

## Philosophical and Psychological Analyze of Tolerance

Muhammad Rezza Septian<sup>1</sup>, Mamat Supriatna<sup>2</sup>, Juntika Nurihsan<sup>3</sup>, Nandang Budiman<sup>4</sup>

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

e-mail: [rezza.septian25@gmail.com](mailto:rezza.septian25@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This article contains an analysis of the philosophical and psychological studies of tolerance in the context of guidance and counseling. The scope of the tolerance study includes a philosophical review and a psychological review of tolerance. The method used is the literature review method, with five stages, namely looking for similarities (compare), looking for dissimilarities (contrast), providing views (criticizing), comparing (synthesizing), and summarizing (summarizing). The results of the study show that philosophical tolerance is influenced by idealism and humanism and is supported by the philosophers Socrates, Spinoza, John Stuart Mill, Jurgen Habermas, Karl Popper, John Rawls, Michael Walzer and Neville. The psychological figures namely Andrew Murphy, Amy Guttmann, and Gordon Allport. The results of the analysis can also be used as material for research and development of tolerance programs in guidance and counseling services.

**Keywords:** philosophical, psychological, tolerance

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia as a plural country has various ethnicities, religions, races and cultures. This pluralism certainly requires a comprehensive strategy in building tolerance to live together in diversity (Lyn Parker, 2014). However, on the other hand, pluralism and diversity can potentially give rise to social conflicts that can threaten the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI), especially if pluralism is not properly addressed and managed (Hikam, Muhammad, 2006).

Tolerance comes from the Latin - *tolerare* or *tolerantia* - the first being a verb meaning "to endure", the second a noun meaning "to forgive". One "accepts" the unpleasant - one gives acceptance, but only reluctantly. The ability to live with feelings that are considered unpleasant reflects that understanding. So, the cosmology of tolerance consists of (1) what is valued; (2) what is hated (which cannot be tolerated); (3) what is belittled but not so strong as to go beyond (tolerated) approval (Wise, 1940).

One of the historical roots of tolerance is the madinah charter or madinah charter which was practiced during the time of Rasulullah SAW by carrying out a spirit of togetherness, mutual respect, egalitarianism, freedom and justice (Abdurrahman, 2019). Tolerance is strongly influenced by the philosophy of idealism and humanism pioneered by Aristotle. As for Socrates as a philosophical figure who was the first to express and practice tolerance. Tolerance in Socrates' view is about readiness to see the truth in others and being prepared to admit the untruth within (Fiala: 2005).

Tolerance in a psychological view is referred to as the tolerant personality (Allport, 1954). The personality of tolerance is an individual who is actively friendly with all kinds of people and does not make a difference of race, skin color or creed so that he has and expresses a friendly and trusting attitude towards other people. The tolerance personality in Allport's view develops at the beginning of life or at an early age that develops through interaction pressure from both the environment, school and family, the stronger the tolerance personality that is formed.

Tolerance can be described as an attitude that allows freedom of expression, peace and freedom for those who have disagreements about religion, race, ethnicity or customs (Kamen, 1967; Galeotti, 2001; Pasamonik, 2004). Michael Walzer (1997) describes tolerance as the key to peaceful coexistence and a necessary condition for human development. Similarly, Fiala (2002) defines tolerance as a pragmatic response to the practical need to coexist with others who have different conceptions of goodness. UNESCO (1995) declares tolerance to be a virtue that enables peace by being manifested as

---

\* Corresponding Author:  [rezza.septian25@gmail.com](mailto:rezza.septian25@gmail.com)

respect, acceptance, respect for the diversity of world cultures, forms of expression, and ways of being human that are fostered by knowledge, openness, communication, freedom of thought, conscience and belief.

According to Hornby (1995) tolerance means "quality of tolerating opinions, beliefs, customs, different from one's own". Vogt (1997) argues that tolerance is a deliberate effort to refrain from facing anything that is disliked, threatening, or bad behavior to maintain the order of social relations in pursuit of harmony. Michael Similarly, Fiala (2002) defines tolerance as a pragmatic response to the practical need to coexist with others who have different conceptions of goodness. Tolerance, says Fiala (2002) develops from the recognition that in practice diversity cannot be eradicated by philosophical arguments or political forces.

