

Representation of Indonesian Democratic Leaders by *Jamā'ah Anṣāru Tawḥīd* and *Ḥizbut Taḥrīr* as Radical Muslim Groups

Karman Karman, Ibnu Hamad
 Department of Communications
 Universitas Indonesia
 Jakarta, Indonesia
 karman61@ui.ac.id

Abstract—This study aims (1) to describe how radical-muslim groups represent Indonesian democratic leader in Indonesia; (2) to identify the implication from the way they represent system of democracy. To get these aims, we collected data, i.e., postings on the websites they managed. We focus on *Jamā'ah Anṣāru Tawḥīd* (JAT) and *Ḥizbut Taḥrīr* Indonesia (HTI) as representatives of radical-muslim groups, indicated by democracy refusal. We analyze their postings by adopting Leeuwen's model of discourse analysis. We find that JAT represent democracy as a “religion”. For JAT, democratic leaders are “Islam apostates”, “kāfir”, “taḡhūt”. Meanwhile, HTI regard democracy as an instrument for capitalists or colonialists. They regard Indonesia democratic leaders as a colonialist's cat's paw. We conclude that radical muslim groups have different perspectives and rationale in representing and delegitimizing leaders within democracy context. Language functions as a structure to oppose, delegitimize democratic leaders. Even more, the practice of language can be used to legitimize violence. For example, construction of “democracy as a religion” and “leader as a kāfir” legitimize sacred violence, e.g. terrorism.

Keywords—radical-muslim groups; delegitimization; democracy; discourse analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

Leaders in any states with a democratic system result from mechanism of general election. Indonesia as a democratic one holds general election regularly. Indonesia has held general election in 1955, 1971, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, 1997, 1999, 2004, 2009, and 2014, regional election in 2018. And, Indonesia will hold the presidential election in 2019. This election is a mechanism for realizing democratic leaders [1].

The leaders will conduct leadership: persuasive activities within social system (group, community, organization, nations) to achieve shared goals. They have an important role in changing culture and systems, and in driving organizational resources. They achieve the goals by influencing, facilitating individual and collective efforts, persuading and giving models to community members, making transformative changes, articulating and realizing the vision, and creating an environment that supports the achievement of organizational goals [2].

Because leaders are the result of a democratic process, peoples make different meaning towards leaders. This is the implication of the different construct among peoples, especially among muslim towards democracy. Some muslim accept democracy e.g., *Naḥḍatul 'Ulamā, Muḥammadiyyah*. But others reject it e.g., *Ḥizbut Taḥrīr, Jamā'ah Anṣāru Tawḥīd* [3,4].

Those accepting democracy are affixed a label to as moderate muslim or muslim with substantivism. Those disagreeing and opposing to democracy are named as fundamentalists [5,6], scripturalist [7,8], revivalist [9], literalist, “*muta'āṣibīn*”, “*mutatarrifīn*”, “right extremist” [10], or radicals. They believe that they are fighting against forces threatening their most sacred values [11]. They think of the sacred texts as God's stipulation. The texts are free from mistakes and self-interpretation, glorious, authoritative, and everlasting [12]. They fight against those who threaten their existence, fight for their life goals and identity, and fight in the name of God [13].

Two variants of the radical groups are *Jamā'ah Anṣāru Tawḥīd* and *Ḥizbut Taḥrīr Indonesia* (hereinafter referred to as JAT for the former and HTI for the latter). These groups reject democracy and delegitimize democracy leaders. This article focuses on answering research questions about “how radical-muslim groups represent democratic-leaders”. This article aims: (1) to describe how radical-muslim groups represent democratic leaders in Indonesia; (2) to identify the implication from the way they represent democracy and the leaders as a product of democratic process.

