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Abstract

Religious culture applied in schools is an effort used by teachers to increase student self-control. Self Control is a positive side that must be possessed by every individual, where self control is a determinant of behavior that reflects itself to others. Self Control can increase through the existence of habits, experiences, and environmental culture both at school or in the family environment, the most important means in increasing student self control are in school institutions that are supported by the many religious activities. This study aims to: (1) to describe and explain the efforts of Islamic religious education teachers in increasing the self control of students at SDIT Friends through the inculcation of religious values, (2), to describe and explain inhibiting factors and solutions in the development of self control students at SDIT Friends through the inculcation of religious values. The research method in this thesis uses qualitative research, data collection of this research with observation, in-depth interviews and documentation techniques. Data checking again with triangulation, data disclosure procedures regarding teacher efforts in increasing student self control through religious culture. For data analysis, the researcher collects data then reduces data, presenting data and then drawing conclusions. The results of the study were concluded that the efforts of Islamic religious education teachers to develop the self control of students at SDIT Friends Tangerang City were carried out in the PAI learning process and in religious activities in schools. In the learning process PAI the teacher’s efforts in forming self control in adolescents are carried out through religious activities such as the prayer of the Dzuhur congregation that must be followed, holding an interactive dialogue about adolescent problems and guiding students to be with a shock/charity. It is expected to be embedded in self control students in everyday life.
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Introduction

The Prophet Muhammad during his lifetime had succeeded brilliantly in spreading the teachings of Islam, this was clearly seen by the strong standing of the Islamic state of Medina which was led directly by him. The territory of the
Muslims at the time of the Prophet could be said to be very wide, because in a very short time the Islamic troops had controlled the Arabian Peninsula.

When the Prophet Muhammad died, there was a long debate between the Muhajirin and Ansor. Both parties claim that it is appropriate to replace the leadership of the Islamic state of Medina. The Ansors appointed Sa’ad Ibn Ubadah, the Emigrants through Abu Bakr said that the Muhajirins brought Ubaidah and Umar. Hearing this proposal, Habbab Ibn Munzir from Ansor tried to convince Ansor that they were the ones who deserved to replace the Messenger of Allah even if the Emigrants refused, then it was better for the Muhajirin and Ansor to have their respective leaders. Hearing that, Umar gave a warning that there could not be two leaders in one power. Basyr Ibn Sa’ad from Ansor tried to calm both parties by saying that the Muhajirin had made more right to replace the Prophet because the Prophet was from their people. After that, Abu Bakr again appointed Ubaidah and Umar, but both refused and instead both chose Abu Bakr as Caliph, so Abu Bakr took allegiance.

This process of selecting the successor of the Prophet then became the trigger for the emergence of the Shia group. Although the emergence of the Shia group overtly occurred during the leadership of Ali bin Abi Talib. The Shia believe that Ali is more entitled to replace the Prophet because Ali has blood ties, as well as the son-in-law of the Prophet. The election of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman as Caliphs in succession, made the Shia group consider the three companions to have usurped the leadership rights of Muslims who should have turned to Ali. This study aims to analyze the different perspectives of the Ismaili and Zaidiyah Shiites on the leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman as Caliphs.

Based on the explanation above, the researchers in this study analyzed the perspective between the Ismaili Shiites and the Zaidiyah Shiites on the leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman. In the Shi’a understanding, the leadership of the three caliphs has usurped the leadership rights of Muslims who should have transferred to Ali bin Abi Talib. The Shi’a believe that Ali was related by blood to the Prophet Muhammad and his son-in-law at the same time. In addition, the Shiites also adhere to the events of Ghadir Khum and some of Sayyidina Ali’s privileges that were conveyed by the Prophet Muhammad.

From the background of the problem above, the researcher believes that this research is very interesting to study. This is because this research can provide a new color in understanding the differences in opinion of the Shi’a group in viewing the leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman as caliphs. So far, the Sunni community in general understands that the Shia group has the same opinion regarding their perspective on the leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman.

Methods

This research uses descriptive qualitative method as a research method. General and basic qualitative methods are used in the social sciences and humanities, in micro-study rules. Especially with regard to patterns and human behavior (behavior) and what is behind the behavior that is usually difficult to measure using numbers. Because what looks symptomatic is not always the same as what is in real thoughts and desires. A qualitative approach is an approach that departs from an inductive thinking pattern, which is based on participatory objective observations of social phenomena (Nursapia Harahap, 2020: 07).

