

## **JACQUES DERRIDA'S DECONSTRUCTION INTERPRETATION OF MINING PERMIT POLICY FOR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN INDONESIA**

**Adhimas Alifian Yuwono**

Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University, Yogyakarta

Email: [adhimasalifian@gmail.com](mailto:adhimasalifian@gmail.com)

### **Abstrak**

*Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memberikan argumen bahwa kebijakan izin pertambangan bagi organisasi masyarakat keagamaan di Indonesia, yang tertuang dalam Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 25 Tahun 2024, merupakan sebuah peristiwa dekonstruksi dalam ranah sosial dan kebijakan publik. Dekonstruksi, sebagai hermeneutika radikal yang dicetuskan oleh Jacques Derrida, menolak keberadaan makna absolut (logosentrisme) yang mendominasi pemahaman terhadap teks (realitas). Dalam konteks ini, penelitian menyoroti cara kebijakan tersebut membongkar asumsi lama bahwa organisasi masyarakat keagamaan hanya layak bergerak di ranah keagamaan dan tidak memiliki kapabilitas untuk mengelola tambang. Proses pembongkaran logosentrisme dianalisis secara rinci melalui enam tahapan kunci dekonstruksi: (1) Difference, yang menegaskan adanya perbedaan dan penangguhan makna antara peran tradisional ormas dan peluang baru di sektor pertambangan; (2) Traces, berupa jejak-jejak makna yang terekam dalam diskursus publik dan respons beragam dari berbagai pihak; (3) Dissemination, yakni penyebaran makna baru yang memungkinkan interpretasi kebijakan berkembang secara dinamis di luar intensi awal pembuat kebijakan; (4) Undecidability, di mana makna kebijakan tidak dapat diputuskan secara mutlak baik-buruknya, melainkan selalu terbuka bagi negosiasi; (5) Supplement, yang menunjukkan bahwa makna kebijakan dipengaruhi oleh konteks sosial, politik, dan ekonomi yang terus berubah; serta (6) Iterability, yang menegaskan otonomi teks kebijakan untuk terus diinterpretasi ulang oleh berbagai aktor sosial. Hasil penelitian menegaskan*

*bahwa kebijakan ini tidak hanya sekadar perubahan administratif, melainkan telah menggoyahkan struktur makna lama dan membuka ruang dialog lintas perspektif. Penelitian ini merekomendasikan agar proses evaluasi dan dialog kritis lintas perspektif terus dibuka sehingga kebijakan dapat berkembang adaptif dan inklusif seiring perubahan zaman dan meminimalkan segala kemungkinan buruknya.*

**Kata kunci:** *kebijakan izin pertambangan, organisasi masyarakat keagamaan, dekonstruksi, Jacques Derrida, logosentrisme, dialog lintas perspektif.*

### **Abstract**

This study aims to argue that the mining permit policy for religious organizations in Indonesia, as stipulated in Government Regulation No. 25 of 2024, is an act of deconstruction in the social and public policy spheres. Deconstruction, as a radical hermeneutics coined by Jacques Derrida, rejects the existence of absolute meaning (logocentrism) that dominates the understanding of texts (reality). In this context, the study highlights how the policy dismantles the old assumption that religious community organizations are only suitable to operate in the religious sphere and do not have the capability to manage mines. The process of dismantling logocentrism is analyzed in detail through six key stages of deconstruction: (1) Difference, which emphasizes the distinction and suspension of meaning between the traditional role of religious organizations and new opportunities in the mining sector; (2) Traces, which are traces of meaning recorded in public discourse and diverse responses from various parties; (3) Dissemination, which is the spread of new meanings that allow policy interpretations to develop dynamically beyond the initial intentions of policymakers; (4) Undecidability, where the meaning of a policy cannot be decided absolutely as good or bad, but is always open to negotiation; (5) Supplement, which shows that the meaning of policy is influenced by the ever-changing social, political, and economic context; and (6) Iterability, which emphasizes the autonomy of policy texts to be continuously reinterpreted by various social actors. The research results confirm that this policy is not merely an administrative change but has shaken the old structure of meaning and opened up space for dialogue across perspectives. The study recommends that the process of evaluation and critical dialogue

across perspectives be kept open so that policies can develop adaptively and inclusively in line with changing times and minimize any potential negative impacts.

**Keywords:** *mining permit policy, religious community organizations, deconstruction, Jacques Derrida, logocentrism, cross-perspective dialogue.*

**Received:** June 24, 2024 | **Reviewed:** May 26, 2025 | **Accepted:** 31 July 2025

---

## INTRODUCTION

Jacques Derrida's deconstruction is a form of hermeneutics that seeks to read the text not merely as a concrete form, such as documents, books, or cultural artifacts. It involves understanding the text as a representation of reality in its entirety (Hardiman, 2015: 219). As Derrida asserts in *Of Grammatology*, "There is nothing outside of the text" (Derrida, 1997: 158). In this statement, Derrida is not claiming that reality does not exist, nor that everything is limited to writing or documents. However, everything we understand about the world is always mediated by a system of signs, language, and structures of meaning. This means that even "reality" can only be accessed through a textual process of interpretation—whether in language, symbols, or structures of meaning. The "text" in Derrida's sense, then, is a network of meanings made up of signs and *différences* that refer to each other, without a fixed center. Texts ultimately include spoken language, writing, cultural symbols, philosophical ideas, social identities, bodies, actions, and cultures. This suggests that interpretations of various social, cultural, or existential realities are in fact always situated within a set of texts—even when we read them as realities outside the text.

