



Available online:

<http://journal.imla.or.id/index.php/arabi>

Arabi : Journal of Arabic Studies, 6 (2), 2021, 167-178

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24865/ajas.v6i2.413>

SEMIOTICS DECONSTRUCTIVE STUDY TOWARDS ARABIC LOANWORDS ON JIHAD IN THE BOOK *AKU MELAWAN TERORIS*

Sukron Kamil, Sri Hidayati

Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding E-mail: sukronkamil@uinjkt.ac.id

Abstract

*Although terrorism belongs to many ideologies and religions in the world, now, terrorism in the name of Islam has swept across many regions of the world, from East to West, and has also been widely studied. However, studies on its relationship with Arabic language are lacking or even non-existent. Therefore, this article bases its exploration on a literature review methodology with a semiotic structuralism theory approach. This research found that based on Imam Samudra's book, *Jl/NII* terrorist circles use Arabic loanword far more than mainstream moderate Islam, especially in social issues. This shows that the more Arabic loanwords, especially in Islamic socio-political texts, the more fundamentalist they are. In Imam Samudra's book, a number of Arabic words were also found which were given new connotations of a jihadist/terrorist fundamentalist nature. In addition, Imam Samudra's understanding of many Arabic loanwords such as *jihād fī sabīlillāh* (jihad in the way of Allah) is also wrong because it is not based on the context of the text and its social context as well as a standard methodology of interpretation in Islam. His jihad understanding cannot be accounted for in Islamic science and language.*

Keywords: Arabic loanword, terrorism, text and context, jihad

Abstrak

Meski terorisme milik banyak ideologi dan agama di dunia, kini terorisme atas nama Islam telah menyapu banyak wilayah di dunia, dari Timur hingga Barat, dan juga sudah banyak dikaji. Namun, kajian dengan melihat relasinya dengan bahasa Arab kurang atau bahkan tidak ada. Karenanya, topik itu menjadi fokus artikel ini dengan berdasarkan metodologi kajian pustaka berbasis pendekatan teori strukturalisme semiotika. Riset ini menemukan bahwa berdasarkan buku Imam Samudra, di kalangan teroris *Jl/NII* penggunaan kata serapan/ambilan Arab jauh lebih banyak ketimbang di kalangan Islam moderat yang *mainstream*, terutama dalam isu-isu sosial. Ini menunjukkan bahwa semakin banyak kata serapan/ambilan Arab terutama dalam tek-teks sosial politik keislaman, maka semakin fundamentalis. Dalam buku Imam Samudra ini juga ditemukan sejumlah kata ambilan Arab yang diberi makna konotasi baru yang bersifat fundamentalis jihadis. Juga menemukan bahwa pemahaman Imam Samudra atas banyak kata ambilan Arab seperti *jihād fī sabīlillāh* (di jalan Allah) juga keliru karena tidak berdasarkan konteks teks dan konteks sosialnya juga metodologi tafsir yang standar/baku. Pemahaman jihadnya tidak bisa dipertanggungjawabkan secara ilmu keislamaan dan bahasa.

Kata Kunci: kata serapan Arab, terorisme, teks dan konteks, jihad

Introduction

As can be read in various kinds of literatures, terrorism is a non-war criminal act of violence to spread panic (widespread intimidation) and damage vital objects, either for political motives against a state or for its own interests (to obtain ransom), which targets innocent civilians, and often the victims are mass. Perpetrators can be individuals, and can also be sub-national groups or clandestine agents (Kuper and Kuper, 2000, p. 1091, Purwawidada 2014, p. 13).

In that sense, terrorism in world history belongs to many extreme (excessive) ideologies and religions. In terrorism, therefore, there is no single political ideology and no single extreme religion that dominates the use of terrorism. In fact, terrorism is generally (motivated) secular. According to Mustafa Akyol (2014, pp. 182-184), the emergence of Islamic terrorism, if not repetition, bears a resemblance to Jewish terrorism when the territory was occupied by the Romans in the past (around 70 AD). In the face of Roman colonialism, the Jews were divided into four. There were Hellenic Jews (Sadducees) who adopted the Greco-Roman language, manners, culture, including its debauchery. They were considered by other Jews as traitors. Similar to full-blooded Muslim secularists such as Mustafa Kemal (secular dictators in contemporary Muslim countries). There are also Essenes who leave the world to get closer to God (similar to Islamic Sufis) who are anti-politics, do not want to be involved with the world. There are also Pharisee Jews who refuse to cooperate, such as contemporary Islamic conservatives, and some of them become Zealots, such as contemporary Islamic jihadist terrorists/fundamentalists. They were part of the Pharisees, but in a radical version who carried out a terrorist-patterned armed resistance against the Roman rulers and their Jewish collaborators. They were also known as the *Sicarii* (people with knives), because of the knives they kept in their robes, they used to stab soldiers, Roman officials, and their collaborators at public gatherings and then disappear without a trace. One of the victims was the Jewish Priest Jonathan.

Although there is no basis in the basic texts of Islam, let alone the random massacre of innocent civilians, lately, the most striking terrorism is terrorism in the name of Islam. Terrorism in the name of Islam continues to grow, even though the war against global terrorism has been going on for more than 10, even 20 years. Islamic terrorist attacks swept the world, from North Africa to Southeast Asia. From Western Europe to North America, as seen from the various events that befell the world. From the events of 9/11 in 2001 that hit New York, USA, the Bali bombings (12/10/2002 and 1/10/2005), Madrid (13/3/2004), London (7/7/2005), and Paris (13/10/2015) (Azra, 2020, p. 44). It also reaches Casablanca, Madrid, Istanbul, Riyadh, Jakarta, and finally Poso.

