Reinterpreting "Belief in One Supreme God": Biblical Theology and the Social Construction of Religious Intolerance in Indonesia

Vinus Zai[1]*, Thinna Naftali Woenardi[2], Andreas[3]

1. Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Abdi Allah (STTIAA) Mojokerto, East Java-Indonesia
2. Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Abdi Allah (STTIAA) Mojokerto, East Java-Indonesia
3. Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Abdi Allah (STTIAA) Mojokerto, East Java-Indonesia

* Corresponding author: vinuszai281085@gmail.com

Abstract: This article analyzes the interpretation *of the One Godhead* (Ketuhanan yang Maha Esa) as the first precept of Pancasila and its relationship to the social construction of religious intolerance in contemporary Indonesia. The unit of analysis of this research is a philosophical, theological, and social discourse that forms the meaning of the first precept in the context of religious pluralism. This study aims to examine how differences in interpretation—particularly between exclusive and inclusive interpretations—affect religious attitudes, public discourse, and social practices related to tolerance. The research method is qualitative, integrating a comprehensive literature review and critical discourse analysis of academic texts, policy documents, religious narratives, and media representations. Key findings suggest that exclusive, literalist interpretations of the One Godhead contribute to the polarization of identity and the legitimation of intolerant practices, while inclusive interpretations that align with biblical theological ethics—such as human dignity, justice, and love— have transformative potential to strengthen social cohesion. This article contributes to the interdisciplinary study of religion and democracy by offering an inclusive conceptual framework for multireligious education based on the philosophy of Pancasila and biblical hermeneutics.

Keywords: Pancasila; Religious Intolerance; Biblical Theology; Social Construction; Pluralism

1.   Introduction

Indonesia is known as a country with a very high level of religious, ethnic, and cultural diversity, but in the last two decades, it has faced an escalation of increasingly complex religious intolerance problems. This phenomenon is reflected in the increasing cases of restrictions on religious freedom, discrimination against minority groups, and conflicts based on religious identity involving state and non-state actors. The Setara Institute report (2024) recorded at least 208 incidents of violations of freedom of religion and belief throughout 2023, showing a relatively stagnant but structurally worrying trend. Similar findings were also reported by the Wahid Foundation (2023) and Komnas HAM (2023), which emphasized that intolerance is not only sporadic but institutionalized through local policies, social pressure, and religion-based symbolic legitimacy. This condition reveals a

fundamental paradox: intolerance actually develops under the umbrella of the Pancasila state ideology, especially the first precept of *Ketuhanan yang Maha Esa*, which is normatively designed to ensure a peaceful and inclusive religious life (Notonagoro, 2022; Supriatna, 2023). Thus, this social fact shows that the problem of intolerance in Indonesia is not solely due to interreligious conflicts, but is closely related to how the principle of Godhead is interpreted and practiced in the social and political space.

Academic studies on religion, state, and tolerance in Indonesia have developed quite widely from various perspectives. A number of scholars highlight the historical and political relationship between Islam and the state (Effendy, 2020; Hefner, 2020), while others emphasize the intellectual dynamics of moderate Islam and religious pluralism (Azra, 2023; Madjid, 2021; Maarif, 2021). Other studies examine intolerance through legal and public policy approaches (Surbakti & Harahap, 2022), multicultural education (Jannah, 2023; Setiawati, 2022), and the role of digital media in the spread of religiously motivated hate speech (Siregar, 2023; Wahyudi, 2024). However, most of these studies still position *the One Godhead* (*Ketuhanan yang Maha Esa*) as a normative or ideological framework that is taken for granted, without an in-depth analysis of how the philosophical and theological interpretation of the first precept contributes to the social construction of intolerance. In addition, cross-theological studies—especially those that employ biblical theology as an analytical lens—are still very limited, even though Indonesia is, in fact, a multireligious society. Thus, there is a research gap in systematically linking the interpretation of the One Godhead, the theory of social construction (Berger & Luckmann, 1966), and the dynamics of religious intolerance in contemporary Indonesia.

