Democracy in *Zuhud* Concept: Politics of Articulation of Truth of Gus Mus' Intelligence Practice in the 2015 NU Congress

Khoiron Khoiron, Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia*
Purwo Santoso, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
Budi Irawanto, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Abstract
This study describes intellectuality as a practice of contesting truth in offering alternative truths aside of the existing truth. This paper aimed to describe how the truth regime is articulated by the subject of knowledge, as well as a political agent namely Ahmad Mustofa Bisri in the 2015 NU Congress. At that moment, Gus Mus' practice of articulation of truth by refusing the position of '*rais aam*' was political. This study questioned how the regime of truth was articulated amid the power contest at the 2015 NU Congress. This study argued that, amid the practice of contesting truth, at the same time, there is a politics of value and idea articulation, carried out by an individual who occupies a position as part of the intellectual. It is at the political level of the articulation of truth that novelty is described in this study. Using text and context-based discourse analysis methods, this study produced truths, including: 1). dismissing '*hubbud dunya*', 2). fostering 'mind' and 'morality', and 3). strengthening '*legawing ati*' in dedication. Whereas, the above markers are marker moments which reinforcers the main marker, namely the regime of *zuhud*, articulated by Gus Mus by self-regulation (subject position) as ' a student' related to elements of discourse antagonism. The term of '*kiai*' related to the position of *rais aam*.

Keywords: Intellectual, Truth, Politics of articulation, Democracy, *Zuhud*, Nahdlatul Ulama

INTRODUCTION

Getting into the 21st century, we are all witnessing an explosion of ironic social, political, and religious events that have brought society into a multidimensional crisis. In Indonesia, at the beginning of the reformation era, there were various acts of violence, especially in Jakarta as the center of governmental power. This is allegedly a distrust of some people to the government, especially reacting to the increased number of unsolved corruption cases. In that situation, amid chaos and declining public trust, the involvement of political elites, religious leaders, and intellectuals, including Gus Mus is important. Moreover, in the history of Indonesia, the upheaval of the political revolution for independence is evidence of the involvement of intellectuals in the struggle for independence. Therefore, in this study, the political practice of articulating the truth that was involved and carried out by Gus Mus with a change in subject position in the 2015 NU Congress case is a novelty that the authors found.

*Correspondence: Kota Malang 65144 East Java, Indonesia
Email: khoiron@unisma.ac.id

Who are the intellectuals?

Ontologically, so far intellectuals by Gramsci (1891) are described as "All men are intellectuals, one could therefore say: but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals". In a sense, anyone can be called an intellectual, if he can perform social functions such as offering ideas (Held, 1983; 573), or the one who offer alternative truths by speaking the truth to the authorities (Said, 1993; 97), because they have two main functions in a society: a stabilizer in the social system, and a critical function for ongoing democratic life to discuss political issues (Ozick, 1995; Karpova et al., 2016). In other words, to distinguish between intellectuals and non-intellectuals, it is sufficient to refer to the dimensions of the social functions an individual performs (Gottlieb, 1989; 115). Furthermore, in order to get additional answers to the previous ontological question, this study shifts to the political activities of what Karl Max calls 'universal thinkers' and 'intellectuals' (Bates, 2007; 21). who struggle in the political revolution.

From here, the answer to who an intellectual is may be a little relief for whoever who questions about subjects or entities labeled as intellectuals. Critically, the previous ontological answer is not enough to explain how the subject occupies the position of being 'intellectual'. This is because intellectual identity is the discursivity result of a certain discourse. Therefore, intellectual is a subject of knowledge, as well as a political agent in the political struggle to articulate the truths. The implication of the previous ontological explanation is that intellectual has become the basis for counter actions, as well as compromises against a certain regime of truth, amid the truth contestation of truth. In the intellectual practice, there is a politics of truth, which dissimulates to claim the existence of a single or universal truth. As an ulama and religionist, Gus Mus certainly believes in the existence of a single truth, namely the truth of Islamic teachings that he absorbs and articulates in the political struggle. Therefore, the focus of this study is not to explain what intellectuals are, but how to practice the contestation of truth, as well as the political practice of articulation of truth. Whereas, intellectuality is a form of political acts.