The most shocking and received the attention of the mass media/world of course the attack on the World Trade Center building and the Pentagon Building in the United States on September 11, 2001, above. Called shocking, because the terrorism incident on September 11, 2001 was an event that killed more than 3,000 civilians. The size and scope of its operations are unprecedented in the world (Esposito and Mogahed, 2008, p. 93, 126-127). Next is the terrorist bombing in Legian, Bali. It is also called shaking because the Bali bombings resulted in the death of around 186 people (other sources say 200 people) and more than 300 people injured. International mass media, such as CNN, as quoted by *TEMPO* Magazine, reported that the Bali bombings were carried out by "the al-Qaidah cell in Indonesia", led by Imam Samudra --whose book is the object of research in this article-- and also Muchlas, the supreme leader of Jamah Islamiah (JI/NII [Islamic State of Indonesia]) in Southeast Asia at that time (Gatra 2005; Fahrudin, 2008; Djelantik, 2010, p. 3; Solahudin, 2011, p. 266).

Academically, of course, there are many books or scientific articles that discuss Islamic terrorism, both from Indonesia and abroad, both in the perspective of social science and Islam. However, there are not many studies that link Islamic typology of terrorism with their language practices such as Arabic, either complete or only Arabic loanwords (Van Dam, 2010, p. 218). In fact, there doesn't seem to be any at all. Therefore, this article wants to discuss the language of its relation to the terrorist understanding of jihad. Due to the limited scope of the study, this article only limits

its case studies to the Indonesian Islamic State organization (NII) or later known as JI (Jamaah Islamiyah) as its branch/splinter.¹ The focus is on Arabic loanwords in the book *Aku Melawan Teroris* (I Against Terrorists) by Imam Samudra, the main perpetrator of the Bali bombing above. He is a member of NII/JI, an alumnus of Afghanistan's war against the Soviet Union.

As one of the movements that want to return to the teachings of the Qur'an and Hadith and follow the practice of the early Islamic orthodox (*as-Salaf as-Shālih*), the use of Arabic loanwords has become an integral part of NII/JI. Apart from showing the identity of the salafi/orthodox religious movement, Arabic is also often referred to as the language of religion. In fact, there is a kind of effort to refract the use of Arabic in daily life among them, especially the elite. This is because some circles, especially the salafi, require Muslims to master the Arabic language. Its function is to be able to understand the Qur'an and Sunnah/hadith in Arabic language as the main sources of Islam correctly. Of course, also the factor of Arabic as the language of the Prophet Muhammad as a prototype and the belief that Arabic as the language of the Muslims in heaven also has an effect, as mentioned in the hadith.

In general, as will be discussed later, in the NII/JI, many Arabic loanwords indicate the identity, religious mindset and activities of their movement as Islamic terrorists/jihadists. Among the words that most often appear are the words: *jihād*, *qitāl*, *i'dād (isti'dād)*, *istisyhād*, and *hākimiyyah*. Most, if not all, of these Arabic words in moderate mainstream Islam are unknown/popular.

The use of Arabic loanwords can also be found in their social interactions and in books that are used by members, or books that reflect NII/JI, or notes written by members. One of the books that can be used as a source to confirm the assumption is the notebook written by Imam Samudra *Aku Melawan Teroris* (I Fight Terrorists). This book is considered quite representative, because it was written by one of the figures/members of the NII fraction, namely JI, who was quite phenomenal. He was the main actor in the Bali bombing above.

The question that can be raised is: what is the difference between the Arabic loanwords taken by the terrorists and the Arabic loanwords taken by the moderates of Islam who are the mainstream Islamic society? What do they understand about Arabic loanwords especially *jihād* based on the context of the text and its social context, and can their jihad understanding be justified (correctly) in an academic standard of Islamic science and language?

Method

The basis of this article is library research, especially the book by Imam Samudra. Later they will be compared/conflicted with academic books on Islamic studies, both their recognized teachings and social practices to see their accuracy based on a study of Arabic loanwords in the book. The approach/theory used is the structuralisme of semiotic theory, namely the semiotic theory of Roland Barthes (1915-1980). It sees explicitly the relation between *signifiant* (language/signifier) and *signifie* (meaning/signifier) in two systems, namely: (a) primary system, when the sign is produced and understood at the first level (called denotation). (b). The secondary system, when the sign is developed in terms of its expression (metalanguage) and at the time the sign receives new content as a result of the expansion of the content (called connotation). There is only one primary system, while the secondary system has two types, namely connotation, both in scientific and literary language, and metalanguage in the terms of science and technology. This secondary system develops

¹ NII is a religious movement that idealizes the form of an Islamic state (Islamic theocracy), for the sake of upholding God's sovereignty, through His laws. From its establishment in 1949 to 1962, NII openly fought against the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). However, since 1962, he has chosen to go underground to avoid being targeted and pursued by government intelligence. They move by a cell system (*shaf* [row]/*usrah* [smallest family]). Called NII or JI (Jamaah Islamiyah), because JI is a splinter group of NII in a new form which was founded by Abdullah Sungkar while living in Malaysia in 1992 (See Alchaidar, 2008, pp. 17-18, <http://en.wikipedia.org>, 2013, Kamil, 2013, pp. 204-205 Mataharitimoer, 2007, Purwawidada, 2014, p. 50-53, Mbai, 2014, pp. 87-92, Abbas, 2005, pp. 68, 75).

in a society called Barthes as a myth (Barthes, 1986, Trifonas, 2001, Noth, 1990, Hoed, 2011, and Kurniawan, 2001, pp. 66-71).