Based on these gaps, this article aims to fill the research gap by analyzing the relationship between philosophical-theological interpretations of *the One Godhead* and the social construction of religious intolerance in Indonesia. In particular, this study examines how exclusive, literalist, and fundamentalist interpretations of the first precept contribute to identity polarization and the delegitimization of pluralism, and how inclusive interpretations can serve as a source of social transformation. Using a qualitative approach grounded in literature review and critical discourse analysis, this study not only relies on normative data but also examines religious narratives, public policy, and media representation as arenas for the production of social meaning. Integration of biblical theological perspectives—especially the concepts *of Imago Dei*, justice, and love (Goldingay, 2009; Bauckham, 2021)—used not for apologetic purposes, but as an ethical-comparative tool in reading Indonesia's religious pluralism. Therefore, the main contribution of this article lies in developing an interdisciplinary conceptual framework that bridges the philosophy of Pancasila, the sociology of religion, and theology to enrich the global discourse on religion, intolerance, and democracy in pluralistic societies.

The main argument of this article is that religious intolerance in Indonesia cannot be understood solely as a deviation from the values of Pancasila, but rather as the result of a process of social construction influenced by an exclusive interpretation of *the One* Godhead. Drawing on the social construction theories of Berger and Luckmann (1966) and the social identity theories of Tajfel and Turner (1979), this article departs from the hypothesis that theological interpretations that emphasize claims of single truth and group superiority tend to reinforce the "us–them" boundaries and legitimize the practice of social exclusion. Instead, an inclusive interpretation that emphasizes universal human dignity and the ethics of justice can reduce conflict and strengthen social cohesion. Biblical theological perspectives reinforce this argument by showing that monotheism is not

synonymous with social exclusivism but can rather serve as the basis for a public ethics that values diversity (Wright, 2006; Bauckham, 2021). Thus, this article proposes the hypothesis that an inclusive reformulation of the interpretation of the One Godhead is an important prerequisite for strengthening pluralism, democracy, and religious tolerance in Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The One Godhead, Religious Freedom, and the Legal Architecture of the State

The study of the first precept ("The One Godhead") in Pancasila is relevant not only as a moral concept, but also as a *normative architecture* that forms the boundaries of freedom of religion/belief (KBB) and civic practice in Indonesia. In the post-Reformation context, a number of studies have shown that the main problem is not the absence of constitutional guarantees, but the interpretive ambiguity that allows discriminatory practices through a regime of religious regulation. For example, Mu'ti and Burhani assert that the "One Godhead" often serves as the basis for limiting KBB—especially when the state positions "legitimate religion" as a standard of public propriety—thereby making space for minority or non-mainstream beliefs vulnerable (Mu'ti & Burhani, 2019). In line with that, Hoon's study unravels how "religious freedom" in Indonesia is in tension between the commitment to pluralism and the push for majoritarian morality, resulting in policies that appear neutral but are not always inclusive (Hoon, 2018). Conceptually, this literature provides a foothold for placing your article: the first precept is not just a theological doctrine, but rather a *political premise* that mediates state–religion relations and determines whether pluralism is understood as "equal coexistence" or "conditional tolerance".

The debate becomes sharper when the first precept intersects with blasphemy law and judicial practice. Crouch shows how the "Blasphemy Law" material test in the Constitutional Court confirms the way the state negotiates "religious truth" through the language of the law—not just for the sake of order, but also for the sake of the definition of orthodoxy that has a real impact on minorities (Crouch, 2012). A complementary perspective is provided by Hasan, who links the post-Suharto expansion of militant religious activism to the failure of religious diversity governance; In this framework, blasphemy is understood as a political-legal mechanism that often operates as a "tool for managing plurality" but has the potential to deepen exclusion (Hasan, 2017). Thus, the theological-biblical arguments in the article can be positioned as a measurable normative critique of the policy regime, rather than just a moral discourse.

2.2. Intolerance as a Social Phenomenon: Structural Predictors and Group Identity Dynamics

The Scopus literature also confirms that intolerance is not adequately explained through "teachings" or "doctrines", but rather through a combination of structural and psychosocial predictors. A large-scale longitudinal study by Yusuf, Shidiq, and Hariyadi used IFLS (2007–2014; >20,000 respondents) to map the relationships among income, education, inequality, poverty, and religiosity and intolerance. The results showed a consistent pattern: education and income were associated with higher tolerance, while self-expressed religiosity tended to be negatively correlated with tolerance; regional inequality and poverty are also associated with increased intolerance (Yusuf et al., 2020). Theoretically, these findings enrich the framework of your article because they provide

an empirical basis that intolerance is a "social product" of the material and ecological conditions of the community, not just individual choice. For articles that carry the "social construction of intolerance", this kind of study can be used to sharpen the literature: intolerance is shaped by the structure of opportunity, the distribution of resources, and the institutionalized sense of threat. Consequently, the reading of the first precepts (and biblical theology) should not stop at the normative level, but should show a causal/explanatory path connecting norms, social structures, and collective actions.