As an understanding of reality, deconstruction comes to criticize the concept of the metaphysics of presence that developed in Europe. The metaphysics of presence is the belief that there is a presence behind language and text, and that it will emerge on its own as truth and essence. This concept—that a text will never be separated from the original speaker or where the text comes from—is known as phonocentrism, which is a transcendental truth that is

believed to be the sole source of truth, giving rise to what is called logocentrism (Mikaeli, 2017: 21).

Logocentrism refers to the "logos" — a unified concept, word, and framework positioned at the center of meaning. Derrida's deconstruction explicitly rejects logocentric centralization because it can symbolize the subjugation of the different, the plural, and the infinite, as a system of truth that is seen as the *archai* (*archia*), the source, origin, and *telos* of life-truth (Al-Fayyadl, 2005: 89). This logocentrism is close to the assumptions behind a text that have been considered common, normal, and unquestionable. Deconstruction encourages observation to discover everything behind these assumptions. This opens the possibility for intellectual exploration unrestricted by any one rule regarded as universally binding within logocentric works (Hasanah, 2021: 1-28). This logocentrism is articulated by structuralists, who want to understand a text, sign, and language with a structure of truth that comes from the center (metaphysics of presence). Thus, the characteristic of logocentrism is taken for granted and remains unchallenged (Siregar, 2019: 69).

In this context, Derrida criticizes logocentrism, the tendency of Western philosophical traditions to prioritize "presence" — usually in the form of spoken language — as a stable and authentic center of meaning. Logocentrism gives birth to a hierarchical structure of binary oppositions, such as oral/written, center/periphery, original/counterfeit, and masculine/feminine. In this structure, one element is always positioned higher and dominant than the others (Dilworth, 1990: 6-11). However, deconstruction does not simply reverse the opposition, but rather dismantles the hierarchical structure and shows that both elements are interdependent, unstable, and have no fixed meaning. Derrida emphasizes that meaning is always in delay and difference (*différance*); it is never fully present or final, but constantly shifting in the network of signs. Deconstruction thus opens up new possibilities for understanding texts and reality, liberating interpretation from the domination of a single regime of meaning and showing that meaning is always

plural, open and provisional (Derrida, 1997: 41). This is the essence of the productivity and transformativeness of deconstruction, because it presents a space for the emergence of other meanings that may have been excluded by the dominant order of meaning.

Through his deconstruction, Derrida wants to dismantle the tradition of understanding the metaphysics of presence that is phonocentric and results in logocentrism and binary opposition towards *grammatology*: the science of writing, signs, and text as reality (Ariwidodo, 2009: 31). The metaphysics of presence is shaken with the help of the power of signs, writing, and text itself. Thus, a meaning can be interpreted to infinity, and truth will always be suspended (Derrida, 1971: 233).

This logocentrism still happens a lot. In Indonesia, for example, the government officially issued a law on licensing mining management to religious community organizations, which is contained in Government Regulation No. 25 of 2024 (Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2024, 2024). This has sparked public controversy, as many believe that most community organizations in Indonesia do not have the capability to manage mines—particularly religious organizations, whose core is, naturally, on religious affairs.

Several studies have examined the policy, including research by Hasbi et al. (2025), which suggests that mining licences should be prioritized for State or Regional Owned Enterprises—Badan Usaha Milik Negara (BUMN) and Badan Usaha Milik Daerah (BUMD)—followed by private institutions. According to this research, religious community organizations are not among the institutions considered eligible. It concludes that these organizations clearly do not have the competence to manage mines, as their role is only to maintain inter-religious harmony. Furthermore, research by Tandika and Hidayat (2024) even states that granting mining rights to religious community organizations has the potential to cause economic losses and environmental conflicts.

However, despite these findings, there are two of the largest religious community organizations that accept the offer to manage

mines, namely Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) and Muhammadiyah. NU, through its chairman, declared its readiness with qualified human resources, comprehensive organizational infrastructure, and a sufficiently strong business network to undertake the responsibility of managing the mine. On the other hand, Muhammadiyah, which initially refused, finally reached a final decision to accept the offer to manage mines (Aanardianto, 2024: 1).

The novelty of this research lies in its philosophical approach, in contrast to previous studies that primarily adopted a legal perspective. This study is grounded in deconstruction hermeneutics, which is considered suitable due to its substantive nature, focused on dismantling established meanings. Upon closer examination, this policy has drawn public criticism rooted in logocentrism, namely that the ability to manage mines can only be carried out by State or Regional-Owned Enterprises (BUMN and BUMD), or related private companies. On the other hand, religious community organizations are institutions commonly perceived as taking care only of religious matters. Thus, the enactment of this policy can be interpreted as an event of deconstruction: a dismantling of logocentrism. In this context, Derrida's concept of deconstruction is highly applicable for showing new meanings behind a general meaning that has been applied.

On the other hand, Derrida's concept of deconstruction has generally been applied to literary texts such as plays, speeches, or novels. For example, Zulfadhli (2012) applied it to the story of Malin Kundang—the lawless son—offering a new interpretation that the lawless one is actually the mother, not Malin Kundang. Huiqing (2019) also applied deconstruction to criticize the binary opposition in John Donne's poem about woman/man, asserting that both are human beings who must be harmonious. Meanwhile, this research employs deconstruction to understand the "reality" of mining permits for religious community organizations in Indonesia as a social text that needs interpretation.

Thus, the purpose of this research is to provide a philosophical argument that the mining permit policy for religious community

organizations is a deconstruction event that dismantles logocentrism. I hope that this research can invite us to continue to open new spaces of possibility, dismantle the boundaries of meaning that have been considered absolute, and postpone all forms of closure of meaning. In the context of the mining management permit policy for religious community organizations, this research will show that the meaning of religious community organizations has shifted, opened up, and is no longer bound by the old logocentrism. The good or bad of this policy also ultimately cannot be decided absolutely, but must be seen as a process that is always open to new interpretations and possibilities.

