by his own standards, and rejection of ancestral ways which are seen as obstacles to progress and yet also cherished as marks of identity” (quoted in Chatterjee 1986: 2). One is also reminded of the dispute between Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo and Soetatmo Soeriokoesoemo in 1918 (Shiraishi 1981), and its continuation in the famous “polemic on culture” (*polemik kebudayaan*), which opposed some of the leading Indonesian intellectuals in the 1930s, concerning the extent to which the emerging national culture should borrow from the West (Mihardja 1948).

“age of thinking and ideas” (*zaman pikiran*) – in short, an “age of progress” (*zaman kemajuan*)⁹. The contrast between the present and the past is commonly expressed by means of such pairings as *baru/kuno*, *muda/tua*, *terang/gelap*, *maju/kolot*, *sudah sadar/masih bodoh* (Anderson 1979: 221). What is striking for today’s readers is the fact that the “times” appear to be credited with an agency of their own (*zaman punya kemauan*) – it is as if the “will of the times” (*kemauan zaman*) requests the reforms advocated by *Surya Kanta*. These reforms are not simply the wishes of mere humans but they are in truth “God’s will” (*kodrat Tuhan*).

The reforms advocated by *Surya Kanta* are formulated in the following manner in the statutes of that organization: a) to foster reason and character (*mengutamakan budi*); b) to improve the economy (*memperbaiki ekonomie*); c) to improve and protect the fate of the commoners (*memperbaiki dan melindungi nasib kaum Jaba*); d) to change the customs that are contrary to the progress of the times (*mengubah adat yang berlawanan dengan kemajuan jaman*) (Surya Kanta 1925, n°2: 16).

The means to these ends is Western-style education (*pendidikan cara Barat*), which is deemed to be the foundation of progress (*pangkal kemajuan*). The Balinese are summoned to move forward and advance themselves (*memajukan diri*), failing which they will be left behind (*ketinggalan zaman*)¹⁰. In that, they should follow the lead of other “nations” (*bangsa*), such as the Javanese or the Malays, who are more advanced than themselves on the way to progress¹¹. They should pursue education not only in Bali, but also in Java and even in Holland if they can. And Balinese girls should be educated as well as the boys.

Once properly educated, the Balinese will be in a better position to improve their economic situation, which has been deteriorating lately. Specifically, they should strive to free their economy from the grasp of foreign capital through setting-up cooperatives. Considering the importance of economy as the foundation of all progress (*ekonomie itu pokok segala kemajuan*), which is stressed right from the first issue of *Surya Kanta*, it is no wonder that numerous articles of that periodical should relate to economic matters. Besides, Balinese should become aware of the importance of being thrifty, particularly as concerns ruinous customary rituals such as cremations (Connor 1996), that more often than not are ostentatious demonstrations of wealth destined to increase the prestige of their initiators rather than to fulfill their religious obligations¹². The reason for this unfortunate situation arises from the fact that Balinese do not know how to differentiate that which belongs to *adat* from that

⁹ Such is in fact the title of the first article published in *Surya Kanta*, that opens with these words: “*Adapun ‘Kemajuan’ artinya bertambah-tambah sempurna, dan suatu bangsa dikatakan ‘berkemajuan’, apabila bangsa itu bertambah-tambah sempurna dalam segala sifat kemanusiaan, yaitu segala sifat yang membedakan manusia dari pada hewan*” (Surya Kanta 1925, n°1: 1). Progress applies to four different fields, each designated by a Dutch term: *physiek*, *aesthetiek*, *intellectueel* and *moreel*.

¹⁰ Needless to say, the modernist intellectuals vehemently repudiated the reputation of their island as a “living museum” (*museum hidup*) propagated by the orientalists, while denouncing the conservative policy conducted by the colonial government, accused to behave like a “museum curator” (*museum beheerder*). They refused to see Bali turned into an “island for tourists” (*pulau turisten*), in search of old-fashioned customs and archaisms of all sorts (*kekolotan*) (Surya Kanta 1927, n°3-4: 29-30).

¹¹ Notwithstanding such calls to the Balinese to follow the lead of the more advanced Javanese and Malays, one finds surprisingly very little reference in either *Surya Kanta* or *Bali Adnjana* to the events which were agitating Java and Sumatra at the time. For one thing, the idea of a “nation” (*bangsa*) as referred to in these periodicals applied only to the main ethnic groups of the archipelago and not to the Indies as a whole. It thus appears that, in the 1920s, Indonesian nationalism was not yet on the agenda of the Balinese intellectuals, even though the name “Indonesia” had already become a powerful symbol in Java since 1924.

¹² In this respect, one notices that Tjakra Tanaja had published in 1924 a booklet written by Poetoe Djlantik in which he advocated simplified and cheaper cremations (Djlantik 1924). Needless to say, *Surya Kanta* was equally critical of the use of opium and the habit of gambling at cockfights.

which pertains to *agama* (*tidak tahu membedakan yang mana adat dan mana agama*) (Surya Kanta 1925, n°3: 1).

Education is expected to enlighten the Balinese people, by supplying them with both “intelligence” (*kepandaian*) and “reason” (*budi*). Thanks to these qualities, the Balinese will then know how to discriminate among their customs (*adat*) between those which they should conserve or invigorate and those which they should reform or abandon, in accordance with the “progress of the world” (*kemajuan dunia*). For whoever keeps defending the customs which are no longer suitable for the present time is guilty of hampering the progress of one’s people¹³.

In Bali, the main obstacle to progress is caste prejudice and the privileges which the *Triwangsa* enjoy in such areas as language, etiquette, cross-caste marriage (*Asu Pundung, Alangkahi Karang Hulu*), corvee labour, and so on. These privileges are legally founded on the *Agama* treatises and imposed by law courts (*Raad Kerta*) dominated by *pedanda*. This is no longer acceptable for the *Jaba*, who demand for themselves the same station in life and society as the *Triwangsa* – “solidarity and equality” (*sama rata sama rasa*)¹⁴.

Instead of feeling proud to inherit a noble title from one’s father (*Ida, Dewa, Gusti*), modern Balinese should struggle to obtain academic titles (*Professor, Meester, Doctor, Insinyur*), as in the present time it is knowledge that becomes power (*pengetahuan itulah yang menjadi kekuasaan*). Indeed, by means of acquiring *budi* and *kepandaian*, the *Jaba* will raise their social status and will be paid due respect by the *Triwangsa*¹⁵. In other words, status in Balinese society should no longer be ascribed but achieved; it should stem from merit and not from birth¹⁶. This, claimed *Surya Kanta*, concurred with the teachings found in Balinese *lontar* (such as the *Sarasamuscaya*) as well as in the sacred books of India (particularly the *Bhagawadgita*), which state that a true *Brahmana* is not someone who is born into a *Brahmana* family (*Brahmana-turunan*), but someone who lives up to *Brahmana* ideals (*Brahmana-budi*)¹⁷.

¹³ “*Barang siapa yang masih membela adat yang tiada dikehendaki lagi oleh zaman, maka orang yang demikian adalah sebagai mengurung jiwa bangsanya didalam peti besi atau menghalangi kemajuan bangsanya*” (Surya Kanta 1926, n°2: 24).

¹⁴ This slogan was coined in 1917 by the Javanese journalist Mas Marco Kartodikromo, publisher of *Doenia Bergerak*, and later popularized by both Sukarno and the communists (Shiraishi 1990: 88-90).

¹⁵ “*Haruslah kaum JABA itu BERKEPANDAIAN dan BERBUDHI, sebab [...] kalau ada seorang JABA yang berkepandaian atau berpangkat agak tinggi ia berbudi serta mengerti pada kemajuan dan tahu ‘TATALOKACARA’ menurut zaman, maka dapatlah orang JABA berkehormatan dari kaum TRIWANGSA, artinya: tidaklah direndahkan lagi*” (Surya Kanta 1926, n°1: 9-10).

¹⁶ Whereas for *Triwangsa*, the *wangsa* hierarchy depended upon their relation to pre-colonial dynasties, the Dutch’s introduction of the word *kasta* to describe the Balinese social system provided the *Jaba* with the opportunity to appropriate the notion of *warna* by referring it to one’s function in society. They then projected that idealised norm onto a bygone era by asserting that the Javanese invaders from Majapahit had distorted the differentiation between functions (*catur warna*) into a hierarchical distinction between titled groups (*catur wangsa*), which they intended to abolish. This exegesis, which has become the politically-cum-religiously correct norm in contemporary Bali, is inspired by a conception of merit acquired by Balinese in colonial schools and conforms to the position of neo-Hindu reformers, especially Dayananda Saraswati (cf. Wiana & Santeri 1993, Wiana 2006, Kerepun 2007).