Roland Barthes' semiotics celebrated the plurality of meanings of a text and proclaimed the death of the author. In the discovery of connotative meaning (second, third, and so on level meanings), according to him, it is individual and there is no single method. A singular approach to meaning is an unproductive repressive method. Although Barthes' semiotics celebrates the plurality of understandings, it does not mean that it does not provide signs in order that in the search for second-level meanings one does not lose direction and footing. Therefore, there is no confusion of meaning. He suggested that text reviewers should rely on the text itself. First of all, the text must be divided into several *lexia* (certain reading units). *Lexia* can be one word, several words, a sentence, a paragraph, or several paragraphs. Then, analyzing the *lexia* from the primary semiotic side (first level) and then proceeding to the second level semiotic analysis based on the text context and the social context of the text. This is because semiotics is also often referred to as semiotic structuralism as one of the theories of post-structuralism which emphasizes the study of the structural elements of language and its coherence (text as a unified whole), as well as its social context (Barthes, 1986, Barthes et al. 2003, pp. 87-93, Trifonas, 2001, and Noth, 1990).

Result and Discussion

Relation of Arabic Loanwords with Terrorist Jihad Understanding

As mentioned above, in order to see the relation of Arabic loanwords words in the NII/JI body with its Islamic pattern of terrorism/jihadist/terrorist fundamentalism, the reference source used for analysis in this article is a notebook written by Imam Samudra *Aku Melawan Teroris* (I Fight Terrorists). This book is considered quite representative, because it was written by a phenomenal figure/member of the NII (JI) fraction. He had carried out the Bali bombing in 2001. This book was written after the Bali bombing tragedy. The contents of this book are the defense of the author as one of the perpetrators of the bombing (which the mass media and academic books call a “terrorist”); ideological reasons for carrying out the bombing; doctrines, heart complaints; and defenses against these actions. This book consists of 4 chapters. Although the contents of the book are divided into several chapters, they are written in a less/unsystematic way. Many of the sub-chapters of the book are not in accordance with the main topic of the chapter. In fact, they seem to overlap. Until the end of the research on which this article is based, no religious books have been found that serve as references for NII/JI.

From the 4 chapters, the most interesting is the third chapter as the core chapter of the book. The third part of the book is entitled “Imam Samudra Against Terrorists”. This chapter tells the background and resistance to the Zionists, America and their allies through the Bali bombings. This section contains many defenses against the bombings that he carried out as a jihad, the reasons for Bali as the target area/location of the bombings, as well as self-defense due to the large number of civilians who were victims. In accordance with the main theme of this chapter, in this section, many Arabic loanwords are used, which show his side as a jihadist/radical/terrorist Islamic fundamentalist. Almost the entire contents of this section tell about *jihād*, its background, justification for jihad in the form of bombings, and *istisyhād* (looking for martyrdom).

The use of Arabic loanwords in this chapter is more than the previous chapter, which is 62 Arabic loanwords. Of the total Arabic loanwords used, about 85% of them have the meaning of jihadist/terrorist Islamic fundamentalism. In fact, the part of the word which actually has a general meaning changes its connotative meaning to mean jihadist/terrorist fundamentalist, when it is used together with other words which mean jihadist fundamentalist. This means that the meaning of the Arabic loanwords used is determined by the words before and after it as a consequence of the meaning of the sentence in the context of the syntactic structure (*naḥwu*), not because of the lexical meaning (*mu'jam*/denotative meaning) and morphology (*sharaf*). An example is the word *fardhu'ain* (mandatory for everyone). This word is a word commonly used to refer denotatively to things that

must be done by all Muslims as individual obligations, for example, the words *shalāt* (five daily prayers), *shaum* (fasting), and *zakāt fithrah*, which are also used by mainstream Islamic moderates. When the law of *fardhu'ain* is given to the word jihad, the meaning contained in the syntactical semantics of the word becomes a jihadist/terrorist fundamentalist (Samudra, 2004, p. 128).

Among the Arabic loanwords in the third part of this book are: *bid'ah* (fake deeds that the Prophet did not commit), *mustadh'affin* (weak people), *ma'shūm* (protected from sin), *marḥalah* (levels/phases), *tarbiyah jihādiyah* (education jihad), *kafful yadd* (holding hands/self), *jihad hujūmī* (offensive jihad), *jihad difā'i* (defensive jihad), *istisyhād* (searching for martyrdom), *istimāt* (looking for death), *masyrū'* (become part of the shari'ah), *qā'idīn* (those who sit down, do not join the war), and *qishash* (revenge).

The last chapter of the book contains the author's notes on prison, patience, heaven and other loose notes about experiences of getting miracles, God's greatness, reconstruction, hacking, and others. In this chapter there are about 37 Arabic loanwords that are used. About 70% of the words have a denotative meaning indicating jihadist fundamentalism, and some of them have a general meaning. Among the Arabic loanwords used are: *mujāhidīn* (people who wage jihad), *al-ḥaq* (truth), *mubthilīn* (perpetrators of wrongdoing), *infāq fī sabīlillāh* (donate in way of Allah), *munāfiq* (hypocrites), *shābiriin* (patients), *bid'ah* (fabricated deeds that the Prophet did not do), *ilhādiyah* (atheism), *kāfir* (a disbeliever), *'uzlah* (isolate oneself to get closer to Allah), *thāgūt* (devil), *al-akh* (brother), *furqān* (differentiation between right and wrong), *zhālim* (an arbitrary person), *riyādḥah* (spiritual exercise), and others (Samudra, 2004).

From the title of the book *Aku Melawan Teroris* (I Fight Terrorists), the nuances of jihadist/terrorist fundamentalism can be clearly felt, especially when viewed from the connotation meaning as the second meaning and so on. Therefore, *jihad fī sabīlillāh* (in the way of Allah) in the sense of the denotation of "war" and in the sense of the connotation of "acts of terrorism" becomes the central issue in this book, namely as a war against the unbelievers (America and allies) which he called terrorists, through the bombing in Bali. And the word *kāfir* (unbeliever) is interpreted in a new political connotation according to its jihad/terrorism agenda, namely the Zionists, officials, military, and citizens of the United States and its allies [collaborators]). There are so many verses and hadiths which are interpreted literally regarding the war orders which became the basis and defense of religion in the Bali bombings. Verses that are used as references include: QS: At-Taubah: 5: "*Dan bunuhlah kaum musyrikīn itu dimana saja kamu jumpai mereka*" ("And kill the *musyrikīn* (polytheists) wherever you find them," and also QS: At-Taubah: 29: "*Perangilah orang-orang yang tidak beriman kepada Allah dan tidak (pula) kepada hari kemudian*" ("Fight those who do not *īmān* (believe) in Allah and not (also) to the hereafter") (Samudra, 2004).

