


ARTICLE

# “It’s a Jihad”: Justifying Violence towards the Ahmadiyya in Indonesia

Ahmad Najib Burhani\* 

Research Center for Society and Culture, Indonesian Institute of Sciences

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [najib27@yahoo.com](mailto:najib27@yahoo.com)

(Received 3 October 2019; revised 11 May 2020; accepted 15 May 2020)

## Abstract

The concept of *al-wala’ wa-l-bara’* (loyalty and disavowal) has become the ideology of modern Salafism; it is used to justify unfriendly relationships with non-Muslims. This concept is usually implemented by reserving love only for fellow Muslims and showing insularity towards non-Muslims. What is the ideological concept that guides some Muslims in their relationship with groups that are considered heretics? This article intends to scrutinize the theological matrix used by vigilante groups in their anti-heresy campaign or attacks on the Ahmadiyya. It also aims to determine why some people believe that persecuting the Ahmadiyya is a theologically justifiable idea. What theological and ideological reasons can be used to justify attacks against the Ahmadiyya community? How do they cope with the conflict between divine law and human/state law? This article argues that instead of feeling guilty, the perpetrators of faith-based violence often feel they have just fulfilled a good religious duty. Committing violence against religious groups deemed heretics is believed to be more than *al-amr bi al-ma’rūf wa al-nahy ‘an al-munkar* (“commanding right and forbidding wrong”)—it is a jihad. Violence is seen not as an illegal act, but as a “virtue” or an effort to save them from the punishment of God in Hell. In justifying the breaching of state law, the idea of a hierarchy in the law is constructed, i.e. state/human law is hierarchically lower than divine law, so attacking the Ahmadiyya is seen as a transgression of human law for the sake of upholding the divine view.

**Keywords:** Ahmadiyya; vigilante; heresy; jihad; fatwa; faith-based violence

“Coercion in this world would save the heretics  
from eternal punishment in the next”

—Augustine of Hippo (354-430) on the persecution  
of the Donatists (Frend 1987: 255)

## Introduction

Hostility and anti-heresy campaigns to stigmatize the Ahmadiyya have existed in Indonesia since this movement arrived in the country in the 1920s. However, the hostility and anti-heresy campaigns were never expressed intensively, with violent attacks or persecution, in stark contrast with the current situation. There were a few incidents of boycotting the Ahmadis or evicting them from Muslim communities, as in the case of Guru Doeali Soetan Mangkoeto and the attacks on the Ahmadis by the Darul Islam/Tentara Islam Indonesia (DI/TII),<sup>1</sup> Muslim rebels of the 1950s, but mostly the heresy campaign against the Ahmadiyya has been undertaken in a discursive form.

After the fall of Suharto in 1998, the heresy campaign against the Ahmadiyya has become more intense and has sometimes involved physical attacks. Scholars have commonly focused on the issues

<sup>1</sup>Discussion on this issue can be found in Amin Mudzakkir (2007: 218-219). This case, however, is generally not included in the discussion of Indonesian Muslims’ persecution of the Ahmadiyya because it concerned a group that was rebelling against the Indonesian state.

of human rights, citizenship, political and social authority, media propaganda or media reports, and the capability of government in managing diversity when discussing the resistance, attack, and heresy campaign against the Ahmadiyya (Connley 2016; Crouch 2011; Hicks 2014; Putra *et al.* 2018; Soedirgo 2018; Suryana 2016, 2018, 2019).

Suryana (2016, 2018, 2019), for instance, discusses agency and structure in the rising of intolerance and violence against minority religious groups. He argues that violence against the Ahmadiyya was possible because of security officials' entangled relations with vigilante groups, together with the inclination of some state institutions to preserve a majoritarian social order. In line with Suryana, Jacqueline Hicks (2014) sees anti-Ahmadiyah discourse in the wider processes of maintaining or securing political and social authority. Aleah Connley (2016) discusses the Ahmadi responses to discrimination and persecution in Indonesia and their strategies for dealing with adversity. Research on the logic and detailed arguments, or the theological matrix used by religious vigilante groups that inflicted acts of violence directed against the Ahmadiyya, is relatively neglected in existing literature. Putra *et al.* (2018) touch on theological discrepancy as a factor in resistance to the Ahmadiyya, but they do not elaborate how the perpetrators frame that discrepancy into solid arguments and then into propaganda that can incite people to attack and even kill the Ahmadi.

Political matters, particularly populist politics—together with a cordial relationship between certain religious groups and law enforcement agencies—explain the rise of religious intolerance and violence against the Ahmadiyya in several districts or provinces. However, only theological issues have given the resistance against the Ahmadiyya longer durability and wider audiences. Theological issues have made various Muslim organizations, including moderate ones, seem reluctant to defend the Ahmadiyya. It is also an ideological issue that has allowed this anti-heresy campaign to penetrate into almost all elements of society, including government officials and law enforcement officers. This article, therefore, will complement existing studies that analyse the diverse factors in the anti-heresy campaign and discrimination against the Ahmadiyya in Indonesia. It will fill the gap in Ahmadiyya studies, particularly in an area that has not been adequately and properly discussed, i.e., the theological justification of violence against the Ahmadiyya.

Specifically, this article intends to uncover the expressed motives of some militia and vigilante groups in their anti-heresy campaign or their attacks on people they consider apostates and heretics. It also aims to determine why some people believe that resisting, attacking, and even persecuting the Ahmadiyya is a theologically justifiable idea. The concept of *al-wala' wa-l-bara'* (loyalty and disavowal) has become the ideology of modern Salafism, and it is used to justify having unfriendly relationships with non-Muslims. This concept is usually implemented by reserving love only for fellow Muslims and showing insularity and hostility towards non-Muslims. What is the ideological concept that guides some Muslims in their relationship with groups who are considered heretics? What is the theological justification for forming a religious militia and attacking the Ahmadiyya? Some of those militia have realized that Indonesia is not an Islamic state and their attack on the Ahmadiyya is against the law. How, then, do they cope with the conflict between divine law that “commands” them to attack the Ahmadiyya, and human/state law that forbids them to do so?

### From Discursive to Violent Resistance

The Ahmadiyya is often seen as the most controversial sect in contemporary Islam. It was established by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad in British India in 1889, and Indonesia, in the Ahmadiyya's claim, “is one of those territories where Ahmadi missionary effort has been crowned with a most remarkable degree of success, territories where the Movement is firmly established, with the strength of a rock” (Mubarak Ahmad 1964: 10). Among the controversial beliefs of the Ahmadiyya are its conception of prophethood; Ghulam Ahmad's claim as the Messiah; its opposition to warfare jihad; its unique caliphate system; the doctrine of intra-community marriage; a prohibition against praying behind a non-Ahmadi imam; and the teaching of *chanda* or *candah* (giving monetary donations). It is, however, the claim of the prophethood of Ghulam Ahmad that has mostly sparked resistance and hostility from other Muslims, and has made some Muslim institutions excommunicate this community by issuing fatwas of apostasy or heresy.

Two fatwas on the Ahmadiyya have been issued by the Council of Indonesian Ulama (MUI): in 1980, during the Suharto “new order” era, and in 2005, during the presidency of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.

