

COUNTER-RADICALISM MOVEMENT AND HYBRIDIZATION OF IDENTITY IN THE YOUNG INTERFAITH COMMUNITY IN YOGYAKARTA

M. Naufal Waliyuddin¹

¹Graduate School of UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta

e-mail: naufal.waliyuddin11@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The radicalism discourse that has been quite widespread in last two decades has produced various responses, ranging from counter-narrative, de-radicalization, and counter-radicalism efforts. This paper investigates specifically how efforts to counter radicalism are pursued from civil society initiatives, one of which is *Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community* (YIPC) in Yogyakarta. Using an interpretative phenomenological approach, this qualitative research explores several motives behind the counter-radicalism movement that they organize and are equipped with a visible hybrid portrait of identity. Observation, informal interviews, and documentation are operated as data retrieval techniques. The literature review was also deepened to elaborate data and develop argumentative narratives. The results obtained show that the three dialectical reasons that trigger them to counter radicalism are a collective awareness, imagined common enemy, and claims of youthfulness. In particular, the hybridization of identity that has been captured in this community can also be observed in changes in attitude, perspective, and behaviour patterns of individuals—before joining and when joining YIPC Yogyakarta. Borrowing from Gadamer's concept, this was due to the mixture of *horizons* which later gave birth to a fused or assimilated character (*hybrid*) and reflected in their speech, attitudes, social media content, and social actions.

Keywords: Counter Radicalism; Hybridization of Identity; Interfaith; Youth

1) INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of radicalism and religious extremism seems to have strengthened in the last two decades, especially among the younger generation in Indonesia. In a broadcast from BBC News, the results of a survey by the National Intelligence Agency (BIN) have found that 39% of Indonesian students have radical ideologies (Utama, 2018). This figure is in accordance with statistical data from BNPT in 2017 about 39% of Indonesian students—in universities—in 15 provinces interested in radicalism. The data then indicates that campuses, especially Indonesian youth, are in the midst of a “radicalization phase”. Furthermore, if you look at the characteristics of radicalism, as formulated by BNPT, it consists of; intolerance, fanaticism, exclusivity, and revolutionary tendencies—it indirectly indicates that Indonesia is experiencing a crisis of tolerance and dryness of broad-mindedness.

On the other hand, with globalization which brings with it the phenomenon of new media, multicultural crossing, the current flow of information in the latest century and the splendour of the world of industry, music, fashion, film, and modern lifestyles, it turns out that all of this makes young people quite diverse in their behaviour. This phenomenon will lead to “identity

hybridization” in youth which is formed as a result of the combination of multi-identities which will later give birth to a new identity that is unique as well as complex and ‘decorative’ (Bamualim, Latief, & Abubakar, 2018; Kersten, 2015). Besides a number of youths exposed to currents of radicalism so that they are exclusive and tend to be intolerant, on the other hand, with this identity hybridization, there are also several young people who tend to be more open with different groups—in the context of this paper: relations between adherents of other religions—and even strive for a counterculture to stem the wave of radicalism. In this context that will be the focus of this study. Young people who moved in the transportation cross-faith (interfaith) seeks and formulates some efforts in countering radicalism flows. The significance of this research is based on the search for why in the midst of radicalism and—in Martin van Bruinessen’s term, a wave of ‘conservative turn’—there are still youths who are encouraged to narrate an inclusive value and dispel radicalism.

The interfaith movement itself is not a new topic. Historically, inter-religious relations have had various forms of expression, ranging from conflict-laden to intersubjective relationships that resulted in peace agreements. Aspects of this interfaith relationship are important to study because their role in social life is quite determinative, particularly in matters of harmony and peace among others. As the Swiss theologian Hans Kung put it: “there can be no more peace among nations without peace between religions, and no peace between religions without dialogue between them” (Kung, 1991, p. 71; Wera, 2017). The urgency of this interfaith dialogue, for Ina Merdjanova and Patrice Brodeur, is an approach practice that has the potential to boost human interaction both locally and globally to recognize the importance of a comprehensive and not one-sided understanding (Merdjanova & Brodeur, 2009, pp. 10–11).

The study of interreligious and interfaith relations has basically been going on for a long time in the academic sphere. Anna Halafoff elaborated on the emergence of interfaith movements—in her term: multifaith movement—globally and officially around 1893 (Halafoff, 2013, pp. 35–39). Meanwhile in Indonesia itself, interfaith dialogue between Muslims and Christians began in 1969. Referring to the explanation and speech of A. Mukti Ali who presented the paper *Dialogue between Muslims and Christians in Indonesia and Its Problems* in 1970 in Ajaltoun, Lebanon, and he admitted that the interfaith dialogue had taken place in November 1969. The process involved himself as a Muslim, two Catholics, and three Protestants (Banawiratma & Bagir, 2010, pp. 4–5). Of course, the dialogue referred to in this context is a more organized and institutional form of interaction. In addition, nowadays there are several movements or community circles that are struggling with interfaith dialogue activities, one of which is the *Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community* (YIPC) in Yogyakarta.