We harness perspective of linguistics (practice of language usage) in describing representation of social actor (democratic leaders) and action (e.g. leadership). Every language serves as a channel to externalize author's consciousness, ideology. Languages play a role in the constitution of social reality and individual experience. Thereupon, they are not neutral and passive in describing external reality [14-16]. Instead of transmitting message, languages transmit ideology because their function as material of ideology [17]. The answer to the question above offers a perspective in explaining the relationship between state and society.

II. METHODOLOGY

This article focuses on JAT and HTI. Those two organizations as an institution have been dissolved. But, as consciousness or ideology, their though still exist. We limit this research problem to the level of texts, namely: articles posted on their websites. Those websites belong to JAT website (<http://ansharuttauhid.com>), and HTI (<http://hizbut-tahrir.or.id>). At the present time, we identify that their websites are not active anymore. Website is communication medium in disseminating their construction towards reality of democratic leader and democratic leadership.

We collect data by searching for articles on the website using the word of "democracy" in the website search functionality. The word of "democracy" is the context of this research. Then, we sort articles to determine the ones dealing with democratic leaders. We analyze the data with a discourse analysis as introduced by Van Leeuwen [18]. His discourse analysis model is called representation of social action and representation of social actors. Leeuwen focuses on ways to investigate the representation of actions or social actors: how they are positioned within texts. This discourse analysis approach includes (1) *the strategy of exclusion*: how texts eliminate, exclude social actors or actions; and (2) *the strategy of inclusion*: how the texts present, include social actors or actions.

A. Exclusion Strategy

For Leeuwen, text eliminates social actors and social action through techniques of *suppression* and *backgrounding*. The suppression techniques exclude social actors and action in order not to be traced in any texts. Meanwhile, exclusion by the backgrounding technique leaves traces for readers (researchers) in order to detect and identify social actors and action excluded.

The suppression technique can be identified from the structure of sentences. The structure consists of: passive voice, nonfinite or infinitive clauses, removal of beneficiaries (actors who benefit from an actions), nominalization, adjective sentences, absence of participant. The backgrounding technique can be identified from the structure of elliptical sentence, nonfinite clauses, infinitive clauses, and paratactic clauses [18].

B. Inclusion Strategy

This strategy presents social actors with certain techniques. *First*, role allocation (by active or passive voice), participation by prepositions (among others, with "by" or "from"), nominalization, possessive pronoun, generalization (by assimilation and collectivization techniques) or specifications (with singularization), association / dissociation, determination and indetermination, personalization and impersonalization, and inclusion by over determination, for detail, see [18].

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. *Jamā'ah Anṣāru Tawḥīd (JAT)*

JAT made de-legitimization against democratic leaders. It's as consequence of their view towards general election. In

democratic system, general election is absolute condition in choosing leaders in any states. JAT issued a decision No.: 05 / VII / 1430, 2nd July 2009, on the presidential election of the Republic of Indonesia. This official decision was a response to the presidential election held on July 14, 2009. JAT's response are: to abandon democracy. JAT advise muslim to refer to and practice Islamic teachings perfectly.

They encouraged muslim to adopt system of *jamā'ah-wal-Imāmah* and the system of *ahlul-halli-wal-'aqdi* or leadership among muslim. JAT encouraged muslim to reject the practice of leadership on the basis of secularism, including democratic system. For JAT, Muslims should not justify democracy by manipulating Islamic teachings. JAT decided not to get involved in the agenda of election for national leadership because they regarded it did not practice Islamic system and did not uphold Islamic law.

JAT delegitimized election with a theological perspective. For them, democracy was a heresy. Therefore, they criticized muslim practicing Islam and democracy at the same time [19]. They argued that Islam and democracy were different to each other. Democracy placed the sovereignty onto the peoples and man-made law. On the contrarily, Islam placed sovereignty onto Allah on the basis of the law of Islam (Al-Quran and As-Sunnah). They disagreed because in democracy, everyone had the same right to become a representative. In Islam, the representatives are '*ulamā*' (plural Arabic word of '*ālim*' or '*alim*' to mean muslim scholars in Islamic studies). According to JAT, democracy separates religion and world or secularism, but Islam does not [20].

