The Correlation between Flexible Humanism and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika as a Solution for the Rising of Intolerance in Indonesia during Covid-19 Pandemic

Septiana Dwiputri Maharani, Medaneo Wibowo, Maximillian Caesaro Parama Bisatya, Chalfi Laroza Virginindya and M. Rodinal Khair Khasri

The Correlation between Flexible Humanism and *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* as a Solution for the Rising of Intolerance in Indonesia during Covid-19 Pandemic

Septiana Dwiputri Maharani[*], **Medaneo Wibowo, Maximillian Caesaro Parama Bisatya, Chalfi Laroza Virginindya, M. Rodinal Khair Khasri**

Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

* E-mail: septiana.dm@ugm.ac.id

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic that has hit the world since the end of 2019 has caused many problems. While solidarity should have strengthened amid a crisis, intolerance has grown even more. The same thing happened in Indonesia. Based on the motto "*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*", this research intends to formulate a solution to alleviate this problem. This study uses the hermeneutic method to find its relevance to the issue of humanization. The results of this study indicate that the main point of view of Flexible Humanism is a solution that can be offered to overcome the problem of intolerance in Indonesia during the COVID-19 pandemic, and is found in the motto "*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*." In practice, humans must carry out an open dialogue that can be carried out through society in order to destroy human categorization and deconstruct the meaning of humans themselves which are the main causes of intolerance.

Keywords

The COVID-19 Pandemic, Intolerance, Flexible Humanism, *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, Human Categorization

1 Introduction

On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) has declared the COVID-19 coronavirus disease outbreak a global pandemic. The determination of this global pandemic status is due to the thirteen-fold increase in positive cases of Covid-19 with a total of 144 countries dealing with the spread of the Covid-19 virus (WHO, 2020). The Covid-19 pandemic has brought new impacts and challenges to be overcome by various nations and countries. Indonesia is also one of the country most severely affected by the Covid-19 pandemic in the Southeast Asia region, especially in the poor handling of the pandemic through regulations and policies provided by the government since the entry of the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia.

The poor handling of Covid-19 has created various tensions in various aspects of the state in Indonesia, especially democracy in society. Since the entry of the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia in 2020 until now, it has given rise to a distinctive democratic dynamic at the community level. This can clearly be seen through the persistence of various acts of intolerance as often happened in Indonesia both before the entry of the Covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia until now. In addition, the current pandemic phenomenon also amplifies the rampant acts of intolerance in society.

From the results on *Laporan Studi Pandemi, Demokrasi, Ekstrimisme Berkekerasan di Indonesia* conducted by The Habibie Center, it has found several cases of intolerance that occurred during the Covid-19 pandemic, such as acts of violation of places of worship and violations of worship that had dominated in Indonesia based on the collection of Media data conducted by Imparsial in 2019 (Alfons, 2019), is still emerging in 2020. Real acts of intolerance to hinder or prohibit the implementation of worship have occurred in various areas in Indonesia, such as the occurrence of actions to prevent the implementation of worship in Bekasi. A congregation of the Protestant Batak Christian Huria Church of Serang Baru City (HKBP KSB) was harassed by a group of masses outside the church singing by turning on loudspeakers to disrupt the implementation of worship carried out by the congregation in the church (Raharjo, 2020). The same thing also happened in Bogor, where a group of people who were also supported by local government officials tried to hinder the implementation of worship because the church that became a place of worship

had violated the rules in the Joint Decree for the permit to build a place of worship. (Boni, 2020). In addition, acts of intolerance also occurred in Mojokerto, which were carried out by the local village head by issuing an official letter addressed to the residents not to put up their religious symbols and make their houses a place of worship. (Santoso, 2020). Almost all cases of acts of intolerance that occur in Indonesia involve several different religious groups. However, acts of intolerance can also occur between the same religious group because of different views on something that causes a conflict within a group. As happened in Solo in August 2020, where a group of mobs abused family members who were doing wedding preparations with the excuse of wanting the event to be stopped (Zamani, 2020). The fact that the amplification of acts of intolerance in Indonesia during the Covid-19 pandemic is also reinforced by research data conducted by the SETARA Institute for Democracy and Peace, where incidents of violations of freedom of religion or belief fluctuated every month throughout 2020, such as in January (21), February (32), March (9), April (12), May (22), June (10), July (12), August (13), September (16), October (15), November (10), and December (8); thus the total cases of intolerance that occur are 170 cases in one year.

Based on the descriptive and quantitative data, it has shown an increase in acts of intolerance in Indonesia during the Covid-19 pandemic. The increase in cases of intolerance in Indonesia involving several religious groups reinforces the assumption that depersonalization of humans as components of a mass can degrade humanity to the level of objects that can be manipulated. In the act of intolerance itself, parties outside the subject group are manipulated solely as objects, such as; summoned using inappropriate words and violated civil rights.