The data collection method is carried out by collecting scientific works because this issue is widely discussed on the internet. The author relies heavily on news media on various related websites that cover the expressions of national figures in politics, community organizations, environmental activists, and academics. The author obtained an understanding of deconstruction from various sources, both referring directly through Derrida's primary works, as well as from the reviews of credible commentators. Given that deconstruction is a complex concept, the commentators' contributions in explaining deconstruction greatly help the author in understanding Derrida's deconstruction. Furthermore, data analysis is carried out by analyzing the collected data within the framework of deconstruction. The first part of this paper will provide a conceptual foundation on Derrida's deconstruction. The second part will review the policy description and proactive response from NU and Muhammadiyah. The third part is a deconstructive analysis to explain the course of deconstruction in this policy.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **1. AN OVERVIEW OF DERRIDA'S DECONSTRUCTION**

Deconstruction cannot be defined; it can only be read through strategies to at least describe what deconstruction is. Derrida, as a pioneer of deconstruction, always rejects a conclusion and

definition, because concluding is the same as deciding (making a decision about right), and making the truth become single and absolute (Hardiman, 2015: 304). Derrida states that a deconstructive reading is a continuous change of meaning or perspective so that the truth cannot be decided (Derrida, 1996: 68) and that the nature of a text's meaning is always provisional and does not guarantee a *sine qua non* force for the stability and coherence of the text (Butt & Ghauri, 2022: 161). Deconstruction, in this case, will also be constantly redefined, since its meaning depends on many contexts as the object of deconstructive reading; thus, defining deconstruction is the same as canceling the principle of deconstruction itself. He says "that all sentences in the form of 'deconstruction is X'" or 'deconstruction is not X' are a priori missing the point" (Derrida, 1985: 14).

Although deconstruction cannot be precisely defined, I will nonetheless explain it within a hermeneutic framework. So, deconstruction will be a way of reading to reach or understand (*verstehen*) the meaning of a text (Hardiman, 2015: 278). It should be emphasized here that the term "text" is not confined to writing or verbal language alone; rather, it encompasses everything that can be perceived in the mind and interpreted by individuals as part of society. Even in its development, deconstruction is widely used to reinterpret a social construction. Thus, deconstruction can be applied not only to written works but also to events, social phenomena, and realities that shape discourse and language.

There are several explanations related to deconstruction. First, deconstruction is a "*pas de méthode*": not a method, because there is no set of rules, no criteria, no program, no sequence of steps, and no theory to follow in deconstruction. Deconstruction is a reading event; it cannot be repeated like a method, it is singular and unique, because it is an event. Secondly, deconstruction always involves the contamination or "bastardization" of binary oppositions, pairs of opposite meanings, so that in the end the two poles of binary opposition cannot be kept pure and consistent; they will tarnish each other, that is, deconstruct themselves. The contamination

occurs through what Derrida calls *differance*. Third, deconstruction is interested in the edge. It is neither outside nor inside. It is on the edge, because the edge that becomes the boundary is seen as an unstable condition in a binary opposition. Deconstruction is interested in that instability. Fourth, deconstruction is history, that every meaning has its own history that is never stable, and has a network with other things. Fifth, nothing is text-free; that a context already exists in the text itself, and that between text and context is an immanent duality in an event or meaning (McQuillan, 2000: 3-14).

Based on this explanation, deconstruction can ultimately be understood as a form of textual interpretation, but it differs radically from other hermeneutic models. Unlike Schleiermacher's romantic hermeneutics—which attempts to reconstruct meaning in a text—or Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics—which constructs meaning through the fusion of horizons, deconstruction hermeneutics avoids any such rehabilitation or construction. Deconstruction presupposes not only the absence of the original meaning of a text, but also the impossibility of the wholeness of a text's meaning. Consequently, the activity of interpretation no longer has a foundational basis and suspends any effort to establish coherent meaning. A meaning can be interpreted to infinity, which is why deconstruction is referred to as radical hermeneutics (Hardiman, 2015: 284).

Deconstruction still aims for understanding (*verstehen*), but in an entirely different, unique, and radical way. Deconstruction assumes that meaning cannot be decided; every attempt to determine meaning is always "stalked" by another meaning that will soon emerge. Deconstructive reading is always open to the "other" outside and inside the text, by being on the periphery. Deconstruction is thus interpreted as an interpretation characterized by a constant shifting of perspectives. In this sense, the goal of deconstruction is not to understand (*verstehen*) through the fusion of horizons or the reconstruction of texts, but to process differences

that cannot be captured and resolved in a whole (Kimmerle, 2000: 48).

## 2. DECONSTRUCTION READING ROADMAP

### *Difference*

Deconstruction can be likened to a journey of reading a text that must be traveled with the right roadmap in order to reach its destination: deconstructive reading. The first map is that of *différence*. *Différence* is neither considered a concept nor even a proper word, because in French dictionaries, no such word is found; it is considered a non-word. The presence of the letter “a” in *différence* makes it void as a word because it disrupts its recognizability as a standard word, distancing it from terms like *deferring* (to postpone or delay) and *differing* (to distinguish). Derrida's *différence*, on the other hand, is understood as preceding the separation between deferring and differentiating; it encompasses both differentiating and deferring (Derrida, 1973: 88).