The two translations of the verse—which contain the two Arabic loanword—if analyzed based on semiotics which emphasize meaning based on the context of the text and its social context, it is very clear that Imam Samudra was interpreted and understood scripturally/literally. Especially the Arabic word *musyrikīn* (polytheists) and the word "do not *īmān* (believe) in Allah". And that means literally non-Muslims in general, especially America and its allies, including its civilians. The two verses are understood by Imam Samudra as they are, according to the meaning of denotation (lexical/dictionary meaning). The two translations of these verses whose original Arabic texts are not understood by taking into account the context of the text of the verse, namely the relationship between the texts of the verses of the Qur'an, both those that are close to the two verses above and those that are far away. Therefore, the understanding of the two verses is not in accordance with the science of interpretation and also the standard *ushūl fiqh* (methodology for determining Islamic law), which in Islam/Arabic tradition is also part of Arabic/Islamic linguistics (Versteegh, 2020).

In the perspective of these two Islamic sciences, a verse or text of the Qur'an is not seen as a stand-alone verse or text. It does not mean just because of himself alone. All the texts of the Qur'an as a coherent text, as an inseparable unit. Moreover, the text of the verse is close, before and after the quoted text. In the language of the science of interpretation in Islam, it is called *manāsabah al-*

āyāt (the compatibility of verses in perfect sentences and between verses). Therefore, the correct interpretation of a verse or a text of the Qur'an must be done by interpreting it with other verses in the Qur'an, both near and far. In the science of interpretation in Islam, it is known as *tafsīr al-āyāt bi al-āyāt*. In modern linguistics, the theory that sees the text as a coherent whole is known as the theory of structuralism (*binā'iyyah*) (Hakim, n.d; al-Mahalli, n.d; Hanafie, 1989; al-Qatthan, 1998; ash-Shiddiqy, 1954; Tabatabai, 1990, p. 31; Versteegh, 2001; Kamil, 2012). Without seeing that the entire text of the Qur'an is a coherent text, then one verse with another verse in the Qur'an can conflict with each other, as mentioned in QS an-Nisa/4: 82. Islam also become inconsistent with space and time (not *shāliḥ li-kulli zamān wa makān*).

Islamic extremists/terrorists such as Imam Samudra like to quote war verses such as the two verses of the QS. at-Tawbat above, but not accompanied by the verse of the Qur'an's urging for peace which is listed as accompanying almost every verse of war, both before and after. The two verses quoted by Imam Samudra above, should be understood by looking at the structure of the previous verse, namely QS. at-Taubah/9 verse 4, just before QS. at-Taubah/9:5 quoted. In QS. at-Taubah/9 verse 4 is literally called, war does not apply to non-Muslims who do not cancel the peace agreement, by not being hostile to or fighting against Muslims. And such an understanding is in line with the sound of the QS. al-Mumtahanah/60: 8 as a verse that becomes the interpretation of QS at-Taubah/9:5/29 quoted by Imam Samudra, even though QS. 60:8 is located not next to each other, because the Qur'an interprets one another. QS. 60:8 it states that Muslims have no problem (not forbidden) to do good and fair to non-Muslims who do not fight and expel them, even in another verse it is recommended.

QS. at-Taubah/9:5 (29) quoted by Imam Samudra above should also be understood by looking at the previous verse as well, namely QS. at-Taubah/9 verse 1. QS. at-Taubah/9: 1 states that the severance of the peaceful relationship of Allah and His Messenger with non-Muslims by allowing them to be fought by Muslims, because they are inconsistent in not being hostile to/fighting Muslims. QS. at-Taubah containing permission to fight came down when the Prophet and his companions returned from the Battle of Tabuk (area around Jordan) against non-Muslim Roman powers in (631 AD) (as-Shabuni, 2001, p. 481). Considering that the Romans withdrew from the Tabuk war because of the size of the Muslim army, the war situation with them (the Roman powers) which at that time was centered in Syria and Egypt had not ended with peace. So, the two verses quoted by Imam Samudra were born in a war situation.

These two verses were also born after the liberation/conquest (*fath*) of the city of Mecca from the hands of the Quraysh in the year 630 AD, because they canceled the Hudaibiyah peace agreement (628 AD) unilaterally. Also after the Battle of Khandaq (627 AD) in which the Jews of Banu Quraizhah canceled the agreement of peaceful alliance with the Prophet according to the Medina Charter by treason through their siding with the Quraysh, the invaders of the Prophet, as previously done by Banu Nadhir. Then, the Jews of Banu Quraizhah were also fought by the Prophet and his companions, because their betrayal was carried out when the Prophet was caught in the attack of the main enemy of the Quraysh by conspiring with them (Haikal, 1988, pp. 337-430). So, the social context and also the context of the text coherence (*munāsabah al-āyāt*) of the two verses quoted by Imam Samudra are the unilateral cancellation of the peace agreement by non-Muslims by fighting the Prophet described in QS at-Taubah verse 1-4, according to the reality of Islamic history above.