The occurrence of an act of intolerance involving several religious groups cannot be separated from the existence of a conflict in it. Some of the factors that cause conflicts between religious groups include the existence of truth claims, where there is a tendency for people in religion to try to justify the teachings of the religion they believe in. This belief leads to forcing religious teachings to other people who have different beliefs with them, in fact there will always be a possibility where religion justifies its religion is the most correct and will always try to get validation for its truth. Thus, truth claims can lead to religious sentiments and have the potential to cause religious conflict. This phenomenon shows the division and categorization of religious people as human beings in the occurrence of a religious conflict in the act of intolerance.

It is undeniable that the depersonalization of humans as a component in a mass that causes dehumanism and the categorization of humans in religious conflicts is a factor in the increase in acts of intolerance in Indonesia during the Covid-19 pandemic. In the Covid-19 pandemic crisis, the existence of acts of intolerance in society has become a contradictory phenomenon in the disaster response period, where acts of intolerance still appear when solidarity between fellow human beings is very much needed in dealing with a crisis during a pandemic. Thus the problem of intolerance, especially during the pandemic, must be alleviated to achieve solidarity between humans so that they can work together to fight the Covid-19 pandemic crisis.

To solve the problem of intolerance during a pandemic, we need a method that can destroy human categorization in solving a conflict so that the potential for increasing intolerance between groups can be muted and create a more peaceful Indonesia during the Covid-19 pandemic. The existence of the degradation of humanity and dehumanism at the stage of human depersonalization in the occurrence of acts of intolerance, therefore a redefinition of humanism is needed that can provide a clear path regarding the humanitarian problems that occur in Indonesia.

In this study, we try to examine more deeply the thinking of F. Budi Hardiman who offers flexible humanism by emphasizing in ontological and ethical account to underlay the critical way to build an appropriate solution to the problem of intolerance that occurs in Indonesia. The problem of intolerance that exists in Indonesia is a problem that must also be resolved in our Indonesianness. In considering the Indonesianness, it can be traced in the notion that social relation and also collective awareness determined by the modes of existence in individual level which directly has a *relata* to the vast level namely in social level where existence is expanded to be co-existence. Besides, it also determined by the ethical account as the consequent of those modes of being or modes of existence. Hence, the dynamics of sociality, whether it is harmony or disharmony—chaotic circumstances—depend on the way each individuals understand and interpret their own existence including the meaning of the selfness in individual level, and how they understand the consequence of every individual act in social level. That is what constitutes a whole in the construction and reflection of Indonesianness. We can also posit flexible humanism as the notion as a "theoretical bridge" in assuring the balance of individual and social account to construct and consider humanism without trapped in grand narration within essentialism paradigm and also naive realism which assuming every notion of humanism is stand on objective account which independent from human's

thought and conception. According to Roty, to humanize humans properly through human thought and must stand without the metaphysics of humanity.

2 Methods

This study uses a hermeneutic method based on *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion* (2011), in which several stages are carried out, namely the first to read the text about *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* in its entirety, slowly and repeatedly to understand the context intended in it. Second, this research tries to interpret the some of the verses in *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* which correlate with the need of this research. Third, this study also tries to contextualize the interpretation in second stage into the modern era as an answer to human categorization in the occurrence of acts of intolerance that occur in Indonesia.

3 Humanism

The humanism movement emerged on the northern side of the Italian peninsula and spread quickly to Germany, France, the Netherlands, and finally to all of mainland Europe (Hardiman, 2020). In "*In The Footsteps of The Ancients,*" (2000) Ronald Witt mentions that humanism emerged in Padua in the 1260s, starting when Lovato dei Lovati created his works in the same style as Ovidius and Horatius while reinventing Ancient Roman pagan literature. In his work, Lovato begins to show no more attachment to religious doctrine – which is generally common in the medieval era such as Dante and his *Divina Commedia* – which seems to be the starting point for the separation of religion from various aspects outside of him. However, Witt continues that the true early humanists – both after and before the Reformation – were Christian scholars. Humanism itself grew up in an entirely Christian environment. However, Witt remains careful to call the humanism promoted by these Christian scholars as "*Christian humanism*" to distinguish it from classical humanism which grew out of religious doctrines (Black, 2002).

The main agenda of humanism is to emphasize humans as creatures who have freedom and are personal. This freedom appears primarily in terms of thought and action. Five centuries after the discourse of humanism began, Immanuel Kant re-criticizes the issue of human freedom: despite living in a strengthened discourse of humanism, humans in his era did not live in the freedom of thought and – furthermore – to act. He mentions laziness and cowardice (which Kant calls immaturity) are the reasons that hinder human freedom even though nature has long provided space for humans to escape from foreign influences. In addition, the authorities who are used to taking advantage of the "immaturity" of the community will also not let the community go free. For Kant, the step to maturity is not only difficult but also dangerous (Kant, 1784).

