



## The Intersection of Citizenship and Freedom of Religion: Legal Challenges in a Multicultural Society

Syahrial Arif Hutagalung<sup>1</sup>, Yessi Kurnia Arjani Manik<sup>2</sup>, Maulana Akhyar Hanif<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Politeknik Negeri Medan, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Madinah, Saudi Arabia

\*Corresponding Author: [syahrialarif@polmed.ac.id](mailto:syahrialarif@polmed.ac.id)

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received : 20 April 2025

Acceptance : 20 May 2025

Published : 21 June 2025

Available online

<http://aspublisher.co.id/index.php/cakrawala>

E-ISSN: 3063-2447

#### How to cite:

Hutagalung, S. A., Manik, A. K. Y., & Hanif, A. K (2025). "The Intersection of Citizenship and Freedom of Religion: Legal Challenges in a Multicultural Society," *Cakrawala: Journal of Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1-10, 2025.



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

### ABSTRACT

*This study investigates the correlation between citizenship status and religious freedom within Indonesia's multicultural society, emphasizing the legal obstacles encountered by religious minority groups. The methodology employed is a normative-doctrinal legal approach, analyzing several national legal instruments, Constitutional Court rulings, and literature on legal and human rights. The research findings indicate a discrepancy between constitutional provisions that ensure religious freedom and prevailing legal practices that are often discriminatory. For instance, restrictions persist that restrict access to civil registry and marriage for followers of faiths beyond the six recognized religions. Furthermore, the legal status of groups like Ahmadiyah and practitioners of indigenous traditions signifies a de facto exclusion from citizenship. The findings suggest that the Indonesian legal system has not yet adequately ensured the concept of non-discrimination within the context of an inclusive rule of law. This research advocates for the enhancement of the alignment between positive legal norms and constitutional ideals, as well as the facilitation of additional studies utilizing comparative and empirical methodologies to advance equitable legal protection for minority groups.*

**Keywords:** *Citizenship, Freedom of Religion, Religious Minorities, Normative Law, Discrimination, Indonesia*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, as a nation that is ethnically, culturally, and religiously diverse, faces serious challenges in realizing the principles of justice and equality for all its citizens (Tangkas & Pakpahan, 2024). One of the crucial issues that continues to emerge is the intersection between citizenship rights and freedom of religion, particularly in the context of religious minority groups (Santoso, 2024). In the Indonesian legal system, freedom of religion is explicitly guaranteed by Article 29 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution, which states that the state guarantees the freedom of every resident to embrace their religion and worship according to their religion. This guarantee is reinforced through other legal

instruments, such as Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights and the ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) in 2005.

However, the facts on the ground indicate a gap between legal norms and social reality. Various minority religious groups, such as Ahmadiyah, Shia, and local belief practitioners, often experience discrimination, administrative violations, and even persecution. Data from the National Commission on Human Rights (Komnas HAM) records dozens of cases of religious freedom violations each year (KOMNASHAM, 2022), while a report by the Setara Institute in 2022 identified 175 incidents with 333 violations of Religious Freedom and Belief (KBB) (Institute, 2022). On the other hand, various public policies, such as the Joint Ministerial Decree (SKB) of the Three Ministers regarding Ahmadiyah and regional regulations prohibiting the construction of places of worship, are often used as a basis for legitimizing discriminatory actions against certain groups.

This issue becomes even more complex when judicial decisions actually narrow the space for protecting religious freedom. One example is the Constitutional Court Decision Number 97/PUU-XIV/2016, which only recently accommodated a "believer" column in identity documents after years of administrative discrimination. More recently, the Constitutional Court's decision in January 2025, which stated that citizens are required to adhere to one of the official religions, was deemed contrary to the universal principles of human rights and the spirit of pluralism. Amnesty International and the Wahid Foundation strongly criticized the ruling because it was deemed to narrow the space for belief and open the door to broader practices of intolerance. Seeing this phenomenon, a fundamental question arises: to what extent is Indonesian positive law consistent with the principles of non-discrimination and protection of religious freedom in the context of citizenship? Has the current national legal system provided equal protection to all citizens regardless of their religious and belief backgrounds?

This research aims to evaluate the coherence and consistency of Indonesia's positive legal norms with the principles of religious freedom guaranteed in the constitution and international law. With a normative-doctrinal approach, this study examines the prevailing legal constructs, observes the discrepancies between norms and practices, and formulates legal policy recommendations that are more inclusive and responsive to the diversity of beliefs in Indonesian society.