Imam Samudra's erroneous way of understanding the two verses of the Qur'an related to the war above is of course not something strange. What he does is the same as other terrorists who like to quote, for example, QS an-Nisa /4: 89, without being matched by the verse after it (Surah an-Nisa/4: 90). In the last verse that the terrorists did not pay attention to, among others, the verse reads: "If they leave you, don't fight you, and bring peace to you, Allah will not make a way for you to hurt (war)" (Armstrong, 2018, p. 55). Or they like to quote QS. al-Anfal/8:60 which ordered the Muslims to make preparations for war, but did not continue with the verse after, QS. al-Anfal/8: 61. QS. al-Anfal/8:61 reads: "However, if they tend to peace, then accept it and put your trust in Allah".

Because it does not look at the social context of the verse, apart from the context between texts/verses, Imam Samudra's jihad understanding is also not standardized based on the science of interpretation in Islam and standard methodology of Islamic law. In these two disciplines, it is stated that in order to understand the text of the Qur'an and also the hadith, one must also know the socio-cultural and political context, and even the economy. This necessity is known as the necessity of mastering *asbāb an-nuzūl* (the causes of the revelation of the Qur'an) and *asbāb al-wurūd* (the causes of the birth of the hadith). By mastering both, it will appear that the verses of the Qur'an and hadith were not born in a vacuum, but have a socio-cultural, even political and economic background. According to A. Hanafi, without knowing *asbāb an-nuzūl*, a reviewer of the linguistic text of the Qur'an (as well as its translation) such as Imam Samudra could not grasp the true meaning of the verse, it could even lead to doubts or disputes regarding the verse of the Qur'an. In fact, if what is meant by a broader social background, then the language text of the verses of the Qur'an and hadith may not be explained according to the logic of the Qur'an itself, namely the logic of the public good (Hakim, No Year, al-Mahalli, No Year, Hanafie, 1989, al-Qatthan, 1998, ash-Shiddiqy, 1954, and Kamil, 2012).

If it is based on the standard methodology of interpreting the Qur'an above, it will be concluded that 100% different from the understanding of Imam Samudra in his book. In Islam, jihad in the sense of armed contact is permissible. However, in Islam, jihad in the sense of war is allowed only as an emergency way. Jihad must be allowed, if it is for self-defense. In essence, Muslims are not allowed to wage war (Surah al-Baqarah/2: 190), because war is basically evil. Fighting is only allowed to avoid persecution (Surah Al-Baqarah/2: 191, 217), so that there is no more *fitnah* in the sense of chaos (not applying justice and the legal system [Surah Al-Baqarah/2: 192), or to preserve civilized values (Surah an-Nisa/4:75, QS al-Hajj/22:39-40 [protecting defenseless civilians as well as religious freedom]).

Because of the misunderstanding of the two main verses above, Imam Samudra's other understanding in the accompanying book is also wrong. For Imam Samudra and his fellow JI members, the Bali Bombings were an attempt at *jihad fī sabīlillāh* (fighting in the way of Allah), an Arabic loanword. His conception of jihad refers to the notion (connotation) of *syar'i* jihad, namely jihad which means war against unbelievers who are fighting Islam and the Muslims. In carrying out this jihad, they refer to what he calls *Salaf ash-Shāliḥ* (early Islamic orthodox/companions of the Prophet) regarding the prescribed jihad, where in Islam there are *marḥaliyyah* (stages/phases). His views on the stages of jihad refer to *Tarbiyah Jihādiyyah* books, JI handbooks, most of which are lectures by Sheikh Abdullah Azzam (a figure of Hizb ut-Tahrīr). *Marḥalah* jihad, for him, consists of 4 (four) stages and one of the 4 stage is stage/phase of refraining from fighting (*kaff al-yadd*). This fourth stage/phase is used as a reference/justification for the bombings that occurred in Bali on October 12, 2002, or in Jakarta after 2002 (Samudra, 2004, p. 125).

Imam Samudra also bases his views on that two verses (Surat At-taubah: 5 and 29), because according to him, the two verses have replaced/removed (*naskh*) QS. al-Baqarah/2: 109 (it seems that he meant QS. al-Baqarah/2: 190). He claims that the *naskh's* view is in accordance with the opinion of Ibn Abbas and Abu Aliyah, Ar-rabi' bin Anas, Qatadah, and As-Sudi, and this is the second problem of Imam Samudra's interpretation (Samudra, 2004).

At first glance, Imam Samudra is convincing by quoting the views of Ibn Kathir, the famous commentator above, and later a number of scholars above. However, the views of Ibn Kathir that he referred to were actually born in the situation of the Crusades and also the war against the power of the Mongols as non-Muslims who at that time became the aggressors of Islam, similar to the situation when the Prophet and his companions lived. Once again, the social context of interpretation escapes the attention of Imam Samudra. He also does not look at the Qur'an as a whole, because if it is done it will appear, that the general and main goal of the Qur'an is towards peace. Limited defensive warfare is permitted only when peaceful and nonviolent measures fail, where the enemy attacks first.

The enemy's religious affiliation to non-Islamic religions is irrelevant and cannot be used as a basis for war. Muhammad Abduh in his commentary book, *al-Mannār*, for example, questioned the interpretation of the word *fitnah* with the meaning of *syirk* (polytheism) in the QS. al-Baqarah/2: 193, as Imam Samudra's interpretation of the two verses of QS. at-Taubah above. The reason is because the interpretation is not in accordance with the previous verse, QS al-Baqarah/2: 190, *walā ta'tadū*, don't overdo it. Of course, Abduh's reasoning can be added, that the meaning of the word *fitnah* does not match the sentence: "Fight in the way of Allah those who fight you" which is also stated in the QS. al-Baqarah/2: 190. Also not compatible with QS. al-Baqarah/2: 192, just before QS al-Baqarah/2: 193, namely: "If they stop (not fighting), then indeed Allah is Forgiving and Merciful". The word *fitnah* as above has been described as the reason why war is permitted in Islam must be interpreted as a socio-political chaos, a situation of instability that must be avoided such as the situation at the end of the caliph of Usman bin 'Affan or the beginning of the caliph of Ali bin Abi Talib. Or in the language of Muhammad Abduh, *fitnah* in the sense of injustice that prohibits Muslim faith. The status of the enemy as a non-Muslim is not valid enough as a *casus belli* (war justification), as also understood by 'Atha Bin Rabah, Sufyan Tsuri, and Ibn Syubrumah (Afsaruddin, 2018, p. 372-409).