In *Humanisme dan Sesudahnya* (2020), F. Budi Hardiman revealed that the colonization carried out by Europeans was a sign that there were "odds" in the body of humanism at that time. Hardiman continued, in the colony areas occupied by Europeans, their efforts to "humanize humans" were carried out by changing the local people's lifestyle to be similar to the European lifestyle which was considered beautiful and cultured. Real humans are seen from the benchmarks of Europeans, so that the way of dressing, language, a procedure for daily activities, are adapted to European ways to "humanize humans." Humans are defined exclusively, that is eurocentrically, and those outside that category are seen as "non-Humans" or "humans" with a lowercase "h". Black people, Asian people, Javanese, native Martiniquette people, are excluded from the category of people who are treated less than those who fall into the category. This is exacerbated by the repetitive hegemony carried out by local rulers or grassroots organizers: mentioning that those who are outside the human category as carriers of disease, have below-average intelligence, and are cursed descendants of Noah (Harari, 2018).

The exclusivist humanism embedded in colonialism has, in the course of history, radicalized and formed a new view of the social system. Hardiman quotes Hannah Arendt as saying that the Nazis' massive ethnic cleansing and the massacre by the Soviet communist regime of their political opponents were one of the effects of the radicalization of colonialism. The experience of treating humans outside Europe as "non-human" has become a collective mindset to justify the categorization of minority groups and political opposition as "non-human." The image of exclusive humanity used by Europeans during the colonial period was radicalized and denoted narrowed. Totalitarianism narrows the scope of humans to only certain

"races" or "classes" which initially, in colonialism, there were still gaps for "non-humans" through civilization (Arendt, 1962).

Efforts to define humans have resulted in an exclusivist humanism that has been proven in history to exclude humans from humanity. The search for universal human nature and nature through discussion and debate behind the pulpit still, in the end, excludes certain classes or groups. There will be a class that is excluded and the intention to produce a universal interpretation of human nature leads to the alienation of humans from their own nature. Thus, in relation to Badiou's moral flexibility, humanism is only a decision that is always inherent in the reality of the times.

However, in contemporary times, the search for a universal synthesis of human nature does not stop. Humanism is no longer trying to find the "core self" or essence like the colonialists, Nazis, and Communists, but is seen as an intertextual reality that is sentimental, in the sense of ignoring differences in ethnicity, religion, race, customs, etc., and sharing the similarities in suffering and abuse. Humanism is no longer understood as a metaphysical element, where humans are as if outside the world; as the standard for truth.

Richard Rorty mentions that belief in metaphysical Humans makes human beings become Gods. He views that genuine or universal meaning never exists because for him no one has a point of view that transcends history. Humans move in history which results in their existence also changing according to the flow of historical movements (Rorty in Hardiman, 2020, p. 57). Derrida, who also influenced Rorty in deconstructing the metaphysics of humanity, tried to understand humans not by basing them on one universal parent meaning. It pluralizes humanism's universal view of human nature. Derrida tries to remove the binary opposition that always requires a hierarchy: Man as subject and man as object. Through the deconstruction of human metaphysics, the relationship between humans and humans is returned to its original position, namely a state where the relationship between "center" and "periphery" has not yet hardened (Hidayat, 2019). Therefore, for Derrida, understanding of humans can only be obtained through the interpretation of various cultural understandings of humanity by assuming that all are equal (Derrida in Hardiman, 2020, p. 57).

3.1 Flexible Humanism

Finally, several questions are quite dilemmatic. Will humanity never include all humans and thus still exclude certain humans, or should we believe in all humans who do not all have the same goal? Are the products of modernism such as religious tolerance and feminism just a waste of time which at a certain stage denies the initial spirit of humanism? Will humans in the end never be able to find Humans?

To answer a series of questions above, Hardiman offers a solution in which humanism must stand without human metaphysics: without humans with a large "H". Hardiman called this type of humanism "flexible humanism" which was (more or less) influenced by Rorty and Derrida. Flexible humanism does not ask what size is used to refer to a person as human but asks how to establish a common standard that embraces as many people as possible in anticipation of the new humanity that will come.

According to Hardiman, two things indicate the emergence of flexible humanism. First, its flexibility expresses the belief that the universality of humanity cannot exist: it is not a monologue established standard, but a vision that is cultivated in heterogeneous dialogues. Flexible humanism emphasizes humans to be open to differences in society; in man himself. This openness makes humans a person who is not easy to judge and able to ignore differences in ethnicity, race, religion, class, or ideology because of human universality in pain. It can be seen that two thoughts are combined here: Derrida's intertextuality and Rorty's sentimentalism. Thus, it can be concluded that the ability to enrich perspectives about being human (as taught by Derrida) is combined with "humanity" (which Rorty coined).

