International Journal of Social Science And Human Research

ISSN(print): 2644-0679, ISSN(online): 2644-0695

Volume 06 Issue 01 January 2023

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v6-i1-64, Impact factor- 5.871

Page No: 487-495

Revisiting Integral Ecology Based on Islamic Communication

Waryani Fajar Riyanto
UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta

ABSTRACT: Communication relationship between humans and the environment has undergone evolution, from the ecocentric, transitional, anthropocentric, to the holistic stage. This study describes ecological issues based on Islamic communication science. The analytical method used is the philosophy of Islamic communication science and ecological philosophy. There are three basic principles in the philosophy of Islamic communication, namely the communicator (God), the communicant (human), and the community (nature). The method of analysis of ecological philosophy uses pessimistic and optimistic views. The findings in this study are the concept of integralistic ecological communication. Namely the concept of ecological maintenance which involves the roles of God, humans, and nature.

KEYWORDS: Communication, Ecology, Integralistik

Introduction

One of the scenarios in the framework of future studies (futurology) is the healthy, humanistic and ecological scenario, which has been offered by James Roberston in his book *The Sane Alternative: A Choice of Future* (Roberston, 1983:2-15). In this scenario, Roberston emphasizes the need for balance (equilibrium) between humans personally and other people (anthropological communication), and between humans and nature (ecological communication) in facing a challenging future. This scenario is very interesting, because it places (communication) ecology as the most important part, in addition to issues of human rights, gender and freedom in dealing with human life in the future. This means, ecology as life in which there is harmony in human relationships and unity, with the elements of cosmological life, must be the starting point and orientation for future life (Arifin, 1994:90).

This ecological problem is important, because at the beginning of the 21st century, humans are faced with many problems, and all the problems they face lead to the problem of an ecological crisis. It is said so, because ecological problems are basically an accumulation of other humanitarian problems, such as the ethical and technical implications of scientific and technological developments. If previously human ecological behavior was ethical and aesthetic, which was manifested by efforts to maintain harmony between humans and their environment, then what happened in subsequent developments, especially during the industrial era, was marked by technological advances, then human behavior towards ecology tends to be pragmatic and technocratic. This is where two paradoxical logics apply, where on the one hand humans are required to develop technology, but on the other hand they are also required to preserve the environment.

The consequences caused by technology (Baiquni, 1990:4-12), by exploiting ecology, have further clouded the face of modern civilization. Haidar Bagir for example (Bagir, 1988:34-37), provides an illustrative view of the consequences caused by technology. There are at least three consequences that can be concluded from this review, namely psychological, rationalist, and ecological consequences. Therefore, at the end of the 20th century, the world community held an Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro on June 3-14, 1992, as evidence of how ecological problems have become global human attention and concern. Even recently, a Global Warming Summit was also held in Bali, Indonesia. This is because several symptoms can be used as indicators of an ecological crisis, the most important of which is the increasing temperature of the earth (Toruan, 1990:23-24).

METHODS

This article is reviewed using the philosophical method in communication science and ecology. There are three basic principles of communication science, namely the communicator, communicant, and community. In the context of this study, the communicator is occupied by God (theology), the communicator is occupied by humans (anthropology), and the community by nature (ecology). Meanwhile, from the side of ecological philosophy, there are two views, namely pessimistic and optimistic. Ronald Higgins for example, as quoted by Arifin (Arifin, 2004:95), came to a pessimistic statement in dealing with the ecological crisis. he said, "There is no better tomorrow than the difficulties we face today". In line with Higgins' pessimism is Robert L. Heibroner, as he