JAT labelled "democracy as a religion". They encouraged Muslims living in any states with democratic system to reject democracy because it was an ideology of *kāfir* [20]. They argued: democracy allowed everyone to become apostate; democracy tolerated false beliefs/religion, wickedness, and (democracy) supported permissive values [21]. Hence, according to them, implementing democracy meant recognizing institutions and principles of *kāfir*.

For JAT, democracy promulgated Islamic law or *sharī'ah* and combined "the-right" and "the-wrong", "Islam" and "*jāhiliyyah* (Arabic language for stupidity of Islamic teachings, or age of ignorance in pre-Islamic era)" [21]. They also encouraged every muslim to replace democracy with Islam by doing "*da'wah and jihād*". If having not been able to do *da'wah and jihād*, JAT obligated muslim to prepare maximum strength or emigrate to countries which allowed them to carry out the *sharī'ah* perfectly [20].

The language JAT used to representate democracy was associating democracy with belief out of Islam. JAT stated that participating in democracy mean following Judaism. JAT also named democracy with bad labels. Those labells are: "incubation of heresy", system of *kāfir*, system of vanity, *jāhiliyyah*, a mother of disbelief. Regarding democratic leader representation, JAT believed that leaders resulting from democratic process belonged to religion of democracy. This can be seen in this excerpt:

"Jamaah ansharut tauhid tidak sepi dari berbagai pressure yang dilakukan oleh pemerintah yang

mengusung agama demokrasi" (*Jamā'ah Anṣāru Tawhīd* was not free from various pressures carried out by the government which belonged to religion of democracy) [22].

JAT representates leaders (government) through website texts by using generalization technique. By this technique, we don't know the leaders (which government) they meant. Social actors were not clear. The phrase of "*religion of democracy*" informs us about JAT's belief which regards democratic leaders as non-Muslim. Democratic leaders were *murtād* (convert from religion of Islam to the one of democracy). JAT regarded democratic leaders as *taḡhūt* (object worshipped). Government servants were *murtād* as well. This is the excerpt.

"Muslims becoming government servants wholeheartedly are *murtād*, as long as they loyal to head of state (*taḡhūt*), do not regard him/her as a *kāfir*, do not hate and fight against *taḡhūt*. Instead, they defend and protect *taḡhūt*" [23].

JAT believes that the government do not create justice [21]. For them, neither muslim nor non-muslim get justice. Law that democratic leaders make is for ordinary peoples, not for rulers. JAT representates democratic leaders as actors having responsibility, playing a role in committing bad actions. The bad actions include: to open the door for lust expression and permissiveness", "to drive fractionality and disputes", "to support colonialism programs", "to divide Islam into tribalism, nationalism, small nations", "to integrate the righteousness and the vanity". JAT representates leaders negatively by technique of epithets. Democratic leaders were labelled by ill-favored epithets. They were: "despotic rulers", "foul rulers", "haughty rulers". JAT also featured leaders with bad qualities: "hypocrite", "hedonic", "arrogant", and "liar".

Leader's representation as "*murtād*" and "*kāfir*" become a foundation for JAT to legitimize or sacralize violence, e.g., terrorism. Indonesia became the target of terrorism acts on October 12, 2002 in Bali. The actors were: Amrozi, Imam Samudra / Abdul Azis, Mukhlas / Ali Ghufron. They were sentenced to death consecutively on 7th July 2003, 10th September 2003, and 2nd October 2003 by Bali high court. And, they were executed in Nusakambangan Island on 9th November 2003. However, JAT legitimized their crimes. They regarded Bali Bomb actors as "*mujāhid*" (martyr). They refused the execution of death penalty [24]. Instead, JAT represented the Indonesian leaders as wrongdoers because of making decision opposing God's law. On the contrary, they regarded Bali bombers as "their Muslim brothers" [24]. On the contrary, JAT supported the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria or ISIS (Jihadist militant organization in Syria and Iraq) and *Jabhaḥ Nuṣrah*. Both of them are radical group in The Middle East. JAT also recognized ISIS as a khilafah and persuaded others to acknowledge it.