This research goes further and is specific to that community. Many researchers with similar themes have been carried out, one of which was from Sumanto Al-Qurtuby who drew the line between religious conflicts in Indonesia and the emergence of a grassroots reconciliation movement to narrate peace (Al-Qurtuby, 2012). Sumanto elaborately presents how this effort can emerge and what factors are behind it. In the terminology of Tony Jenkins and Betty A. Reardon it is categorized into “civil society initiatives” (Webel & Galtung, 2007, pp. 209–230). Then in a broader scope, the research book published by Globethics entitled *Social Ethics in Inter-Religious Interaction* (Noor & Siregar, 2015) describes the multi-perspective variety of social and religious ethics. The presence of religion in the public sphere, plural society, and humanistic, political, and economic socio-cultural aspects are dialectically explained. However, there is a specific niche regarding the portrait of identity hybridization that has not been studied, especially in its intersection with interfaith communities.

2) METHODS

This research is qualitative and uses an *interpretative phenomenological approach*. This approach was chosen as the basis for direct (participatory) involvement with the aim of understanding,

exploring and analysing why and how the counter-radicalism efforts at YIPC Yogyakarta. On the other hand, as a search for information, researchers conducted observations, interviews with informal dialogues with a number of sources, and documentation. The literature review will also be deepened as an aid in elaborating the data. The theory used is social action from Max Weber (Ritzer & Stepnisky, 2018, pp. 142–144; Weber, 2012) and Gadamer's hermeneutics, especially regarding the concept of *fusion of horizons* (Gadamer, 2004, p. 301; Hardiman, 2015, pp. 167–191). Both of them will be used to build an argumentative narrative regarding the motives behind their incorporation into interfaith communities and counter-radicalism efforts as well as the phenomenon of identity hybridization as a portrait of contemporary youth's religiosity.

3) RESULTS

Discourse on Radicalism, Effects of Globalization and Youth Response

The discourse of radicalism, especially in the religious domain, has become widely discussed in public spaces and academic pulpits not only because of the series of tragedies of terrorism in this century, but also because of the active role of the media (Esposito & Iner, 2019, pp. 15–19). The highlights of Karen Armstrong (Armstrong, 2001; Armstrong et al., 2018), Bruce Hoffman (Naharong, 2013, p. 612), John L. Esposito, Martin van Bruinessen (Bruinessen, 2002), and a number of Indonesian academics on the phenomenon of radicalism often brought into contact with various other prominent discourses such as *Islamophobia*, fundamentalism, to violent extremism. It is undeniable that the important characteristics and determinants of today's acts of terrorism are quite a lot supported by “religiously motivated”. The main thing lies in the meaning and interpretation of certain religious scriptures.

However, the study of radicalism as a discursive narrative does not stop being seen as an alarming social fact that needs a response. It is also viewed from a series of large, multi-perspective fields. Steven Pinker presents an argumentative synthesis that addresses radicalism as an understanding that is often biased only in the religious realm, even though it can manifest into various segments—economic, political, social, cyberspace radicalism—with materialistic desires (Pinker, 2018). As a human existential challenge this century, the roots of radicalism permeate many intertwined things, ranging from injustice, economic conditions, the need for security, political position, health, to the psychology of hatred (Sternberg & Sternberg, 2008; Yanay, 2013). Problems of social segregation, political polarization, friction across schools of thought, to inter-ethnic and gender sentiments can be relied upon as well as portrayed as potential for strengthening radicalism in the contemporary era.

In addition, Amanah Nurish's review is quite interesting, presented as a counterweight to the big narrative about radicalism. Nurish asks critical questions about the image of dominant religious radicalism that shapes the understanding of the population, especially in Indonesia (Nurish, 2020). For him, radicalism is only a matter of perspective and in an essential sense—before peyoration occurs—it is actually needed in intellectual cognition efforts. The political language that comes out of the media's authority and power needs to be fully realized so as not to get caught in a slip of views. In the context of Indonesia, Nurish admits that there is an element of naivety in dealing with religious radicalism. On the other hand, there is a kind of tactic to use *common-enemy* psychology in this matter. So far, Nurish also considers that there is a role for *hyper reality* in entering people's subconscious minds to be wary of religious radicalism, while at the same time, there are some parties who reap political-economic benefits behind this response.

