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Abstract

The discourse of terrorism, extremism, and fundamentalism movements is not a new issue, but what becomes a public question is why all these actions are always in the name of religion. From various events, the majority of people claim the action was carried out by hardline groups with the face of Islam, such as Al-Qaeda, ISIS, Boko Haram, Abu Sayyaf, and so on. In fact, acts of terror are also carried out by groups with other religious backgrounds, such as the bombings that occurred in Malegaon, Maharashtra, and in Modasa, Gujarat in India on September 29, 2008. The question is, is it true that religions teach their followers to commit violence and justify such acts? What are the factors behind the emergence of religious violence? This research aims to examine religious sects from all religions in the world that often commit violence in the name of religion. In addition, it also wants to know the history of the emergence and movement of fundamentalist sects that become a forum for religious radicalism.

Abstrak


Introduction

The discourse of acts of terrorism, extremism, and fundamentalist movements is not a new problem, but what has become a public question is why all these actions are always in the name of religion (Mahfud, 2016, p. 17). The bombing of the World Trade Center (WTC) building on September 11, 2021, is evidence of acts of violence in the name of religion, the alleged perpetrator being the Al-Qaeda group led by Osama bin Laden (Nadia, 2021, p. 29), (Windiani, 2017, p. 136), (Kartini, 2000, p. 106). According to Armstrong, the tragedy that occurred in the Superpower was closely related to the fundamentalism movement that occurred in the country (Armstrong, 2001, p. 9). A year later, on October 12, 2002, Indonesia was shocked by the Bali bomb attack, which was
ally the perpetrator's response to a voice recording of Al-Qaeda's leader and senior deputy, Ayman Al-Zawahiri. The recording was distributed by Al-Jazeera earlier on October 6, 2002, as a call to attack the interests of the United States and the West (Ulandari, Swastanto, and Effendi, 2020, p. 2). In fact, recently Israeli forces attacked Palestinian Muslims while praying at Al-Aqsa Mosque and Jews were celebrating Passover. The attacks are still ongoing, even when Palestinian Muslims are fasting in the month of Ramadan (Tria and Paidi, 2023).

All of the above acts of terrorism are often considered fundamentalist movements motivated by religious radicalism (Ridho, 2021a, p. 93). From these various incidents, the majority of people claim that the actions were carried out by hardline groups with Islamic religious faces, such as Al-Qaeda, ISIS, Boko Haram, Abu Sayyaf, and so on (Jalil, 2021, p. 221). In fact, acts of terror are also carried out by groups with other religious backgrounds, such as the bombings that occurred in Malegaon, Maharashtra, and in Modasa, Gujarat in India on September 29, 2008. These tragedies killed 8 people and injured more than 80 people, the majority of whom were Muslims. According to several witnesses and local authorities, these acts of violence were committed by Indian hardliners with a Hindu religious background (Damayanti, 2018, p. 1).

The same thing happened in Myanmar, where a number of Buddhist monks committed violence, discrimination, forced evictions, and massacres against Rohingya Muslims (Yunus, 2014, p. 218). The Myanmar government seems to allow this to happen and is even considered to support the radical Buddhist movement (Dwijayanto, Fathoni, and Affif, 2019, pp. 249–251). In Christianity, there are also terrorist groups, such as the Army Of God and Ku Klux Klan in the United States, The National Liberation Front of Tripura in India, and The Lord Resistance Army in Uganda. These three radical groups carry out acts of violence in the name of religion, very dangerous like extremist Islamic groups. They kill people even fellow Christians who are not in line with the group’s ideology (Putra, 2022, p. 95).

Another piece of evidence is that genocide against Muslims took place in Xinjiang or East Turkestan, China. The massacre resulted in the death of at least 160 Uyghur Muslims, while according to local residents, 400 Muslims were killed, hundreds were injured, and some were captured alive. The Chinese government took control of East Turkestan and incorporated it into China and changed its colonization system to population colonization. China moved about eight million people of Han descent to East Turkestan, then they were given important positions and full power, while the original population was made lowly employees (Saragih, Hamid, and Munthe, 2016, p. 7).

