



Prejudice and Religious Conflict: Dispositive Analysis of Film “Nama Saya Ahmad”

Dwi Wahyuni^{1*}, Ahmad Ali Nurdin²

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Imam Bonjol, Padang, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung, Indonesia

E-mail: dwiwahyuni@uinib.ac.id, ali.nurdin@uinsgd.ac.id

Abstract

So far, studies on the sources of conflict are more dominantly viewed from a macro-social perspective without considering a micro-social perspective. Socio-cultural disparities, political dominance, inequality in economic distribution, and differences in religious or ethnic identity are more dominantly understood as causes of conflict. Whereas the potential for animal power that is inherent in humans is also a factor in the occurrence of conflict. Applying the method of dispositive analysis modeled by S. Jager and F. Maier, this text-based article aims to complete the lack of interpretation of the source of the conflict and analyze how the text of the film “Nama Saya Ahmad” represents the correlation of prejudice and religious conflict. This article shows that the film “Nama Saya Ahmad” depicts religious conflicts starting from prejudice between religious believers. In order for prejudice to be parsed, it is important to expand the dialogue space. Apart from breaking down prejudices, dialogue can also strengthen the social integration of the community.

Keywords: Dialogue; Prejudice; Religious Conflict; Social Integration.

Abstrak

Sejauh ini studi tentang sumber konflik lebih dominan dipandang secara makro-sosial saja tanpa mempertimbangkan perspektif mikro-sosial. Kesenjangan sosial-budaya, dominasi politik, ketimpangan distribusi ekonomi, dan perbedaan identitas agama atau etnis lebih dominan dipahami sebagai penyebab terjadinya konflik. Padahal potensi kebinatangan yang inheren dalam diri manusia juga menjadi faktor terjadinya konflik. Mengaplikasikan metode analisis dispositif model S. Jager dan F. Maier, artikel berbasis kajian teks ini bertujuan untuk melengkapi kekurangan penafsiran atas sumber konflik dan menganalisis bagaimana teks film “Nama Saya Ahmad” merepresentasikan korelasi prasangka dan konflik keagamaan. Artikel ini menunjukkan bahwa film “Nama Saya Ahmad” menggambarkan konflik keagamaan berawal dari prasangka antarumat beragama. Agar prasangka dapat diurai maka penting diperluas ruang dialog. Selain mengurai prasangka, dialog juga dapat memperkuat integrasi sosial masyarakat.

Kata Kunci: Dialog; prasangka; konflik keagamaan; integrasi sosial.

INTRODUCTION

There are three forms of expression of religious experience: theoretical expression in the form of a belief system; practical expression in the form of a worship system; and social expression in the form of a system of social relations (Wach, 1958). The social expression has a very strong power to create human religious social bonds. However, religion is always accompanied by "two faces". On the one hand, religion as a system of social relations is seen as capable of building an established social order so that integration can be formed. On the other hand, conflict will inevitably occur when religious fanaticism and egoism grow strong (Wahyuni, 2017).

The dominant view in conflict theories states that the main factor causing conflict is the contestation between groups for resources, both material and symbolic (Bromwich, 2018; Eck, 2014). Such contestation can be exacerbated by economic inequality. Poverty and inequality in society are generally considered to be the background of the anger of groups who have been marginalized and have the potential to spark violent conflicts between community groups (Abdel-Fadil, 2019; Basedau & Schaefer-Kehnert, 2019; Burhanuddin et al., 2019; Kanas & Martinovic, 2017; Maoz & Henderson, 2020).

Van Klinken's study, for example, suggests that competition between local political elite groups and competition between groups was the main cause of the 1999 Ambon conflict (Klinken, 2001). Wilson said that elite political groups at the national level and changes in political structure in 1998 were the main causes of the Maluku conflict (Wilson, 2008). Bertrand explained that political changes at the national level had implications for the contestation among elites at the local level, which became the context of the post-reform social conflict in Maluku and Sulawesi (Bertrand, 2004). However, a number of these studies have become the main reference in the study of conflict in Indonesia. Adam and Gismar criticize that most conflict studies have not focused on the individual level to identify empirical factors why someone participates in acts of intolerance and radicalism.