¹⁷ “*Meskipun Brahmana (turunan) sekalipun, kalau ia tiada menepati sesana (darma), tiadalah patut dihormati, dan walaupun Sudra (turunan) kalau ia menjalankan darmanya, tertib sopan santun, puji dan hormatilah ia, kata Sanghyang Aji [...] Perjalanan atau sesana Brahmana itu dapat sempurna dilakukan oleh segala orang yang sanggup melakukannya, misalnya oleh orang yang berkepandaian dan budiman (bangsawan-fikiran) karena itulah sesana yang terutama [...] dari kaum Jaba pun tidak ada halangannya medwijati, asal beliau sanggup melakukan kewajibannya kelak*” (Surya Kanta 1925, n°1: 5). This entailed that Surya Kanta already claimed for *Jaba* the right to gain access to the status of *pedanda*, a right that will be eventually conceded by the

Faced with such virulent attacks, the *Triwangsa* attempted to defend their prerogatives as best as they could in *Bali Adnjana*¹⁸. Yet, it would be an oversimplification to conclude that this journal was their mouthpiece. First of all, until August 1926 when its motto was removed from the mast head, *Bali Adnjana* was still officially the “voice of *Santi*” (*Muat suara Santi dan keperluan untuk umum*), whose members were mostly *Jaba*. And the fact is that until that time, which also corresponds to the last meeting of *Santi*, the opinions expressed in its pages were fairly diverse and often frankly polemical. Besides, unlike *Surya Kanta*, which was avowedly partisan, *Bali Adnjana* was always careful to present itself as neutral in the feud between *Jaba* and *Triwangsa*. It was dedicated to the common good of the Balinese people as a whole, that is, to the so-called *catur wangsa*¹⁹. Yet, after the foundation of *Tjwadega Hindoe Bali*, in May 1926, *Bali Adnjana* became the unofficial organ of this new organisation, and it grew more and more conservative over the years.

Besides, whereas *Surya Kanta* was produced by teamwork, *Bali Adnjana* was for the most part the undertaking of the sole Tjakra Tanaja. Unlike the leaders of *Surya Kanta*, who were representative of the so-called *kaum muda* of modernist Balinese who had received a Western-style education, Tjakra Tanaja considered himself a member of the *kaum kuno*²⁰. Born into a family of *punggawa*, and a retired *punggawa* himself, he had been educated in traditional Balinese manner through reading *lontar*. And he never missed an opportunity to assert his old-fashioned inclinations, at times using rather provocative formulas to convey his opinion: “*Barang baru harga murah, sebab campuran atau palsu. Barang kuno harga mahal, sebab tulen atau asli*” (*Bali Adnjana* 1927, n°30: 3).

The position which Tjakra Tanaja defended was delineated in the issue of *Bali Adnjana* published immediately after the launching of *Surya Kanta* in October 1925, in which he replied to those who complained that *Bali Adnjana* lacked clear directions, siding at times with *Triwangsa* and at times with *Sudra*²¹. Without ever mentioning *Surya Kanta*, he imparted his opinion regarding status within Balinese society, by driving home that being a *Brahmana* or a *Sudra* has nothing to do with *budi* but everything with *asal usul turunannya*²².

Parisada Hindu Dharma's during its second congress, in 1968, even though it is still widely opposed up to this day.

¹⁸ *Bali Adnjana* (Kawi and Balinese) literally signifies “Balinese thoughts”, or, in the words of Tjakra Tanaja: “*Bali Adnjana adalah berarti keutamaan Budi Bali*” (*Bali Adnjana* 1925, n°15: 2).

¹⁹ This is why Tjakra Tanaja refused the proposition put forward in *Bali Adnjana* in December 1925 to create a *Triwangsa* association (*Tjandra Kanta*), in order to counter *Surya Kanta*'s influence, arguing that it was preferable to revivify *Santi* rather than exacerbate dissension among the Balinese.

²⁰ In more than one respect, the polemics between *Surya Kanta* and *Bali Adnjana* reminds one of the conflict between *kaum muda* and *kaum tua* which had raged in Java, West Sumatra and Malaya during the early decades of the 20th century (Roff 1962, Abdullah 1971, Kahn 1993).

²¹ I quote Tjakra Tanaja's reply at length, so as to give the reader an inkling of his peculiar rhetoric: “*Memang saya MENGAKUI BETUL bahasa saya sebentar memihak pada TRIWANGSA dan sebentar saya memihak pada SUDRA, tetapi MEMIHAK saya itu sekali kali bukan bermaksud MERUSAK akan keadaan TRIWANGSA atau SUDRA melainkan saya bermaksud sedapat dapat akan mendamaikan dengan cara mempelajari bahasa Kawi supaya bisa lekas mengerti membaca lontar TUTUR dan TATUA yang kebanyakan memang berbahasa KAWI dan disitulah akan didapatinya nasehat nasehat yang utama utama untuk membersihkan atau menyucikan pikirannya yang kotor hingga menjadi bersih. KEBERSIHAN PIKIRAN itulah MENYAMPURNAKAN BUDI. Kesempurnaan BUDILAH mendatangkan (menghasilkan) KESELAMATAN. Saya membilang banyak terima kasih kalau saya musti memihak pada TRIWANGSA atau SUDRA yang BERMAKSUD akan merusakkan salah satu, tetapi saya suka sekali dan mengharap akan memihak pada SIAPAPUN yang BERMAKSUD menuju KESELAMATAN dengan TIDAK memandang BANGSA (Triwangsa atau SUDRA)*” (*Bali Adnjana* 1925, n°29: 1).

²² “*Pada bangsa BALI HINDU adalah pada LAHIRNYA PERTINGKATAN kebangsaan atau KAWONGAN (ingat Tuan! bukan BUDI lo'), yang diteguhkan atau ditetapkan oleh asal usul turunannya [...] Menjadi BRAHMANA, SATRYA, WESYA dan SUDRA itu adalah nama KAWONGANNYA dan sekali kali bukan*

Upon which, he declared his intentions (*tujuan*) as (1) reconciling the Balinese people (*perdamaian*), (2) strengthening the religion (*keteguhan berlakunya Agama*), (3) changing its outdated customs (*perubahan adat yang sudah kurang baik pada jaman ini*), and (4) eliminating the oppression of evil-doers (*menghapuskan tindasannya si angkara murka*) (Bali Adnjana 1925, n°29: 2). Tjakra Tanaja then concluded his plea by stating: “*Bukti bukti maksud saya sebagai berikut:*”, followed by “Conversation between A and B” (*Percakapan A dan B*), a recurrent rhetorical device of his, where we encounter the very first mention of *Surya Kanta* (cf. appendix 1). In the ensuing issue of *Bali Adnjana*, Tjakra Tanaja inserted a short acknowledgement of *Surya Kanta*²³, immediately followed by a *Percakapan A dan B*²⁴.

After this somewhat conciliatory – or rather sarcastic – start, the exchanges between Ktoet Nasa and Tjakra Tanaja grew more aggressive, while the latter kept on accusing *Surya Kanta*’s leaders of being motivated by greed and envy in their foolish pursuit to abolish caste hierarchy²⁵. He warned them that, by challenging the *Triwangsa*, they were dividing the Balinese people, with the risk of weakening their resilience and of sowing dissension in their ranks. Not only did the Balinese inherit the hierarchical order from their ancestors but, furthermore, it is based on religious teachings found in *lontar*, which stipulate that one’s current status is the fruit of one’s *karma*²⁶. Accordingly, it is very dangerous to challenge the caste system (*sistem kasta*) in Bali, as this might undermine the religious foundations of

BUDINYA, artinya IDA BAGUS KANGIN belum tentu lebih BUDINYA dari pada KTUT KELOD tetapi KAWONGANNYA nyatalah sudah KELEBIHANNYA” (Bali Adnjana 1925, n°29: 2).

²³ “*SURYA KANTA. Begitulah nama SURAT KABAR BULANAN yang mengunjungi kantor Redactie Bali Adnjana. Terlebih dahulu saya mengucapkan beribu banyak terima kasih tentang kedermawaannya pengurus SURYA KANTA melontarkan surat bulanannya kepada saudaranya BALI ADNJANA. Menilik PENDAHULUAN dalam SURYA KANTA itu, maka saya bersetuju sekali dengan haluannya Tuan N [Ktoet Nasa] dan mudah mudahan tercapailah maksudnya yaitu MEMIMPIN bangsa Bali yang terbilang ‘gelap’ budinyaf enz. Dengan pendiriannya SURYA KANTA ini mudah mudahanlah kemajuan tanah BALI dan LOMBOK tentang HIDUP di DUNIA dan KEALUSAN BUDI bisa lekas tercapai. Sedangkan saya sebagai pengurus BALI ADNJANA sanggup juga sedapat dapat menyokong maksud itu, yang mana berlaku dengan cara DAMAI. Lanjutlah usianya SURYA KANTA dan KEKALLAH persaudaraannya dengan surat kabar MINGGUAN BALI ADNJANA. Hormat saya Redacteur B.A. I.G.TJAKRATANAJA*” (Bali Adnjana 1925, n°30: 5).

²⁴ “*A. Ini lo lihat bagusnya surat kabar bulanan SURYA KANTA. [...] B. Aku belum bisa mengatakan apa apa tentang hal tujuannya SURYA KANTA, sebab baru sekali terbit dan disitu belum ada pertimbangannya Redacteur terhadap pada karangannya PENGARANG. Cuma sekarang aku baru lihat ada api kecil sekali didalam SURYA KANTA yang dinyatakan oleh karangan yang berkepala PEMANDANGAN dan NGABEN. Aku rasa api itu akan berbahaya apabila Tuan Redacteurnya tidak lekas menguruskan itu api supaya bisa menjadi lampu penerangan dan jangan lantas menjadi api PEMBAKAR KEBANGSAAN [...]*” (Bali Adnjana 1925, n°30: 5).

²⁵ Tjakra Tanaja went occasionally further in his attack against *Surya Kanta*, which he accused of being a “lair of communists” (*S.[arang] K.[ominis]*), an accusation which, especially after the communist uprisings of 1926-27 in Java and Sumatra and their ensuing repression, was a not too subtle way of arousing the colonial government’s vigilance.