The 1980 fatwa consists of two points: that the Ahmadiyya is a community outside the pale of Islam—a deviant and misleading community (*jama'ah di luar Islam, sesat dan menyesatkan*); and that in dealing with the Ahmadiyya, the MUI is expected to always communicate with the government (Sekretariat MUI 2010: 41-42). The 2005 fatwa declares that a) the Ahmadiyya is *di luar Islam* (outside the pale of Islam), *sesat dan menyesatkan* (misguided/deviant and misleading), and any Muslim who follows the Ahmadiyya is *murtad* (apostate); b) those who already follow the Ahmadiyya are required to return immediately to the true teachings of Islam, that is, an Islam that is in line with the Qur'an and the Hadith; and c) the government must prohibit the spread of the Ahmadiyya in Indonesia, freeze the organization, and seal off wherever they congregate.<sup>2</sup>

The 2005 fatwa has become—or has been utilized as—religious justification for the subsequent physical attacks and heresy propaganda campaigns against the Ahmadiyya. It can be said that the fatwa provides “ideological persuasion” for brutal actions conducted by some radical Muslims to the Ahmadiyya community (Assyaukanie 2007, 2009; Colbran 2010). In almost every attack on the Ahmadiyya, the attackers justify their violence with the MUI's fatwa. Using a term from Bruce Lincoln (1989), the fatwa can be seen as “ideological persuasion” for people to exclude, be cautious about, and persecute the Ahmadis. The term “ideology” in this context is used to indicate that the fatwa is not necessarily true from a rational or empirical perspective, let alone from a human rights perspective, in judging the heterodoxy or even the apostasy of this movement, but it is powerful and effective in directing people to certain ends. The truth claimed by the fatwas is usually called “paradigmatic truth”, not “scientific truth”.

There are two terms in the fatwa that support this view: *sesat dan menyesatkan* (misguided/deviant and misleading) and *murtad* (apostasy). These terms have a persuasive power to incite people to take violent action. They are employed as part of taxonomic process, using Lincoln's term (1989), to strip the Ahmadiyya of their humanity. People might not have courage to shed the blood of their fellow human beings unless the Ahmadiyya are dehumanized, degraded into non-human beings. Just as in a war, the process of dehumanizing the enemy was employed to inflame the rage of the warriors.

The fatwa not only labels the Ahmadiyya *sesat dan menyesatkan*, it also strongly insists that the government ban the spread of the Ahmadiyya in Indonesia, to freeze their organization, and to seal off the places of their activities. This is perhaps the strongest and most specific MUI directive that could be perceived as directly inciting people to commit violence against the Ahmadiyya. This statement is also its difference from the 1980 fatwa, where the MUI only declares the Ahmadiyya to be a deviant and misleading community, full stop. When the MUI's persistent demand that the government take harsh action toward the Ahmadiyya is not positively answered, this could provoke people to take the law into their own hands, particularly during the time when law enforcement is weak. Therefore, the MUI's fatwa is not only providing a legal opinion for Muslims, but in this context, it also creates negative sentiments and hostility, and even provokes people to attack the Ahmadiyya. It provides new blood for militia groups such as the Front for the Defense of Islam (FPI), the Anti-Ahmadiyya Movement (GERAH), and the Muslim Reformists Movement (GARIS).<sup>3</sup>

Previously known as an anti-vice civil vigilante group, in 2005—the same year as the MUI fatwa on the Ahmadiyya—the FPI expanded its activities to cover the issue of theology.<sup>4</sup> Since then, the FPI has been involved in major violent attacks and rallies against the Ahmadiyya, and has played enforcer in the demand to disband the Ahmadiyya movement. Here I will discuss three major confrontations with the Ahmadiyya in which the FPI was strongly involved: the violent attack on the Ahmadiyya compound in Parung, Bogor, in 2005; the inflammatory speech of Sobri Lubis, the then general-secretary (now chairperson) of the FPI, in Banjar, West Java; and the conflict between the FPI and the National Alliance for

<sup>2</sup>For a detailed discussion of the fatwas against the Ahmadiyya, see Burhani (2014b).

<sup>3</sup>The above acronyms seem not to be created arbitrarily. They are chosen to indicate their mission, belief, and feeling. *Garis* means “boundary” or “line”. This acronym shows that the mission of GARIS is to enforce the boundary between orthodox and heterodox Islam, and also between Muslims and non-Muslims. *Gerah* means “stifling”, and indicates that people in GERAH felt unhappy or disturbed by the existence of the Ahmadis in Indonesia.

<sup>4</sup>The extension of the FPI's activities beyond its “original” mission was endorsed by the FPI's *Munas* (National Congress) of in Bogor in 2008 (Syihab 2011a).

Freedom of Religion and Belief (AKKBB)—a coalition of large organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and individuals that was formed to defend religious minorities such as the Ahmadiyya.<sup>5</sup>

During the attack on the Ahmadiyya compound in Parung on 15 July 2005, the role of the FPI was mainly to be the “muscle” in the demand to disband this movement. The FPI’s involvement in theological issues was still in its infancy. The Institute for Islamic Study and Research (LPPPI)<sup>6</sup> invited the FPI to join its attack because the latter’s ability to gather a large number of demonstrators on short notice had been very helpful in its effort to enforce the ban on what they considered deviant groups. After its involvement in this attack, the FPI has been participating in rallies and attacks on the Ahmadiyya in Jakarta and other cities.

The second important example of the FPI’s opposition to the Ahmadiyya was the incendiary statements made by Sobri Lubis in a public gathering in Banjar, Ciamis, West Java, on 14 February 2008. The following is part of his speech:

Muslim people! We call upon you! Let’s fight against the Ahmadiyya! Kill the Ahmadis wherever they are, my brothers! *Allāhu akbar!* Kill, kill, kill...kill them all! It is okay to kill them. This is self-defence. They destroy our religion. [Therefore, their lives] are no longer sacred...Without any doubt, it is permissible [to shed the Ahmadis’ blood]...definitely permissible (*hola!*)! This is not a joke. It is *halāl* to shed the blood of the Ahmadis. If people say that this killing violates human rights, I say, “Go to hell, Universal Declarations of Human Rights! *Tai kucing* (shit!), the human rights declaration!”...Fight the Ahmadiyya, kill the Ahmadis, and exterminate the Ahmadis in Indonesia! *Allāhu akbar!* It is okay, it is okay. I am personally responsible, the FPI, other ulama, and all other Muslims are also responsible. If anyone of you kills the Ahmadis [and then gets arrested], say that you are doing so because ordered by ustadh Sobri Lubis, ordered by Rizieq Syihab. It is not going to matter. We are ready to take responsibility in the world and in the hereafter. Kill the Ahmadis wherever they are! *Allāhu akbar!*<sup>7</sup>

Although not as harsh as Sobri Lubis, Rizieq Syihab has also delivered a number of speeches condemning the Ahmadiyya. Syihab considered the Ahmadis “impostor Muslims” and condemned them for “hijacking” Islamic teachings for their own purposes. He uses the terms “pirating” and “copyright crime” to describe the religious beliefs and practices of the Ahmadis.<sup>8</sup> In his recorded speech at Al-Islah Mosque, Petamburan, Jakarta, before the Monas Tragedy, he also called on people to wage war against the Ahmadiyya because the Ahmadis were apostates and a deviant sect. Therefore, banning the Ahmadiyya, in his view, was “*harga mati*” (non-negotiable) (Wahid Institute 2008b: 4; Syihab 2011a).<sup>9</sup>

The third notable example of the FPI’s opposition to the Ahmadiyya is the conflict between this organization and the AKKBB at the National Monument (Monas) on 1 June 2008, famously known as “Tragedi Monas” (the Monas Tragedy).<sup>10</sup> In reality, the FPI was not the only organization in conflict

<sup>5</sup>A list of the FPI activities in attacking the Ahmadiyya can be found, for instance in the Wahid Institute’s annual report (2011: 49).

<sup>6</sup>The name of this organization does not entirely reflect its activities, as its main program, as stated on its website, is to oppose deviant streams of Islam (*aliran sesat*) and splinter movements (*gerakan sempalan*), rather than perform research on Islam, as understood in an academic sense. See the *infolppi* website <http://infolppi.blogspot.com/2010/05/profile-lppi-lembaga-penelitian-dan.html>. For more detail information on the LPPPI, see Burhani (2016).

<sup>7</sup>The complete transcript of the speech consists of 1230 words and is available at <http://www.mail-archive.com/wanita-muslimah@yahooogroups.com/msg44990.html>. The video is available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pK98JL-LN4g&feature=related> or <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U7RLCXNdKF4> (accessed 15 January 2012).

