

Taking Up Deliberative Democracy and Tolerance of Indonesian Plural Society From Axel Honneth's Recognition Perspectives

Fabianus Fensi

¹(Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, BundaMulia University, Indonesia)

ABSTRACT: *Modernity has a quite serious impact on both humans and humanity. The world is boundless because it's not only a place but a set of values that determine how humans are arranged and controlled technologically. This research questions the phenomenon of shifting values of Indonesian plurality, which no longer reinforces the basis of deliberation as the best way to overcome the conflicts of their community. Strengthening social conflicts with identity issues (race, ethnicity, class, and religion) triggers disintegration between citizens. By using the perspective of "recognition" of Axel Honneth, this study not only questions the deliberative democracy but also the praxis of tolerance that is used to dialogue the social plurality of the nation's history. According to Honneth, each individual becomes what they are only in and through a relationship of mutual recognition with others. Mutual recognition is an overall characteristic of a society's intersubjective relations. So, it should go beyond the praxis of tolerance, the dimension of recognition, not only placed but also must be established as a "conditio sine qua non" that strengthens the multicultural rationality of the Indonesian. Three types of recognition: love, respect, and esteem can overcome the deliberative consensus pathology experienced in a plural society.*

KEYWORDS: Deliberative Democracy, Plural Society, Recognition, Tolerance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The world is increasingly showing its changing face. Open association between world societies without barriers becomes a smooth path for all forms of change. So it is true that Marshall McLuhan (1911-80) made an analogy of this giant world, as nothing more than just a global village. The terminology refers to a new form of social organization that is instantly controlled electronically through television, radio, and even digital media. The world becomes a whole, both in terms of social, political change, and also the value system adopted in the cultures of the world community (Baran, 2012: 231).

As part of a world that is traversed by new modern technology transportation routes, Indonesia is entering a new era of self-development. No longer isolated, but become part of the world and are involved in changing the world. Indonesia no longer places itself as a spectator of the ongoing match, but also an active player who makes the playing field named the world, pleasant to watch, or, on the other hand, becomes ugly so that it is avoided as far as possible from being watched.

Now, globalization, according to John Hartley (2002: 98) is no longer as simple as it is described by many as a mere process of reducing understanding of world economic problems but has touched a broader dimension, namely regarding the culture and culturing of the world community. The phenomenon of the spread of global entertainment, the availability of types of fast food, fashion, and tourism (Hartley, 2002: 98) is a cultural dimension that is influenced by globalization. Global culture is no longer an opposition to local culture,

traditional communities, and cultural identities, but a complete unity that encourages the possibility of the birth and increase of new cultures (Hartley, 2002: 99).

Based on that, we can say that globalization, - the real child of modernity - is no longer just a tool, but also the existence of modern society. We also know that modern society is characterized, not only by the recognition of me as a subject, other - not insignificant - as far as maximizing my autonomy the subject can be considered to be accepted but also marked by the emergence of a plurality of values, an expression of a plurality of values, ideologies, actions that reflects ideology, views, ways of life, practices of ways of life, ways of thinking, and expressions of thinking in society.

The meeting of various value standards, on the one hand, illustrates the wealth of the world that can fill the space of relativity, on the other hand, the mixing of various values without the resilience of the normative infrastructure of local culture creates a crisis of its own in culture. Modern society, including Indonesian society, consciously or unconsciously is experiencing a great crisis when faced with vis a vis various global phenomena, namely: the diversity of values, ideologies, and ways of life that accompany them.

Jurgen Habermas (1929-) has warned that the crisis is nothing but disruption to system integration which will ultimately threaten the survival of social integration stakes. Social integration is at stake because all norm structures obtained through consensus are deliberately destroyed so that society is threatened with moral chaos/anomie (Hardiman, 2009: 162-165). Conflict cannot be avoided, when the old values which are integrated into the common consensus of the local community and culture, are marginalized because of the instant offer of new global values. The pain of this process was initiated by a set of contemporary digital social media.