Results & Discussion

History of the emergence of Shi’ism

Abu Zahrah said that Shi’ism is the oldest political school in Islam and the first to emerge. This is because the first problem that arises in Islam is not a question of belief but of politics. Shi’ism first emerged after the war between Ali bin Abi Talib and Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan which ended with the holding of tahkim between the two parties. Harun Nasution said that at that time three political groups had emerged, Ali’s group which became known as the Shi’a, the group that left Ali’s line was the Khawarij, and Mu’awiyah. From the description it is clear that the problem that caused the emergence of Shi’ism is a political problem, he emphasized the caliphate or in Shi’a terms the issue of Imamat. The Shiites consider that the position of head of state is not the right of every Muslim nor is it the right of every Quraysh. For them that position is the monopoly right of Ali bin Abi Talib and his descendants. Ali even as a substitute for the Prophet who had been determined by the Prophet himself in his will (Ris’an Rusli, 2015: 205).

Shi’ism was originally an expression of love and admiration, then developed into love, compassion and pity when they saw the Prophet’s family did not occupy a natural position in society. Furthermore, when there was persecution in the form of torture, expulsion, cutting off limbs, gouging out eyes, and killing Ali’s family and sympathizers. Thus, the Shia group was born in the sense of the term. Ali’s family and sympathizers kept trying to develop these Shi’a ideas with material and moral support, but to no avail and in the end referred to the Qur’an and Sunnah by imposing interpretations and making narrations to support these ideas and their belief. As a result of this effort, in the end it
gave birth to many Shia groups, some of which even went beyond the limits and took extreme attitudes, such as the Ghulat Shia sect (Helmi Chandra et al, 2021: 45).

Historically, the roots of the Shi’a sect were formed immediately after the death of the Prophet Muhammad, when Abu Bakr was elected as the first caliph at the Tsaqifah meeting which was held in the meetinghouse known as Dar Nadwa in Medina. At the beginning of its formation, for the Shiites, the most important issue was not law or mysticism but loyalty to Caliph Ali and the affirmation that the right of caliphate could only occur within the Ali family. However, over time, Shia as a school then split into several sects or groups that have different religious attitudes and views, as historians note that the only principle agreed upon by all Shia groups is regarding the issue of Imamate or Khilafah. They argue that Imamate must come from the descendants of Ali, Imamate in the Shia view is not only a political issue, but part of religious belief (Irwan Supriadin J, 2020: 20).

Shia Groups That Still Exist Today

Shia are broadly divided into three major groups. First, the Twelve Imams Shiites who became the official understanding of the government in Persia since the reign of the Safavid Dynasty which came to power in 1501 AD. The Twelve Imams Shiites are a Shiite group which is followed by 60% of Iraqis and some minority groups in Afghanistan, Lebanon, Pakistan and Syria. Second, the Zaidiyah Shiites, who are also called the Five Imams, these Shiites are spread throughout the territory of Yemen. Third, the Ismaili Shiites, which are synonymous with the Seven Imams Shiites, these Shiites are based in India, widely spread in Central Asia, Iran, Syria, and East Africa (Irwan Supriadin J, 2020: 20).

Meanwhile, Abu al-Khair al-Baghdadi, divided the Shiites into four major groups, namely Zaidiyah, Ismaili, Twelve Imams, and Ghulat (extremists). The divisions within the Shia group mostly occur because of differences in the principles of belief in the issue of Imamate. Imam in Shia becomes very important, because the duties and responsibilities of an Imam is almost equal to the position of the Prophet. The Imam for the Shia is obliged to explain the meaning of the Qur’an, explain the Shari’a law, prevent the division of the people, answer all religious and theological issues, uphold justice, educate the people, and protect the territory. The Shia split first occurred after the leadership of Imam Husayn because of differences in views on who had the right to replace the leadership of the Imam. Some followers assume that the right to hold the position of Imam is Ali’s son who was not born from Fatimah’s womb, namely Muhammad Ibn Hanifah. This sect is known as the Kaisaniyah. The Kaisaniyah sect did not develop further (Oki Setiana Dewi, 2016: 224–225). More specifically, the researcher will describe the three Shi’a groups that currently have the most followers, namely the Twelve Imams, the Ismaili, and the Zaidiyah.