states in his book, *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect* (Heibroner, t.t.: 23). Even though this pessimistic view is based on empirical facts, such a view cannot be expected much, because it clearly ignores human abilities as *Khalifah fi al-ard* (Rahardjo, 2002:346-364). In addition, a pessimistic view has placed humans in a deterministic and fatalistic situation (Afrizal, 2006:27-28).
Meanwhile, James Robertson argues otherwise (Roberston: 1989:34), in which he is optimistic by arguing that this pessimistic view is caused by methodological errors, namely estimates based on known natural resources (known resources). Therefore, as religious people, of course we choose an optimistic attitude. The consequence of this choice is that it will lead us to efforts to seek holistic creative alternatives, both technically and methodologically. By not reducing the appreciation of the ecological-sociological perspective that is partial-structural and functional (Alexander, 1987:34), researchers offer an ecological perspective that is holistic-integral (Suryani, 1987:13). By not reducing respect for bio-ecosystem theory and geo-social-system theory (Abdillah, 2001:164-170), researchers offer alternative findings called integralistic ecological communication. So that the relationship that is created is not only linear, between humans and their environment or nature, but also holistic-integralistic relationships, between God (communicator-theology), humans (communicant-anthropology), and nature (community-ecology).
Referring to Fritjof Capra in his book *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture* states (Capra, t.t.: 54), that the catastrophes that are happening on earth today, such as ecological damage that occurs as a result of technological developments, are caused by technology not being accompanied by spiritual (religious) insights. Therefore Capra invites scientists to leave the paradigm of science which overly emphasizes material-positivistic aspects, to move toward a holistic-integralistic paradigm of knowledge, where on this plane, religious and religious (Islamic) issues, as well as spiritual ethical values in religious teachings (Al-Qur'an), become very important to put forward, and continuously studied in depth. In dealing with the problems of the ecological crisis, researchers, using basic principles in the philosophy of communication science, offer the concept of ecological communication.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The basic principles in communication science can be understood as follows: first, message delivery; second, from the communicator; third, to the communicant; fourth, through the media; and fifth, raises feedback. Thus, in simple terms, a communication practice contains an element of existencemessage, communicator, communicant, community, media andfeedback (Widjaja, 2000:30). If this pattern is used by researchers to read the concept of communication in religion (Islam), then the communicator is Allah (*Ja'ilun*-Theocentric), the communicator is Rasul Muhammad SAW (Caliph-Anthropocentric), the message is treatise (language) of the Qur'an, the medium is 'Arabic, and the community is *alam* (*Ardun*-Cosmocentric) (Riyanto, 2007:7). Thus, in the communication practice above, the position of the Qur'an relates to language. In other words, when talking about the Qur'an, in the context of communication science, we must speak in terms of the message of the language. Therefore, the significance of the study of the Koran in communication science is that language (the text of the Koran) plays a very significant role.
Position of study (science) Al-Quran (ethical principles of communication language) in the pillars of communication, positioned as a message. While the position of the study Knowledge of *Tawhid* on the communicator, namely Allah (the criterion of divinity) (Riyanto, 2007:5); study of Knowledge of *Sirah and al-Hadith* on the communicant, namely the Prophet Muhammad (principle: *sidq, amanah, tablig*, and *fatonah*); research *Sufism* (the principle of social piety) on the communication relationship between the Prophet Muhammad and God; and the Prophet Muhammad with the people; study Islamic Civilization Social History (principles of transcendence, humanization, and liberation-Kuntowijoyo Prophetic Social Sciences) at feedback, research Science Qur'anic Society (the principles of the Medina Charter) on the community, and the study of Communication in the Qur'an (the principles of visual-visual media, audio-hearing, and audio-visual-heart) on the media. Based on the communication principles above, there is an integralistic relationship between the theological communicator, the anthropology communicant, and the ecological community. Or there are three types of integralistic communication relationships, namely between theological communication, anthropological communication, and ecological communication. Integrate at once, between religious communication, social communication, and science communication. The science of secular communication is more likely to only discuss the concept of anthropological communication, or the process of communication that discusses the relationship between humans, not between humans and nature (ecological communication).
Judging from its history, ecology was first developed by Ernest Haeckel within the framework of the scientific discipline of biology (Odum, 1983:3). Because of this, ecology is often referred to as a branch of biology in the early history of its development, which discusses ecosystems (Suroyo, 2003:49-51). Of course, ecological issues of this kind will carry certain epistemological implications, namely that ecological problems are seen in reality as purely physical in nature. This is perhaps what is called the insight of "shallow ecology". Only recently has there been dissatisfaction with this shallow ecological perspective, which then gave birth to a new ecological perspective called "deep ecology", developed by Rudolf Bahro, as quoted by Arifin (Arifin, 2003:96). This ecology tries to provide an insight or orientation to the human environment with a deep and solid metaphysical and spiritual basis.

Etymologically, the word *ecology* derived from the Greek, which is a combination of two words *oikos* which means *household* and *logos* which means *knowledge* (Odum, 1994:22). Therefore, etymologically, ecology can be developed meaning to be science that studies the ins and outs of the house, including the process and implementation of functions and relationships between components as a whole. Meanwhile, terminologically, ecology is the science that examines the processes of interrelation and interdependence between organisms in a particular environmental container as a whole. In subsequent developments, ecology has attracted less attention from scientists, because ecology is considered a pure science that is too general and not useful. It's just that, after the environmental crisis occurred and an international conference on the environment was held in Stockholm in 1972, then ecology attracted the attention of all parties, both scientists, politicians, especially religious people.

If ecology is the science, then environmental ecosystems orenviorenment is the object of knowledge. In general, the ecological community understands that what is meant byenvironment isthe whole life outside of an organism, both in the form of inanimate (abiotic) and living (biotic). Therefore, the science that studies the interrelationships between living things and each other, or with the inanimate creatures around them called byecology. Thus, basically ecology is a pure science that questions, investigates and understands the basic principles of how nature works, how living things exist in living systems. The results of the answers to these questions are then abstracted and formulated in various ecological doctrines which are commonly called the basic principles of ecology (Soeriatmadja, 1981:13-31).

Even though the ecological community, ecologist society, that is, the theoretical ecological community realizes that the environment essentially encompasses the wholebiosphere outside an organism, but the environmental management community, enviorenmentalist society, namely the applicable ecological society, tends to narrow environmental discourse. In environmental management societies, it is customary to refer to the environment as a study of the human environment, human ecology, not ecology in a broad sense, encompassing the living environment of all organisms. In fact, the understanding of the human environment has firmly indicated a certain type of environment in the general sense of the environment. Therefore, if environmental science is meant not for the human environment, then it is customary to be given titles, such as forest ecology, forest ecology, and so on. Such a narrowing of the meaning of the environmental management community, is an applicative implementation of the basic principles of normative ecology, so that ecology becomes an applied science, applied science (Danusaputra, 1983:62-63).

