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Abstract
The ambiguity of conception results in the explanation of the symptoms of religious radicalism at the global level becoming interpretative, depending on the contexts and meanings given by intellectuals. It becomes natural that knowledge of the conception overlaps with others, such as religious revivalism, fundamentalism, extremism, militancy, terrorism, and jihad. In line with the idea, knowledge on the discourses of religious radicalism in post-authoritarian Indonesia has been produced by institutions having the authorities and motives to make interpretations, according to the knowledge structure developed by their predecessors. These institutions, both state and civil society, construct the discourses of radicalism with descriptive explanations, to produce reproductive ideas rather than elaborative-transformative knowledge. The aforementioned opinion is true, but in practice, it is necessary to add a more comprehensive framework in explaining radicalism to anticipate its impacts. This article argues that the construction of knowledge on the discourses of radicalism must be placed within the framework of morphogenesis, where there are an elaboration and a transformation of the process of knowledge reproduction structurally, to produce a repertoire of new knowledge that is predictive. Mapping and construction of radicalism have been carried out based on products (results) as well as product makers (agencies) that form knowledge structures that can be used to mitigate as well as to provide early warning to control radicalism.
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INTRODUCTION

The symptoms of religious radicalism that have emerged in the last two decades—both at the global and national levels—have actually received attention from academics for some time (Huntington 1996; Said 2002; Lewis 2003; Esposito 1992 2002). Some intellectuals have noted concerning the symptoms of religious radicalism emerging after the Cold War that has given rise to several key concepts about the movements of religious revival, fundamentalism, radicalism, jihad, and terrorism. The ambiguity and lack of agreement on some conceptions have led to explanations of the symptoms of religious radicalism being interpretative—depending on the context of an interpretation of an intellectual. On the other hand, the idea of religious radicalism at the national level has been reviewed in terms of political dimension (Fealy 2004; Hadiz 2008) and movement (Mubarak 2007; Nashir 2007; Rahmat 2005) in its relationship with the state. There are two factors influencing the relationship between the state and Islamic movement groups in Indonesia. First, the inheritance of fluctuating relations between Muslims and the state in the post-independence era in the form of political oppression of Islamic groups. The second is political-economic oppression causing the rise of radicalism based on class responses to fight the dominance of oligarchic capital lying with the state. The explanations are fairly descriptive and explanatory, but I argue that other prescriptive and predictive efforts are needed. Attempts to construct discourses on radicalism that is measurable and has clear parameters have been carried out by several elements of civil society institutions in Indonesia. As a result, the parameters of radicalism have been measured through indicators of public perception, and not through indicators of activities, organizations, and institutions related to radicalism. Besides, methodologically (Babbie 1995; Bernard 2000; Wysocki 2001), the constructed discourses, conceptions, and indicators are still vague and unclear, so that they have implications for the emergence of weaknesses in measurements and policy recommendations in making early detections and predictions about radicalism (Cariey 1983). In this article, I would like to propose an explanation of how knowledge about radicalism discourses is produced and reproduced by agents, and how the structure of knowledge influences the discourses of radicalism that is formed. The analysis of radicalism, in my opinion, relies more on the structure-
agency perspective, which needs to be complemented in the framework of the analytical dualism of structure-agency. I argue that the construction of knowledge on the discourses of radicalism must be placed within the framework of morphogenesis (Archer 1995; 1998; 2004) where there are elaboration and transformation of the process of knowledge reproduction structurally to produce a repertoire of new knowledge that is predictive. Mapping and construction of radicalism have been carried out based on products (results) as well as product makers (agencies) that form knowledge structures that can be used to mitigate as well as to provide early warning to control radicalism. Explanations of the analytical dualism of structure-agency can be found in Archer’s conception of morphogenesis, in which there are processes of structural conditions, social interaction, structural reproduction and structural elaboration.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This article uses a qualitative approach (Bernard 2000; Bryman 2004; Creswell 2003; Neuman 2003) by viewing discourses of radicalism developed by several elements of civil society (nongovernmental organization/NGO) namely: Lazuardi Birru, Maarif Institute, and SETARA Institute; an academic institution, CSRC (Center for the Study of Religion and Culture); and a state institution, namely BNPT (Indonesian National Counter-Terrorism Agency). This research is explanatory (Neuman 1991) by analysing the processes of production and reproduction of the discourses of radicalism constructed by various agencies within the framework of morphogenesis. Product and producer analysis of radicalism discourses are explained based on the process, background or symptom contexts, to provide information in the form of categories or classifications produced by each agency. There are several stages in collecting data on the discourses of radicalism. First, I collected and identified several books, journals, articles, and research results related to radicalism discourses. Second, I conducted a document mapping on radicalism, which was then followed by compiling it in a descriptive and comparative form. Third, I conducted interviews with the parties who compiled or wrote books, journals, articles, and research results to get an overview of the production processes and knowledge reproduction on the discourses of radicalism. Data analysis was carried out by making categorizations of each theme based on the context of research, framing, and methodological criti-
cism on the discourses of radicalism constructed by each agency. Comparisons among agencies based on the classification themes became the main reference for the writer in making methodological criticism. The knowledge structure on the discourses of radicalism that was produced and reproduced by each agency has experienced a process of social interaction within which has given rise to an expansion of new knowledge structures on radicalism discourses. The expansion of new knowledge structures can be both structural reproduction and structural elaboration.