Second, the flexibility of this solution demonstrates his belief in the epistemic potential of religions that can overlap with the truths sought in philosophy and science; showing respect for the boundaries between religious faith and rationality. According to Hardiman, a humanist who distances himself from the metaphysics of humanity can become someone who believes in God through religion without falling into fideism. A true humanist will believe by seeking understanding and understanding without denying his faith in religion. A flexible humanist will move away from efforts to objectify God, find God through the eyes of empiricism, and material proof. A true humanist will realize one thing: instead of trying to understand everything from the point of view of the modern "reason" that has taken root in the world's culture of knowledge over the last few centuries, he realizes that he has encountered an "arrogance of reason," a "lack of sense," in the style of European Enlightenment thought. By being moderate towards reason, freedom, and faith, a humanism that grows without narcissism and triumphalism will show humans the true meaning of humanity that is buried under the rubble of human metaphysics.

4 *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*

Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is the official motto of the State of Indonesia. This motto can be found on the grip of the foot of Indonesia's national symbol, Garuda Pancasila. The use of these slogans and symbols is regulated in Article 36A of the 1945 Constitution, which reads "The State Emblem is Garuda Pancasila with the motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*". In general, this Old Javanese motto can be translated into: "Unity in diversity." In daily life, this motto is often used as the main basis for living in the plurality of Indonesian society. However, nowadays, it is undeniable that the meaning of this slogan is often taken for granted by the people of Indonesia and in practice in life –as evidenced by the increasing cases of intolerance during the pandemic– nowadays, people's behavior often does not reflect the meaning of the slogan. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the specific reasons why this expression was chosen as the national motto of Indonesia as our basis for being able to re-establish *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* in the lives of Indonesian society today. One thing that can be done is to review the historical context, the meaning that accompanies it, and the implications that existed when *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* was created so that it could be re-contextualized with the current state of Indonesia.

In *Asal-Usul Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (2015), Woro Aryadini explains that the motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* can be found for the first time around the 14th century as the conclusion of a session held by the Majapahit kingdom during the reign of King Hayam Wuruk. The results of the trial were published in a kakawin entitled *Kakawin Sutasoma* which was written in Old Javanese using Balinese script by Mpu Tantular. At that time Buddhism and Hinduism were officially considered the state religions. This is done to avoid friction in society because the number of adherents of the two religions is almost the same. Specifically, *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* can be found in verse 5 pupuh 139 *Kakawin Sutasoma*, which reads:

> *Rwāneka dhātu winuwus Buddha Wiswa,*
> *Bhinnêki rakwa ring apan kena parwanosen,*
> *Mangka ng Jinatwa kalawan Śiwatatwa tunggal,*
> *Bhinnêka tunggal ika tan hana dharma mangrwa.*

According to Soewito in *Boddhakawya-Sutasoma : a study in Javanese Wajrayana, text - translation - commentary* (1968), the verse can be translated as:

> It is said that the well-known Buddha and Çiwa are two different substances.
> They are indeed different, yet how is it possible to recognize their difference in a glance,
> since the Truth of Jina and the Truth of Çiwa is one.
> They are indeed different, but they are of the same kind, as there is no division in Truth.

The meaning of 'They are indeed different ' in the above translation refers to Buddhism and Hinduism, and the phrase 'but they are of the same kind ' refers to the mission of Shiva-Buddhist unity. Meanwhile, the meaning of the phrase ' as there is no division in Truth ' refers to the absence of differences in devotion in Buddhism and Hinduism because the purpose of their devotion is the same, namely God Almighty (Aryadini, 2015).

Furthermore, the historical context of the motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* can be clarified by the previous expression which reads: "Mangka ng Jinatwa kalawan iwatatwa Tunggal," or translated: "Because the truth of Jina (Buddha) and Shiva is one." According to Dwi Woro in *Kakawin Sutasoma - Mpu Tantular* (2009), the relationship between Buddha and Shiva in Kakawin Sutasoma is explained through Sutasoma's character to his students. Both are paths to final release while immersing oneself in the unthinkable Absolute "whose form is Emptiness or Void (śūnyatā)" (Woro, 2009). Thus, this expression can be interpreted that although the efforts to achieve goals may vary, but the goals are one and the same: Buddha and Shiva are one and the same (Aryadini, 2015).

