

Islamisme Di Masa Transisi Demokrasi: Studi Perbandingan Tentang Tuntutan Penguatan Posisi Dan Peran Syariat Islam Dalam Amandemen Konstitusi Indonesia (1999-2002) Dan Mesir (2012) = Islamism during the Transition Period of Democracy: Case Study on the Comparison/Contrast of the Enforcement of Islamic Sharia Role and Position In the Amendment of Constitution In Indonesia (1999-2002) and Egypt (2012)

Muhammad Imdadun, author

Deskripsi Lengkap: <https://lib.ui.ac.id/detail?id=9999920531068&lokasi=lokal>

---

Abstrak

Pada era Reformasi, di Indonesia dan Mesir mengemuka agenda Islamisme berupa tuntutan penguatan peran Syariat Islam ketika berlangsung amandemen konstitusi. Kajian ini menggambarkan bagaimana negara Muslim mengelola konflik ideologis antara Islamisme dengan nasionalisme dalam rangka melewati fase transisi demokrasi. Pertanyaan penelitiannya menyangkut apa argumen penguatan Syariat Islam, proses amandemen konstitusinya; dan apa faktor yang mendukung dan menghambat manajemen konflik ideologisnya. Penelitian ini menggunakan dua teori manajemen konflik antar budaya dan ideologi yakni teori demokrasi konsosiasional (Robert Dahl) dan centripetalisme (Geovanni Sartori). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif, data-data diperoleh dari sumber kepustakaan, wawancara dan observasi. Kesimpulannya, Indonesia berhasil melewati fase transisi demokrasi karena sukses mengelola pertentangan ideologis tersebut. Sedangkan Mesir gagal akibat konflik ideologis yang tidak terkelola dan disusul oleh kudeta militer. Terdapat berbagai faktor yang menyebabkannya. Pertama, moderasi ideology. Di Indonesia, partai-partai serta ormas keagamaan telah mengalami moderasi. Di Mesir, moderasi tersebut belum terjadi. Kedua, pola persaingan Multi Polar. Di Indonesia, pertentangan politik berciri multi polar. Konflik yang terjadi antara dua kubu di Mesir semakin menajam akibat sifatnya yang dwi-polar. Ketiga, durasi waktu. Semakin lama proses amandemen semakin mudah mengelola konflik karena adanya lobi-lobi para pemimpin nasional. Keempat, akomodasi politik semua kelompok. Di Indonesia, terbangun pemerintahan yang konsosiasional. Sedangkan Mesir pemerintahan Mursi dinilai tidak representative.

Teori konsosiasional (Robert Dahl) dan centripetalisme (Geovanni Sartori) memadai untuk alat analisis dalam memahami tantangan yang dihadapi oleh Indonesia dan Mesir pada masa transisi demokrasi. Demokrasi konsosiasional mengandaikan keterwakilan seluruh ragam elemen masyarakat dalam kekuasaan. Pemerintahan reformasi di Indonesia yang bercorak koalisi besar membuatnya didukung semua kelompok, kuat, efektif, dan legitimasinya kuat. Mesir yang bercorak “the winner takes all” mudah dikudeta oleh militer. Centripetalisme menggambarkan pengelolaan perbedaan ideologis yang tajam antara Islamisme dengan nasionalisme, liberalism, dan ideologi kiri. Centripetalisme di Indonesia mendorong pengelompokan politik menjadi lintas identitas; ideologi, agama, bahasa, etnis, dan budaya serta memudahkan dialog, negosiasi, kompromi dan akomodasi. Sedangkan di Mesir sentrifugalisme mendorong mengerasnya pertentangan antar identitas dan berakhir dengan kebuntuan politik yang mengundang militer mengambil alih kekuasaan.

.....During the Reformation era, Indonesia and Egypt proposed an Islamic agenda—the reinforcement of Sharia role in the constitutional amendment. This study illustrates how Islamic countries manage or regulate

ideological conflicts between Islamism and nationalism in order to pass through the transitional phase of democracy. There are two major questions in this study. First, what was the argument behind the enforcement of the Islamic Sharia? Second, what supported and hindered the management of ideological conflicts? This research uses the theory of consociationalism (Robert Dahl) and the theory of centripetalism (Geovanni Sartori). Furthermore, this research uses the qualitative method, and the data are collected through literary sources, interviews, and observation.

In conclusion, Indonesia succeeded in passing through the transitional phase due to its success in managing the ideological conflicts, while Egypt failed due to its failure in managing it resulted in a coup d'état. There are various factors that caused it. The first factor is ideological moderation. In Indonesia, the parties and mass organizations have gone through moderation, while Egypt lacked moderation. The second factor is the pattern of multi-polar competition. The political conflicts in Indonesia were multi-polar while the political conflicts in Egypt were bipolar. The third factor is the duration. The longer the process of the amendment, the easier it is to manage conflicts because of the national leaders' lobbying. Last, the political accommodation of all the groups. Indonesia has a consociational government, while Egypt is lacks representation.

The consociationalism theory (Robert Dahl) and centripetal theory (Geovanni Sartori) is used as the tool of analysis in understanding the challenges faced by Indonesia and Egypt during the transitional period. Consociational democracy is the state where all the elements of society are represented. The Indonesian government during reformation which takes the form of a coalition was strong, effective, had strong legitimacy, and was supported by all the groups. However, Egypt's "the winner takes all" government was prone to military coup d'état. Centripetalism illustrates the management of ideological differences among Islamism, nationalism, liberalism, and socialism-communism. In Indonesia, centripetalism supports political grouping as a form inter-identity (ideology, religion, language, ethnicity, and culture), and gives access to discussions, negotiations, compromise, and accommodations. On the contrary, Egypt's centrifugalism worsened the conflict between the identities and led to a dead end, which resulted in the overthrowing of the government.