**MORPHOGENESIS AND KNOWLEDGE STRUCTURES ON RADICALISM DISCOURSES**

This article uses the framework of thinking as well as the structure-agency analysis pioneered by Margaret Archer regarding morphogenesis. Archer developed the idea of morphogenesis based on the criticism of the transformation model developed by Bhaskar (1986, 1989, 2005, 2008). Archer saw that Bhaskar’s framework of thinking about the transformation model did not clearly analyse how the model explained the differences between the processes of reproduction and transformation. Archer argues that reproduction is a result of structural reproduction that is morphostatic[^1] in nature, whereas transformation is the result of structural elaboration that is morphogenetic[^2]—as a form of theoretical analysis as well as methodology. This conception was used by Archer as a tool for analysing the knowledge produced by a society in the framework of structure-agency thinking.

Archer argues that the structure-agency analysis framework must be understood in the context of analytical dualism[^3]. First, structure and agency are two separate and different entities. Second, structure and agency operate based on different historical contexts for two reasons. The first reason is that structure precedes actions

[^1]: A process in a complex system that attempts or tends to maintain the form of an existing system.
[^2]: A process that attempts or tends to elaborate or change the form of an existing system, made by structure or “state.”
[^3]: Analytical dualism can be interpreted differently. First, the analytical dualism sees that ontologically the social worldview of structure-agency is stratified. Second, methodologically between structure-agency, both can be distinguished temporally by examining the relationship between the two and by explaining the changes that occur between the two.
that later produce reproduction and structural transformation. The second reason is that structural elaboration exists after the emergence of actions. Relationships between structure-agency influence each other all the time. It appears here that time is a variable that determines the structure-agency relationship. Between structure-agency, both emerge, are interrelated and redefine each other. The conception was developed by Archer based on the critical realism view presented by Bhaskar. This conception is related to three other concepts namely downward conflation, upward conflation, and central conflation.

The conception of morphogenesis (Sibeon 2004:97) consists of two elements namely “morpho” and “genesis”. The first element of this concept implies that what is called society is not a form of recognition made by the state, so that society is dynamic or changing. The second element implies that society is an acknowledgment formed from and by agencies that come from the consequences, whether desired or not, of their activities. All this time, the relationship between structure and agency is defined in terms of a certain direction—both the structure that dominates the agency and agency that forms the structure. Furthermore, Archer argues that the process of interaction between structure-agency does not only create a structural change of a system, but it also produces a structural extension both theoretically and methodologically.

In the conception of downward conflation, Archer (2004:25-45) sees that the agency is explained in the context of the structure. This conception rests on the notion of structural determinism as opposed to structural conditioning (Figure 1). Society in this context is an unplanned outcome of conflict, negotiation, and compromise among groups. However, in the conception of upward conflation, Archer (2004:46-71) sees that a larger social system (society) is described as an aggregation of face-to-face (micro) interactions. This conception rests on the idea of interactionist sociology, which sees structure as the product of agency, yet, it means more than just the product of agency. The structure can be easily changed by actors,

---

4 Archer’s morphogenetic analysis works through three stages: 1) Structural conditioning, which refers to the previous (pre-existing) structure that conditions something but does not determine (to condition but not determine); 2) Socio-cultural interaction, which arises from actions oriented to the realization of interests (interests) and needs (needs) that originate from the agency and leads to; 3) Structural elaboration or modification, which is a change in the relationship between the parts in a social system.
provided that they have necessary motivation and information to promote social change. Between downward and upward conflation, agency and structure are basically autonomous. Errors arise when assuming that agency or structure are the main constituents of society, rather than interactions between the two.