The narrowing of environmental discourse in applied ecology creates a reality, that the ecological approach is anthropocentrism (Chiras, 1985:4), or eco-anthropocentrism. This means that the focus point for studying environmental problems is always based on profit values for human interests, not eco-cosmocentrism or even eco-theocentrism, namely the profit value for the environment itself, or the benefits of rewards obtained from God. As a result, environmental problems that do not benefit humans will be neglected, ignored or even pushed aside. Thus, the ecology of anthropocentrism is an ecology of arrogance, not a whole, decent, sentient ecology. The anthropocentrism approach in ecology refers to a social belief of the environmental community, that humans are elite, exclusive, special, andsuper being. Organisms outside of humans are created and provided for the interests and needs of humans. Therefore, species other than humans are not important for attention. Linearly, the ecological anthropocentric approach facilitates the way for humans to exploit the environment and legitimizes human absolute power over the environment.

Such an anthropocentrism approach in ecology is an implication of the development of science and technology, which is anthropocentric, exploitative, and not friendly to the environment (Jacob, 1989:69). The birth and development of anthropocentric technology is motivated by a social belief that the environment and natural resources must be conquered and exploited to achieve progress in order to meet the needs of life, and realize human welfare and happiness. Beliefs like this are the antithesis of local religious social beliefs, myths, traditional communities about the environment (Geertz, t.t.: 97). Traditional societies tend to be friendly, and even very respectful of the environment, by always maintaining harmony and living in balance with the environment or equilibrium society.

In contrast to traditional societies (*turas*), modern society (*tajdid*) based on technology believe (theologize), that if humans want to progress and prosper, they must be able to free themselves from traditional beliefs (*turas*), that is, subject to and controlled by nature. Humans must replace these traditional beliefs (classical theology) with new beliefs (modern theology). The focus of the new belief is that nature must be controlled and conquered in order to meet human needs and happiness and well-being. This new awareness encouraged the birth and development of anthropocentric science and technology rapidly since the last XVII century (Ali, 1984:53). On the other hand, it turns out that technology has a negative impact in the form of environmental damage, causing serious environmental problems. Thus, the development and use of technology that is anthropocentric and exploitative towards the environment actually makes it more vulnerable to a decline in the carrying capacity of the environment for human life itself and the lives of other species. In other words, anthropocentric ecology can pose a threat to human welfare and environmental sustainability, so it is necessary to initiate a new paradigm, such as cosmocentric ecology or theocentric ecology, or even all three at once, namely eco-theo-anthropo-cosmocentric-integralistic.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Ecological Communication Religion

Relating ecological issues to religion is an interesting and challenging thought, because religion is often seen as a teaching that only provides ritualistic and normative instructions for life. Previously, in the discourse on ecology as a scientific discipline, religion did not really get a place, at least as a reference approach in looking at ecological problems. Thus, the first thing that must be done in finding the link between religion and ecology is a paradigmatic problem. Even though there has been a kind of development in ecological discourse with the pursuit of "deep ecology", it must still be admitted that the positivistic ecological paradigm is still dominant, as seen in the structural approach in dealing with ecological problems. This paradigm, as has been said, sees ecological problems solely as natural-empirical problems, which have little to do with religious-spiritualist issues.

In the above perspective, namely natural-empirical only, the exploration and exploitation of nature by human beings is apart from spiritual considerations which will instead guide humans "how should" (das sollen) treat nature. If then the exploration and exploitation of nature give rise to ecological problems, all of these are considered not as ethical-spiritual issues, but merely natural and technical factors, as seen in the view of environmentalism West. This view is based on the assumption that ecological crises arise due to the entry of foreign substances into the natural environment beyond their natural ability to solve problems. So the solutions offered are technical in nature, not substantial, and only rely on scientific and technological technical instruments, not religious values.

Although the view of Western environmentalism above cannot be completely blamed, merely viewing ecological problems as problems that are technical in nature is a partialistic view, not integralistic. This is because the more fundamental issues, both because of their nature and influence, namely the basic human view (weltanschauung) (Mahzar, 2004:4) about themselves and their natural environment, are not touched upon at all. Yet according to Daniel B. Batkin and Edward A. Keller in his book, *Environmental Studies: The Earth as Living Planet* (Keller, 1982:82), every human being has a set of beliefs as the basic framework of his view in seeing the phenomena of the universe. With this belief, says Gregory Bateson, in his work *Step to An Ecology of Mind* (Bateson, 1972:72), it is man who "creates" nature. With this it is clear that ecological problems are fundamentally rooted in basic human views which are used as a reference in treating nature. Thus, ecological issues are not merely technical-instrumentalist-empirical issues, but also ethical-substantial-spiritualist issues.

Furthermore, in looking for a link between ecology and religion, there are problems within religion itself, both related to the doctrinal framework of religion, as well as the empirical reality of religion which often gives a blurry picture due to the absence of a significant link between doctrinal riches and their empirical reality. Presumably this problem often causes many doubts from other parties, if religion is to be used as an alternative paradigm to deal with ecological problems. From Marxism, for example, as quoted by Arifin (Arifin, 2004:97), despite his overall view of religion which has a minor tone, there is a critical view from this circle. According to them, the problem of ecology actually originates from Christianity which is too anthropocentric in placing humans in the midst of cosmological reality.