<sup>8</sup>The statement from Rizieq Syihab can be found in his speech entitled “Kesesatan Ahmadiyah” at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pSQ04yvB9OM&NR=1> (accessed 13 May 2020). Syihab’s argument is quite similar to the one used in Pakistan, namely, comparing the practice of the Ahmadis to “that of a ‘trader passing off his inferior goods as superior to those of a reputable firm’” (Kennedy 1989: 97).

<sup>9</sup>This speech was replayed during his trial for the Monas Tragedy.

<sup>10</sup>The AKKBB’s rally was held to commemorate the 63rd anniversary of the Pancasila, the Indonesian state ideology. The organizers and participants of this rally believed that Pancasila guaranteed religious freedom, plurality, and diversity in Indonesia, but some Indonesians tend to ignore these values, as shown by the number of attacks on minority groups such as the Ahmadiyya. The rally, therefore, was held to remind people about the spirit of Pancasila. The FPI and the HTI, on the

with the AKKBB at that time, as the Indonesian Hizbut Tahrir (HTI) were also involved in the conflict (Suaedy 2010: 139). However, because the FPI played the leading role in the attack and was the only organization with a paramilitary unit, the FPI was singled out as holding the most responsibility for the incident, which resulted in fourteen people being injured (Suaedy 2010: 139; Wahid Institute 2008a: 71).

Although the Ahmadiyya movement was not directly mentioned during this clash, it could not be denied that this tragedy was related to the issue of the Ahmadiyya. During the months before the tragedy, these groups were in fierce contestation with one another, defending and opposing the Ahmadiyya. The banners, flyers, and chants during the rally—such as “Ahmadiyah = Islam” and “UUD 45 sebagai dasar hukum, bukan fatwa MUI!” (UUD 45 is the foundation of law, not fatwas of the MUI)—illustrated the position of the AKKBB, which was diametrically opposed to the demand for the dissolution of the Ahmadiyya voiced by the FPI and its allies.<sup>11</sup> The blame for the violence was mainly directed at the FPI because the attackers were wearing or exhibiting the FPI’s attributes and symbols.

The second organization in the list of violent opposition to the Ahmadiyya is GARIS. This organization was established in Cianjur district, West Java, in 1998, and since its establishment, the leader of this organization has been its founder, Chep Hernawan, a native businessperson from that district. He is an activist in the Muslim Union (Persis) and the Indonesian Council for Islamic Propagation (DDII), and a fervent supporter of the implementation of sharia law in Indonesia. As a member of the Bulan Bintang family (a term that refers to the members of the former Masyumi party and the DDII), he has participated in the establishment of the Crescent Star Party (PBB), serving as the treasurer of the party’s central board until his resignation in 2001.

GARIS publicly claimed that it was responsible for a violent attack on four villages in Cianjur, where a significant percentage of the population is Ahmadi, on 19 September 2005. These four villages were Panyairan, Cicakra, Neglasari, and Ciparay. During this incident, a vigilante group vandalized 43 houses, four mosques, three schools, and five shops (Mohammad and Arifin 2005; Hasani and Naipospos 2010: 164; Mudzakir 2008: 13-14). In June 2008, GARIS sealed off and demolished six Ahmadiyya mosques in the villages of Sukadana and Panyairan Cianjur. They sprayed red paint on the wall and the windows of Al-Ghofur Mosque in the city of Cianjur, stating that the mosque had been “sealed off by the Muslim community” (Aziz 2008). On 4 December 2010, GARIS dispersed the National Congress of the Ahmadiyya at Hotel Setia, Cipanas, Cianjur. This congress was initially supposed to be held in Jakarta, but because the FPI was prepared to disperse it in Jakarta, the Ahmadiyya moved it to Cianjur. Unfortunately, they found a similar vigilante group there with a close relationship with the FPI, which felt extremely motivated to attack the Ahmadiyya (Hernawan 2010; Lukito 2016; Hasani and Naipospos 2010: 160). On 11 March 2011, GARIS took over Al-Ghofur Mosque and forced the Ahmadi to change it into a public mosque (Aziz 2011).

The third most active organization in opposing the Ahmadiyya is GERAH. It was established in Manis Lor, Kuningan, West Java, in 2003.<sup>12</sup> Since its establishment, GERAH has been led by Nasruddin Sa’dillah. He is an activist of a local branch of the Nahdlatul Ulama (NU), the largest traditionalist organization in Indonesia, and the head of the Council for the Caretakers of Al-Huda Mosque. He is also the younger brother of Salimin Sa’dillah, the chairperson of the MUI and the principal of an Islamic Middle School in Manis Lor. Nasruddin is a member of the *ketib* (Ar. *khaṭīb*) family, the caretakers of Al-Huda Mosque for many years and representatives of the *santri* (pious Muslim) tradition in this village. This *ketib* family was in competition with the *kuwu* (head of the village) family even before the Ahmadiyya’s arrival in the 1950s. Before the arrival of the Ahmadiyya, the *kuwu* family had represented

---

other hand, organized a rally in front of the presidential palace to protest the government’s decision to raise the price of the refined fuel oil (BBM). Because the rallying places of these two opposing groups (one a defender and the other an opponent) were in close proximity to one another, the aforementioned incident occurred (Purwanto 2009: 88-93; Crouch 2009: 12-15).

<sup>11</sup>In his statement as a witness in the trial of the Monas tragedy, Anick H. Tohari, the coordinator of the AKKBB, stated, “We did not act because of the Ahmadiyya, but for the AKKBB. [However,] the rights of the Ahmadiyya must be defended” (Wahid Institute 2008b: 3).

<sup>12</sup>Manis Lor is a village in the subdistrict of Jalaksana, Kuningan, where more than 70 per cent of the population is composed of followers of the Ahmadiyya—the largest number of Ahmadi in one location. This village hosted the Ahmadiyya’s *Jalsa Salana* (annual meeting) several times. During his visit to Indonesia in 2000, the fourth Caliph of the Ahmadiyya, Mirza Tahir Ahmad, also spent time visiting the village.



Figure 1. A placard hung in the front yard of a house not far from the headquarters of the FPI in Petamburan, Jakarta

the *jangjawokan* or *abangan* (nominal Muslim) tradition in Manis Lor. After the arrival of the Ahmadiyya, virtually the entire *kuwu* family became followers of the Ahmadiyya, building their own mosque called An-Nur. In the conflict between Ahmadis and non-Ahmadis, An-Nur Mosque and Al-Huda Mosques have often been used as symbols of the religious and social identities of the two opposing groups (Nurul Rosidin 2009: 4-5; Burhani 2017). This can be seen from stickers put on the doors or walls of houses in the village such as “Al-Huda Muslim, follower of the Prophet Muhammad SAW”. (“SAW” is an abbreviation for an Arabic phrase that means “God bless him and his family and grant him peace”).

The first attack on the Ahmadiyya in Manis Lor occurred on 23 December 2002. With the help of the LPPI and students from Pesantren Husnul Khotimah in Manis Kidul, non-Ahmadis from Manis Lor terrorized the Ahmadis by vandalizing their homes. They also intimidated the Ahmadis to such an extent that they closed down their schools and places of worship (Rosyidin and Mursyid 2007: 57; Muryadi, ed. 2005: 116). On 20 October 2004, the vigilante groups renewed their attack by vandalizing two places of worship, Musalla at-Taqwa and Musalla al-Hidayah (Muryadi, ed. 2005: 116; Nurul Rosidin 2009: 18). On 18 December 2007, GERAH launched another attack on the Ahmadiyya, this time with the help of various hardline groups in West Java vandalizing five homes and two places of worship (Hapsari 2011). Violent attacks on the Ahmadiyya occurred again on 29 July 2010. This time, the attack was carried out by a crowd of people after attending *istighosah* (communal prayer) at al-Huda Mosque. However, their goal of attacking an-Nur Mosque (200 meters from al-Huda mosque) was not achieved because the Ahmadis defended their mosque. As a result, a fight between these two groups could not be avoided (Bagir *et al.*, 2011: 45-6; Karni, Djafar, and Pamungkas 2010). During these attacks, the defenders of the Ahmadiyya came from the Banser, a militia group of the Nahdlatul Ulama, together with human rights activists.