From this, it can be understood that violent behavior and acts of terrorism are influenced by fanaticism. According to Amanah Nurish, being too fanatical about religion can lead to acts of extremism, such as suicide bombings. These actions are included in extraordinary crimes that not only involve security, economy, politics, education, media, law, human rights, and religious ideology but also involve gender issues and social psychology (Nurish, 2019, pp. 32–33). Acts of radicalism and anarchism are closely related to fundamentalism. The negative excesses of radicalism are what give birth to extremism.

A psychological theory that can explain extremism is Sigmund Freud’s view of religion, which is represented through illusory conditions. As quoted by Nurish, the illusion is a human way of thinking that is contaminated with biased reality and evidence (Nurish, 2019, p. 33). In Sharia terminology, extreme attitudes are often termed ghuluw, which is exaggeration in a matter or being extreme in one matter by exceeding the limits that have been prescribed (Al-'Asqalani, 1998, p. Volume XII, 137).
In terms of ghuluw is a religious model that causes someone to deviate from the religion (Al-Ifrîqi, 2001, p. 131). In fact, in Afroni’s research, it is said that one of the characteristics of ghuluw is being too fanatical about one view which can later have an impact on the attitude of extremism and fundamentalism (Afroni, 2016, p. 82).

Fundamentalism can be defined as the assertion of certain religious activists who understand religious teachings absolutely and textually. In other words, an attempt to purify religious beliefs and practices in accordance with subjective understanding (Ahdar, 2017, pp. 22–23). John L. Esposito explains three characteristics of the fundamentalist school, namely; first, calling for a return to basic religious teachings or pure religious foundations. Second, the understanding and perception of fundamentalism are strongly influenced by American Protestant groups, namely the 20th-century Protestant movement that emphasizes the literal interpretation of the Gospel which is fundamental to the life of Christianity. Third, the term fundamentalism is often aligned with political activity, extremism, fanaticism, terrorism, and anti-Americanism (Esposito, 1992, pp. 8–9).

In contrast to Esposito, Mark Juergensmeyer prefers not to use the term fundamentalism for three reasons, including; first, the term fundamentalism is pejorative. Second, fundamentalism is an inappropriate category for making cross-cultural comparisons, because it comes from the Protestant religious tradition, making it difficult to apply to other groups. Thirdly, the term fundamentalism tends not to contain political movements and is more concerned with religious elements than worldly affairs (Juergensmeyer, 1998, pp. 16–18). Juergensmeyer's statement was criticized by Burrel that the term fundamentalism can be used in many different senses, the aim is to avoid exclusivism in the use of the term fundamentalism. According to Burrel, the concept of fundamentalism is not limited to Islam, because there are many examples of fundamentalism in several political movements that have secular ideologies (Jalil, 2021, p. 223).

Departing from the above dilemma, a question then arises whether it is true that religion teaches its followers to be violent. What are the factors behind the emergence of violence in religion? This research aims to examine religious sects from all religions in the world that often commit violence in the name of religion. In addition, it also wants to know the history of the emergence and movement of fundamentalist sects that become a forum for religious radicalism.

Methods
This type of research uses a qualitative literature study by emphasizing the study of scientific, theoretical, and reference literature (Mustari and Rahman, 2012, p. 86). Primary data sources used in this research refer to journals, books, and online media articles that discuss fundamentalism and violence in the name of religion. Meanwhile, the approach used is more descriptive through critical-historical studies. Historical research is an examination of the problem of past phenomena which includes understanding, explaining, investigating, and so on relating to past circumstances. The purpose of historical research is to reconstruct past phenomena systematically, objectively, and accurately to explain present phenomena (Sudaryono, 2017, p. 88). According to Louis Gottschalk, historical research is considered a scientific method if it meets two conditions, namely; first, if the method is able to determine facts that can be proven. Second, if the fact comes from an element obtained from a critical examination of historical documents (Gottschalk, 1956, p. 193).
Results and Discussion

1. Fundamentalist Historicity: Its Emergence and Movement

The term fundamentalism was first coined by Western academics in the context of religious history. Fundamentalism is defined as a sect that clings to the ‘fundamentals’ of Christianity through literalist and rigid interpretations of its scriptures (Mahendra, 1999, pp. 5–6). Emerging in the nineteenth century, fundamentalism was a reaction to modernism that was then emerging with vigor in the United States, despite being challenged by many (Ahdar, 2017, p. 23). More specifically, between 1909 and 1915 a group of American theologians wrote a small book entitled "The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth" which contained a doctrine of the textual truth of the Bible in every statement and affirmation. The debate about this took place in the 1920s and since then the proponents of this textualist stance have been called fundamentalists (Esposito, 1995, pp. 32–33).