As political warriors, intellectuals articulate ideas and values because they work in a universal space, not bound by identity and specialization (Melzer, 1992; Leo & Hitchock, 2016). Intellectuals struggle for values and ideals according to their respective versions. However, behind their political struggle, they represent values and ideas as a person of ideas, namely someone who loves big and broad ideas, which are mostly used for their own interests (Melzer, 1992; 04). Therefore, Michel Foucault (1977) stated that intellectuals struggle in creating truth, where truth is understood as something that is produced, maintained, validated, and regulated by a series of political mechanisms, techniques, and procedures (Goswani, 2014; 8). Truth is the result of the practice of discourse, as well as the practice of the politics of articulation.

As stated by Foucault that:
"Truth is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for

the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements" (Foucault, 1980; 133).

From here, truth is constructed by a discursive system or order of knowledge, which then creates a regime of truth by delegitimizing and negating other knowledges. In that position, a knowledge becomes a regime of truth because it is functioned as 'true', and other discourses as 'wrong'. Truth in the truth regime is a knowledge considered very legitimate, so it has the privilege of guiding human cognition and action (Reyna & Schiller, 1998; 337). In a sense, a knowledge has become a technology of power, and a tactical element to legitimize and negate other truths produced by the subject of knowledge, as well as a political agent through the practice of politics of articulation of certain truths.

Laclau and Mouffe (1985) explained the concept of articulation that:

"We will call articulation any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice. The structured totality resulting from the articulatory practice, we will call discourse" (Laclau & Mouffe 1985 (2001); 105).

The politics of articulation of the truth of identity or subject depends on what elements of antagonism or discourse build relationships, so that identity can change a certain subject position. In that subject position, the practice of articulation of truth is political due to changes in the identities of different subjects. In this context, the political agency of Gus Mus can only be identified as long as it is connected with the antagonistic elements of discourse, so that it can regulate itself, and at the same time delegitimize and negate other truths.

METHODS

This study used discourse analysis based on text. In addition, this study also used discourse analysis method in Foucault and Van Dijk style, where both overlap not only in the text and context, but also in the same purpose, namely the dimension of 'the making of subject'.

DYNAMICS OF CONTESTATION OF TRUTH: Pro and Con of Ahlul Halli, Wal Aqdi or Ahwa

At that time, the congress was opened by the President. The atmosphere of the Jombang square was lively and crowded. Thousands of *Nahdliyin* (people affiliated with NU organization) attended the 5-year event. After being opened, the event continued with the first plenary session which discussed the rules for the activities of the congress. During the plenary session, a conflict related to the discussion of the rules for the election of *Rais Aam* (the highest leader of NU organization), namely *Ahlul halli wal aqdi* or *Ahwa* (the election of the highest leader of NU organization) occurred between the Said Aqil group vis a vis the Hasyim Muzadi's group. The Said Aqil's group

supported *Ahwa*.[1] According to them, *Ahwa* is the implementation of the election mechanism as regulated in the organization. On the other hand, the Hasyim Muzadi's group rejected *Ahwa* as a way of electing *Rais Aam*.[2] According to them, *Ahwa* did not comply with the organization's regulations. Therefore, constitutionally *Ahwa* is not true. These situations created disputes in the *Nahdliyin* community.

One of *Ahwa*'s supporters argued "Don't be wrong, the rules for the election and determination of *rais aam* in the bylaws NU article 41 paragraph (1) letter (a) are actually the entry point for the formal legal application of *Ahwa*. In fact, the *Ahwa* system is considered to be in line with the principles of democracy or deliberation in the NU community. In a sense, the *Ahwa* system is the democratic culture of the *Nahdliyin*, or what is known as the principle of

'*wasawirhum fil amr*' or discuss on every problem. Baidlawi, a committee, said "That is legal, but it must not conflict with the articles of association and bylaws because obeying the articles of association and bylaws is our collective obligation.