The word of "brother" indicates representation with the honorification technique. It indicates that JAT are appreciative, proud of Bali Bombers. JAT have a sense of empathy, feeling of in-group, solidarity towards Bali Bombers. For JAT, terrorism is not a crime or violence but it is a part of sacred

violence. We argue that ideology of "democracy as a religion" is the base for sacralizing violence, including terrorism.

This is in line with JAT method in achieving their goal. Their method is "*Da'wah and jihād*". *Da'wah* or proselytizing is attempt to improve behavior in order to be in line with Islam. *Jihād* is persistence in carrying out Islam or holy war. If cannot do that, they suggested muslim to make *i'dād* (preparation) for "*da'wah*" and "*jihād*" or "*hijrah*" (move to somewhere in order to practice Islam perfectly) [20].

B. *Ḥizbut Tahrīr Indonesia (HTI)*

HTI legitimated Indonesian democratic leader as a consequence of delegitimizing the general election. HTI's view towards democracy is reflected in these articles, posted on their website. Those article titles are: "*Demokrasi Sistem Rusak, Menghasilkan Kerusakan* (Democracy is a Damaged System, Produces Damage)" (21 April 2014), "*Pemilu, Sulap Demokrasi Kelabui Rakyat*" (General Election, Magic of Democracy in the Deception of the People) (23 April 2014), "*Harapan Semu Demokrasi*" (Pseudo Hope of Democracy) (8 Mei 2014), "*Selama Menerapkan Demokrasi Kapitalisme Liberal Jokowi JK Tetap Antek Penjajah!*" (As long as Applying the liberal-capitalism Democracy, Jokowi-JK remains colonialist stooge!) (29 Oktober 2014), "*Ganti Demokrasi Dengan Syariah dan Khilafah Untuk Indonesia Lebih Baik*" (Replace Democracy with Sharia and Caliphate for Indonesia Better) (11 November 2014).

There are two perspectives on which HTI's argument based in repudiating the general election: theology and political-economy. From the theological perspective, HTI views (*first*) democracy as a "*kufur system*". Hence, all process and elements of democracy are *kufur*. For HTI, the election contradicts Islam, Allah law. Therefore, democracy is illicit to adopt, practice, and disseminate [25]. HTI did not recognize the islamization of democracy. They regarded democracy as a form of "*shirīq*" (polytheism). Democracy makes humans as competitors of Allah because of making rules for human life [26].

In the perspective of political economy, HTI rejects democracy system because the election is an instrument for the rulers and the businessmen, instead of "*from, by, and for the people*". Ruler's policies always get influences from the businessmen because they sponsor the rulers in the general election. The policy will always support interests of the political elites and the capital owners. Election is only a tool to turn political investment back and keep in power [27].

In the election, politician distributes money without violating the election rules, instead of fighting for programs. As a result, corruptors keep to arise because of having to return capital and profits. The corruption will be something reasonable and keep to occur. Election is only a tool for interests of the western countries. The interests are secularization and liberalization of the Islamic world, colonialism and efforts to distance muslim from Islam.

The implication and consequence of the general election rejection is the rejection democratic leaders. HTI considers the Indonesia democratic leaders to be "the lackey of invaders",

and "the corrupts" so that they will not make betterment for Indonesia. They are only imprisoned in neoliberalism which sided with the capitalists rather than the people [28]. According to HTI, the deterioration of Islamic countries results from bad political conditions, due to the control and occupation of the Western countries. Although the Islamic governments appear to be independent, they are subject to *qiyādah fiqriyyah* of capitalism. Hence, for HTI, the problem of democracy is actually the problem of *kufur*, not as simple as election for rulers [28].