The textual interpretation of religious dogmatics is not only found among Protestant fundamentalists but also among adherents of other religions. Therefore, it is natural for Western Islamists to refer to similar symptoms among Muslims as Islamic fundamentalism. They also assume similar symptoms exist in other religions, so the term Catholic fundamentalists, Protestants, Sikhs, Hindus, and so on, even though they are reluctant and refuse to be called so (Syaifuddin et al., 2018, p. 45). This is in line with Taufani’s view that the phenomenon of fundamentalism is not only characteristic of Protestants but also of all religions, including Islam. The cause is understanding the holy book literally and textually, so it tends to ignore the historical context and cultural background of the text itself (Taufani, 2019, p. 13).

As the public and scholars became more aware of the religious revival in society, in the 1970s the term fundamentalism began to be applied to religious movements in various contexts. People started talking about Jewish, Hindu, and Islamic fundamentalism. By the 1990s, the term Islamic fundamentalism had begun to be widely used in scholarly literature (Ahdar, 2017, pp. 23–24). Later, the phrases fundamentalism and modernism began to be used to distinguish between the two trends in Christian thought and other religions, including Islam. However, in the development of social science, Muslim and Western scholars use other terms to categorize the two trends, such as reformism, reawakening, renaissance, and renewal for modernism. Meanwhile, fundamentalism is often termed revivalism, militancy, reassertion, activism, and reconstructionism (Mahendra, 1999, p. 6).

In Indonesia, the 20th century was the beginning of the development of fundamentalist ideology marked by the polarization of State Islam (Kraton Islam) led by a Sultan and folk Islam that developed outside the sultanate. This difference in pattern triggered conflict between the kiai of the people and the kiai of the palace, which was influenced by the reformation of Islamic thought in the Middle East in the late 19th century. The clash then ended and merged into cultural Islam. From this, religious organizations such as Nahdlatul Ulama, Muhammadiyah, and Persis emerged (Ng, 2006, pp. 49–52). According to Nafis (1996), fundamentalist groups have the following characteristics; [1] Absolute obedience and devotion to God. [2] Always textual and literal in understanding religious teachings. [3] Believing that God has revealed His will universally to humans. [4] Shows great enthusiasm in applying the doctrine thoroughly. [5] Emphasizes symbols. [6] Aspires to establish a Caliphate state. [7] Tend to be harsh and reluctant to compromise with different groups (Nafis, 1996, pp. 100–107).
Fundamentalism is closely related to radicalism because radicalism is born from a fundamentalist paradigm in religion. Radicalism, radicalization, and radical are the same word, but their meanings are very different. Radical is often associated with a way of thinking, while radicalization is the process of becoming radical. Radical thinking is thinking deeply about the root. However, the meaning of radical becomes very different when combined with the word ideology, so the meaning of radical ideology can give birth to an understanding called radicalism.

The understanding of religious radicalism is not always identified with acts of violence alone because in reality many groups are considered radical only to the extent of their thinking and ideology. They do not use violent, extreme, and validating attitudes, but their way of thinking justifies all means in fighting for their religion. From the perspective of socio-political science, the term radicalism refers to a person or group's dissatisfaction with the status quo and demands for fundamental changes to something that has been established (Nuhrison, 2009, pp. 35–47). According to Scoot M. Thomas, radical movements and thoughts are usually related to religious and ideological factors. He also argues that the term radicalism is the result of labeling religious and political movements that have distinguishing characteristics from mainstream religious and political movements. Moreover, religious radicalism is more related to a community of believers than a body of belief (Thomas, 2005, p. 24).

If analogized, religious radicalism is like a coin that has two conflicting sides. On the one hand, religion teaches peace, and kindness, and brings grace to its adherents. However, on the other hand, religion also has the potential to cause damage and destruction (Nugraha, 2018, p. 42). In this issue, Peter Berger (2005) concluded that when religion has been structured in an institution, conflicts that damage all aspects of human life can easily occur. That is when religion is no longer seen as a manifestation of belief and is only seen as an institution in which there is a set of rules, norms, and sanctions, then religion is very likely to be a source of conflict. This is because religious believers try to make their religious rules and teachings serve as guidelines for all (Berger, 2005, pp. 11–22).

