Breaking Up the Root of Conflict: Fundamentalism and Radicalism in Social Context

Sahid Wahid[1], Barsihannor[1], Mahmuddin[1]

[1]Postgraduate Program of Alauddin State Islamic University Makassar, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: Sahid Wahid
Email: sahidwahid099@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study critically examines the interrelated phenomena of fundamentalism and radicalism, focusing on their conceptual foundations, socio-political functions, and ambivalent impacts within contemporary Indonesian society. Drawing on a qualitative, literature-based methodology, the research engages religious texts, academic discourse, and socio-political theory to explore how these ideologies emerge in response to structural inequality, moral disorientation, and identity-based exclusion. Rather than reducing fundamentalism and radicalism to extremist threats, the study analyzes them as complex, context-dependent responses to perceived injustice and cultural fragmentation. The findings reveal that both ideologies possess dual potentials: they can foster moral solidarity, community resilience, and ethical critique, yet they also risk producing intolerance, exclusion, and authoritarianism particularly when politicized or absolutized. Root causes such as economic marginalization, epistemic insecurity, and elite manipulation are identified as key drivers of ideological entrenchment. The study concludes by emphasizing the need for nuanced, justice-oriented responses that address the structural conditions underlying ideological radicalization, and calls for future research grounded in lived experience, interdisciplinary analysis, and civic ethics.*

Keywords: Fundamentalism, Radicalism, Advantages and Disadvantages

INTRODUCTION

Fundamentalism along with radicalism emerges in modern discourse for indicating dangerous social situations and extremist ideology while signaling religious regression (Maghfuri, 2019). The built-in benefits of these classification frameworks lead people to lump together various hard-to-understand phenomena that actually exist in more complex ways. The essence of fundamentalism consists in following strict literal interpretations of holy scriptures coupled with the decline of modern behavior while advocates seek to restore what they deem genuine religious doctrine (Oliveira, 2023; Mulia, 2022). Radicalism describes the drive to transform core social and political structures with possible confrontations or violence-based tactics (Yunus 2017).

The provided definitions offer general theoretical frameworks but they fail to illustrate the layered social and political foundations of these ideologies. These ideologies emerge primarily from multi-faceted meaning-related crises as well as authority breakdowns and economic imbalances and identity-based conflicts. The understanding of these ideologies demands scrutiny of their historical development (Moore, 1995). The current manifestation of fundamentalism began to take shape during the early twentieth century as people reacted against secular and liberal religious schemings and modern biblical translation methods.

Fundamentalism found its origins in the American Protestant movement through the "Fundamentals" series which ran from 1910 to 1915 to preserve religious beliefs based on literal scriptural interpretation against scientific and social advancements. The concept has gained international use although its application sometimes extends to wrong situations where religious groups oppose theological change or exhibit religious conservatives. Populist and governmental activism constitute the historical foundation of radicalism as opposed to spiritual and political heritage (Simaremare, 2023). The concept originated from the French Revolution during the Enlightenment to express public appeals for transforming aristocratic and clerical social structures at their base (Sewell, 1985).

The concept has advanced into being used for studying revolutionary and dissentful political activities. According to tahir (2015), the expression has become a common concept used across both religious circles and non-religious spheres for analyzing radicalism and violent political actions. Fundamentalism together with radicalism emerged stronger than ever in modern times because of global forces including economic inequalities that lead to cultural disintegration and a lack of confidence in liberal democratic systems. Kinnvall (2004) established the ontological insecurity theory which explains the existential distress that happens after modern institutions eliminate traditional bases for meaning like religion and family and community support.

Under present circumstances fundamentalist ideologies serve to provide people with firm foundations and clear moral standards combined with secure groundings. Fundamentalist ideologies exist beyond belief frameworks because they act primarily as psychological defense mechanisms against the constant change and unclear aspects of modern existence (Kruglanski & Fishman, 2009). Next to its opposition toward external power systems radicalism also provides members with a pathway for renewing their existence. According to Mahmud (2024) and Sani (2023) people embrace radical ideologies to regain control over systems which make them face invisibility or powerlessness.

These ideological systems create mental equilibrium and societal cohesion although they potentially result in violent authoritarian behavior that excludes people (Huriani et al., 2022). Fundamentalist groups create rigid divisions between authentic elements and corrupt ones which generate opposition toward diverse perspectives alongside resistance to gender liberation and interfaith interaction. Systemic critique through radicalism has emancipatory potential since it examines injustice but transforms into dogmatic and militant actions when it bypasses democratic mechanisms and inclusive methods. Academic research has not fully investigated how these two ideologies function both as empowering forces and destroyers (Sternberg, 2010).

Security research and theological studies have separate approaches to these religious ideologies through either treating them as threats or studying them as theological mistakes. Research on fundamentalist and radical worldviews lacks sufficient analysis of their internal struggles and strategic transformations together with their links to social environments (Hafez & Mullins, 2015). This particular country establishes itself as an excellent example to study the underlying forces which shape such phenomena. Align with research from Hefner (2021), As the entire world's largest Muslim democracy Indonesia stands peculiarly between plural religious traditions and modern politics as well as political independence from colonial powers.

