



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 460-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: ATI120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VII Número: 1 Artículo no.:41 Período: 1 de Septiembre al 31 de diciembre, 2019.

TÍTULO: La educación democrática deliberativa como base de la tolerancia religiosa.

AUTORES:

1. S. Sos. Alif Firdaus Zamzam.
2. Ph.D. Setyabudi Indartono.

RESUMEN: Últimamente, la violencia contra los creyentes es muy alta y los casos cada vez más generalizados de intolerancia son el resultado de la inmadurez de la educación sobre los derechos civiles en la religión; este artículo utiliza una revisión de la literatura combinada con un análisis del concepto de "espacio público" de Habermas para hacer formulaciones sobre tolerancia, comunicación y apertura de la igualdad de derechos en los espacios públicos. Este estudio plantea deliberadamente el valor de la democracia para hacer que la sociedad sea más democrática con una introducción intensa a cada elemento de la comunidad multirreligiosa a través de foros de discusión ciudadana. Los resultados, en el proceso de democracia deliberativa a través de la discusión del espacio público, puede establecer tolerancia entre las personas religiosas.

PALABRAS CLAVES: democracia, deliberativo, educación, espacio público.

TITLE: Deliberative democracy education as the basis of religious tolerance.

AUTHORS:

1. S. Sos. Alif Firdaus Zamzam.
2. Ph.D. Setyabudi Indartono.

ABSTRACT: Lately, violence against believers is very high. With regard to the increasingly widespread cases of intolerance which are a result of the immaturity of education regarding civil rights in religion, this article uses a literature review combined with an analysis of Habermas's concept of "public space" to make formulations for building tolerance, including communication and openness of equal rights in public spaces. This study focused on deliberately planting the value of democracy, with the aim of making society more democratic, intense introduction to each element of multi-religious community through citizen discussion forums. With the results, the process of deliberative democracy through discussion of public space is able to establish tolerance among religious people.

KEY WORDS: democracy, deliberative, education, public space.

INTRODUCTION.

In the view of the author of the world, there is now a huge problem related to freedom which is the core value of democracy. It can be seen from the start of the rise of terrorism cases if the starting point is to be closely related to religion, whose adherents lose their tolerance by addressing other religions in extreme and different ways. Although, in some cases the underlying aspects are political and economic. As an illustration, when some Muslim groups consider that other than their group (non-Muslim) is legitimate to be harmed or frowned on their lives. As a form, they terrorize with explosives and so on. The next effect is that non-Muslims also react to terror by intimidating Muslim minorities in their territory even if it is analyzed there is no connection, even though Muslim minorities are not a group of separatist members.

Even countries with the most established level of democracy (USA) were shaken up with intolerant issues after the events of 11 September 2001 and other minor cases that followed behind them. The negative stigma between one and the other is always reinforced and seems to be the deeper gap

between them. The effect arises from a strong stereotypical view that states that if one individual has a certain set of similarities to a group, it is certain that he is a member of the group without any deeper consideration.

The formulation of democracy needs to be revisited by removing the stigma of that view. The main point of democracy is government that originates from the people, in which there are various differences in the backgrounds and beliefs of each individual for decisions related to the life with each of them (Martin Samuelson, 2018); that is, in religion each community also has rights that must be respected and protected by the government with decisions that come from the people as well. Decisions made based on involving every small part of the community as a minority group will be very helpful in accommodating their shared interests, so the level of hegemony of the majority towards minorities can be suppressed. This problem seems to be the main thing besides only the people holding political power. This means that if democracy limits the power of the government through control by the people then democracy also limits the power of the majority to the minority.

DEVELOPMENT.

Deliberative Democracy Education.

The term education of deliberative democracy adopted from the concept of public sphere from Habermas. Deliberative democracy prioritizes the use of deliberative decision-making procedures through dialogue and exchange of experience among parties to produce a fair and mutually accepting agreement. The involvement of citizens is at the core of deliberative democracy in contrast to strict representative democracy, using majority and minority votes. Deliberative democracy prioritizes cooperation between ideas and between parties, while representative democracy is competition between ideas and between groups.

Deliberative democracy in this case is defined as a view that places public deliberation on free and equal citizenship as the core legitimacy of political decision making and self-government. Deliberation itself as a terminology comes from Latin, namely *deliberatio* which means weighing, consultation or deliberation (Hardiman, 2004: 18). Democracy is deliberative, if the process of giving reasons for a candidate's public policy is tested first through public consultation or through Habermas's theoretical vocabulary of "public discourse".