²⁶ “*Siapakah Bali itu? Pada rasa penulis ialah sang CATURJADMA (Brahmana Satrya Wesya dan Sudra). Barang siapa merasa atau mengaku BALI, tetapi jikalau tidak menganggap adanya CATURJADMA tersebut diatas, tentulah kebalikannya itu hanya PULASAN saja atau sudah RUSAK karena menuruti hawa nafsu yang melupakan ADNYANA (fikir) [...] Dari sebab sekarang nyatanya kaum JABA sudah memisahkan diri pada sang Triwangsa, maka merasalah penulis bahasa keadaan kedua pihak itu kurang sempurna dan berarti juga cerai. Apabila perceraian itu terus menerus, tentulah berbahaya untuk nama BALI yang penulis terangkan diatas [...] Janganlah orang iri melihat atau mendengar orang SUDRA hormat kepada orang Triwangsa, walaupun yang tidak terpelajar sekalipun, sebab itulah memang sudah mesti menerima karmanya masing masing. Jikalau memang kepingin supaya juga bisa mendapat kehormatan Triwangsa, seharusnya supaya melakukan perbuatan yang utama supaya kemudian bisa mendapat karma yang lebih baik dari sekarang*” (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°2: 1-2).

Balinese society²⁷ – if only inasmuch as access to the status of *pedanda* is the exclusive prerogative of *Brahmana*. And, as if to drive his point home, in addressing his opponents Tjakra Tanaja obstinately refused to substitute the term *Jaba* for that of *Sudra*, which the commoners objected to as being derogatory.

In numerous articles, Tjakra Tanaja kept launching virulent attacks against the so-called “progress”, stressing its ominous consequences²⁸. Far from improving the situation of the Balinese people, the “passion for progress” (*hawa nafsu maju*) is bringing about poverty and misery to Bali, just the way it has done to Java. Unaware that they are heading for ruin, the Balinese have started selling their wealth in order to be able to buy imported goods, flattered by foreign capitalists eager to sell them their manufactured products²⁹. For the time being, agriculture in Bali is still in the hands of the Balinese, unlike the situation that prevails in Java, where it is controlled by foreign capital. But this might not be for long. Therefore, far from taking the Javanese as a model, as *Surya Kanta* urges them to, the Balinese should be wary of foreign influences, be they Javanese or Western, which can bring only trouble to their island.

The ones who are to blame for making Bali prey to such unwanted influences are those half-baked Balinese “intellectuals” (*intellectueelen*), whom Tjakra Tanaja accuses of “arrogance” (*sombong*) for pretending to lead their unenlightened brethren along the path to progress. In their eagerness to pursue Western knowledge, they have forgotten their Balineseness (*lupa pada kebalianya*)³⁰. Preferring to express themselves in Malay or even in Dutch, they are no longer able to speak correct Balinese, that is, to use the respectful language prescribed by the customary etiquette³¹.

More generally, Tjakra Tanaja feared that Balinese educated in Dutch schools would look down on their parents as being *kolot* and would no longer want to engage in farming³². This does not mean that he denied the Balinese people access to modern education, but he considered that academic titles were useless for them (except that of medical doctor). In order

²⁷ “*Dengan lenyapnya Triwangsa, adalah berarti kelenyapannya peradaban dan Agama serta Adat yang bersifat Hindu Bali, sebab kaum Triwangsalah yang harus meneguhkan hal itu*” (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°17: 1).

²⁸ In his opinion, the *zaman kemajuan* celebrated by *Surya Kanta* is tantamount to *Kaliyuga*: “*Pendiriannya SURYA KANTA [...] berarti LAJULAH KEMAJUAN KITA MENUJU JURANG KENERAKAAN DUNIA AKHIRAT*” (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°19: 4).

²⁹ Among the foreign goods which some of the more urbanised Balinese dreamed of possessing were automobiles, symbol of status as much as of progress. The fact that Tjakra Tanaja held up to ridicule such questionable dreams obviously did not prevent *Bali Adnjana* from advertising newly released models of automobiles for sale in Singaraja.

³⁰ “*Maju kemana kita ditunjukkan? O, ke BARAT ke BARAAAAAAT! Nah, kalau sudah sampai ke BARAT, apa kita tak menjadi KEPARAAAT? TENTU! sebab Natuur sudah memastikan BADAN KITA untuk TIMUR (BALI)*” (Bali Adnjana 1927, n°17: 4).

³¹ Ironically, while Tjakra Tanaja stressed the importance of the Balinese language in sustaining Balinese identity, it did not seem to bother him that he had to resort to Malay in order to convey his point. This is all the more striking as, in Balinese as well as in Malay, the word for “language” (*basa, bahasa*) has a much broader semantic field than in English, including, as Ben Anderson once remarked, “the notions of civility, rationality, and truth” (Anderson 1990: 28). This is to say that, even for such conservatives as Tjakra Tanaja, language had started to lose its esoteric character and thus its power over the world.

³² Tjakra Tanaja’s denunciation of the young Balinese educated in Java would find a similar echo a decade later in the concluding remarks of Covarrubias’ *Island of Bali*: “The younger generation is rapidly being cut off from a cultural environment which they have learned to regard as below them, considering their parents, formerly their model of behaviour, as rude peasants who have not gone to school. [...] those young Balinese who have gone to Java to become teachers for the Western-style Government schools have returned convinced that what they learned in Java is the essence of knowledge and progress. They have become conscious of the contempt of Europeans for the native cultures and have been influenced to believe that the philosophy, arts and habits of their country are signs of peasant backwardness” (1937: 394).

for Balinese children to become proficient farmers, he contended that it is enough for them to learn how to read, write and count, besides acquiring some basic notions of trade and craftsmanship. And it is more important that they study the Balinese language and script, as well as the traditional teachings (*tutur dan tatua*) contained in the *lontar*³³.

Yet, for all this, Tjakra Tanaja claimed to be a true advocate of progress. But his idea of progress was the one which prevailed in the past, when the aim was to fill one's spirit (*kemajuan cara dulu, adalah kemajuan untuk mengisi pikir*), and not according to the present, when it is only a matter of filling one's stomach (*kemajuan cara sekarang, adalah kemajuan untuk mencari isi perut*) (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°28: 5). Progress is welcome, as long as it does not uproot the Balinese from their identity. Progress should not be forced upon the Balinese, the vast majority of whom are "still ignorant" (*masih bodoh*), but it has to come progressively and naturally, according to the changing of the times. In short, it should be the result of an "evolution" (*evolutive*) and not of a "revolution" (*revolutive*).

Such conciliatory stance was to bring Tjakra Tanaja rather close at times to the position of the foreign-educated intellectuals concerning the necessity of balancing the values of tradition with the benefits of progress. Thus, one finds in both journals similar admonitions to the effect that the Balinese should accept and emulate what is valuable in Western education without losing sight of their own identity³⁴. Moreover, the terms used to refer to each of these worlds – the foreign and the indigenous – are remarkably consistent and present a coherent vision that contrasts the material West – *kasar, ilmu lahir, ilmu dunia, sekala*, etc. – with the spiritual East – *halus, ilmu batin, ilmu akhirat, niskala*, etc.

It would certainly be difficult to find a more eloquent illustration of this delicate exercise in equilibrium than the image which adorned the mast head of *Bali Adnjana* between September 1925 and July 1926 – two Balinese men, one dressed in Western garb, the other in Balinese clothes, stand facing each other, separated by a pair of scales on one side of which are piled books (*buku*) and on the other side palm leaf manuscripts (*lontar*). And one encounters that same intent to benefit from both worlds in *Surya Kanta's* motto – *Penyebar kitab-kitab pusaka dan sesuluh kemajuan umum*.

The foundations of *Kebalian*: agama and adat

³³ Tjakra Tanaja's opinion regarding the appropriate education for Balinese children would meet with a favourable reception from the colonial authorities. Whereas the initial impetus of the "Ethical Policy" had emphasised Western education for the native elites, in the 1920s the Ethical project, however, lost its momentum, while Dutch colonial policy underwent a conservative turn. The purpose was no longer the assimilation of the native elites through Western education, but rather the strengthening of the indigenous communities through enforcing their own customs. The educational policy was revised accordingly, so that "natives would not be alienated from their cultural roots" (Gouda 1995: 97). In Bali, this new trend would result in an educational policy known as "Balisation" (*Baliseering*), launched in the late 1920s (Flierhaar 1941). Conceived by Dutch orientalist, this policy was intended to teach the Balinese people how to keep on being authentically Balinese, by making the native youth conscious of the value of their cultural heritage by means of an education focusing on Balinese language, literature and the arts.

³⁴ Surya Kanta (1926, n°2: 18): "*Kami mengingatkan kepada putra-putra kami itu, supaya bergiat benar-benar memburu kepandaian cara barat itu, tetapi jangan lupa dengan kulitnya, nenek-moyangnya, adat tata cara kita Bali yang masih bolih dipakai yang cocok dengan jaman sekarang*". Bali Adnjana (1926, n°35: 2): "*Penulis [...] menyatakan perasaan sebagai rakyat Bali yang masih mengingat pada ke BALIAN artinya tak melupakan Adat dan Agama HINDU BALI, walaupun telah menerima didikan cara BARAT, sebab didikan BARAT itu penulis gunakan sebagai alat untuk mencari penghidupan lahir yang berhubung dengan keperluan BARAT, yang mana penulis pandang memang amat perlu untuk dewasa ini. Sedangkan untuk keutamaan FIKIR sebagai bangsa Bali Hindu, adalah terutama penulis gunakan didikan BALI yang terdapat dalam lontar lontar perbuatan Bagawan atau Empu, yang mana sudah dianggap baik dan betul oleh sebagian besar penduduk BALI bangsa BALI HINDU*".

