

Developing a Dialogical Community in the Context of Multireligious Indonesia

Carolus Borromeus Mulyatno ^{1*}, Indra Tanureja ²

Faculty of Theology, Universitas Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta

Abstract-As a multicultural and multireligious nation, Indonesia has *Pancasila* as the basis of the state and the nation's philosophy of life. *Pancasila* contains religious-humanistic values extracted from the life experiences of various local communities that are widespread in the territory of Indonesia. Dialogue is one of the essential pillars in preserving Indonesia's plurality. To preserve the identity of a plural nation amid global relations, it is necessary to continue developing dialogue in all areas of life. This qualitative research, using the literature study method, aims to analyse the dialogue of the *Pancasila* community based on Jurgen Habermas' theory of communicative action. There are two significant findings from this study. First, there is a closeness of thought between communicative action in Habermas's thought and dialogue, which is a communicative action that preserves the values of *Pancasila*. Second, the communicative and dialogical actions of Indonesian communities, which are multicultural, multireligious, and multiracial, have a rational, egalitarian, and democratic character, as initiated by Habermas. The uniqueness of the communicative dialogue of the *Pancasila* community lies in the communal-affective and empathic character lived by various multireligious and multicultural local communities. Communicative dialogue is at the level of praxis of living together based on humanistic-religious values for unity in diversity.

Keywords: Community, Dialogue, *Pancasila* Values, Unity.

1. Introduction

Indonesia is a state consisting of various tribes, races, religions, beliefs, cultures and regions. In other words, Indonesia is a unity of plurality. The identity of every Indonesian is rooted and developed in the experience of dialogue in diversity. The diversity of cultures, ethnicities, races, religions and religions is a wealth that shapes the identity of the Indonesian nation. The identity of Indonesian can be seen in the richness of local traditions in the diversity of clothing, traditional house architectural styles, sports, local food, music, traditional ceremonies, dances, languages, fine arts, and local celebration rituals (Nuryanto, 2014).

In fact, differences in ethnicity, race, religion and culture can potentially cause social conflicts that threaten the unity of the nation in pluralism (Akhmadi, 2019). Often, social conflicts break out when triggered by sentiments of differences in race, ethnicity, religion, and belief. Therefore, all elements of national life have a role and responsibility to maintain unity in diversity as the nation's cultural and political identity (Pedersen, 2016). The big challenge for the Indonesian nation, which has a diversity of religions and beliefs, is to establish communication and mutual cooperation so that various religions and beliefs in diversity so that religions and beliefs contribute to the development of a just, brotherly, compassionate and peaceful national life (Kusuma & Susilo, 2020).

Although Indonesia is neither religious nor secular, belief in God Almighty is the soul of every Indonesian citizen's life (Nuryanto, 2014). Religious values based on religious teachings and local beliefs are integral to common life in Indonesia. Indonesian people live united in religious diversity and belief. In other words, Indonesia is not an adherent of pluralism that simply recognizes diversity but a nation that is united in diversity or a nation that is *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (unity in diversity). The paradigm of religious tolerance and belief oriented towards respect for diversity is no less effective for Indonesian people who are *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*. A relational, communicative, integrative, dialogical and affective climate of coexistence is needed to preserve unity in diversity for the development of productive, harmonious, just and peaceful coexistence (Nazar, 2014). Affective and dialogical touches on the formation of a religious, civilized, united, democratic and just Indonesian communities

that need to be continuously instilled in the understanding, attitudes, behaviour and habituation of every Indonesian citizen (Winarno, 2018). In other words, every Indonesian citizen has the duty and responsibility to preserve unity in diversity based on the values of *Pancasila* (five precepts as the foundation of national life).

Families, communities, and schools need to cultivate dialogical attitudes and communication skills for each of the nation's next generations so that living together in a diversity of religions and beliefs becomes a space to foster critical and dialogical attitudes. Jurgen Habermas is one of the famous thinkers in terms of public communication based on a critical attitude to build the transformation of society. Habermas's theory of communication helps people live respectful and democratic lives together (Best & Kellner, 2003). Habermas's ideas on public communication deserve to be explored and used to develop dialogical communication to realise a harmonious, peaceful and united life in diversity.

Research on communicative action to develop dialogue in the *Pancasila* community has never been made. In recent years, at least two people have researched the elaboration of Habermas's thought. Syahrul Kirom (2020) conducted research on communicative individuals from the perspective of human philosophy. He asserted that man is essentially a subject who communicates with another person to authentically assert his existence (Kirom, 2020). As social beings, each individual interprets himself in communicative actions. Tri Harnowo (2020) elaborated on Habermas' communicative actions for dispute resolution in his research. Mediation, in which people listen to each other democratically, is an important step in resolving various disputes that occur in social life (Harnowo, 2020). The study did not explicitly mention the relationship between communicative action and the appreciation of *Pancasila* which contains integral religious-humanist values.