Conflict as something that no longer only stems from the issue of economic inequality and political interests. However, differences in identity such as religion, ethnicity, and race also contributed to the increasing intensity of conflict (Campbell, 1999; Harish, 2006; Kunovich & Hodson, 1999). At the end of the 20th century, religious sentiment emerged as a source of conflict in several countries, including Indonesia. Religion became a sentiment capable of mobilizing conflict in its escalative form. The purpose of religion as a peacemaker suddenly appears as a weapon to legitimize the violent actions of its adherents (Affandi, 2004).

So far, studies on the sources of conflict have paid little attention to how prejudice and conflict are correlated. Prejudice is one of the most destructive aspects of human behavior and often leads to horrific acts (Alfandi, 2013). Gordon Allport first introduced the definition of prejudice in his book *The Nature of Prejudice* published in 1954. The term prejudice comes from the word *pra-judicium* which means a statement or conclusion about something based on superficial feelings or experiences against a certain person or group of people. According to Allport, prejudice is an antipathy (negative feeling) based on a false generalization or an inflexible generalization (Liliweri, 2018).

Meanwhile, according to Brown, prejudice is the holding of social attitudes or cognitive beliefs that are degrading, negative affect expression, and hostile or discriminatory actions against members of a group associated with membership in the group. There are several characteristics of prejudice based on the definition put forward by Brown, namely: degrading cognitive beliefs, expression of negative feelings, hostile and discriminatory actions. The characteristics of prejudice put forward by Brown have covered three domains of prejudice, namely: degrading beliefs are the cognitive domain (thoughts), negative

feelings are the affective domain (feelings), while hostile and discriminatory actions are conative domains (behavior) (Liliweri, 2018).

This research is based on the assumption that prejudice has a close correlation with conflict. Prejudice contains negative thoughts and attitudes which then lead to discriminatory actions. Prejudice is still at the level of thought and attitude, but discrimination has led to systematic action. When the accumulation of discriminatory actions continues, it will certainly lead to conflict. "Don't jump to conclusions too quickly. Many of my friends are also Muslims. Kiayi-kiayi I am also close to them. I also like to discuss with them. Now, we're jumping to conclusions too quickly, so a lot of people are hostile." This is part of the conversation in the short film "Nama Saya Ahmad" that a priest gave to a young Muslim named Ahmad.

RESEARCH METHODS

Applying the method of dispositive analysis modelled by S. Jäger and F. Maier, this text-based article aims to complete the lack of interpretation of the source of the conflict and analyze how the text of the film "Nama Saya Ahmad" represents the correlation of prejudice and religious conflict. Film as a discourse expressed through audio-visual media can be treated as text. There are three elements in the film that must be discussed separately: discursive discourse, non-discursive discourse, and materialization of discourse. The relationship between these three elements by Jäger is called dispositive which cannot be separated from the meaning of discourse (Haryatmoko, 2019).

Discourse is not something that is independent but is related to dispositive elements. According to Jäger, dispositivity is the synthesis of knowledge that is always evolving and built into language, action and discourse materialization (Jäger & Maier, 2009). Discourse is not just a discursive practice (talk and thought), but includes non-discursive practice (in the form of actions or gestures) and also discourse materialization (representation/description of objects built through non-discursive practice).

Dispositive analysis includes several steps: First, reconstructing knowledge built in discursive practice through critical discourse analysis. This analysis is the basis for moving forward in making further dispositive analyzes because it has helped create awareness of the importance of the dispositive aspects. Second, reconstructing knowledge that is built in non-discursive practices. Third, reconstructing the knowledge that was built in the form of materialization into objects, and non-discursive practices that have created the materialization of discourse (Jäger & Maier, 2009).

The dispositive concept of discourse is shown in the form of a triangle that rotates in three transit points, namely non-discursive practice (action), language practice (talk, interview and text), and object materialization (Jäger & Maier, 2009). The triangular relation of the discourse elements also changes with the passage of time so that it has its history and will always be influenced by other elements. However, synchronic analysis is still needed to identify the current state. The triangle shows the importance of critical discourse analysis because it does not only rely on verbal discourse analysis, but also through actions and discourse materialization. The steps of critical discourse analysis of films take into account these three aspects.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synopsis of the film " Nama Saya Ahmad "

Ahmad is a husband who is experiencing financial difficulties in his household. Since Ahmad and his family decided to move to Jakarta from Central Java, until now Ahmad has not found a job in Jakarta. One morning on the front porch of the house, Ahmad, who was filling his free time by filling out crossword puzzles, was approached by his wife Nurlela who delivered him coffee while asking Ahmad, "When will Ahmad get a job" because his wife no longer has money for household needs and school children. The difficulty of finding a job in the capital city made Ahmad unable to do much, so his wife said she regretted moving to Jakarta "if you know it's better like this in the village, you can eat from gardening" said Ahmad's wife.