The opposition of Nasruddin and GERAH to the Ahmadiyya was not only expressed in the form of violent attacks and intimidation, but also by preventing the Ahmadis from having their marriages registered in the Islamic registrar’s office. This was of course not the work of Nasruddin and GERAH alone, but also the work of a number of government institutions, such as the office of the Ministry of Religion in

Kuningan and the Office of Religious Affairs (KUA) in Jalaksana, the two government offices with the authority to issue marriage certificates. The role of Nasruddin, however, was significant because he was the person in charge of registering marriages in Manis Lor. He frequently attempted to make the process of registering marriages difficult for the Ahmadis by asking them to disavow the Ahmadiyya, because he believed that the Ahmadiyya is not Islamic (Rosyidin and Mursyid, 2007: 63). In addition to marriage registration, the Ahmadis were also impeded from making pilgrimages to Mecca and Madina. Nasruddin reported to the relevant government offices, i.e., the district office of the Ministry of Religion, the names of the Ahmadis who planned to make pilgrimages, so that those offices could delete their names or cancel their plans (Riza and Ivansyah 2008; Rosyidin and Mursyid 2007: 64-65).

### The Ideological Justification for and Religious Symbolism in the Attacks

Religion-motivated violence is different from other violence done by “regular” thugs or gangsters. The main difference between religious vigilante groups and non-religious ones is in the way they justify their existence and motivate their actions. Religious mores and symbols have been evoked by these religious militias to give moral, political, and legal justifications for their violent acts. In this section, I elaborate upon (1) the ideological justification used by the above three groups to appoint themselves the “religious police” on theological affairs, not just matters of morality and behaviour; (2) the notion of the *Dirār* mosque and the “fraudulent Qur’an” as a theological justification for vandalizing or destroying Ahmadiyya mosques and burning their Qur’ans; and (3) the way they resolve the contradiction between divine law and state law in relation to their violence against the Ahmadiyya.

### Jihad Discourse and Justifications of the Attacks

In the eyes of hardline Indonesian Muslims, the image of the Ahmadis is extremely negative—they are seen as being even worse than infidels and apostates. Abu Bakar Ba’asyir, a leading figure in hardline Islam and the chair of the GARIS advisory council, even believes that the Ahmadis are worse than Indonesian communists. He says that “the Ahmadiyya is crueller than the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). The PKI are clearly infidels, but the Ahmadis are infidels who claim to be Muslims” (Ba’asyir 2011). Echoes of Ba’asyir’s view of the Ahmadiyya can easily be heard from other hardline Muslims.

In the context of Indonesian Muslims, juxtaposing someone with the PKI (now defunct) is the worst insult possible, indicating that the person in question is cruel and evil—possibly the worst person in the world. This relates to Indonesian history in that people from the PKI were believed to have insulted, defamed, and besmirched Islam, and even killed *ulama*—Muslim scholars specializing in transmitting and interpreting Islamic knowledge. The statement from Ba’asyir clearly shows that the hardline Muslims’ hostility toward the Ahmadiyya is quite similar to their hostility toward Communists. They not only refuse to include the Ahmadis in the category of Muslim communities, but they even believe that the Ahmadis hijack and pirate Islamic teachings and use them for different ends (Djamaluddin 2008: vi).<sup>13</sup> They believed that the existence of the Ahmadiyya only serves to destroy Islam from within, “*mengacak-acak Islam*” (Djamaluddin 2011: ii). It is in this context that Sobri Lubis of the FPI called for people to exterminate the Ahmadis. In fact, he is not the only person to have made such an incendiary statement; similar statements have been made by other hardline Muslims as well. The declaration of jihad against the Ahmadiyya in Manis Lor by Muslim groups in Kuningan, led by GERAH, also uses a similar statement. It says, “The Ahmadis claim that they are Muslims, but their *aqidah* contradicts Islamic *aqidah*. Therefore, the Ahmadiyya beliefs must be declared deviant and harmful to Islam. According to [Islamic] law, they must be exterminated”.<sup>14</sup>

The FPI and GERAH no longer classify the fight against the Ahmadiyya as *al-amr bi al-ma’rūf wa al-nahy ‘an al-munkar* (commanding right and forbidding wrong), because this principle is mainly

<sup>13</sup>A similar statement from Syihab on this issue can be found in his speech entitled “Kesesatan Ahmadiyah”. Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pSQ04yvB9OM&NR=1> (accessed 13 May 2020).

<sup>14</sup>This declaration of jihad is available at: <http://akkbb.wordpress.com/2007/11/19/surat-komponen-muslim-kuningan/> (accessed 13 May 2020).

directed at fellow Muslims. The declaration from Muslims in Kuningan, for instance, stated that attacking the Ahmadiyya was a jihad and that people who died in this jihad were martyrs.<sup>15</sup> Nasruddin, the leader of GERAH, further explained that the fight against the Ahmadiyya was in defence of the Islamic faith and that it was not part of *dakwah* (propagating Islam) or intended to call Muslims to *ma'rūf* (the right) (*Radar Cirebon* 2007). A quite similar view is stated by Rizieq Syihab of the FPI. Responding to the killing of three Ahmadis in Cikeusik, Banten, Syihab said, “Those Muslims who are sincerely striving to dissolve the Ahmadiyah are *mujāhid* (jihad warriors) blessed by God and the Prophet” (Syihab 2011b). Syihab gave further warning to the government, saying that if they continued to defend the Ahmadiyya, then, “All Muslims must prepare themselves for waging a revolution. Depose the current regime, change the system!” (Syihab 2011a).<sup>16</sup> In short, since they considered the fight against the Ahmadiyya to be a jihad, they needed more than just “religious police” who “commanded right and forbade wrong”; rather, they needed jihad warriors or troops who waged war against infidels.<sup>17</sup>

It is only because there is a legitimate government—the Indonesian government—that these hardline groups refrain from exterminating the Ahmadis, instead waiting for the government to take action and dissolve the movement. However, they constantly warn the government that if it does not disband the Ahmadiyya quickly, they will take the law into their own hands. Rizieq Syihab, for instance, threatened the government that if it revokes the Joint Ministerial Decree (SKB) on the Ahmadiyya in 2008 and lets the Ahmadiyya exist in Indonesia, “then Muslims would wage war against the Ahmadis, the infidels. If today three Ahmadis are murdered, maybe tomorrow there could be thousands of Ahmadis slaughtered by Muslims, just as in Pakistan” (Syihab 2011b).

Jihad against the Ahmadiyya should be seen as being different from jihad against other groups, such as the attacks on Christians in the Moluccas conflict. Here is more about warfare jihad against an insider enemy. It is a jihad against heresy, not infidelity. In the Muslim community, the Ahmadis are often seen as “wolves in sheep’s clothing” or “snakes in the grass”. Sociologically, the terms commonly used by hardliners to describe the existence of the Ahmadiyya within Islam are “cancer” or “*bisul*” (abscess) (Burhani 2014a: 139). Theologically, they are seen in “an intense union of both nearness and remoteness” (Kurtz 1983: 1087). Some hardliners hate them more than they hate infidels. Therefore, the treatment of heretics is often harsher than of people of other religions, or other enemies. In Cikeusik, where three Ahmadis were brutally killed in 2011, they were treated like “bare life” (Agamben 1998: 138). They were stripped of their clothes until nearly naked, and then pelted with stones and beaten with blunt objects such as wood and bamboo sticks until they died. For hardliners, killing the Ahmadis is not enough—they need to be killed brutally. They hold their personalities in reserve when dealing with non-Muslims, since they want to show respect as taught by their religion. In the case of the Ahmadiyya, their full personalities are involved as they feel that the Ahmadiyya have betrayed them by using the same values and doctrines but bringing them to different ends.