Tillman (2004) suggests points of reflection on the character of tolerance, including (a) peace is the goal; (b) tolerance is open and receptive to the beauty of difference; (c) tolerance respects individuals and differences; (d) tolerance is mutual respect for one another; (e) the seeds of intolerance are fear and indifference; (f) the seed of tolerance is love; (g) if there is no love there is no tolerance; (h) who knows how to appreciate the good in others and situations have tolerance; (i) tolerance means facing difficult situations; and (j) tolerance of life's inconveniences by letting go, lighthearted, and letting others go. These points of reflection on the character of tolerance will lead to peace between individuals.

The need for tolerance is driven by everyday social interactions that treat individuals with respect and dignity (Walt, 2012). There are so many views on tolerance, so this article will analyze tolerance from a philosophical and psychological point of view, as well as its use for guidance and counseling.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This study uses library research, namely research conducted only based on written works such as books, encyclopedias, journals, dictionaries and magazines (Harahap, 2014). As for this research, it uses sources that are relevant to the research problem raised. These sources were obtained from the internet, books, and journals. The design of this study is descriptive analysis, namely the regular breakdown of the data that has been obtained, then given an understanding and explanation so that it can be well understood by the reader. The data used in this research is secondary data. Secondary data is data obtained not from direct observation. However, the data was obtained from the results of research that had been conducted by previous researchers. Secondary data sources in question are in the form of books and primary or original scientific reports contained in articles or journals regarding philosophical and psychological studies of tolerance. The philosophical and psychological analysis will be described based on the views of figures from philosophy and psychology which are presented in table.1 as follows.

Table.1 Philosophical and Psychological Figures in the Study of Tolerance

No	Filsafat	Psikologi
1	Socrates	Andrew Murphy
2	Spinoza	Amy Guttmann
3	John Stuart Mill	Gordon Allport
4	Jurgen Habermas	
5	Karl Popper	
6	John Rawls	
7	Michael Walzer	
8	Neville	

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The philosophy that underlies the topic of tolerance is the philosophy of idealism and humanism pioneered by Plato (427-347 BC). Philosophy of idealism is a school that teaches that the nature of the physical world can only be understood in relation to the soul and spirit. Figures in the flow of idealism philosophy include: Plato and Aristotle. However, tolerance is also discussed, which originates from the philosophy of Socrates. The philosophy of humanism is a group of philosophies

and ethical perspectives that emphasize the value and human body individually and collectively, and generally prefer individual thinking and evidence founded on faith. Figures in the flow of humanist philosophy include John Locke, Rousseau, J.S. Mill, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Cesare Beccaria, and so on.

### 1. Human Nature

According to idealism, human nature is that in human development there is a harmony between humans and nature. That which is highest in the soul is also the deepest in nature. The soul (self) is not an isolated or unreal unit; the soul is an actual part of the natural process. This process at a high level shows itself as activity, mind, soul, or individual. Man as a part of nature shows the structure of nature in his own life (Titus: 1954). Plato (Thabrani, 2015) states that every human being has three parts of the soul (Plato's Tripartite Theory), namely nous (mind) which is rational power, thumos (spirit or courage), and epithumia (desire, need or lust). The idealist deterministic view of human beings states that the absolute spirit (God) is free and infinite, but human beings as part or embodiment of the absolute spirit are not free and finite. Both the position and actions of man are pre-arranged or predetermined by the absolute spirit. There is no human freedom, either individually or collectively, because human freedom is actually the absolute freedom of the spirit. Human development is basically the development of the absolute spirit (Abidin, 2017).

Human nature in the view of the philosophy of humanism is that humans have the nature of goodness in themselves. In this case, if humans are in an environment that is conducive to potential development and are given a kind of freedom to develop, they will be able to actualize or realize attitudes and behaviors that are beneficial to themselves and society in general (Hanurawan, 2006). Adherents of the humanistic school give the view that every human being has freedom and autonomy which has direct consequences for individuality and human potential.