When Ahmad and his wife had just finished praying in the evening, Ahmad's cell phone rang. David, Ahmad's friend, who also lives in Jakarta, offered him a job as a driver to replace him because David's wife was about to give birth. The next day Ahmad and David met to discuss a job as a driver. Became a driver for a man named Albert to be brought to Yogyakarta. However, Albert asked to find a non-Muslim driver. David advised Ahmad to be careful not to tell Albert that Ahmad is a Muslim. Ahmad accepted the job because the wages he would receive were sufficient to help his family finances to welcome the holy month of Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr.

With doubts, Ahmad told his wife that he had already found a job as a driver and that tomorrow he would start working only to take him to Yogyakarta. But what bothered Ahmad was that he couldn't carry out his first Saur this year with his wife and children again. Because Ahmad really needed money at that time, Ahmad still accepted the job even though his wife did not give a good response because he would be left again in the first fast like the previous year.

The next day Ahmad took Albert, the morning trip from Jakarta to Yogyakarta. Along the way, Ahmad and Albert didn't talk much. Only occasionally talking to get rid of the silence that could make Ahmad sleepy. Ahmad introduced himself as Joko to Albert because he was afraid that he would be known as a Muslim if he introduced himself by the name Ahmad. And Ahmad told a lot of lies when asked about his opinion on Islam. Ahmad also admitted to worshipping at a church near his house. This is done so that he is not seen as a Muslim. When they rested at the gas station, Albert saw Ahmad who was praying in the prayer room in the Rest Area. However, Albert did not directly ask Ahmad about his religion. Their journey continued and reached Yogyakarta the following morning. Joko alias Ahmad took Albert to one of the Islamic universities there. While Albert was filling out the seminar material at the Islamic university, Ahmad was waiting in the car.

After they finished, they continued on their way back to Jakarta. In the course of time, indicating that it was time for tarawih prayer, Albert ordered Ahmad to drive the car to a roadside mosque to rest. Arriving at the mosque, Ahmad who was confused and nervous asked why he stopped at the mosque. It turned out that Albert told Ahmad to pray tarawih. Ahmad still obeyed Albert's orders to get out of the car by slightly refusing Albert's offer and immediately headed to the mosque.

Ahmad with nervousness and fear that covered his chest when he finished praying saw Albert sitting in front of the door of the mosque. With stiff steps, Ahmad approached and sat beside Albert. Ahmad hoped that Albert would not immediately berate him for the lies he had committed. It was Albert who started to lighten the mood by telling the incident of a bomb explosion abroad which resulted in the death of his wife and child. Ahmad suddenly grew more afraid because what he knew was that the incident was carried out by terrorists who were labeled as Islamic terrorists. Ahmad tried to remain calm by asking for

the reasons that made Albert hate Muslims. Albert answered Ahmad's question with a small laugh which added to Ahmad's confusion.

Albert explained, "David likes to exaggerate, why am I looking for a non-Muslim driver because I don't want to disturb my driver's first fast, who takes me on this first fast which should be done with my family at home". Ahmad finally realized that he had put forward prejudice against Albert from Albert's explanation. After explaining Albert immediately invited Ahmad to continue the journey back to Jakarta. In the middle of the trip, Albert gave Ahmad the opportunity to eat breakfast at one of the restaurants on the side of the highway. Ahmad also admitted that his name was not Joko but Ahmad at the restaurant.

Representative Conversational Forms "Correlation of Prejudice and Religious Conflict"

The conversation between Ahmad and David in the film "Nama Saya Ahmad" shows David's prejudice against a Pastor named Albert. Below, excerpts from the conversation that directly relate to the theme of the film "Correlation of Prejudice and Religious Conflict".