What is typical of Habermas is that he developed his thoughts in continuous discourse with other thinkers: Karl Marx, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Goerge-Herbert Mead, Georg Lukacs, Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno. Opposing Habermas: Karl Popper, Niklas Luhman, Herbert Marcuse, Sigmund Frued, Gadamer, John L. Agustin, Talcott Parson and Hannah Arendt. Everything has helped Habermas in clarifying what he is looking for. And there is another one that is very influential in Habermas's thought, Immanuel Kant, because in essence, he is a gift par excellence.

One of Habermas's works which deals with deliberative democracy is *Faktizitas und geltung*, which is translated in English: *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. The book has been proof of Habermas's commitment to a democratic legal state. *Faktizitas und Geltung* was born from Habermas's assumption that "the state of law cannot be obtained or maintained without radical democracy" (Habermas, 1989).

In deliberative democracy, there are three main principles: 1. The principle of deliberation, meaning that before making a decision it is necessary to take deep consideration with all parties involved. 2. The principle of reasonableness, meaning that in carrying out joint consideration there should be a willingness to understand the other party, and the arguments raised can be accounted for rationally. 3. The principle of freedom and equality of position means that all parties involved have equal opportunities and have the freedom to express their thoughts, considerations, and ideas openly and willingness to listen (Meyer, 2002).

Deliberative discussion is needed to unite the various interests that arise in heterogeneous Indonesian societies in religion and culture. So, every public policy should be born from deliberation rather than forced. Deliberations are carried out to reach a resolution of a conflict of interest. Then a fair process is needed to obtain agreement on a public policy for the sake of social order and national and cultural stability.

This stability can be obtained because it provides opportunities for various parties to think together to solve their own problems. This communication building must be based on equal awareness that requires each other. In this case no strongest party is opposed to the weak party, but all are equal.

Hardiman underlines that deliberative democracy emphasizes 'the process' of public decision making and not 'the results'. That is, whether public decisions are taken by the government through public testing, public debate, deliberation or only decided by a few people (government) in the political system without going through the previous (democratic) deliberation process. He pointed out several figures who helped popularize the idea of deliberative democracy, namely Habermas, John Rawls, Andrew Arato, Guy B. Peters, and so on.

Theoretically, the theory of deliberative democracy emphasizes the importance of the role of public space as a locus of intersubjective communication which is considered a fundamental variable in democracy. Deliberative democracy in principle requires the achievement of democratic substance in the form of government by those ruled through communication efforts in the public space rather than merely fulfilling procedural standards of democracy such as elections, political parties, mass media, trias politics, etc., which tend to ignore the essence of democracy.

Slightly different, Ulil Abshar in the introduction to the book "Citizen Forum: Representative vs. Deliberative Democracy" explained that deliberative democracy is an effort to deepen and radicalise existing democracy by strengthening civil society networks (Abdalla, 2000). Public space, which is

conducive to deliberation and consensus, will be able to educate people through habits, so that the community naturally grows its democratic mentality.

The importance of Deliberative Democracy Education.

So far, democracy has become a hot topic to be discussed and also debated, when many developed countries apply the concept of democracy to the maximum with the support of every citizen who is ready and understands the concept of democracy originating from literature and campaigns delivered. On the other hand, there are still many countries that use democracy in government and state systems, but the lower classes of society still do not understand what, how, and by whom democracy is. Even though the most important thing is the behavior that acts democratically, not only about conceptual knowledge.

There are still many people, who among some parties, sometimes do not feel that they harm others, on the contrary there are also those who do not feel that they have been harmed. Such facts sometimes grow entrenched, so that it has become commonplace for one party to oppress the other party, the majority group against minority groups. This seemingly ordinary feeling will accumulate longer and one day it can explode with the form of rebellion and the outbreak of conflict.

Hence, from that deliberative democracy, education is very closely related to that problem. With the aim that before the problem accumulates, they can already understand each other's rights through a healthy discussion process between groups that have differences so that they do not break through other rights, also carry out their obligations regularly according to the creation of a predetermined agreement with each - each component supports each other.

The application of democratic education, especially in areas that were previously fully controlled by indigenous leaders, cultural leaders, and religious leaders who have great power to force their followers is indeed difficult, because in their routines, the people have been isolated by group rules

and their leaders curb them. This usually occurs in communities that are homogeneous in both culture and diversity.