In addition to considering the attack and resistance to the Ahmadiyya to be jihad, another reason for the massive anti-heresy campaign is because some militias or vigilante groups felt that the government was acting too slowly in disbanding that group. A banner in Manis Lor, for instance, says, “*Aksi birokrasi mandul, aksi jihad muncul*”, which means that the government’s hesitance to disband the Ahmadiyya made the jihad movement become urgent. The above groups feel there is a need to work together to pressure and even force the government to disband the Ahmadiyya movement. They compare the case of the Ahmadiyya to other cases of religious deviation such as Lia Eden, Yusman Roy, and Ahmad Mosadeq, all of which have been declared guilty for breaching either Law No. 1/PNPS/1965 on the Prevention of the Misuse or Defamation of Religion, or Article 156a of the Criminal Code concerning the defamation of religion.

<sup>15</sup>Because the only fight allowed in Islam is jihad, it becomes understandable that whenever hardline groups felt obliged to give reasons for their attacks on the Ahmadiyya, they justified them by stating that their acts were in the category of jihad.

<sup>16</sup>This ultimatum is quite similar to the ultimatum from the anti-Ahmadiyya movement in Pakistan (led by the Ahrar and Jamaat-e-Islami) to the Pakistani government if it did not heed their demands (Saeed 2007: 137).

<sup>17</sup>The role of “religious police”, both self-appointed and appointed by the government (such as the *muṭawwiin* in Saudi Arabia and the *polisi syariah* or shari’a police in Aceh), is commonly related to the issue of religious rituals, behaviours, and morality. However, instead of morality, the main concern of the aforementioned militias and vigilante groups is theology. They do not enforce certain moralities or interpretations of sharia, but instead enforce orthodox Islamic beliefs.



Employing conspiracy theory, Rizieq Syihab has accused the government of treating the Ahmadiyya differently because of the intervention of the US government (Syihab 2011b). It is known that the Ahmadiyya has a strong international network; they have documented every attack against them and widely distributed these documents to the world through its media network, using both the Internet and satellite television, including its own station, Muslim Television Ahmadiyya (MTA). The killing of three Ahmadis in Cikeusik, Banten, on 14 February 2011 was recorded by Arif Rahman, an Ahmadi himself, and then uploaded to YouTube by Andreas Harsono, a human rights activist and a consultant in Jakarta for the New York-based Human Rights Watch. Hardline groups such as the FPI believe that it is the international intervention, as part of a conspiracy against Islam, has made it difficult to disband the Ahmadiyya. International pressure has made the government treat the Ahmadiyya differently from the way it treated Lia Eden, Yusman Roy, and other groups it considered heretics (Syihab 2011c; Jaiz and Tede 2011).

### *The Notion of Masjid al-Dirār and the Fraud Qur'an*

In the attacks committed by the aforementioned militias or vigilante groups, Ahmadiyya mosques have always been the primary targets. As many as dozens of Ahmadiyya mosques have been burned, destroyed, vandalized, sealed off, or taken over by vigilante groups. During an attack on the Ahmadiyya community in Manis Lor in 2007, for instance, two *mushalla* (small places of worship) were vandalized. Several times, GERAH members have attempted to seal off or destroy An-Nur Mosque, the main (and largest) Ahmadiyya mosque in Manis Lor. GARIS also took over, sealed off or vandalized more than ten Ahmadiyya mosques in that district. In addition to mosques, a number of vigilante mobs also burnt copies of the Qur'an in Cisalada and Parung, Bogor. Instead of stopping these activities, the state apparatus, including the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP), sometimes even helped them execute their mission. This occurred in Manis Lor, where the Satpol PP sealed off An-Nur Mosque in July 2010.

Some outsiders might be surprised to hear and see that hardline Muslims have vandalized or burned mosques simply because those mosques belonged to the Ahmadis. They might also be confused as to why some Muslims would dare to burn the Qur'an. When a Florida pastor, Terry Jones, publicly threatened to burn the Qur'an on September 11, 2010, he received worldwide condemnation for his plan. Likewise, when several US military personnel burned copies of the Qur'an in Afghanistan in early 2012, it provoked a similar reaction. Muslims were furious when a mosque in Ningxia Hui, China, was destroyed by police in early 2012. A similar reaction occurred when the Babri mosque in Ayodhya, India, was destroyed. People might therefore be bewildered as to why some Indonesian Muslims have burned the Qur'an and destroyed a number of mosques.

What is their theological justification for destroying mosques and burning the Qur'an? A sociological answer might point out the centrality of mosques to the Ahmadiyya life. Therefore, opponents of the Ahmadiyya might believe that, burning or destroying these mosques might lead the Ahmadis to return to orthodox Islam or stop them from going astray.<sup>18</sup> However, from a theological perspective, the notion of Masjid al-Dirār (a mosque of harm or dissent) is commonly used by hardline groups as justification for destroying or burning Ahmadiyya mosques. A story about Dirār Mosque is mentioned in the Qur'an *sura* al-Tauba 9.107-110. Dirār Mosque was built close to Quba' Mosque and was intended to create disunity among Muslims. Upon receiving a revelation about the intention behind the building of the mosque, the Prophet Muhammad then commanded his companions to burn it down.<sup>19</sup>

Some hardline Muslims believe that Ahmadiyya mosques can be compared to Masjid al-Dirār and, therefore, they have the right to burn them down or demolish them. This kind of belief is held, for instance, by people in Manis Kidul, a village adjacent to Manis Lor. As reported by Ali Amin (2005: 81-82), the Ahmadiyya community in Manis Kidul built a mosque in 1999. The building of the mosque was perceived by non-Ahmadis in that village as proof that the Ahmadis did not want to integrate with

<sup>18</sup>The same reasoning was used by Augustine of Hippo (354-430). To justify the persecution of the Donatists, he says that "coercion in this world would save the heretics from eternal punishment in the next" (Frend 1987: 255).

<sup>19</sup>Detailed discussion on Masjid al-Dirār can be found in Michael Lecker's work entitled *Muslims, Jews and Pagans: Studies on Early Islamic Medina* (1995), particularly pages 74-146.

other Muslims but wanted to create disunity in the Muslim community. With permission from some *ulama*, people then demolished the mosque because they believed that the mosque was similar to Masjid al-Dirār. During his speech at Al-Azhar Mosque in Jakarta on 5 August 2005, Habib Faiz of the FPI also employed the same argument about the permissibility of destroying “places of vice” (Karni, Arifin, Pitakasari 2005).<sup>20</sup>

Burning the Qur’an during attacks on the Ahmadiyya is not as frequent as burning and destroying mosques. The only reported case of Qur’an burning was during an attack on the Ahmadiyya in Cislada, Bogor, on 1 October 2010 (Harsono 2010). It is possible that the attackers did this by mistake, because attackers burned all Ahmadiyya books in the other cases, such as in Cianjur, but saved the Qur’an (Hatmodjo 2011). However, there is a belief in Indonesian Muslim society that the Ahmadiyya have corrupted or altered the Qur’an, and therefore, the Qur’an that the Ahmadis use contains *tahrīf* (corruption, alteration). This belief comes particularly from a resolution fatwa issued by the Rābiṭa al-‘Ālam al-Islāmī (Muslim World League) as well as agitation from Amin Djamaluddin in his book *Ahmadiyah dan pembajakan Al-Qur’an* (2008).<sup>21</sup> In its resolution, the Rābiṭa asked Muslims to “publish photostat copies of the Qadiyani distortions of the Holy Qur’an, take inventory of the Qadiyani translations of the meaning of the Holy Qur’an, highlight the distortions, and ban the circulation of such translations”. Because of this kind of propaganda, many people believe that the Ahmadiyya have a different Qur’an than the one used by mainstream Muslims (Burhani 2015). It is this belief that makes them dare to burn the Qur’an during attacks on the Ahmadiyya, if they indeed do so intentionally.