Beyond the much publicized polemics between *Bali Adnjana* and *Surya Kanta*, both factions shared a common preoccupation with their Balinese identity and were eager to preserve its foundations. As far as I could assess, it is in the debates within and between these publications that, for the first time, the Balinese viewed themselves as a singular entity – as a “nation”, a “people” (*kita bangsa Bali*). Of course one could assert that a sense of pan-Bali identity already existed through reference to Majapahit (Creese 1997), but it is doubtful that the Balinese could have apprehended their island as an integrated totality prior to its incorporation within the colonial state. Until then, their identities were particularistic, in the sense that Balinese identified themselves as members of a village, of a kinship group, or of a temple network, rather than as “Balinese”. Their collective identity, based on the awareness of sharing common characteristics and adhering to unifying symbols, started to take shape during the colonial period, when they attempted to define themselves as different from both the foreign colonisers and the other *bangsa* in the Indies (Howe 2001).

In their publications, *Jaba* and *Triwangsa* described themselves both as a religious minority, the stronghold of “Hinduism” threatened by the proselytism of Islam and Christianity, and as a particular ethnic group characterised by their own customs. Specifically, they construed their identity – which they started then naming *Kebalian* – as being based simultaneously on *agama* and on *adat* (*Kebalian kita berdasar agama dan adat*)³⁵. Now, the very fact of the Balinese resorting to these foreign terms to define their identity testifies to the conceptual shift occurring on the island after its takeover by an alien power³⁶.

The word *agama* is commonly translated as “religion”. However, *agama* covers a much more restricted semantic field than does the common understanding of religion. In point of fact, *agama* is the peculiar combination in Sanskrit guise of a Christian view of what counts as a world religion, with an Islamic understanding of what defines a proper religion – that is, a Prophet, a Holy Book, and a belief in the One and Only God. Moreover, *agama* has not always signified “religion” in the Archipelago.

Etymologically, the word *āgama* means “that which has come down”, and it refers to “anything handed down as fixed by tradition”, according to Jan Gonda in his study of *Sanskrit in Indonesia* (Gonda 1973: 499-500). In a more specific sense, *Āgama* is the name of the canonical texts of the Shaiva-Siddhanta order in South India. Surprisingly few scholars appear to have wondered how such a Sanskrit loanword so laden with Indic references could have come to designate an Islamic conception of what “religion” is about. One could surmise that the fact that the word *agama* came to mean religion in Indonesia had to do with the paramount importance of the Shaivite agamic texts in Java and Bali. Yet, this still leaves many questions unanswered, since in Shaiva-Siddhanta *āgama* does not signify “religion”, a notion which in any case was actually unknown to the Indian world before the 19th century.

Although we don’t know when the word *agama* came to mean “religion” in Indonesia, we know that in Javanese and Balinese textual traditions the generic title *Agama* “used to refer to a range of texts dealing with moral, religious and legal sanctions and practices” (Creese 2009: 242, n. 2; see also Hoadley & Hooker 1981, 1986). These texts are mainly

³⁵ The reference to “culture” as a pillar of *Kebalian* would only appear in the 1930s. Yet, one already encounters in both *Bali Adnjana* and *Surya Kanta* the terms *cultuur* and *peradaban*, which will become more common in such publications as *Bhāwanāgara* (1930-1935) and *Djatajoe* (1936-1941), before making way for *budaya*, a neologism of Sanskrit origin whose root (*budi*) points to the development of reason and to the character of an individual.

³⁶ The problem is that, as early as the 1920s, we are faced with a conception of Balinese identity which is already fully framed in terms of *agama* and *adat*. Thus, unfortunately, the investigation of these publications does not allow us to elucidate how the Balinese arrived at this conception, which presupposes not only the awareness of a distinctive identity but also the attribution of such a distinction to some specific entities and their imminent reification.

drawn from the Sanskrit *Manava Dharmasāstra* – the most prominent of all the *Dharmasāstra* literature.

My working hypothesis is that, in the manner of what occurred with the concept of *dharma* in India, the legal and religious features of *agama* became dissociated in Indonesia when – through its adoption by Islam and later on by Christianity – *agama* took on the meaning of “religion” (Picard 2012). By appropriating this word, Muslims and Christians added new implications to it, namely, the exclusive worship of one Supreme God and the requirement of conversion to a foreign doctrine whose teachings are contained in a Holy Book, as well as an ideal of societal progress (Howell 1978, 1982).

Such a scriptural turn appears to be as old as the coming of Islam to the Archipelago, as attested by 14th-century Malay chronicles, in which the word *agama* is always associated with Islam, and appears to be equivalent to the word *dīn*. Therefore, one has to conclude that for centuries the word *agama* had in Indonesia two distinct denotations, that of *dharma* as well as that of *dīn*, according to the context and to the language of its occurrence.

By taking on the meaning of “religion”, *agama* was not only being dissociated from “law” but also from “tradition”, which is rendered in Indonesia by the Arabic loanword *adat*. In the same fashion as *dharma*, *adat* refers to the cosmic order and to social life in agreement with that order – at once describing the ideal order and prescribing the behaviour required to achieve that order. This universal scope was fragmented by Islam and Christianity, which strove to curtail the religious import of *adat* by confining its significance to the customs of a people. In particular, the word *adat* entered the language of Islamised populations to refer to indigenous “customary law” as opposed to Islamic “religious law” (*hukum*).

Introduced to Bali by the Dutch, the word *adat* replaced a varied terminology for particularistic customs (*dresta*, *kerta*, *sima*, *awig-awig*, *tata krama*, *tata loka cara*, etc.), which governed the relationships between social groups and infused the sense of communal solidarity in the villages (Warren 1993). The incorporation of a miscellaneous assortment of context-sensitive customs into a generic term altered their meaning for the Balinese – what had been, until then, an interplay of significant differences deliberately fostered between villages and between social groups was becoming the locus of Balinese ethnic identity, in the sense of a customary body of inherited rules and institutions governing the lives of the Balinese people as a whole.

Admittedly, we don’t know when Balinese started using the word *agama* in the sense of “religion”. However, we know that, in contrast to Islamised (and Christianised) areas of Indonesia, in contemporary Bali the word *agama* has retained its original polysemy, as attested by Balinese-Indonesian dictionaries, which translate *agama* as (1) *agama*, (2) *hukum*, and (3) *adat* (Warna 1990: 7)³⁷.

We don’t know either when Balinese actually chose to label their own *agama* as *Hindu*. But we do know that long before they began defining themselves as *Hindu*, the Balinese had already been “Hinduised” by orientalist, at a time when they had yet to learn the word “Hindu” (Guermonprez 2001: 272). However, despite the fact that both Crawford and Friederich took it for granted that the Balinese were Hindus – and glossed the word *agama* as religion – I think it unlikely that this word could already mean “religion” for Balinese in the 19th century.

It is significant, for example, that, in the catalogue established in 1928 by Balinese literati for the *Kirtya* library, the entry *agama* refers not to religion but to *Dharmasastra*, *Nitisastra* (ethical and didactic precepts), and *Sasana* (rules of life). There is no entry

³⁷ In his Indonesian-Balinese dictionary, Sri Reshi Anandakusuma translates *agama* as *dharma* (Anandakusuma 1986: 234).

corresponding to the category “religion” (Kadjeng 1929)³⁸. On the other hand, when the first generation of Balinese educated in colonial schools started to question their identity, they used the word *agama* in the sense of religion, as they were attempting to promote their own religion on a par with Islam and Christianity. For the Balinese, Islam and Christianity were seen not only as a threat, but also as a model of what a true religion should be, and we find in *Surya Kanta* numerous injunctions to the Balinese to follow the example of Muslims and Christians in defending their own religion³⁹. Confronted with Muslim schoolteachers and Christian missionaries, they were challenged to formulate what exactly their religion was about. This proved to be a highly contentious issue, that triggered a protracted conflict between the Balinese wanting to retain their religious traditions, and those who strove to reform them in accordance with their idea of Hinduism.

If both *Jaba* and *Triwangsa* shared a common reference to *agama* and *adat* as the foundations of *Kebalian*, they held different opinions as to how their respective fields were connected, as well as to how Balinese religion related to Indian Hinduism. And it is this divergence, as much as the more visible “caste conflict”, which explains the famous schism within *Santi*. For the founding members of *Santi*, things were still relatively unproblematic: its statutes proposed to strengthen the Hindu religion (*meneguhkan Agama Hindu*) (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°30: 5). Whereas *Bali Adnjana* determined to buttress both tradition and religion (*meneguhkan Adat dan Agama*), *Surya Kanta* wanted to reform *agama* while ridding *adat* of all the customs deemed incompatible with the “will of the times” (*meneguhkan Agama dan merobah adat istiadat yang bertentangan dengan kemauan zaman*) (Surya Kanta 1926, n°8: 99)⁴⁰. Thus, for the former, Balinese religion was based on tradition (*agama kita wong Bali berdasar adat*), from which it was indissociable (*adat dan agama tak boleh bercerai*) (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°21: 3); whereas for the latter, religion could and should be dissociated from a traditional order seen not only as unfair but also as a hindrance to progress. But they proved unable to differentiate between that which pertains to *adat* and that which belongs to *agama* (*tidak tahu membedakan yang mana adat dan mana agama*) (Surya Kanta 1925, n°3: 1).

The inability of the Balinese to dissociate *agama* from *adat* did not stem solely from the polysemy of these terms, whose respective semantic fields overlap, but also from the fact that up until then the Balinese people did not regard religion as a bounded field that could be demarcated from other aspects of their life. One could even say that it was not singled out as “religion”, in the sense of a set of beliefs and practices liable to be labelled with a specific name.