In the process, many related scientists argue that the basis of democratic education is how to negotiate in democracy so that it will result in democratic societies in terms of ways of thinking, just as teaching provides the ability to provide reasons, to listen, and a kind of reciprocal value. (Samuelsson & Boyum, 2015 in Martin Samuelson, 2018) so that democracy education is a training that ensures that every individual understands his rights boldly expresses arguments about it, is also ready to share with others in terms of exchange of values; so that, not only accept what a unilateral decision is given. On the other hand (Ruitenberg, 2010), feel hesitant to use the idea of democracy by the basic way of negotiating consensus as a goal in democratic public education on the basis of consensus, will reduce the possibility of disagreement. By using consensus, natural or natural conflicts experienced in democracy can be erased, and therefore he also argues that consensus is not suitable as a goal of democratic education.

Deliberative Education and the process.

In deliberative democracy, Jurgen Habermas presents the concept of 'public space' as a means of discussion. Space that is independent and separate from the state (state) and market (market). Although in Habermas's study focuses on political issues, public space is also very relevant to discuss matters of religion and culture. Public space ensures that every citizen has access to be a bearer of public opinion. This public opinion has a role to influence, including informally, the behaviors in the state and market 'space'.

The concept of public space was taken from the history of the public sphere of the bourgeoisie in eighteenth-century Germany (Habermas: 1964). Although in his later book, Habermas lamented the death of public space because of the transition from liberal capitalism to monopoly capitalism (Eley, G: 1992). He continues to argue that public space can still be an ideal type for the prospect of

democracy in the present. Unlike its predecessor at the Frankfurt School who tended to be pessimistic about the prospect of democracy, Habermas had great hopes that the enlightenment project could be continued by raising public rationality through media dialogue. This study later became the background of his research on communicative action theory (theory of communicative action).

In the Theory of Communicative Action, Habermas argues that modern society consists of 'life-world' (lifeworld) and system (system). 'Life-world' usually more autonomous, meaning achieving self-chosen goals, which are not possible in the system. While the system according to him, consists of a subsystem of money and power, and in this subsystem human behavior is instrumentalized to achieve the objectives of these subsystems (Finlayson, G: 2005).

By being home to communicative action, the 'life-world' allows participants to achieve their goals cooperatively with an understanding of situations defined together (Habermas, J.: 1985). As a mechanism to achieve understanding, contained in communicative action is rational potential. The rational potential of communicative action consists of openness to logic (reason) and opinion (argument). In it, consensus is achieved through the exchange of agreement and disagreement using logic. With this theoretical argument, Habermas also argues that the purpose of social change is to ensure that the 'life-world', or public space, exists independently of the 'system' tendency and the colonizing subsystem.

The concept of public space, built by Habermas fifty years ago, has been criticized and has led to many productive discussions and theoretical developments in many fields. The first reaction was criticism from Geoff Eley about two things. First, according to Eley, Habermas idealizes public space only in the bourgeois version. Second, he has ignored the sources of different emancipatory forces that exist in radical and popular traditions (Calhoun: 1992), with the intention of being a public of the ordinary people who also existed in the period of liberal public space during Habermas's research period.

Eley questioned if the public of the common people is a form of liberal models as Habermas argues or is another independent model in the forms of disclosure because it is faced with the fact that liberal public spaces and institutions are built through sectionalism, exclusivity and repression, and by hence it is always shaped by conflict (Calhoun: 1992). So that in the end the ideal type of public space is still being sought for its concrete form and evolution. Because according to Eley, since its emergence it was exclusive and particularistic.

Another critique that is also relevant is from Nancy Fraser. According to Fraser, it is necessary to analyze the conditions in which the existence of public space is not enough if only acknowledging it from a political orientation. The plurality of competing publics needs more seriously to doubt the concept of public space in which it intends to cover up, rather than eliminate, the imbalance of social structures (Fraser, N: 2003). Fraser argues that public space should contain all social components, there is no particular class exclusivity like the one from Habermas, with only the Bourgeois having a role in it.

In its slow form, public space has begun to shift to the media, we can refer to Yovantra Arief's analysis of the TV industry. Yovantra argues that the term frequency is public property, which is currently heavily used to fight the content and ownership of televisions that do not represent the public voice, although the ideal remains problematic, or contains paradox (Arief, Y: 2015). The concept of the public according to him is ideal because with it we no longer talk about individuals who are driven by taste, but as the subject of the collective who has the rights as citizens to get shows that are healthy, educational and relevant to life.