As for the conception of central conflation, Archer (2004:72-96) explicitly expresses her disapproval of Giddens’s duality of structure, which causes a blurring of comprehensive observations of how agency and structure influence each other, as if there is a missing element from conventional analysis of agency-structure. The missing part is then raised in the concept of agency and cultural relations to better show its contextual aspect. The analytical dualism that Archer offers sees structure-agency differently as separate phenomena. Temporality is seen as the main aspect of the reciprocal relationship between structure-agency. The structure precedes actions, which in turn causes structural reproduction or elaboration, and this cycle repeats continuously.

Culture is the key word for agency-culture relations in Archer’s conception. This is a dynamic concept and it implicitly states that this is an inherent factor in the structure-agency relationship. Agency interactions and actions give rise to a structure that also reacts and changes with the actions and interactions of their agencies. In addition, the changes will always create a structural expansion. There are two levels of cultural analysis that Archer offers. First, at the level of cultural system (CS), things related to ideas and beliefs that exist in society can be confirmed by their truths and errors and are still open to contradiction. Second, at the level of socio-cultural interaction (S-C), things related to ideas and beliefs that exist in society can still be approved or be rejected depending on the choices, tastes, or attractiveness possessed by each agency. In other words, cultural system can also be a decisive guide for the actions of each agency or only condition the agency before taking actions. The following schematic shows the morphogenesis model submitted by Archer.

---

5 Archer offers four propositions related to the analysis between CS and S-C. First, there are logical relationships between each CS component. Second, there is a causal effect emphasized by CS for each level of S-C. Third, there is a causal relationship between individuals and groups at the S-C level. Fourth, there is CS elaboration caused by modification at the S-C level, which relates logically and raises a new SC.
Based on the previous description, this article formulates two theoretical propositions conveyed by Archer. First, the process of interaction between structure-agency does not only create a structural change of a system, but it also produces a structural extension both theoretically and methodologically. Second, the analytical dualism that Archer offers sees that between structure and agency, which are separate phenomena, temporality is seen as the main aspect of the interrelationship between structure-agency, structure precedes actions which in turn lead to structural reproduction (morphostatis) or structural elaboration (morphogenesis), and this cycle repeats continuously.

The position of the morphogenetic framework in this article lies in the process of interaction between the knowledge structure on the discourses of radicalism and the agency who reproduce it and has produced structural and theoretical extensions. The reproductive results of this knowledge can take the form of structural reproduction (morphostatis) or structural elaboration (morphogenesis). The knowledge structure on the discourses of radicalism is a pre-existing condition. This knowledge is adopted by each agency by carrying out structural conditioning processes, socio-cultural interaction, and structural expansion. The relation between the knowledge structure on the discourses of radicalism and each agency produces a continuation of new radicalism discourses.

The existing knowledge structure on radicalism influences the construction of knowledge discourses adopted by each agency that is the subject of this research. Knowledge of radicalism that is constructed
by each agency is actually not a new idea. It was the result of adoption of ideas related to radicalism that emerged earlier. The position of existing knowledge is only conditioning, but it does not determine each agency to adopt it fully. This depends on the socio-cultural interactions that each agency performs on the existing knowledge structure. The structure of existing knowledge can be a causal factor that conditions knowledge production and knowledge reproduction by each agency. Individual and group relations in each agency determine the extent to which knowledge modification is carried out. Eventually, a form of structural expansion of knowledge about radicalism that is reproductive and elaborative will be produced.