Lynn White Jr. Statement for example, as also quoted by Arifin, even more provocative. He stated that the roots of today's ecological problems lay in the Judeo-Christian ethic. With the Biblical view that places humans "above" nature, as in the Book of Genesis, White considers Christianity to have encouraged the emergence of an exploitative ecological ethic. Based on this view, White was then convinced that it was Christianity that should be responsible for environmental damage, because the roots of the ecological crisis were listed in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis.

Even though a religious doctrine on ecology (ecological theology) provides the opposite view - unlike the view above, namely a theological view that places humans on an equal footing with other creatures - this does not mean guaranteeing the birth of a harmonious ecological reality full of balance (equilibrium). Sayyed Hossein Nasr for example (Nasr, t.t.: 45), gave an example in the Islamic world. According to Nasr, at the operational level related to the provision of Islamic ecological infrastructure, the Islamic world is not more successful in avoiding the ecological crisis, even though religiously the positive attitude of Islam towards nature is evident. Today in the Islamic world one can find signs of a fundamental and very striking root of the ecological crisis in almost every country, for example the massive deforestation that has occurred in Indonesia.

If one examines to the roots of the problem, the ecological crisis that has arisen in human life actually originates from the existence of human domination over nature, which is realized by the development of science and technology in the context of exploring and exploiting nature for the benefit of humans. Science and technology which was developed on the assumption of human domination over nature, has given rise to two forms that are equally destructive, namely the emergence of an arrogant form of science and technology (Nasr, 2002:231).

The existence of such a form of science and technology-which in turn influences human ecological conditions-historically and philosophically, is actually rooted in Western philosophical views which place humans as everything. This view is typical of Western rationalism and humanism. It was Rene Descartes who laid the foundation for this philosophical thought, which basically reaffirmed Aristotelian logic. The Cartesian paradigm stands on adage I think, therefore I am (I Think, therefore I am) (If I think, then I exist). According to Ignas Kleden, the above-mentioned philosophical views produce two very basic consequences (Kleden, 1987:23); First, elements I think become so important and get a high position. Second, elements ego become very dominant. The

whole effort of human thinking is not to prove that there is another (the other being), but most importantly to prove the existence of the other ego. Thinking is always connected with interests ego and interests of other matters determined by ego the. Because it has put ego in the first place, Descartes is accused by modern philosophers of edification Egologist, namely philosophy that departs from ego (human) and ends in the ego (anthropocentrism) (Freud, 1984:88). Ecology (environment) which is built with egology (I-ness), will create disharmony and natural discontinuity.

As a source of perennialistic teachings, religions (religions) teach a harmonious relationship between humans and nature. All religions basically have a perennial vision related to the maintenance of the cosmic nature (Arifin, 2004:99). With the spirit of ecumenical tolerance-borrowing Peter L. Berger's term-it is emphasized that all religions have the right to speak on ecological issues. An example of this is the Hindu worldview which emphasizes the harmony of life between humans and nature. The Hindu worldview is based on the mutual relationship between *prajapati, praja, kamandhuk* (Darmayasa, 1993:11). *Prajapati (at the center)* is God as the king of the universe, *praja* (anthropocentric) is human, the most complete living being because it has *tri pratama*, namely *sabda, bayu,* and *idep* (voice, energy, and thought). Whereas *kamandhuk* (cosmocentris) is a cow, a myth in Hinduism that is often used as a symbol of the universe or a symbol of the earth. The earth inhabited by humans, animals and plants is a source of human life that needs to be maintained in harmony. In Hinduism, harmony between humans and nature is the basis for leading to the highest harmony, namely God Almighty. In other words, religious (Hinduism) teachings, for example, have actually taught an ecological paradigm that is integrated, between God, Man, and Nature, or an ecological paradigm that is more spiritualistic in nature, not just positivistic.

If the root of the problem of environmental pollution, for example, is the domination of a positivistic ecological paradigm towards nature, then the effort that needs to be made now is to have a dialogue, or even to integrate the ecological paradigm which is positivistic, with an ecology which is spiritualistic in nature. According to Sayyed Hossein Nasr (Nasr, 1987:34), the West (Christianity), now, has carried out a reconstruction in the field of theology (ecology) in the direction of a theology that places humans as "parts", no longer as rulers who are "above" nature. Meanwhile, in the Islamic world, efforts should be made to create infrastructure that will encourage the realization of existing ecological doctrines. The discussion below attempts to re-elaborate the conception (theology) of ecology in religion (Islam), by also including analysis in the science of communication.

Quranization of Ecological Communication

Islam as a religion with its universal mission is to give mercy to the universe (*rahmatan li al-'alamin*) has provided a systematic view of God, Man, and Nature. It can be said that the main themes of the Qur'an (*Major Themes of the Qur'an*) revolve around these three issues, with all the dialectic relations between the three (Rahman, 1980:11). With the explanation of the three issues above, it is not wrong to say that Islam contains a basic framework of relevant ecological ethics. The problem lies in how far the intellectual creativity of Muslims, in elaborating more deeply and seriously a universal ethical study. And most importantly, integrate it in more operational matters, so that the message of Islam does not stop at the holy sky.