This means that the wordlessness contains both meanings—or events—simultaneously. In other words, *différence* contains two moments at once: temporalization and spatialization, because *différence* is both distinguishing (spatialization) and suspending (temporalization) a meaning. It can be observed that Derrida is not concerned with the impact of presence, but rather the impact of difference and delay (Souza, 2023: 15). Here, in this wordlessness, deconstruction as a radical hermeneutics is a way of understanding or interpreting by distinguishing, but without deciding or judging. Through difference, Derrida suspends the binary opposition within, and deconstructive interpretation destabilizes the meaning of any established regime of meaning (Derrida, 1997: 27).

### *Trace*

Traces of meaning mean that meaning is never fully and stably present in a text. For Derrida, there is always a gap between the signifier and the sign, between the text and its meaning. The search

for absolute meaning is an impossibility. The search for meaning is always trace after trace (signifier of signifier) (Derrida, 1997: 237). Derrida rejects the understanding of absolute meaning or signification, transcendental meaning, and universal meaning, because deconstruction is the processing of differences, traces of differences, spacing, by which elements are related to each other (Norris, 2003: 11). Therefore, the absolute sign will always take the form of a trace and behind the trace there is a trace, and so on. What is certain, according to Derrida, is uncertainty: everything must be suspended while playing freely with difference.

### *Dissemination*

Dissemination is the spread of meaning that cannot be fully controlled or contained by a text or its author. This concept encourages us to see how meaning is always on the move, always shifting and evolving. Dissemination essentially “undermines” traditional interpretations and explanations. It shows how the text also has a different meaning from what its author, origin, or center intended: that a text is always autonomous. Derrida says, “The absence of the transcendental signified extends the domain and the play of signification to infinity” (Derrida, 1997: 7). The purpose of deployment is to reveal to us the instability or “indeterminacy” of meaning. Deconstruction shows that, once a text is created and circulated, it is detached from its author's intentions. It escapes its author's control —deconstruction also challenges our basic concept of authorship. Through dissemination, meaning and/or presence experience an irreducible and generative multiplicity (Ramoya, 2016: 81).

### *Undecidability*

Undecidability refers to the inability to decide or determine a definite meaning, thus allowing meaning to fluctuate and change. Derrida uses this concept to criticize linguistic structures that try to construct stable and definite meanings, and to show that meanings

are always in the process of change and are never completely stable. Derrida says, "There is no rigorous definition, no concept, and no rigorous opposition that can escape this law (deconstruction)" (Derrida, 1997: 19). In the framework of deconstruction, uncertainty allows a deeper analysis of meaning. It also allows the discovery of more complex and multidimensional meanings, not only giving rise to black-and-white interpretations (Koeswinarno, 2012: 45). Thus, undecidability becomes an integral part of deconstruction that seeks to reveal the complexity of meaning that is always in the process of change and never fully stable.

### *Supplement*

Supplement is a perspective to interpret language/writing in a non-absolute way: that every text is always influenced by external elements (different contexts). So that the reading of a text becomes very multi-interpretive because of the various influences that surround the interpreter. Derrida says, "The supplement is exterior, outside of the positivity to which it is super-added, an inessential extra ... As a complement added to a presence, it can only compensate for a lack, but the possibility of the supplement" (Derrida, 1997: 144-145). Supplement states that reality is not present in language/writing, but only traces of it. Therefore, language/writing in supplementation undoubtedly has the potential to deconstruct itself. Through the concept of supplement, deconstruction can be interpreted based on the context used (Derrida, 1988: 4-5). This supplement concept emerges as an alternative to representationalism, which believes that reality is present in the structure of language. Representationalism states that language is the best reflection of reality. However, every language is always influenced by different contexts that do not necessarily represent the real reality. As a result, representationalism presupposes the existence of ideal speech/writing about reality, which leads to the dominance of a single interpretation of reality (Ruhupatty, 2023: 81).

### *Iterability*

The concept of iterability focuses on the ability of a text to remain readable and comprehensible even if there is no author, speaker, or source present (autonomous). Derrida says, "Every sign, linguistic or non-linguistic, spoken or written ... can function in the absence of the sender and receiver" (Derrida, 1997: 7-8). Derrida argues that a text can still function and be meaningful even if there is no clear empirical context, because the text has a structure that can be understood logically and can be translated into various contexts (Ramoya, 2016: 81).

At this point, it can be understood that the deconstructive reading contains *differance*, which is the distinction of a distinctive meaning while suspending its truth. After that, each reading of the meaning has a complex, diverse, and widely interrelated trace. These traces eventually make the text autonomous from the general discourse, central, and widespread, so that various new meanings continue to emerge (dissemination). Because of the multiplicity of meanings, an absolute meaning, a single conclusion cannot be decided (undecidability). Every reading of meaning is affected by different contexts (supplement). Every text is capable of being interpreted by every interpreter even without the presence of a general discourse behind it (iterability).

Simply put, the method offered by Derrida is that in understanding the meaning of the text, one should not continue to maintain the old (existing) meaning. Instead, a truly new truth must be obtained and articulated. This truth is obtained without getting rid of past truths or meanings which have preceded it. Once this truth is discovered, we cannot legitimately claim that it is the real or absolute truth, because it will also be dismantled by the next new meaning that will emerge. Therefore, meaning is never final and interpretation will continue to infinity.

### 3. REGULATION ON MINING MANAGEMENT LICENSE

Through Government Regulation No. 25 of 2024, as an amendment to Government Regulation No. 96 of 2021 concerning the implementation of mineral and coal mining business activities, Indonesia officially allows religious community organizations to manage mines. The license is explicitly stated in Article 83A paragraph (1), which reads: "In the context of improving community welfare, Wilayah Izin Usaha Pertambangan Khusus (WIUPK) can be offered on a priority basis to Business Entities owned by religious community organizations" (Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2024, 2024; own translation). The purpose of the license is to empower business entities owned by religious community organizations. A "religious community organization" refers to an organization in which one of its constituent bodies carries out economic activities and aims to empower the economic well-being of its members and the welfare of the community.