### 2. Purpose of Life

The purpose of life in the view of idealism is spiritual. This means that even though humans are part of natural processes and are natural, there is something inside that cannot only be considered as material. It is not enough for human interpretation to see oneself as an animal or to describe it as controlling only physiological and mechanical processes. Man discovers his abilities by knowing God's disposition through man and his aspirations. (Titus: 1954). In line with Plato's view (Thabrani, 2015) the task and purpose of human life is to live according to his talents and moral values and norms derived from the Absolute. In relation to the nature of human beings who have a soul and spirit, the purpose of human life is to live according to their soul as bestowed by God. So that human behavior contains intent and purpose, not merely moving mechanically. The main source or driver of behavior is not external forces (stimulus and central nervous system) but internal forces, namely the soul that wants to manifest itself in reaching personal values and societal and religious norms or laws. The purpose of human life is thus to actualize themselves and the values they believe in (Abidin, 2017). The purpose of life in the view of humanism is paidea Ancient Greece namely to make humans as beings who understand and understand their human potential in the context of Humanity Education which also has strong relevance as a dogma for educating humans.

### 3. World View

The world view in Idealism (Titus: 1954) is that basic reality consists of or is very closely related to ideas, thoughts, or souls. The world has a different meaning from what appears on the surface. The world is understood and interpreted by investigations into the laws of mind and consciousness, and not simply by the methods of objective science alone. Aristotle explained that the view of human life must be adapted to the conditions of its environment. Humans have intellects that must be optimized in order to adapt to the environment (Miswari, 2016). In objective idealism does not deny the existence of external reality. Thus finding in nature the same principles of order, reason and purpose are found in human beings. Nature existed before the individual soul and will continue after the soul; nature also existed before the human group existed. But "there" in the sense of something like reason or thought in the midst of ideals. The meaningful order of reality was given to humans to think about and participate in it. Belief in meaning and thought in the structure of the world is the basic intuition that forms the basis of idealism. The world view in humanism is related to human values or even to the search for human nature.

#### 4. Life Values

Idealism philosophically justifies that the person has meaning and dignity; Humans have value and are higher than institutions and things. Idealism corresponds to many human intuitions and aspirations. Followers of idealism say that idealism gives moral support to human spiritual intuition. The appeal of idealism is based on human moral aspirations and not only on the basis of logic or epistemology (Titus: 1954). Idealism considers the values of life to have a basis in a higher field than just individual or social groups. In absolute idealism nature comes first and is higher than the particular (the special), therefore in Plato's view that idea or universal is a transcendent essence. Even modern idealism emphasizes that humans are considered as moral actors who can express values. In this way, idealism provides an objective basis for moral values and obligations. The values of life in humanism are related to paidea (happiness), where humans understand their humanity and human potential.

#### 5. Views of Philosophical Figures Regarding Tolerance

##### a. Socrates

According to Socrates, truth can be pursued only when adopting an attitude of ignorance (ignorance). Ignorance is associated with sophrosyne (self-control), humility, and tolerance. These values are important for the search for philosophical truth. Socrates always deliberately restrained himself and acted ignorantly in order to let others develop his thoughts or even make important mistakes in his search for the truth. Socrates' goal is to discover the truth through open minded debate. Without this kind of tolerance, there can be no dialogue and no development of knowledge. In associative language the dialogue in the Athena assembly with the sophists is as follows.

And what kind of man am I? One of those who will gladly argue if anything I say is untrue, and will gladly disprove others who say what is untrue, but will be more than happy to disprove myself rather than disprove, for I consider it a benefit greater, in so far as it is a greater gift to be freed from one's own worst crimes than to free others (Fiala, 2005).

For Socrates, the pursuit of truth must be related to the willingness to consider other ways of thinking, or other truths that is being open to other ideas of thinking and acting. Tolerance in Socrates' view (Fiala, 2005) is about readiness to see the truth in others, while being prepared to admit unrighteousness within. This means that a person may tend to a certain position in truth. But then one finds another position or truth, which then calls into question one's own truth, thereby forcing one to refute it.

##### b. Spinoza

Spinoza underlined the importance of freedom of human thought. Political authority is the authority over the control of actions, not at all the control or suppression of thoughts.