No research publications have elaborated Habermas's thoughts on communicative action as a framework for developing *Pancasila* community dialogue. The researcher assumes that Habermas's thoughts on communicative action emphasize an egalitarian, democratic, and honest dialogue process to reach an understanding of common thought and action, which are very suitable for building dialogue in the *Pancasila* community. Therefore, researchers are encouraged to examine the theme. This qualitative research applies analytical-critical methods and literature studies (George, 2008; Sugiyono, 2018). The main source of literature is the thought of Jürgen Habermas. Other sources are used to construct analytical-critical arguments related to the development of dialogue in the *Pancasila* community.

Based on the description above, this study explores the main points of Jurgen Habermas's idea of communicative action as a philosophical framework for developing *Pancasila* community dialogue. Three basic questions guide this research. First, what is the basic idea or philosophical framework of Jürgen Habermas about communicative action? Second, how can the philosophical framework of communicative action be elaborated to develop dialogue in the *Pancasila* community? Third, how can the dialogue of life be rooted in the context of multireligious Indonesia?

2. Method

The proposed research method entails a qualitative study with a literature review approach that analyses the dialogical dynamics within *Pancasila* communities amidst Indonesia's multicultural and multireligious context. The research object comprises the dialogues occurring within these communities. At the same time, data is sourced from relevant literature encompassing academic articles, books, journals, and official documents concerning *Pancasila*, communication theory, and Habermas' communicative action theory. The population includes a wide array of literature, with samples selected based on inclusion criteria aligned with the research objectives. Data collection involves a thorough review and critical analysis of the selected literature, employing content analysis techniques to identify and explore predominant themes. The study refrains from stating explicit hypotheses due to its descriptive and exploratory nature, aiming instead to uncover implications for understanding and practicing dialogues within *Pancasila* communities in Indonesia's multireligious setting, potentially incorporating Habermasian concepts into local contexts.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Communicative Theory of Action Framework

Habermas described increased social public space in the XVIII century, such as the emergence of literary clubs,

salons, newspapers, political journals, political discussions and political participation (Best & Kellner, 2003). Modernity creates a positive climate through rationality in democratic public conversation. However, the development of state-backed economic capitalism is slowly taking over the control of public discourse and bringing society into an environment of domination. To that end, Habermas presented his ideas on critical theory (Habermas, 1984). In the context of the development of the Frankfurt School, Habermas's critical theory spread as a framework for critiquing various forms of domination that opposed rationality and the interests of human coexistence.

Habermas's critical theory is used in response to social problems that occur in society due to the dominance of a strong group over a weak group (Simons, 2006). In later developments, Habermas strengthened critical theory by elaborating on the contributions of communication theory and the philosophy of language (Simons, 2006). Language essentially articulates man's ideas and concerns about the situation he is experiencing. In other words, language is the expression of ideas that develop life and critique all forms of opposing religious-human values (Ritzer & Smart, 2009). Language is part of human expression in conveying ideas in a dialogical atmosphere. Through language, a person articulates his ideas and experiences originally buried in his mind and heart.

Critical theory is a long-term methodological program always being improved and equipped with new insights. In other words, critical theory is not a standard and completed frame of mind. An open attitude to discourse or dialogue in an egalitarian and democratic manner is a characteristic of critical theorists. Adherents of critical theory are open to many different perspectives and diversity of understanding of critical theory itself. Nevertheless, a common thread can be drawn that critical theory aims to build a climate and rational frame of mind that links reason and will, research and values, knowledge and life, and theory and praxis.

Habermas's critical theory critiques modern society's communication patterns that tend to live instrumental rationality with technological and technocratic consciousness. Habermas begins the description of the idea of communicative action by exploring the two pillars of sociality of modern society, namely the living world and the system (Habermas, 1984). In the book *Theory of Communicative Action*, Habermas explains that Horkheimer and Adorno's idea of work is inadequate because it does not place communicative dialogue as spirit in work (Habermas, 1984). Both figures whom Habermas criticized understood work as man's attitude toward nature. Man is placed as an active subject, while nature is understood as a passive object. The relationship between the two is asymmetry (Magnis Suseno, 2000). Habermas emphasized that there is communication at work. Communication is a dialogical act and not a monological one. The process of communication is always social-dialogical, not individualistic-dominative.