This caused a backlash from various parties. Almost all news reported about rejection, disapproval, and calls to revoke, cancel, or replace the regulation. One expert in environmental law, Agung Wardana, said that this policy is not a form of state generosity, but a response to the legitimacy crisis of the extractive industry in Indonesia. The mining industry is facing a serious legitimacy crisis and is often opposed by the community due to the destructive impacts it produces: environmental pollution, social injustice, and health problems. By granting mining concessions or licenses to religious organizations, the government tried to ameliorate the industry's legitimacy crisis. This is exacerbated by the leery statement by the coordinator of Jaringan Advokasi Tambang (JATAM), Melky Nahar, that this policy has the potential to trigger horizontal conflicts between community organizations and even internal instability within the organizations themselves, considering that this project is very profitable (Awaludin, 2024: 1). Moreover, religious organizations do not have the capability to explore and exploit mining commodities (Mardiansyah, 2024: 1).

In addition, there are loud voices who even say that the policy is legally flawed. Chairman of Perhimpunan Ahli Pertambangan Indonesia (Perhapi) Rizal Kasli assessed that Government Regulation No. 25 of 2024, which gives priority to religious organizations to own mining business licenses resulting from the relinquishment of former Perjanjian Karya Pengusahaan Pertambangan Batubara (PKP2B), is considered contrary to Law No. 3 of 2020 concerning Mineral and Coal Mining, which requires that the relinquishment of PKP2B prioritized for auction to State or Regional-Owned Enterprises. New licenses may be granted to public organizations if State or Regional-Owned Enterprises have no interest in buying the auction (Mardiansyah, 2024: 1). In his argument, Rizal also agreed with what was conveyed by an energy economics observer from Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), Fahmy Radhi, who viewed that the decision to grant mining business licenses to religious mass organizations was inappropriate and a blunder. This is because, said Fahmy, religious community organizations again do not have the capability to explore and exploit mining commodities. In addition, the funds for investment in mining are not small.

Strong criticism in the same tone also came from Wahana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (WALHI), an organization engaged in the environment, which based its rejection on the argument that the need for resource mobilization capabilities to support technical operations in the mining business as well as mastery of coal trading systems are not capabilities currently possessed by religious community organizations. Religious organizations were not formed for the purpose of the mining business in the first place (Jambore, 2024: 1).

Many religious organizations also do not support the policy, because it is considered inappropriate to be given to religious organizations. Some of these organizations include Nahdlatul Wathan Diniyah Islamiah (NWDI), Persekutuan Gereja-Gereja di Indonesia (PGI), Konferensi Waligereja Indonesia (KWI), Huria

Kristen Batak Protestan (HKBP), and Perhimpunan Mahasiswa Katolik Republik Indonesia (PMKRI) (Hendarto, 2024: 1).

In essence, this policy has drawn criticism from the public, and when examined more deeply, the strongest and most entrenched basic assumption in the rejection discourse, apart from normative legal considerations and sociological analysis, is an assumption that religious community organizations are considered incapable of managing mines properly. The field commonly managed by community organizations in Indonesia is religious matters: worship, community harmony, and the like. This is connected to logocentrism, and this will be the entry point to show how this policy is an event of deconstruction.

#### **4. THE PROACTIVE RESPONSE OF NADHATUL ULAMA' AND MUHAMMADIYAH**

Amidst a wave of rejection from various parties, the religious community organization, NU surprised the public by openly supporting and welcoming the policy. However, internal NU organizations—such as Jaringan Gusdurian (a community that upholds the values and thoughts of Gus Dur, NU's former chairman) and Front Nahdliyin Untuk Kedaulatan Sumber Daya Alam—rejected the mining policy, arguing that it risked triggering horizontal conflict and harming grassroot NU communities. They considered NU's move ahistorical and proposed that the NU economy focus on agriculture and small businesses, not the mining business (Hendarto, 2024: 1).

Despite this opposition, NU still welcomed the policy. NU chairman Yahya Cholil Staquf described it as one of the bold governmental breakthroughs issued to expand the benefits of resources for the people more directly—rather than restricting access solely to BUMN or private professionals (Perdana, 2024: 1). Following this statement, NU asserted its readiness, citing qualified human resources, complete organizational tools, and an extensive business network. Shortly afterward, NU swiftly applied for a

special mining business license, arguing that it was an opportunity that demanded immediate action (Patoni, 2024: 1). Furthermore, an NU figure—who also served as Vice Chairman of Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI)—openly stated that NU and Islamic religious community organizations also have the ability to manage mines. He said that NU has many professors and energy experts to manage mines (Nugraha et al., 2024: 1).

Muhammadiyah, which previously insisted on avoiding involvement in mining activities, ultimately agreed to seize the opportunity to manage mines. Muhammadiyah even issued a *fatwa* (religious edict) stating that mining falls under the category of *muamalah*—governing social and economic transactions—whose basic legal status is permissible (*mubah*) (Ajeng, 2024: 1). This shift is justified by referring to its Articles of Association and Bylaws, which state that Muhammadiyah's purpose is to promote good and prevent evil in all spheres of life. One way to achieve these goals is through establishing businesses that maintain, develop, and utilize natural resources and the environment for public prosperity. This stance is supported by the Decree of the 47th Muhammadiyah Congress, which mandates strengthening *da'wah* in the economic field, alongside efforts in education, health, social welfare, and others. Based on this foundation, the decision to manage mines was taken. The proceeds from the management of the mine will be used to support Muhammadiyah's *da'wah* facilities and the broader community (Fajri & Ananda, 2024: 1).

