

Veils, Radicalism, and a Policy

written by Harakatuna

These days, we are shocked by the policy of the Minister of Religion (Menag) Fachrul Razi who discourages the ban on wearing veils and Cingkrang pants in government agencies. Although the veil ban has actually been applied for a long time, but in lecture classrooms, this time the ban is reaping the pros and cons because it targets public space.

Responses also arrive. Both religious leaders, politicians, and even terrorism prevention have different opinions about the policy. One DPR member from the PP faction even said that the policy needed to be reviewed. "This policy has the potential to violate human rights even though from a security perspective it could be justified," said Baidowi, Friday (1/11).

The topic of the veil, as well as its relation to radicalism, soon spread. Indonesia Lawyers Club (ILC) appointed him on Tuesday (5/11) yesterday. The Chief Editor of ILC, Karni Ilyas brought speakers from various elements; party politicians, MUI, NU Online, Culture, BNPT, as well as Niqab Squad veil users.

Veil as Controversial

Basically, in Islam, the veil is not something new, or something that must be seen as polemic. Moreover, Cingkrang pants, which are purely a particular cultural product. The problem is, when the veil is seen as an "identity", which more or less makes the veil itself has a negative stigma.

The school of priests also disagreed about the use of the veil. According to Imam Shafi'i (d. 820), the legal veil is mandatory, because the whole body of a woman is considered as aurat, if outside prayer. Imam Ahmad ibn Hanbal (d. 855) is even more strict, saying that a woman's entire body, even her nails, is also naked. So the veil is an obligation.

Different from Imam Shafi'i and Imam Ahmad, Imam Abu Hanifah (d. 767) and Imam Malik (d. 795) agree that the face of a woman does not include genitalia. However, if backbiting becomes something that is vulnerable, then the veil is not only sunnah but obligatory. The opinions of the four Imams are purely about the veil, not yet contaminated with the context of radicalism.

It is important to note that the ikhtilaf among the ulama is contextual. However, fiqh is a particular consensus, it cannot be separated from the context of when and where the formulation of a law was made. Did not rule out the possibility, what is the consensus of fiqh cannot be applied because of the relevance of the context itself.

As proof, we must depart from the realization that initially, the veil was culture. The form of the veil is a cultural product. When the Islamic Shari'a highlights the genitalia as a sin, and must be covered, then covered using a veil, then at that time the cultural products enter the Shari'a room. Then, the veil is considered part of the Shari'a.

Such an assumption may be justified. But it must also be realized, that initially the veil was a cultural product. Because the culture is diverse, closing the genitals is not merely a veil. Phobias of other cultures that then sparked debate. And from that the pros and cons of the veil found its momentum.

As a middle way, sharization of the veil may not be to blame, as it cannot be blamed by its users. However, in plural Indonesia, wearing the veil is a mirror of exclusivity, limiting heterogeneous multi-interactions. This is apart from the notion that the veil - as well as the pants - is a symbol of radicalism.

Radical; Discourse and Stigma

Perhaps it is true, and must be agreed, what Prof. Irfan Idris, Director of Deradicalization of the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT), said that there are no physical radical criteria. Even if you wear a veil, pants or a gloved one, it can't be the reason someone is labeled radical or not.

Therefore, radicals themselves must be understood in their entirety, holistically. Radical is one thing, veil is another. A person who holds a radical view, in the sense of takfiri, intolerant, rejects the Unitary Republic of Indonesia, and rejects Pancasila, does not have to wear a veil or wear pants. Likewise, veiling doesn't mean people who like to bomb, if that's an example of radical action.

Radical as a discourse has a connotation of positive meaning, which is thinking to its roots. Radical conditions are comprehensive, systematic and universal. Unfortunately, radicals then become an ism, then connotes stigmatic. Radical as ism is then interpreted as an effort to undermine the existence of the Unitary

Republic of Indonesia with violent, extreme channels.

When it becomes ism, negative stigma does find space. Every person who acts extreme will be labeled as radical. Each actor is also then symbolically marked. This is the forerunner to the stigmatization of the veil as a symbol of radicalism. Borrowing the language of Savic Ali, Director of NU Online, the veil experienced stereotyping and over-generalizing as a radical symbol.

Both as a discourse and as a stigma, in fact, radicals have experienced the development of meaning. Forcing the will, acting in the name of Islam, and using violence is a concrete proof of radicalism. But he is not bound by any symbol, including the veil. Making stereotypes and over-generalizing will only make things worse.

Government Policy

Now we go to the source of the polemic, why is the policy of Minister of Religion Fachrul Razi busy responded by various parties. As part of the government, one of the tasks of the Minister of Religion is to eradicate radicalism. Perhaps public rejection is the method used by the Minister of Religion; forbid veils and trousers.

Agree or not with the policy is a matter of diversity of perceptions about the veil itself. However, in the context of staffing administration, that ASN is in a state institution, a ban on veils might be justified. Even if it is considered to injure human rights, it is important to remember that personal rights can be reduced by institutional rights.

Using the veil is not the only worship, and because of ikhtilaf, removing it is not disobedience. Even so, generalizing the veil users as radicals is also a bad act, as is the bad assumption that Islam has accommodated radicalism. Radicals are the mindset. Especially with religion, even with religious symbols he is not bound at all.

Finally, we must both realize that radicalism is a common enemy. Takfiri with his expressions of hatred, jihadists with his terror, as well as ideological political provocations need to be counteracted from various aspects. Veils and trousers are not stigmatized, but they are not the only source of merit either.

Preserving the Sunnah is not merely a matter of veiling. Practicing Islamic law

does not have to clash with government policy. Again, radicalism is one thing, veils and conical pants are another. The main thing is to protect Pancasila and the unity of the State from division, and the chronic epidemic called radicalism-extremism.

Allah A'lam bi ash-Shawab