On the other hand, the group that refused considered that it was not in line with the organization's rules, and even violated the articles of association and bylaws, which reads that the election of *rais aam* is through direct election or deliberation, not with the *Ahlul Halli Wal Aqdi* system or *Ahwa*. The implication is *Ahwa* is legally flawed because it did not have strong legitimacy and was decided at the 2014 Muslim Ulama National Conference, which had a lower position than the congress.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Proposing Politics with Zuhud Concept

On the third day, the plenary session found an agreement after Gus Mus issued a fatwa (a legal ruling on a point of Islamic law) related to *Ahwa*. Thus, on the fourth day, the commission's sessions went relatively well, and were conducive. In fact, the plenary session of the Organizational Commission led by Ishomudin also confirmed that *Ahwa* could be agreed upon as a mechanism for selecting *rais aam*. The plenary session was completed, and the event continued with the process of delegating the PBNU management for the 2010-2015 period by Said Aqil, and the event continued with the process of calculating the members of *Ahwa* that had been proposed by the NU regional administrators. The committee meeting

---

[1] This group considers that *Ahwa* is the embodiment of deliberation or consensus '*wasawirhum fi al-amri*' as stated in the articles of association and bylaws (AD/ART), as a election mechanism. In https://news.okezone.com/read/2015/08/03/519/1189754/gus-aiz-dinamika-muktamar-sudahmengarah-konflik. Accessed on August 20, 2020

[2] According to the group rejecting the *Ahwa* mechanism, that the mechanism has been imposed within election of *rais aam*, and is considered a political effort that violates the rules of the NU organization. According to them, the *Ahwa* mechanism was only agreed upon in the 2014 National Conference, and there is none legitimacy in the articles of association and bylaws of the NU organization because, the National Conference is only a forum that is still being held under the authority of the congress and cannot change the articles of association and bylaws, and the National Conference is only capable of discusses '*Masail Diniyyah*' or religious problems in the daily life of religious people. In https://www.kompasiana.com/cakPujiono/55c97f992b7a61950fbfefb2/ini-dia-kejanggalandan-engineering-muktamar-ke-33-nu?page=3. Accessed on 20 July 2020

conducted a vote count led by Muzakki, and nine *kiai khos* (*kiai* with certain criteria in religious teaching).

The *Ahwa* group discussed. They presented their views and arguments one by one. However, after considering the advice from Kiai Maemon Zubair who is considered senior *kiai*, the *Ahwa* group decided to choose Gus Mus to be *rais aam* again, and Ma'ruf Amin to be the representative for the 2015-2020 period. However, Gus Mus rejected the decision. The committee rushed to convey this to the *Ahwa* group, and other committees. In fact, to convince the *Ahwa* members and the committee, Gus Mus officially rejected the position he had held since 2014-2015.

Dismissing 'Hubbud Duniya' (An Interest toward Materials)

At that time, the disagreement between the Tebuireng group, Hasyim Muzadi's group, and Sholahudin Wahid's group regarding the *Ahwa* system in the *rais aam* election had made the situation of the congress even more heated, and became an arena for open disputes between the pro and con. The first plenary session that discussed the draft rules of procedure for the 33rd NU congress in Jombang Square was chaotic several times, and even there were clashes between speakers at least three times. The trial was tough. The pro and contra had an argument that ended in a fistfight.

One of the administrators from Central Malacca said "*Ahlul halli wal aqdi* is the result of the National Conference in Jakarta. The National Conference has no right to decide the electoral system". Therefore, the *Ahwa* system cannot be

used in the congress. *Ahwa* is only decided on a lower forum than the congress. The plenary session became chaotic again, and Slamet Effendy Yusuf as the chairman of the Steering Committee (SC) who led the trial suspended the plenary session for the fourth time. In an interview, Abdul Malik Madani who claimed to be the first initiator of the *Ahwa* election model considered that the *Ahwa* system is better than the voting system, at the plenary session instead suggesting that the election of *rais aam* be adjusted to NU's Articles of Association and Bylaws, namely through direct elections or deliberation. Until the end of time, the plenary session of the congress had not yet found a common ground.