Paradigmatically, the communication relationship between God (theological communication), Man (anthropological communication), and Nature (ecological communication), lies in the Islamic doctrine of monotheism. Doctrine monotheism this is what happened-as Ismail Raji al-Faruqi said in his book, *Tawhid: Its Implication for Thought and Life*-world view (weltanschauung) which provides a holistic explanation of reality (Faruqi, 1982:56). Building diversity in unity, not unity in diversity. In view monotheism there are three important principles about reality; First, duality, that is, every reality always consists of a pair of dualities, and the two need each other, for example, heaven and earth, day and night, man and nature, and so on. Second, ideationality, that all axiomatic provisions of Allah in the form of natural law, follow the sunnatullah law. Third, theology, that the ideational view is not positivistic or materialistic. This view clearly contradicts the principle of tawhid which views reality as teleological in nature, which has a purpose, a design [Q.S. (3): 191]. In the Qur'an it is explained that reality is not created in vain, but instead has a universal purpose [Q.S. (32): 7].

In Islamic religious literature, the concept of ecological communication or environmental communication (ecologist) in the study of ecology, was introduced by the Qur'an with various terms. For all species by term *'alamin* (Dzar, 1994:19), environment or *bi'ah* (Ma'luf, t.t.:27-31), and earth or *ardun*. In this paper, only the last term is studied, namely term *ardun* which means *earth*. In quality, earth or *ardun* used in the Qur'an 463 times, either appearing alone or combined with the word assignment (Al-Baqi, 1981:32-46). While in terms of quality, said *ardun* has two variations of meaning; First, means the environment of planet Earth that has been made with the connotation of soil as a space for organisms or micro-organisms, areas for human life and geological phenomena. Second, meaning that the environment of planet Earth is in the process of becoming, namely the process of creation and the occurrence of planet Earth. For the sake of the formulation of the concept of environment, it seems that the first connotation, namely the earth's environment that has been made, can help and reinforce the concept. As for the word *ardun* in the connotation of the process of creating an environment it is more appropriate if it is used for the benefit of philosophical studies. Therefore, what needs to be examined further is the word *ardun* which connotes *earth* as a built-in environment.

As for the spread of ecological verses that use the word *ardun* with various connotations in the Qur'an are as follows: First, connotes the ecology of the earth [Q.S. (2): 164]. Second, connotes the environment [Q.S. (2): 22]. Third, connotes the ecosystem

of the earth [Q.S. (16): 15]. Fourth, connotes recycling in the earth's ecosystem [Q.S. (22): 2]. Based on the data of the semantic meaning of the word *ardun* revealed in the Qur'an above, then there is a strong indication that the word *ardun* in the Qur'an used as one of the terms to introduce the term *environment* in the ecological disciplines. Thus, it is strong enough to state that one of the environmental concepts in the Qur'an is expressed by using terms *ardun*. This is in parallel with the tradition of ecological societies that commonly use the term environment to mean planet earth. In other words, it is customary for the ecological community to understand the term environment as another expression of the term planet earth.

Integralistic Ecological Communication

If studied with a structural ecological approach, the structural communication relationship between humans and the environment has undergone evolution, from the ecocentric, transitional, anthropocentric, to the holistic stage (Salim, 1986:35). Stage*first*, at first in relation to communication with the environment, humans are still natural, because humans feel that the environment is the center of everything, humans are a part (*min*) from the environment. Such a view can be called a view ecocentrisme (Danusaputra, 1983:70). That is, all environmental components must simultaneously make the environment the estuary of all its activities. Humans are a small part of the environment that must submit to the sunnah of the environment, because humans are part of the environment. Other experts call the view at this stage the term inclusiveness (Suryani, 1983:2). That is, humans are the microcosm and the environment is the macrocosm. Ecocentrism or inclusivism theology systems on the one hand can have implications for the formation of a balanced society in relation to its environment. But on the other hand, this theology forms a society that is difficult to move forward.

Level second, at this stage humans feel that in communication with the environment humans need to use assistive devices (*'an*). This is due to the increase in human knowledge about the environment in line with the rate of increase in their living needs. At this stage can be referred to as the stage of transitionalism or stages inclusiveness more. That is, humans already feel that they are no longer an integral part of the environment in full. But on the other hand, humans also do not feel as part of their environment. The view of transitionalism theology can have implications for the formation of ambiguous societal behavior.

Level third, at this stage humans feel they are no longer part of the environment, but as part of the outside environment (*'ala*). Such a view is called a view exclusivism. In other words, humans feel themselves as special creatures, super being, and as the absolute ruler of the environment. Views like this are more commonly known as views anthropocentrism. This view of communication relations is marked by the development of an industrial society that masters science and technology, science and technology. This anthropocentrism view creates an exploitative attitude towards the environment. Thus, the ideology of anthropocentrism can be said to be the theological root of environmental pollution and damage.