For sociologists such as Mark Juergensmeyer and Peter Berger, religion is considered a human product. Religion is formed due to the behavior and interactions between humans who live in a particular group. Then, religion is seen as a process, in which people live and live and interact with each other in it. In this process, the religion which was previously considered a human product over time turns into a control tool for its adherents through existing rules. Religion can be used by humans to regulate and control others to fulfill their personal and group interests. This is where religion is then considered an institution that controls the people in it. As an institution, religion can make its followers do various ways, ranging from the most subtle ways to violent acts to achieve their goals and interests.

2. The Global Phenomenon of Religious Radicalism

Speaking of religious radicalism, many people accuse terrorist groups of being born and emerging from the teachings of Islam, such as Al-Qaeda, ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Sham) or commonly referred to as Islamic State and Daesh, Boko Haram, Abu Sayaff, and Al-Shabaab. These groups often quote Qur’anic verses and Hadith texts to support their movements and acts of terror. As a result, the majority of people have suffered material losses and casualties. The government has also developed a strategy to stop the violence of these groups, ranging from prevention, arrest, and guidance, to the death penalty as a sanction for what they have done (Damayanti, 2018, p. 24).
According to the author, religious radicalism is not only motivated by Islam but acts of terrorism in the name of religion are also motivated by other religions. The existence of radical movements from certain religious groups in a country can affect certain religious groups and other religions in different countries. For example, the movement of radical Buddhist groups in Myanmar who committed acts of violence against Muslims was able to trigger the anger of Muslims in Indonesia and affect the religious life of Muslims in this country. Here are some illustrations of radical movements motivated by religions other than Islam in the world and acts of violence committed by non-Muslim radical groups.

a. **Jewish Religious Radicalism**

The Jewish religious radicalism movement has been around for a long time, although it is rather difficult to separate between radical actions motivated by religion and Jewish ethnicity and politics because the three are interrelated. Radicalism motivated by Jewish religion and politics can be traced back to the 1st century AD. Jewish radical groups at that time were known as Zealots who strongly opposed the Roman Empire occupying Judea, while also firmly maintaining Jewish religious traditions. Actions carried out by Zealots usually often walk around in crowds wearing robes while carrying small knives used to stab Romans and their supporters who are considered apostates from their religious teachings (Hoffman, 2006), (Pedahzur and Perliger, 2009), (Hendropriyono, 2009).

In 1948, after the political establishment of the State of Israel, many radical acts and terrorism in the name of Judaism continued to occur. Such as the Brit Hakanaim group which opposed the emergence of secularization in the State of Israel and often carried out actions in 1950-1953. Generally, the radical groups that existed at that time wanted the state of Israel to be established using the Jewish name as its guideline. At the same time, the Malchut Yisrael group also carried out actions against all diplomatic facilities of the Soviet Union and fired on Jordanian soldiers standing guard along the Jerusalem borderline. The group also attempted a bombing of the Israeli Ministry of Education in 1953, as it was accused of corrupting Jewish values and traditions with secular values (Damayanti, 2018, pp. 5–6).

In the 1980s, violence in Israel was often carried out by Ultra-Orthodox Jewish groups that rejected assimilation and integration between the pure Jewish population and immigrants from other countries of Jewish descent. Some organizations such as Lehava, Sikrikim, Kach, and Kahane Chai were even labeled as terrorist groups by the government because they had spread hatred towards people of ethnicities and religions other than Jews (Damayanti, 2018, p. 6).

b. **Hindu Radicalism**

Hinduism is the oldest religion in the world that began to develop along with the emergence of civilization on the Hindustan River in India in the 15th century BC. This means that the practices of this religion existed before monotheistic religions, such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Currently, Hinduism is the third largest religion after Christianity and Islam with approximately 1 billion people or 15% of the world’s population and 94% of Hindus living in India. Others are scattered in several countries such as South Africa, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Bangladesh, and Indonesia (Bali). Until about a decade ago, radical movements in Hinduism did not receive much attention. This could be because countries in the world were more focused on attacks by other terrorist groups with a larger and more global impact, such as Al-Qaeda and its networks in various places.
The actions of Hindu radical groups in India only received attention, after in 1999, an Australian Christian missionary named Graham Saines and his two sons were burned alive in Orissa. This incident then continued when in 2002, the same group massacred Muslims and burned houses in Gujarat. This incident left 790 Muslims and 254 Hindus dead, approximately 2500 injured and 223 reported missing (Marshall, 2004).