DISCOURSES OF RADICALISM IN POST-AUTHORITARIAN INDONESIA

Discourses of radicalism developing in post-authoritarian Indonesian have been inseparable from the role of several agencies that constructed the discourses. Each agency has different subjective and objective ideas. This depends on how each agency captures the development of social phenomena in the society, especially related to radicalism, as objective ideas that are then used as the basic foundation for constructing subjective discourse construction. This article looks at several agencies that construct radicalism discourses starting from the intellectuals or academics (CSRC), state (BNPT), as well as NGOs (Lazuardi Birru, SETARA Institute, Maarif Institute). The profile of the agencies can be seen based on different contexts, framing, goals, actors, and strategies in constructing radicalism discourses (Ridwan and Gaus eds. 2010; Ridwan et. al 2011; Hasan and Abubakar 2011; Hasani and Naipospos eds. 2010, 2012; Hasani 2012).

The context of the establishment of each agency (organization, institution, or bureaucracy) is basically influenced by a similar factor, namely dawn of a new era (Reformation, post-New Order, or post-authoritarian), which tends to be more democratic in society. Those historical moments are important for the emerging process of democratization and also the implications that follow. First, the increasing role and influence of religion in the public sphere, which has been one of the backgrounds of the establishment of the CSRC. Second, the rampant incidents of bombings and acts of terrorism that have become the basis for the formation of the BNPT. Third, the
rise of several incidents of violence and conflicts that often take the name of religion, which have triggered the founding of Lazuardi Birru organization. Fourth, the occurrence of intolerant and discriminative actions among community groups on the basis of religion, ethnicity, tribe, race, gender, and social strata, which have encouraged the establishment of SETARA Institute and Maarif Institute.

The establishment of several agencies with different contexts is the basis for the selection of framing used. There are agencies that operate using the approach of democracy, pluralism, culture, religion, and humanity (CSRC, SETARA Institute, Maarif Institute), an agency using the security approach (BNPT), and additionally, an agency emphasizing the issue of peace, namely Lazuardi Birru.

Therefore, the placement of the framing used by each agency to achieve goals has more or less different variations. The CSRC places the role of religion (in this case Islam) as a perspective to produce quality scientific work to create a just, prosperous, strong, democratic and peaceful society. On the other hand, BNPT has a vision and mission to protect citizens and national interests from the dangers of terrorism with comprehensive efforts. Lazuardi Birru, however, conducts a social campaign for the youth to realize a peaceful life as the goal of the organization. Meanwhile, Maarif Institute conducts a schools intervention program to promote character education for students to strengthen nationalism commitment. Finally, SETARA Institute strives to realize an equal, plural and dignified treatment in the life of a more democratic society.

In order to achieve its goals, each agency has relatively varied actors with different habits. CSRC, as an institution formed under the auspices of a university, has a membership dominated by lecturers, researchers and students. BNPT, as a body under the coordination of the Coordinating Ministry for Politics and Security, has a membership of mostly police, military officers, and bureaucrats. Lazuardi Birru, which is considered as a youth-centric organization, mostly consists of students and several lawyers and activists concerned about this issue. SETARA Institute and Maarif Institute stand within the framework of the issue of equality, and have their membership consisting of activists and researchers.

The varied groups making up the membership of the agencies do not necessarily make each agency take different strategies in achieving their goals. Research, publication, advocacy, intervention programs and training activities are a number of strategies carried out by CSRC,
Lazuardi Birru, Maarif Institute, and SETARA Institute to achieve their goals. BNPT is more focused on policy-making activities to achieve its goals. Based on the notes and the results of interviews, it has been shown that the agencies often meet with each other in similar forums, when there are discussions on the issue of radicalism. They have even collaborated in conducting research and advocacy activities.

Based on the aforementioned explanation, I attempt to make the typology of each agency. This typology of agencies is based on Archer’s framework (2010:272-301) about routine and reflexivity. First, CSRC is categorized as an academic research-based institution typology, focusing on religious studies, democracy, pluralism, and culture. Academic activities become a forum for the development of discourses of radicalism by the CSRC, so that it is natural that most actors involved have relatively good intellectual routines. Second, BNPT is categorized as a bureaucratic institution based on a security approach and focusing on acts of terrorism. Political activities (related to government policies) become the arena for BNPT to monitor the development of radicalism discourses so that the bureaucratic routine is inherent in every actor within. Third, Lazuardi Birru is categorized as a social campaign-based institution, and focusing on the study of the youth. Social activities become an arena for social campaigns of Lazuardi Birru to carry out activities for the youth, so that the youthful routines with high dynamics are targeted by the campaign. Fourth, SETARA Institute and Maarif Institute are categorized as advocacy-based institutions focusing on the study of human rights, pluralism, humanity, equality, and democracy. The retinue of activists attached to these organizations make their activities include various activities related to advocacy programs for people who experience discrimination. The typologies make it easier to see the relation between the position of each agency and the construction of discourses on radicalism produced.