The digitization of social media is bringing the world to be "I" and "I" to become my world. As part of the world community, the value conflict caused by the globalization of modernity values must also be experienced by the Indonesian people. We can no longer use the judge's perspective, which punishes a new value that comes as not ours. Say, the value of democracy can no longer be seen as a new value, the result of imports, but should be seen as a modification of the cultural value of an already established nation. This means that long before modern democracy was adopted by most of the world's nations, Indonesia already had a democratic and deliberative way of communicating, which was very strong in a deliberative nature, in what we know as deliberation for consensus, *musyawarah-mufakat*.

This research is intended as a reaction to the recent flood of information through the globalization of social media in Indonesia. Social conflicts trigger a trend of disintegration between groups. The basis for deliberative democracy has been deliberately forgotten, even though this pattern was used by the founding fathers to respond to the social plurality of the nation's history. By using Axel Honneth's "Recognition" perspective, this study intends to file a lawsuit against Indonesia's deliberative democracy in response to the given history of being a pluralistic nation (ethnicity, religion, race, intergroup, views, ideology, and belief) and democratic since its birth.

This study will consecutively discuss: the concept of deliberative democracy, the essence of a plural society, the essence of Axel Honneth's idea of recognition, and based on this concept, social conflict is then placed as a pathology. The whole discussion was closed by discussing the plurality of Indonesia in Axel Honneth recognition lens.

II. Discussion

Deliberative Democracy

In the introduction to the book "Power in Deliberative Democracy, Norms, Forums, Systems", Nicole Curato, et al (2019: vi) says that deliberative democracy does not only exist because of the phenomenon of power, but it

also exists to question the roots of the phenomenon of power. According to him, deliberative democracy does not only deal with, or influence forms of justification of power but also affect the power of justification. Power in a deliberative democracy is distributed dynamically.

For Robert Tallise, deliberative democracy takes place in a context where our aspirations are systematically turned against itself due to polarization and information inequality (Curato, 2019: 2). According to Nicole Curato, deliberative democracy draws our attention, not only to the various possibilities for overcoming the certainty of pathologies of political life, but also the possibility that these pathologies obscure power relations.

Deliberative democracy began as a form of criticism of liberal democracy which affects individual rights and various competitions in general elections. The implications of deliberative democracy for the vision of democracy are (1) the emergence of an inclusive, open rational discussion and (2) providing a democratic voice room for ordinary citizens (Curato, 2019: 3). Deliberative democracy is not a matter of rules, laws, and norms, but how appropriate procedures are taken to produce these rules or laws. Deliberative democracy asks basic questions, namely under what conditions the rules are produced so that citizens obey (Hardiman, 2009: 128-129). Deliberative democracy emphasizes a consultative process (deliberation) in producing a rule for living together, not on the results achieved from these rules.

Jurgen Habermas has three academic positions regarding deliberative democratic politics (Hardiman, 2009: 130-132), namely: (1) The need for rules of the game in democracy, guarantees for the right to freedom, parties must compete, have fair elections, emphasize the principle of majority, and public rational debates; (2) Context-sensitive deliberative democracy. He takes into account changes in society globally through information technology (internet, multimedia, and telecommunications). Democracy is born from within the society and is driven by the existing system. Deliberative democracy is how the potential for rationalization of rule of law practice is actualized; (3) Ideally deliberative democracy is characterized by the importance of rational argumentation, openness of consultation participants, freedom from all forms of coercion; and reaching consensus.

The question is, what is the fate of deliberative democracy in contemporary communicative society today? Hanna-KaisaPernaa (2017: 13) in a study on "Deliberative Future Visioning: Utilizing the Deliberative Democracy Theory and Practice in Future Research" said that the essence of deliberative democracy lies in its direct attention to the open decision-making process, placing every participant in an equal position, and emphasize the quality of the argument. The legitimacy of decision-making lies in rewarding the public consultation process by citizens in a free and egalitarian manner.