- Ahmad : So what do you mean?
David : Yes, that's..., that's the date my wife is about to give birth, it's already close when she's about to give birth, I'm leaving. What kind of husband are you trying?
Ahmad : So it's about the beginning of fasting, right?
David : Yes..., from Jogja later in the evening, yes..., at least arrive here in the morning. Then you can have sahur on the road.
Ahmad : Oops..., I said Nur first, because last year was also the beginning of fasting I was not at home.
David : It's okay, I can give it to someone else, the pay is pretty good. Yes..., that's what you can buy Eid clothes, right!!!
Ahmad : Nod yes.
David : eeemm..., but this is mad, !!!
Ahmad : What ?
David : Don't look at it if you're a Muslim. !!!
Ahmad : Haa..., it's crazy how I was told to change my religion, I just became a driver.,
David : It's not a change of religion either, you just don't see that you're a Muslim. So my boss, Mr. Albert, doesn't want the driver to be a Muslim. It seems that he doesn't like Muslims like that, yes... you can do it later if you want to pray, just give him an excuse. Do you want to go to the gas station, Kek, Kewarung Kek, can you?
Ahmad : The most beautiful prayer alone in the shop!
David : Yelaa mad..., the first fast, you don't have to look so much..., right!!! oh yeah .., don't let you get caught huh..! mad danger..., danger
Ahmad : No need to scare you...!!!
David : It's not scary, it's dangerous.
Ahmad : Looking for death, not looking for money.
David : Yes, as long as you don't get caught, it's safe.
Ahmad : Yes, that's fine., I won't worry about it anymore..
David : Yes..., okay
-

Conversation 1. Ahmad and David's Conversation at the Coffee Shop

Conversation 1 shows that David gave information to Ahmad, that Albert doesn't seem to like Muslims. Therefore, Albert looked for a non-Muslim driver to take him to Yogyakarta. This suggests that David made statements against Albert based on superficial feelings or experiences. In the end, David judged with a false generalization or an inflexible generalization of Albert.

David's assessment of Albert had misinformed Ahmad. Therefore, Ahmad also relied on what was conveyed by David. So on the way to Yogyakarta, Ahmad was forced to lie and hide his identity to Albert. The following is the conversation between Ahmad and Albert in the car on the way to Yogyakarta.

- Albert : Oh yeah .., what was your name?
Ahmad : Joko sir.
Albert : What's the original from Jakarta?
Ahmad : Immigrants, my wife and I are from Central Java.
Albert : Oh..,!!!
Ahmad : What's the event in Yogyakarta, sir?
Albert : There are seminars on campus.
Ahmad : Which campus sir?
Albert : I'll let you know later.
Ahmad : Oh yeah... why don't you just take a plane, sir? Isn't it faster? not tired either.
Albert : Yes, but I prefer to use a car, so I can see the scenery, while chatting, right, on the plane you can't talk to the pilot. !
Ahmad : Hehehe..,!!!
-

Conversation 2. Ahmad and Albert's Conversation in the Car to Yogyakarta

Conversation 2 shows that Ahmad is hiding his real name, Ahmad admits his name is Joko. This shows that judgments based on wrong generalizations or generalizations that are not flexible make each other mutually closed. Finally, prejudice thrives and is far from understanding each other.

Likewise, when prejudice cannot be parsed properly, lies and falsehood will continue to occur. Below is a continuation of the conversation between Ahmad and Albert in the car on the way to Yogyakarta.

- Ahmad : Do you like reading, sir?
Albert : Oh yeah, this is a book about Christian religious thought, surely you haven't read it yet?
Ahmad : Hehe.., it's okay, sir, I don't have the book. At least the newspaper at home.
Albert : this is about the thoughts of Christian professors, good..., once in a while if you have time, read it often, so that you know who our real enemy is. !
Ahmad : Yes sir.

Instantly the atmosphere in the car became quiet, Ahmad who was driving was lost in thought and the car accidentally tripped over something, thus breaking Ahmad's daydream.

- Ahmad : Astafirullah
Albert : What do you say. ?
Ahmad : It's okay sir! Just thinking about the wife and children at home.
Albert : Oh...,
-

Ahmad and Albert's journey stopped at a gas station, when Albert was sleeping, Ahmad left him in the car. Ahmad went to the gas station prayer room to perform the Isha' prayer. However, Albert also woke up and headed to the gas station toilet. Albert accidentally saw Ahmad was praying. After Ahmad finished, while in the car there was a conversation between Ahmad and Albert.