Twelve Shia Imams

Today, Shia groups in the Islamic world such as Iran, Iraq, Syria, and other Islamic countries, are groups that carry the name Shia Imamiyah. In the matter of Imamate, the Shi’a Imamiyah group agrees that Ali is the recipient of the Prophet Muhammad’s will through texts. The Ismaili Shiites are the Shi’ite group of Shiites who promoted Ali’s Imamate directly after the Prophet, and asserted that there is valid and explicit evidence of Ali’s Imamate. This group agreed on the Imamate of Ali, and passed it on to his two sons (Hasan and Husayn), then to Husayn’s son Zainal Abidin, his son Muhammad al-Baqir, and continued by his son, Ja’far ash-Sadiq. After Imam Ja’far, they disagreed about who should be the next Imam after that. They divide the Imamate from their own circle (Ahmad Atabik, 2016: 335).

In the following period, this group of Imamite Shiites became the Twelve Imams Shiites (also known as Ja’fariyah Shiites). This group argues that after Imam Ja’far Sadiq, Imamate was given to his son, Musa al-Kazim, then to his son Ali Rida, then to his son Muhammad al-Jawwad, then to his son, Ali al-Hadith, then to his son Hasan al-Hadith. ‘Askary, then to his son, Muhammad al-Mahdi al-Muntadzar (the long awaited al-Mahdi) who is their twelfth Imam. The Shia group of the Twelve Imams believe that the twelfth Imam (al-Mahdi) does not die, but disappears for a period of time, and will reappear later to fill the world with justice and security, after injustice and rampant darkness (Ahmad Atabik, 2016: 336).

Ismaili Shia

The formation of the Shia Ismaili group was more due to differences in the determination of the successor of Imam Ja’far Sadiq. In the year 148 AH/765 AD in the city of Kufta some of the Shiites broke away. This separation was closely related to the struggle against the Abbasid dynasty. The idea behind this struggle is the belief that a government based on justice can only be justified if it is carried out behind the leadership of Ismaili bin Ja’ far (Imam Ja’far Sadiq’s eldest son). In the year 297 H the first government that was successfully established was named Fahimiyyun. This success was under the leadership of the Ismaili Imam, Ubaiddilah al-Mahdi. The Ismaili government was established in North Africa. That year can be called the golden age of the Ismaili Shiites. In the year 687 H/1094 AD the biggest crisis was experienced by the Ismaili Shiites. This crisis is closely related to the post–Imam Ismaili leadership. This crisis caused the Ismaili Shia to split into two parts; Musta’lawiyah and Nizariyah. The dispute that occurred caused the weakening of the Ismaili Shiites in the face of the Sunnis (Pasmah Chandra, 2020: 15–16).
These Shi’a followers are of the opinion that after Imam Ja’far Sadiq, the sixth in the Shi’ites fell to his eldest son, Ismail. In contrast to the Shia Twelve Imams who state that the seventh Imam is Musa al-Khadzim. However, Ismail as the eldest son died before Imam Ja’far Sahadiq. If he had not died, he would have been the Imam because he was very dear to his father. Therefore, this group is of the opinion that the descendants of Ishmael should be the Imams. Some Shiites also argue that Ismail did not die but just went into hiding and would appear in the future as the promised al-Mahdi (Aisyah Rahadianti Ratna Kemalasari, 2022: 87).

The summoning of several witnesses, including the Governor of Medina, by Imam Ja’far Sadiq, was seen by them as a way to hide the truth for fear of al-Mansur, the Abbasid caliph. These concerns and fears are very reasonable because the existence of the Imam has always been a shadow of the fall of the position of the Abbasid caliph at that time. After Ishmael, the Imamate passed to his son Muhammad Ibn Ismail who they say was the perfect seventh Imam. After that, the Imams hid themselves (al-Aimmah al-Masturin). Meanwhile, those who show themselves are the only preachers (Aisyah Rahadianti Ratna Kemalasari, 2022: 87).