The historical context of the harmonious life of the ancient Javanese people is also strengthened by the fact that even from the 8th to the 16th centuries the Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms in Java had coexisted despite the striking differences between Hindu-Buddhist temples, such as: separated to form very different worship statues (Sedyawati, 1993). In addition to coexistence, there is also unity among them; one of which can be seen from the level of concepts contained in each religion. This can be seen from the concept of the level of holiness of Borobudur Temple (8th century, Buddhist temple) which is a and Prambanan Temple (9th century, Hindu temple). The concept is equally divided into three zones, namely: *Bhurloka* in Hinduism and *Kamadhatu* in Buddhism, is the lowest realm of mortal beings and where humans are bound by lust,

desire, and impure ways of life; *Bhuwarloka* in Hinduism and *Rupadathu* in Buddhism, is the middle realm where saints and priests begin to see the light of truth; and *Swarloka* in Hinduism or *Arupadhatu* in Buddhism, which is the highest realm and the holiest place where gods reside.

The historical context of the harmonious life of the ancient Javanese people is also strengthened by the fact that even from the 8th to the 16th centuries the Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms in Java had coexisted despite the striking differences between Hindu-Buddhist temples, such as: separated to form very different worship statues (Sedyawati, 1993). In addition to coexistence, there is also unity among them; one of which can be seen from the level of concepts contained in each religion. This can be seen from the concept of the level of holiness of Borobudur Temple (8th century, Buddhist temple) which is a and Prambanan Temple (9th century, Hindu temple). The concept is equally divided into three zones, namely: *Bhurloka* in Hinduism and *Kamadhatu* in Buddhism, is the lowest realm of mortal beings and where humans are bound by lust, desire, and impure ways of life; *Bhuwarloka* in Hinduism and *Rupadathu* in Buddhism, is the middle realm where saints and priests begin to see the light of truth; and *Swarloka* in Hinduism or *Arupadhatu* in Buddhism, which is the highest realm and the holiest place where gods reside.

In addition to the proof of conception above, based on historical data according to Aryadini, in the 8th to 10th centuries during the construction of Hindu temples such as Prambanan Temple, the ruler of the Syailendra dynasty, who was a Buddhist at that time, gave permission and helped build Hindu temples as indicated by the Sojomerta Inscription. On the other hand, the construction of Buddhist temples, including the Borobudur Temple was also possible because the heir of Sanjaya from the Hindu-styled Ancient Mataram Kingdom, Rakai Panangkaran, gave permission and also helped Buddhists to build the temple. Although there is an assumption that Prambanan Temple was built by Rakai Pikatan as an answer to the Sanjaya dynasty to compete with the Syailendra dynasty's Borobudur Temple, some parties believe that there is an atmosphere of tolerance and togetherness between the two houses, as evidenced by Syailendra's involvement in the construction of the Ciwa Temple in Prambanan.

Furthermore, in the following centuries, such as when the Hindu Mataram kingdom moved to East Java, a king named Raja Kartanegara emerged who called himself *'I am Sang Ciwa Buddha'*, the last king of the Singosari Kingdom who embraced Hinduism and Buddhism. The concept of unity during this period also emerged with the establishment of three temples: Jawi Temple, Singosari Temple, and Jagu Temple; all of which have a style of Hindu and Buddhist influence. It was only later that during the Majapahit kingdom, the people and their kings embraced this religion, as evidenced by the procession of the death of a Majapahit king, where his ashes will be stored in two different temples, namely: a Hindu-style temple and a Buddhist-style temple.

In fact, according to Peter Carey in our online interview (2021), other evidence that a harmonious life was created among the people of Majapahit at that time could be seen from Troloyo, a royal tomb as evidenced by the symbols on the tomb. The tomb is located in Trowulan, the capital of the Majapahit Kingdom at that time. Those buried there were people who were Muslim at that time, so it became clear that even those who differed from the majority at that time were still treated well. Furthermore, according to Carey, other evidence is seen from the many tombs of the Chinese in Trowulan who played a role in trade at that time.

In addition, Carey also added evidence of the plurality of society at that time from the religious differences adopted in the genealogy of the Majapahit kingdom at that time. Gayatri who was the wife of the founder of Majapahit, Raden Wijaya, was a devout Buddhist. "However, his grandson who later became king of Majapahit, Hayam Wuruk, is a Hindu and is considered an incarnation of the god Vishnu," said Carey. The existence of religious changes in a family tree at that time was a natural thing.

The pattern of life that is mutually sustainable and harmonious between Hindus and Buddhists from the time of the Old Javanese Kingdom to the Majapahit Kingdom is what eventually became the background for *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* to emerge. Mpu Tantular initiated *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* as the final conclusion of the people's assembly at that time as an attempt to bridge the two sects which had a background of tolerance for a long time.

In the context of modern Indonesia, there is an assumption that the motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* was first coined in the realm of Indonesian politics at the session of the Investigating Agency for Preparatory Work for Independence (BPUPKI) between May-July 1945 by Mohammad Yamin in a limited discussion with Ir. Soekarno and I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa after he read Hendrik Kern's writing entitled Verspreide Geschriften where the phrase was published (Waskito, 2020). It was said in the limited discussion, Yamin mentioned the phrase *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* which was then answered by "*Tan hana dharma mangrwa*" by Bagus Sugirwa.