Moreover, the constellation of global life that is intertwined in the digital era now contributes to the socio-anthropological character of humans in their respective locations, and does not escape religious matters (Beyer & Beaman, 2007; Hefner, 2018). The impact of globalization brings with it the challenges of *hoax*, *post truth*, collective religious narcissism and so forth (Waliyuddin, 2019, 2020). Meetings as well as crosses between cultures in the world are

now growing rapidly and at a tempo that seems to be running (Piliang, 2017). This series of events, directly or indirectly, will also contribute to changes in young people—both their psychological, social, and even spiritual aspects. Youth as heirs of the mandate in the future, are affected by a variety of global obstacles, which in turn they will respond with varied behavior, and may be *hybrid*. In this context: the younger generation can become more radically exclusive, liberal modernist, or balanced and inclusive.

In the case of Indonesia itself, the response of young people to radicalism is quite sad. The evidence supporting the above description can rest on the findings of PPIM UIN Jakarta in its survey on religion, state, and intolerance which was held from September 1 to October 7 2017. Of the 2,181 respondents (consisting of teachers, students, and university students) from 34 provinces, 68 districts and 8 cities in Indonesia, 37.71% agree that jihad is the same as war and *qital* (killing). Furthermore, 23.35% agree that suicide bombings are Islamic jihad. Then 34.03% agreed that apostates deserve to be executed and 33.34% thought that being intolerant towards minorities was not a problem (Saputra, 2018, p. 40). The respondents of this survey, sadly, are dominated by young people today.

However, the attitude of youth in Indonesia is not single-faced and there are still various variations in their behavior. Young people, according to the UN (UNESCO) definition, are 15-24 years old (Unesco.org, n.d.), go through a stage which in Larson's terms (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1984) is called "consciousness restructuring". They experience a ladder of psychological development which is marked by a transitional process from a state of *entropy* (a state of consciousness that is not yet organized) to *negentropy* (a state of well-ordered consciousness) (Sarwono, 2016, pp. 13–15). At this stage the young religious openness in a significant role in shaping the character (*personality*) as well as their attitude and their behavior.

Symptoms of the tendency of the younger generation towards radicalism cannot be separated from the multi-factors that play a role. Psychologically, the transition phase which is marked by an identity crisis within them is potential enough to experience what Quintan Wictorowicz calls *cognitive opening* (Gadd & Jefferson, 2013, p. 152). A micro-sociological process that strengthens them to accept new ideas that is more radical in nature. Other factors that also need to be considered are changes in the socio-political climate, economic conditions, stretching of modernization, and globalization. All of these spheres are configured and contribute to the increasing anxiety and sense of future uncertainty in those who are undergoing a transition period (Hasan, 2013, 2016). The combination of psychological and socio-political-economic factors also has an influence on young people who then turn to the world of radicalism and extremism. This is triggered, among other things, by the temptation and the offer of efficacious formulas in the name of religion which are often presented by these groups which for the youth are felt to be able to make them calm and dispel anxiety (Bamualim et al., 2018, p. 7). In this way, the phenomenon of religious radicalism as a complex issue is basically influenced by multiple factors, including globalization, and the responses of young people are also quite diverse.

Peace Building and Interfaith Relation: A Brief Portrait of YIPC Yogyakarta

Historically, the embryo that later grew and became known as the *Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community* (YIPC) was initially initiated by two academics, namely Andreas Jonathan (Christian) and Ayi Yunus Rusyana (Muslim) in 2012 ("YIPC-Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community," n.d.). At that time they were pursuing doctoral education in the ICRS (*Indonesian Consortium for Religious Studies*) program and started to realize their ideas in the form of the *Young Peacemaker Training* program, on 9-12 July 2012 with a target audience of students. The activity was finally enlivened by 25 Christian and Muslim students from various backgrounds and universities in Yogyakarta. Andreas Jonathan, an activist for the *Campus Peace Movement* (CPM) and Ayi Yunus as an activist for the *Peace Generation*, also formulated the peace values of their respective communities to formulate interfaith dialogue as well as conflict reconciliation and peace

education in an intense interactive manner. After the training, the YIPC community was formed as a forum for *follow-up* and a means of sustainable regeneration.