At the level of social psychology, the dynamics of group identity provide an explanation for why religious issues are easily mobilized into support for intergroup violence. Setiawan, Scheepers, and Sterkens tested *a social identity model of collective action* to predict support for interreligious violence in Indonesia (n=1,995). They found that religious identification can drive perceptions of injustice and collective efficacy, which in turn increases support for acts of violence (Setiawan et al., 2020). This evidence is important for your article because it helps bridge the "social construct" with the "psychological mechanism": intolerance is not just the result of doctrine, but also the result of threat framing, moral legitimacy, and the reinforcement of in-group/out-group identity. With this framework, the reading of the first Pancasila precept can be analyzed as *a symbolic repertoire* used to thicken group boundaries ("who is considered to be rightly God") or—as a converse—as an integrative symbol of plural cohesion. If your article presents a biblical-theological lens, then its contribution will be stronger if it shows how certain theological narratives can dampen (or even strengthen) the mechanisms of collective identity, for example, through the concept of universal human dignity and the ethics of reconciliation.

2.3. Digital Public Space, Production of Intolerance Discourse, and Ethical-Theological Offerings

The transformation of public spaces into social media accelerates the circulation of hate speech while complicating efforts to mitigate intolerance, because meaning is produced rapidly, fragmented, and often curated by networks of friends and user choices. In general, platform research shows that cross-ideological exposure is influenced by a combination of network structure and individual selection; A very large-scale Facebook study found that both algorithms and user choices play a role in reducing exposure to cross-view content (Bakshy et al., 2015). In the Indonesian context, computational studies also show the expansion of hate speech and its detection challenges; A systematic review in Heliyon confirms that research on the detection of *hate speech/abusive language* is still dominated by classical approaches and faces the challenge of identifying targets, categories, levels of hatred, and spreading actors (Ibrohim & Budi, 2023). This literature may reinforce your article's position: the "social construction of intolerance" is now prevalent through a digital ecology that produces moral legitimacy, *moral outrage*, and micro-polarization. Therefore, when your article combines Pancasila and biblical theology, it is necessary to show how the "norm" works as an effective *counter-narrative* in the digital public space—not just as a philosophical ideal.

In order for the contribution of biblical theology in your article to appear "scientific-international journal", it needs to be tied to a contemporary operationalized public ethics debate. One of the strong paths is the concept of human dignity and *the imago Dei* as the basis of universal ethics that restrains exclusivism. Müller, for example, shows that the Christian tradition can sustain narratives of human rights and dignity across anthropological, moral, legal, and practical dimensions; however, he also

warns that an exclusive reading of *the imago Dei* can erode universal acceptance of human dignity (Müller, 2020). In the context of religious pluralism and inclusion, Szczerba emphasized that *the imago Dei* can be read relationally, functioning as a theological symbol for recognizing dignity and inclusion across faiths (Szczerba, 2020). With these two references, your article can clarify the "bridge" between the first precept and intolerance: the first precept can be understood as a recognition of the Divine that should give birth to an ethics of respect for the dignity of every human being, not a justification for removal. That is, the novelty you may emphasize is the first model of precept interpretation grounded in the theology of universal human dignity and tested for its relevance to the practice of intolerance, including in the digital public space.

3. Methods

3.1 Material Objects

The material object of this research is an interpretive discourse on *the One Godhead* as the first precept of Pancasila and its representation in religious discourse, public policy, and social media in Indonesia. The study focuses on the relationship between philosophical-theological interpretation and the social construction of religious intolerance. These objects are understood as social realities produced through symbolic and institutional processes (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Thus, this study places the first precept as a socially contested field of meaning.

3.2 Research Design

This study uses a qualitative design with an interpretive-critical approach to understand the relationship between religious discourse and intolerance practices. This approach was chosen because it allows for an in-depth analysis of the meanings, ideologies, and power relations at work in texts and social practices (Creswell & Poth, 2018). In particular, this study integrates Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to explore how interpretations of the One Godhead are constructed and legitimized in the public sphere (Fairclough, 2015).