In communication, participants coordinate their action plans rather than using other participants to achieve group or individual goals (Habermas, 1984). Dialogical communication is a climate that fights the ice in communication asymmetry or polarized communication. This dialogical communication that unites ideas, wills and action plans for the development of life is what Habermas calls communicative action (Habermas, 1984). Communicative actions aim to achieve mutual understanding to avoid instrumentalization of communicating partners. Habermas's idea of communicative action in the context of social criticism is a form of improvement on various critical theories that tend to place the critic more dominant than the recipient of criticism. Communicative action is a dialogical encounter that places each individual involved in the dialogue on an equal footing and has an equal right to be involved in expressing his or her ideas.

Communicative action respects the dialogue process with an orientation towards understanding basic ideas, action plans and common steps to realize the common good (Habermas, 1984). Communicative actions have a humanist character and are not just strategic actions that occur in corporate organizations that are more oriented towards achieving targets or success that have been determined from the beginning before acting. To achieve goals designed from the beginning, strategic actions tend to justify persuasion, engineering, manipulation, suppression, and coercion roughly or persuasively. In communicative action, honesty, openness, and egalitarian or equal attitudes are emphasized to achieve common goals found in the praxis of communicative action. In the praxis of communicative action, each individual gets space to be actively involved to achieve mutual understanding. Communicative action occurs when social interactions are based on a concerted effort to understand each other and not on an egocentric basis for personal success. The process of acting communicatively is built on each person's commitment so that an atmosphere of intersubjective communication is formed that is open and free from

the pressure or dominance of certain parties.

Habermas presented a number of criteria that mark the validity or validity of communicative actions (Habermas, 1984). First, each person's statement contains truth. Second, the ideas conveyed contain accuracy (rightness). That is, dialogical communication is carried out in accordance with the normative context or applicable communication rules. Third, ideas and experiences conveyed in the praxis of communicative action contain honesty (truthfulness or sincerity). These three claims of validity are closely related to the objective-external world, the intersubjective world or society and the subjective-internal world.

The perpetrator of dialogue in the praxis of communicative action is a person who can distinguish rational and irrational attitudes. A subject who denies any of the claims or criteria for the validity of communicative acts can be categorized as irrational. If dialogue actors want to reach a common understanding, but deny one of the claims or criteria of validity, then mutual understanding cannot be achieved. The above claims or validity criteria cannot be coerced or fabricated. Thus, by committing to comply with claims or criteria of validity, interference or domination of certain powers can be avoided. Communicative action is successfully practiced when the parties involved can build a free and equal relationship (Magnis Suseno, 2000). The above claims of validity constitute the normative scope of communicative action praxis directed at claims of comprehension or shared understanding (Habermas, 1984).

Habermas presented four conditions for creating an ideal discussion situation in communicative action (Habermas in Hardiman, 2009). First, each individual who engages in dialogue gets the same opportunity to express his ideas and experiences. Second, in dialogue or praxis communicative action, all participants should be treated equally and have equal opportunities to express interpretations, statements, suggestions, explanations and justifications. Third, all participants should have a reasonable communicative attitude when conveying their ideas and experiences to other participants. Fourth, every participant in the dialogue or praxis of communicative action has equal authority in engaging in dialogue. In the praxis of communicative action, no participant is allowed to hinder the freedom and involvement of other participants in the dialogue. It can be concluded that the praxis of communicative action facilitates each individual's engagement and contribution, respect for equal rights and roles, convey ideas and experiences independently, and have equal authority in determining the direction of action.

Implementing these four conditions guarantees the achievement of communicative dialogue or action, namely rational consensus or mutual agreement. The praxis of communicative action, which is carried out continuously, eventually forms a rational culture that supports respect for equality and the involvement of each person in building a peaceful life together (Sitton, 2003). Gagasan Habermas's description of communicative action affirms that man is essentially a subject who communicates with another person. In this communicative act, an individual affirms his authentic existence (Kirom, 2020). Communicative action is the process of each individual asserting and meaning his identity as a social being.

3.2 The *Pancasila* Community Dialogue in Indonesian Context

Jürgen Habermas's frame of mind on communicative action confirms three central ideas. First, communicative action, as Habermas thinks, flows from being honest, right and appropriate according to the context and norms of society. Second, praxis and communicative action processes create a climate that supports individuals to actively engage and contribute, respect each other's equal rights and roles, dialogue ideas and experiences freely, and respect common authority in determining the direction of action. Third, the praxis of communicative action is directed at achieving an understanding of common goals.

If Jürgen Habermas's thoughts on communicative action are elaborated as a framework for dialogue in the *Pancasila* community, several important points are found in the table below.