The Indian government considers the Gujarat incident as just another communal riot and conflict. However, some observers see this as a form of organized violence by Hindu nationalist-religious groups who aspire to establish a state based on Hindu religion and traditions/culture. The alleged mastermind of the Gujarat riots is the Sangh Parivar, a group affiliated or at least ideologically similar to India’s leading Hindu religious organization, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). In addition to aspiring to establish a Hindu state, the RSS and its affiliates are not averse to violence in pursuit of their goals. The organization has been implicated in several violent cases such as the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi in 1948 and several religious conflicts in India such as the Hindu-Muslim riots and conflict in Gujarat in 1969 and the destruction of the Babri Mosque in Ayodhya in 1992.

Although Hindu radicalism has grown stronger in India along with the influence of the BAP political party, it has not spread internationally and has not led to the emergence of Hindu radicalism in India’s neighboring countries such as Sri Lanka, Myanmar, and Pakistan. The insignificant number of Hindus in other countries seems to be one of the reasons why Hindu radicalism has not spread to other countries in the world. However, there have been recent concerns about the emergence of Hindu radicalism in Bali, given that Hindus are the majority group in Bali Province, Indonesia. This is associated with the rejection of Hindu community groups in Bali against the desire of some parties to make Bali a Sharia tourism destination.

c. Buddhist Radicalism

Buddhism is often regarded as the least violent religion because it teaches ‘Ahimsa’, which means not harming any creature in the world (Jerryson and Juergensmeyer, 2010, p. 3). However, this does not mean that there is no violence in the name of Buddhism or inspired by its teachings. There has been some violence perpetrated by radical groups (Sinhala Buddhists) who have invoked Buddhism or used its teachings as justification for violence. For example, many Buddhist monks in Thailand committed violence against Malaysian Muslims living in Southern Thailand. 6,500 Muslims have died since 2004 as a result of the monks’ violence. The monks in Thailand were inspired to do this by the violence committed by monks in their neighboring country, Myanmar, against Rohingya refugees (Zega, 2020, p. 6).

Violence in the name of Buddhism also occurs in another Southeast Asian country, Myanmar. The country, with a population of around 50 million people, has 95% Buddhists from the Burmese, Shan, Karen, and Rakhine ethnicities, while the rest are Christians, Hindus, and Muslims from the Rohingya tribe as well as people of Chinese and Indian descent. The religious conflict between Buddhists and non-Buddhists dates back to before the country’s independence in 1948. During World War II, some Muslim Rohingyas supported the British government to take control of the region, while Buddhist Burmese supported the Japanese government. As a result, when the country finally became an independent country, the Burmese,
who are the majority group in Myanmar, rejected the Rohingya people to live in Myanmar (Dwijayanto et al., 2019, pp. 251–252).

In its 2013 report, Human Rights Watch stated that the attacks by Buddhist radicals in Myanmar against Muslims and their homes in Arakan were organized by the Myanmar government, community leaders, and Buddhist monks. This is even supported by the local security forces when they do not provide help and protection to Rohingya people who are threatened and even allow and appear to be very favorable to Buddhists. The Myanmar government under the leadership of Thein Sein at that time did not even take serious legal action against the monks who attacked Muslims in Arakan, Rakhine (Ula, 2017, p. 19).

As a result of the violence committed by monks in Myanmar, many monks in other countries refuse to be associated with the acts of Buddhist radicalism in Myanmar. For example, in Indonesia, Chairman of the Representative of Buddhists in Indonesia (Walubi) Arief Harsono even emphasized that Buddhism in Indonesia is different from the teachings delivered by Monk Ashin Wirathu in Myanmar. This was conveyed by the Walubi leader to prevent the emergence of Buddhist radicalism in Indonesia and avoid inter-religious conflicts or acts of revenge from other religious groups, especially Islam against Buddhists in Indonesia.