##### c. John Stuart Mill

John Stuart Mill (1859) provides three segments for tolerance which is called the harm principle

- The application of social or political power can only be justified if it is aimed at preventing people from hurting each other, not for imposing an idea in a paternalistic way.
- Tolerance towards opinion can be justified, both for right opinion and wrong opinion, because it leads to a productive social learning process.
- Tolerance for unusual life experiments to support the value of individuality and individual originality.

##### d. Jurgen Habermas

Habermas argues about tolerance only when the parties involved base their rejection on a cognitive conflict with reasonable reasons. Not all objections can be considered reasonable. Often the basis is prejudice, for example racism. Tolerance demands that all prejudices and discriminatory attitudes must first be eliminated. Tolerance is about equal rights. If there is still prejudice, discussions about equal rights cannot be initiated. Tolerance can begin if unreasonable discrimination is confronted first.

According to Habermas, there is no inclusion without exclusion. Only by mutual agreement and acceptance of universal limits of tolerance and mutual understanding and acceptance of other perspectives, the sharp knife of intolerance can be

blunted. In order for tolerance to be kept away from suspicion of intolerance, rules regarding tolerant behavior need to be agreed upon by all parties. Habermas advocates a rational effort (deliberation) in which the norms of tolerance, including tolerance limits and norms governing the relationship between those who tolerate and those who are tolerated, result from deliberate and rational efforts between the parties touched by these norms.

Tolerance based on mutual acceptance and respect for different views of life allows democracy and religion to live together in a pluralistic environment and enables reconciliation between multiculturalism and equality. The relationship between homophily and intolerance arises when the tolerant party is faced with a dilemma in choosing between having positive relations with tolerant individuals in different groups and having positive relations with members of their own intolerant group.

e. Karl Popper

According to Popper (1945) tolerance that is applied without limits can actually eliminate the tolerance itself. So when the unlimited right of tolerance is given to the intolerant, and if we are not prepared to defend a tolerant society against attacks from the intolerant, there is a danger that both tolerant and intolerant societies will be destroyed. In this formation, Popper implies a statement that intolerance does not have to be silenced. As long as it can be faced with a rational argument and public opinion, then silencing intolerance is not wise. But there must be the right to suppress, if necessary by force, because intolerant people are most likely not ready to face rational arguments. They can reject all arguments and forbid their followers to listen to rational arguments because they think that rational arguments are a trick. Those who are intolerant are taught to respond to arguments with physical violence. Therefore, in defending tolerance, humans must have the right not to tolerate those who are intolerant.

f. John Rawls

According to John Rawls (1971) a just society needs to tolerate the intolerant. Otherwise, society could consider it intolerant and thus unjust. However, like Popper, Rawls also believes that society has the right to carry out self-preservation against intolerant actions that violate the principle of tolerance. Intolerant groups can complain because their freedom is limited only when tolerant people have rational reasons that their security and that of their group is in danger.

The idea of tolerance stems from the opinion that diverse individuals can tolerate one another by building overlapping consensus. Individuals and groups with diverse views will look for reasons to agree with certain principles of justice which include the principle of tolerance. This is the empirical and historical argument by which diverse individuals or groups eventually overcome differences by committing pragmatically to tolerance as a *modus vivendi* or way of life.

The philosophy of John Rawls (1971) reminds all people that a diverse society needs to develop a paradigm of tolerance that emphasizes understanding others as understood by others. In addition, it is necessary to develop a transformative paradigm that emphasizes collaboration with others in order to create systemic and institutional changes. Institutional change can be successful when there are greater opportunities to encourage people who steadfastly support diversity and social, political and economic equity.

g. Michael Walzer

Michael Walzer (1997) questions whether the intolerant can be tolerated. He said that most of the minority groups that are tolerated are also intolerant in some way. In a tolerant society, intolerant groups can learn to be tolerant or behave as if they have tolerance values. This means that there is an effect of behavior modification (behavior modification) through the strategy of forgiveness.

h. Neville

According to Neville (2014) in the 21st century there are two ways of viewing the discourse of tolerance. First, tolerance is seen as an in-group and out-group problem. The problem of tolerance is a double standard or a double issue against group boundaries. There is something related to tolerance from outgroups according to the characteristics of the members or from the competition. There is a tolerance associated with deviation within the in group. Second, tolerance is seen as a narrative problem. Many of the narratives deal with conflict, obstacles and constraints, war, strife, purges, religious

opposition, apostasy, betrayal, competition, domination, and submission. Many people want to understand their life through narrative.