The quality of the consultative deliberation process, according to Hanna-KaisaPernaa lies in the following five possibilities: (1) Correct and relevant information gives each participant an obligation to assess the various alternative resources available; (2) Emphasizes the evaluation of various considerations as the basis of a consultation; (3) Respect the differences and heterogeneity of society in every debate; (4) Awareness of the power of argument which is free from pressure; and (5) Taking into account equality and evaluating all forms of argumentation based on the quality of the content, not from the social position/prestige of the participants in making arguments (Pernaa, 2017: 14).

The future of deliberative democracy has a visionary and vital prospect as an inseparable part of the communication process, both in democratic decision-making in parliamentary legislation, as well as self-regulation, and in living the civil society movement. Deliberative democracy according to Robert Richards (2015: 1) is indispensable because its procedures in decision making require participants to base themselves on the norms of equality and mutual respect, collect information on an issue, prioritize values, determine policy solutions, analyze the consequences of a solution, and choose one of the many solutions by following the rule of democratic decisions. The rational legitimacy of a consensus is the main goal of deliberative democracy (Richard, 2015: 2-3).

Habermas emphasized that although deliberative democracy cannot completely solve socio-political problems, at least deliberative democracy can show a way of solving problems by adhering to democratic procedures. Deliberative democracy has the stance that the more often we solve socio-political problems using nonviolent discursive means the more inclusive and open rational discourse is carried out. The consequence is that the more stable and dynamic life together with society is politically recognized (Hardiman, 2009: 170).

Plural Society

Arend Lijphart defines plural society as political parties, interest groups, communication media, schools as volunteer associations, which tend to be segmentally organized by club lines, such as religion, ideology, language, group, culture, and ethnicity. Although the main emphasis of this definition is centered on political plurality or the assumption of political parties and the various interest groups involved in it, one thing is that politics or political parties always play through the symptoms of religious, ideological, linguistic, and ethnic diversity. We agree with Richard Bellamy (2001: 3) that the basic basis of social pluralism is the integration of various values, both moral and non-moral, in the life practices of different societies.

True pluralist societies are people who can accept differences in culture, value traditions, and beliefs to create a better life together. Or, if you want to summarize, the plurality of society is a condition where there are so many resources and it comes to be lived as a guide for togetherness in society (Bellami, 2001: 2). Thus, the plurality of society (culture, ethnicity, race, class, and religion) inevitably contains within itself the diversity of values and appreciation of these values. The act of respecting plurality is also a demand to respect the fact of the diversity of values contained by these different elements.

This research focuses on the context of the plural society in Indonesia. Countries with various conditions, even preconditions that are complicated and problematic, because social plurality is framed in the reality of multiculturalism. The reality of multiculturalism in Indonesia can be emphasized as something that is given, which means that the history of the Indonesian nation has its strength standing on the diversity of cultures, ethnicities, races, groups, beliefs, and religious beliefs. Plurality is the basic foundation for the establishment of nationality and statehood.

According to Donny GahralAdian (2011: 2), the roots of all forms of commitment to pluralism and tolerance as ideals born in the womb of the Indonesian nation are manifested in cooperation. According to him, the ideals of “gotong royong” (helping each other) provide a set of pragmatic and non-ideological frameworks to build consensus discourse amidst limited tolerance. Social consensus building is essential for creating peace in a multicultural society. In a book review entitled: *Pluralism, Democracy, and Tolerance*, the *Ledalero Journal* writes: “The fact of plurality in Indonesia is seen in the diversity of ethnicities, ethnicities, languages, and religions. Since Indonesia was founded, the founding fathers have realized that the mistake of taking a stand on the diversity that exists will have fatal consequences for the survival of Indonesia as a country (Watu, 2012: 403).

With these quotes, it would be emphasized that the plurality of society in multiculturalism is a *conditio sine qua non*, whose existence cannot be negotiated. Thus, the plurality of society (culture, ethnicity, race, class, and religion) inevitably contains within itself the diversity of values and appreciation of these values. The act of respecting plurality is not only a categorical imperative, which demands that we respect the fact of the diversity of values contained by these different elements, but also a categorical imperative that goes beyond that, that we are required to live in plurality and continue to live it.