Table 1. Communicative Action in the *Pancasila* Community Dialogue

Habermas Communicative Action	The <i>Pancasila</i> Community Dialogue
Batin Attitude: Honest, true and accurate according to context and norms	Inner attitude: confidence in God Almighty as the basis of an honest, true and accurate inner attitude in dialogue (1st please)
Process: Each individual is actively involved, contributing, respectful, dialogical, independent, respecting each other's authority, and directed towards a common goal	Process: Dialogue is carried out on the basis of equality as a creature of God (please 1st) in a climate of deliberation to find consent (4th, please 4th) manifested in the mutual mutual cooperation tradition.
Commonality of purpose: finding understanding, purpose and engagement to achieve a common goal	Equality of purpose: awareness and understanding to preserve the unity of nations in diversity (3rd please), creating social justice (2nd and 5th kind).

From the chart above, the three basic ideas of communicative action appear in the five precepts of *Pancasila*. The Precepts of the Almighty Godhead become the basic attitude to develop dialogue at all levels and fields of people's lives. By living the first precept as the spiritual basis of dialogue, deliberation and consensus which is the appreciation of the fourth precept of *Pancasila* has a direction towards realising a common life of religious-humanist value. The realization of a united society in diversity and social justice is a marker of religious-humanist life in the Indonesian context. The appreciation of harmonious, united, and ethical life values based on religious values is the orientation of the *Pancasila* community dialogue that is in harmony with the character of Eastern philosophy (Dewantara, 2017).

All Indonesians from various ethnicities, races, and cultures have faith in God Almighty. The belief in God Almighty that every Indonesian has is the philosophical basis that every citizen is equal as God's creation living in the context of multicultural, multireligious, and multiracial Indonesia. The diversity of islands, biodiversity, crops and oceans is also a gift that becomes a space for the growth of all Indonesian citizens (Sutoyo, 2010). A dialogue of life oriented towards the preservation and development of the nation based on the understanding and practice of *Pancasila* values including human development, natural wealth, and biodiversity within the framework of Indonesian unity.

Related to the basic attitude or inner attitude that is honest, correct and appropriate as a motivation for communicative action, can also be found in the precepts of *Pancasila*. The religious-human values contained in the precepts of *Pancasila* are the philosophical foundation and the basis for developing an honest, correct and appropriate inner attitude in living together. The values of *Pancasila* are the glue and unifier of the life of a harmonious and brotherly nation. In other words, *Pancasila* became the soul of the Indonesian nation (Bung Karno, 1960)

Five please *Pancasila* contain the sublime values of the nation's life in the course of a long history. Five please is an integral union that lives a nation in Indonesia's obscurity. (Dewantara, 2017; Oktavian, 2018; Hijriana, 2020). The first precept underlies the other four precepts. The Precepts of the Almighty Godhead are the basis that belief in the Almighty is the identity of Indonesian people. Mutual respect for followers of different religions and beliefs is part of the awareness and practice of living together. The just and civilized precepts of humanity are the basis for mutual respect for the dignity of the human person as God's creation without discrimination against differences. The precepts of Indonesian unity become moral principles and ethical imperatives for all Indonesians to preserve the unity of the nation. This precept is the basis that unity in diversity and difference is the identity of the Indonesian nation that needs to be preserved (Siswoyo, 2013; Mangunwijaya, 2020). Popular precepts led by wisdom in representative consultation are the basis for building a tradition of dialogue and deliberation in determining decisions related to the interests of living together. The principle of deliberation or dialogue provides opportunities and rights for every citizen to actively determine policies for living together. The precepts of social

justice for all Indonesians are the basis that the principle of justice guarantees living together in diversity. Fairness, solidarity and generosity to live in mutual aid or gotong-royong are philosophies of life that have been integrated with the traditions of Indonesian life since before independence (Endro, 2016; Dewantara, 2017).

For Indonesians, *Pancasila* is a philosophy of living together that contains ontological, epistemological and axiological values (Widuseno, 2014; Dewantara, 2017). The values of *Pancasila* are the life of the community that existed before the establishment of Indonesia as a State. Ontologically, the values of *Pancasila* become the basis of living together that moves to live together in brotherhood for the sake of national unity. Epistemologically, the values of *Pancasila* contain truths that have stood the test of time and are extracted from the life practices of various local communities spread throughout Indonesia. Axiologically, the values of *Pancasila* animate the lives of every Indonesian citizen and become ethical imperatives to preserve unity in diversity and develop the quality of life of the nation and the State of Indonesia. The distinctive thing about *Pancasila* is its existence that blends with the culture and life of the nation. *Pancasila* is not taken from the formulation of books and political theories, but is extracted from the experiences and traditions of communities in Indonesian (Darmadi, 2017)