Hence, *agama* could not become a boundary marker for the Balinese before they started viewing Islam and Christianity as a threat, and in this respect I concur with Adrian Vickers (1987: 35) that, in their eyes, religious differences were signs used to distinguish groups seen as having basic similarities. From this perspective, Islam was conceived as belonging to the same cultural sphere as Bali (Couteau 1999, 2000; Hauser-Schäublin 2004). Indeed, even in *Surya Kanta*, so eager to impute Balinese identity to Hinduism, one finds references to

³⁸ There is no entry for *adat* either, nor for *hukum*.

³⁹ “Marilah kita selidiki usaha orang Kristen dan Islam tentang meneguhkan dan mengembangkan agamanya masing-masing [...] Menilik usaha bangsa lain akan meneguhkan dan mengembangkan agamanya, maka yakinlah kita, bahwa kita jauh terbelakang dari bangsa itu tentang pengetahuan dan penyebaran agama” (Surya Kanta 1925, n°3: 7).

⁴⁰ As a matter of fact, Tjakra Tanaja came at times surprisingly close to a similar aspiration: “Meneguhkan Agama yang sudah ada dan memperbaiki adat yang sudah tidak sesuai dengan keadaan jaman (ingat, tidak membuang dan membikin baru) sedapat dapat supaya beralasan tutur dan tatua kita Hindu Bali dengan jalan evolutive” (Bali Adnjana 1925, n°30: 3).

Balinese who embraced Islam alongside those who embraced Hinduism: “*Bangsa Bali memeluk dua agama, yaitu: bangsa Bali beragama Islam dan bangsa Bali beragama Hindu*” (Surya Kanta 1926, n°1: 17).

Henceforth, the concern of the Balinese intelligentsia was to ensure that their religion could resist the thrust of Islamic and Christian proselytism. They disagreed, however, as regards what should be done to strengthen their religion. According to *Surya Kanta*, the problem was that the Balinese did not really know their religion and were the unenlightened victims of “superstitions” (*takhyul*) arising from the restrictions placed by the *pedanda* on their access to sacred knowledge contained in *lontar* (*Ajawera*)⁴¹. As long as they contented themselves with blindly following the priests who lead their ceremonies without understanding the true signification of their rites (*milu-milu tuara nawang*; *mula keto*), the Balinese would be easy prey to Muslim or Christian indoctrination⁴². In order to remedy this unfortunate situation, the *pedanda* were asked to teach the Balinese the fundamentals of their religion⁴³.

For *Bali Adnjana*, on the contrary, as long as the Balinese were holding firmly onto their *agama* and to their *adat*, they were not likely to fall prey to another faith⁴⁴. Indeed, they had no reason to feel ashamed of their rites and beliefs, which did not suffer from a comparison with those of the Muslims or the Christians⁴⁵. If there was actually a problem, it

⁴¹ “[...] kebanyakan orang menjalankan syarak agamanya, hanya menurut-nurut saja dengan tak mengerti maksud yang terkandungnya. Jika ada seorang memberanikan dirinya, menanyakan keterangan-keterangan beberapa jalan agama pada pendeta kita, acap kali diterimanya suatu jawaban, yang tak memuaskan hatinya, sebagai: ‘Tuan tak boleh mengetahui hal itu. Hanya kita sajalah yang harus mempelajarinya’” (Surya Kanta 1925, n°3: 7).

⁴² “Apa tidak dari tipis pengetahuannyakah, maka penduduk pulau Lombok, yang mula-mulanya beragama Siwa atau Buda telah berduyun-duyun meninggalkannya akan masuk Islam [...]? Kalau keadaan sekarang ini tak lekas berubah, apa tidakkah lekas lenyap agama kita dan terganti oleh Islam atau Kristen?” (Surya Kanta 1925, n°3: 7-8; cf. also *Bali Adnjana* 1925, n°32: 2).

⁴³ “Hendaklah Pandita itu memberi pengajaran kepada kita dan hal agama dengan sejelas-jelasnya, sebab menurut rontal memang sudah kewajibannya Pandita itu menjadi guru agama” (Surya Kanta 1926, n°4: 12). Yet, *Surya Kanta* had no illusion about the *pedanda*’s goodwill, as they had already thwarted *Santi*’s project to open a religious school in Singaraja.

⁴⁴ “Sebagai tuan tuan telah dengar, maka belum lama ini ada khabar, bahwa lain Igama berniat masuk ditanah Bali ini. Betul sekarang di Bali ada Igama Asing, yaitu Igama Islam, tetapi kami tiada berasa khawatir, sebab dari dahulu kala hingga sekarang ini Igama itu tiada dapat maju didalam negeri kami. Lain dari pada dipesisir boleh dikatakan tiada Igama Islam yang dipeluk oleh orang bumi putra [...] Kita orang Bali setia pada tanah air kita, setia dengan adat dan Igama kita, yang menjadi pusaka dari nenek moyang leluhur kita” (*Bali Adnjana* 1926, n°15: 1).

⁴⁵ “Hai bangsaku TEGUHKANLAH Agama kita Hindu, walaupun dikatakan KURANG TERANG atau bagaimana juga oleh kaum MUDA yang barangkali sudah mengetahui akan terangnya Agama lain. Tetapi sebagai aku tidak memerlukan terang atau tidaknya. Karena bodohku aku hanya melihat bukti pahalanya saja. Misalnya sebagai Agama kita dikatakan TIDAK TERANG sebab kurang diterangkan oleh Penditanya, tetapi buahnya amat BAGUS yaitu segala bangsa menyukai akan adat dan tatalokacara kita sehingga Pemerintah Agungpun merasakan juga pahalanya sehingga dihadiahkan pada kita jabatan yang belum kita bisa jabat. Buktinya lagi kebagusan Agama kita, adakah di Bali perkumpulan yang bermaksud MENENTANG pada PEMERINTAH? Sebagai keadaan dilain lain negeri, sehingga Pemerintah terpaksa melakukan TANGAN BESINYA? Ya, betul sekarang di Bali baru ada terbit perkumpulan SURYA KANTA, yang nyatanya sekarang baru bermaksud memisahkan diri pada kaum Triwangsa, menurut Statutennya, tetapi hal ini belumlah mengawatirkan pada penduduk Bali, sebab maksud itu kira kiraku belumlah disetujui oleh kebanyakan KAUM JABA yang masih tahu dan ingat pada LELUHURNYA” (*Bali Adnjana* 1926, n°3: 3).

resulted from the critical stance adopted by *Surya Kanta* intellectuals towards their own religion, and in their ensuing intention to transform it as they thought fit⁴⁶.

Viewed from this perspective, the controversy that erupted between *Jaba* and *Triwangsa* over the name that the Balinese religion should adopt makes perfect sense. One should know that in the past, the Balinese had no generic name to designate that which would later on become their “religion”. Once they had adopted the word *agama* for that purpose, they referred to their religion simply as *agama Bali*. Afterward, Balinese started using various names for their religion. Those that I found in both *Bali Adnjana* and *Surya Kanta* are *Agama Tirta*, *Agama Siwa* and *Agama Buda*, as well as *Agama Siwa-Buda*. I also found *Agama Hindu*, *Agama Bali Hindu* and *Agama Hindu Bali*, as well as, infrequently, *Agama Trimurti*. Hence the rhetorical question asked by *Surya Kanta*: “*Diantara nama-nama yang tersebut manakah yang sebenarnya dan bagaimanakah jalannya?*” (*Surya Kanta* 1926, n°8: 102).

The question was to surface in a most pressing fashion during the meeting which sealed the fate of *Santi*, in May 1925, when the chairman, Njoman Kadjeng, proposed to change the association statutes by replacing *Agama Hindu* with *Agama Hindu Bali*, arguing that there were numerous forms of *Agama Hindu* and that it was therefore necessary to specify the Hindu religion the way it was actually practised in Bali⁴⁷. It appears that his proposition met with a large approval, but it was firmly rejected by Ktoet Nasa, who declared that “the Hindu religion in Bali was ruined” (*Agama Hindu di Bali rusak*), and that it should be reformed accordingly (*Bali Adnjana* 1925, n°15: 1; see also *Bali Adnjana* 1925, n°18: 3; 1926, n°30: 5; and 1929, n°5: 3; as well as *Surya Kanta* 1926, n°8: 98-99). A year later, in May 1926, the newly created association *Tjatoerwangsa Derja Gama Hindoe Bali* declared as its purpose “to strengthen the Hindu Bali religion” (*Meneguhkan Igama Hindu Bali*) (*Bali Adnjana* 1926, n°14: 4) (cf. in appendix 2 how these statutes were assessed in *Surya Kanta*).

Njoman Kadjeng’s proposition was substantiated by Tjakra Tanaja in the following manner: there exist two main religious trends in Bali, *Agama Siwa* and *Agama Buda*, with their respective priests, the *pedanda Siwa* and the *pedanda Buda*; their convergence over centuries resulted in *Agama Siwa-Buda*, which Tjakra Tanaja personally adheres to; most Balinese resort to *tirta pedanda* for their ceremonies, hence the name *Agama Tirta* given to their religious rites; yet, there are some minority groups in Bali, such as the *Pande* or the *Bali Aga*, who dispense with the services of the *pedanda* and refuse their *tirta*; thus, Tjakra Tanaja advocated the name *Agama Hindu Bali* in order to accommodate the practices of these various Balinese religious communities⁴⁸.