In contrast to this according to Waskito, Muhammad Hatta, Indonesia's first vice president, stated that the phrase *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* was first coined by Ir. Sukarno. The idea was proposed after Indonesia's

Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities 8: 00008 (2022)
Proceeding of 9th International Conference on Nusantara Philosophy (ICNP)

https://doi.org/10.29037/digitalpress.48421

independence, at the moment of designing the national symbol of Garuda Pancasila. According to Hatta, the motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, which was then pinned on a white ribbon in the grip of the two feet of the Garuda Pancasila as the symbol of the state by Sultan Hamid II, was then inaugurated in the Cabinet Session of the United States of Indonesia (RIS) which he chaired on February 11, 1950. Then, the motto *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* together with Garuda Pancasila was officially written in the Indonesian Constitution through the second amendment to the 1945 Constitution in the second General Assembly of the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) which was held on 7-18 August 2000 (Raditya, 2019).

By the founding fathers of the nation, Mpu Tantular's phrase was given a new perspective because its context and relevance met the strategic needs of a newly independent Indonesia. With the fact that the struggle of the Indonesian people to achieve independence is the effort of the Indonesian people in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-religious, and multi-lingual reality; the existence of a basic philosophical guide or philosofische grondslag is needed as a framework for living together (Waskito, 2019). The meaning of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika tan hana dharma mangrwa* which at the time of the Majapahit kingdom as " They are indeed different, but they are of the same kind, as there is no division in Truth" replaced with "Unity in diversity" by looking at the plural conditions that exist in the social conditions of Indonesian society after independence. Without a universalism basis as exemplified by *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* during the Majapahit era, Indonesian people's life may not be avoided from the trap of particularism, racism, narrow sectarianism, and so on.

5 Result and Discussion

5.1 Human Intolerance and Depersonalization

As described in the previous section, the hierarchy of meaning that arises in relation to human categorization results in certain groups being excluded from the human class. Those who don't fall into one particular category deserve to be treated as non-Humans: treated below Human standards (with a big 'H') or even inanimate objects and animals. Those who fall into the Human category with a large 'H' deserve a special place in various aspects of life. On the other hand, those who do not fall into this category only become side variables that are not even taken into account at all in the decision-making process and/or daily life.

In the case of intolerance, the category of Humans with a large 'H' is occupied by people from one particular group who uphold the supremacy of the group. With the identity that is owned as a member of the group, each individual in it dares to negate the humanity of other individuals (read: humans) that appear in the violation of the basic rights inherent in these other individuals. The other individual is seen as a lower state than himself because he is not in the same group as himself and believes what he believes. Strictly speaking, in intolerance, humans (with a lowercase 'h'/lesser humans) outside a group who uphold the supremacy of the group are viewed as non-Humans and are therefore inferior to members of the group, and maybe treated worse than members of the group. From this perspective, various acts of intolerance have emerged that require human divisions arranged in a hierarchy of meaning.

5.2 Causes of Intolerance

Haryatmoko in *Dominasi Penuh Muslihat: Akar Kekerasan dan Diskriminasi* (2010) states that acts of intolerance stem from the absence of critical elements and the death of the signs of true interpretation. When the existing interpretation does not comply with the signs of a true interpretation—in this case, political content and group interests are infiltrated—rejection of "those who are different" begins to emerge. Religious leaders take a big role in the effort to interpret reality which includes relationships with other religious people. As a result, when a religious leader with certain political content or interest gives an interpretation, he has the potential to direct his followers to become intolerant individuals.

The change of society into an intolerant individual is a sign that the moral color of society has changed. The moral which was originally aimed at and based on human dignity as a complete person shifted to relying on an ideology or synthetic view that was considered correct. In the case of intolerance, the moral foundation shifts: from what was originally based on religion as a way of life that leads to the welfare of all creation (rahmatan lil alamin), to religion as a mere movement ideology. In its position as a movement ideology, religion is only used as an adhesive tool for a society because it provides an interpretive framework in the meaning of social relations (Haryatmoko, 2010). The consequence is that those who are

outside the ideological-religious ties are seen as *liyan* (the other). As a result, when these ideological-religious groups meet other groups that are different from themselves, feelings of suspicion and dislike arise because the other is seen as "not-us" because they are not bound by ideological religions that give certain meanings (in this case the interpretation of social relations) within the religious-ideological group.

The relationship between members of an ideological-religious group with others manifested in feelings of suspicion and disapproval is – again referring to Derrida – a manifestation of the hardening of the relationship between meanings in a hierarchical structure. The hardened relationship reveals the fabrication of the position of one meaning in relation to other meanings so that one meaning is seen as more prior than the next. Therefore, in order to overcome intolerance, the relationship between the meanings contained in the ideological-religious groups and the meanings of *liyan* (the other) must be returned to a state when the relationship between these meanings has not yet hardened, in a sense, is placed in the same position. Strictly speaking, in order to reduce intolerance, the spirit of equality and unity must be cultivated.