A review of the previous literature shows that although there have been many empirical studies on discrimination against religious minorities, the doctrinal approach that systematically examines the discrepancies between legal norms and their implementation is still relatively limited. The contribution of this research is important in strengthening the role of the Indonesian rule of law in ensuring the constitutional rights of citizens fairly and nondiscriminatorily. Thus, the existence of this research is not only academically important but also practically urgent. In an environment of democracy and multiculturalism, the role of the state in ensuring equality and freedom for all its citizens becomes a key indicator of the success of just legal governance and administration. The findings and analysis in this research are expected to serve as an argumentative basis for public policy reforms that better respect diversity and strengthen the nation's social cohesion.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODE

This study employs a normative-doctrinal methodology, which constitutes legal research focused on the methodical analysis of legal concepts, legal frameworks, and relevant laws (David tan, 2021). Normative study involves the analysis of positive legal norms governing citizenship rights and religious freedom, particularly concerning the protection of religious minority groups in Indonesia. This methodology was selected due to its efficacy in delineating the correspondence among constitutional norms, national legislation, and globally acknowledged human rights concepts. The initial phase of this research involves the gathering of primary and secondary legal resources. Primary legal materials comprise the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights, Law Number 23 of 2006 about Population Administration, along with rulings from the Constitutional Court and further implementing regulations. Concurrently, secondary legal materials encompass legal literature, scholarly journals, articles, reports from independent entities such as the National Commission on Human Rights (Komnas HAM), Setara Institute, and Wahid Foundation, along with documents arising from the ratification of international treaties such as the ICCPR. The subsequent phase involves a legal examination of statutory provisions. The investigation employs a conceptual and legislative framework to investigate the correlation between citizenship rights and religious freedom. A case approach is utilized by examining various court opinions pertinent to the safeguarding of religious freedom, including Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 and the January 2025 Constitutional Court Decision concerning the requirement to follow a religion. This research examines legal substances and products that affect religious minority groups, including Ahmadiyah, Shia, and practitioners of local beliefs, rather than individual participants. The sampling technique employed purposive sampling of legal documents and pertinent cases, adhering to the following criteria: (1) normative in nature and directly influencing citizenship rights and religious freedom, (2) involving religious minority groups as the affected parties, (3) representing significant advancements in national legal practice. The subsequent phase involves data analysis, executed qualitatively by legal interpretative methods, including grammatical, systematic, or teleological approaches. This study use content analysis methods on judicial rulings and regulations to detect biases, contradictions, or prejudice within legal standards. The researchers analyzed the degree to which Indonesian rules and legal practices conform to or conflict with the principles of non-discrimination and freedom of religion as established in international law (Moleong, 2011).

## 3. RESULT AND ANALYSIS

### **Discrepancy of Legal Norms with the Principle of Religious Freedom**

This research identified a disparity between Indonesian constitutional standards and operational legislation, namely regarding the right to religious freedom and citizenship protections for religious minorities. Article 28E and Article 29 of the 1945 Constitution

ensure the right to religious freedom and the conduct of worship in accordance with individual views. In practice, technical regulations, such as the Population Administration Law (Law No. 23 of 2006), previously failed to acknowledge adherents of belief systems in official papers, including identification cards and family cards. This resulted in administrative discrimination that affected other civil rights, including marriage, employment, and education. This can be theoretically elucidated through Niklas Luhmann's legal system framework, wherein law, as an autonomous system, does not consistently respond to pluralistic social processes. The legal system in Indonesia functions under a normative framework that fails to adapt to its multicultural reality, leading to a disjunction between constitutional values and sectoral laws (Bahri, 2024). This research's primary finding is the discordance between constitutional principles and sectoral legislation, especially concerning the safeguarding of religious freedom and citizenship rights for religious minority groups in Indonesia. This research employs a normative-doctrinal approach to demonstrate that technical regulations, exemplified by Law No. 23 of 2006 on Population Administration (prior to revision), fail to acknowledge belief systems in official identity documents, including ID cards and family cards, despite constitutional guarantees of religious and belief freedom (Article 28E paragraph (1), Article 29 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution).