Zaidiyah Shia

Imam Yahya bin Hamzah Alawi (d. 749 H), one of the Zaidiyah Shia scholars, identified the Zaidiyah Shia as a branch of the Shia sect that has the doctrine of Imam Zaid bin Ali bin al-Husain. The term Zaidiyah appeared after the era of Imam Zaid and even the name Zaidiyah itself was taken from his name. Since then, later Zaidiyah became known as one of the branches of the Shia movement. He also explained that the name of Shia Zaidiyah is associated with the name of Imam Zaid not claimed by the imam, but confirmed by his followers. In its development, Shi’a Zaidiyah is often associated with the term rifaidah. To a certain extent, even this term became one of the important themes in the existence of Zaidiyah Shia. The term rifaidah was coined by Imam Zaid and is intended for the Itsna Asyariyah Shi’a group. It started from the resistance movement of Imam Zaid and his followers against the Umayyad caliphate. At that time, he was supported by 15 thousand people from Kufa, Iraq. If you look back at the history, this team is the descendants of the people of Kufa who once deceived Husain bin Ali (Imam Zaid’s grandfather) who died in Karbala (Muhammad Irfanudin Kurniawan, 2020: 122-123).

After Zaid’s death, his son Yahya bin Zaid succeeded him as Imam. He, like his father, is a brave and war hero, with tenacity in fighting to uphold his faith. When his father was killed, he fled to Khurazan. But he was captured by Khurazan guards and imprisoned in the city of Muru. After his release he emigrated to the Turjjan region (now part of Turkistan). In a new place he continued his struggle against the Umayyad dynasty. In the battle he died in the year 125 H, Yahya bequeathed the imamate to one of the descendants of Hasan bin Ali named Muhammad bin Abdullah who is known as “al-Nafsa al-Zakiyah”, that is a pure soul. Almost twenty years (125H-145H) in the Hijaz region, this new imam continued his struggle against the government. He tried to establish his imamate by fighting the Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties. He took the title of Mahdi in Medina. During the leadership of Abu Ja’far al-Mansur, the Abbasid caliphate (the second caliph of the Abbasid dynasty) the caliph fought him and he died in the Battle of Medina in the year 45 AH (Aminun P. Omolu: 210).

The leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman from the perspective of Shi’a Ismailiyah and Zaidiyah

Ismaili Shia Perspective

The Ismaili Shiies not only looked at the companions of the Prophet with a negative view, they even looked at the companions with ugliness and humiliation. In interpreting verses 2–3 of Surah al-Anfal, al-Kulaini mentions in his book Usul al-Kafi narrated from Ja’far that everyone at the time of the Prophet, apostates after the death of the Prophet, except for a few people, namely Ali bin Abi Talib, Migdad bin al-Awasid, Abu Zar al-Ghifari, Salmon al-Farisi, and an uncertain person, namely Ammar. Meanwhile, al-Kisyssyi added three more names to the list of friends who did not apostatize after the death of the Prophet, namely Abu Syasvan al-Anshori, Abu Amrah, and Syatirah, bringing the total to seven people. Al-Kulaini also cites a narration that explains the reward of those who claim to be entitled to Imamat even though they are not entitled to it (Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman), all those who deny the Imamate, and everyone who claims to be Imam. Muslims while in reality they are not, they are not Shiies, they will not be seen by Allah, will not be punished, and for them the punishment will be very painful. According to the Ismaili Shiies, the companions of the Prophet were ordinary people who could commit sins or immorality and even nifaq and could also be apostates (Muhammad Syaifandi: 8-9).

In the history of the Shafawi dynasty, there was a peace agreement with the Ottomans through Abbas I by promising not to insult the first three caliphs in Islam (Abu Bakr, Umar, Usman) in his Friday sermon (Pasmah Chandra, 2020: 20). The Shafawi dynasty is one of the dynasties in Islamic history that adheres to the teachings of the Ismaili Shiies, when viewed from the agreement made by Abbas I with the Ottoman Turks, it shows that the hatred of the Ismaili Shiites to Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman is so deep. deprived Ali bin Abi Talib of the rights.