In defending *Agama Hindu Bali* as the proper name, Tjakra Tanja and the *Triwangsa* were asserting that the Balinese people had appropriated and reinterpreted *Agama Hindu* to

⁴⁶ “Keteguhan kita pada AGAMA akan berobah menjadi LEMAH dan RUSAK, apabila menuruti hawa nafsunya salah seorang pemimpin SURYA KANTA, yang bermaksud mengembangkan Agama Hindu yang murni (katanya sebagai Agama Hindu yang dilakukan di Hindustan)” (*Bali Adnjana* 1926, n°20: 4).

⁴⁷ “Dari sebab Agama Hindu itu ada banyak, apakah tidak baik kalau statuten itu dirobah saja dengan perkataan AGAMA HINDU BALI, artinya Agama Hindu yang ada di Bali” (*Bali Adnjana* 1926, n°30: 5).

⁴⁸ “Mengingat maksud PERDAMAIAN, maka sayapun lalu mengambil putusan untuk menamai Agama kita di Bali yaitu AGAMA HINDU BALI yaitu supaya satu antara lain jangan menjadi sakit hati karena merasa terhina dalam hal Agama. Misalnya sebagai orang yang merasa memeluk Agama Siwa, tentulah merasa terhina jikalau lantas nama Agamanya dirobah menjadi Agama Buda atau lain lain. Barangkali untuk orang yang memeluk Agama Siwa dan memeluk Agama Buda tidak akan merasa terhina apabila nama Agama itu kita jadikan satu yaitu AGAMA SIWA BUDA. Tetapi bagaimanakah perasaan orang Bali yang tidak mengakui memeluk Siwa dan Buda sebagai orang Bratan, Sembiran, Tenganan dan lain lainnya? Boleh jadi juga barangkali orang tidak menyesal jika Agama kita dinamakan AGAMA TIRTA, tetapi ketahuilah bahasa Tirta itu ada berlain lainnya terjadinya suci: misalnya ada yang karena Weda dari Brahmana (Pendita), ada yang dari Panti atau Pura dan lainnya” (*Bali Adnjana* 1925, n°30: 6; cf. also 1925, n°29: 4-6)

such an extent that it had become indigenous to their island. In this way, they were clearly trying to preserve the established social and religious order of yore, by retaining the religion actually practised by the Balinese⁴⁹. Whereas in defending the name *Agama Bali Hindu*, Ktoet Nasa and the *Jaba* were claiming that the Balinese were truly Hindus – even if their religious practices were corrupt, owing to their ignorance of the true nature of their religion⁵⁰. Yet, in order to become the true Hindus which they were supposed to be, the Balinese had to discard all the indigenous accretions which contaminated their religious practices. Hence the accusation proffered by the Tjakra Tanja that *Surya Kanta* aimed to promote a “pure” (*murni*) form of Hinduism, similar to the one found in India⁵¹. This, so he claimed, amounted to inventing a new religion, which was alien to the Balinese as their religion originated not in India but in Majapahit⁵². It was therefore the duty of the Balinese to remain faithful to the religion which their ancestors had brought to Bali when they had fled the propagation of Islam in Java after the fall of Majapahit⁵³.

⁴⁹ “*Nama Hindu Bali yaitu yang berarti meneguhkan Agama Hindu yang sudah ada dan dipeluk oleh wong Bali*” (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°17: 2).

⁵⁰ As a matter of fact, one commonly encounters both names in *Bali Adnjana – Agama Bali Hindu* as much as *Agama Hindu Bali* – the former appearing to be the most popular during the colonial period. It seems to me that it is only after some Balinese had converted to Islam or Christianity that the name *Agama Hindu Bali* became customary, in order to distinguish *Hindu Bali* from *Islam Bali* or *Kristen Bali*.

⁵¹ “[...] *Surya Kanta, yang bermaksud mengembangkan Agama Hindu yang murni (katanya sebagai Agama Hindu yang dilakukan di Hindustan)*” (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°20: 4).

⁵² “*Jikalau sekarang kita meneguhkan Agama cara di Hindustan, adalah berarti kita membikin Agama BARU [...] dalam lontar kita tak ada terdapat perkataan atau ukara yang menerangkan asal kita dari HINDU. Tetapi apabila kita perhatikan keadaan kita berasal dari Mojopahit*” (Bali Adnjana 1926, n°17: 2-3).

⁵³ Tjakra Tanaja’s standpoint was subjected to ridicule in *Surya Kanta*: “*Bagaimanakah keadaan bangsa yang dipimpin itu, apabila pemimpin itu berjalan jauh kebelakang dengan membawa obor mode Majapahit, sambil menyanyi-nyanyi ‘kidung-kekawin’ serta berteriak-teriak ‘ingatlah purwa dresta, ingatlah tatalokacara, ingatlah darma, terimalah karma, janganlah meyesal dihinakan’ dll. yang mana sekalian itu didengarkan dengan belakangnya saja?*” (Surya Kanta 1926, n°9-10: 145).

Appendix 1

Percakapan A dan B (Bali Adnjana 1925, n°29: 3)

A. Pada suatu hari aku bertemu dengan sobat karibku di Lombok, yaitu seorang mantri guru. Setelah sudah panjang lebar peromongannya, lantas ia bertanya padaku katanya: Hai, A, bagaimanakah kabarnya perkumpulan SURYA KANTA di Buleleng, apa sudah banyakkah ledennya? Mendengar pertanyaan itu, akupun terkejut hingga tercengang sebab di Buleleng aku belum sekali pernah mendengar perkataan SURYA KANTA, dan akupun lantas menjawab dengan sebenarnya mengatakan bahasa di Buleleng belum ada terdengar perkumpulan semacam itu. Kalau perkumpulan SANTI aku bilang ada. Sobatku lantas bilang: Ach, A, kamu jangan sembunyi akan hal itu sebab tahu sama tahu. Pendeknya sekarang aku kasih tahu padamu yang disini sekarang sudah berdiri cabang perkumpulan SURYA KANTA. Adapun besarnya di Buleleng sebab yang mengemudikan juga tinggal di Buleleng. Mustahil sekali kalau kamu bilang tidak tahu dan sedikit hari lagi akan mengeluarkan Maanblad (surat kabar bulanan) dan namanyapun SURYA KANTA.

B. Apa kamu tidak terus tanyakan apa tujuannya itu perkumpulan?

A. Aku ya tanya, tetapi rupanya sobat ku tidak mau menerangkan sama sekali, cuma katanya akan mengembangkan pengajaran mencapai kesempurnaan budi supaya lantas bisa mempunyai perasaan sama rata sama rasa pada sekalian manusia yang juga sama saja keadannya sebelum berbudi. Apabila dikemudian hari jika sudah berbudi disitulah akan ditentukan derajatnya artinya jikalau orang bisa melakukan dharmanya atau Sesana Brahmana haruslah mendapat pujian dan kehormatan sebagai Brahmana walaupun itu orang berasal bangsa Sudra sekalipun. Sebaliknya meskipun bangsa Brahmana sekalipun jikalau tidak berbudi, sama saja dengan Sudra.

B. Wah kalau begitu jadinya umpama ada orang nama Pan Dama dan lantas bisa melakukan dharmanya atau Sesananya Brahmana lantas saja musti diberi kehormatan dan pujian secara seorang Ida Bagus Kaler yang juga sudah melakukan dharmanya yaitu menjadi Ida Padanda Dama. Apa memang begitulah tujuannya?

A. Dari itu si aku tidak tahu apa begitu apa tidak sebab cuma sebegitu saja kabar yang aku dengar. Tetapi juga sobatku itu berpesan supaya hal ini jangan dulu disiarkan sebab masih dirahasiakan sebelum Maanblad keluar (terbit). Waaah B, kalau aku ingat ingat itu kabar lantas bulu kalongku berdiri, sebab bagaimanakah akan perasaannya kaum Triwangsa apabila benar begitu tujuannya itu perkumpulan? Apakah kiranya juga dia orang sama nyenyak tidur sebagai keadaan sekarang ini???? (yang kebanyakan lo’).

B. Cih A, kamu kok sebagai kanak kanak yang baru lahir saja. Baru begitu saja sudah mengkirik, apa kamu sudah berani memastikan bahasa akan kurang baik jadinya?? Toch boleh jadi juga karena pendiriannya perkumpulan itu dan terbitnya Maandblad itu, tanah Bali bisa bertambah maju, maupun pergerakannya dan kebangsaanya. Lupakah kamu pada kata Ulama: Semua baik berasal jelek dan semua bersih berasal kotor. Dari itu baiklah sekarang kita tunggu saja dulu apa datangnya dan kalau sudah berwujud disitulah kita bisa menamakan ini atau itu menilik dari darma laksananya. Masakan Tuhan mengadakan apa apa yang tidak perlu bagai kita, itu kan mustahil sekali. Bertambah banyak terbitnya surat kabar di Bali bertambah bersilah keadaannya negeri dan semakin padamlah hawa nafsunya si angkara murka dan semakin mendekatlah Ratu Adil.

Appendix 2

Surya Kanta 1926, n°5: 65-67.

Statuten perhimpunan Tjatoerwangsa Derja Gama Hindoe Bali

Dengan pendiriannya perhimpunan Tjatoerwangsa Derja Gama Hindoe Bali, maka penulis pun berasa sedih didalam hati, sebab pendirian perkumpulan itu berarti satu langkah mundur dari kalangan kemajuan.

Apakah sebabnya penulis berani katakan begitu? Lihatlah Statutennya!