Seeing such dynamic situation and condition, through his Twitter account, Gus Mus said "From the arena of the NU Congress, I sincerely convey the highest respect and salute to Muhammadiyah and its congress. *Mabruk..![3]* Indeed, in another place, Muhammadiyah was holding a congress which, as far as media reported, went quite conducive and smoothly compared to the dynamics of the 33rd NU congress in Jombang at that time. In fact, the NU Congress has led to physical conflicts among the participants. Still in the plenary session, the atmosphere of the NU Congress in Jombang square was out of control. Participants insulted each other, and there was physical friction. The security forces, consisting of *Banser*

---

[3] In https://news.detik.com/berita/d-2983379/gus-mus-salut-setinggi-tingginyakepada-muktamar-muhammadiyah. selasa, 04 agustus 2015. 21: 39 WIB. Accessed on 10
March 2020

and *Ansor*, even expelled participants who had carried out physical violence and insulted the dignity of the ulama.

Right after Gus Mus had a meeting at the Regency Hall, he immediately headed to the location of the Plenary Session. Once on stage, the frenzied atmosphere of the congress forum after the conflict suddenly turned quiet. With a slightly hoarse tone of voice and teary eyes, Gus Mus said "When I attended past trials, I cried because NU, which has been imaged as a religious organization, a role model full of morality, and often criticizes the disgraceful practices of other parties is portrayed so badly in the mass media. I am ashamed of Allah, I am ashamed of Mbah Hasyim, Mbah Wahab, and Mbah Bisri. I accidentally became the leader because I had to replace Kiai Sahal, so I was forced to accept this position. Why did Kiai Sahal have to pass first? NU was founded here. Do we want to disable it here too. I am ashamed of K.H. Hasyim Asyari, K.H. Wahab Hasbullah, and K.H. Bisri Sansuri.[4] Remember that NU is bigger than this little thing. NU is bigger because NU is expected to be an example. Not only for Indonesia but also the world nowadays. I had not slept since last night because of thinking of you all".[5] Gus Mus felt ashamed of the founders of NU because the democratic carried out by the *Nahdliyin* reflected a greedy, irrational, and anarchist character.

Fostering 'Mind' and 'Morality'

As previously described, the atmosphere of the commission's plenary session was not conducive but chaotic. Disputes and conflicts occurred between two groups, claiming what they stood for as right, and the other was wrong. Furthermore, in the commission's plenary session, Gus Mus continued his speech by saying "Please forgive me, if necessary, I will kiss your feet to show you *tawaduk* (politeness) as taught by Kiai Hasyim. Listen to your leader, I am *rais aam*. If you do not listen, why am I here, just let me go, I will be back as an ordinary NU citizen.[6] Democracy is not an arena for creating conflict, discord, and enmity. Democracy should rest on a clear mind.

With a distinctive tone, Gus Mus continued his speech "Please forgive me, I beg your pardon, especially those who come from far away, especially the elder *kiai*. I humbly apologize, this is my responsibility, please forgive me, forgive them (the committee), the mistake was my fault. When I attended past trials, I cried because NU, imaged as a religious organization, a role model full of morality, and often criticizing the unscrupulous practices of other parties, but is portrayed in the mass media so badly. I am ashamed of Allah, ashamed of K.H. Hasyim Asy'ari, K.H. Wahab Hasbullah, K.H. Bisri Syansuri and our predecessors. Moreover, when I was

---

[4] In https://daerah.sindonews.com/berita/1029157/151/tangis-gus-mus-redammuktamar-nu. Accessed on 10 March 2020

[5] In https://daerah.sindonews.com/berita/1029157/151/tangis-gus-mus-redammuktamar-nu. Accessed on 10 March 2020

[6] In https://daerah.sindonews.com/berita/1029157/151/tangis-gus-mus-redammuktamar-nu. Accessed on 10 March 2020

presented with a newspaper whose headline was 'The NU Congress was rowdy, the Muhammadiyah Conference was shady'. I beg you once again, let's recite Al-Fatihah sincerely, ask for his help (Prophet Muhammad SAW). *Rais aam* who made me into a position like this, K.H. Sahal Mahfud, why did he pass, so now I carry this burden, lend me your ears, pray for me, this is the last time I hold a position that is not for me".[7]

Indeed, democracy is an instrument to pursue and maintain a position. However, in pursuing a position, it is more important to obtain and maintain that power amid democratization which has become a global discourse. The democratic practice must be carried out within an ethical framework (*akhlaqul karimah*), both in fighting for, pursuing, and maintaining power. Through this perspective, democracy as a political instrument has its true meaning, namely harmony in political differences.