This community is domiciled in Yogyakarta and, as a follow-up, just held its inaugural program in September 2013. By holding an *interfaith dialogue* in it, this program was named *Student Interfaith Peace Camp* (SIPC) and carried the theme “*Building Peace Generation Through Young Peacemakers*”—which later became known as the motto as well as the main mission of the YIPC community. The participants who took part in the initial follow-up activity were 30 students from various regions (Bandung, Solo, Surabaya, Kebumen, Madura, Palembang). Starting from the series of processes above, since 2014 until now, YIPC has had regional branches in strategic cities such as Medan, Bandung, Surabaya, Jakarta, Solo, Malang, Semarang, to Bangkalan and Ambon. The fundamental values of peace propagated by this community—as a result of the combination of the 12 Peace Values of *Peace Generation with Interfaith Dialogue and Scriptural Reasoning* (SR)—includes 4 main components: making peace with God (vertical-divine and supernatural relationships), making peace with oneself (a form of *self-awareness* and *self-acceptance*), making peace with others (social-horizontal), and making peace with the environment (*ecological values*).

In practice, this community is engaged in the education sector for peace and religious tolerance which focuses on involving young people. This can be seen as a futuristic projection that translates into value investment behavior for the next generation to become *peacemakers*. However, YIPC’s target is specific and limited, in this context it is students and students. The routine SIPC program is usually held twice a year and the participants are accompanied by mentors, facilitators who are longtime members of the community. The structure of YIPC itself is relatively simple, consisting of a National Head Facilitator (usually two people: men and women representing different religions) and Regional Heads (varied: one to three people in each region), then Assistant Facilitators in each basecamp lined up from proactive new members, and the last one is a member or members.

The pattern of peace education and interfaith relations carried out by this community is interactive-dialogical, not one-way like the religious lecture method. The series of activities in this community vary and are framed according to the mission they carry out. *Nobar* activities (acronym: watching together), routine SR, book review, discussions, and virtual meetings are vehicles for achieving vision. They did not escape the transmission of YIPC’s peace values through the creation of content on social media, from Instagram, Facebook, Twitter to audiovisuals on Youtube and the organization’s website. Once upon a time YIPC also traveled to tourist attractions while sharing stories, sometimes visiting places of worship of religions, local beliefs and the like. At the moment of celebrating religious holidays, they congratulated each other for followers of other religions, for example “Merry Christmas” from Muslims to Christians and “Happy Eid” from Christians to their Muslim friends.

Apart from the above series of activities, there are also a number of internal management events. Nationally they held a joint conference in a certain place to discuss the work program and evaluation of the previous period. Then regional meetings are held by each branch. At other times, cooperation with interfaith communities from the International has also been carried out several times, such as in November 2019 YIPC Yogyakarta was visited by an Australian Jewish rabbi named Avraham Bart. At the event, which was held at the restaurant, they had dialogues ranging from theological doctrines, religious practices, to decentralized Jewish diversity. In addition, the annual celebration in the form of *World Interfaith Harmony Week* (the first week of February every year) is a place for them to meet while realizing certain programs.

To illustrate the process and dynamics in activities at YIPC Yogyakarta, it can be observed in several portraits of interesting things and situations that I obtained during observations and interviews with informal dialogues. One of the moments during SIPC (8-10 November 2019) at a

villa in the Kaliurang area) there was a Christian female participant with the initials MW from Flores and was studying at STAK Marturia Yogyakarta. MW, who is still an early student, articulated his impressions on the sharing and breaking prejudice session:

"...I think the Muslims in my area wear all black clothes and cover their faces. I asked myself, do they use black magic? So... But here I just realized that you guys are just like us." (MW, STAK Marturia)

To the laughter of the other participants, the woman with a distinctive East Indonesian accent smiled and the session continued to the other participants. MW's expression is quite unique and if it is highlighted from Max Weber's social actions, the dialectical process of MW's thoughts which initially harbored suspicions and has now turned into daring to associate with Muslims is the result of the impact of the social atmosphere that surrounds him—in this context when he migrates to a pluralistic Yogyakarta. If categorized according to Weber's typology, the MW phenomenon is classified as "rational action".

Meanwhile, I had another response when I spoke informally with RN, one of the male Muslim participants and a mid-semester UIN Sunan Kalijaga student from Madura. He decided to join SIPC after receiving information from his classmates and then felt the need to join because of his uniform background. RN said that because of the monoculture environment of Islam, it made him want to seek new experiences, make acquaintances with non-Muslims, and expand his social circle. In the previous review, the *cognitive opening* phase for youth, which was disseminated by Quintan Wictorowicz, turned out to play a role not only in opening the risk of youth to fall into radicalism, but also providing side opportunities, namely being more open and accepting of diversity.