Art.1: *Meneguhkan Igama Hindu Bali*. Artinya: Igama (?) yang sebagai berlaku sekarang ini yaitu percampuran Igama Hindu dengan upacara-upacara penduduk pulau Bali pada zaman purbakala yang bukan Igama, itulah yang akan diteguhkan, dengan tiada berusaha akan merubah atau memperbaiki keadaannya, ataupun menyelidiki bagaimana sejatinya. Jalanlah sebagaimana yang telah berlaku! T.t. pembaca, Igama itu tiadalah boleh dirobah. Akan tetapi siapakah membilang, bahwa Igama kita ini tiada banyak sudah mendapat perubahan dan percampuran? Jika demikian apakah tidak wajib kita berusaha menyelidiki sejatinya Igama kita, supaya tiada ada perubahannya atau percampurannya? Dan apakah gunanya kita beragama, jika kita tiada tahu akan arti dan maksud upacara-upacara itu? Dan apakah maknanya meneguhkan Igama Hindu Bali, dan bukan Igama Hindu? Itulah sekaliannya harus kita fikir-fikir, ketahuilah t.t., bahwa pada masa ini susahlah amat dapat dibilang, upacara-upacara manakah yang masuk golongan Igama dan manakah yang tergolong adat. Jika tiada ada usaha akan menyelidiki ini, selamanyapun tiadalah akan kita tahu membedakannya. Apakah perbedaan bahasa dalam Caturwangsa, potong gigi, melaspasin rumah dan l.l. perjalanan Igamakah atau adat? Adat itu jika perlu boleh dirobah, Igama tidak. “Jalankan lah segala hal ikhwal yang telah berlaku, janganlah menyelidiki keadaan sejati”, katanya Tjwadega Hindoe Bali. Apa maksudnya, boleh diterka!

[...]

Art.3: *Menetapkan kemajuan Negeri agar laju jalannya dengan jalan yang patut, yang tidak bertentangan dengan adat istiadat*. T.t. pembaca, perhatikanlah bunyinya art. ini! Tjwadega Hindoe Bali mau mengejar kemajuan dengan meneguhkan segala adat istiadat, yang telah lazim dijalankan. Bagaimanakah akan kejadiannya? Apakah dengan jalan demikian dapatkah dimajukan bangsa kita? Mengingat bunyinya art. 1 dan 3 ini, Tjwadega Hindoe Bali melarang kita merubah atau memperbaiki segala keadaan-keadaan yang berlaku di Bali (Igama dan Adat). Jika telah kejadian demikian, siapakah yang beruntung? Sekalian bangsa Balikah? T.t. pembaca dapat fikir sendiri!

Art.4: *Memeliharakan kepercayaan diantara keempat suku bangsa (catur wangsa) dengan mengingat dharma, supaya mereka itu merasa seperti menjadi sebadan dan sehat dengan bersama-sama menanggung hal ikhwal di Bali dan Lombok*. [...] Artinya: Kerukunan keempat suku bangsa itu harus diikhtiarkan dengan jalan mengingat dharmanya masing-masing. A. Apakah dapat Caturwangsa menetapi dharmanya? [...] B. Bagaimana dapat kita rukun, jika yang satu menganggap dirinya lebih tinggi dari pada yang lainnya?

Art.5: *Dengan tertib memperbaiki lakunya adat istiadat yang berlawanan dengan kemauan jaman*. Hm! Lihatlah art. 3! Apakah art. ini tiada bertentangan dengan art. itu? Melihat uraian diatas art. ini tiadalah boleh dijalankan. [...]

Mengejar kemajuan dengan jalan kembali pulang pokok! Sungguhpun nama kita Bali bersangkutan sekali dengan “kekolotan” negeri kita.

Banyak orang asing mengunjungi negeri kita sebagai mengunjungi satu Museum, yang berisi barang kuno. Jika kita mencari nama dalam hal ini, janganlah merubah apa-apa keadaan di Bali, tetapkanlah “kekolotan” kita. Akan tetapi jika kita menuruti bangsa lain, mengejar kemajuan, hilanglah lekas nama kita sebagai barang kuno, akan tetapi lekaslah mendapat nama lain.

Memikirkan sekalian hal yang tersebut diatas, maka Tjwadega Hindoe Balipun menyalahi namanya (Catur Wangsa d.l.l.), sebab kurangnya mengawat-awati keperluan umum, yaitu negeri serta sekalian penduduknya, hanyalah memikirkan enaknya beberapa golongan sahaja!

Begitulah pendapat kami.

Sira N.M. [Nengah Metra]

Bibliography

- Abdullah, Taufik, 1971, *Schools and Politics. The Kaum Muda Movement in West Sumatra*, Ithaca, Modern Indonesia Project, Cornell University.
- Adam, Ahmat B., 1995, *The Vernacular Press and the Emergence of Modern Indonesian Consciousness (1855-1913)*, Ithaca, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University.
- Anandakusuma, Sri Reshi, 1986, *Kamus Bahasa Bali*, Denpasar, C.V. Kayumas.
- Anderson, Benedict R.O'G., 1979, A Time of Darkness and a Time of Light: Transposition in Early Indonesian Nationalist Thought, in Anthony Reid & David Marr (eds), *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, Singapore, Heinemann, p. 219-248.
- Anderson, Benedict R.O'G., 1990, Language, Fantasy, Revolution: Java 1900-1945, *Prisma*, 50: 25-39.
- Anderson, Benedict R.O'G., 1991, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, Verso [1983].
- Ari Dwipayana, AA. GN., 2001, *Kelas dan Kasta. Pergulatan Kelas Menengah Bali*, Yogyakarta, Laper Pustaka Utama.
- Atmadja, Nengah Bawa, 2001, *Reformasi ke Arah Kemajuan yang Sempurna dan Holistik. Gagasan Perkumpulan Surya Kanta Tentang Bali di Masa Depan*, Surabaya, Paramita.
- Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah, 1969, *Pertentangan kasta dalam bentuk baru pada masyarakat Bali*, Denpasar, Universitas Udayana.
- Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah, 1972, *A Short Note on the Modern Hindu Movements in Balinese Society*, Denpasar, Universitas Udayana.
- Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah, 1975, Surya Kanta: A kewangsaan movement of the jaba caste in Bali, *Masyarakat Indonesia*, 2/2: 153-162.
- Bagus, I Gusti Ngurah, 1996, The Play 'Woman's Fidelity': Literature and Caste Conflict in Bali, in Adrian Vickers (eds), *Being Modern in Bali. Image and Change*, New Haven, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, p. 92-114.
- Bakker, Frederik Lambertus, 1993, *The Struggle of the Hindu Balinese Intellectuals. Developments in Modern Hindu Thinking in Independent Indonesia*, Amsterdam, VU University Press.
- Boon, James A., 1977, *The Anthropological Romance of Bali 1597-1972: Dynamic Perspectives in Marriage and Caste, Politics and Religion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Chatterjee, Partha, 1986, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World. A Derivative Discourse*, London, Zed Books.
- Cohn, Bernard S., 1987, *An Anthropologist Among the Historians and Other Essays*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Connor, Linda H., 1996, Contestation and Transformation of Balinese Ritual: The Case of Ngaben Ngirit, in Adrian Vickers (eds), *Being Modern in Bali. Image and Change*, New Haven, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, p. 179-211.
- Couteau, Jean, 1999, Bali et l'islam: 1. Rencontre historique, *Archipel*, 58: 159-188.
- Couteau, Jean, 2000, Bali et l'islam: 2. Coexistence et perspectives contemporaines, *Archipel*, 60: 45-64.
- Covarrubias, Miguel, 1937, *Island of Bali*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf.

- Crawfurd, John, 1820, On the existence of the Hindu religion in the island of Bali, *Asiatick Researches*, 13: 128-170.
- Creese, Helen, 2009, Old Javanese legal traditions in pre-colonial Bali, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 165/ 2-3: 241-290.
- Dirks, Nicholas B. (ed.), 1992, *Colonialism and Culture*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press.
- Djlantik, I Goesti Poetoe, 1924, *Penoentoen menghémat mengabén. Tanda peringatan dari I Goesti Poetoe Djlantik atas membitjaraannja dalam vergadering Perkoempoelan Santy Singaradja pada 2 November 1924*, Singaradja, I Goesti Bagoes Tjakra Tanaja.
- Flierhaar, Hendrik te, 1941, De aanpassing van het inlandsch onderwijs op Bali aan de eigen sfeer, *Koloniale Studiën*, 25: 135-159.
- Friederich, Rudolf H.Th., 1849-50, Voorlopig verslag van het eiland Bali, *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen*, 22: 1-63; 23: 1-57.
- Friederich, Rudolf H.Th., 1959, *The Civilization and Culture of Bali*, Calcutta, Susil Gupta.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1973, 'Internal Conversion' in Contemporary Bali, in Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York, Basic Books, p. 170-189 [1964].
- Gonda, Jan, 1973, *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, New Delhi, International Academy of Indian Culture [1952].
- Goris, Roelof, 1933, 'De strijd over Bali en de Zending'. *De waarde van Dr. Kraemer's boek*, Batavia, Minerva.
- Gouda, Frances, 1995, *Dutch Culture Overseas. Colonial Practice in the Netherlands Indies 1900-1942*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.
- Guermontprez, Jean-François, 2001, La religion balinaise dans le miroir de l'hindouisme, *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 88: 271-293.
- Hauser-Schäublin, Brigitta, 2004, 'Bali Aga' and Islam: Ethnicity, ritual practice, and 'Old-Balinese' as an anthropological construct, *Indonesia*, 77: 1-28.
- Hoadley, Mason C. & Hooker, M. Barry, 1981, *An Introduction to Javanese Law. A Translation of and Commentary on the Agama*, Tucson, The University of Arizona Press.
- Hoadley, Mason C. & Hooker, M. Barry, 1986, The law texts of Java and Bali, in M. Barry Hooker (ed.), *The Laws of South-East Asia. Volume 1: The pre-modern texts*, Singapore, Butterworths, p. 241-346.
- Hobart, Mark, 1989, *Western knowledge and Bali: Towards the emergence of Indonesian social theory*, Denpasar, Fakultas Sastra, Udayana University.
- Hobart, Mark, 1997, The Missing Subject: Balinese Time and the Elimination of History, *RIMA*, 31/1: 123-172.
- Howe, Leo, E.A., 2001, *Hinduism & Hierarchy in Bali*, Oxford, James Currey & Santa Fe, School of American Research Press.
- Howell, Julia Day, 1978, Modernizing Religious Reform and the Far Eastern Religions in Twentieth Century Indonesia, in S. Udin (ed.), *Spectrum. Essays presented to Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana on his Seventieth Birthday*, Jakarta, Dian Rakyat, p. 260-276.
- Howell, Julia Day, 1982, Indonesia: Searching for Consensus, in Carlo Caldarola, *Religions and Societies: Asia and the Middle East*, Berlin, Mouton, p. 497-548.
- Kadjeng, Njoman, 1929, Voorloopig overzicht der op Bali aanwezige literatuurschat, *Mededeelingen van de Kirtya Liefrinck – van der Tuuk*, Aflevering 1: 19-40.