Ahmad : Sir, I filled up with gas and went to the toilet.
Albert : Oh yes, it's still far, isn't it? Jogja?
Ahmad : eeeh not soon, do you want to go directly or stop by first?
Albert : stop by to eat first, I'm hungry.
Ahmad : Yes sir.

Conversation 3. Ahmad and Albert's Conversation in the Car to Yogyakarta

Conversation 3 shows that Ahmad has not been able to unravel the prejudice against Albert. So Ahmad continues to lie about his identity. The following is the continuation of the conversation between Ahmad and Albert in the car on the way home to Jakarta.

Albert : What do you think about Islam?
Ahmad : He..., (Ahmad just smiled shyly)
Albert : Many of your neighbors are Muslim, right?
Ahmad : Yes, sir, my neighbors are Muslim, but I rarely talk to them. !
Albert : Why ?
Ahmad : Because I don't like it, sir.
Albert : Ahaha ..., where do you usually worship?
Ahmad : At the church near the house, sir.
Albert : Oh .., often to church?
Ahmad : He.. every week.
Albert : What do you do at church?
Ahmad : Yes.., sit down, listen to the lecture.
Albert : Hey.., which area do you live in?
Ahmad : My house is in the Mampang area, sir.
Albert : What is the name of the church?
Ahmad : eee..., I moved around, sir, not just there.

Conversation 4. Ahmad and Albert Conversation in the Car to Yogyakarta

Conversation 4 shows that Albert is trying to open up so that Ahmad doesn't lie again about his identity. But Ahmad still lies by making up stories that he is a Christian. When asked what the name of the church where Ahmad worships is, Ahmad looks confused and still lies by looking for excuses. The following is the continuation of the conversation between Ahmad and Albert in the car on the way home to Jakarta.

Albert : The mosque in front of us will stop!
Ahmad : What do you mean sir?
Albert : Yes, the mosque in front of it is the mosque.! We'll stop there, let's take a break.
Ahmad : Yes sir,
Albert : It is okay now. Why are you still here? are you out?
Ahmad : No sir, what are you going to do?
Albert : Taraweeh right?
Ahmad : you mean dad?
Albert : Already there praying, I already know how come.

Ahmad : I really don't understand what do you mean?
Albert : You don't have to wait too long, you'll be in a hurry, you'll talk later.
Ahmad : Okay sir. (gets out of the car to the mosque and prays)

Conversation 5. Ahmad and Albert's Conversation in the Car to Jakarta

Conversation 5 shows that Albert showed Ahmad that he already knew Ahmad was a Muslim. On the way back to Jakarta Albert asked to stop at a mosque and invited Ahmad to pray Taraweeh.

Albert's attitude towards Ahmad is an attempt to break down prejudices so that openness to one another can occur. In the next conversation, it shows this openness. The following is the continuation of the conversation between Ahmad and Albert in the car on the way home to Jakarta.

Albert : Have you prayed?
Ahmad : Hey.., already sir.
Albert : Okay, now what do you want to ask, don't be afraid I don't eat people.
Ahmad : He.., Yes sir,
Albert : My wife and children were killed by bombs abroad, I was so traumatized.
Ahmad : Terrorist, sir?
Albert : Since then I have never taken public transportation again, everywhere I have taken my own car.
Ahmad : Is that why you don't like Islam?
Albert : I don't hate Muslims, I just don't want to burden you by working with me.
Ahmad : What do you mean?
Albert : This is the beginning of fasting, I disturb the beginning of your fasting, you should be the first sauce with your family.
Ahmad : So you are not anti-Islam?
Albert : Hehe..., David didn't tell the story.
Ahmad : He..., yes
Albert : David, if the story really likes exaggerating, I just ask the driver to be a non-Muslim, if possible. After all, the bombing incident did not make me hate Muslims. I just hate people who in the name of religion do whatever they want.
Ahmad : Hehe.., I think you are anti-Islam.
Albert : Hee., don't be too quick to conclude, many of my friends are also Muslim, Kyai are close to them and they also like to discuss with them.
Ahmad : Oh.
Albert : Now we are too quick to conclude, so many people are hostile, you know the book I read?
Ahmad : (*shakes head*)
Albert : he said, our real enemy is ourselves, not other people.
Ahmad : He.. Yes, sir, it's like that too.
Albert : If you've talked about this, then you understand so you know the truth haha...
Ahmad : Ahaha ..., Yes sir, can we rest for a while, sir?
Albert : Okay.. just sleep if you want to sleep, I want to find coffee first.
Ahmad : Sorry sir.
Albert : Ah..., relax