HTI's stance as illustrated above cannot be separated from what they called *mabda* as explained by An-Nabhani (founder of *Ḥizbut Tahrīr*). *Mabda* is "*aqīdah 'aqliyyah*": the foundation of thought which gives birth to the rules of overall life and becomes the ideological bond. It functions as a *qiyādah fiqriyyah* (intellectual leadership) and *qāidah fiqriyyah* (principles and system of thought). *Mabda* determines how individuals interpret reality (e.g., economy, politic, social, culture). Accordingly, *mabda* can be named as an ideology, worldview, or *weltanschauung* (in Germany).

Meanwhile, HTI's methods are *-tathqīf* (Arabic language for formation and improvement of cadres), *tafā'ul ma'a al-ummah* (interacting with the *umma*), *istilām al-ḥukmi* (power acceptance). Criticism of HTI is the effort to build awareness and public opinion about Islamic thoughts and laws. For this purpose, HTI participates in upheaval of thought: opposing ideology, rules and ideas of *kufur*, perverted creed, erroneous understandings, explaining the falsehood of the thought and its incompatibility with Islam [29].

IV. CONCLUSION

JAT and HTI understand democratic leadership in theological discourse. Their de-legitimization against leaders is the consequence of their de-legitimation of democratic system, including general elections. JAT sees general elections as a "religion of democracy", a form of "*kāfir*", and "*murtād*". On the contrary, HTI regards general election as a form of *kufur*, a tool for the sake of the Western country's interests. It means that HTI regards muslim participating in general election as muslim. The word of *kufur* describes attitude of having not/little thankfulness to God. They with *kufur* are Muslim. For example, Muslims have much wealth but do not share to others in need. Consequently, because believing that those accepting democracy are *kāfir*, (*first*) JAT legitimizes violence and crime against them as something sacred. JAT supports and makes legitimization of sacred violence (terrorist regarded as *mujāhid* (Arabic word for a martyr) and their brother). *Second*, JAT closed the door of dialogue with out-of-group because unwillingness to interact with *kāfir*. But, HTI opened for dialogue. Dialogue is an opportunity for disseminating thought of HTI. It is in compliance with one of their method: "*tafā'ul ma'a al-ummah*"

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I write this article while attending a PhD program at Universitas Indonesia. Therefore, I would like to thank to my institution (research and development board for human

resources in communication and information, ministry of information and communication) for funding me.