Pancasila community dialogue is a praxis of living the values of *Pancasila* that believes in God Almighty, upholds just and civilized humanity, preserves the unity of Indonesia, realizes the rights and obligations of every citizen to actively participate in the life of the nation, and the struggle to implement social justice for all Indonesian people (Siswoyo, 2013; Hijriana, 2020). The process and praxis of *Pancasila* community dialogue becomes the implementation of the Indonesian nation's humanism-religious values, which are extracted from the experiences and traditions of multireligious Indonesian society (Darmadi, 2017; Mangunwijaya, 2020). The development of *Pancasila* community dialogue is the implementation of religious moral norms and ethical imperatives for every Indonesian citizen. In other words, *Pancasila* is the normative context of every Indonesian citizen in preserving and developing the State of Indonesia as a whole and with dignity (Na'imah, Sukiman, & Nurdin, 2017).

In an Indonesian society imbued with the values of *Pancasila*, dialogue is built on two essential human values that unite Indonesian communities (Mangunwijaya, 2020). First, various local communities in a pluralistic Indonesian society have religious values that become the soul of common life and contribute to Indonesia's unity. Second, diversity or unity in diversity is one of the essential structures or distinctive Indonesian characters. The founding fathers highly valued the nation's history which was shaped and developed in the experience of relations between citizens who have religious backgrounds (beliefs), races, tribes, skin colors, and languages in the context of thousands of islands, traditions, rituals, myths, legends, building symbolism, produce, and diverse flora-fauna. Indonesian diversity contains the Indonesian nation's religious values, philosophies, and humanism (Na'imah, Sukiman, & Nurdin, 2017).

The process and praxis of *Pancasila* community dialogue provide space for every citizen to contribute to building the nation and the world as a form of social justice. The spiritual and moral basis of social justice is the belief that every citizen needs each other together as social beings (Kaelan, 2002). Harmony and peace are the needs of every individual in living together in the midst of the world. The creation of a harmonious, peaceful and united life as a nation is the responsibility of each individual in togetherness that thickens the sense of security and gratitude of each individual as a member of community.

The unity of social and national life based on the values of *Pancasila* needs to be preserved and passed on from generation to generation through education. *Pancasila* education aims to shape the ability to behave: 1) able to take a responsible attitude in accordance with their conscience for the progress of the nation, 2) able to recognize problems living together and find ways to solve them, 3) able to recognize changes and developments in science and technology and art, 4) able to interpret historical events and national cultural values to rally the unity of Indonesia (Kaelan., 2016). In other words, education within the framework of *Pancasila* philosophical values forms superior personal character and skills, rational and collaborative academic character, religious character that unites diversity, empathetic and brotherly social character (Sulianti, 2018).

Pancasila is a vision and perspective of dialogical and humanist-religious common life in the *Pancasila* community for the affirmation of the identity of the Indonesian nation that respects the noble values of the nation, preserves diversity, and is open to dialogue in the era of globalization (Shofiana, 2014). The dialogue of the *Pancasila* community is oriented towards a vision of nationhood that preserves diversity in unity and appreciation for religious values that value humans as God's creatures who make a pilgrimage to Him as the purpose of life

(Dewantara, 2017; Mangunwijaya, 2020). The process and practice of *Pancasila* community dialogue strengthen the dynamic relationship of every fellow Indonesian in the spirit of mutual respect and unite the life of the nation in diversity. *Pancasila* community dialogue also aims to protect the diversity of natural resources and the environment as part of the practice of *Pancasila* values (Riyanto, 2006).

It is worth highlighting that Habermas's theory of communicative action contributes to the dialogue of the *Pancasila* community that needs to be built in a climate of communicative rationality. Communicative action aims to achieve well-being in each individual and society or lifeworld (Habermas, 1984). In the lifeworld, each lives solidarity for the realization of common welfare. Habermas understood that society is a network of communicative actions that harmonize functional obligations, maintain cultural continuity in society, sustain social order, and provide individuals with social competence. In the context of the *Pancasila* community, solidarity is synonymous with the philosophy of gotong-royong.

Pancasila is the unifier and soul of life of every Indonesian citizen since before the formation of Indonesia as an independent state. In the context of an independent Indonesia, *Pancasila* is the basis of the State, the philosophy of life and the nation's vision (Siswoyo, 2013; Hijriana, 2020). All Indonesians are united in the same ideal to develop themselves and contribute to the realization of *Pancasila* values through the spirit and action of gotong-royong. Family life, society and formal education activities have the same ideal, which is to realize the values of *Pancasila* for the preservation of national unity and the welfare of the entire nation.