Still in Gus Mus' speech, "Listen to me as your supreme leader. Please listen to me, respectfully, if necessary, I kiss all your feet, so that you follow the morality of Kiai Hasyim Asy'ari and our predecessors. I call the older *kiai*, and most of them are all concerned, very deeply concerned." As a global discourse, democracy has dimensions that are equal with deliberation, where there is a consensus in diversity and guarantees political rights for all people. However, democracy exists with its vulnerabilities and weaknesses. Instead

of desiring to liberate people's rights, this freedom goes irrational and even anarchic.

Strengthening 'Legawing Ati' (An attitude to Accept) in Devotion

Still in Gus Mus' speech "If later you all cannot be united again, then *kiai* and I will give a solution, if you can, please discuss. If not, you can vote. That is our Articles of Association and Bylaws. Since this is a matter for the election of *rais aam*, *kiai* will choose the leader of the *kiai*. And the procedures that have been agreed upon need to be implemented immediately. If you still do not accept this, then I am the one who accept it, because I am only Mustafa Bisri, I am just a person who accidentally replaced Kiai Sahal. Otherwise, just let me go". Conceptually, the essence of democracy is competition. Through competition, everyone tries to get something as a basic right.

Furthermore, Gus Mus added "On this land lie our *kiai*, here NU was founded, do we want to destroy it here too, *Naudzubillah*, I ask you to humbly let go of everything, and think of Allah and our founders. Therefore, after considering the situation, *kiai* who had gathered until this afternoon, aside from their concerns, also some points that need to be used as guidelines for further discussion. We only agree on a few solutions, so it is not the same as in Senayan. First, if there is an article that has not been agreed upon in the congress regarding the election of *rais aam*, and it cannot be solved through deliberation and consensus, then a vote

---

[7] In https://news.detik.com/berita/d-2983379/gus-mus-salutsetinggi-tingginya-kepada-muktamar-muhammadiyah. Accessed on 10 March 2020

will be carried out by *rais syuriah*.[8] It is often recognized that in politics, there are no friends and foes, but interests. However, even if such interests exist, the dimensions of justice, humanity, and the common good must be prioritized. Thus, if there is an interest in the NU Congress, it is certainly in line with the interests of this organization, namely the common good. While shedding tears. Gus Mus said "Please pray that I will only become *rais aam* once. I had not slept since last night because I think of you all. I apologize to all the congress, especially those from far away and the elders, the technical committee that disappoints you, please forgive them, forgive me. It is my fault, I hope you will forgive me".

After Gus Mus delivered his speech on the third day (3 August 2015), the atmosphere at the NU Congress was much calmer. The participants were silent and shed tears. In fact, many participants hugged each other to forgive. They looked regretting their action. The tears had turned the conflict into silence in the plenary session of the congress that night. As a national asset, in its historical record, NU has played an important role in the struggle for and defending independence. Gus Mus said "Kiai Haji Hasyim Asy'ari was the 'foundation stone' of the independence of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945.' Thus, Gus Mus added "NU people are Indonesians who are Muslim" because in Indonesia the members of the *Nahdliyin* community were born, they eat, drink, die, and are buried in Indonesia.

Even though *Nahdliyin* do not understand the concept of nationalism, they will fight for and defend the independence of the Republic of Indonesia with all the risks they carry on their shoulders. Therefore, whether Indonesia is good or bad depends on the Indonesian Muslims as the majority in carrying out religious teachings in their lives, including the political contestation of power at the congress. On another occasion, Gus Mus was asked about the refusal of *rais aam* position, and then he answered "This is not my level, and *rais aam* has very high level, I am still at very low. There are many who deserve, they all deserve more than I".[9] The level is very high, which is only intended for individuals who have sufficient qualifications.