The official framework of Indonesia which follows Pancasila celebrates both social harmony and religious tolerance according to its constitutional framework (Kawangung, 2019). Pluralism in Indonesia faces practical challenges because conservative Islamic movements and religious identity politicization and intolerant online and offline rhetoric are becoming more prevalent. The nation has experienced multiple events including religious minority persecution alongside the 212 movement together with church attacks which support a rising fundamentalist as well as radical movement (Bahri et al., 2021; Wahid, 2018). These developments have organic roots within Indonesian historical patterns of discrimination and political exploitation along with moralistic reactions compiled from domestic heritage.

Both the reproduction and challenge of these ideologies involve Indonesian educational institutions together with media structures and legal frameworks (Husaeni, 2023). The Indigenous country has two major moderate forces related to Islamic practices led by Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah. ounters with religious sentiment by national officials and political elites have resulted in promoting extreme ideologies as these politicians seek electoral benefit. The present theoretical weakness in research emerges from the refusal to analyze deeply how religion serves simultaneously as a peaceful instrument alongside promoting polarization (Mahmud, 2024).

The majority of studies about deradicalization programs monitor actions to stop violence but they ignore ideological aspects that stem from deeper symbols and structural elements. Interventions operate by addressing symptoms yet ignore the fundamental reasons which produce ideological extremism (Gielen, 2019). Research in this field has several limitations because the publications fail to recognize and describe positive attributes of fundamentalist and radical elements. Extremist ideologies commonly linked to violent actions produce necessary social roles for different groups within communities (Kruglanski et al., 2014). Fundamentalism delivers moral stability to communities undergoing intense cultural changes or moral fluidity.

The ideology creates unity based on mutual values and ethical guidance which modern neoliberal societies tend to lack in their individualistic approaches. Radicalism maintains its ability to serve as a social reform instrument even when its non-violent nature is displayed. Throughout history radical movements created vital roles in three historical movements: civil rights liberation and economic justice movements (Fleming & Morris, 2015). The true question lies in determining the environmental elements that drive these ideas to become harmful rather than examining their essential nature (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002).

This research targets improved comprehension through detailed investigation of fundamentalism's constructive aspects and radicalism's destructive aspects. This research utilizes a qualitative literature-based methodology to study primary and secondary sources in religious studies together with political theory and sociology as well as conflict analysis for documenting fundamentalist and radical movement development and historical origins and modern manifestations. The study takes a critical position that evaluates the power relations which support this ideology while also analyzing its intellectual foundations. The research employs Indonesian context as its primary focus to develop findings that stand locally and globally while questioning simple explanations and inspiring reflection about societial methods to manage ideological differences while safeguarding pluralism and justice and human dignity.

METHODS

This research applies a qualitative method with descriptive-analytical framework to study the intricate relationship that exists between fundamentalism and radicalism in religious systems alongside social structures. Qualitative research methods proved ideal to study complex societal phenomena in their original environment because they effectively interpret social ideological frameworks in real-world contexts and religious texts. The researcher uses library-based or literature research methods to obtain data. Through library-based or literature research methods academic and theological discourses can be examined deeply while researchers avoid fieldwork activities which helps the study focus on theoretical dimensions. A comprehensive set of primary and secondary sources served as data collection foundations including sacred religious documents such as the Qur'an and Hadith which deliver theological basics. A comprehensive review of scholarly books along with peer-reviewed journal articles and academic theses and conference proceedings focused on fundamentalism and radicalism and their social effects took place. The research incorporates sources from religious studies sociology political science and conflict studies therefore providing multiple perspectives about the topic. The study uses both thematic analysis and deductive analysis methods. The authors conducted thematic analysis to find and unite repeated themes across literature regarding fundamentalist and radical ideology origins as well as manifestations and effects. The research team utilized deductive

reasoning to connect identified thematic findings with theoretical principles in order to develop universal principles that could be applied when interpreting textual observations. The research enjoys its base from a normative-theoretical framework. This methodology allows researchers to analyze both value systems and ideological bases which direct fundamentalist and radical movements. A thorough comprehension emerges from the analysis when researchers conduct an investigation which integrates pluralism theories and religious orthodox traditions and political identity development alongside social justice perspectives. The research relies on extensive literature as its main source of information instead of conducting empirical data collection through interviews or surveys but it still serves as an excellent base for conceptual analysis. This method contains a significant weakness because it relies on previous written works to derive insights but it successfully reveals important ideological and sociological aspects of the studied phenomena.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The study findings get presented and interpreted through a critical examination that uses existing literature as its foundation. The study analyzes fundamentalism and radicalism without fixated concepts of definitive categories as negative phenomena because these instances need contextual evaluation along with recognition of their multilevel social dynamics. The study draws from textual evidence and theoretical concepts and scholarly work to decode how these ideologies apply to social systems and cultural frameworks within political structures of the Indonesian nation. This research investigates the enduring factors behind ideology retention while studying acquisition methods and social functions performed by different groups holding specific beliefs under historical circumstances. This research divides its investigation into four distinct sections based on radicalism, fundamentalism, root causes, ideological ambivalence, and societal implications to provide comprehensive academic and policy-based insights.