Furthermore, there are also the views of commentators such as Ibn Umar, one of the companions of the Prophet, and ar-Razi, the author of *Tafsir Mafātih al-Ghaib*. They view that the verses of war in the Qur'an are only the obligation of the companions of the Prophet (Afsaruddin, 2018, p. 372-409). Therefore, it does not apply to non-companions Muslims, where the da'wah of Islam must be spread peacefully and only war is allowed for self-defense.

Regarding the two verses which Imam Samudra considers to have deleted (*nasakh*) various other verses --that contain war must be accompanied by peace (war as a defense)-- is a not strong view, even wrong. Moreover, the verses that are considered by Imam Samudra to be *nasakh* (deleted), can actually be read and become an official part of the Qur'an to this day. Many commentators whose opinion contradicts the view of Imam Samudra in academic literature is the main source of al-Wahidi. Among them Ikrimah, al-Rabi, az-Zamaksyari, and ar-Razi. According to the well-known commentators, Muslims should not initiate attacks. They must uphold the provisions of non-aggression. War without being initiated by enemy provocation is invalid, according to the verse *wala ta'tadu* (don't overdo it) in the QS. al-Baqarah/2:190 above. So even in fiqh, war is only an obligation for all Muslims (*farḍu 'ain*) when the enemy who wants to attack the Muslims is about 80.6 km away (Afsaruddin, 2018, p. 372-409 and Rashid, 1995, p. 455).

Because of a mistake in understanding the two verses of QS. at-Taubah above, the Bali bombing was also according to Imam Samudra (2004) as *jihad fī sabīlillāh* (jihad in the way of Allah), an Arabic loanword that legitimizes it. The argument he put forward is because it is based on the intention of the jihad he does as jihad in the way of Allah. Also the targets are colonial nations such as America and its allies, who have the right to be fought. This action is considered a recompense (*qishāsh*) for what has been done by America and its allies in Afghanistan and Palestine. He also interpreted the Bali bombing as an act of Muslim solidarity towards the plight of other Muslims, although this could be true if it was carried out in Afghanistan and Palestine as the war place at that time. Terrorism as an act of Muslim solidarity is based on a hadith --that is used as a reference incorrectly-- which states: "The faith of one of you is not perfect, so that he loves his Muslim brother as he loves himself", where the truth is that the hadith is not just to justify terrorism, but on the contrary, namely for the benefit of humanity solidarity as Islamic grace.

This book also explains the arguments of Imam Samudra (2004) as a JI/NII elite, why the Bali Bombings were carried out in Bali and the victims were civilians. Of course the reason seems to be sought by citing haphazard justification arguments, not according to the consideration of public benefit as the main logic/core of Islam, and not in its place. Imam Samudra et al (NII/JI) argued that the Bali bombings were part of *jihad hujūmī* (offensive jihad), where they understood Umar bin Khattab's statement, "*Khair ad-difā' al-hujūm*" (The best defense is attack). In fact, the Umar's

statement were used to justify the attack by Muslims at that time on Syria/Egypt (the Romans who had previously fought the Prophet through the Mu'tah and Tabuk wars). Also his attack on Persia whose king at the time of the Prophet lived tore up the Prophet's diplomatic letter. This means, that Umar's statement was born in a situation of war before, between Muslims and Rome, as well as Persia, there had not been peace at all with the Muslims to stop the war (Kamil, 2002). Therefore, the attack (war in an offensive sense) is justified by the Qur'an (QS. at-Taubah) which resulted in the birth of Umar's statement above, because in a war situation that has not ended with peace or victory for one of the parties.

According to jihadist/terrorist fundamentalist groups such as Imam Samudra (2004, p. 188-190), *jihād fī sabīlillāh* must start an attack, as they understand literally from the QS. At-Taubah/9: 5 which has also been quoted above, "When the forbidden months are over, then kill them, the polytheists (*musyrikīn*), wherever you find them". Imam Samudra considered the verse as a command to start fighting the infidels and not just defending oneself, a misunderstanding as above has been explained. Both in quoting Umar's statement and in quoting QS at-Taubah/9: 5, it appears that JI/NII activists such as Imam Samudra who bombed Bali experienced acute literalism that misguided and misled him.

The Bali bombings which killed civilians were considered by Imam Samudra (2004) as a commendable act, as has been done by America and its allies against Afghanistan and Palestine, where civilians were also victims. For JI/NII activists such as Imam Samudra, fighting the civilians of the colonial nations in the Bali bombings is called a commensurate and fair act. Another reason that JI/NII activists such as Imam Samudra gave in carrying out the Bali bombings was that what America and its allies had done had gone beyond the limits. America and its allies are what Imam Samudra means by the word terrorist in his book. For him, America and its allies are terrorist countries that carry out terrorism on behalf of the state.

Imam Samudra (2004, p.107-116) admits that the jihad exemplified by the Prophet Muhammad when fighting the unbelievers was indeed limited to those who fought Islam, an honest confession from him. War, in Islam is not allowed to fight people who are not involved in war (civilians), he stressed. He therefore knows the verse of the Qur'an which reads: "And fight in the way of Allah those who fight against you. And do not transgress, verily Allah does not like those who transgress (outstrip)" (Surah Al-Baqarah/2: 190). And what is meant by word transgress (not exceeding limits) is understood by Imam Samudra, not fighting civilians. However, according to him, as well as other JI/NII activists, America and its allies have crossed the line (transgress). Therefore, war for war, blood for blood, life for life, excesses of boundaries are also repaid in kind. They find legitimacy for this action in QS: Al-Baqarah/2: 194 and An-Nahl/16: 126. Again, it is understood literally, especially the end of QS. An-Nahl/16: 126 which literally emphasizes that being patient is better.