Conversation 6. Ahmad and Albert's Conversation in the Car to Jakarta

Conversation 6 shows that openness between Ahmad and Albert can occur when Ahmad's prejudice against Albert has been properly explained. Ahmad and Albert have presented their respective identities without lying and have established communication with each other to open the barriers to harmonious relations between them.

Albert : Jok., wake up
Ahmad : Where is this sir?
Albert : It's 3 o'clock, right?
Ahmad : How come we've arrived here, sir?
Albert : Let's eat first.
Ahmad : erm...,

Ahmad & Albert got out of the car walking towards the restaurant

Albert : What do you usually do at Saur's house with Jok?
Ahmad : Oh yes, sir, my name is actually not Joko.
Albert : Continue ?
Ahmad : My name is Ahmad sir.
Albert : Ohhh..., Hahaha.

Conversation 7. Ahmad and Albert's Conversation in the Car to Jakarta

At the end of the film, conversation 7 shows that Ahmad and Albert's openness is getting better. It came to Ahmad's honesty to admit that his name was not Joko. except Ahmad.

Correlation of Prejudice and Religious Conflict

Conflicts that occur in society tend to be viewed in a macro-social manner, which means that conflict is understood as something caused by factors of socio-cultural inequality, political dominance, inequality in economic distribution, and differences in religious or ethnic identity. The implication is that conflict is seen as ending if social, economic, political, cultural and religious-ethnic differences can be answered. Based on these assumptions, social scientists then campaign for democracy, liberalism and modernism as an answer. However, several conflicts that have occurred in the trajectory of modern world history show the shortcomings of this view.

The economic crisis that hit Asian and Third World countries at the end of the 20th century showed the collapse of the paradigm of economic development so far, which was previously campaigned as a way to world prosperity. Liberalism has caused very unfair relations between developed industrial countries and Third World countries (Developing Countries). Therefore, the emergence of terrorism and radical groups in the early 21st century is believed to be a form of crisis and distrust of this paradigm. Another real example is the crimes against humanity in Iraq, in the name of democracy and the jargon of liberating the people from the tyrannical dictatorship, America-British operating killing machines that kill children, the weak, women and other civilians in Iraq (Affandi, 2004).

Focusing too much on macro-social issues and neglecting micro-social issues makes conflict cannot be understood more comprehensively. Conflicts that are only explained in a macro-social way will be trapped in a utopia. To dream of a system capable of creating balance and harmony between social, economic, political and cultural forces really has no historical basis. The history of the development of society is the history of conflicts and wars that can be destructive or constructive. Whereas the past and future are governed by the same social laws that can be seen in the present.

Conflict can be understood comprehensively by paying attention to macro-social and micro-social perspectives. Before discussing social, economic, and political issues, and differences in identity that cause conflict, it is important to first discuss the nature of human beings in relation to God, nature, and fellow human beings. Humans not only have the potential to develop their human existence, they also have the potential to be a threat to the survival of humanity itself. Three potentials that can develop human existence on earth are *intelligibilia*, *sensibilia*, and *spiritualia*. With this potential, humans are expected to be able to carry out their mandate as caliphs on earth (Affandi, 2004; Heryanto, 2021).

The implication from a micro-social perspective is that conflict is understood as something that always exists and stems from the potential for animal power that is inherent in humans. Humans have an aggressive character as a result of animal power in them which encourages violence or persecution. This human aggressiveness can result in conflict in the midst of people's lives.