Here is the term condition that allows the public space proposed by Fraser to be relevant to help us get out of this ontological chaos. As long as television (and other media) is still controlled by corporations, public space can never be achieved. The same is true with euphoria about social media and its potential as a public space. So that in terms of media, democratically can be reached by anyone,

various groups can enter and participate, but in space other than the real world the effects of offense are very big opportunities, in addition to the still being of the public in digesting information that is not necessarily accountable. In commodity terms, the internet is also heavily penetrated by the interests of capitalism which can hijack public space with the satisfaction of opinion.

Creating a space that everyone can participate deliberatively in participating in discussing and deciding matters relating to every aspect of our political, social and cultural life, we need effective tools to achieve them. Actually in Indonesia, deliberative practices in the public sphere have long been carried out even before independence, so Eley's concept of 'the common people' is indeed in history, namely the practice of *openbare vergaderingen* (general meeting) in 1920-1926. In the encyclopedia (Subijanto, R., 2014).

Development of Public Space.

Even though it was brief, the period 1920-1926 was a turning point in the history of the social revolution movement in Indonesia. This is mainly because of the character of the anti-colonial movement that is different from the previous periods. Previously, associations and meetings were usually held by and for educated indigenous elites and usually did not include the majority of the population of uneducated ordinary people. Since the founding of the Sarekat Islam in 1912, we have witnessed the participation of the commoners in the anti-colonial movement which was not only popular but also organized both inside and outside Java. But people who cannot read or write can still move even though at that time only 1% of the indigenous population could read or write.

Based on reports from PKI organs, the Sinar Hindia newspaper (1920-1926), there were approximately 900 public meetings held in the Dutch East Indies, mainly concentrated in Java and Sumatra. These meetings were held in mountainous, coastal and even other remote areas in homes, fields, offices and theaters with a total of 50-10,000 people including men, women, Chinese, natives

and citizens of Indian and Arab descent . The communicative character of the rally formed the character of the red Indonesian Communist Party / Sarekat Islam / Sarekat Ra'jat which at that time was still in the process of being formed and was always under threat from both the colonial government and other indigenous parties, including the Sarekat Islam putih. In insiklopedia (Subijanto, 2014).

For the people, openbare vergaderingen is a tool for organizing itself. One writer said "the only way to move is to attend meetings". But the point is not only that, it is precisely the debate and discussion in the meeting that is able to move. Openbare vergaderingen is also an educational tool for the majority of people who do not go to school, because of the lack of formal education at that time. In meetings, newspapers are usually read aloud to be discussed further and debated. This is why openbare vergaderingen is also a place for people to update their knowledge of foreign affairs, historical analysis and other local issues. The principle of free debate is the main principle of openbare vergaderingen.

There are at least three theoretical implications of this vergaderingen openbare practice. First, these meetings were not carried out immediately only to hold different horizontal publics based on identity or taste. This public space was held to oppose colonial state power. This requires that we respond to Fraser's concept of 'public multiplicity', ie when public multiplicity is held in capitalism it will only succeed in holding horizontal competition between the existing (or created) public and diverting us from conflict between the people and the capitalist state. The movement to represent public multiplicity in the present usually only manifests the public based on identity politics.

Second, behind the spirit of revolution that invites people to take part in public meetings is the desire to overcome the contradiction between the people and the colonial state that fails to represent the interests of the colonized people. This is different from the concept of liberal public space that is carried by Habermas. According to Habermas, 'public space' is an independent space that is separate

from the state and market and is very important to create equilibrium between these three spaces. In its own language, the aim is no longer to abolish the capitalist economic system and the system of domination of the bureaucracy but to make a dam of democracy to deal with the colonial disruption of the system in the world of life. The challenge faced is to create an independent and autonomous public space held within the system and the state whose reason is still imperialist. One of the public demands of openbare vergaderingen at that time was to replace the colonial government with zelfbestuur, or self-government led by indigenous people.

Third, the public space that contains the "depression" community is built to achieve the goal of eliminating the identity that unites them themselves. In other words, vergaderingen unites colonized people, but in their struggle they aim to overcome and eliminate this colonized identity to become free and free. Habermas's theory is only able to 'acknowledge' and 'represent' public-public based on different identities but is unable to overcome / eliminate identity which is usually a product of oppressive and exploitative systems.