d. Christian Religious Radicalism

A Protestant Christian extremist group that is still active in the United States is the Ku Klux Klan. This group was first established in the late 1860s in the Southern region of the United States. However, because the group often used violence in carrying out actions to achieve their goals, the group was eventually banned from operating by federal law at the time. However, the group was re-established in 1915 and grew rapidly and spread to almost all parts of the country by the mid-1920s, especially in urban areas. The Protestant Christian-based group often committed violence against Catholic and Jewish immigrants and their places of worship (Pegram, 2011, p. 32). In the 1950s, many small, localized, unconnected groups called themselves part of the Ku Klux Klan. These groups opposed the civil rights movement, and often used violence to kill activists supporting the movement. As of 2016, it is estimated that they numbered 6000 members.

In Congo, Central Africa, and Northern Uganda there are also radical groups that use Christian teachings as their foundation for their activities. This group is called the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) or also called the Lord’s Resistance Movement with its founder Joseph Kony who considers himself a prophet sent by God. The group was originally known as the United Holy Salvation Army or Uganda Christian Movement which aimed to establish a Ugandan state based on the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament of the Bible.

Another radical Christian group also emerged in India, the National Liberation Front of Tripura (NLFT). The Indian government even categorized the NLFT as a terrorist group in 1997. The Indian government used the Prevention of Unlawful Activities Act 1967 and later the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2002 to declare this group as a terrorist group, in addition to the fact that this group sought to secede from India and form the state of Tripuri which they described as the Kingdom of God and Jesus Christ in Tripuri, using violent means.

A large number of non-Islamic radical groups in various countries around the world and the violent acts they commit prove that religious radicalism is not only the property of Islam. Every religion has the potential to be used as a foothold for its adherents in committing violence (Ridho, 2021b, p. 161). In this case, religious
verses are often used as a reference to justify the use of violence carried out intending to defend religion and uphold the teachings of their religion or even with a more political goal, namely to establish a state using their version of religion as a foundation (Ridho and Mirwan, 2022, pp. 347–348). From the explanation above, it can also be concluded that generally certain religious radical groups emerge in countries where the religion has a majority of adherents. Furthermore, radicalism in the name of religion is manifested when they interact with other religious groups that are much smaller in number or immigrant groups that have a different religion from the religion of the majority community group.

The acts of violence and radical attitudes above are certainly influenced by several things that can trigger riots and conflicts between people. According to Abdurrahman bin Mu‘alla Al-Lawahiq, three factors cause extremism and radicalism, among others; first, factors related to scientific methodology in the form of ignorance in understanding religious teachings. Too eager to practice religious teachings only by looking at the text without looking at the context can lead to radical and extreme attitudes. One of the causes is studying religious teachings partially, not thoroughly, and giving a conclusion based on minimal knowledge. In addition, a fanatical attitude towards groups that makes it difficult to accept the truth from others is also a major factor in the emergence of radicalism. Second, factors related to psychological and educational aspects include character and a harsh environment. Third, factors related to social, economic, political, and world problems. Dissatisfaction with the condition of a group that is socially and economically downtrodden is often the reason for radical groups to act extremist (Luwaihiq, 2014, p. 48).

Conclusion

The term fundamentalism was first coined by Western academics in the context of religious history. Fundamentalism is defined as a sect that clings to the ‘fundamentals’ of Christianity through literalist and rigid interpretations of its scriptures. The dogmatic textual interpretation of religion is not only found among Protestant fundamentalists but also among adherents of other religions. Therefore, it is natural for Western Islamists to refer to similar symptoms among Muslims as Islamic fundamentalism. They also assume similar symptoms exist in other religions, hence the term Catholic fundamentalists, Protestants, Sikhs, Hindus, and so on, although they are reluctant and refuse to be called so.

Fundamentalism is closely related to radicalism because radicalism is born from a fundamentalist paradigm in religion. Religious radicalism is not only motivated by Islam such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS, but acts of terrorism in the name of religion are also found in other religions, such as the Zealots (Jewish), Sangh Parivar (Hindu), Sinhala Buddhists (Buddhist), and Ku Klux Klan (Christian). The acts of violence committed by these groups are at least influenced by three factors, namely; factors related to scientific methodology in the form of ignorance in understanding religious teachings. Second, factors related to psychological and educational aspects, include character and a harsh environment. Third, factors related to social, economic, political, and world problems.
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