Level fourth, at this stage humans feel that on the one hand they are indeed an integral part of the environment (*fi*), but on the other hand humans also realize that they have the advantage of reason. Such a human view can be identified as a holistic ideology (Hadi, 1995:10). Namely the ideological view which states that the potential for freedom possessed by humans is responsible. Holistic-integralistic ideology offers a balanced life system which is a prerequisite for the realization of a sustainable life. Holistic-integralistic ideology promises environmental wisdom, which deserves to be developed, in order to shift the extreme ideology of ecocentrism or inclusivism, as well as the ideology of anthropocentrism or exclusivism.

If it is studied based on a social ecological approach, namely an ecological functional approach, then the communication relationship between humans and their environment has been examined by ecologists. In general, this theory is distinguished by the ecological community into two major theories, namely the bio-ecosystem theory and the geo-social-system theory. According to bio-ecosystem theory (natural law) (Keraf, 1997:13), the position and function of humans in ecosystems is the same as other creatures. If examined in depth, it can be said that the bio-ecosystem theory denies the superiority of the human species in its environment. This theory itself is rooted in the philosophical tradition of extreme materialism. The thought of extreme materialism itself is rooted in the notion of mechanism, that nature is a big machine, and it is in nature that humans live. Thus it can be said that the bio-ecosystem theory is a derivation of the theory of extreme materialism (Poedjawijatno, 1983:57-60). On the one hand, bio-ecosystem theory can create wisdom towards the environment. But on the other hand, this theory can reduce human dignity, because it is equated with other natural objects. Man as a rational being, rational being for example, equated with other objects that do not make sense. Likewise, humans as cultured beings, cultural species, equated with other non-cultured creatures.

Along with the findings of new facts about the functional communication relationship between humans and their environment, a critical theory of the bio-ecosystem theory was born, known as the geo-social-system theory. Unlike the bio-ecosystem theory which equates human ecology with the ecology of other species in the environment, geo-social-system theory does not equate human ecology with the ecology of other creatures in an ecosystem. In this theory, humans are not natural objects, but are natural subjects. Because humans have the ability to manage, plan, and regulate the utilization of natural resources and the environment for the benefit of humans in an ecologically rational manner (Kaslan, 1991: 273).

The formulation of the geo-social-system theory is based on the objective fact that humans are not only a biotic species, but also a rational social species. As a rational species, with the potential of rational reason, humans have the opportunity to develop individual values, become communal values, which are then believed to be social values and beliefs. It is in this context that

humans are placed as a civilized species, cultural and civilized species. But at the level of reality, geo-social-system theory will actually give birth to the concept of humans as special beings, the super being species. Thus it can be said that although ideally the moral theory of geo-social-systems should be able to give birth to the concept of humans who are responsible for environmental sustainability, at the actual level of reality it actually becomes one of the roots of environmental pollution and damage. This is because values that are considered good by humans cannot be confronted with nature. And the most basic thing is, the geo-social-system theory has not been able to touch human existence as a spiritual being.

Bio-ecosystem theory views humans as the same as other species in ecosystems, while geo-social-system theory has described the boundaries that differentiate humans from other species, but humans are still believed to have a functional communication relationship between themselves and biophysical systems, because humans are the interior of a large environmental unit. Another thing that is more basic, that the geo-social-system theory has not been able to touch at all on the existence of humans as spiritual beings, not only as social beings. Whereas humans are not only as social beings, but also as spiritual beings. In other words, not only bio-ecosystem or geo-social-system theory, but a theory called meta-social-system.

To find the roots of meta-social-system theory or integralistic ecological communication theory, or theo-anthropo-cosmocentric theory, researchers use a proposition from the verses of the Koran about the human caliphate. If Christians believe, for example, that the position of humans and nature is "above", while adherents of the bio-ecocentric view believe that humans are "part" of nature, then the Qur'an emphasizes that the position of humans is "inside natural". The verse of the Qur'an that the author means is, *"Inni ja'ilun fi al-ardi khalifah"* [Q.S. (2):30]. There are three substance relationships in the verse, namely between *Ja'ilun* as God, *ardun* as a symbol of nature, and *khalifah* (caliph) as a human symbol. So that the communication relationship that occurs is a triangular communication relationship between God (theology), Nature (ecology), and Humans (anthropology). These three communication relations will create a pattern of integrative communication relations between theocentric-spiritualism communication, anthropocentric-exclusivism communication, and cosmocentric (ecological)-inclusivism communication.

In the sentence above using the word *fi*, which means *inside* (Ma'luf, 1981:45), to show the position of the caliph as a human being, above *ardun* as natural or environmental. Thus, the communication relationship that is created between humans and nature is that the position of humans is inside natural. Therefore, the position of the human inside is like the position of the spirit in the body. Because, humans are to nature, like a spirit in a body, where humans are the spirit, and nature is the body. It is the spirit that animates the body, and without a spirit (the caliph as a human), the body (*ardun* as earth or nature) will die. If humans know this substantial position, namely their central function as a spirit for nature, of course it will have an impact on their practical actions in treating the environment. This harmonious communication relationship between the spirit and the body will create a relationship of balance or equilibrium. The spirit will not have a material existence if it does not reside in the body, and the body will not have a spiritual existence if it is not enlivened by the spirit. The relationship between the body, the spirit, and those who create the spirit, is an integralistic relationship that cannot be separated, between the material-empiricism body, the immaterial-rationalism spirit, and the creator of the non-material-spiritual spirit.