Of course, the conditions in the 1920s are different from the current conditions, each era has its own problems, because it is not only capitalism, but also the issue of interests and the issue of sara issues which continue to be heralded to be quite precarious conditions for the continuity of unity. If in the past its mission was to gather unity which was not yet structurally strong, the current mission was not to allow the long-established unity to be easily shaken and solved by any issue. The concept of public space has potential, and is used to continue to work together to form a democratic environment so that it is able to mature the community through the deliberative education in it.

Tolerance model.

The description of dogmatic attitudes also has negative implications with prejudice, which is to give assumptions in advance to the shape of a particular situation without knowing in a rational manner what is actually, so that understanding will be confined in a rigid condition. This situation makes

tolerance difficult to practice in society (Evan Stewart, Penny Edgell & Jack Delehanty, 2017) When others say X religion tends to be negative, it will also define it equally without any rational proof.

In the research, Laura Kurth & Pieter Glasbergen (2017) provide an overview of the shift in the meaning of tolerance The subject and object of tolerance and the power to intervene are directly derived from conceptualization. The hierarchy of values comes from the idea that there are objections and voluntary decisions not to interfere. Both are based on values, where objections are judged to be less than voluntary, the decision not to interfere. The last aspect of the tolerance limits included in such a framework seems to be an important element of tolerance.

The subject of tolerance is an actor who tolerates attributes, attitudes, beliefs or behaviors that are considered undesirable. Because the condition of tolerance can only exist when the subject of tolerance has the power to interfere, it might be concluded that the subject of tolerance must be part of the dominant group, for example in Indonesia. However, the subject of tolerance can also be part of a group minority in relation to other minorities or powerless in their own community (Nehushtan, 2007). In addition, being part of a minority does not always mean lack of power. Thus, tolerance can occur unilaterally or mutually.

Objects of tolerance are attributes, attitudes, beliefs or unwanted behaviors of individuals or groups. What is considered an object of tolerance depends on the subject of tolerance, because all characteristics of a group or individual that are considered undesirable may be objects of tolerance. Desires exist with highly subjective judgments, depending on people's expectations and personal preferences. In addition, relative objections may also exist, which implies that one would prefer other options in alternative choices (Newman, 1978). Like subject tolerance, objects can be a feature of a majority or a minority.

Value hierarchies occur from the fact that tolerance is not a neutral concept, but value-laden and subject to judgment (Nehushtan, 2007). One can oppose objects of tolerance for moral reasons, out

of fear, etc. To tolerate less desirable options, there must be another value that is higher in the value hierarchy. Examples might be the practice of Islam and Jews; for example, slaughter of animals, which may be opposed for cruel reasons for animals, but accepted to ensure religious freedom. However, tolerance for ritual slaughter can only occur if the value of religious freedom is considered relatively higher in the hierarchy of values than the protection of animals.

The perceived power to interfere is an inherent condition for tolerance. If the subject of tolerance does not have the power felt to challenge the existence of objects of tolerance, we are talking about helplessness, not tolerance. Forced power, depends on whether the subject of tolerance has a dominant group in the community or minority, the dynamics of power between different groups and the ability to influence the dominant discourse that reproduces or challenges power relations.

The last aspect is related to tolerance limits. Vogt (1997) argues that tolerance appears in the gray realm between immoral and illegal. So, a tolerance limit is clearly illustrated by law, because illegal actions are not tolerated. However, there are certain attributes, attitudes, beliefs, and practices that (some) people may consider immoral, but which are not prohibited by law. One question that often arises in this context is the community level, where it must be tolerant of intolerant individuals or groups.

Separating tolerant attitudes that are truly existing and tolerant to "rational" which can only be obtained by means of consensus that can only emerge through ways of deliberation in which those who are related are obliged to engage in shared perspective taking. Such power of legitimacy can be general and institutionalized only in the process of democratic will. In short, political tolerance can only be guaranteed if applied in certain norms through a democratic process. With the goal of norms that uphold human rights.

Most scholars study religion from two main perspectives, namely the functional structural point of view and the perspective of conflict. (Johnstone, Ronald L., 2001) provides an overview of religion

in society from various perspectives such as structural, functional and conflict. There is an interesting connection between these theories when we use them to understand religious tolerance. In the author's assumption, the level of conflict in society will decrease when the tolerance level increases and vice versa.