Therefore, Gus Mus with his agility and expertise in articulating values and ideas amid the power contestation at the NU Congress stems from the regime of *zuhud* concept in politics. As a matter of fact, *zuhud* in politics becomes relevant when it is looked at the political dynamics that only covers who gets what, when, and how, as in the Schumpeterian and Laswelian concept. Whereas, *zuhud* does not mean anti-position or anti-politics, but *zuhud* is understood as a process of cleansing and emptying the heart from material attachment (wealth, position, or power) which will later damage the cleanliness of the soul and heart. In other words, *zuhud* concept in democracy is an

---

[8] In https://news.detik.com/berita/d-2983379/gus-mus-salut-setinggi-tingginyakepada-muktamar-muhammadiyah. Accessed on 10 March 2020

[9] In https://nasional.sindonews.com/berita/1033382/15/ini-alasan-gus-mus-mundur-dari-rois-aampbnu

attitude and behavior of individuals who divert the pleasures of the world towards something much better, amid the encirclement of liberal and capitalistic modern democratic regimes.

Liberal-Capitalist Society

From the previous description, it is true that after the collapse of the New Order regime in 1998, political life and constellation undergo very fundamental changes, such as freedom of speech, collect, and other political rights. Moreover, the public sphere has turned into an arena for contestation of discourses from various particular identities, and the implication of the current 'liberal-democracy' regime or political change is the emergence of several new political parties participating in the ongoing power contestation. In fact, the explosion of democratization was even stronger in early 2011. There was a 'democratic' change of government movement throughout the Arabian countries, which pro-democracy groups later referred to as the 'fourth wave' or expansion of democratization after the third wave of democratization at the end of the 20th century.

Since the overthrow of the Portuguese dictatorship in April 1974, the number of democratic countries in the world has increased dramatically (Diamond, 2011), until the fourth wave of democratization in 2011 hit the Arabian countries, otherwise known as Arab Spring, signifying that more and more countries are shifting from totalitarianism to democracy. In democratic countries, elections become a prominent discourse in the public

sphere, including in Indonesia. In fact, the 2014 election in Indonesia was a turning point in democratic life such as after the collapse of the Soeharto regime. Because at that time, the 2014 election gave voters a choice, whether to maintain the existing democratic government, or to take the path of populist experimentation and neo-authoritarian regression. This is then seen as another calibration for Indonesia in the process of consolidating democracy which is being built in the reform era (Homayotsu, 2015; 174). Therefore, several research results show that the 2014 election managed to create a record for people's satisfaction with the development of democracy in Indonesia since the late 2000s and early 2010s (83 percent in July 2014), and the total number of voters had reached 75 percent, increased from 71 percent in the previous election in 2009, and the highest during the post-Soeharto elections (Meitzner, 2014; Aspinall, 2014; 96). The implication of this situation is that political liberalization policies in various sectors are a political choice to provide a strong foundation for the progress of the ongoing and liberal democratization process (Lowry, 1998; 137-138). However, despite the various advances that have taken place, democracy nowadays has actually been reduced to a procedural, formalistic, and anarchic system.

Globally, democracy is almost always assumed as the starting point for economic development, increasing guarantees of human rights, and social order, especially in developing countries. This is because it has a strong basic value such as; ownership rights,

freedom, equality in politics, and it also guarantees 'private ownership' of the means of production (Mises, 2005; 03). With that perspective, every country claims to be a democratic country, at least in contestation or competition in political processes such as elections. This is because democracy presupposes political freedom to pursue, achieve, and maintain the resources they have. On the other hand, the air of democracy that the Indonesian people are breathing expected to create a just, harmonious, and prosperous life actually creates a life that eliminates rationality in democracy.

Amid the ongoing decline in the quality of democracy, at the same time the current of democratization has become increasingly globalized. In fact, modern humans have entered a 'democracy era' with a form where half of the world's population lives in an electoral democratic regime (Stockwell, 2011; 08), which in this democracy era, includes not only issues of competition, participation, civil liberties, and politics (Sorensen, 2008; 27) but also issues related to equality, interests, and political autonomy (Corey, 2006; 261). From here, the power of democracy couples with liberalization in all sectors has been able to adapt to the current criticism. We can see in 2004 in Indonesia, the process of political liberalization was manifested in the direct implementation of the 2004 presidential election by the Indonesian people (Nyman, 2006; 208) amid the efforts of certain entities trying to weaken the quality of democracy itself. The democratic currents have created an era of competition where the 'leadership' system is competitive (Chee, 1994;

Medearis, 2001), where one of the dimensions of a state called democracy is direct-election[10] or in-direct-election by all people.