Then in the material session, a senior RB facilitator, a Batak Christian man who is also a teacher in Yogyakarta, was explaining Hans Kung's passage about inter-religious peace. He explained that world peace can be started with peace between religious communities and this needs to be started with interfaith dialogue. While explaining the SR process to the SIPC participants, he added:

"Later on during SR, you don't have to agree. But this quote from Hans Kung is worth considering. Let's think together, the number of followers of Christianity and Islam is the largest in the world. And if the adherents of these two religions are at peace, then world peace will be very possible." (Presentation by RB at SIPC November 2019).

As with the program that I participated in, YIPC as a communal entity of students and students engaged in inter-religious harmony carries out a dialogue-interactive pattern of peace campaigns. Regarding the division of small groups based on varied backgrounds so that participants directly experience the simulated atmosphere of diversity. The format of the event is packaged in an attractive manner and colored by the nuances of intimacy through singing together, games, quizzes, to emotional reflection. Regarding the last point mentioned, one of the female facilitators from Aceh and studying at UIN Sunan Kalijaga, AN, led a self-acceptance session by opening up her personal family problems. Participants were then directed to write something similar on a small piece of paper, a book, or their respective devices to finally accept and make peace with themselves. Such an event gives the impression to the participants to become familiar, open, and more aware of the psychological turmoil within each other. Even so, if you observe that the percentage of participants who are actively participating in post-SIPC follow-up is only slightly and more returning to their respective activities, the question that arises is: does the experience of following SIPC have a significant impact on the individuals involved, or does it just become a kind of ephemeral intimacy that passes quickly and doesn't last? The next review tries to map indirectly with a variety of variables, concepts, other ideas that are relevant and potential to be raised.

Counter Radicalism: Collective Awareness, Imagined Common Enemy, and the Claim of Youthfulness

Radicalism as one of the *wicked problems* (J. Rittel & Weber, 1973) this century should be addressed with multi-approaches that are not linear and mono-discipline but multi-inter-transdisciplinary science (Abdullah, 2020). There have been many responses given to the issue of radicalism from various segments of society, including the government, related authorized institutions, educational institutions, communities, and civil society initiatives. This is the starting point for efforts to unravel the complexities, complications, and complexities that are interdependent with each other in the issue of religious radicalism. Preventive and curative efforts regarding this need could be addressed as a response from the global community to the construction of their inner understanding.

In relation to this research, there have been many academic studies that have presented discourses on *countering religious radicalism* (Anis, n.d.; Jonathan, Widjaya, & Husein, 2016; Rusyana, n.d.; Wille, 2017) and specifically researched YIPC itself in various regions. From a number of previous studies, most of them examine how youths carry out counter-narratives against radicalism and what strategies are realized. However, not many have delved deeper into why they could be moved to join the fight against radicalism and actualize it through a series of programs. The distinction of this research lies in, primarily in accentuating, the motives behind the decisions of individuals involved in this community so that they are willing and involved in tackling radicalism. In addition, it is rare for anyone to extrapolate the concept of identity hybridization with counter-radicalism efforts—which will be applied in this paper. The ideas put forward more often associated it with pop-culture, the urban middle class, and youth resistance.

After reading a number of behaviors, activities, expressions, stories and conversations in the YIPC Yogyakarta community, there flashed an implicit indication that there is a circle of discourse that surrounds us in this world of information. Conditions shape our perspective and response to religious radicalism. Especially in the multicultural zone of Yogyakarta and opens a wide space for interaction between newcomers and their respective socio-anthropological characteristics. In the social sciences, natural, cultural and social wealth (natural, cultural and social diversity) is not only useful as a capital for harmony and welfare of life, it also has the potential to cause conflict or social disaster. Thus, the counter-radicalism efforts in particular, or in general to unravel the labyrinth of potential conflicts in the future—*decoding the labyrinth of conflict*—had its own urgency.

Based on the points above, in researching the YIPC Yogyakarta counter radicalism, I explored the roots and the underlying factors. There are a number of concepts that could represent the research findings, namely: *collective awareness, imagined common enemy, and the claim of youthfulness*. Collective concern grows in response to external situations that demand or even threaten the need for security in humans. This response can trigger the establishment of communal interactions which then foster collective action—in this context, actions to tackle religious radicalism which they perceive from various sources and developing information. This element of collective concern is one of the factors that move individuals in YIPC to suppress potential conflicts.