The principle regarding inter-religious tolerance, namely: (1) there must be no coercion in religion whether coercion is in the form of being subtle or done roughly; (2) humans have the right to choose and embrace the religion they believe in and worship according to that belief; (3) it will not be useful to force someone to follow a certain belief; and (4) the Almighty God does not forbid living with non-understanding or non-religious communities, in the hope of avoiding mutual hostility (Ali, 1986).

The state acts as a harmonious national life manager over the plurality of existing religions, while religious leaders act as wise and synergistic broadcasters of the teachings so that the mission of religion as the creator of peace can be felt in the life of the state especially in strengthening national unity. The positive image of religion through the behavior of tolerant and wise religious people will determine the positive image of the country.

Result.

In the process, democratic attitudes have a long historical story, a society will flexibly practice freedom of opinion, feel safe when living together in a heterogeneous environment if their culture has indeed practiced a democratic way of life. Indeed, a reflection of democratic attitudes is a form of tolerant communication and interaction, both when addressing different religions, different cultures, and racial or ethnic minorities. Habermas said, not only does the term tolerance designate the general character of treating individuals with respect, more specifically we use it to refer to political policy through the form of agreement with different communities. In the sense of tolerance, as many philosophers have expressed, is a norm and a core element of free political culture or what we call liberal. (Jurgen Habermas, 2003).

Democracy is closely related to human rights provided by determining the set of moral principles agreed upon through democratic deliberations and embedded in positive law that serve as instruments for the practical implementation of tolerance. The implementation of human rights does not mean eliminating the pattern of intolerance, but it means neutralizing the practical impact of intolerance. In the words of Jürgen Habermas, "to end discrimination does not always signal the beginning of tolerance towards people who are no longer discriminated against", but the availability of individuals or groups to accept the interests of the rights of other parties as members who are equal to the political community.

Equality is one of the main assumptions of the concept of human rights, and the right to equal participation in the regulation of public norms is a prerequisite for democracy. This is why the catalog of human rights includes the right of every citizen to participate in politics, more broadly, the right to religion, socialization, economic rights and others. Thus, every citizen will have rights without distinction and without unreasonable restrictions: this is, basically, a human right to democracy. However, we need more than the right to participate politically equally.

Most, tend to narrow the concept of human rights to a catalog of civilized rules of behavior with humans. If in country X people are not tortured, if the police behave properly, and the function of the justice system is acceptable, we usually conclude that the country does not have human rights problems. In terms of the quality of democracy, we often predict it by analyzing democratic institutions and political procedures, such as the presence of political parties, parliaments, general elections, and so on. In fact, democratic political institutions and procedures are not only insufficient, but also operate ineffectively, without the foundation of human rights.

To ensure the actual applicability of the right to participation in equal politics, we need to safeguard classical liberal freedoms, especially freedom of expression, and freedom of association and assembly. By enjoying these rights, in turn, citizens feel safe this is why international and national

human rights include the right to life and physical integrity, prohibition of torture, the right to a trial that is fair and respectful of different personal, religious, cultural and ethnic life in between other rights. The symbiotic relationship between democracy and human rights is reflected in human rights articles or laws which stipulate that restrictions on certain things must go through the stages of the democratic process.

Simply put, we need democracy to practice tolerance. Own tolerance as expressed by John Christian Laursen (2005) in (Talib & Gill: 2012) has the meaning that policies to address something that is not fully accepted but has not been actively rejected. The word tolerance itself comes from Latin *tolerare* (to bear or endure), showing the basic meaning of receiving something. There is no single and widely accepted definition of the term, and it is almost no exaggeration to say that each writer uses it in his own way. Therefore, it might be best to understand the word with other similar words, for example, be willing, willing, understand and match the other words.

Tolerance is instilled through knowledge, openness, communication and freedom of thought. Tolerance is not only a moral value that every individual must have, but also a political requirement. Tolerance is capable of transforming a culture that has an antagonism into peace and harmony. Tolerance is the opposite of intolerance, which can be interpreted as a negative behavior and rejects the views and actions of others. The attitude of intolerance has the essence that there is a belief that considers the existence of a view or way of life that is better and better than others. The negative side is related to oppression, rejection of certain ethnicities, acts of discrimination, even genocide which ignores the needs and rights of other groups (Nur & Khadijah, 2013).

Nur and Khadijah revealed that many different religions were increasingly training to cultivate a tolerant attitude from each of their adherents. They also found that the elements and explanations of religious tolerance were indeed in the results of his research on religious diversity in Malaysia. By suggesting further research is needed to identify areas and limits of tolerance.