### Psychological Analysis Of Tolerance

In the concept of psychology, tolerance consists of three dimensions which are sometimes separate and sometimes integrated. The first dimension is the agree or disagree dimension (approval or disapproval). Second, the dimensions allow or prohibit (permission or prohibition). Third, the dimension of origins of beliefs. In some views of psychology figures, tolerance is described in the following analysis.

#### 1. Andrew Murphy

According to Andrew Murphy, tolerance is an effort to refrain from denying or limiting the autonomous rights of other parties who have different ways of life or behavior. Tolerance has a double meaning, not only being able to defend oneself or rejecting a view or behavior, but also accepting these views and actions as long as they do not harm anyone physically, psychologically or emotionally.

#### 2. Amy Gutmann

According to Amy Gutmann tolerance is an agreement to disagree with other parties regarding beliefs and behavior because this is the essence of basic liberty (basic human freedom). In essence, agree to disagree (agree to disagree) because mutual respect is part of an equal moral human attitude.

In psychology, tolerance can be seen as a personality trait that reflects a liberal attitude, acceptance of the behavior, beliefs, and values of others. this term is associated with psychological resilience that arises from the ability to tolerate various forms of stress without negative consequences. In the understanding of psychology, tolerance is an individual or collective (group) attitude and the practice of accepting other parties to be and act differently from themselves or their own group.

At the individual level, tolerance can be considered as a personality trait related to agreeableness and openness to experiences. At the social level, tolerance is associated with social acceptance. Tolerance is the ability to restrain and control oneself from interfering in the opinions or behavior of other parties even though they deviate from their own views and even though they do not agree morally (Nicholson, 1985).

#### 3. Gordon Allport

Allport (1954) contributed to psychology with his thoughts on personality traits. Allport uses the term persona which he defines as

- The self as it appears to others (not the real self)
- The role played in life
- A mix of personal traits appropriate to place in life
- Uniqueness and dignity

#### a. Personality

Personality is a dynamic organization in individuals who are included in psychophysical systems that determine their unique adjustments to the environment.

Dynamic Organization. According to Allport (1954) personality involves an active organization that is constantly evolving and changing and that involves motivation and self-regulation. So this is something dynamic, not static. Organization also carries the possibility of disorganization which results in abnormal states and is associated with personality disorders or mental illness.

Psychophysical Systems. Intended to remind that personality reflects the mind (mind) and body (body) and the total organism. The system includes various habits, attitudes, sentiments, and dispositions. The most important is the trait that is latent or active

Determining tendencies. Personality is something and do something. Personality is not the same as behavior. Personality underlies behavior from within the individual. These systems are called determining tendencies.

Unique. Individual adjustments are unique, both in time, space and quality.

Adjustments to his environment. According to Allport (1954) personality is a form of survival that has a functional and evolutionary meaning. For humans, personality is not only reactive, but can also be spontaneous and creative. Humans can master the environment, but can also be influenced by the environment.

The psychophysical systems referred to by Allport gave birth to traits, the core of Allport's theory of personality. Allport discusses the trait as a form of readiness or a determining tendency. An important aspect of the trait is the equivalence between perception and behavior. Traits treat different stimuli in the same way in perception and response.

According to Allport (1954) traits are influenced by childhood experiences, the present environment, and interactions between the two. There are three types of traits contained in personality. First, Cardinal traits shape individuals, namely in terms of self-concept, emotional composition, attitudes, and behavior. Cardinal trait dominates the entire personality of the individual; second, Central trait is a general characteristic that forms the basis of personality. The central trait is not as dominant as the cardinal trait. Central trait is the main characteristic that can describe a person. This is a pending trait, but not dominant. Traits such as kindness, honesty, and friendliness are the central traits. Every human being, according to Allport, has five to ten central traits. Its presence varies in each individual. This includes intelligence, shame and honesty. Central trait is the main factor that determines behavior.