Each institution has a different reflexivity on the structure of ideas about radicalism that develops in society. The CSRC sees more that the structure of ideas about radical Islam that has developed in the public sphere needs to be anticipated by generating alternative ideas about moderate Islam. BNPT emphasizes that the structure of ideas on terrorism that has developed in society needs to be punished and deradicalised in order to realize the idea of peace. Lazuardi Birru views that the structure of ideas about acts of violence in the name of religion must be minimized by promoting ideas about peace. Maarif Institute
believes that religious and nationalism commitments can be achieved if there are interventions to strengthen character education in schools to fortify against radicalism. SETARA Institute argues that the structure of ideas about intolerance that has developed in society needs to be balanced with the ideas of equality and pluralism.

The author argues that the structure of ideas on the discourses of radicalism developed by each agency appears to be related to an issue within the discourses of radical Islam, terrorism, violence in the name of religion, and also the intolerant actions that occur in society. However, the author also argues that the structure of ideas developed by each agency does not necessarily relate to ideas about radicalism discourse. Based on the reflexivity of each agency, the formulation of discourses on radicalism appears in accordance with the agenda behind each agency. This can be seen from the values promoted by each agency regarding moderate Islam, democracy, pluralism, peace, tolerance, humanity, and equality. It should also be seen that the values promoted by each agency actually also represent a certain structure of interests and power. I see the ideas offered by each agency as inseparable from the interests and influence of democratic countries, through funding agencies, in perpetuating the idea of democracy, which contains its fundamental values, such as pluralism, tolerance, equality and peace. I believe that a larger structure of ideas is behind all of these, which is nothing other than to promote democratic values to be more dominant than the other set of values, namely Islamic radicalism.

PRODUCTION AND REPRODUCTION OF DISCOURSES OF RADICALISM

The discourses of radicalism constructed by several agencies in post-authoritarian Indonesia are closely related to the role of several actors (agencies). Intellectuals or academics, activists, journalists, and bureaucrats are also part of the actors (agencies) in each. Each actor (agency) has a different background in knowledge, education and experience. Therefore, the discourses of radicalism constructed in each agency are actually not an easy process to realize. Debates and fights of ideas about radicalism often appear quite fiercely in every agency.

The development of discourses of radicalism in post-authoritarian Indonesia cannot be separated from the role of various analyses carried
out by intellectuals. Explanations and arguments from intellectuals have contributed to the realm of knowledge regarding the causes and effects that arise as results of symptoms of radicalism. The discourses of radicalism themselves have undergone a process of knowledge production and knowledge reproduction that complement each other. Therefore, naturally there are differences of opinions among intellectuals in explaining the phenomenon of radicalism. There are intellectuals who explain the symptoms of radicalism based on socio-history, economics-politics, social movements, or even religious approaches. These explanations have been adopted by different agencies that carry out the construction of discourses of radicalism in Indonesia, such as the CSRC, Lazuardi Birru, Maarif Institute, and SETARA Institute. Moreover, several policies related to eradication of terrorism are often carried out by BNPT by considering some of the results of research carried out by some of these agencies.

Based on Margaret Archer’s framework of thinking regarding morphogenesis, this article analyses how each agency that constructs discourses of radicalism produces and reproduces knowledge in their social interactions. It needs to be re-emphasized here that the doer (agency), in each agency and in their social interactions, raises a structure that also reacts and changes along with the actions and interactions of the agencies. Changes that occur always create structural extensions.