The positive law in Indonesia establishes artificial categories for citizenship, accommodating just six official religions in administrative and legal services. This contravenes the concept of equality before the law and the principle of non-discrimination as stipulated in Articles 3 and 12 of the ICCPR, approved by Law No. 12 of 2005. This legislation breaches Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, particularly Articles 22 and 23, which assert that all individuals are entitled to freedom of religion and belief, and have the right to acquire citizenship without discrimination. Simultaneously, Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 serves as a crucial reference. The Constitutional Court ruled that adherents of belief systems must receive equal treatment to followers of faiths in public administration services. This decision reinforces the assurance of constitutional rights and underscores the disparity between normative law and policy execution. Nonetheless, although the decision is definitive and obligatory, its execution at the local bureaucratic level encounters opposition due to the predominant perspectives within the state apparatus, as indicated in the studies by Komnas HAM and Setara Institute.

According to Niklas Luhmann's legal system theory, this discrepancy can be elucidated by the notion of operational closure, wherein the legal system functions according to its own logic and is not consistently responsive to societal dynamics, including religion and belief heterogeneity (Abbas, 2023). Consequently, the Indonesian legal system is predominantly normatively closed and lacks sensitivity to societal variety, which may ultimately undermine legal legitimacy and exacerbate the social isolation of minority groups. The research of regulations and judicial documents reveals a systemic bias within the legal framework that necessitates the identification of specific religions to obtain fundamental services. This relegates religious and belief minority to a subordinate status within the citizenship framework, since their civil and social rights are contingent upon

the state's acknowledgment of their belief identity. This scenario results in citizenship stratification, specifically a hierarchy of individuals determined by the religion acknowledged by the state (Wijayanto, 2023).

Utilizing systematic and teleological interpretation, it becomes evident that the constitutional objective of the state to safeguard all people (Article 28D paragraph (1)) is inadequately represented in the framework of positive law. This signifies the necessity for sector-specific regulatory reform, encompassing a reevaluation of the Population Administration Law, to conform to the principles of universal rights and inclusive constitutional values.

### **The Paradox of Legal Principles and Discrimination against Minorities**

Despite Indonesia's assertion of being a rule of law state (*rechtsstaat*), its legislative methods and policies frequently exhibit legal majoritarianism. An instance is illustrated in the 2008 Joint Decree of Three Ministers, which limits the religious practices of the Ahmadiyah community. While it does not directly forbid, this legislation legitimizes restrictive actions by authorities and society, so creating a legal gray area susceptible to intolerance. This undermines the premise of the rule of law in a multicultural democracy, which must ensure the rights of minorities without yielding to the pressures of dominant groups. Kymlicka's theory on collective rights demonstrates that the safeguarding of minorities transcends mere tolerance and is integral to distributive justice, which must be actualized within the framework of citizenship (Rustam & Putri, 2023). The analytical results indicate that the Joint Ministerial Decree of Three Ministers lacks the same formal legal authority as a law; yet, its presence is broadly acknowledged and enforced by state authorities and public institutions. This engenders a disparity between constitutional principles-ensuring freedom of religion without discrimination (Article 28E and Article 29 of the 1945 Constitution)-and administrative actions that entrench prejudice under the guise of social stability or public morality.

Legal analysis revealed that regulations, including the Joint Ministerial Decree of Three Ministers, Sharia Regional Regulations, and other majoritarian instruments, fundamentally contravene Articles 22 and 23 of Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, as well as Indonesia's international obligations under the ICCPR framework, particularly Article 18 concerning freedom of religion and belief. These policies are often prejudiced against dominant groups and do not incorporate diversity as a fundamental aspect of legal justice. A democratic rule of law state must not alone execute the law based on numerical majority; it must also extend special protection to vulnerable minority groups to rectify social structural inequities and mitigate possible marginalization (Risdiarto, 2017). Constitutional Court Decision No. 140/PUU-VII/2009, which invalidated discriminatory regional regulations, and Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 concerning the acknowledgment of belief systems, affirm that the constitutional court exhibits a more progressive stance than executive policymakers. The disjunction between judicial decisions and policy execution suggests a deficient incorporation of rule of law ideas inside public administration practices. Theoretically, according to Luhmann, this phenomena illustrates a legal system that is indifferent to social plurality due to its

excessive emphasis on internal normative logic and the perpetuation of established power structures. The assertion of the rule of law becomes contradictory when it enables bigotry via non-neutral legal mechanisms.

### **Constitutional Court Decision: Advancements Present, Yet Not Fully Transformative**

This research underscores the significance of the Constitutional Court (MK), particularly in decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016, which acknowledges the legal position of individuals adhering to belief systems in population documentation. Nevertheless, these progressive verdicts have not been accompanied by systemic changes in other domains, such as education and marriage legislation. According to Marshall's citizenship theory, the optimal position of citizenship includes comprehensive civil, political, and social rights (Winda Roselina Effendi, 2018). In Indonesia, citizenship remains conditional and hierarchical, particularly for those not affiliated with the six recognized faiths. This establishes a hierarchical citizenship structure, which contradicts the notion of universal rights.