In the context of the plurality of religious beliefs in Indonesia, we agree with Zainul Fuad (2007: 98) that the often-used depiction states that people easily equate religious pluralism with religious differences, whereas pluralism does not only refer to differences in their appreciation of the religion they embrace, but more than that pluralism is a form of appreciation for the fact that religious pluralism is a positive value in our society.

Thus, a plural society can be identified as a social, cultural, belief, value, and belief condition that grows and will continue to live in a variety of differences. Differences are the foundation of the existence of a society. Therefore, it is not enough for a difference to be accepted, further than that, it is acknowledged. Plural society always demands to be recognized for its existence just as it also recognizes the existence of other people / other communities in living together socially.

Axel Honneth and the Idea of Recognition

Talking about recognition means talking about a thinker, philosopher, and social theorist from the third generation of the Frankfurt School, Axel Honneth (1949-). Born in Essen, Germany, in 1949, to a father named Horst Honneth and a mother named Annemarie Honneth. He was involved in the student movement (1969-1974) and studied many fields of science (philosophy, sociology, and various German literature). The knowledge he got from several places: Bochum, Bonn, and Berlin.

He achieved his Master's program in Philosophy at Bochum (1974) while he earned his doctoral program at the Free University, Berlin. In 1980, while completing his doctoral study program, he published an important book entitled "Social Action and Human Nature" with Hans Joas (1980). In 1985, his doctoral dissertation entitled, "Critique of Power: Reflective Stages in a Critical Social Theory" was published. In 1983, he moved to Frankfurt to become Jurgen Habermas's assistant in philosophy. In 1990, Axel Honneth completed a second dissertation entitled "Struggle for Recognition." This is a work that synthesizes all critical thinking in the third generation of the Frankfurt school.

What distinguishes Honneth's thinking from the first and second generations, Max Horkheimer (1895-1973), Jurgen Habermas (1929-)? Honneth talked about two things: (1) structural transformation of recognition, and (2) the paradox of capitalist modernization (Zurn, 2015: 1-4). His thoughts are scattered in the many books he has written himself, co-authored with others, or edited/journaled. All of Axel Honneth's thoughts are synthesized in his theory of social recognition. According to Honneth, the normative criteria of critical theory are not only guided by cognitive rationality but also based on the norm of recognition which is closely related to the inner disposition of the subject.

According to Honneth, each individual becomes what they are only in and through mutual recognition relationships with others. Mutual recognition is the overall character of an intersubjective relationship, both the relationship between parents and children, the love relationship between two friends, the subjective legal relationship, the relationship between participants in the labor market, the relationship between consumers and producers, the relationship between citizens, the relationship between men and women, relations between members of different ethnicities and races, relations between various groups of civil society, as well as relations between democratic factors in social and political life (Zurn, 2015: 6).

According to Honneth, a person's identity is fundamentally determined by the construction and maintenance of social recognition. The distinctive identity of a person demands moral sensitivity to be recognized by others and is also a basic moral obligation for us to acknowledge others as well as in building intersubjective relationships. Honneth thus prepares a typology of different forms of mutual recognition as a practical identity formation procedure (Zurn, 2015: 7).

He criticized Habermas' theory of communicative action for limiting himself to the dimensions of communication rationality but forgetting the dimension of social recognition. Honneth raises the dimension of social recognition as an important aspect of the spirit of modernity. According to him, recognition is not just a cognitive intersubjective pattern of the socialization process but it also contains moral and psychological prerequisites that shape the desire for emancipation (Schmitz, 2019: 176).