Based on Archer’s explanation, it can be seen how the CSRC, Lazuardi Birru, Maarif Institute, and SETARA Institute conduct structural expansion in reproducing or elaborating discourses of radicalism. An initial explanation can be given by seeing the emergence of symptoms of radicalism captured in different contexts by each agency. Nevertheless, each agency has more or less the same view, especially when they see the historical moment of the collapse of the New Order’s authoritarian regime as one of the important factors in the rise of radicalism in Indonesia. This has made the momentum of post-authoritarian Indonesia to become a pre-existing structure conditioning the emergence of ideas about radicalism and influencing the production and reproduction of knowledge made by each agency. Agency interactions and actions in viewing the knowledge structure in the post-authoritarian Indonesia are more open and democratic, making it easier for the agencies to adopt various ideas about discourses of radicalism from intellectual circles. The CSRC sees that the existence of the moment increases the role and influence of religion in the public
sphere as a context that emerges in society. Lazuardi Birru argues that the phenomena of violence in the name of religion often arise during the era. Maarif Institute believes that the trend of conservatism, especially among students, is rising, so that it disrupts the country’s ideology. SETARA Institute views that the society commits a lot of intolerant and discriminative actions. In addition, the enactment of BNPT was not free from the rampant incidents of bombings and acts of terrorism.

The post-authoritarian Indonesian scene has created a reaction for each agency to provide new discourses on the symptoms of radicalism that is more elaborative and is not merely reproductive. However, on the other hand, there have been various analyses from intellectual circles regarding these symptoms. Therefore, the discourses of radicalism developed by each agency are actually not new because the ideas are inseparable from the process of knowledge reproduction on the discourses of radicalism that were developed before among intellectuals. CSRC, for example, adopted many ideas from intellectuals such as Gilles Kepel and Oliver Roy (1994, 2005) on the conception of Islamism and political Islam, Greg Fealy (2004) on the concept of Muslimness, Mark Jurgensmeyer on the concept of radicalism, and Nurcholis Madjid and Abdurrahman Wahid on the concept of cultural Islam and several other concepts. Slightly different from CSRC, SETARA Institute also took some ideas related to symptoms of radicalism from intellectuals such as Oliver Roy and John L. Esposito regarding the concepts of fundamentalism and William R. Liddle (1999) on the concept of Islamic scripturalism.

The conception of knowledge related to the symptoms of radicalism adopted by each agency has allowed them to carry out a process of knowledge reproduction on the discourses of radicalism. What is interesting about the process of knowledge reproduction by each existing agency? In my opinion, each agency has not yet reproduced discourses of radicalism from several intellectuals by producing new knowledge that can explain again the background factors of the emergence of symptoms of radicalism. If this is done, the role of each agency will only be as a party that reproduces knowledge that is merely static—Archer refers to the term morphostatis. However, more than that, I believe that every existing agency does not just attempt to reproduce knowledge about discourses of radicalism, but also attempts to elaborate knowledge by trying to construct indicators and parameters of radicalism. These efforts, in the context of Archer’s thinking, include a form of elaborative
extension of structural knowledge, or morphogenesis, which may become the foundation for social change in the context of knowledge development regarding discourses of radicalism.

Discourses of radicalism at this stage have developed from a symptom that can be explained explanatively to a more practical stage. The index of socio-religious radicalism vulnerability developed by Lazuardi Birru can become one of the viewpoints used to view the condition of the degree of radicalism experienced by the Indonesians. The spectrum of cultural Islam and political Islam (radical Islamism) expressed by the CSRC can give an idea of how Islamic characters actually exist in Indonesia. The degree of passive and active intolerance measurement developed by SETARA Institute provides an understanding of the extent of society’s position in the stages towards radicalism. The character education supplement intervention program in schools, for Maarif Institute, is a means for countering violence extremism.

The analyses at least illustrate how Archer’s theoretical framework contributes in providing explanations that the process of knowledge reproduction and knowledge elaboration can be done within the framework of structure-agency. However, it should also be noted that the process of knowledge elaboration that occurs in each agency is not necessarily as easy as imagined. Every actor in each agency actually experiences a fierce battle in their effort to elaborate knowledge on the discourses of radicalism.

The transformation of discourses of radicalism that has occurred in post-authoritarian Indonesia in each agency has experienced various processes. However, actors in each agency have faced a similar battle. The main issue that is being debated by each doer is more concerned with the issue of whether the constructed discourses of radicalism must be emphasized within a more abstract academic framework or within the framework of more concrete practical goals.