This research establishes that the Constitutional Court Decision (MK) No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 is a significant milestone in the formal acknowledgment of adherents of belief systems as citizens with equal legal status, particularly concerning population administration. The Constitutional Court has interpreted Article 28E and Article 29 of the 1945 Constitution inclusively by eliminating discrimination in the religion column of ID cards and family cards, aligning with the non-discrimination principle established in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). This method illustrates the Constitutional Court's proactive role in broadening the scope of constitutional rights for excluded populations. Nonetheless, the analysis reveals that the ruling has not been accompanied by transformative normative and administrative modifications in other legal domains, through both a conceptual and statutory lens. In the national education system, proponents of various belief systems continue to have challenges in accessing educational services aligned with their convictions, particularly about the curriculum and subject recognition. In the marriage law framework, statutes like Marriage Law No. 1 of 1974 continue to predicate the legitimacy of marriage on state-recognized religions rather than on belief systems. This mismatch indicates that modifications at the court level have not yet been completely assimilated by the national legal framework in an intersectoral context. Content analysis tools revealed that the implementation of documents, including ministerial rules and public sector SOPs, has not yet demonstrated the inclusivity required by the Constitutional Court. The disparity within sectors results in a fragmentation of rights, because administrative acknowledgment does not inherently ensure the realization of further civil, political, and social rights. This research indicates that adherents of faith are still perceived as second-class citizens, possessing only a fraction of the privileges afforded to others. This signifies the presence of conditional and hierarchical citizenship, which undermines the notion of universal rights in contemporary democracy.

Upon comparing Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016 with procedures in other areas, we may identify systematic inconsistencies. Furthermore, a teleological interpretation of the law indicates that the objective of constitutional

protection remains unfulfilled if sectoral implementation continues to exhibit a bias in favor of the majority religion (Kahmad, 2017). This disparity can be elucidated through Luhmann's framework, which posits the legal system as autonomous and resistant to external influences. Consequently, despite the Constitutional Court serving as a catalyst for change, the legal system as a whole has yet to assimilate the principles of pluralism and substantive equality. This research underscores the necessity for court decisions to be accompanied by reforms in administrative, educational, and family law, ensuring that constitutional concepts evolve into enforceable norms that effectively transform the framework of social relations. A systematic and interdisciplinary approach is essential for the Indonesian rule of law to adequately and equitably fulfill its constitutional mission (Suhady, 2006).

### **The Discrepancy in Safeguarding between Standards and Actuality**

According to the Setara Institute, there were 333 violations of religious freedom and belief during the year, encompassing the restriction of worship, mob violence, and administrative discrimination (Institute, 2022). This indicates that the legislation fails to function as an effective safeguard for minority populations. This phenomenon can be elucidated through Boaventura de Sousa Santos's idea of legal pluralism, which repudiates the notion of legal centralism. In pluralistic societies such as Indonesia, social norms, cultural pressures, and predominant interpretations of religious doctrines frequently exert greater influence than formal legal standards (Sukmana, Susilawati, Chairijah, Ari, & Heriyanto, 2016). Consequently, despite the normative availability of legal protection, such protection fails to manifest in practice. This study uncovers a significant gap between established legal standards and actual practices on the protection of freedom of religion and belief in Indonesia (Hutagalung, Murizal, Isnani, & Saragih, 2023). Despite the formal legal framework, including Articles 28E and 29 of the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, and international instruments such as the ratified ICCPR, which normatively assure the right to practice religion or belief according to individual conviction, the Setara Institute documented 333 violations of this right. The presence of norms does not inherently ensure their execution in practice. The Indonesian legal system has been determined to incorporate sufficient principles for the protection of human rights. The research of law enforcement methods indicates that religious minority groups, including Ahmadiyah, Shia, and adherents of indigenous religions, routinely suffer abuses perpetrated by both state and non-state actors, sometimes without sufficient legal repercussions. This reflects the limited efficacy of legal standards in safeguarding the constitutional rights of minorities. In Indonesia, characterized by social and religious pluralism, informal norms such as community pressure, conservative religious interpretations, and local discriminatory practices frequently supersede official law. Consequently, despite the inclusivity of state law norms, exclusive and repressive social practices endure, frequently remaining ignored by the government. The research of rules and judicial rulings uncovers anomalies in the application and enforcement of legal standards, including instances where governmental infrastructure permits mob violence or restricts worship for specific groups. This is exemplified by the inadequate law

enforcement regarding the destruction of minority places of worship and the suppression of religious activities that diverge from the prevailing interpretation.