Third, Secondary trait related to attitudes or preferences. This is a less generalized disposition and appears only in specific situations or circumstances, for example, nervousness before delivering a speech on stage. Individuals who have an aggressive cardinal trait may show a submissive attitude when dealing with the police. So, the secondary trait may or may not appear when there are other interactions. According to Allport, secondary traits are difficult to detect because the stimulation that can bring them out is rarer. Attitude includes trait and includes secondary trait. Tolerance and intolerance are attitudes, meaning they are included in the secondary trait. Allport also distinguished between individual traits and common traits. No one has exactly the same traits. Each has an individual trait. However, in a society people also develop forms of adjustment so that common traits also occur.

#### b. Basic Prejudice

With the increase in diversity in society, so do problems in society, namely the problem of segregation, prejudice, and hostility between groups (intergroup hostility). According to Allport (1954) humans are not born with prejudice. Prejudice is a learned attitude. Prejudice deprives human dignity and breaks the fundamental unity between people.

Allport (1954) defines prejudice as an attitude or feeling of hostility towards someone just because that person belongs to a group that is considered to have negative characteristics. Allport emphasized that this hostility was not just a quick judgment before knowing the facts. This hostile attitude arises from judgments that reject facts and truth or honesty. Thus, prejudice blinds itself to facts and creates a kind of natural poison in relationships. Although prejudice occurs in everyday life, it also includes incorrect ideas about a group as a whole. There is prejudice regarding religion, race, and ethnicity which is a sense of antipathy that is based on generalizations or wrong and rigid stereotypes. Prejudice based on race occurs because first, prejudice gives someone a false awareness of self-identity and self-esteem. A person may discriminate against others to make himself feel more powerful and to increase his self-esteem; second, categorization and stereotyping often makes it easier for people to place one party as the scapegoat for individual problems over groups.

Discrimination is an act as a result of negative Prejudice. According to Allport (1954) the stages of behavior caused by discrimination are

- Spoken abuse, also known as anti-locution
- Avoidance
- Organized racism and discrimination
- Violence or physical assault
- Systematic extermination of a group

Polite prejudice does not carry serious consequences because it is limited to gossip and idle talk. Maybe not many humans move from verbally abusing towards being more aggressive, but activities at one level make it easier for humans to carry out activities at the next level.

#### c. Mature Personality and Tolerance

Extension of the sense of the mature human self focuses not only on his inner needs, but also on his outward attraction. By participating in life, they give direction to life.

- Warm relating of self to others. The mature human being is characterized by two kinds of warmth. On the one hand, they are capable of intimate intimacy with the ability to love. On the other hand, humans avoid relationships that are full of gossip, meddle in other people's affairs, or are possessive. Humans respect other human beings as individuals and are tolerant. This is called democratic character structure.
- Emotional security (self-acceptance). Mature humans can have emotional grace. They have the ability to avoid excessive behavior (over acting) as well as having a tolerance for frustration (frustration tolerance). In these two aspects, Allport differentiates the understanding of tolerance into three: first, warm tolerance is a warm attitude for all, second, cold tolerance is holding back things that are not liked, third, limit tolerance is tolerance for intolerance.
- Realistic perception, skills, and assignments. Mature individuals are very close to real life (real world). They see things with clear eyes and are able to see true reality.
- Self objectification, insight, and humor. There is a correlation between insight and humor. Humans who really know themselves can see themselves objectively and laugh at the shortcomings and mistakes that are made.
- A unifying philosophy of life. Mature individuals realize the purpose of life. Awareness of this life purpose is a clear direction in life, in a strong orientation towards religious values or conscience. Awareness of moral obligations can provide a philosophy of life without having to be connected with religious beliefs.

#### Use of Tolerances for Guidance and Counseling

Tolerance in theory and practice can provide benefits for Guidance and Counseling. Tolerance that accepts differences to be able to live together (Vogt, 1997) can even be the key to peaceful coexistence (Walzer, 1997). Galtung (1967) conceptualized the meaning of peace as an internal human condition that has peaceful thoughts towards itself when faced with a certain situation. Theoretically tolerance becomes a reference material for the implementation of guidance and counseling services in the social sector to increase competence in respecting differences in terms of ethnicity, religion, race, culture, habits, traditions and other differences in educational and daily activities (Savchits et al, 2017) so that live together in diversity and difference. As for practice, tolerance makes a major contribution to both majority and minority students (Ahmad & Amin, 2018) who receive guidance and counseling services to actively dissolve in differences and create peaceful mindsets and behaviors, peaceful lives and a culture of peace in a process that tiered and multi-channel, starting from an early age to higher education, even through formal, non-formal and informal education levels (Sunaryo, 2018).