Whereas *imagined common enemy* I base on Benedict Anderson's idea of *imagined communities* (Anderson, 2008) which explains nationalism. However, in this paper, I combine it with the *common enemy* review implied in Amanah Nurish's study which narrates the "myth of radicalism" like this:

"Supported by media, 'hyper-reality' created an image of enemy that must be fight. This example can be seen through movies, entertainments, newspaper, memes on Twitter-Facebook-or-Instagram, etc. imagined as 'the others'." (Nurish, 2020, pp. 118–119)

Referring to the narrative, the synthesis of *imagined common enemies* (Jaegher & Hoyer, 2014) is also one of the determinative psychological factors that stimulates individuals to be compelled to make counter-radicalism efforts. They view this understanding as a common enemy so that this has a positive impact as ‘glue’ for group solidarity, but at the same time, it has a negative impact: unable to stop the cycle of hatred (*reciprocal hatred* or ‘curse’ of *vicious cycle of hate*). When translated into question form, a representative illustration might read something like a perennial philosophy question, “Can there be a possibility that we dispel hate without being trapped in becoming haters of haters? What is the right action and position to stop this cycle of hatred?” In reality, we often find that groups that promote tolerance secretly slip into hating and anti-tolerance to those who are intolerant. Such a dilemma point becomes more complex. Individuals who are members of YIPC, throughout this research, most of them still have not reached the awareness that radicals are also ‘victims’ of globalization which is massively engulfing and producing various problems such as structural poverty, minority discrimination, and other sense of injustice with different gradations of forms. However, it must also be acknowledged that some others have reached this awareness, especially among the facilitators.

Even so, it is difficult to avoid that today’s young generation has indeed been *fait accompli* with complications by a series of problems with a dynamic socio-political climate, all of which seem to support the statement that “radicalism must be suppressed and fought against”. They are besieged by prominent narratives cast by the media, state authorities, and other institutional powers that grow in society to act in this way. Automatically, the counter-radicalism efforts that they spread, one of them, are motivated by the subconscious imagining a common enemy to be overcome.

While the last aspect, namely the claim of youth. In the current era of social media, narcissistic tendencies have become epidemic (Twenge & Campbell, 2009), especially among young people, and take various forms of expression that can be both positive and negative. In the process of my observation, the contestation of discourse in online media and the temperament of the younger generation, both of which are sufficient to accommodate the movement of the YIPC Yogyakarta community. In other words, their attempt to counter the flow of religious radicalism is nothing but a form of self-actualization which—besides accommodating the potential of contemporary narcissism—is also a channel of expression to claim youthfulness (Sunesti, Hasan, & Azca, 2018). So, as a fulfillment of human existential needs, the counter-radicalism actions that are promoted also contain psychological elements that want to show their sense of youth in modern times. This can be observed in a number of YIPC’s social media posts which seem to imply that: “the youth of today, yes, youth who love peace”. This indicates that another motive that makes them stem the potential for radicalism is their interpretation of the contemporary sense of youth.

A Sketch of Identity Hybridization and the Search for Equilibrium

YIPC Yogyakarta as a community has members with varied backgrounds which will enable reciprocal intellectual-emotional-cultural interactions. Moreover, in terms of economic diversity, gender, ethnicity, political views, education history, affiliated organizations, life orientation, ideals, and so on also helped determine the pattern of attitude and behavior that mixed (*hybrid*). The cultural distance and psychological range between the internal members of the community itself, after interactive dialectics and negotiations, have an impact on the identity of each individual. If examined from the perspective of Gadamer’s hermeneutics, especially the *fusion of horizons*, this cross-cultural and religious encounter will produce patterns of thought that blend together and are automatically related to their identities.

The matter highlighted in this research is then called the *hybridization of identity* (Nilan & Feixa, 2006; Stockhammer, 2012; Syafruddin & Ropi, 2018; Werbner & Modood, 2015). Varieties of their identity—starting from students from what campus, from which ethnic

group, what family with how much income, alumni of Islamic boarding schools or public schools, Catholic or Protestant or Muslim, NU-Muhammadiyah-Ahmadiyah or Shia, and so on—basically forming a pattern of understanding (*horizon*) within each one. Then after touching each other's thoughts within the YIPC Yogyakarta community, they experienced a phase of melting the *horizons* which later gave rise to relatively new characters and perspectives as a dissolving across cultural entities. While outside the community, the process of fusion of these horizons does not just stop. It will always evolve over time and depend on the discourse that is perceived by everyone.

The concept of Gadamer's ideas which was originally used as an instrument for examining texts—the text horizon blends in with the interpreter's horizon—seems to also be able to be used to map the mingling of discourse horizons, phenomena, social interactions and reality horizons with the horizons of subjects or parties who absorb discourse, observe phenomena, and experience interactions, and observers of reality. From there, the sketch of identity hybridization can be studied with this concept and spread to the activities of congratulating each adherent of a certain religion without worrying about being accused of being infidels, liberals or apostates. Another example is also reflected in the *iftār* activities (*buka puasa bersama*) together which often involve Christian members to participate in the celebration. These two small examples represent a simple spectrum of identity hybridization.