The teleological interpretation of law necessitates that it aims to fulfill the objectives of justice and the safeguarding of human rights; nevertheless, in practice, law enforcement officers and local authorities frequently yield to the influences of the predominant social group. This signifies a failure in the legal system to guarantee equitable access to justice for all citizens, especially minority populations. This research, through a normative-doctrinal analysis of positive legal norms and their application, contends that legal safeguards for religious freedom have shown to be ineffectual. This mismatch underscores the assertion that Indonesia has not completely realized the principle of substantive rule of law, wherein the law serves not merely as an apparatus for state control but also as a mechanism for the equitable protection of citizens' rights. Consequently, it is imperative to reformulate laws and regulations, alongside augmenting the capabilities of law enforcement personnel and institutions, to ensure not just the establishment of norms but also their efficacy within a pluralistic societal framework. This encompasses training based on human rights, fortifying local legal safeguards, and aligning regulations with constitutional tenets and international frameworks for freedom of religion (Misrah, Nurcahaya, Ismail, & Hutagalung, 2024).

### **Insights from the Legal Frameworks of Other Multicultural Nations**

Canada and South Africa exemplify nations that have legally embraced a diversity strategy. Canada, via the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and South Africa, through the 1996 Constitution, ensure the acknowledgment of all belief systems as integral to inalienable citizenship rights. Conversely, the Indonesian legal system continues to uphold a normative homogeneity rooted in the predominant religion. This research indicates that Indonesia has not established a legal framework that accurately mirrors the sociological reality of its diversified society, hence presenting a considerable impediment to attaining substantive justice for all individuals. In the realm of safeguarding religious freedom and citizenship rights for minority groups, it is pertinent to compare the legal systems of other nations to assess the alignment of the Indonesian legal framework with the principles of non-discrimination and the acknowledgment of pluralism as enshrined in international law.

This comparative analysis, underpinned by content analysis of the Indonesian constitution and judicial decisions (notably Constitutional Court Decision No. 97/PUU-XIV/2016), reveals that Indonesia exhibits a tendency towards normative homogeneity influenced by the predominant religion, evident in the limitations on official religion recognition and discriminatory governance in population administration. This generates a divergence between constitutional principles (which broadly acknowledge freedom of religion in Articles 28E and 29 of the 1945 Constitution) and the legal reality that restricts recognition to merely six official religions, thereby disregarding the validity of other beliefs that are sociologically and historically legitimate. The Indonesian legal system has not yet fully embodied the notion of equal citizenship, as determined by a conceptual analysis. Conversely, a hierarchical citizenship arises in which the acknowledgment of rights is



contingent upon the religious identity sanctioned by the state. This unequivocally contravenes the principle of universality of human rights as articulated in ICCPR Article 18, which Indonesia has adopted via Law No. 12 of 2005.

Utilizing systematic and teleological interpretation methods, one can contend that the national legal system has inadequately accomplished its constitutional mandate to attain substantive justice. The lack of a multicultural approach in legislation and judicial interpretation signifies the state's inability to address the pluralistic social reality, which ought to serve as the primary basis for the establishment of legal norms. In Canada and South Africa, the ideals of inclusion and acknowledgment of heterogeneity have become fundamental components of the national legal frameworks, rather than mere exceptions (Isharyanto, 2017). This research yields significant insights to promote legal reforms that formally embrace diversity and integrate the principles of pluralism throughout the legal framework, including the creation of laws, amendments to administrative regulations, or innovative constitutional interpretations.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This research suggests that notwithstanding the affirmation of constitutional rights for religious freedom and citizenship equality in Indonesia's 1945 Constitution, the application of positive law continues to exhibit discriminatory patterns against religious and belief minorities. The divergence between fundamental principles and sector-specific rules, shown by the Population Administration Law and the Marriage Law, restricts minority groups' access to essential civil rights, including legal identification, lawful marriage, and public services. This signifies the presence of a hierarchical or tiered citizenship, which undermines the idea of universality of human rights within a democratic rule of law framework. Normatively, the Constitutional Court has demonstrated a progressive trajectory through various rulings that advocate for inclusivity; however, these decisions reveal that the changes remain insufficiently transformative, as they have not been accompanied by comprehensive sectoral policy reforms and institutional awareness. Within the context of a multicultural society, Indonesian law remains predominantly influenced by a majoritarian perspective that inadequately addresses the plurality of opinions and convictions within the community. Future research may use an empirical methodology by examining the experiences of minority citizens in exercising their rights within administrative and social contexts. A comparative analysis with other multicultural nations, such as Canada, India, or South Africa, will significantly aid in developing a more inclusive and transformational legal policy framework. Future research should investigate the efficacy of executing Constitutional Court decisions across different bureaucratic tiers to attain substantive equality for all people, free from discrimination based on religion or belief.