The verse above, in order, places the word *ardun* or earth or nature preceded man as caliph. This provides an illustration of morality for us, that the position of nature for humans, such as the position of a house, has been created by the owner of the house, for the guest or visitor to the house. Moreover, just because of a dust powder that was in the yard of the house, the guest was created. Humans are guests of nature, thus, the guest cannot just exploit all kinds of food and drink without the permission of the owner of the house. Only with the permission of the owner of the house, the guest can live in the house. And in the same position, the house has been entrusted to the guest, by the owner of the house. The integralistic communication relations mentioned above, namely between the owner of the house, the house and the guests, will create a pattern of integralistic communication relations, between the principles of theocentrism communication, anthropocentrism communication, and cosmocentrism communication or ecological communication (theo-anthropo-cosmocentric-integralistic) (Abdullah, 2004:3-23), or the integration between the values of spiritualist communication, rationalist communication, and empirical communication.

On the other hand, ecosystems in natural law (*sunnatullah*), explain naturally, about the concept of natural balance, which in turn creates a balance of value principles, namely the principle of textuality or *bayani* (producers), liberality or *burhani* (decomposers), rationality or *burhani* (decomposers), and light or *irfani* (abiotic). Is a blend of normativity philosophy, liberality, humanity, and philosophy of illumination. A harmonious communication relationship between humans and nature (ecological communication) in an ecosystem (multiculture), in the context of biology (ecology), is called a mutualism-integralistic symbiotic relationship. In the context of a wider community ecosystem, the mutualism-integralistic symbiotic communication relationship above, it turns out, not only integrates the realms of science, but also creates an integralization of religious harmony, in which each of its teachings, of course, teaches ecological preservation. In other words, in the context of integration, cultural multiculturalism and religious pluralism are a necessity.

CONCLUSION

This article discovers the concept of integralistic ecological communication. Namely the concept of a communication relationship between humans and nature or the relationship between humans and their environment or the relationship between humans and

their ecology. The Qur'an calls it a spiritualist-integralistic view, not anthropocentric-integralistic. That is, an integralistic communication relationship, between theological communication (God), anthropocentric communication (human), and ecological communication (nature), or between theocentric-spiritualism communication science paradigms, anthropocentric-exclusivism communication, and cosmocentric-inclusivism communication. The relationship between the three, researchers call the communication of integralistic ecology or theo (spiritualist)-anthropo (rationalist)-cosmocentric (empirical)-integralistic.

REFERENCES

1) Abdullah, M. Amin, "Etika Tauhidik Sebagai Dasar Kesatuan Epistemologi Keilmuan Umum dan Agama: Dari Paradigma Positivistik-Sekularistik ke Arah Teoantroposentrik-Integralistik" (Tauhidik Ethics as the Basis for Epistemological Unity of General Science and Religion: From a Positivistic-Secularistic Paradigm to Theoanthropocentric-Integralistic Direction), in *Integrasi Sains-Islam: Mempertemukan Epistemologi Islam dan Sains (Science-Islam Integration: Bringing Islamic Epistemology and Science Together)*, Yogyakarta: Nuansa Aksara, 2004.
2) Arifin, Syamsul, "Agama dan Masa Depan Ekologi Manusia" (Religion and the Future of Human Ecology), in *Journal of Ulumul Qur'an*, No. 5 dan 6, Vol. V, Jakarta: tnp., 1994.
3) Abdillah, Mujiyono, *Agama Ramah Lingkungan: Perspektif al-Qur'an* (*Eco-Friendly Religion: Perspective of the Qur'an)*, Jakarta: Paramadina, 2001.
4) Afrizal, *Ibn Rusyd: Tujuh Perdebatan Utama dalam Teologi Islam* (*Ibn Rushd: Seven Major Debates in Islamic Theology)*, Jakarta: Erlangga, 2006.
5) Alexander, Efrey C., *Twenty Lectures*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
6) Ali, Mukti, "Manusia, Filsafat, dan Tuhan" (Man, Philosophy, and God), in *Dialog Manusia dan Filsafat, Budaya, dan Pembangunan (Human Dialogue and Philosophy, Culture and Development)*, Malang: YP2LPM, 1984.
7) Al-Baqi, Muhammad Fu'ad, *al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras Li Alfaz al-Qur'an al-Karim*, Beirut: Dar al-Fikr, 1981.
8) Baiquni, Achmad, "Filsafat Fisika dan al-Qur'an" (Philosophy of Physics and the Qur'an), in *Journal of Ulumul Qur'an*, No. 4, Vol 11, 1990.
9) Bagir, Haidar, dan Zainal Abidin, "Filsafat Sains-Islami: Kenyataan atau Khayalan" (Philosophy of Islamic Science: Reality or Illusion), in Mahdi Ghulsyani, *Filsafat Sains Menurut al-Qur'an (Philosophy of Science According to the Qur'an)*, Bandung: Mizan, 1988.
10) Batkin, Daniel, dan Keller, Edward A, *Environmental Studies: The Eary as a Living Planet*, Ohio: Marriel Publishing Company, 1982.
11) Bateson, Gregory, *Step to An Ecology of Mind*, ttp.: tnp., 1972.
12) Capra, Fritjof, *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture*, ttp.: tnp., t.t.
13) Chiras, Daniel D., *Environmental Science A Frame Work For Dicision Making*, Canada: The Benyamin Publishing, 1985.
14) Darmayasa, *Keagungan Sapi Menurut Weda (The Majesty of the Cow According to the Vedas)*, Jakarta: Pustaka Manikhemi, 1993.
15) Ad-Dusuqy, Sidi Syaikh Mukhtar 'Ali Muhammad, *al-Mukhtar fi Qawl al-Akhyar*, Kairo: Dar al-Mazra'ah al-Kiram, 2008.
16) Dzar, Sirajjuddin, *Konsep Penciptaan Alam Pemikiran Islam: Sains dan al-Qur'an (The Concept of Creation in Islamic Thought: Science and the Qur'an)*, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 1994.
17) Freud, Sigmund, *Memperkenalkan Psikoanalisa (Introducing Psychoanalysis)*, trans. K. Bertens, Jakarta: Gramedia, 1984.
18) Al-Faruqi, Ismail Raji, *Tawhid: Its Implication for Thought and Life*, Pensylvania: Wyncote Press, 1982.
19) Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Culture*, New York: Basic Books, t.t.
20) Held, Virginia, *Etika Moral: Pembenaran Tindakan Sosial (Moral Ethics: Justification of Social Actions)*, Jakarta: Erlangga, 1989.
21) Heibroner, Robert, *An Inquiry into the Human Prospect*, ttp.: tnp., t.t.
22) Hadi, Sudharto P., "Lingkungan Hidup dalam Perspektif Sosiologis" (Environment in a Sociological Perspective), in *Makalah Seminar Nasional: Islam dan Lingkungan Hidup (National Seminar Paper: Islam and the Environment)*, Salatiga: Fak. Tarbiyyah IAIN, 1995.
23) Jacob T., *Manusia, Ilmu, dan Teknologi (People, Science, and Technology)*, Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana, 1989.
24) Kaslan, Tahir, *Butir-butir Tata Lingkungan (Environmental Management Points)*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1991.
25) Kleden, Ignas, *Sikap Ilmiah dan Kritik Kebudayaan (Scientific Attitudes and Cultural Criticism)*, Jakarta: LP3ES, 1987.
26) Mahzar, Armahedi, *Merumuskan Paradigma Sains dan Teknologi: Revolusi Integralisme Islam (Formulating Science and Technology Paradigm: Revolution of Islamic Integralism)*, Bandung: Mizan, 2004.
27) Ma'luf, Louis, *al-Mujid fi al-Lugah wa al-Adab wa al-'Ulum*, Beirut: tnp, t.t.