Different from the majority view, al-Jabbar sees the leader after the Prophet as Ali ibn Abi Talib, then Hasan and Husayn and then by his descendants. As for the Ismailis, the leaders after the Prophet were Ali bin Abi Talib, then Hasan, then Husayn, up to the seventh Imam (Ris’an Rusli, 2015: 215).
Zaidiyah Shia perspective

The Zaidiyah Shia are a Shia sect that rejects the claim that the Imam was inherited by the mentioned Prophet and person. The will is actually just a feature. From these characteristics, it is known that it turned out that Ali was worthy of being an Imam after the Messenger of Allah because this characteristic did not exist in other people. These characteristics require that the priest comes from the Bani Hashim, pious, taqwa, pious and generous. Then after the death of Ali bin Abi Talib, the condition for an Imam must be from the descent of Fatima bint Rasulullah (Aminun P. Omolu: 210–211).

The Zaidiyah Shiites circulating in Yemen are moderate Shiites. They did not deny Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman. They believed that Ali was superior to Abu Bakr. Zaidiyah Shiites believe that Muslims who commit major sins, if they die before repenting, are an infidel, and remain in hell (Dwi Yesi Ariyani, 2017: 23).

The Zaidiyah Shiites argue that the caliphate of Abu Bakr, Umar bin Khattab, and Usman is legitimate from an Islamic point of view. They did not seize power from the hands of Ali bin Abi Talib. In their view, if Ahlul Halli Wa‘l’Aqiq chooses a leader from among the Muslims, even though he does not meet the criteria of an imam set by Zaidiyah and has been sworn in by them, then his leadership becomes valid and the people are obliged to pledge allegiance to him. They also did not disbelieve any of the companions of the Prophet. When Ahlul Halli Wa’l’Aqiq chooses an imam who is imperfect in some qualities and takes allegiance to him, then the imam and his pledge are valid. On the basis of that principle, Imam Zaid determined the validity of the leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman and was not an infidel, even a friend of the Prophet (Dwi Yesi Ariyani, 2017: 26).

Zaidiyah’s understanding of Imamat which is more political–realistic has led them to take a negative stance against several doctrinal concepts that exist in other Shi’a schools. They oppose the concept of al–taqiyyah and al–bad’. They reject the notion of ‘ishmah being given to other than the Prophet and they do not adhere to the teachings of al–istitar, namely that an imam who is still weak in combat strength must hide his identity (Ris’an Rusli, 2015: 208).

It is mentioned in several books that before taking allegiance or making Imam Zaid a leader and before going to war, the Kufa people asked the imam about the quality of the caliph Abu Bakr and caliph Umar bin Khatab. Then Imam Zaid replied that not only according to his ancestors, but according to himself, Caliph Abu Bakr and Caliph Umar bin Khatab were good people. After hearing this, a number of Kufa residents defected and refused to take allegiance to Imam Zaid. Immediately after that, Imam Zaid said, “Rafad tumūnī, rafad tumūnī”, you have left me, you have left me. From the term rafad tumūnī, the term rafidah emerged. However, it is not people who have left, but it means to be among the Shiites who like to criticize and berate the caliph Abu Bakr and caliph Umar bin Khatab. In short, the Shiites who like to criticize and berate the caliph Abu Bakr and caliph Umar bin Khatab are often referred to as Shia rafidah (Muhammad Irfanudin Kurniawan, 2020: 124).

Conclusion

Based on the previous discussion, this study concludes that there is a considerable difference between the Ismaili Shiites and the Zaidiyah Shiites in responding to the leadership of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman as caliphs. The Ismaili Shiites have a view that is not much different from the Twelve Imams Shiites who understand that the leadership of the three caliphates before Ali was invalid. This was motivated because they had the assumption that only Ali was worthy of being the caliph as well as the imam who replaced the leadership of the Prophet Muhammad as a spiritual and political leader. The Ismaili Shiites also disbelieved some of the Prophet’s companions, and especially Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman.

Unlike the Ismaili Shiites, the Zaidiyah Shiites still recognize the leadership of the three caliphs before Ali. In addition, the Zaidiyah Shiites also did not disbelieve the companions of the Prophet. Even the Zaidiyah Shiites strongly disagree with the Shia group who openly insults and disbelieves the companions of the Prophet. But behind that, the Zaidiyah Shiites still believe that Ali is the most important friend when compared to the other companions of the Prophet.
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