In one different place, in Dowd's study of diversity in Nigeria, different times and places that might influence both ideas applied in this way that encourage or inhibit religious tolerance. More precisely, in the development of the world, religious diversity received considerable attention. Many researchers have revealed that religious differences result in increasingly being less tolerant and more inclined to conflict leading to violence (Lipset 1959; Easterly and Levine 1997; Karatnicky 2002; Montalvo and Reynal-Querol 2003; Quinn and Quinn 2003; Esteban and Mayoral 2011). Other researchers also found evidence of a positive relationship between different religions and indications that illustrate greater tolerance. (Fearon and Laitin 2003; Fish and Brooks 2004). However, the two observer groups still found it difficult to believe that, religious diversity might produce more tolerance and advocate a causal relationship of tolerance which had an impact on religious diversity (Dowd, 2014).

According to Adeney (1926), in his entry of tolerance in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, the word 'toleration' in its application is legal, and doctrinal has a very limited meaning. This connotes refraining from prohibitions and persecution. However, this shows latent disagreement, and usually refers to a condition in which freedom, which is possible, is limited and conditional. Tolerance is not equivalent to religious freedom, and it is far from religious equality. He assumes the existence of an authority that may be coercive, but which for its own reasons is not pushed to an extreme attitude. This implies voluntary efforts, and political leeway.

Colin Gunton (1996), in his tolerance entry in the *Dictionary of Ethics, Theology, and Society*, defines tolerance as a virtue of readiness to receive for the greater good - especially the welfare of the community of beliefs and beliefs.

Every act of tolerance must limit the characteristics of what we must accept and determine what is rejected or cannot be tolerated. This limitation is given to escape the suspicion of something that exists outside the individual or group, the rules of tolerant behavior must be rationally accepted for all, not only accept dogmatically.

CONCLUSIONS.

The education of deliberative democracy can shape the character of society through the primacy of the use of deliberative decision-making procedures with dialogue and exchange of experience among the parties to produce a fair and mutually accepting agreement. Citizen involvement is at the core of deliberative democracy prioritizing cooperation between ideas and between parties. Democracy is deliberative, if the process of giving reasons for a candidate's public policy is tested first through public consultation or through Habermas's theoretical vocabulary of "public discourse".

The function of teaching people to behave democratically in a form capable of expressing opinions will have an impact on the softness of attitudes with a picture that is tolerant of other religions and cultures. To practice democratic practices requires habituation that starts from everyday life and is supported by a flexible culture in it; so that, the role of the state is very crucial to provide and support the existence of a healthy public space as a vehicle for people to implement this democratic education. This practice of democracy in public space was detected in the period 1920-1926; even though, it was brief, a turning point in the history of the previous social revolution in Indonesia, associations and meetings were usually held by educated indigenous elites.

Since the founding of the Sarekat Islam in 1912, ordinary people have begun to be included in the anti-colonial movement which is not only popular but also organized both inside and outside Java with the term *Openbare Vergaderingen*. The movement is concentrated in Java and Sumatra. These meetings were held in mountainous, coastal and even other remote areas in homes, fields, offices and theaters with a total of 50-10,000 people including men, women, Chinese, natives and citizens of Indian and Arab descent.

There are at least three theoretical implications of this *vergaderingen openbare* practice. First, these meetings were held to disguise the identity of the group so that they could unite against the colonial, in connection now it could be possible to unite together to fight foreign interests in national identity.

Second, behind the spirit of revolution that invites people to take part in public meetings is the desire to overcome the contradiction between the people and the colonial state that fails to represent the interests of the colonized people. This is different from the concept of liberal public space that is carried by Habermas. According to Habermas, 'public space' is an independent space that is separate from the state and market and is very important to create equilibrium between these three spaces. Third, public space forms a new identity for its members to achieve common goals.

The ideal public space can be used as a vehicle for education to instill tolerance value, with its melting form of dogmatic attitude which implies a negative tendency with prejudice, namely giving assumptions in advance to certain types of circumstances without knowing in advance what is actually rational. By placing it as a subject, the way is to place the majority as actors who tolerate attributes, attitudes, beliefs or behaviors that are considered undesirable, because conditions of tolerance can only exist when the subject of tolerance has the power to interfere, it might be concluded that the subject of tolerance must be part of the dominant group, for example in Indonesia and placing minorities as objects of tolerance. Object of tolerance that has attributes, attitudes, beliefs or behaviors that are not desired by individuals or majority groups. However, subjects of tolerance can also be part of a group minority in relation to other minorities or powerless in their own communities.