To legitimize his view that the Bali bombings were an act of retaliation (*qishāsh*) for what America and its allies had done to Palestinians and Afghans and also as an act of solidarity with fellow Muslims, Imam Samudra also (2004, pp. 106, 99) understands Palestinians and Afghanistanis as *mustadh'afīn* (the weak), an Arabic loanword also. *Mustadh'afīn* in his book is defined as civilians who are victims of American and allied attacks in Palestine and Afghanistan, a new connotation meaning. He interprets it in a different way from the meaning of the mainstream moderate Islam. Generally, mainstream moderate Muslims interpret the word *mustdh'afīn* as poor people who are economically/socially weak as legitimacy for peaceful actions to help humanity, such as through philanthropic activities. The word *mustadh'afīn* in Imam Samudra's book is interpreted as being military weak, a connotative meaning that is too forward, too far away. If the new meaning of the word *mustdh'afīn* from Imam Samudra can be justified, the defense must be carried out in a place of war. Imam Samudra's connotative change in the meaning of the word *mustdh'afīn* from the meaning of humanity to being jihadist/terrorist, is similar to the meaning of the word *fardhu 'ain* above.

Although Imam Samudra's view understands *jihād fī sabīlillāh* by attacking civilians who are not involved in the war through acts of terrorism as if there is a justification for it, in general this view is also wrong as he also expressed himself above. In Islam, let alone in a normal situation of peace, even in a state of war, as in the hadith narrated by Muslim, certain acts of violence are still prohibited. Within the framework of the ethics of war according to Islam, what is forbidden is the act of killing children, women, old people (the elderly), and people who devote their lives to worship services (monks). In short, civilians who are not involved in the war (innocent). It is also forbidden to commit acts of violence such as disturbing livestock and plants or trees, especially those that are fruiting. By burning for example. This Muslim Hadith is even strengthened by the Hadith narrated by Abu Daud. In another hadith it is even forbidden to kill paid workers and in *fiqh* (Islamic law) it is added, namely the prohibition of killing slaves and sick people. In this case, Muslims are required to respect the processes that are running in nature such as trees and humanity. This explanation shows us, in principle, in Islam, everything must be respected and approached with love (*rahmah*), because love (*rahmah*) is one of the causes for the sustainability of nature, and even in war, do not lose that side in everything. The reason is because war is an emergency way and the tendency of Islam is more to peace.

The verses of war, besides having to be understood in the context of the verses before and after which surround them, must also be balanced with verses such as the QS. al-A'raf/7:199 as an interpreter or balancer. QS. al-A'raf/7:199 reads: "Be forgiving people, tell people to do what is *ma'rūf* (good), and turn away from stupid people (don't know)". This includes non-Muslims who do not like Islam, because they do not know the real Islam as long as they do not fight. It must also be balanced with the hadith narrated by Turmudzi which is supported by the hadith narrated by Muslim, the Prophet said: "O people, spread peace, feed the poor, connect love, and pray while others are sleeping, then you will enter paradise, a land of peace" (an-Nawawi, No Year., pp. 309, 387).

Based on that explanation, it is natural that orientalist such as Bernard Lewis (2003, p. 39) argue that acts of terrorism and heinous killings that make civilians as victims --as Imam Samudra do-- have no basis in the basic texts of Islam, by randomly massacring civilians who were not involved in the war at all.

Conclusion

Jl/NII circles use Arabic loanwords far more than mainstream moderate Muslims, especially in social matters. For example, the Arabic loan words *jihad hujūmi*, *istisyhād*, and *daulah Islāmiyyah*. This shows that the more Arabic loanwords, especially in Islamic socio-political texts, the more fundamentalist they are. What is interesting is that the Arabic loanwords in Imam Samudra's book are largely unknown among moderate mainstream Muslims, who do not have an Islamic theocratic state agenda and also violence/terrorism (jihad as war) by targeting civilians. The word/language used in this case shows the mind of the users, including the jihadist fundamentalist religious typology. In addition, Imam Samudra's book also presents a number of Arabic loanwords that are known and used in mainstream Islam, but in Imam Samudra's hands, their meaning has changed to become jihadist/terrorist fundamentalists by targeting civilians. For example, the loanwords *mustadh'afīn* (weak people) and *fardhu 'ain*. It has given new meaning of jihadist fundamentalist connotation to these Arabic loanwords.

In addition, Imam Samudra's understanding of many Arabic loanwords, especially the word *jihād*, is also wrong because it is not based on the context of the text and its social context, as emphasized by semiotics (semiotic structuralism) as well as the standard methodology of interpretation in Islam, which in Islamic/Arabic traditions are part of Arabic/Islamic linguistics as well. The understanding cannot be accounted for in terms of Islamic science and language. For example, the words *mustadh'afīn*, and especially *jihād hujūmi*. The fact that non-Muslim communities have affiliation with non-Islamic religions is not valid enough to justify the attack/war, as understood by Imam Samudra. This happens because the verse referred to as justification for *jihād*

(Arabic loanword) in the sense of terrorism is not understood in the context of the text (verse) and the social context of the text (verse), as the statement of the Islamic figure or expert he quoted is understood in the same way. Verse of war in QS. at-Taubah which Imam Samudra refers to is not understood as a verse that only applies to those (non-Muslims) who cancel the peace treaty with the Muslims, and they declare war. Terrorists such as Imam Samudra also do not understand the war verse in QS. at-Taubah came down in a war situation (Tabuk War). Even war in Islam --if the interpretation is carried out based on the interpretation of the verse with other verses and also the social context as a standard interpretation-- only applies to those who start the war as a defensive act. War is also an emergency way, when peaceful means cannot be taken. Of course, terrorists such as Imam Samudra who target civilians have no basis in the basic texts of Islam, because it is against the ethics of war in Islam.[]