## CONCLUSION

Tolerance is philosophically influenced by idealism and humanism and is supported by the philosophers Socrates, Spinoza, John Stuart Mill, Jurgen Habermas, Karl Popper, John Rawls, Michael Walzer and Neville. The psychological figures namely Andrew Murphy, Amy Guttmann, and Gordon Allport. The results of the analysis are useful as material for research and development of tolerance programs in guidance and counseling services in the social field to increase competence in respecting differences in terms of ethnicity, religion, race, culture, habits, traditions and other differences in educational and daily activities so that they can live together as a whole. side by side in diversity and difference.

## REFERENCES

- Abdurrahman, F. (2019). *Jalan Damai Ala Rasulullah: Risalah rahmat Bagi Semua*. Jakarta: Alvabet.
- Abidin. (2017). *Memahami dan Mengukur Toleransi dari Perspektif Psikologi Sosial*. 15(September), 16–17

- Ahmad, K., & Amin, B. (2018). The Role of Cross-Cultural Counselling in Efforts to Improve The Tolerance of Tionghoa Ethnic Students. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 274
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Andrew Murphy. (NA) What is Tolerance?
- Fiala, A. G. (2002). Toleration and pragmatism. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, New Series, 16(2), 103–116.
- Fiala, A. G. (2005). *Tolerance and Ethical Life*. London: Continuum
- Galeotti, A. E. (2001). Do we need toleration as a moral virtue?. *Res Publica*, 7, 273–292
- Hanurawan, F. (2006). *Filsafat Pendidikan*. Malang: FIP UM.
- Harahap, N. (2014). PENELITIAN KEPUSTAKAAN. *Iqra*, 8(01), 68–74.
- Hikam, M. (2006). *Demokrasi dan Civil Society*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Hornby, AS. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jurgen Habermas. (NA). Paper on intolerance and Discrimination
- Kamen, H. (1967). *The Rise of Toleration*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Karl Popper. (1945). *The Open Society and its Enemies*
- Lyn Parker, "Religious education for peaceful coexistence in Indonesia?", *South East Asia Research*, 22, 4, pp 487–504 doi: 10.5367/sear.2014.0231, p.3, 2014.
- Miswari. (2016). *Filsafat Terakhir : Evaluasi Filsafat Sepanjang Masa*. Unimal Press.
- Pasamonik, B. (2004). The paradoxes of tolerance. developing tolerant attitudes in students, *Social Studies*, 95, 206–210.
- SAVCHITS, N. Y., Ismailova, S. A., Turebayeva, B. Z. (2017). The experience of students' interethnic tolerance formation in the conditions of university's multicultural educational space. *Espacios*. Vol. 39 2018. Page 19
- Kartadinata, S. (2018). Keynote speech in the 1st UPI ICEBEF (International Conference on Economics, Business, Entrepreneurship & Finance, September, 18, 2018.
- Thabrani, A. M. (2015). *Filsafat dalam Pendidikan*. In IAIN Jember Press. IAIN Jember Press.
- Titus, H. H. (1959). *Living Issues in Philosophy*, New York: American Book Co.
- Tillman, Diane. 2004. *Pendidikan Nilai Untuk Kaum Muda Dewasa (Terjemahan Risa Pratono)*. Jakarta: Grasindo
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of Tolerance*
- Vogt, W. P. (1997). *Tolerance and education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. London: Sage.
- Walzer, M. (1997). *On Toleration Castle Lectures in Ethics, Politics, and Economics*. New York: Yale University Press.
- Walt, J. L. Van Der. (2012). Towards understanding (religious) in tolerance in education. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i3.1977>
- Wise, J. W. "Introduction" in *From Bigotry to Brotherhood: A Tolerance Reader*, edited by James Waterman Wise. New York: Council Against Intolerance in America. (Though undated the book is most likely from the early 1940s.)