Radicalism as a Response to Disruption and Dispossession

Academic literature and political speech exist in continuous disagreement regarding the conceptual definition of radicalism. The association between radicalism and violence as well as extremism together with threats to state order functions automatically in most mainstream contexts. According to Esen & Gumuscu (2021) the process known as "securitization of dissent" leads states to view any radical thought automatically as threats rather than analytical critiques. The term radicalism without political bias refers to beliefs that dedicate themselves to understanding fundamental origin points (radix) yet revolutionary conduct might or might not be included.

Since history began radicalism served as a foundation for making progressive political changes including anti-slavery movements as well as decolonization civil rights and feminist revolutions. During the period after September 11 radicalism merged with Islamic language to acquire a simplified definition as terrorism. Scholarly research and policy development lose analytical power because the simplification of radicalism reveals itself as dangerous to academic practice and governmental decision-making. As a critical position radicalism never exists for destructive purposes but rejects all attempts to normalize institutional violence or moral ambiguity.

The authors in Musyafak & Nisa (2020) effectively identify three distinct levels for radicalism starting from thought to behavior to action. The movement demonstrates radicalism exists beyond a single form or unchanging nature. Thinking in radical terms includes either theological innovations or attacks against partisan political unrighteousness. Radical behavior shows itself through abstaining from social interactions and it also includes making symbolic statements. The highest intervention level occurs during stage three action when disruptive elements accept either peaceful activist principles or insurgency-based violence principles. The combination of social environment with political elements decides the path radical movements follow.

This distinction holds immense value in Indonesian society. The post-1998 Islamic radicalism can be understood as a direct consequence of democratization which led to extensive authority decentralization alongside religious discourse fragmentation along with political Islamic groups entering electoral competitions. When mass protests erupted after Reformasi took hold the government allowed ideological expression yet failed to establish needed regulatory procedures and public education that would manage pluralism. Radical voices emerged as both peaceful and militant groups after the state withdrew its presence during the consequent vacancy. The religious doctrine on its own cannot be blamed for this increase.

This document provides better value when readers view it as a reaction against multiple forms of displacement which includes economic rejection along with moral ambiguity and political broken promises. Many radical ideology followers do not become ideologically indoctrinated yet feel existential disillusionment according to both Mahmud (2024) and Modiano (2021). People join radical movements to find purpose and structure as well as control over their destinies rather than for purposes of violence. The emotional aspect plays a significant role in understanding radical behavior. Radicalization theories that focus solely on cognition tend to overlook the central role that powerful emotions and states of anger, humiliation, fear and social connection between members play in the process (Howard et al., 2024). Radical social groups provide emotional stability to individuals in situations full of paradoxes. Stemming from these movements are double functions: they offer ideological beliefs as well as maintain a moral and emotional framework for participants.

The Indonesian state depends mostly on security-based approaches to combat radical ideology by viewing it as an infectious threat that needs elimination (Bin, 2010). Counter-radicalization programs do exist but they separate themselves from the basic factors that push individuals toward radicalism. The counterterrorism measures designed to fight radicalism often backfire by worsening the underlying concerns that drive people toward such extremism according to Bahri et al. (2021) as their strategies address ideology without providing structural changes. Better institutional strategies should differentiate radical dissension from violent extremism while acknowledging that the first category belongs to democratic processes. The approach would facilitate open discussions combined with critical teaching and public participation through inclusion instead of using force. The state must evolve from post-radical measures towards systematic changes that address the spiritual and political needs which attract radicals to their philosophy.

Fundamentalism as Moral Reassertion in a Fractured World

Media outlets together with political entities commonly misconceive religious fundamentalism through their coverage by labeling it as a source of extremism and depicting it as a counter-modern irrational institution. The concept and practice of fundamentalism exists in multiple dimensions of complexity. Fundamentalism represents a moral initiative that defends absolute truth statements as people experience growing uncertainty and relativistic viewpoints in modern times (Nagata, 2001). The concept of "ontological insecurity" created by Possamai (2002) identifies the psychological disruption brought on by modernity that destroys established structures of meaning and authority. Men seek fundamentalism to stabilize their lives during times of accelerating change by using divine absolutes to construct a structured framework.