Several figures such as Lorenz (biologist), Freud (psychology), and Hobbes (sociologist) provide theoretical explanations of how human aggressiveness results in conflict (Affandi, 2004). Konrad Lorenz and Robert Ardrey suggested that, like other animals, humans also have aggressive instincts in their genetic structure. Still closely related to biology is psychology which says that violence is rooted in the structure of the human psyche. Sigmund Freud and the Freudian school argued that humans are inferior creatures filled with violence, hatred, and aggression. Fromm, one of the social scientists who built his theory based on psychological and sociological theories, has conducted many studies on the potential for conflict (violence) in humans. Fromm did not deny the potential for aggression in humans.

Human aggression that causes conflict is strongly influenced by the prejudices that exist in humans (Liliwari, 2018). Prejudice is one of the most destructive aspects of human behavior and often leads to horrific acts. There are several characteristics of prejudice: degrading cognitive beliefs, expression of negative feelings, and hostile and discriminatory actions. The characteristics of prejudice have included three domains of prejudice, namely: degrading beliefs are cognitive domains (thoughts), negative feelings are affective domains (feelings), while hostile and discriminatory actions are conative domains (behaviors). Prejudice contains negative thoughts and attitudes, leading to discriminatory actions and even being aggressive. Prejudice is still at the level of thought and attitude, but discrimination has led to systematic action. When the accumulation of discriminatory actions continues, it will certainly increase the intensity of the conflict.

Dialogue: Unraveling Prejudice and Strengthening Social Integration

Religious conflict as something that no longer only stems from problems of economic inequality and political interests. However, prejudice between religious communities is the cause of conflict. The important thing that urgently needs to be done is to create and expand religious dialogue as a space for inter-religious encounters (Lestari, 2021; Wahyuni, Yurnalis, & Idris, 2021). The perspective that places religion as a source of conflict has led to various attempts to reinterpret religious teachings and then find common ground at a certain level. If religious people know each other and understand each other, then religious people can work together. The solution to the problem of an ideal social life requires the widest possible participation of every religious community to build a life of true, solid harmony (Wahyuni, 2019).

In the dialogue, the similarities between various religions are brought up and still show the differences so that each religious community can understand and respect each other. By establishing conditions of mutual understanding and respect, conflicts between religious communities can be avoided. Indeed, conflicts that occur in many places are actually not caused by a single factor. But it cannot be denied, prejudice between religious communities is the cause of conflict.

Dialogue is not just an intellectual hobby but a necessity. True dialogue is carried out in equality, principles must not be ignored and must not merely seek false peace. Dialogue must be a testimony given and received in order to advance one another in the journey of religious quest and experience. Dialogue is directed to get rid of prejudice and intolerance. Dialogue requires a consistent attitude, openness, humility and candor so that dialogue can enrich each party. According to Olaf Schumann, an expert on interfaith dialogue in Indonesia: "dialogue does not in any way diminish full and honest loyalty to one's own faith, but rather enriches and strengthens it. Dialogue is a basic thing in eliminating misunderstandings and prejudices that have arisen in the past (Philips, 2016). Religious dialogue must be based on integrity and openness. Dialogue is carried out with clear integrity and genuine openness for mutual understanding. Integrity and openness to dialogue with existing differences contribute to understanding different conceptions and breaking down prejudices among religious believers.

Not only dissolving prejudice, dialogue can also be expected as an effort to strengthen social integration. Potential conflicts in society will lead to real conflicts when horizontal and vertical factors meet. In other words, ascribed factors such as ethnicity and religion against achievement factors such as income, place of residence and political position, will increase the intensity of conflict. On the other hand, if horizontal factors do not meet vertical factors, the intensity of conflict can decrease and even open the way to integration in society. Dialogue is carried out so that horizontal factors do not meet with vertical factors, so that conflicts do not occur and social integration of the community can be strengthened.