Based on the description above, YIPC Yogyakarta can be seen as a miniature or diorama of a community that accommodates the younger generation to find a balance point in life and the search for an identity that fits their considerations in the midst of the chaotic social conflicts of the latest century. Although in practice YIPC Yogyakarta has not really penetrated the grass roots, especially street children whose potential for violence is quite frequent there, this community approach strategy to students and college students is considered effective as a preventive measure. If the middle class that makes up the majority of this community can move with a wider radius, the potential for lasting and impact will be more significant.

4) DISCUSSION

The analytical elaboration that has been presented previously shows that the effort to counter radicalism in the interfaith community in Yogyakarta is principally inseparable from the big constellation in the international arena, namely globalization. The younger generation who live in the span of this century psychologically experience a transitional phase, and at that point, *cognitive opening* joins in framing their socio-anthropological character. There are those who choose to act and join conservative and radical currents, but on the other hand, there are also those who act inclusively while opening up to different groups. The latter is what is represented in the YIPC Yogyakarta case. The motives that underlie them comprehensively must be *multifaceted*, but what the researcher captures are at least three aspects: *collective awareness*, *imagined common enemy*, and *the claims of youthfulness*. Then another interesting thing that needs to be presented is the portrait of the hybrid identity that exists in the community that can be observed in changes in attitudes, perspectives, and behavior patterns of individuals—from before joining and when joining YIPC Yogyakarta. Borrowing Gadamer's concept, this is due to the mixing of *horizons* which then gives birth to a *hybrid* and diffuse character of their attitudes, speech, social media content, and social actions.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, M. A. (2020). *Multidisiplin, Interdisiplin, & Transdisiplin: Metode Studi Agama & Studi Islam di Era Kontemporer*. Yogyakarta: IB Pustaka.

- Al-Qurtuby, S. (2012). Reconciliation from Below: Indonesia's Religious Conflict and Grassroot Agency for Peace. *Peace Research*, 44(2), 135–162.
- Amstrong, K. (2001). *Berperang Demi Tuhan: Fundamentalisme dalam Islam, Kristen dan Yahudi* (Y. Liputo, Trans.). Jakarta: Serambi.
- Amstrong, K., Ramadan, T., Esposito, J. L., Hussain, D., Mujahid, I. A. M., Gupta, V., ... Roqayah. (2018). *Islamofobia: Melacak Akar Ketakutan terhadap Islam di Dunia Barat* (P. M. Pabottingi, Trans.). Bandung: Mizan.
- Anderson, B. (2008). *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (O. I. Naomi, Trans.). Yogyakarta: INSIST Press & Pustaka Pelajar.
- Anis, E. Z. (n.d.). *Countering Terrorist Narratives: Winning the Hearts and Minds of Indonesian Millennials*. 2018, 189–210. KnE Social Sciences.
- Bamualim, C. S., Latief, H., & Abubakar, I. (Eds.). (2018). *Kaum Muda Muslim Milenial: Konservatisme, Hibridasi Identitas, dan Tantangan Radikalisme*. Tangerang Selatan: Center for The Study of Religion and Culture (CSRC).
- Banawiratma, J. B., & Bagir, Z. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Dialog Antarumat Beragama: Gagasan dan Praktik di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Mizan Publika dan CRCS UGM.
- Beyer, P., & Beaman, L. (Eds.). (2007). *Religion, Globalization and Culture*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Bruinessen, M. van. (2002). Genealogies of Islamic Radicalism in Post-Suharto Indonesia. *South East Asia Research*, 10(2), 117–154.
- Csikszentimihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1984). *Being Adolescent, Conflict and Growth in the Teenage Years*. New York: Basic Books.
- Esposito, J. L., & Iner, D. (Eds.). (2019). *Islamophobia and Radicalization: Breeding Intolerance and Violence*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). London: Continuum.
- Gadd, D., & Jefferson, T. (2013). *Kriminologi Psikososial*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Halafoff, A. (2013). *The Multifaith Movement: Global Risks and Cosmopolitan Solutions*. New York & London: Springer.
- Hardiman, F. B. (2015). *Seni Memahami*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Hasan, N. (2013). *Narasi dan Politik Identitas: Pola Penyebaran dan Penerimaan Radikalisme dan Terorisme di Indonesia* [Laporan Penelitian]. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Syariah dan Hukum UIN Sunan Kalijaga bekerjasama dengan FKPT dan BNPT.
- Hasan, N. (2016). Violent Activism, Islamic Ideology, and the Conquest of Public Space among Youth in Indonesia. In *Youth Identity and Social Transformation in Modern Indonesia*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hefner, R. W. (Ed.). (2018). *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary Indonesia*. New York: Routledge.
- J. Rittel, H. W., & Weber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Policy Science*, 4(2), 155–169.
- Jaegher, K. D., & Hoyer, B. (2014). Collective Action and the Common Enemy Effect. *Defence and Peace Economics*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10242694.2014.925676>
- Jonathan, A., Widjaya, P., & Husein, F. (2016). *Fostering Religious Exclusivism and Political Pluralism in Indonesia Through Interfaith-based Student Community*. 2018, 53–70. KnE Social Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.182/kss.v3i5.2325>
- Kersten, C. (2015). *Islam in Indonesia: The Contest for Societies, Ideas and Values*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Kung, H. (1991). *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