People find fundamentalism satisfying because of its both spiritual teachings and structured meaning system. The ambiguous flexible aspects present in modern liberal narratives become clear in fundamentalist discourse through its well-defined moral code and designated enemy alignment combined with its concrete sense of identity. Fundamentalism presents a complete framework that controls all personal, social and political matters through religious commands. According to Oliveira (2023) and Isnawan et al. (2019) fundamentalist theology brings special appeal to persons facing doubts about moral direction or lacking trust in institutions. Fundamentalist interpretations help people find answers in sacred texts when they face modern non-religious emergency situations.

The Indonesian postcolonial identity struggle forms the fundamental basis which drives religious fundamentalist movements throughout the nation (Liddle, 1996). According to Indonesian law Pancasila establishes both religious pluralism and national unity among diverse interests. The national identity struggles to remain consistent with its ideals because a variety of religious movements battle to make their exclusive interpretation of Islam prevail as the national moral standard. With state removal from moral oversight during the Reformasi era non-state religious figures obtained freedom to create definitions about truth along with virtue and public moral standards. Many ethical and social structural components were absent from state organizations so fundamentalist groups utilized their better organization skills to present moral clarity and governance structure (Razaghi et al., 2020).

These groups establish material support frameworks which include school systems alongside medical centers and welfare networks that serve both social requirements and function to maintain ideological beliefs. Community legitimacy increases through infrastructural development since government institutions do not deliver reliable or sufficient services in these areas. During such circumstances fundamentalist ideology functions as an independent governmental system which combines religious oversight with communal administration. The qualities which draw people to fundamentalist movements generate key dangers for their followers. Fundamentalists who aim to recall "original truths" usually dismiss interpretive plurality through their actions which silences internal debates while invalidating minority perspectives.

Wahid (2018) identifies this pattern during Indonesian fundamentalist group discussions about gender issues with interfaith interactions and religious innovation (bid'ah). A narrow moral pyramid enforced by fundamentalists denies access to people unaffiliated from Islam yet simultaneously diminishes and ostracizes both forward-thinking Muslims together with female believers and minority group members. Global Islamic fundamentalism has shaped Indonesian discourse through activities such as networking with other groups and distributing funds and sharing Islamic ideologies across borders. Wahhabism and Salafism movements have worked astoContain promoting interpretations of Islam which focus on standardized texts instead of cultural differences. Halimang (2021) observes that global Islamic flows have reshaped traditional Indonesian religious customs by declaring them against Muslim teachings. Through these efforts fundamentalist movements damage indigenous religious traditions and establish standardized transnational religious practices.

Fundamentalist ideology poses significant danger whenever it finds support from either state governing bodies or electoral officials. Political actors use religious feelings to seek legitimacy while running for office in contemporary elections. During the 2017 Jakarta gubernatorial election fundamentalist discourse transformed easily into rallying tools for political gain which subsequently led to social segregation. According to Ismail (2023) these situations move away from using morality to enforce ideology because religion works as identity markers along with political tools in shaping group identities. The theological thought of fundamentalism must be separated from how it is used in social and political matters. The majority of adherents do not exhibit extremist conduct since they look for purpose while seeking belonging together with moral consistency.

Their vital issues such as corruption and moral decline along with cultural detachment prove to hold legitimate value. There exists a problem with the ways which these concerns get translated through framing and institutionalization processes. Fundamentalist ideologies control political settings by reducing democratic openness while fighting against pluralistic interests pretending to protect moral norms. Fundamentalism exists as a crucial indicator which displays ongoing social trouble rather than an unusual event. The lack of moral fulfillment coupled with declining institutional might reveals the basic human need to discover spiritual transcendence in public secular settings. The solution to decrease fundamentalism's dangers includes developing better ethical institutions with meaning and justice which combat dogmatic extremism and authoritarian exclusion.

Root Causes of Fundamentalism and Radicalism

Fundamentalist and radical activities cannot appear by themselves and never materialize independently. Focused structural and cultural and psychological elements operating within particular historical and sociopolitical environments produce these outcomes. According to Khamdan (2015) fundamentalist ideologies begin to form through the combination of three main elements which include social unrest and identity marginalization and political manipulation. A thorough critical assessment needs readers to move past simple descriptive elements and discover deeper connections about how environmental conditions develop radical movement and ideological inflexibility.

Real social dissatisfaction usually hides structural inequality and systemic corruption together with institutional failure which persists over time. Radical and fundamentalist ideologies in Indonesia attract followers because they present substitute systems for justice and accountability between economic growth and widespread poverty and employment risks alongside social variance. The theological clarity alongside moral critique against commonplace norms constitute primary draws that attract various individuals to such ideologies. Mainstream politics fails in the eyes of citizens because state institutions appear corrupt or incapable of delivering on ethical governance thus making religious ideologies attract people who feel excluded.

Youth populations along with minority groups experience modernity mostly as a form of disempowerment rather than advancement in the world. Modern economic systems based on globalization along with digital technology together with urban growth have created both future possibilities and safety uncertainties. Under conditions of limited economic and social opportunities many Indonesian young adults pursue groups that grant them both spiritual salvation and present-day dignity and decision-making power. Rejecting conformity gives people the ability to exercise moral leadership against societal norms that render some citizens unseen according to Mahmud (2024).