Apart from these principled reasons, Muhammadiyah has stated that it is capable of managing mines. Muhammadiyah stated that it has human resources who are experts in mining, including lecturers, foreign graduates, mining vocational schools, and cadres of mining entrepreneurs. Muhammadiyah involves experts (internal and external), analyzes social, legal, and environmental aspects of mining, and receives input from various parties before making a decision. Muhammadiyah has even formed special business entities (PT) to manage mines (Izzuddin, 2025: 1).

In principle, two of the largest religious community organizations in Indonesia view this policy as a timely and beneficial opportunity—based on two considerations. First is the consideration of the benefits that can be obtained, both internally for organizational development and externally for the broader community. The second is the technical, scientific, and organizational capability to manage mines. The proactive response of these two religious community organizations wants to emphasize that mine management does not conflict with the foundation of organizational principles, because it turns out that religious community organizations are not only limited to religious affairs, but can have and build economic capacity for mine management.

## 5. DECONSTRUCTIVE INTERPRETATION OF MINING LICENSE

The main issue that I want to highlight in this research, related to mining permit policy for religious community organizations in Indonesia, is the assumption that religious community organizations are typically confined to managing religious domains, such as worship practices, discussion forums, and activities to spread other religious teachings. In contrast, mining affairs are commonly handled only by the government or private professionals. Therefore, permitting religious community organizations to manage mines is considered misguided because these organizations are considered incapable. This perception has triggered public rejection.

If we look fairly, religious community organizations, especially NU and Muhammadiyah (which are the two religious community organizations with the largest number of followers in Indonesia), in fact do not only deal with purely religious areas: both are also able to intersect with economic, educational, social, and even political affairs. For example, it can be seen that NU, through LAZISNU (NU Zakat Institution), *pesantren*, and also the establishment of formal schools has been able to empower the

economy of the community in many areas (Azhar & Khotimah, 2019). In politics, NU cadres actively fight for pro-people policies, such as agrarian reform and labor advocacy (Widayati & Suparjan, 2019). Meanwhile, Muhammadiyah—with its educational assets, hospitals, and Mega Bank Syariah—encourages people's independence through the modernization of the socio-economic system (Pratolo et al., 2022). This means that the religious value attached to religious community organizations is a "potential condition" that can be actualized into any area, including, in this case, mining management.

The government's permission to manage mines to religious community organizations—regardless of all the negative stigmas thrown by experts—through deconstruction reading that dismantles logocentrism, can bring out a meaning that religious community organizations also have the right and opportunity to train themselves in managing mines, especially since it can be used to develop the quality of the organization in the funding sector for benefits. This means that there is a theo-anthropo-ecocentric spirit to be embodied by religious community organizations that manage mines. The theo-anthropo-ecocentric spirit referred to here is that religious community organizations are certainly based on theological normative values (theocentric) which then penetrate into the humanitarian area, which also has a duty to prosper others (anthropocentric). In the process, environmental management is carried out as part of safeguarding the environment based on the normative values adopted while being managed for human benefit (ecocentric).

However, I want to place this discussion within the framework of Derrida's deconstruction. In the deconstruction framework, logocentrism in this case is the general view that the authority to manage mines belongs to the state and the mining private sector. Meanwhile, the "text" in question is the licensing policy for managing mines to religious community organizations themselves. And, the many responses from various parties symbolize new meanings as a result of interpretation, which shows

a shift and instability in the construction of meaning. This policy is referred to as a "text" in Derrida's understanding, because it is not only a policy that is stated textually in the Law, but also enveloped by a sign system, language, and the structure of meaning so that in the end it sticks out into the public domain and causes rejection.

Through deconstruction, it can be analyzed that there has been a difference in this event, in which the policy is a differentiation (spatialization) of another understanding, namely the prevalent assumption so far, that mining management can only be done by business enterprises. However, the differentiation also occurs at the same time (temporalization), meaning that to say this policy is good or bad, right or wrong, is undecidable at this time. It may be replaced by another policy because it is considered more efficient, but it may also be a good policy when it is seen to have a positive impact in the future. This means that the situation is highly deconstructive.

Furthermore, this mining management permit policy does not escape the traces of understanding that are very broad and complex. The decision was made based on various interpretations, for example, related to the aim of improving community welfare, believing that religious community organizations have a value commitment to environmental ethics so as to improve welfare, and other strategic considerations, all of which are interrelated traces of meaning. So, in this case, this policy cannot be considered as a single meaning. It is always related to traces that are never stable, which may soon be replaced by other meanings. In the end, the traces are widely disseminated and unreachable by the trace maker (government), and the text (policy) becomes autonomous (can be interpreted differently). The rejection or stigma towards the policy is proof that the meaning present is different from the author of the text. But its support and approval is also independent from the author of the text. This indicates a shift in perspective. For those who agree, religious community organizations have become more open, fluid, and flexible in many fields that lead to the welfare of the people. There is no absolute meaning because there are so

many meanings circulating. This applies regardless of which side is the majority. NU and Muhammadiyah in this context—apart from being a symbol of shifting meaning—are symbols of uncertainty (undecidability). Every text, in this case the mining management permit policy, can be interpreted differently by different interpreters. Those who disagree argue that the policy is bad due to group interests. In contrast, NU and Muhammadiyah say it is good because they see it as an opportunity and a divine mandate. In this situation, the nuances of the supplement are very apparent. This is because every text—including this policy phenomenon—can be interpreted despite the absence of understanding from the center (iterability), in this case the government as the policymaker.