Habermas's idea of egalitarian, democratic and rational communicative action helped to foster the process and practice of egalitarian and emancipatory-humanistic *Pancasila* community dialogue for the unity of national life. For Indonesian society that is diverse in educational levels, Habermas' communicative actions need to be complemented by a more persuasive and affective cultural approach through mutual activities that strengthen bonds of brotherhood and mutual cooperation. Living the values of *Pancasila* dialogically in everyday life integrally through mutual cooperation is a practice of Eastern philosophy in the Indonesian context (Dewantara, 2017).

In the condition of a plural Indonesian society, each community also needs to elaborate religious potential to build empathic relationships that support and dynamic the process and practice of dialogue that is manifested in the tradition of working together in common life in the community (Endro, 2016). Dialogue or communicative action of the *Pancasila* community becomes a space for the implementation of human activities that actualize cognitive, spiritual, affective, social, and moral potential directed at the integral preservation of national unity. The dialogue of the *Pancasila* community is integrated with the dynamics of the meaning of life of each person in Indonesia. The process and practice of *Pancasila* community dialogue takes place continuously in the midst of the times to affirm the nation's identity and affirm the nation's contribution amid global challenges.

Pancasila, which contains religious-human values, should not be reduced to mere practical political interpretation that tends to be led by the power interests of certain groups. Various religious and cultural communities need to encourage a spirit and climate of appreciation for the diversity of ways of living the values of *Pancasila* in various local wisdom of Indonesian society. By appreciating the various values of *Pancasila* in local communities, *Pancasila* is restored to its position as a national life force that contains religious values that unite people with religious and cultural diversity backgrounds. Various gotong-royong practices and local cultural traditions as an implementation of *Pancasila* values need to be preserved so as not to be easily displaced by the transactional way of life in an individualistic lifestyle in industrial society.

Habermas's idea of communicative action is very relevant to revitalize and contextualize the values of *Pancasila* through empathic appreciation of various cultural phenomena and traditions that actually represent the appreciation of *Pancasila* values in the local wisdom of people in various regions of Indonesia (Rosidin, 2016). To optimize the process of revitalization and contextualization of *Pancasila* values preserved in various local cultural treasures and gotong-royong traditions as the philosophy of life of the Indonesian people, political policy support in the form of legal instruments is needed. Thus, communicative actions manifested in the *Pancasila* community dialogue with an integral religious-humanist vision become awareness and practices that are guaranteed to be sustainable in the lives of people and various local communities in Indonesia.

3.2 Rooting in a Harmonious Life Dialogue

As part of Asian society, Indonesian society has a moral and religious life foundation that emphasizes the importance of dialogical communication practices in preserving unity in plurality. Religious values influence the formation of each person's character and society's way of life. Living in harmonious fraternity and solidarity takes precedence over individual interests to maintain unity in plurality. The climate of brotherhood and gotong-royong is preserved in various local communities spread across Indonesia. In social and political life, religious values derived from the philosophy of *Pancasila* have a major influence on the formation of communication patterns, relationships and leadership models (Dewantara, 2017). Religious values also affect the pattern and dynamics of education in families and communities. Religious values are influential in understanding the meaning and living the meaning of well-being.

Indonesians in particular and Asians in general believe that living on earth is a pilgrimage to the goal of immortality. Major Asian religions and various local faiths contains of beliefs about life as a pilgrimage process. Millions of Muslims spread across Asia and the world make pilgrimages to the holy land of Mecca. Christians also have a tradition of pilgrimages to holy places. The tradition of pilgrimage also exists in Hindu teachings. Buddhists also have a tradition of spiritual pilgrimage. In various local communities of Indonesian people there is also a tradition of pilgrimage to holy places. Pilgrimage is an activity that is driven by inner movement and choice from within the heart (Manchala, 2014). Pilgrimage is a spiritual movement that departs from the consciousness of the heart to the transformation of human life about nature. The pilgrimage symbolises a journey of religious people to understand their identity, their relationship with God, and openness to experience His help and guidance in achieving nourishment (Manchala, 2014).