The principle regarding inter-religious tolerance is: (1) There must be no coercion in religion whether coercion is in the form of being subtle or done roughly; (2) Humans have the right to choose and embrace the religion they believe in and worship according to that belief; (3) It will not be useful to force someone to follow a certain belief; and (4) God Almighty does not forbid living with non-understanding or non-religious communities, in the hope of avoiding mutual hostility. On the basis of that assumption, when in a society already has a high tolerance level, the potential for conflict will be more likely to be avoided, and vice versa, the conflict that ends in violence will potentially arise when people tend to be intolerant.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Adeney, W.F. (1926). Toleration in Hastings, James. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Vol 12. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. p 361.
2. Ali, Mohammad Daud. (1986). *Islam Untuk Disiplin Ilmu Hukum, Sosial dan Politik*. Jakarta: CV Wirabuana.
3. Arief, Yuvantra, (2015). *Orde Media : Kajian Televisi dan Media di Indonesia Pasca-Orde Baru*. INSISTPress, Yogyakarta.
4. A.T. Talib & Sarjit S. Gill. (2012). *Global journal of human socialscience*, volume XII issue VIII version I may.
5. Calhoun, C (ed.) (1992). *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, (London: The MIT Press).
6. Evan Stewart, Penny Edgell, and Jack Delehanty. (2017). *The Politics of Religious Prejudice and Tolerance for Cultural Others*, *Journal of The Sociological Quarterly*.
7. Finlayson, G. (2005). *Habermas: A Very Short Introduction*, (Oxford: Oxford UP), 55.
8. Fraser, N. (1990). "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," *Social Text* (25/26/1990): 65.
9. Hardiman, Budi, (2009) *Demokrasi Deliberatif*. Yogyakarta : Kanisius.
10. Hassan, M. K. and Basri, G. B. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Malaysia; Religions and Beliefs*. Singapore, Archipelago Press.
11. Ihsan, Bakir. (2009). *Menebar Toleransi Menyemai Harmoni*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
12. Johnstone, R. L. (2004). *Religion in Society: A Sociology of Religion*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
13. Jurgen Habermas, (2003). *Intolerance and discrimination*, *Oxford University Press and New York University School of Law, LCON*, Volume 1, Number 1, pp 2-12).
14. Laursen, J. C. (2005). *Toleration*. In Horowitz, M.C. *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. London: Thomson Gale. v. 6 p. 2337.

15. Laura Kurth & Pieter Glasbergen, (2017). The influence of populism on tolerance: a thematic content analysis of the Dutch Islam debate *Culture and Religion, an Interdisciplinary Journal*. 18:3, 212-231, DOI: 10.1080/14755610.2017.1358194.
16. Martin Ruitenberg, (2010). Conflict, Affect, and Political: On disagreement as democratic capacity. *In factic Pax*, 4(1).
17. Martin Samuelson. (2018). *Democracy & Education*, vol 26 no 1, education for deliberatif democracy and the aim of consensus. Nehushtan, Y. (2007). "The Limits of Tolerance: A Substantive-liberal Perspective." *Ratio Juris* 20 (2): 230–257. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9337.2007.00357.x.
18. Newman, J. (1978) "The Idea of Religious Tolerance." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (3): 187–195.
19. Nur Farhana Abdul Rahman & Khadijah Mohd Khambali., (2013). Religious Tolerance in Malaysia: Problems and Challenges *International Journal of Islamic Thought* Vol. 3: (June) 83.
20. Robert A. Dowd. (2014). *Religious Diversity and Religious Tolerance : Lessons From Nigeria*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2016, Vol. 60(4) 617-644 The Author(s).
21. Subijanto, R. (2014). *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism*. Immanuel Ness dan Saër Maty Bâ (eds.), Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. **Alif Firdaus Zamzam.** Postgraduate student of Social Education, State University of Yogyakarta. **Indonesia.** E-mail: azekzam@yahoo.com
2. **Setyabudi Indartono.** Associate Professor and teaching staff at the State University of Yogyakarta. **Indonesia.** E-mail: setyabudi_indartono@uny.ac.id

RECIBIDO: 8 de agosto del 2019.

APROBADO: 22 de agosto del 2019.