Honneth criticized both the first and second generation of critical theories of the Frankfurt School, for their pathology in their claims of rationality. According to Honneth, there is a universal ratio that provides various possibilities for the subject's self-actualization to be realized but is distinguished by the nature of its practical action. According to Honneth, when Horkheimer talks about work, and when Herbert Marcuse talks about aesthetic life, or when Habermas talks about communicative consensus as a prerequisite for social integration, then at the same time there has been a social pathology or a deficit process of rationality.

Social pathology occurs due to the unavailability of the subject's self-expression space in society. Or, pathology occurs because the rationality potential of modern society cannot be actualized through participation in a social institution, or in behavioral practices, and its daily life. Self-actualization of the subject is only possible by a universal ratio which always directs itself based on ethical principles or the process of institutionalizing a rational goal.

The theory of Axel Honneth's recognition was deliberately built to overcome this social pathology. By referring to Hegel (Runesi, 2014: 327-338), Honneth reconstructs the form of social recognition that determines the self-development of the subject, in three ethical areas, namely: (1) the subjective area (love); (2) objective area (legal rights); and (3) social area (solidarity). The subjective area (love) is the basis for the recognition of social subjects. Love is not just an individual (family) experience, but a social experience that reaches out to others outside the family (outside the self). According to Honneth, recognition is not only genetic but also logical because it is acceptable insofar as it affirms the growth of subjective agency confidence.

While the subjective area of love emphasizes the recognition of reciprocal identity among social subjects, legal relations in the objective sphere emphasize the equal status of each social subject. Social subjects and other social subjects recognize each other as legal subjects and obey the same laws that have been agreed upon. According to Honneth, in an attitude of obeying the law, legal subjects recognize each other, both as individual persons who have the autonomy, and rationally decide to obey the law based on socially acceptable norms through the consensus.

According to Honneth, solidarity in the social sphere is a social structure that is situated in a normative order. And that normative order is none other than where social subjects can realize their freedom. Individuals found in the social community values that can be accepted to realize their potential. According to Honneth, solidarity is not a facticity, as Martin Heidegger admits, but a precondition, because solidarity is a relentless effort to continue to find facticity. For Honneth, the essence and existence of our humanity do not determine a fact of solidarity, but rather the struggle to form solidarity that is the essence and existence that determines our humanity (Runesi, 2014: 338-339).

Indonesian Tolerance in Axel Honneth's Recognition Lens

A journal is written by Olli-Pekka Vainio and Aku Visala, (2016), entitled, *Tolerance or Recognition? What Can We Expect*, is interesting not only because it has a slightly provocative nuance, but, although it is written in a western context, it is suitable to be submitted to the Indonesian reading public? The word "tolerance" is familiar to Indonesians. Its appearance coincided with the history of nationality. Meanwhile, the word recognition does not seem as familiar as when we use the word tolerance.

If traced encyclopedically, the word "tolerance" in the Indonesian language can be interpreted in three contexts, namely: (1) as a tolerant trait or attitude: Two groups of different cultures are interconnected with tolerance; (2) Limits of measurement for additions or subtractions that are still allowed; (3) Deviations that are still acceptable in job measurement (Ministry of National Education, 2008: 1478). Meanwhile, the word "recognition" is not specifically written in the Big Indonesian Language Dictionary. This word can only be traced from the use of the word "aku" (I) as a pronoun for the first person to speak or write (in a familiar manner), myself, I (Ministry of National Education, 2008: 32). The word "aku" ("I") gave birth to the word "mengaku" (declare/consider

himself). The word "recognition" is closer to the word "pengaku" (recognitor/confessor). By using the suffix "an" in the word "pengaku", the resulting word "pengakuan" (recognition) is defined as the process, method, act to recognize or acknowledging (Ministry of National Education, 2008: 33).

The question is, in what context are these two words used? Is tolerance a condition of recognition? Or is recognition a prerequisite for a tolerant society? How did Axel Honneth initiate the recognition project? Is it in the context of building a tolerant attitude from a rational society? Questions that are difficult to answer, but need to be given adequate reflexive space. By referring to the meaning of tolerance as a tolerant trait or attitude, the emergence of this terminology always presupposes the existence of social differences as the locus of a society's interaction. And, recognition is a rational consequence of social differences to be accepted as the common property of society. Acknowledgment is a rational act as an expression of tolerance in a plural society.