Human consciousness as pilgrims is symbolically expressed in various traditional dances and ceremonies. The local ceremonies are concrete forms of traditional celebrations that express the human belief that life is a pilgrimage. Pilgrimage activities and traditional pilgrimage ceremonies express the belief that God is the master of human life and the universe. In traditional celebrations that express the belief in the importance of life renewal in the pilgrimage of life, the responsibility of humans to preserve nature is also clearly expressed. Human salvation is characterized by a harmonious relationship between humans and God and the universe that powers the liberation or development of each person's potential (Mangunwijaya, 2020). This belief is also one of the core teachings of the faith of the followers of major religions. By performing traditional ceremonies or local wisdom that express belief in the pilgrimage of life, followers of different religions get space to dialogue and renew relations and their commitment to preserving brotherhood and preserving nature. The practice of pilgrimage and dialogue within various local communities in Indonesia has its roots in religious beliefs passed down from generation to generation. As such, dialogue is not just a requirement of social life but an expression of religiosity that has spiritual significance.

Many indigenous religions in Asia and Indonesia live life as a pilgrimage and community life dialogue rooted in religious beliefs. Pilgrimage and community life dialogue are religious attitudes that have a relational and dynamic character (Painadath, 2014). Every human being is a pilgrim. It comes from the Creator and goes to the Creator. The dynamic spirituality of pilgrimage becomes a meeting point for various adherents of different religions to build a harmonious, just and brotherly life together so that they can help each other in undergoing the pilgrimage of life in peace and happiness. Relations and dialogues between followers of different religions and between mankind as pilgrims are increasingly qualified when each individual truly lives up to his responsibility to preserve nature and maintain harmony in this pilgrimage of life. In dialogue, awareness and responsibility are also built to realize justice and awareness as part of the human community as the same creation of God (Painadath, 2014).

As a nation rooted in diversity and rich religious values, Indonesia needs to optimize dialogue education between religions, beliefs, beliefs, cultures and local wisdom to affirm national identity and unity. The values of *Pancasila* are the basis for the development of a transformative dialogue paradigm to preserve cultural, religious, racial and ethnic pluralities in the midst of challenges and threats of national division. On this *Pancasila* earth, religious institutions are pillars of national life that control and maintain unity in diversity in a dynamic, collaborative, dialogal, emphatic, and transformative manner. Peaceful and transformative dialogue is a model of national life that deserves to be promoted to nations in the midst of this globalization.

4. Conclusion

The results of this study show the closeness of Habermas's idea of communicative action directed at understanding to realize common goals with the philosophy of mutual cooperation that emphasizes the establishment of brotherhood and harmony in living together. For the Indonesian people, communicative and mutual cooperation actions boil down to an understanding of preserving cultural diversity, religiosity, and tradition to realise national unity. Communicative actions that are empathetic and practiced through emancipatory or gotong-royong actions in various communities spread throughout Indonesia deserve publicized through various means or digital communication media. In the context of Indonesian society, Habermas's critical theory implemented through communicative action needs to be enriched with religious values, affective-communal motivation and tradition or habituation of gotong-royong (Winarno, 2018).

By using Habermas's frame of thought and *Pancasila's* frame of mind to carry out the practice of communicative action or community dialogue, the three claims of validity in dialogical communication as Habermas thought could be implemented integrally. *Pancasila* community dialogue embodies the objective-external world, namely the practice of living the values of deliberation, humanity that is just and civilized for the unity of a socially just Indonesia. This practice is carried out intersubjectively through dialogue and mutual cooperation (Dewantara, 2017). In the process of dialogue, the subjective-internal world in the form of ideas and affective powers is revealed in democratic, egalitarian and emancipatory public discourse. The process and practice of *Pancasila* community dialogue go hand in hand with the lives of the Indonesian people and nation in developing themselves and affirming their contribution to world development.