CONCLUSION

The film "Nama Saya Ahmad" raises the issue of inter-religious relations which shows the correlation between prejudice and religious conflict. Conflict is not only seen only macro-social, but more comprehensively by considering micro-social views. In addition to socio-cultural inequality factors, political dominance, economic distribution inequality, and differences in religious or ethnic identity, the inherent animal power in humans also increases the intensity of conflict. The film "Nama Saya Ahmad" illustrates that religious conflicts (discriminatory and hostile) originate from prejudice between religious people. Therefore, it is important to have a dialogue to break down prejudices so that potential conflicts can be identified early and strengthen the social integration of the community.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Fadil, M. (2019). The politics of affect: The glue of religious and identity conflicts in social media. *Journal of Religion, Media and Digital Culture*, 8(1), 11–34.
- Affandi, H. I. (2004). *Akar konflik sepanjang zaman: elaborasi pemikiran Ibn Khaldun*. Bandung: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Alfandi, M. (2013). Prasangka: Potensi Pemicu Konflik Internal Umat Islam. *Walisongo: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan*, 21(1), 113–140.
- Basedau, M., & Schaefer-Kehnert, J. (2019). Religious Discrimination and Religious Armed Conflict in sub-Saharan Africa: an Obvious Relationship? *Religion, State and Society*, 47(1), 30–47.
- Bertrand, J. (2004). *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bromwich, B. (2018). Power, contested institutions and land: repoliticising analysis of natural resources and conflict in Darfur. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 12(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2017.1403782>

- Burhanuddin, N., Nurdin, A. A., & Helmy, M. I. (2019). Religious Conflict and Regional Autonomy in Church Establishment and Islamic Clothing in West Pasaman and Dharmasraya West Sumatera. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, 9(2), 189–216.
- Campbell, J. (1999). Nationalism, Ethnicity and Religion: Fundamental Conflicts and the Politics of Identity in Tanzania. *Nations and Nationalism*, 5(1), 105–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1354-5078.1999.00105.x>
- Eck, K. (2014). The law of the land. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(4), 441–454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343314522257>
- Harish, S. P. (2006). Ethnic or religious cleavage? Investigating the nature of the conflict in Southern Thailand. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 28(1), 48–69.
- Haryatmoko. (2019). *Critical Discourse Analysis (Analisis Wacana Kritis): Landasan Teori, Metodologi dan Penerapan*. Depok: Rajawali Pers.
- Heryanto, H. (2021). Kesadaran Beragama dalam Perspektif Ihsan: Pengalaman Pertaubatan Preman. *Khazanah Theologia*, 3(2), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.15575/kt.v3i2.10974>
- Jäger, S., & Maier, F. (2009). Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian CDA and Dispositive Analysis. In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 34–61). London: Sage.
- Kanas, A., & Martinovic, B. (2017). Political Action in Conflict and Nonconflict Regions in Indonesia: The Role of Religious and National Identifications. *Political Psychology*, 38(2), 209–225.
- Klinken, G. van. (2001). The Maluku Wars: Bringing Society Back In. *Indonesia*, 71(1), 1–26.
- Kunovich, R. M., & Hodson, R. (1999). Conflict, Religious Identity, and Ethnic Intolerance in Croatia. *Social Forces*, 78(2), 643–668. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/78.2.643>
- Lestari, G. (2021). Radikalisme Atas Nama Agama dalam Perspektif Intelektual Muda di Tengah Realitas Multikultural. *Khazanah Theologia*, 3(3), 181–193.
- Liliweri, A. (2018). *Prasangka, Konflik, dan Komunikasi Antarbudaya*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Maoz, Z., & Henderson, E. A. (2020). *Scriptures, Shrines, Scapegoats, and World Politics: Religious Sources of Conflict and Cooperation in the Modern Era*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Philips, G. (2016). *Melampaui Pluralisme: Integritas Terbuka sebagai Pendekatan yang Sesuai bagi Dialog Muslim-Kristen*. Malang: Madani.
- Wach, J. (1958). *The Comparative Study of Religions* (J. M. Kitagawa, ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wahyuni, D. (2017). Agama Sebagai Media dan Media Sebagai Agama. *Jurnal Ilmu Agama: Mengkaji Doktrin, Pemikiran, Dan Fenomena Agama*, 18(2).
- Wahyuni, D. (2019). Gerakan Dialog Keagamaan: Ruang Perjumpaan Antar Umat Beragama di Kota Bandung. *Religious: Jurnal Studi Agama-Agama Dan Lintas Budaya*, 3(2), 188–197.
- Wahyuni, D., Yurnarlis, S. A. F. H., & Idris, M. (2021). Filsafat Perennial dan Dialog Agama: Studi Pemikiran Seyyed Hossein Nasr. *Jurnal Al-Aqidah*, 13(1), 103–116.
- Wilson, C. (2008). *Ethno-Religious Violence in Indonesia: From Soil to God*. Abingdon: Routledge.