### *Tensions between Divine Law and State Law*

The belief that fighting against the Ahmadiyya is a jihad offers “divine” justification for violent acts committed against the Ahmadiyya; in the eyes of God, or at least from a religious perspective, attacking the Ahmadiyya would seem to not only be permitted, but even required. The life of the Ahmadis, for conservative *ulama* such as Sobri Lubis, Nasruddin Sa’dilla, and Amin Djamaluddin, as shown in their books, statements, and speeches, is “life devoid of value” (Agamben 1989: 138). The term “*holo!*” used by Lubis depicts this with perfect clarity.<sup>22</sup> It is an endorsement to annihilate the Ahmadis because they were considered unworthy of living; they caused nothing but uneasiness and unrest, and disrupted religious and social order. Because the Ahmadis are no longer considered to have value from a religious perspective, some radical Muslims believe that attacking and persecuting them does not transgress divine law (*ius divinum*) and is not a form of homicide. It would not even be considered a violation of human rights. Instead of feeling guilty, people who kill Ahmadis feel as if they just accomplished a mission from God, guarding the purity of His religion.

However, although all the aforementioned groups believe that attacking the Ahmadiyya is allowed in their religion, or is even considered jihad, they know that taking the law into their own hands is against Indonesian law. Vandalizing the properties of the Ahmadis, let alone killing the Ahmadis, could send them to prison, because it is a violation of state law. Supposing they were aware of this consequence, why would they still commit violence against the Ahmadiyya? As stated above, notwithstanding the weak Indonesian state after the collapse of Suharto in 1998 and the failure of the government to enforce the law, these groups employed theological arguments to justify their violent acts against the Ahmadiyya.

To deal with this contradiction between *ius humanum* (human law) and *ius divinum* (divine law), some activists in these groups justify their acts by stating that state or human law is hierarchically lower than divine law. Attacking the Ahmadis, therefore, is a transgression of human law committed for the sake of upholding divine law. This stance can be seen, for instance, from a banner made by GERAH in Manis Lor. The banner says, “*Ahmadiyah. Jelas!!! Aliran sesat dan menyesatkan. Halal darahnya (agama). Haram darahnya (negara)*” [“Ahmadiyya. Absolutely!!! Deviant and misleading sect.

<sup>20</sup>In his book *Dialog FPI Amar Ma’ruf Nahi Munkar*, Rizieq Syihab of the FPI gives a detailed explanation about the using the notion of Masjid al-Dirār to justify raiding the places he considers to be sources of evil and sinfulness (Syihab 2008: 77-83).

<sup>21</sup>This fatwa is available at <http://www.anti-ahmadiyya.org/en/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=180>. The Arabic version of this fatwa is available at: <http://alhafeez.org/rashid/rabita.jpg> (accessed 13 May 2020).

<sup>22</sup>The term “*holo!*” originally came from the term *halal* (Ar. *halāl*). Switching the “a” and “o” characters in Indonesian lexicography implies multiple emphases on the meaning.



Figure 2. State law vs. Divine law

Their blood is *halal* (religion). Their blood is *haram* (state)"]. An additional confirmation of this stance can be found in the declaration of jihad issued by GERAH and other hardline groups in Kuningan against the Ahmadiyya in Manis Lor. Among other things, the declaration stated that:

Any Muslim who does not attack the Ahmadiyya is considered committing sin everyday....The blood of the followers, supporters, and defenders of the Ahmadiyya are *halal* [allowed to be shed]....As a Muslim, it is happier to be imprisoned [in this world] but guaranteed a space in heaven, than living a normal life in this world but without any guarantee of a space in heaven.

The statements in this quotation show that members of GERAH were definitely aware that their violent acts against the Ahmadiyya could send them to prison. However, they believed that their deeds were done to fulfil a command from God. If they rejected or ignored this command, then they would be continuously committing a great sin every day until they took arms to attack the Ahmadiyya. By attacking the Ahmadiyya, they have fulfilled a “virtue” and would be guaranteed a place in heaven by God, though they could be imprisoned for breaking state law.

FPI members have the same beliefs as GERAH members. During an attack on the Ahmadiyyah compound in Parung, Bogor, in July 2005, Alawi Usman, the chairperson of the Investigation Agency of the Central Board of the FPI, stated that the FPI could be charged under Article No. 170 of the Criminal Code (KUHP), but that he did not care. If he went to jail for destroying the property of the Ahmadiyya, he said he would accept the sentence because it was a consequence of his struggle against evil and vice. He said enthusiastically that “although there were some police, we would still attack them” (Haryadi and Barus 2005). After Asep Abdurahman, a member of the FPI who was convicted for a 2012 attack on an Ahmadiyya mosque in Bandung, a senior member of FPI (Soirin Ahmad Abdulah) stated a similar belief: “We are not deterred. For the sake of correct belief, we are ready to do anything. Being jailed is something normal; consider it as *uzlah* [seclusion for spiritual attainment]. If we are killed, it is martyrdom” (Detik.com 2013). Instead of feeling guilty after hurting other human beings or destroying their property,

the perpetrators believe that attacking the Ahmadiyya is a good deed and even a virtue. Amin Djamaluddin, the leader of the attack, also underlined his readiness to be imprisoned for his participation in the attack. He said, "I am ready! I have been in jail four times" (Haryadi and Barus 2005).

During the *tabligh akbar* in Al-Azhar mosque on 5 August 2005, a quite similar statement was issued by Ja'far Shodiq, the commander of the Islamic Defenders Force (LPI), the paramilitary division of the FPI. He stated his readiness to go to prison for attacking the Ahmadiyya because he believed it was an action committed in defence of Islam. Shodiq knew that he is a man of vice because he was an ex-convict. However, he believed that he could go to heaven by defending the *ulama*. He said that "Even a dog can go to heaven because he defended *Ashabul kahfi* [companions of the cave]. We could do better than a dog....*Insyah Allah* [If God wills], we can go to heaven by defending the *ulama*...we are no longer afraid of prison" (Karni, Arifin, and Pitakasari 2005). Shodiq's statement reveals important points about the differences between the FPI and the secular militia, and why ex-convicts and thugs joined religious militia groups. Although both types of militias have employed similarly violent means, religious militias have justified their acts with religious doctrines. The role of ideology in this context should not be considered less important than the violent act itself, because part of these militias' appeals to people lies in its ideology: conducting violence for the sake of Islam, or as a means of redemption for the *preman* (thug) (Wilson 2008: 207).

## Conclusion

The heresy campaign against the Ahmadiyya before 1998 was mostly limited to a discursive level in the form of issuance of fatwas, publication of books and articles, and public speech and debate. After 1998, there was a shift in the way Indonesian Muslims resist this religious movement. It was no longer limited to the discursive level, but now it also employed the use of force; attacking Ahmadiyya offices and homes, sealing off or burning down Ahmadiyya mosques, halting any religious activities of the Ahmadis, and demanding the dissolution of Ahmadiyya. Violent attacks on the Ahmadis and the properties of the Ahmadiyya even became a habit or a new common feature of the campaign against this movement.

The shift from discursiveness to violence was partly influenced by the fatwa by the MUI, which became theological justification and ideological persuasion for the attack, and the role of vigilante groups in executing the fatwa against what they considered heretical groups. It can be said that the MUI is the brain in the heresy campaign against the Ahmadiyya, whereas FPI, GARIS, and GERAH are the brawns of this movement; they became the muscle in the anti-Ahmadiyya movement. The fatwa from the MUI has become an "ideological persuasion" for resisting the Ahmadiyya, and made the violent attacks on that community theologically justifiable.