So, it can be stated that the mining management licensing policy to religious community organizations is an event of deconstruction (dismantling, overhauling) of logocentrism, namely that mining management is only appropriate to be managed by the state under BUMN or BUMD and private parties who is related to the field, while religious community organizations are only accustomed to taking care of theological areas and therefore incapable in managing mines. After the deconstructive event, it turns out that religious community organizations also have the ability to manage mines that can be used for internal welfare and the wider community.

After conducting the analysis, it can be understood that the mining permit policy for religious community organizations is the main trigger for the deconstruction of meaning that has been strictly separating the roles of religion and economy. This policy opens and shakes the boundaries of meaning that were previously considered absolute, so that the meaning of religious organizations is no longer single and static. The proactive attitude of NU and Muhammadiyah in accepting and managing the mine confirms that deconstruction does not only occur at the policy level, but also permeates social practice, expanding interpretations and opening up new meanings that are more dynamic and inclusive. This analysis leads to an understanding that public policy is not a final product whose

meaning is fixed, but an open space that continues to develop through dialogues across perspectives and interpretations of various parties. An open attitude towards changes in meaning and deconstructive reflections are key in dealing with the complexity of social reality and avoiding binary mindsets and logocentrism. Thus, dynamic and inclusive policies can encourage shared learning, innovation, and build a democratic and open-minded society.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research argues that the mining permit policy for religious community organizations is a deconstruction event in the Indonesian social and public policy context. Through Derrida's deconstruction perspective, this policy dismantles and challenges old logocentric meanings—namely the assumption that religious community organizations only have the right to operate in the religious realm, while mining management is the domain of the state or private professionals. With the emergence of this policy, and the proactive response from NU and Muhammadiyah, there is a shift and expansion of meaning that marks that the boundaries of identity and social function can be renegotiated according to the needs of the times. This research confirms that the policy is not merely an administrative decision, but an interpretative event that opens up new possibilities for the role of religious community organizations beyond their traditional boundaries.

Philosophically, deconstruction rejects the absolute good or bad judgment of a text. The most important thing in deconstruction is the opening of space for meaning and opportunities for new interpretations that continue to develop. Thus, the mining permit policy for religious community organizations must be understood as a process that is always open to negotiation of meaning. The implication of this approach is the need for communities, academics, and policy makers to always be reflective, critical, and open. This research recommends continuing to open space for dialog across perspectives, avoiding premature closure of meaning, and making

every policy an opportunity to enrich interpretations and expand inclusive social horizons.

## REFERENCES

- Aanardianto. (2024, July 28). *Muhammadiyah siap kelola tambang dengan pertimbangan yang seksama*. Muhammadiyah. <https://muhammadiyah.or.id/2024/07/muhammadiyah-siap-kelola-tambang-dengan-pertimbangan-yang-seksama/>
- Ajeng, N. (2024, July 29). *Muhammadiyah terima tawaran Presiden Jokowi kelola konsesi tambang*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/articles/cgrljger2wro>
- Al-Fayyadl, M. (2005). *Derrida*. LKiS.
- Ariwidodo, E. (2009). Logosentrisme Jacques Derrida dalam filsafat bahasa. *Karsa: Jurnal Sosial Dan Budaya Keislaman*, 21(2), 340–355. <https://doi.org/10.19105/karsa.v21i2.38>
- Awaludin, A. A. (2024, June 11). *Kebijakan tambang bagi ormas keagamaan: Kepedulian atau kepentingan?* UNAIR News. <https://unair.ac.id/kebijakan-tambang-bagi-ormas-keagamaan-kepedulian-atau-kepentingan/>
- Azhar, M., & Khotimah, K. (2019). Strategi LAZISNU dalam pemberdayaan umat (studi kasus LAZISNU PAC Dolopo Kabupaten Madiun). *Journal of Community Development and Disaster Management*, 1(2), 69–78. <https://doi.org/10.37680/jcd.v1i2.739>
- Butt, G. S., & Ghauri, I. ur R. (2022). Theory Of deconstruction: A comparative study of the views of Western and Muslim theorists and philosophers. *Al-Jami'ah*, 60(1), 131–166. <https://doi.org/10.14421/AJIS.2022.601.131-166>
- Derrida, J. (1971). *A escritura e a diferença*. Perspectiva.
- Derrida, J. (1973). *Speech and phenomena and other essays on Husserl's theory of signs*. Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1985). Letter to a Japanese friend. In Wood & Bernascon (Eds.), *Derrida and Differance* (pp. 1–5). Parousia Press.
- Derrida, J. (1988). *Derrida and differance*. Northwestern University Press.