5.3 Equality in Flexible Humanism

The main idea of the flexible humanism offered by Hardiman lies in its openness to various possible meanings that can expand the scope of new universal humanism in the future. This openness and breadth of coverage stem from the views that Hardiman uses as a basis for formulating his views.

Starting from Heidegger, Heidegger's attempt to unravel the hierarchy between humans and other circumstances around them (including each other) makes humans on an equal footing with other states. By calling humans the shepherds of 'Being' (*Hirt des Seins*) and neighbors of 'Being' (*Nachbar des Seins*), Heidegger tries to––not only––put humans on par with other beings and avoid feelings of supremacy, and have full responsibility to the sustainability and welfare of other circumstances (like a shepherd who must ensure the welfare of his livestock and neighbors who show concern for the people next door).

Derrida's view plays a crucial role in Hardiman's thought. Derrida, who is not in a hurry to establish the relationship between meanings, but first puts all meanings equally, makes Hardiman formulate a method in which all views are assumed to be equal. With this perspective, meaning can be returned to its original state: neutral and classless. In intolerance, the perspective of one group is assumed to be equal to formulate a new perspective on humans. A peaceful process and a new definition that is formed when all existing views sit together (read: assumed to be equal), will not only erase intolerance on paper but also regenerate a spirit of kinship and unity.

5.4 Equality in *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*

The social conditions when *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* was created can explain how in the ancient Javanese kingdoms there was also diversity at the level of society. This can be seen from the continuity that existed in various aspects of harmonious life between the Buddhists and Hindus at that time. One interesting thing, the main idea of Hardiman's flexible humanism was already evident at that time. The differences that emerged – and were inevitable – from the Buddhist and Hindu cultures by the people of that time, especially Mpu Tantular, were united in such a way in a large landscape of tolerance.

The emergence of a king who embraced both religions, the establishment of three temples with a combination of Hindu-Buddhist patterns, the similarity in the concept of zoning between Borobudur and Prambanan temples, and the existence of tombs used even by minority religions at that time are only a small part of the evidence that tolerance at that time existed. One thing that can create such conditions, is none other than the fact that people at that time considered each other to be equal. As in the construction of Borobudur and Prambanan Temples, the two Wangsa (Syailendra and Sanjaya) actually had the power to move the masses to reject each other's temple construction. However, what happened was that the two Houses were tolerant of each other and helped each other in their respective creations.

More radically, there was an attempt to create tolerance at that time with the emergence of the concept of Buddha-Shiva unity in verse 5 pupuh 139 *Kakawin Sutasoma*. This is what Hardiman meant in his flexible humanism about the need for openness to various possible meanings that could expand the scope of new universal humanism which would later be able to accommodate every different human being so that intolerance would not occur. The different conceptions, methods, and even methods possessed by the two religions at that time were united in one goal contained in that 5th verse.

In addition, such tolerant conditions were none other than the result of government intervention at that time which could be interpreted in Heidegger's thinking as an attempt to make humans on an equal footing with other circumstances. The Majapahit government's awareness of the plurality of society at that time made the policies taken to accommodate all levels of society. This can be seen from how Hinduism and

Buddhism are recognized as state religions, or when a king dies, his ashes will be scattered in two temples with different patterns.

From the plurality of the society of the ancient Javanese kingdom to Majapahit, we must learn that it takes the role of every human being in it to create tolerance among the plurality of society. Modifying Heidegger's thinking, as Indonesian people who exist in his Indonesianness, it is appropriate for us to return to our Indonesianness to overcome our problems, such as intolerance which is increasingly rampant in recent times; and *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, which is one of the important elements in our Indonesia, can be used as a solution to overcome intolerance in Indonesia.

6 Conclusions

In summary, to rebuild tolerance in Indonesia, pluralistic dialogue is needed to raise the assumption of equality in all human groups and rebuild universal humanity. The new universal humanity will erase the categorization of human beings that leads to intolerance. To achieve this, *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* must be re-instilled in Indonesian society because *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* is clear proof of how the plurality of society can be integrated into a tolerant harmony as evidenced in the days of the ancient Javanese kingdoms and Majapahit.

Plural dialogue that is carried out at all levels of society must be carried out immediately because more and more human categorizations will appear considering the increasing diversity of humans in the development of human civilization in the future and Indonesia also cannot avoid this.