The militias and vigilante groups behind the attacks of the Ahmadiyya believed that the Ahmadiyya has insulted and besmirched Islam and theologically deserved to be exterminated. Attacking the Ahmadis was seen as fulfilling a religious call and doing a good deed. It is even believed as a jihad. Therefore, instead of feeling guilty, the perpetrators believed they had done a religious virtue, brought the Ahmadis to the true path of religion, and rescued them from the punishment of God in Hell. They also believed that this movement has transgressed state laws, particularly SKB 2008 on the Ahmadiyya, and Law No. 1/PNPS/1965 on the Prevention of the Misuse or Defamation of Religion. However, they watched the government hesitate to punish them because of international pressure. Motivated by the "command" from religion to punish the Ahmadiyya and the weakness of the government, these groups then took the law into their own hands by attacking the Ahmadiyya. Although they knew that destroying Ahmadiyya properties and killing Ahmadis is a violation of state law, they felt that their acts were justified by divine law.

## References

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer, Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Amin, Ali. 2005. "Intra-Religious Persecution in West Java: Case Study of Ahmadiyah Community in Manis Lor Kuningan." MA thesis, CRCS Gadjah Mada University.
- Assyaukanie, Luthfi. 2007. "Fatwa dan kekerasan terhadap Ahmadiyah." *Jawa Pos.*, 12 March.
- Assyaukanie, Luthfi. 2009. "Fatwa and violence in Indonesia." *Journal of Religion and Society* 11: 1-21.

- Aziz, Deden Abdul. 2008. "Dua masjid Ahmadiyah Cianjur disegel." *Tempo Interaktif*, 20 June. Available at: <http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2008/06/20/058126179/Dua-Masjid-Ahmadiyah-Cianjur-Disegel> (accessed 27 March 2012).
- Aziz, Deden Abdul. 2011. "Massa ormas Islam Cianjur duduki masjid Ahmadiyah." *Tempo*, 11 March. Available at: <http://www.tempo.co/read/news/2011/03/11/178319272/Massa-Ormas-Islam-Cianjur-Duduki-Masjid-Ahmadiyah> (accessed 23 June 2011).
- Ba'asyir, Abu Bakar. 2011. "Ahmadiyah lebih kejam dari PKI." *Jawa Pos National Network*, 24 February. Available at: <http://www.jpnn.com/read/2011/02/24/85166/Ba%27asyir-Ahmadiyah-Lebih-Kejam-dari-PKI-> (accessed 30 March 2012).
- Bagir, Zainal Abidin, et al. 2011. *Laporan tahunan kehidupan beragama di Indonesia 2010*. Yogyakarta: CRCS-UGM.
- Burhani, Ahmad Najib. 2014a. "Hating the Ahmadiyya: the place of heretics in contemporary Indonesian Muslim society." *Contemporary Islam* 8(2): 133-152.
- Burhani, Ahmad Najib. 2014b. "Treating minorities with Fatwas: a study of the Ahmadiyya community in Indonesia." *Contemporary Islam* 8(3): 285-301.
- Burhani, Ahmad Najib. 2015. "Sectarian translation of the Qur'an in Indonesia: the case of the Ahmadiyya." *Al-Jami'ah* 52(2): 251-282.
- Burhani, Ahmad Najib. 2016. "Fundamentalism and religious dissent: the LPPPI's mission to eradicate the Ahmadiyya in Indonesia." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 44(129): 145-164.
- Burhani, Ahmad Najib. 2017. "Geertz's trichotomy of Abangan, Santri, and Priyayi: controversy and continuity." *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 11(2): 329-50.
- Colbran, Nicola. 2010. "Realities and challenges in realising freedom of religion or belief in Indonesia." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 14(5): 678-704.
- Connley, Aleah. 2016. "Understanding the oppressed: a study of the Ahmadiyah and their strategies for overcoming adversity in contemporary Indonesia." *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 35(1): 29-58.
- Crouch, Melissa. 2009. *Indonesia, Militant Islam and Ahmadiyah: Origins and Implications*. Melbourne: ARC Federation Fellowship, Centre for Islamic Law and Society, Melbourne Law School, University of Melbourne.
- Crouch, Melissa. 2011. "Ahmadiyah in Indonesia: a history of religious tolerance under threat?" *Alternative Law Journal* 36(1): 56-57.
- Detik.com. 2013. "Terdakwa perusakan masjid Ahmadiyah bersukur divonis 3,5 bulan." *Detik.com*, 5 February. Available at: <http://bandung.detik.com/read/2013/02/05/144534/2161664/486/terdakwa-perusakan-masjid-ahmadiyah-bersukur-divonis-35-bulan> (accessed 13 May 2020).
- Djamaluddin, M. Amin. 2008. *Ahmadiyah & Pembajakan Al-Qur'an*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian & Pengkajian Islam.
- Djamaluddin, M. Amin. 2011. *Ahmadiyah Menodai Islam: Kumpulan Fakta dan Data*. Jakarta: Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengkajian Islam.
- Frend, William H.C. 1987. "Persecution." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Mircea Eliade and Charles J. Adams, v. 11, 247-256. New York: Macmillan.
- Hapsari, Arghea Desafti. 2011. "Manislor, the largest Ahmadiyah ghetto." *The Jakarta Post*, 17 January. Available at: <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2011/01/17/manislor-largest-ahmadiyahghetto.html> (accessed 23 March 2012).
- Harsono, Andreas. 2010. "Membakar al Quran di Cisalada." *andreasarsono.net*, 10 October. Available at: <http://www.andreasarsono.net/2010/10/membakar-al-quran-di-cisalada.html> (accessed 13 May 2020).
- Haryadi, Rohmat, and Deni M. Barus. 2005. "Marah pada yang diberkahi." *Gatra*, 36/XI, 23 July. Available with subscription at: <http://www.gatra.com/2005-07-18/majalah/artikel.php?pil=23&id=86547> (accessed 24 May 2011).
- Hasani, Ismail, and Bonar T. Naipospos. 2010. *Wajah Para 'Pembela' Islam: Radikalisme Agama dan Implikasinya Terhadap Jaminan Kebebasan Beragama/ Berkeyakinan di Jabodetabek dan Jawa Barat*. Jakarta: Pustaka Masyarakat Setara.
- Hatmodjo, Tri. 2011. "Warga serang masjid dan bakar kitab Ahmadiyah." *Joglosemar*, 14 March. Available at: <http://harianjoglosemar.com/berita/warga-serang-masjid-bakar-kitab-ahmadiyah-38693.html> (accessed 3 April 2012).
- Hernawan, Chep. 2010. "Ahmadiyah dan gereja liar menjadi 'makanan kami'." Interview by Abdul Halim. *Suara Islam Online*, 15 December. Available at: <http://www.suara-islam.com/news/berita/wawancara/1597-ahmadiyah-dan-gereja-liar-menjadi-makanan-kami> (accessed 23 March 2012).
- Hicks, Jacqueline. 2014. "Heresy and authority: understanding the turn against Ahmadiyah in Indonesia." *South East Asia Research* 22(3): 321-339.
- Jaiz, Hartono Ahmad, and Hamzah Tede. 2011. "Rekayasa Ahmadiyah cari dukungan musuh Islam." *Era Muslim*, 25 February. Available at: <http://www.erasuslim.com/berita/laporan-khusus/rekayasa-ahmadiyah-cari-dukungan-musuh-islam.htm#.URa5uPJo0-U> (accessed 13 May 2020).
- Karni, Asrori S., Lukman H. Arifin, and Ajeng R. Pitakasari. 2005. "Keluar sarang mencari titik temu." *Gatra*, 39/XI, 13 August. Available with subscription at: <http://www.gatra.com/2005-08-08/majalah/artikel.php?pil=23&id=87419> (accessed 24 June 2011).
- Karni, Asrori S., Anthony Djafar, and Wisnu W. Pamungkas. 2010. "Bara terpendam sengketa keagamaan." *Gatra*, 39/XVI, 18 August. Available with subscription at: <http://www.gatra.com/2010-08-09/majalah/artikel.php?pil=23&id=140692> (accessed 24 June 2011).
- Kennedy, Charles H. 1989. "Towards the definition of a Muslim in an Islamic state: the case of the Ahmadiyya in Pakistan." In *Religious and Ethnic Minority Politics in South Asia*, edited by Dharendra Vajpeyi and Yogendra K. Malik, 71-108. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Kurtz, Lester R. 1983. "The politics of heresy." *American Journal of Sociology* 88(6), 1085-1115.
- Lecker, Michael. 1995. *Muslims, Jews, and Pagans: Studies on Early Islamic Medina*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