References

- Abbas, Nasir. 2005. *Membongkar Jamaah Islamiyyah*. Jakarta: Grafindo Khazanah Ilmu.
- Afsaruddin, Asma. 2018. *Tafsir Dekonstruksi Jihad dan Syahid*. Terjemahan dari *Striving in the Path of God, Jihad and Martyrdom in Islamic Thought*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Akyol, Mustafa. 2014. *Islam Tanpa Kekerasan, Potret Seorang Muslim untuk Kebebasan*. Jakarta: Quanta.
- Alchaidar. 2008. *Negara Islam Indonesia: Antara Fitnah dan Realita*. Jakarta: Madani Press.
- Amstrong, Karen. 2018. *Melacak Akar Ketakutan terhadap Islam di Dunia Barat*. Terjemahan dari *Islamophobia: Guidebook*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Azra, Azyumari. 2020. *Moderasi Islam di Indonesia, Dari Ajaran, Ibadah, Hingga Prilaku*. Jakarta: Prenada.
- Barthes, Roland. 1986. *The Rustl of Language*. California: University of California Press.
- Barthes, Roland., et al. 2003. *Nazhariyyāt al-Qirāah: Min al-Binyawiyah ilā Jamaliyah at-Talaqqā*, Terjemahan Abd ar-Raman Bu'ali. Damaskus: Dar al-Hiwar.
- Djelantik, Sukawarsini. 2010. *Terorisme: Tinjauan Psiko-Politis, Peran Mdia, Kemiskinan dan Keamanan Nasional*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor.
- Esposito, John L., dan Dalia Mogahed. 2008. *Saatnya Muslim Bicara*. Terjemahan dari *Who Speaks for Islam?*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Fahrudin. 2014. "Fenomena Ji di Asia Tenggara: Sebuah Gerakan Jihad Internasional", *Thesis*, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Haikal, Muhammad Husein. 1088 H. *Hayat Muhammad*. Kairo: Dar al-Ma'rif.
- Hakim, Abdul. n.d. *al-Bayan*. Padang Panjang: Sa'diyah Putra.
- Hanafie, A. 1989. *Ushul Fiqh*. Jakarta: Widjaya.
- Hoed, Beny H. 2011. *Semiotik dan Dianamika Sosisal Budaya*. Depok: Komunitas Bambu.
- Ismail, Asep Usman. 2013. *Wawancara*, 5 Desember.
- Kamil, Sukron. 2002. *Islam dan Demokrasi, Telah Konseptual dan Historis*. Jakarta: Gaya Media Pratama.
- Kamil, Sukron. 2012. *Teori Kritik Sastra Arab Klasik dan Modern*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Kamil, Sukron. 2013. *Islam dan Politik di Indonesia Terkini*. Jakarta: PSIA.

Arabi : Journal of Arabic Studies

- Kuper, Adam., dan Jessica Kuper. 2000. *Ensiklopedi Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial, Jilid II*. Terjemahan dari *The Soscial Sciences Encyclopedia*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Kurniawan, 2001. *Semiologi Roland Barthes*. Jakarta: Indonesiaterra.
- Lewis, Bernard, 2003. *The Crisis of Islam, Holy War and Unholy Terror*. New York: The Modern Library.
- al-Mahalli, Jalaluluddin. No Year. *Syarah Jam'u al-Jawāmi'*. n.p.: Dar Ihya al-Kutub al-'Arabiyyah.
- Mataharitimoer. 2007. *Jihad Terlarang, Cerita dari Bawah Tanah: Kisah Nyata Mantan Aktifis Islam Garis Keras*. Jakarta: Kayla Pustaka.
- Mbai, Ansyad. 2014. *Dinamika Baru Jejaring Teror di Indonesia*. Jakarta: AS Production Indonesia.
- Noth, Winfried. 1990. *Handbok of Semiotics*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Purwawidada, Fajar. 2014. *Jaringan Teroris Solo*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- al-Qatthan, Manna Khalil. 1998. *Studi Ilmu-Ilmu al-Qur'an*, Terjemahan dari *Mabāḥits fī 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān*. Bogor: Litera Antar Nusa.
- Rasyid, Sulaiman. 1995. *Fikih Islam*, Bandung: Sinar Baru Algensindo.
- Redaktur. 2005. "Majalah Gatra 14 November".
- Redaktur. 2014. "2002-2008: Orkes Teror Bom", dalam <http://lipsus.vivanews.com>.
- Samudra, Imam. 2004. *Aku Melawan Teroris*. Solo: Jazeera.
- ash-Shabuni, 'Ali. 2001. *Shafwah at-Tafāsir*. Jilid I. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr.
- as-Shiddiqy, M. Hasbi. 1954. *Sejarah dan Pengantar Ilmu al-Qur'an*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Solahudin. 2011. *NII sampai JI, Salafi Jihadisme di Indoenesia*. Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu.
- Thabathabai, MH. 1990. *Mengungkap Rahasia al-Qur'an*. Terjemahan dari *al-Qur'ān fī al-Islām*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Trifonas, Peter Pericles. 2003. *Barthes and Empirer of Sign*. UK: Icon Book, 2001.
- Van Dam, Nikolaos. 2010. "Arabic loanwords in Indonesian revisited", *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde / Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences of Southeast Asia*, Vol. 166, No. 2/3.
- Versteegh, Kees. 2001. "Linguistic Contacts between Arabic and Other Languages", *Arabica*, Vol. 48, No. 4.
- Versteegh, Kees. 2020. "Can a Language be Islamic?", *Eurasian Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1.