As previously described, as a political concept, democracy, at least in the last two decades, has been reduced to electoral-procedural dimensions. In fact, democracy has become the root of conflict and dispute amid a pluralistic and heterogeneous society like Indonesia. Instead of strengthening social cohesion with freedom, freedom actually creates 'greed' in political competition, including what happened at the 2015 NU Congress. In this case, the politics of articulation of the truth of discourse, known in the *pesantren* (religious boarding school) community as *zuhud*, becomes an alternative truth amid the weakness and vulnerability of liberal democracy which so far has an irrational and anarchic character.

CONCLUSION

As a country with Muslim majority, the quality of democracy is at stake. Therefore, this study finds a new discourse, namely: *zuhud* in democracy. In this sense, the practice of running democracy is not only based on

---

[10] Conceptually, a governmental system based on democracy is a government whose leaders come from the people, by the people, and for the people. Therefore, the direct election by the people is part of the manifestation of power in the hands of the people. Power is from the people, and democracy has become the democratic method that presupposes institutional arrangements, where political decisions are embodied in 'the common good' by getting everyone to solve the problem through individual election and collecting in order to carry out his will. See Schumpeter, A, Joseph. 2003. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Introduction By Richard Swedberg. Stockholm University. First Published in The USA This Issue Published in The Taylor & Francis E-Library. pg., 250

procedural-mechanistic as theorizing democracy. On the contrary, democracy is based on the common good. The practice of *zuhud* in democracy displays the form of ethics, justice, and humanity amid power contestations. More than that, the practice of articulating the truth of the *zuhud* discourse by refusing the *rais aam* position has become an explanation of the vulnerabilities and weaknesses of the procedural-mechanistic democracy. In that position, the articulation of truth is political. This study shows how an intellectual's agility and expertise in the politics of articulation amid the ongoing contestation of truth can offer the truth of *zuhud* as a counter discourse and an explanation of the vulnerabilities and weaknesses of ironic procedural-mechanistic democracy. In this case, a Javanese philosophy of *mati ing jeroning urip* is appropriate, meaning that lust is eliminated from the human body and puts justice and the common good together.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Aspinall, Edward & Marcus Mietzner, Marcus (2014). Indonesian Politics in
2014: Democracy's Close Call, Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies,
50:3, 347-369, DOI: 10.1080/00074918.2014.980375.

Aspinall, Esward (2014). Indonesia's 2014 Elections. Parliament and Patronage.
Journal of Democracy Volume 25, Number 4 October 2014 © 2014 National Endowment for Democracy and Johns Hopkins University Press.

Almond. A, Gabriel (1991). Capitalism and Democracy Author (s): Source: PS:
Political Science and Politics, Sep., 1991, Vol. 24, No. 3 (Sep., 1991), pp. 467- 474. Published by: American Political Science Association Stable URL:
ttps://www.jstor.org/stable/420091.

Bates, David (2007). Intruduction: Marxism, Intellectuals and Politics in   Marx
and Intellectuals. Paul Blackledge. First published in 2007 by PALGRAVE
MACMILLAN. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and   175
Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010. Companies and representatives
throughout the world.

Brettschneider, Corey (2006). The value theory of democracy. *Brown University*,
USA. Politics Philosophy Economics. SAGE Publications Ltd. London Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi.

Chee, H. Chan (1994). Democracy: Evolution and Implementation. An Asian
Perspective. Dalam Robert L.

Bartley, Chan Chee, and Samuel Huntington.
1994. Democracy and capitalism; Asian and American perspectives. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

Diamond, Larry (2011). The Flow and Ebb of Democracy's Third Wave. The
Mongolian Journal of International Affairs.

Foucault, Michel (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. Selected Interviews and Other Writings. 1972-1977. Pantheon Books, New York.

Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections From The Prison Notebooks*. edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell smith. International
publishers, New York.

Gottlieb, S. Roger (1989). An Anthology of Western Marxism. From Lukacs and Gramsci to Socialist-Feminism Edited by New York Oxford. OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS.1989

Goswami, Sribas (2014). *Michel Foucault: Structures of Truth and Power. by Academic Publishing House Researcher*. Published in the Russian Federation. European Journal of Philosophical Research.