- Merdjanova, I., & Brodeur, P. (2009). *Religion as a Conversation Starter: Interreligious Dialogue for Peacebuilding*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Naharong, A. M. (2013). Terorisme Atas Nama Agama. *Jurnal Refleksi*, XIII(5).
- Nilan, P., & Feixa, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Global Youth? Hybrid Identities, Plural Worlds*. New York: Routledge.
- Noor, N. M., & Siregar, F. M. (Eds.). (2015). *Social Ethics in Inter-Religious Interaction*. Geneva: Globethics.net. Retrieved from www.globethics.net
- Nurish, A. (2020). The Myth of Religious Radicalism. *AL-ALBAB*, 9(1), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.24260/alalbab.v9i1.1546>
- Piliang, Y. A. (2017). *Dunia yang Berlari*. Yogyakarta: Cantrik Pustaka.
- Pinker, S. (2018). *Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*. London: Penguin Books.
- Ritzer, G., & Stepnisky, J. (2018). *Teori Sosiologi* (10th ed.; R. K. P., Trans.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Rusyana, A. Y. (n.d.). *Raising up 100.000 Young Peacemakers: Disseminating the Islamic Values of Peace among Muslim Youth*. Presented at the Annual International Conference on Islamic Studies (AICIS XII).
- Saputra, R. E. (2018). *Api dalam Sekam: Keberagamaan Generasi Z* (No. Vol. 1, No. 1). Tangerang Selatan: PPIM UIN Jakarta dan UNDP Indonesia.
- Sarwono, S. W. (2016). *Psikologi Remaja*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Sternberg, K. (2008). *The Nature of Hate*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stockhammer, P. W. (Ed.). (2012). *Conceptualizing Cultural Hybridization: A Transdisciplinary Approach*. Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer.
- Sunesti, Y., Hasan, N., & Azca, M. N. (2018). Young Salafi-Niqabi and Hijrah: Agency and Identity Negotiation. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, 8(2), 173–197.
- Syafruddin, D., & Ropi, I. (Eds.). (2018). *Gen Z: Kegagalan Identitas Keagamaan*. Tangerang Selatan: PPIM UIN Jakarta.
- Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The Narcissism Epidemic: Living in the Age of Entitlement*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: Free Press.
- Unesco.org. (n.d.). What Do We Mean by “Youth”? Retrieved December 2, 2019, from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/youth/youth-definition/>
- Utama, A. (2018, Mei). Badan Intelijen Menemukan 39% Mahasiswa di Indonesia Radikal, Apa Tindak Lanjutnya? *BBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-43949279>
- Waliyuddin, M. N. (2019). Religious Expression of Millennial Muslims within Collective Narcissism Discourse in Digital Era. *Wawasan: Jurnal Ilmiah Agama Dan Sosial Budaya*, 4(2), 176–190.
- Waliyuddin, M. N. (2020). *Puasa, Corona, dan Keterlanaan Manusia*. Jakarta: Bukupedia.
- Webel, C., & Galtung, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (2012). *Sosiologi Agama* (Y. Santoso, Trans.). Yogyakarta: IRCiSoD.
- Wera, M. (2017). Membingkai Ruang Dialog Beragama: Belajar dari Hans Kung dan Seyyed Hosein Nasr. *Societas Dei*, 4(2), 165–196.
- Werbner, P., & Modood, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multicultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

- Wille, M. (2017). *Countering Radicalisation and Violent Extremism (on Higher Education)* (Master Thesis in Philosophy). University of Oslo, Norway.
- Yanay, N. (2013). *The Ideology of Hatred*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- YIPC-Young Interfaith Peacemaker Community. (n.d.). Retrieved June 23, 2020, from <https://yipci.org/>