Globalization together with identity-based insecurities have produced this second fundamental reason why identity exclusion becomes such an important element. People look for solid ground after traditional ways of belonging (religion, ethnicity, language) become unstable due to fast cultural and technological changes. Through fundamentalism and radicalism people find a permanent identity and identifiable enemies alongside spiritual functions. Fundamentalist movements exert maximum influence upon cultural segments that feel their political and culture is disappearing. Fundamentalist movements allow individuals in areas where their native Muslim culture faces suppression from urban and Westernized success models to resist foreign cultural leadership via "faith-based reassertion" concept.

The historical events of Dutch colonialism coupled with New Order religious censorship policies in Indonesia create an additional intensity to identity anxiety which is further complicated by the recent global conflict against terror. The political correctness of Islamic identity exists within an environment that performs simultaneous surveillance and celebration practices. The dual treatment of Muslims causes a situation labels as "ban-opticon" where Muslims experience both inclusion and exclusion along with visibility but suspicion while receiving voting invitations yet needing to demonstrate constant loyalty. Fundamentalist and radical groups use this ambiguous space to provide an unambiguous answer because they position their community as a pure righteous force which makes the world fearful by delivering authentic truth.

Among all root causes political manipulation constitutes the most dangerous form of manipulation. Throughout past centuries ruling administrations reinforced their power structures through religious rhetoric and imagery but also employed these elements to silence accusations coming from dissenting groups. Indonesia is no exception. Election periods provide political actors with politik a resource to appeal to religious sentiment among voters by using fundamentalist imagery and rhetoric. Official political leaders create ideological extremism by

adopting positions endorsed by clerical authorities at the cost of discriminatory policies under religious value pretenses.

The progressive normalization creates two sectors: first, religious exclusivism transforms into an acceptable political position and second, intolerance becomes a means for achieving national unity. Pursuing religious hardliners proves beneficial to Indonesian political elites per Ismail (2023) because the elites recognize how the hardliners can effectively mobilize people rather than because they agree with the exclusionary ideologies. The strategic partnership enables extremist beliefs to gain legitimacy thus blocking moderate religious actors because they lack state backing and media networks.

These root causes serve to strengthen one another throughout their existing relationship. People who experience economic marginalization develop identity anxiety which enables actors who want societal divisions to gain power. Every single one of these contributing factors reaches peak success during times of epistemic crisis when truth remains contested and both authority becomes broken and ethical principles remain obscure. Radicalism and fundamentalism answer religious questions while using dichotomous thinking between our people and enemies or right vs wrong and good and bad elements.

This two-sided thinking system protects these ideologies from transformation and blocks all potential compromises. People who adopt this perspective cannot recognize any opponent without labeling them as immoral traitors to their beliefs thus eliminating the possibility of communication. Deradicalization programs that do not address both deep-rooted worldviews and triggering social factors alongside behavior modification achieve limited and temporary results. The process of ideological transformation demands both new beliefs along with firsthand encounters of dignity and justice and meaningful belonging.

The essential origins behind fundamentalism along with radicalism need direct remediation beyond religious restructuring and security operations. The reconstruction of society must happen through the development of reliable institutions which welcome everyone while delivering security along with deeper meanings of morality. A solid foundation is needed for counter-radicalization efforts because without this ground they become reactive and superficial thus rendering them unstable in the long run.

The Dual-Edged Nature of Fundamentalism and Radicalism

The primary accomplishment of this study centers on demonstrating the dual characteristics of fundamentalism and radicalism since they encompass multiple facets which use emancipatory or repressive mechanisms based on their shape and their environmental placement. These multiple functions of these movements challenge traditional viewpoints that simplify them through labels of irrationality or violent behavior while needing analysis using ethical and sociological methods.

The primary target of criticism against fundamentalism revolves around its inflexible attitudes combined with hardline gender views alongside its rejection of multicultural perspectives. The dissolution of moral values and identity markers within modern society encourages people to turn towards fundamentalism according to Zygmunt Bauman's cultural conception of "liquid modernity." Such conditions require fundamentalist communities to establish frameworks of "ontological security" according to Croft (2012) which help members understand where they stand in the world. According to Bendle (2002) a stable environment presents psychological recover for individuals who view modernity as alienating and ethical decline.

The fundamentalist groups fulfill crucial social and economic functions primarily for areas that lack necessary support and suffer from social marginalization. These groups establish schools while giving health services and aid distribution along with mutual support systems. Their ideological project requires these activities as essential elements for its successful implementation. The fundamentalists establish religious-based social care networks that attain

higher levels of legitimacy compared to state-run institutions. The processes which generate voluntary social identification among members simultaneously enable forceful membership control. Distinguishing believers from infidels through an absolute boundary along with pure/impure dualism creates settings where opposition finds no place except through declaration as heretical.