- Lincoln, Bruce.** 1989. *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lukito, Ratno.** 2016. "Islamisation as legal intolerance: the case of GARIS in Cianjur, West Java." *Al Jami'ah* 54(2): 393-425.
- Mohammad, Herry, and Luqman Hakim Arifin.** 2005. "Merusak rumah menjarah harta." *Gatra*, 46/XI, 1 October. Available with subscription at: <http://www.gatra.com/2005-09-26/majalah/artikel.php?pil=23&id=88726> (accessed 24 June 2011).
- Mubarak Ahmad, Mirza.** 1964. *Ahmadiyyat in the Far East*. Trans. from Urdu by Soofi A.Q. Niaz. Rabwah, West Pakistan: Ahmadiyya Muslim Foreign Missions.
- Mudzakkir, Amin.** 2007. "Menjadi minoritas di tengah perubahan: dinamika komunitas Ahmadiyah di Ciparay." In *Hak Minoritas: Multikulturalisme dan Dilema Negara Bangsa*, edited by Mashudi Noorsalim, Muhammad Nurkhoiron, and Ridwan Al-Makassary, 195-235. Lenteng Agung, Jakarta: Interseksi Foundation.
- Mudzakkir, Amin.** 2008. "Politik Muslim dan Ahmadiyah di Indonesia pasca Soeharto: kasus Cianjur dan Tasikmalaya." Paper presented at the Seminar Internasional IX Dinamika Politik Lokal di Indonesia on *Politik Identitas: Agama, Etnisitas, dan Ruang/Space dalam Dinamika Politik Lokal dan Asia Tenggara Yayasan Percik Salatiga*, 15-17 July.
- Muryadi, ed.** 2005. *Ahmadiyah: Keyakinan yang Digugat*. Jakarta: Pusat Data & Analisa Tempo.
- Nurul Rosidin, Didin.** 2009. "Islam, Ahmadiyah and the government: unresolved religious conflicts in Manis Lor Kuningan, West Java." Paper presented at the second International Conference on *Islam, Democracy and Good Governance in Indonesia*, Semarang, Indonesia, 6-8 October.
- Purwanto, Wawan H.** 2009. *Mengurai Benang Kusut Konflik FPI-AKKBB*. Pasar Rebo, Jakarta: CMB Press.
- Putra, Idamsyah Eka, Peter Holtz, and Any Rufaedah.** 2018. "Who is to blame, the victims or the perpetrators? A study to understand a series of violence targeting the accused heretic group Ahmadiyya." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 10 (2): 166-173.
- Radar Cirebon.** 2007. "Tempat ibadah Ahmadiyah terancam dibongkar." 3 December. Available at: <http://akkbb.wordpress.com/2007/12/03/tempat-ibadah-ahmadiyah-terancam-dibongkar/> (accessed 30 March 2012).
- Riza, Budi, and Ivansyah.** 2008. "Ahmadiyah: mendung gerimis di Manis Lor." *Tempo*, 21 January. Available at: <http://majalah.tempointeraktif.com/id/arsip/2008/01/21/NAS/mbm.20080121>. NAS126146.id.html (accessed 23 June 2011).
- Rosyidin, and Ali Mursyid.** 2007. "Diskriminasi hak sipil minoritas: pelarangan pencatatan pernikahan jemaat Ahmadiyah Kuningan." In *Politisasi Agama dan Konflik Komunal: Beberapa Isu penting di Indonesia*, edited by Ahmad Suaedy and Rumadi, 49-78. Jakarta: Wahid Institute.
- Saeed, Sadia.** 2007. "Pakistani nationalism and the state marginalisation of the Ahmadiyya community in Pakistan." *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 7(3): 132-152.
- Sekretariat Majelis Ulama Indonesia.** 2010. *Himpunan Fatwā Majelis Ulama Indonesia*. Jakarta: Majelis Ulama Indonesia.
- Soedirgo, Jessica.** 2018. "Informal networks and religious intolerance: how clientelism incentivizes the discrimination of the Ahmadiyah in Indonesia." *Citizenship Studies* 22(2): 191-207.
- Suaedy, Ahmad.** 2010. "Religious freedom and violence in Indonesia." In *Islam in contention: Rethinking Islam and state in Indonesia*, edited by Ota Atsushi, Okamoto Masaaki, and Ahmad Suaedy, 139-169. Jakarta: Wahid Institute-CSEAS-CAPAS.
- Suryana, A'an.** 2016. "President Yudhoyono's response to violence against Ahmadiyah and Shia: interplay between agency and structure." *Kawalu: Journal of Local Culture* 3(1): 1-22.
- Suryana A'an.** 2018. "Indonesian Presidents and communal violence against non-mainstream faiths." *South East Asia Research* 26(2): 147-160.
- Suryana, A'an.** 2019. "State officials' entanglement with vigilante groups in violence against Ahmadiyah and Shi'a communities in Indonesia." *Asian Studies Review* 43(3): 475-492.
- Syihab, Rizieq.** 2008. *Dialog FPI Amar Mâruf Nahi Munkar: Menjawab Berbagai Tuduhan terhadap Gerakan Nasional Anti Mâsiat di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pustaka Ibnu Sidah.
- Syihab, Rizieq.** 2011a. "Bubarkan Ahmadiyah atau revolusi." Interview by Abdul Halim. *Suara Islam Online*, 18 February. Available at: <http://www.suara-islam.com/news/berita/wawancara/1969-bubarkan-ahmadiyah-atau-revolusi> (accessed 28 March 2012).
- Syihab, Rizieq.** 2011b. "Bubarkan Ahmadiyah!" Interview by Sirad Firdaus and Joko Prasetyo. *Tabloid Media Umat*, No. 53, 5 April. Available at: <http://mediaumat.com/wawancara/2615-53-bubarkan-ahmadiyah.html> (accessed 30 March 2012).
- Syihab, Rizieq.** 2011c. "FPI bersumpah, akan terus berjuang membubarkan Ahmadiyah sampai tetes darah terakhir!" *Suara Islam*, 18 February. Available at: <http://fpi.or.id/?p=detail&nid=346> (accessed 9 February 2013).
- Wahid Institute.** 2008a. *Laporan Tahunan the Wahid Institute 2008, Pluralisme Beragama/ Berkeyakinan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: The Wahid Institute.
- Wahid Institute.** 2008b. "Kekerasan di sidang tragedy Monas." *Monthly Report on Religious Issues*. Edition XIV, September.
- Wahid Institute.** 2011. *Lampu Merah Kebebasan Beragama: Laporan Kebebasan Beragama dan Toleransi di Indonesia 2011*. Jakarta: The Wahid Institute.
- Wilson, Ian Douglas.** 2008. "'As long as it's halal': Islamic preman in Jakarta." In *Expressing Islam: Religious Life and Politics in Indonesia*, edited by G. Fealy and S. White, 192-210. Singapore: ISEAS.