From its history, Indonesia contains within itself the diversity of socio-culture, values, beliefs, religions, ethnicities, and races. If explained from a cultural perspective, Indonesia is a country with a strong multiculturalism status. Indonesian multiculturalism is expressed through practices of different values, beliefs, religions, ethnicities, and races. This social reality can be viewed as both wealth and danger. Indonesian plurality can become a nation's wealth if they can provide the potential for unity to strengthen a common identity, but he becomes a danger if they are being placed as a group identity as opposed to the identities of other groups.

The danger of multiculturalism makes Axel Honneth's concept of recognition not only relevant but also important. The increasing constellation of social movements post-cold war has also increased awareness to drive a positive assessment of ethnic diversity and the development of social justice for minority groups (Anna, 2018: 10). Here multiculturalism advocates for social and political recognition among different identity groups and the way they maintain life within these different racial, ethnic and cultural categories. Diverse and different cultures in the concept of multiculturalism can be seen as a "body" of various social beliefs and practices in which everyone understands themselves and their world as a part that is organized collectively (Anna, 2018: 10-11). The question is where is the place of tolerance in a plural society, like Indonesia?

With tolerance, we agree to accept the fact that there are differences of opinion and differences in beliefs and practices in a society that has a high level of difference. Three possibilities are needed to make tolerance possible: (1) There is disagreement with one belief system and its practice in two different groups. If there is no agreement then there is a rational chance that one party will tolerate the other group; (2) There are possible ways in which one party could, provided they are given the option to hide or forget acts of tolerance; (3) There is a possibility that the act of hiding and supervising is not carried out so that differences of opinion are allowed (Vainio, 2016: 554).

We know that the consultative function through a deliberative-consensus scheme is part of the history of Indonesian political decision-making. The author believes that Indonesia's deliberative democracy, which was formulated through a collective agreement scheme, exists due to historical considerations of socio-cultural plurality. The question is, does the deliberative function guarantee the strengthening of citizen tolerance?

Goenawan Mohamad (senior journalist), in a commentary on the book "Deliberative Democracy" written by F. Budi Hardiman (2009), wrote: "Indonesia has gone through two ages when" deliberative democracy "was severed. First, in an almost totalitarian revolutionary political atmosphere, it was called "Demokrasi Terpimpin" (Guided Democracy) from 1958-1966. Second, under the bureaucratic-authoritarian rule, it was called the "Orde Baru" (New Order), 1966-1998. Now, after the reformation, can democracy bring us to a strong consensus?"

This comment implies a problem of consensus pathology due to the influence of the political regime. Consensus to be different breeds tolerance. But what is wrong with tolerance so that politics and practices of sectarian life

are getting stronger through the institutionalization of identity-based politics? We know that identity politics reduces the idealism of tolerance. Religion, race, ethnicity, and various primordial censuses should be given space to be involved in managing the rational public sphere. This problem must be solved immediately. How to solve it?

Tolerance agreement in a plural society must be reinforced by the dimensions of recognition. Here, Axel Honneth becomes important because intersubjective recognition in a plural society becomes a *conditio sine qua non* that strengthens the rationality of multiculturalism. Three types or models of Honneth recognition: love, respect, and acceptance (Vainio, 2016: 555) can overcome the pathology of deliberative consensus in the plural society, in Indonesia. Indonesia's deliberative democracy should be not stopped at a mutual agreement to be tolerant only but go beyond that, namely, must act to recognize one another in an intersubjective way among different subjects, whether in religious, ethnic, racial, cultural, or political beliefs.

III. Conclusion

The recognition's project of Axel Honnet is important to organize the rationality of modern society. Modernity gave birth to a variety of value systems that influence social action in modern society. The emergence of various value systems creates conflict as well as a shock for the community, both as individuals and socially. Identity politics is getting stronger, adding to the burden of conflict in this plural society.