#### References

Abbas, M. (2023). *SOSIOLOGI HUKUM: Pengantar Teori-Teori Hukum dalam*

- Ruang Sosial*. Jakarta: Sonpedia Publishing.
- Bahri, R. A. (2024). *MENGUJI VALIDITAS TEORI LUHMANN DALAM KONTEKS GLOBAL THE DYNAMICS OF THE LEGAL SYSTEM IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY: 1*, 44-53.
- David tan. (2021). Metode penelitian Hukum: Mengupas Dan Mengulas Metodologi Dalam Menyelenggarakan penelitian Hukum. *NUSANTARA: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*, 8(5), 1332-1336. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/490668614.pdf>
- Hutagalung, S. A., Murizal, I., Isnani, R., & Saragih, F. (2023). *Productive Waqf: Solutions for Strengthening the Ummah 's Economy and Social Empowerment*. 1(3), 10-17.
- Institute, S. (2022). *SIARAN PERS KONDISI KEBEBASAN BERAGAMA/BERKEYAKINAN (KBB) 2022*.
- Isharyanto. (2017). *Hukum Internasional dalam Pusaran Politik dan Kekuasaan*. Ciputat: Pustakapedia.
- Kahmad, D. (2017). Wawasan Agama Madani. *Bandung: Majelis Pustaka Dan ...*, 1-117. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/327165356.pdf>
- KOMNASHAM. (2022). *Capaian, TanTanGan & Optimisme melanjutkan langkah dalam pemajuan & penegakan HAM*. Jakarta.
- Misrah, Nurcahya, Ismail, & Hutagalung, S. A. (2024). *From Classroom to Ideological Space: The Formation of Radicalism in the Academic Environment*. 23(3).
- Moleong. (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Rosda.
- Risdiarto, D. (2017). Perlindungan Terhadap Kelompok Minoritas Di Indonesia Dalam. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, 6(1), 125-142. Retrieved from <http://www.hukumonline.com/berita/baca/lt574e8e59757a1/ini-catatan-komnas-ham-terhadap->
- Rustam, H. L., & Putri, L. S. (2023). Kewarganegaraan Inklusif: Menempatkan Model Budaya Disabilitas Dalam Teori Multikultural Liberal Will Kymlicka. *Jurnal Lintas Budaya*, 2(4), 423-436. <https://doi.org/10.7454/multikultura.v2i4.1054>
- Santoso, H. E. (2024). Moderasi Beragama dan Hak Asasi Manusia ( HAM ): Analisis Peran Agama dalam Memperkuat Toleransi dan Kesetaraan untuk memperkuat toleransi dan kesetaraan , kenyataannya adalah. *IN RIGHT :Jurnal Agama Dan Hak Azazi Manusia*, 13(1).
- Suhady, I. (2006). Kegiatan Penelitian/Kajian Untuk Pengembangan Sistem Administrasi Negara. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi*, 3(2), 149-159.
- Sukmana, S., Susilawati, T., Chairijah, Ari, W., & Heriyanto, B. (2016). *ESSENSI PLURALISME HUKUM INTERNASIONAL DALAM PERSPEKTIF SISTEM HUKUM DUNIA*. 10(September), 1-23.
- Tangkas, R. L., & Pakpahan, G. K. R. (2024). *Merawat Harmoni: Prinsip Deliberatif Jürgen Habermas sebagai Pilar Penghormatan Keberagaman di Indonesia*. 6(1), 63-76.
- Wijayanto, E. (2023). Konvergensi Politik Hukum, Hak Asasi Manusia Dan Pancasila Terhadap Perkawinan Beda Agama Di Indonesia. *Wicarana*, 2(1), 39-55. <https://doi.org/10.57123/wicarana.v2i1.31>
- Winda Roselina Effendi. (2018). Konsepsi Kewarganegaraan Dalam Perspektif Tradisi LiberalDan Republikan. *Jurnal Trias Politika*, 2(1), 55-62.