28) Nasr, Seyyed Hossein, "Islam and the Environmental Crisis", in *The Islamic Quorterly*, Vol. XXXIV, t.t.
29) Odum, Eugene P., *Basic Ecology*, New York: Sounders college Publishing, 1983.
30) Poedjawijatno, *Manusia dengan Alamnya (Man with Nature)*, Jakarta: Bina Aksara, 1983.
31) Roberston, James, *The Sane Alternative: A Choice of Futures*, ttp.: River Basin Publishing Co, 1983.
32) Rahardjo, Dawam, *Eksiklopedi al-Qur'an: Tafsir Sosial Berdasarkan Konsep-konsep Kunci (Qur'anic Excyclopedia: Social Interpretation Based on Key Concepts)*, Jakarta: Paramadina, 2002.
33) Rahman, Fazlur, *Major Themes of the Qur'an*, Chicago: Islamica, 1980.
34) Suryani, Mohammad (ed.), *Lingkungan: Sumberdaya Alam dan Kependudukan dalam Pembangunan (Environment: Natural Resources and Population in Development)*, Jakarta: UI Press, 1987.
35) Suryani, *Manusia dalam Keserasian Lingkungan (Humans in Environmental Harmony)*, Jakarta: UI Press 1983.
36) Suroyo dkk, *Ensiklopedi Sains dan Kehidupan (Encyclopedia of Science and Life)*, Jakarta: Tarity Samudra Berlian, 2003.
37) Soemarwoto, Otto, *Ekologi, Lingkungan Hidup dan Pembangunan (Ecology, Environment and Development)*, Jakarta: Djambatan, 1994.
38) Soeriaatmadja, R. E., *Ilmu Lingkungan (Environmental Science)*, Bandung: ITB Bandung, 1981.
39) Salim, Emil, *Pembangunan Berwawasan Lingkungan (Environmentally Friendly Development)*, Jakarta: LP3ES, 1986.
40) Sumarwoto, Otto, *Analilis Dampak Lingkungan (Environmental Impact Analysis)*, Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1992.
41) Toruan, Raymond, "Globalisasi: Bumi Makin Panas" (Globalization: The Earth Is Getting Hotter), in *Menuju Masyarakat Baru Indonesia: Antisipasi Terhadap Tantangan Abad XXI (Towards a New Indonesian Society: Anticipation of the Challenges of the XXI Century)*, Jakarta: Gramedia, 1990.
42) Widjaja, *Ilmu Komunikasi: Pengantar Studi (Communication Studies: Introduction to the Study)*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2000.