- Kahn, Joel S., 1993, *Constituting the Minangkabau. Peasants, Culture, and Modernity in Colonial Indonesia*, Oxford, Berg.
- Keeler, Ward, 2006, The Pleasures of Polyglossia: Translation in Balinese and Javanese Performing Arts, in Jennifer Lindsay (ed.), *Between Tongues. Translation and/of/in Performance in Asia*, Singapore, Singapore University Press, p. 204-223.
- Keesing, Roger M., 1989, Creating the Past: Custom and Identity in the Contemporary Pacific, *The Contemporary Pacific*, 1/1&2: 19-42.
- Kerepun, Made Kembar, 2007, *Mengurai Benang Kusut Kasta. Membedah Kiat Pengajegan Kasta di Bali*, Denpasar, Panakom.
- Korn, Victor Emanuel, 1932, *Het Adatrecht van Bali*, 's-Gravenhage, Naeff [1924].
- Kraemer, Hendrik, 1933, *De strijd over Bali en de Zending. Een studie en een appel*, Amsterdam, H.J. Paris.
- Kutoyo, S. et al., 1977-78, *Sejarah Kebangkitan Nasional (1900-1942) Daerah Bali*, Jakarta, Proyek Penelitian dan Pencatatan Kebudayaan Daerah, Pusat Penelitian Sejarah dan Budaya, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Liem, Maya H.T., 2033, *The Turning Wheel of Time. Roda Jaman Berputar. Modernity and Writing Identity in Bali 1900-1970*, PhD Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Maier, Henk M.J., 1993, From Heteroglossia to Polyglossia: The Creation of Malay and Dutch in the Indies, *Indonesia* 56, p. 37-65.
- Mihardja, Achdiat K. (ed.), 1948, *Polemik Kebudajaan*, Jakarta, Pustaka Jaya.
- Padmawati, Ni Putu, 1982, *Pertumbuhan Perkoempoelan Shanti di Singaraja Antara Tahun 1921-1924*, Denpasar, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Udayana.
- Parker, Lynette, 2000, The Introduction of Western-style Education to Bali: Domination by Consent?, in Adrian Vickers et I Nyoman Darma Putra (dir.), *To Change Bali. Essays In Honour of I Gusti Ngurah Bagus*, Denpasar, Bali Post & University of Wollongong, Institute of Social Change and Critical Inquiry, p. 47-69.
- Picard, Michel, 1990, 'Cultural Tourism' in Bali. Cultural Performances as Tourist Attraction, *Indonesia*, 49: 37-74.
- Picard, Michel, 1995, Cultural Heritage and Tourist Capital. Cultural Tourism in Bali, in Marie-Françoise Lanfant, John B. Allcock & Edward M. Bruner (eds), *International Tourism: Identity and Change*, London, Sage, p. 44-66.
- Picard, Michel, 1996, Dance and Drama in Bali: The Making of an Indonesian Art Form, in Adrian Vickers (ed.), *Being Modern in Bali. Image and Change*, New Haven, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, p. 115-157.
- Picard, Michel, 2012, What's in a name? An enquiry about the interpretation of *Agama Hindu* as 'Hinduism', *Jurnal Kajian Bali*, 2/2: 113-140.
- Projek, 1971a, *Hasil Keputusan Seminar Pariwisata Budaya Daerah Bali*, Denpasar, Proyek Pemeliharaan dan Pengembangan Kebudayaan Daerah.
- Projek, 1971b, *Seminar Seni Sakral dan Provan Bidang Tari*, Denpasar, Proyek Pemeliharaan dan Pengembangan Kebudayaan Daerah.
- Putra, I Nyoman Darma, 2011, *A Literary Mirror. Balinese Reflections on Modernity and Identity in the Twentieth Century*, Leiden, KITLV Press.
- Putra Agung, Anak Agung Gde, 1972, Lahirnja idee-idee pembaharuan dalam organisasi sosial di Bali, *Basis*, 21/6: 183-189.
- Putra Agung, Anak Agung Gde, 2001, *Perubahan Sosial dan Pertentangan Kasta di Bali Utara*, Yogyakarta, Yayasan Untuk Indonesia.

- Raffles, Thomas Stamford, 1817, *The History of Java*, London, Black, Parbury & Allen.
- Ramanujan, A.K., 1989, Is there an Indian way of thinking? An informal essay, *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 23/1: 41-58.
- Robinson, Geoffrey B., 1995, *The Dark Side of Paradise. Political Violence in Bali*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Roff, William R., 1962, *Kaum Muda - Kaum Tua: Innovation and Reaction amongst the Malays, 1900-1941*, in K.G. Tregonning (ed.), *Papers on Malayan History*, Singapore, University of Singapore, p.162-192.
- Rubinstein, Raechelle, 1992, Pepaosan: Challenges and Change, in Danker Schaareman (ed.), *Balinese Music in Context. A Sixty-fifth Birthday Tribute to Hans Oesch*, Winterthur, Amadeus Verlag, p. 85-113.
- Sahlins, Marshall, 1993, Goodbye to Tristes Tropes: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History, *Journal of Modern History*, 65/1: 1-25.
- Said, Edward, 1978, *Orientalism*, New York, Random House.
- Schulte Nordholt, Henk, 1994, The Making of Traditional Bali: Colonial Ethnography and Bureaucratic Reproduction, *History and Anthropology*, 8/1-4: 89-127.
- Shiraishi, Takashi, 1981, The Disputes Between Tjipto Mangoenkoesoemo and Soetatmo Soeriokoesoemo: Satria vs. Pandita, *Indonesia*, 32: 93-108.
- Shiraishi, Takashi, 1990, *An Age in Motion. Popular Radicalism in Java, 1912-1926*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Sweeney, Amin, 1987, *A Full Hearing. Orality and Literacy in the Malay World*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Thomas, Nicholas, 1994, *Colonialism's Culture. Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Van Hoëvell, Wolter Robert Baron, 1848, Recent Scientific Researches on the Islands of Bali and Lombok, *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, 2: 151-159.
- Vickers, Adrian, 1987, Hinduism and Islam in Indonesia: Bali and the Pasisir World, *Indonesia*, 44: 31-58.
- Vickers, Adrian, 1996, Modernity and Being *Moderen*: An Introduction, in Adrian Vickers (ed.), *Being Modern in Bali. Image and Change*, New Haven, Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, pp.1-36.
- Vickers, Adrian, 2000, I Nengah Metra 1902-1946: Thoughts on the Biography of a Modern Balinese, in Adrian Vickers & I Nyoman Darma Putra (eds), *To Change Bali. Essays In Honour of I Gusti Ngurah Bagus*, Denpasar, Bali Post & University of Wollongong, Institute of Social Change and Critical Inquiry, p. 89-112.
- Vickers, Adrian, 2012, *Bali: A Paradise Created*, Singapore, Tuttle Publishing [1989].
- Warna, Wayan et al., 1990, *Kamus Bali-Indonesia*, Denpasar, Dinas Pendidikan Dasar Propinsi Dati I Bali.
- Warren, Carol, 1993, *Adat and Dinas. Balinese Communities in the Indonesian State*, Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press.
- Wiana, Ketut, 2006, *Memahami Perbedaan Catur Varna, Kasta dan Wangsa*, Surabaya, Paramita.
- Wiana, Ketut et Santeri, Raka, 1993, *Kasta dalam Hindu. Kesalahpahaman Berabad-abad*, Denpasar, Yayasan Dharma Narada.
- Wijaya, I Nyoman, 2007, *Mencintai Diri Sendiri : Memutar Gerakan Ajeg Bali Ke Masa Lampau 1910-2002*, Yogyakarta, Program Studi Sejarah, Universitas Gajah Mada.

- Wijaya, I Nyoman, 2009, *Mencintai Diri Sendiri : Gerakan Ajeg Bali dalam Sejarah Kebudayaan Bali 1910-2007*, PhD thesis, Yogyakarta, Program Pascasarjana Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Zurbuchen, Mary Sabina, 1987, *The Language of Balinese Shadow Theater*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Zurbuchen, Mary Sabina, 1989, Internal Translation in Balinese Poetry, in Alton L. Becker (ed.), *Writing on the Tongue*, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan, p. 215-279.