As part of a world with multiculturalism, Indonesia is dealing directly with this identity-faced conflict. Various methods are used to overcome these social problems. Deliberative democracy should be revived. The pattern of political decision-making that is deliberative-consensus should be a rational-ethical way for society to build their intersubjective togetherness.

Tolerance is the basis for moral development to accept individual/group differences because ethnic, racial, religious and belief identities are believed to be sufficient ways to accept others as subjects. But in reality, this is not the case. The existence of differences is not to be accepted as part of the nation but instead is questioned. What is wrong? Axel Honneth offers that beyond tolerance: differences in cultural identities, religions, cultures, political views, and beliefs, it is not enough to stop at understanding and acceptance, but also recognize it or them! Actions for recognize!

The act of recognition always presupposes that we with others and others with us inhabit a common social space for sharing. This social sharing space must be recognized by all those who live it. Thus recognition means accepting a different identity, not to replace it, but to build togetherness in a situation without pressure and domination, but always based on three ethical dimensions of Axel Honneth's recognition: love, appreciation, and acceptance.

References

Journal Papers:

- [1.] Perna, Hanna-Kaisa, *Deliberative Future Visioning: Utilizing the Deliberative Democracy Theory and Practice in Future Research*, *European Journal of Future Research*, 2017, 13.
- [2.] Robert Richards, *Symbolic-Cognitive Proceduralism: A Model of Deliberative Legitimacy*, *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 2015, 2-3.
- [3.] Adian, Donny Gahral, 2011. *Multicultural Politics in Indonesia: Dialogue and Gotong Royong*, *Dialogue and UniversalimE Journal* (2)2, 2011, 2.

- [4.] Watu, Wilson Bhara., 2012. Responding to Plurality, *Journal of Ledalero (Discourse on Faith and Culture)*, (12), 201.
- [5.] Fuad, Zainul, 2007, *Religious Pluralism in Indonesia Muslim-Christian Discourse*, Doctoral Dissertation, 2007.
- [6.] Runesi, Yasintus T, *Recognition as Intersubjective Grammar According to Axel Honnet*, MELINTAS Journal, 2014.
- [7.] Vainio, Olli-Pekka, *AkuVisala, 2016Tolerance or Recognition? What Can We Expect?*, De Gruyter Open, 2016.

Books:

- [8.] Stanley J. Baran & Dennis K. Davis, *Mass Communication Theory: Foundation, Ferment, and Future (Sixth Edition)*, (Wadsworth: Cengage Learning, 2012).
- [9.] John Hartley, *Communication, Cultural and Media Studies: The Key Concepts (Third Edition)*, (London & New York: Routledge, 2020).
- [10.] F. Budi Hardiman, *Towards a Communicative Society, Science, Society, Politics, Postmodernism According to Jurgen Habermas*, (Yogyakarta: Kanisius., 2009)
- [11.] F. Budi Hardiman, *Deliberative Democracy: Considering the State of Law and Public Space in Jurgen Habermas's Discourse Theory*, (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2009).
- [12.] Nicole Curato, Marit Hammond, and John B. Min, *Power in Deliberative Democracy, Norms, Forums, Systems*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).
- [13.] Richard Bellamy, *Liberalism and Pluralism: Toward a politics of Compromise*, (New York: Routledge, 2001).
- [14.] Christopher F. Zurn, *Axel Honneth: A Critical Theory of the Social*, (Cambridge UK: Polity Press: 2015).
- [15.] Volker Schmitz, *Volker, Axel Honneth and the Critical Theory of Recognition*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).
- [16.] Ministry of Education of Indonesia, *Dictionary of Indonesian Language Center (fourth edition)*, (Jakarta: Gramedia, 2008).
- [17.] Bona Anna, *Honneth and Everyday Intercultural (Mis) Recognition, Work, Marginalisation and Integration*, (Sydney: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018)