- Derrida, J. (1996). *Gesetzeskraft der Mystische Grund der Autoritat*. Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Derrida, J. (1997). *Of grammatology*. Hopkins University.
- Dilworth, D. A. (1990). The critique of logocentrism, or (else) Derrida's dead line. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 17(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6253.1990.tb00029.x>
- Fajri, M., & Ananda, F. R. (2024, July 28). *Ini alasan Muhammadiyah terima tawaran kelola tambang batu bara*. Kumparan. <https://kumparan.com/kumparanbisnis/ini-alasan-muhammadiyah-terima-tawaran-kelola-tambang-batu-bara-23DSfnbtVre>
- Hardiman, F. B. (2015). *Seni memahami: Hermeneutik dari Schleiermacher sampai Derrida*. Kanisius.
- Hasanah, M. dan R. A. (2021). Diferensiasi konsep perempuan tiga zaman: Kajian dekonstruksi Jacques Derrida. *Litera: Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 20(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v20i1.39036>
- Hasbi, S., Marco, M., & Triadi, I. (2025). Analisis kebijakan izin tambang bagi organisasi masyarakat dalam aspek konstitusional dan politik. *Quantum Juris: Jurnal Hukum Modern*, 7(1), 272–282. <https://journalversa.com/s/index.php/jhm/article/view/824>
- Hendarto, Y. M. (2024, June 13). *Ormas keagamaan perlu kembali pada khitahnya*. Kompas.id. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/riset/2024/06/12/ormas-keagamaan-perlu-kembali-pada-khitahnya>
- Huiqing, J. (2019). Deconstruction of binary oppositions in John Donne's a valediction: Forbidding mourning. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 7(6), 34–39. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0706004>
- Izzuddin, H. (2025, January 14). *Muhammadiyah sudah bentuk badan usaha untuk kelola area tambang eks Adaro*. Tempo.co. <https://www.tempo.co/politik/muhammadiyah-sudah-bentuk-badan-usaha-untuk-kelola-area-tambang-eks-adaro-1193768>
- Jambore, F. T. (2024, June 5). *Izin pertambangan untuk ormas*

- keagamaan: Kado buruk Jokowi pada peringatan hari Lingkungan Hidup Sedunia. WALHI. <https://www.walhi.or.id/izin-pertambangan-untuk-ormas-keagamaan-kado-buruk-jokowi-pada-peringatan-hari-lingkungan-hidup-sedunia>
- Kimmerle, H. (2000). *Derrida zur Einführung*. Junius.
- Koeswinarno. (2012). Dekonstruksi dan representasi kebudayaan untuk memahami model komunikasi kaum marginal. *Masyarakat Telematika Dan Informasi*, 3(1), 43–50. <https://bpsdm.komdigi.go.id/repositori/index.php?p=fstreampdf&fid=745&bid=641>
- Mardiansyah, D. (2024, June 2). *Para pengamat angkat suara soal ormas keagamaan dapat jatah IUP tambang*. Kontan. <https://industri.kontan.co.id/news/para-pengamat-angkat-suara-soal-ormas-keagamaan-dapat-jatah-iup-tambang>
- McQuillan, M. (2000). *Deconstruction: A reader*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Mikaeli, A. (2017). Supplementation and metaphysics of presence in Mohammad Rezae Rad's verb. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices (JWEEP)*, 2(1), 17–25. <https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jweep/article/view/21>
- Norris, C. (2003). *Membongkar teori dekonstruksi Jacques Derrida* (I. R. Muzir, Trans.). Ar-ruzz.
- Nugraha, N. P., Priadi, B., & Antara. (2024, June 15). *Tokoh NU sebut ormas Islam itu punya kemampuan kelola izin tambang, ini alasannya*. Tempo.co. <https://www.tempo.co/politik/tokoh-nu-sebut-ormas-islam-itu-punya-kemampuan-kelola-izin-tambang-ini-alasannya--48909>
- Patoni. (2024, June 3). *Ketua Umum PBNU angkat bicara soal konsesi tambang untuk ormas keagamaan*. NU Online. <https://www.nu.or.id/nasional/ketua-umum-pbnu-angkat-bicara-soal-konsesi-tambang-untuk-ormas-keagamaan-RXbOF>
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2024, Pub. L. No. 25 Tahun 2024, Rencana Umum Energi Nasional 1 (2024). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/286980/pp-no-25-tahun-2024>

- Perdana, A. P. (2024, June 3). *Gus Yahya: NU business network is strong enough to manage mines*. Kompas.id. <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/en-gus-yahya-jaringan-bisnis-pbnu-cukup-kuat-untuk-kelola-tambang>
- Pratolo, S., Anwar, M., & Dewi, V. S. (2022). Pengembangan kemandirian amal usaha pendidikan Muhammadiyah melalui unimmart.com marketplace gerakan bedukmutu. *Berdikari: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Penerapan Ipteks*, 10(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.18196/berdikari.v10i1.14053>
- Ramoya, M. C. B. (2016). Elements of deconstruction: Differance, dissemination, destinnance, and geocatastrophe. *Philosophia (Philippines)*, 17(1), 69–92. <https://archium.ateneo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1075&context=philo-faculty-pubs>
- Ruhupatty, C. (2023). Bahasa sebagai suplemen dalam pandangan dekonstruksi. *Dekonstruksi*, 9(02), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.54154/dekonstruksi.v9i02.140>
- Siregar, M. (2019). Kritik terhadap teori dekonstruksi Derrida. *Journal of Urban Sociology*, 2(1), 66–67. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30742/jus.v2i1.611>
- Souza, G. R. de. (2023). Who's afraid of Derrida?: Gumbrecht and the metaphysics of presence. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Da Presença*, 13(2), 0–33. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2237-2660126100vs02>
- Tandika, F., & Hidayat, Y. (2024). Peluang ormas keagamaan mengelola tambang di Indonesia pasca Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 25 Tahun 2024. *Lex Journalica*, 21(3), 257–263. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.47007/lj.v21i3.8605>
- Widayati, A., & Suparjan. (2019). Reaktualisasi perjuangan Nahdlatul Ulama dalam mewujudkan kedaulatan sumber daya agraria (studi gerakan demokrasi radikal pada FNKSDA). *BHUMI: Jurnal Agraria Dan Pertanahan*, 5(1), 84–98. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v5i1.321>
- Zulfadhli, Z. (2012). Dekonstruksi dalam cerpen Malin Kundang, ibunya durhaka karya A. A. Navis. *Komposisi: Jurnal Pendidikan*

*Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Seni*, 10(2), 132-137.  
<https://doi.org/10.24036/komposisi.v10i2.62>.