The state of tolerance of life as exemplified by the people of the ancient Javanese and Majapahit kingdoms cannot be separated from the willingness of all different levels of society in their plurality to want to consider those who are different as equal. Therefore, the current Indonesian government must cooperate with multidisciplinary intellectuals and the public who have the capability to find methods to re-establish *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* into all aspects of Indonesian people to overcome this intolerance.

References

Alfons, M. (2019). *Imparsial: Ada 31 Kasus Intoleransi di Indonesia, Mayoritas Pelarangan Ibadah.* Retrieved 21 November 2021 from https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4787954/imparsial-ada-31-kasus-intoleransi-di-indonesia-mayoritas-pelarangan-ibadah

Arendt, H. (1962). *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* Ohio: The World Publishing Company.

Aryadini, W. (2014). *Asal-Usul Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (The History of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika).* Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.

Bertens, K. (2019*). Filsafat Barat Kontemporer Jilid I: Inggris & Jerman*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Black, R. (2002*). Review: The origins of Humanism, its educational context and its early development: a review article of Ronald Witt's 'In the Footsteps of the Ancients'*. Vivarium, 272-297.

Boni. (2020). *UMAT GEREJA DI JONGGOL MENGAKU DILARANG BERIBADAH.* Retrieved 21 November 2021, from https://www.koranindonews.com/2020/09/22/umat-gereja-di-jonggol-mengaku-dilarang-beribadah/

Carey. P (2021, November 18). [In person]. Online Interview.

Engler, S., & Stausberg, M. (2011). *The Routledge Handbook of Research in the Study of Religion*. Routledge.

Harari, Y. N. (2018). *Sapiens*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.

Hardiman, F. B. (2020). *Humanisme dan Sesudahnya*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.

Haryatmoko. (2010). *Dominasi Penuh Muslihat: Akar Kekerasan dan Diskriminasi.* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hidayat, M. A. (2019). Menimbang Teori-Teori Sosial Postmodern: Sejarah, Pemikiran, Kritik, dan Masa Depan Postmodernisme. Journal of Urban Sociology, 42-64.

Kant, I. (1784). *Beantwortung der Frage: Was Ist Aufklärung*.

Raditya, I. (2019). *Isi Perubahan Kedua & Sejarah Amandemen UUD 1945 Tahun 2000*. Retrieved from https://tirto.id/isi-perubahan-kedua-sejarah-amandemen-uud-1945-tahun-2000-ejFV

Raharjo, D. (2020). *Sekelompok Orang Ganggu Ibadah Jemaat HKBP Serang, Ketum PKPI: Memalukan*. Retrieved 21 November 2021, from https://www.suara.com/news/2020/09/17/203950/sekelompok-massa-ganggu-ibadah-jemaat-hkbp-serang-ketumpkpi-memalukan?page=all

Santoso, B. (2020). *Heboh Larangan Beribadah di Desa Ngastemi, Ketum PKPI: Tindakan Bodoh!.* Retrieved 21 November 2021, from https://www.suara.com/news/2020/09/28/074649/heboh-larangan-beribadah-di-desa-ngastemi-ketum-pkpi-tindakan-bodoh

Santoso, S. (1968). *Boddhakawya-Sutasoma : a study in Javanese Wajrayana, text - translation - commentary* (Ph.D). Australian National University.

Sedyawati, E. (2011). Bhinneka Tunggal Ika Tan Hana Dharma Mangrwa: Sebuah Konsep yang Dirimuskan di Zaman Majapahit Abad Ke- 14 M. Warta Hindu Dharma.

SETARA Institute. (2021). *PANDEMI LAHAN SUBUR DISKRIMINASI DAN INTOLERANSI*. Retrieved from https://setara-institute.org/pandemi-lahan-subur-diskriminasi-dan-intoleransi/

Tantular, & Woro, D. (2009). *Kakawin Sutasoma*. Depok: Komunitas Bambu.

The Habibie Center. (2021). *Pandemi, Demokrasi, dan Ekstremisme Berkekerasan di Indonesia*. Jakarta, Indonesia: The Habibie Center. Retrieved from http://habibiecenter.or.id/img/publication/5b9f109d63b1d05010b2b0f42198f4eb.pdf

Waskito. (2020). *Sebuah Filsafat Perenialisme Tertua.* Retrieved 21 November 2021, from https://indonesia.go.id/kategori/komoditas/1631/sebuah-filsafat-perenialisme-tertua

Witt, R. (2000). *In The Footsteps of the Ancients*. Leiden: Brill.

WHO. (2021). *WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020.* Retrieved 21 November 2021, from https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020

Zamani, L. (2020*). Kasus Pembubaran Paksa Acara Midodareni di Solo, Kapolda Jateng: Kita Kejar Pelaku Lainnya.* Retrieved 21 November 2021, from https://regional.kompas.com/read/2020/08/12/07000091/kasus-pembubaran-paksa-acara-midodareni-di-solo-kapolda-jateng--kita-kejar?page=all