Repressive tolerance operates when limited approved thoughts and behaviors receive authorization under false pretenses of moral purity. Fundamentalism tends to transform into authoritarianism when it connects with political power that supports it either through state institutions or nationalistic movements. Radicalism displays a similar dualism. The best manifestation shows itself as a moral rebellion that exposes entrenched systems that cause inequality while combating both hypocrisy and unjust systems. Radical ideas drive essential transformations of society by making people address conflicts they tend to avoid. According to Nurjannah (2013) radical messaging develops as a result of political speech failing to voice inclusive justice needs. Several prominent social movements such as those fighting for racial equity and indigenous sovereignty along with climate action have used both radical tactics and language to destroy systems which resist change.

Positive radicalism differentiates from destructive extremism through the combined elements of ethical direction and strategic approach besides ideological differences. During his later years Malcolm X and anti-colonial thinkers in Indonesia employed radical critique to reveal injustice while continuing to respect the dignity of their adversaries. Radical groups that practice absolutism and dehumanization reduce their ability to achieve emancipation by creating new systems that replicate the forms of oppression they initially wanted to remove. Radical or fundamentalist actors shift their positions when they adopt what termed the "logic of necessity" that aligns historic destiny with one predetermined end which makes all dissent against this end morally wrongful. According to this thinking violence develops from being a fault to becoming a requirement and sacred duty. During this time ideological passion transforms into ideological rigidity which then gives birth to ideological violence.

Public relations between religious beliefs and political power create an urgent threat to transformation in Indonesia because of the close relationship between ideology and political legitimacy. Religious rhetoric in Indonesia extends beyond theological spaces because according to Wahid (2018) and Ismail (2023) it infiltrates both electoral early stages of politics and policy dialogue along with public morality regulations. Fundamentalist or radical narratives which become part of a national identity acquire enough political strength to control both personal beliefs and unified social standards. Such an approach initially creates stability yet develops harmful effects on democratic diversity within the long run. Opposing all forms of radical or fundamentalist speech operates as an equally problematic practice. The strategic failure to differentiate between peaceful dissent and violent extremism within radical ideologies leads to such ideologies becoming hidden activities that develop a stronger extremist philosophy.

Repression does not eliminate resistance according to Smollan (2011), but it changes the nature of resistance instead. Rarely does public dismissal eliminate radical ideas because marginalization drives them toward intellectual radicalization during their hidden existence. We require deep analysis of fundamentalism and radicalism instead of universal denunciations. The conditions which make these ideologies become vehicles for moral agency require investigation because they also possess abilities to function as instruments of domination. At what moments do fundamental movements protect human dignity and when do they choose to destroy it?

The questions encourage us to pass ideological boundaries and practice ethical judgment while acknowledging that extremism stems from similar causes which eventually result in liberation based on their developmental path and resistance strategies. Analytical failure is not the reason for this complex situation because these ideologies need evaluation through intellectual humility combined with political responsibility. Efforts at dehumanization along with idealistic portrayals become inadequate strategic approaches. The need exists for society to

possess courage in balancing its understanding of fundamentalism's comfort and control with radicalism's freedom and destruction because all these elements depend on how people respond in both official policies and everyday educational and social settings.

CONCLUSION

This research explores the fundamental and complex nature of fundamentalism together with radicalism as two systems despite common public myths they should be viewed as historical anti-establishment reactions to fundamental societal tensions and social-political obstacles and ethical ambiguities. Analysis reveals fundamentalism and radicalism emerge as reactions to particular economic disparities and cultural tensions along with institutional collapse and political propaganda as opposed to being labeled as moderation versus extremism. Through this research the authors disturb simplistic explanations by revealing the sophisticated processes through which extremist ideologies spread throughout Indonesian society after Reformasi took effect. The analysis reveals that both ideologies maintain an uncertain relationship toward one another. Fundamentalism together with radicalism do not necessarily cause harm because they contain vital components for ethical transformation along with rebuilding identities and fostering group bonds. Such ideologies present dual characteristics which include tendencies toward authoritarianism alongside epistemic limitations and severe moral segregation but only emerge when being exploited by political forces or used as absolute principles. Such dual aspects of fundamentalism and radicalism create situations where they pose risks but remain essential elements. While such movements become destructive without critical examination or forced suppression they become essential when used to demand ethical change and cultural independence. Fundamentalist and radical ideologies maintain their strength in Indonesia through direct experience at the levels of social life. These movements demonstrate a combination of theological beliefs together with substantive complaints and emotional requirements as well as continuing historical suffering. Therefore many followers embrace these ideologies because they wish to find order coupled with meaning and dignity in a society where these elements are routinely absent. We ought to refrain from disregarding their valid concerns about corruption alongside moral decadence and injustice and the marginalization that affects them. Sincere efforts for dialogue and empathetic engagement along with meaningful reform initiatives should replace the current dismissing attitude toward such groups. The research results generate additional conclusions about the proper reaction of societies facing twin ideological challenges. State institutions together with civil organizations must shift from watchful security practices to dedicated involvement with radical identification causes which result from structural conditions along with symbolic factors. The success of counter-extremism initiatives depends on having programs that base their approaches on achieving social equality alongside economic chance and multicultural learning over ideological reform alone. Academic research needs to create analytical models which analyze extremist ideologies neither as abstract threats nor as acceptable manifestations but delve into both their self-contradicting aspects and their actual influence in the real world.