Hamayotsu, Kikue (2015). Indonesia in 2014: The Year of Electing the "People's
President" Source: Asian Survey, Vol. 55, No. 1, A Survey of Asia in 2014
(January/February 2015), pp. 174-183 Published by: University of California Press.

Howard, O. Matthew (2010). Social Workers as Public Intellectuals. Social Work
Research, Vol. 34, No. 3 (September 2010), pp. 131-133. Published by: Oxford University Press. Stable URL:
https://www.jstor.org/stable/426597 57. Accessed: 24-11-2018 05:46 UTC.

Held, Virginia (1983). The Independence of Intellectuals. Source: The Journal of
Philosophy, Vol. 80, No. 10, Part 1: Eightieth Annual Meeting of the American Philosophical Association, Eastern Division (Oct., 1983), pp.
572-582. Published by: Journal of Philosophy, Inc. Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/202615 2. Accessed: 30-04-2019 04:46 UTC.

Karpova, Yu. Anna dkk. (2016). The political role of intellectuals .Tomsk polytechnic university, 634050 Lenina str., 30, Tomsk, The Authors, published by EDP Sciences. This is an open access article
distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution. License
4.0
(http://creativecommons.org/license s/by/4.0/). SHS Web of Conferences 28, 01147 (2016) DOI: 10.1051/shsconf/20162801
RPTSS 2015.

Lowry, Bob (1998). INDONESIA: Towards Transition. Source: Southeast Asian
Affairs, (1998), pp. 124-138. Published by: ISEAS - Yusof Ishak

Institute.

Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/.

Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal (1985). 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics.* Second Edition. This

second edition first published by Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto (1990). *Antagonisms and Dislocation; New Reflections on The Revólution of Our Time*. Fist published by *Verso.*

Melzer. M. Arthur (1992). What Is an Intellectual? The Public Intellectual. Between Philosophy and Politics. Edited by Arthur M. Melzer, Jerry Weinberger, and M. Richard Zinman. ROWMAN & LITnEFIELD PUBLISHERS, INC. Published in the United States of America. 1992 by Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. **A** Member of the Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group 4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham,

Maryland 20706.

Mises, Von. Ludwig (2005). Edited by Bettina Bien Greaves Liberalism *The Classical Tradition*; Editorial Additions © 2005 Liberty Fund, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

Medearis, John (2001). Joseph Schumpeter's Two Theories. of Democracy.

Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts. London, England.

Mietzner, Marcus. (2014). Indonesia's 2014 Elections. How Jokowi Won and

Democracy Survived. *October 2014, Volume 25. Journal of Democracy.*

Nyman, Mikaela (2006). Democratising Indonesia The Challenges Of Civil Society In The Era Of Reformasi. Institute of Asian Studies. Leifsgade 33,

DK–2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark.

Neuman, W. Lawrence (2005). *Power, State, and Society; An Introduction to Political Sociology.* Waveland Press. INC. USA.

Ozick, Cynthia (1995). Public and Private Intellectuals. Source: The American Scholar, Vol. 64, No. 3 (Summer 1995), pp. 353-358. Published by: The Phi Beta Kappa Society. Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/412123 42.

Accessed: 30-04-2019 04:50 UTC.

R. Di Leo, Jeffrey and Hitchcock, Peter (2016). Introduction: Before the Beginning, After the End: Toward the New Public Intellectual. Individual

chapters their respective contributors. Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2016 978-1-137-58575-2.

Said, W. Edwar (1993). Representations of the Intellectual. THE 1993 REITH LECTURES. First Vintage Books Edition, April 1996. Copyright © 1994

by Edward W. Said. VINTAGE BOOKS A DIVISION OF RANDOM

HOUSE, I NC. NEW YORK.

Schumpeter, A, Joseph (2003). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy

Introduction by Richard Swedberg.

Stockholm University. first published in
the usa this edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-library.

Van Dijk, Teun (1995). *What is Political Discourse Analysis*? Universiteit van Amsterdam, Belanda.

Van Dijk, Teun (2002). *Political Discourse and Political Cognition. In Politics as Text and Talk;* Analytic approaches; to political discourse. *Edited by* Paul Chilton and Christina Schäffner. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.