REFERENCES

- [1] BAPPENAS and UNDP, Measuring Democracy In Indonesia 2009 Indonesia Democracy Index. Jakarta, 2016.
- [2] C. Harrison, Leadership Theory and Research: A Critical Approach to New and Existing Paradigms. Hamilton, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- [3] N. Lestari, "Wacana Demokrasi dalam Public Sphere Komunikasi Politik di Organisasi Islam Indonesia (Analisis Wacana Demokrasi di HTI, FPI, Muhammadiyah, dan NU)," 2014.
- [4] H. Haqqani, "Islamists and Democracy: Cautions from Pakistan," J. Democr., vol. 24, no. 2, 2013.
- [5] M. Castells, The Information Age: Economy, Society And Culture Volume II, The Power of Identity, 1st ed. Blackwell: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [6] S. Huntington, Gelombang Demokratisasi, 3rd ed. Jakarta: PT Pustaka Utama Grafiti, 1995.
- [7] R.W. Liddle, "Media Dakwah Scripturalism: One Form of Islamic Political Thought and Action," in Toward A New Paradigm: Recent Development in Indonesian Islamic Thought, M.R. Woodward, Ed. Tempe-Arizona: Arizona University Press, 1996.
- [8] R.W. Liddle, Leadership and culture in Indonesian Politics. New South Wales, Australia: Allen and Unwin Pty Ltd, 1996.
- [9] J.L. Esposito, ISLAM: The Straight Path, 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- [10] Y.I. Mahendra, Modernisme dan Fundamentalisme Dalam Politik Islam, Perbandingan Partai Masyumi (Indonesia) dan Partai Jama'at-i-Islami (Pakistan), 1st ed. Jakarta: Paramadina, 1999.
- [11] K. Armstrong, The battle for God, 1st ed. New York: f Random House, Inc., 2000.
- [12] R.W. Hood, P.C. Hill, and W.P. Williamson, The Psychology of Religious Fundamentalism. New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2005.
- [13] T. Taher, Radikalisme Agama, 1st ed. Jakarta: Pusat Pengkajian Islam dan Masyarakat (PPIM), IAIN Jakarta, 1998.
- [14] N. Edley, "Unravelling social constructionism," Theory Psychol., vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 433-441, 2001.
- [15] V.N. Vološinov, Marksizm i filosofija Jazyka / Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. New York and London: Seminar Press, Inc., 1973.
- [16] K.J. Gergen, "The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology," Am. Psychol., vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 266-275, 1985.
- [17] M.M. Bakhtin, Speech Gere and Other Late Essays, 1st ed. Texas: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- [18] T.V. Leeuwen, Discourse and practice: new tools for critical discourse analysis. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc, 2008.
- [19] JAT, "Berpijak di Atas Kebenaran Hadapi Kaum Kuffar," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://ansharuttauhid.com/read/sariyah/488/khutbah-iedul-fithri-1435-h-berpijak-%0Adi-atas-kebenaran/#sthash.mFIVSWJQ.dpuf>.
- [20] JAT, "Sikap JAT tentang Demokrasi," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://ansharuttauhid.com/read/publikasi/140/sikap-jat-tentang-demokrasi/#sthash.wDKEgOIH.dpuf>.
- [21] JAT, "Dampak Kerusakan Demokrasi," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://ansharuttauhid.com/read/sariyah/431/dampak-kerusakan-demokrasi-khutbah-jumat-edisi-006/#sthash.bPV06SE9.dpuf>.
- [22] JAT, "JAT Siap Hadapi Isu Pembubaran!," 2011. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.ansharuttauhid.com/read/publikasi/275/jat-siap-hadapi-isu-pembubaran/#sthash.qthXWcgX.dpuf>.
- [23] JAT, "Pernyataan Sikap JAT Terhadap Umat Islam Yang Menolak Khilafah Islamiyyah," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://ansharuttauhid.com/read/publikasi/491/pernyataan-sikap-jat>.

- [terhadap-umat-islam-yang-menolak-khilafah-islamiyyah/#sthash.tQMbgOEL.dpuf](#)
- [24] A.B. Baasyir, "Penolakan eksekusi mati Trio Mujahid (pernyataan jamaah Ansharu Tauhid Tanggal 30 Dzulhijjah 1429/29 Desember 2008 Tentang Penolakan Eksekusi mati Mujahid Bali)," 2008.
- [25] HTI, "Pemilu, Sulap Demokrasi Kelabui Rakyat," 2014.
- [26] HTI, "Harapan Semu Demokrasi," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://hizbut-tahrir.or.id/2014/05/08/hip-kendal-harapan-semu-demokrasi/>.
- [27] HTI, "Demokrasi Sistem Rusak, Menghasilkan Kerusakan," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://hizbut-tahrir.or.id/2014/04/21/hti-banjarbaru-demokrasi-sistem-rusak-menghasilkan-kerusakan/>.
- [28] HTI, "Ganti Demokrasi Dengan Syariah dan Khilafah Untuk Indonesia Lebih Baik," 2014. [Online]. Retrieved from: <http://hizbut-tahrir.or.id/category/agenda-dakwah/liputan-kegiatan/>.
- [29] I.D. Tsaqofah, "Tahapan Dakwah Hizbut Tahrir," 2017. [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://tsaqofah.id/tahapan-dakwah-hizbut-tahrir/>.