REFERENCES

Bahri, A. S. R. M., Rohmah, N. H., & Jamila, M. (2021). Radikalisme dalam Perspektif Ilmu Psikologi Agama. *Al Ghazali*, *4*(2), 153-166. https://doi.org/10.52484/al_ghazali.v4i2.251

Bendle, M. F. (2002). The crisis of 'identity'in high modernity. *The British journal of sociology*, *53*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071310120109302

Bin Abdullah, K. (2010). Emerging Threats to Malaysia's National Security. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, *5*(2), 55-70. https://doi.org/10.1080/18335300.2010.9686949

Croft, S. (2012). Constructing ontological insecurity: the insecuritization of Britain's Muslims. *Contemporary security policy*, *33*(2), 219-235. https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2012.693776

Esen, B., & Gumuscu, S. (2021). Why did Turkish democracy collapse? A political economy account of AKP's authoritarianism. *Party Politics*, *27*(6), 1075-1091. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068820923722

Fleming, C. M., & Morris, A. (2015). Theorizing ethnic and racial movements in the global age: Lessons from the Civil Rights Movement. *Sociology of race and ethnicity*, *1*(1), 105-126. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214562473

Gielen, A. J. (2019). Countering violent extremism: A realist review for assessing what works, for whom, in what circumstances, and how?. *Terrorism and political violence*, *31*(6), 1149-1167. https://doi.org/10.1080/09546553.2017.1313736

Hafez, M., & Mullins, C. (2015). The radicalization puzzle: A theoretical synthesis of empirical approaches to homegrown extremism. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *38*(11), 958-975. https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2015.1051375

Halimang, S. (2021). Fundamentalisme dan Radikalisme: Diskursus Komprehensif tentang Karakteristik dan Kiprahnya. *Al-Fikra: Jurnal Ilmiah Keislaman*, *20*(1), 40-54. https://doi.org/10.24014/af.V19i2.10680

Hefner, R. W. (2021). Islam and institutional religious freedom in Indonesia. *Religions*, *12*(6), 415. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12060415

Hidayah, U. (2024). Perempuan dan Keterlibatan Radikalisme: Upaya Preventif Melalui Pendidikan Keluarga. *AJMIE: Alhikam Journal of Multidisciplinary Islamic Education*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.32478/pdp5js26

Howard, T., Poston, B., & Lopez, A. (2024). Extremist Radicalization in the Virtual Era: Analyzing the Neurocognitive Process of Online Radicalization. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, *47*(8), 862-887. https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2021.2016558

Huriani, Y., Zulaiha, E., & Dilawati, R. (2022). *Buku saku moderasi beragama untuk perempuan muslim*. Bandung: Prodi S2 Studi Agama-agama UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung.

Husaeni, M. F. (2023). Critical literature review on moral education system in Indonesia: How Islamic education and pancasila education monopolize morality in schools. *Muslim Education Review*, *2*(1), 65-98. https://doi.org/10.56529/mer.v2i1.163

Ismail, Z. (2023). Gerakan Radikalisme Islam Kontemporer:(Sebuah Analisa Sosiologis dan Politis). *Fikroh*, *7*(1), 58-68. https://doi.org/10.37216/fikroh.v7i1.970

Isnawan, R., Sakina, L., & Bintang, M.D. (2019), "Gerakan Sosial Anti Riba sebagai Gerakan Fundamentalisme Keagamaan". *Aplikasia: Jurnal Aplikasi Ilmu-ilmu Agama*, 19(1), 53-68. https://doi.org/10.14421/aplikasia.v19i1.1912.

Kawangung, Y. (2019). Religious moderation discourse in plurality of social harmony in Indonesia. *International journal of social sciences and humanities*, *3*(1), 160-170. https://doi.org/10.29332/ijssh.v3n1.277

Khamdan, M. (2015). Rethinking deradikalisasi: Konstruksi bina damai penanganan terorisme. *Addin*, *9*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.21043/addin.v9i1.612

Kinnvall, C. (2004). Globalization and religious nationalism: Self, identity, and the search for ontological security. *Political psychology*, *25*(5), 741-767. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00396.x

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior?. *Environmental education research*, *8*(3), 239-260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504620220145401

Kruglanski, A. W., & Fishman, S. (2009). Psychological factors in terrorism and counterterrorism: Individual, group, and organizational levels of analysis. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *3*(1), 1-44. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2009.01009.x

Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Bélanger, J. J., Sheveland, A., Hetiarachchi, M., & Gunaratna, R. (2014). The psychology of radicalization and deradicalization: How significance quest impacts violent extremism. *Political Psychology*, *35*, 69-93. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12163

Liddle, R. W. (1996). The Islamic turn in Indonesia: A political explanation. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *55*(3), 613-634. https://doi.org/10.2307/2646448

Maghfuri, A. (2019). Peran Lembaga Pendidikan Dalam Pengarusutamaan Islam Moderat Sebagai Upaya Melawan Paham Konservatif-Radikal. *TADRIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *14*(2), 247-260. https://doi.org/10.19105/tjpi.v14i2.2713

Mahmud, A. (2024). Krisis identitas di kalangan generasi Z dalam perspektif patologi sosial pada era media sosial. *Jurnal Ushuluddin: Media Dialog Pemikiran Islam*, *26*(2). https://doi.org/10.24252/jumdpi.v26i2.51032

Modiano, J. Y. (2021). Pengaruh Budaya Patriarki dan Kaitannya Dengan Kekerasan Dalam Rumah Tangga. *Sapientia Et Virtus*, *6*(2), 129-140. https://doi.org/10.37477/sev.v6i2.335

Moore, D. B. (1995). Development discourse as hegemony: Towards an ideological history—1945–1995. In *Debating development discourse: Institutional and popular perspectives* (pp. 1-53). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24199-6_1

Mulia, S. M. (2022). Melawan Fundamentalisme: Memanusiakan Perempuan. *AL-KAINAH: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *1*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.69698/jis.v1i1.3

Musyafak, N., & Nisa, L. C. (2020). *Resiliensi Masyarakat Melawan Radikalisme; Aksi Damai dalam Konflik Agama*. Jawa Tengah: Penerbit Lawwana.

Nagata, J. (2001). Beyond Theology: Toward an Anthropology of" Fundamentalism". *American Anthropologist*, *103*(2), 481-498. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2001.103.2.481

Nurjannah, N. (2013). Faktor Pemicu Munculnya Radikalisme Islam Atas Nama Dakwah. *Jurnal Dakwah: Media Komunikasi dan Dakwah*, *14*(2), 177-198. https://doi.org/10.14421/jd.2013.14202

Oliveira de Souza, R. L. (2023). Religious Fundamentalism: A Theoretical-Constitutional Analysis. *Cuestiones constitucionales*, (49), 209-262. https://doi.org/10.22201/iij.24484881e.2023.49.18584

Possamai-Inesedy, A. (2002). Beck's risk society and Giddens' search for ontological security: A comparative analysis between the Anthroposophical society and the Assemblies of God. *Australian Religion Studies Review*, *15*(1).

Razaghi, M., Chavoshian, H., Chanzanagh, H. E., & Rabiei, K. (2020). Religious fundamentalism, individuality, and collective identity: A case study of two student organizations in Iran. *Critical Research on Religion*, *8*(1), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/2050303219900226

Sani, A. (2023). A Radikalisme dan Ekstremisme dalam Pemikiran Sayyid Qutb: Tinjauan Kritis atas Tafsir Fi-Zilalil Qur'an. *Al-Misykah: Jurnal Studi Al-qur'an dan Tafsir*, *4*(2), 43-64. https://doi.org/10.19109/almisykah.v4i2.20140

Sewell Jr, W. H. (1985). Ideologies and social revolutions: Reflections on the French case. *The Journal of Modern History*, *57*(1), 57-85.

Simaremare, R. (2023). Pengaruh Alkitab dalam pergerakan nasionalisme. *Te Deum (Jurnal Teologi dan Pengembangan Pelayanan)*, *12*(2), 257-287. https://doi.org/10.51828/td.v12i2.228

Smollan, R. K. (2011). The multi-dimensional nature of resistance to change. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *17*(6), 828-849. https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.2011.828

Sternberg, E. (2010). Purifying the world: What the new radical ideology stands for. *Orbis*, *54*(1), 61-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orbis.2009.10.006

Tahir, M. (2015). Wacana Fikih Kebangsaan dalam Penanggulangan dan Pencegahan Radikalisme di Lingkungan Kampus di NTB. *Asy-Syir'ah: Jurnal Ilmu Syari'ah dan Hukum*, *49*(2), 298-314. https://doi.org/10.14421/ajish.v49i2.143

Wahid, A. (2018). Fundamentalisme dan Radikalisme Islam (Telaah Kritis tentang Eksistensinya Masa Kini). *Sulesana: Jurnal Wawasan Keislaman*, *12*(1), 61-75. https://doi.org/10.24252/sulesana.v12i1.5669.

Yunus, A. F. (2017). Radikalisme, liberalisme dan terorisme: pengaruhnya terhadap agama islam. *Jurnal Studi Al-Qur'an*, *13*(1), 76-94. https://doi.org/10.21009/JSQ.013.1.06