References

- [1] Akhmadi, Agus (2019). Moderasi Beragama dalam Keragaman Indonesia (Religious Moderation In Indonesia's Diversity). *Jurnal Diklat Keagamaan*, Vol. 13, no. 2; 45-55.
- [2] Best, S., & Kellner, D. (2003). *Teori Postmodernisme: Interogasi Kritis*. Yogyakarta: Boyan Publishing.
- [3] Darmadi, H. (2017). *Eksistensi Pancasila dan Undang-undang Dasar 1945 sebagai Pemersatu Bangsa*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [4] Dewantara, A. W. (2017). *Diskursus Filsafat: Pancasila Dewasa ini*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- [5] Endro, G. (2016). Tinjauan Filosofis Praktik Gotong Royong. *Respons: Jurnal Etika Sosial*, 21(1), 89-112. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25170/respons.v21i01.526>
- [6] George, M. (2008). *The Elements of Library Research*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- [7] Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communication Active Vol. 1: Reason and The Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- [8] Hardiman, B. F. (2009). *Demokrasi Deliberatif : Menimbang Negara Hukum dan Ruang Publik dalam Teori Diskursus Jurgen Habermas*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- [9] Harnowo, T. (2020). Penerapan Teori Diskursus Habermas Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa. *Mimbar Hukum*, 32(1), 55-72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.45145>
- [10] Hijriana. (2020). Building Indonesian Humanity trough Civic Education in High School. *Journal La Edusci*, 1(4), 26-30.
- [11] Kaelan. (2002). *Filsafat Pancasila Pandangan Hidup Bangsa Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Paradigma.
- [12] Kaelan. (2016). *Pendidikan Pancasila: Edisi Reformasi 2016*. Yogyakarta: Paradigma Indonesia.
- [13] Karno, B. (1960). *Pantjasila Dasar Filsafat Negara*. Djakarta: Jajasan Empu Tantular.
- [14] Kirom, S. (2020). Individu Komunikatif Menurut Jurgen Habermas Dalam Perspektif Filsafat Manusia. *Jurnal Yaqzhan*, 6(2), 202-216. DOI: [10.24235/jy.v6i2.7205](https://doi.org/10.24235/jy.v6i2.7205)
- [15] Kusuma, J. H., & Susilo, S. (2020). Intercultural and Religious Sensitivity among Young Indonesian Interfaith Groups. *Religious*, 11(1), 1-22. DOI: [10.3390/rel11010026](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11010026)
- [16] Magnis Suseno, F. (2000). *12 Tokoh Etika Abad ke-20*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- [17] Manchala, D. (2014). Theological reflections on pilgrimage. *The Ecumenical Review*, 66(2), 139-146.
- [18] Mangunwijaya. (2020). *Menumbuhkan Sikap Religius Anak-anak*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

- [19] Na'imah, Sukiman, & Nurdin, I. F. (2017). Developing The Model of Inclusive religious Education at Indonesia and Thailand Elementary Schools. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 7(5), 63-67.
- [20] Nazar, H. (2014). Interreligious Relation and Violence on Religion in Indonesia Religion Philosophy Perspective. *Al-Ulum*, 14(2), 311-324.
- [21] Nuryanto, M. A. (2014). Comparing Religious Education in Indonesia and Japan. *Al-Jamiah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, 52(2), 435-458. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14421/ajis.2014.522.435-458>
- [22] Oktavian, W. A. (2018). Urgensi Memahami dan Mengimplementasikan Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Dalam Kehidupan Sehari-Hari Sebagai Sebuah Bangsa. *Jurnal Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, 5(2), 123-128. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2016.1218534>
- [23] Painadath, S. (2014) *Spiritual Co-Pilgrims: Toward a Christian Spirituality in Dialogue with Asian Religions*, Quezon City: Claretian Publications.
- [24] Pedersen, L. (2016). Religious Pluralism in Indonesia. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 17(5), 387-398.
- [25] Ritzer, G., & Smart, B. (2009). *Handbook of Social Theory*. California: Sage.
- [26] Riyanto, A. (2006). Pengamalan/Aplikasi Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Dalam Aspek Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup. *Yustisia*, 69(1), 1-6.
- [27] Rosidin. (2016). Role of Local Wisdom in Preserving The Religious Harmony of Samin Community in Blimbing Blora. *International Journal of Latest Research in Science and Technology*, 5(2), 25-30.
- [28] Shofiana, G. F. (2014). Philosophy, Pancasila and Modern Technology. *Yuridika*, 9(2), 139-148. DOI : 10.20473/ydk.v29i2.363
- [29] Simons. (2006). *Contemporary Critical Theorists: From Lacan to Said*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [30] Siswoyo, D. (2013). Philosophy of Education in Indonesia: Theory and Thoughts of Institutionalized State (Pancasila). *Asian Social Science*, 9(12), 136-146. DOI:10.5539/ass.v9n12p136
- [31] Sitton, J. F. (2003). *Habermas and Contemporary Society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [32] Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- [33] Sulianti, A. (2018). Revitalisasi Pendidikan Pancasila dalam Pembentukan Life Skill. *Citizenship: Jurnal Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 6(2), 110-117. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25273/citizenship.v6i2.3156>
- [34] Sutoyo. (2010). Keanekaragaman Hayati Indonesia Suatu Tinjauan: Masalah dan Pemecahannya. *Buana Sains*, 10(2), 101-106.
- [35] Widisuseno, I. (2014). Azas Filosofis Pancasila Sebagai Ideologi dan Dasar Negara. *Humanika*, 20(2), 62-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.20.2.62-66>
- [36] Winarno. (2018). *Paradigma Baru Pendidikan Pancasila*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.