CSRC, for example, as a research institution under the auspices of a university, becomes one of the agencies experiencing intense debates. Researchers at the CSRC, when developing discourses of radicalism, collide with the issue of whether the results of the research conducted have purely academic or strategic objectives. If research is developed for purely academic purposes, the conceptual and operational frameworks of the developed theoretical basis must consider appropriate and rigorous methodology. Nevertheless, if the research is developed for the purpose of strategic needs such as advocacy, strict methodological
considerations do not become a barrier. The involvement of several academics (lecturers), students, and activists in this research institution has made the dynamics of the debates more complicated. The academics emphasize that as a research institution under a university, the interests of developing science need to be emphasized. However, the activists have the opposite view in that they assume that a university research institution must contribute to community development.

One of the debates at CSRC is on the use of scientific terms in the results of their research. Activists do not approve the use of academic terms leading to debates that will not be understood by the public and potentially triggering different interpretations of research results. Not much different from CSRC, SETARA Institute has also experienced quite a tough battle regarding the purpose of the research conducted. However, because this institution has more activist members, the purpose of their research is slanted towards advocacy purposes. The same process has been experienced by Lazuardi Birru where a debate has occurred when determining how to reduce the conceptual framework of radicalism to an index. The issue surrounding how a concept can be measured turns out to be problematic for some members of this institution, mostly from a lawyer background. Finally, in order to make it possible to continue to be able to measure the radicalism index, this institution has involved several intellectuals such as Syaiful Mujani, Hamdi Muluk, and Burhanudin Muhtadi, who are accustomed to developing indices.

One concern that needs to be emphasized here is that the process of knowledge elaboration occurring in each agency has involved battles and debates of discourses. This has become one of the processes by which knowledge production is not only dominated by existing knowledge structures. The knowledge structure has also experienced a process of interaction with the doers in the form of debates. Therefore, it can be seen that the formation of the knowledge structure regarding the discourses of radicalism undergoes a dynamic dialectical process between the knowledge structure and agencies that reproduce the knowledge.

Nevertheless, it also needs to be pointed out that the elaborative discourses of radicalism also have weaknesses. One of the weaknesses of the construction of radicalism indicators developed by each agency lies in the development of descriptive indicators. This cannot be used as a predictive benchmark. Therefore, I argues that there needs to be
a methodological critique of the radicalism indicators that have been developed by the three agencies. This is to show that the applicative knowledge elaboration also requires a justification that meets rigorous academic standards.

**CONCLUSION**

Discourses of radicalism developed by various agencies does not merely construct knowledge, but it also places Islam as a variable that stands facing other values such as democracy and tolerance. The idea of constructing discourses of radicalism, has an implicit meaning that it is inherent in Islam, and assumes as if it has binary opposition to the West. Islam has become the main articulator in contributing to a radical society orientation. The idea of discourses of radicalism developed by the three agencies seems to agree with Huntington’s (1996) idea of the clash of civilizations—between Islam and the West—even though implicitly.

The idea of discourses of radicalism has experienced the process of knowledge production and reproduction that complement each other. The conception of knowledge related to the symptoms of radicalism adopted by each agency allows them to carry out a process of knowledge reproduction on discourses of radicalism. Every agency does not just make an effort to reproduce knowledge on the discourses of radicalism, but also elaborates knowledge by attempting to construct indicators and parameters of radicalism. Discourses of radicalism have developed from symptoms that can be described explanatively towards a stage that is more practical. However, the weakness of the radicalism indicators developed lies in its descriptive and explanatory nature, rather than predictive.

There are several aspects that can be concluded from this article. First, each agency is an institution that has the authority to carry out production, reproduction, and control over knowledge about the discourse of radicalism. Second, the existing agency functions as an agent who reproduces and elaborates sustainable knowledge based on the idea of discourses of radicalism that developed earlier. Third, the notion of knowledge about Islam appears implicitly and imaginarily as having binary opposition to the West. The emergence of knowledge about the discourses of radicalism developed by each agent cannot be separated from the genealogy of previous knowledge developed by Western intellectuals. The post-authoritarian moment became
a conditioning structure for the emergence of the notions about radicalism in Indonesia, which experienced elaborative expansion. Post-authoritarianism became one of the conceptual time frame variables that determined the development of discourses of radicalism developed by each agent in Indonesia.
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