3.3 Data Source

The data sources of this research consist of secondary data which include: (1) articles from reputable international journals (Scopus-indexed) related to Pancasila, intolerance, and religion; (2) the main academic book in the philosophy of Pancasila and theology; (3) policy documents and reports of independent institutions such as the Setara Institute, the Wahid Foundation, and Komnas HAM; and (4) media and social media texts that represent the discourse of intolerance. The use of these diverse sources aims to strengthen the validity and depth of analysis through conceptual triangulation (Denzin, 2012).

3.4 Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was carried out through a systematic literature review and a search of relevant public documents. Academic literature was selected based on thematic relevance, journal reputation, and publication novelty (2015–2025). In addition, media texts and public statements are analyzed as artifacts of social discourse. This technique aligns with the practice of document-based qualitative research in religious and political studies (Bowen, 2009).

3.5 Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis was carried out through critical discourse analysis, comprising the following stages: identification of dominant themes, coding of exclusive and inclusive narratives, and interpretation of the relationships among texts, social contexts, and power structures. The thematic process follows the reflexive approach of Braun and Clarke, while the critical reading of the discourse emphasizes the ideological and normative dimensions (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Through this technique, the research uncovered the mechanism of how the interpretation of the One Godhead contributes to the legitimacy of intolerance or social cohesion.

4. Result

4.1. Patterns of Interpretation *of the One Godhead* in Public and Religious Discourse

The results of the literature review and document analysis show that interpretations of the One Godhead in Indonesian public discourse fall along a clear spectrum from exclusive to inclusive. Exclusive interpretations generally emphasize claims of singular truth, harmony between the majority religion and public morality, and the use of divine terms as markers of social legitimacy. This pattern can be found in local policy documents, statements by religious actors, and public discourse that attribute the legitimacy of religious expression to certain orthodoxy standards (Notonagoro, 2022; Supriatna, 2023). The Setara Institute (2024) and Komnas HAM (2023) report documents that this kind of interpretation often appears as a basis for administrative justification in restricting the establishment of houses of worship and prohibiting the activities of minority groups. These findings are consistent with comparative research on state-religion relations in religious majority societies, which show that the concept of state divinity is often operationalized exclusively in policy practice (Hoon, 2018). Empirically, this data shows that the first precept serves as a symbolic reference that can be selectively mobilized in public discourse.

On the contrary, the findings also point to an inclusive interpretation of the One Godhead that emphasizes the recognition of the plurality of expressions of faith and the equality of citizens. This interpretation appears mainly in academic works, statements by interfaith figures, multicultural educational documents, and tolerance policies. The studies by Azra (2023), Madjid (2021), and Maarif (2021) noted that this approach views divinity as a source of universal ethical values, rather than a tool for classifying faith. Data from the Center for the Study of Religion and Democracy (2022) shows that regions with strong interfaith dialogue programs tend to have higher tolerance indexes. These findings align with international research showing that framing religion as a source of universal value correlates with inclusive attitudes towards other groups (Hefner, 2020). Thus, this study's results show that two patterns of interpretation coexist in the Indonesian social space, each with distinct social implications.

Analysis of religious texts, including biblical theological literature used in Indonesian Christian academic discourse, shows that the concept of monotheism is also represented in a variety of ways. Theological texts that emphasize human dignity, justice, and love as a consequence of monotheistic faith are more often used in interfaith discourse and tolerance education (Goldingay, 2009; Bauckham, 2021). These findings are descriptive and suggest that the same theological source can yield different social representations depending on the context in which it is used. International

studies of religion and public space have documented a similar phenomenon: religious texts function as *symbolic resources* that can be used both inclusively and exclusively (Juergensmeyer, 2017). Overall, the results in this subsection show that *the One Godhead does* not have a single meaning in social practice, but rather exists as a discursive field produced through the interaction of actors, institutions, and social contexts.

4.2. The Relationship between the Interpretation of the First Precept and the Practice of Religious Intolerance

Empirical findings from independent institutional reports show a link between the exclusive interpretation of the first precept and the practice of religious intolerance. The Setara Institute (2024) notes that the majority of cases of violations of freedom of religion and belief involve normative justifications grounded in divine values and public morals. These forms of violations include refusal to establish houses of worship, dissolution of religious activities, and social pressure on minority groups. Komnas HAM data (2023) reinforces these findings by showing that the narrative of order and harmony is often used to limit certain religious expressions. Empirically, this pattern has also been observed in cross-border studies, which show that intolerance is more common when religion is associated with national identity or state morality (Yusuf et al., 2020). These findings are descriptive and suggest that normative interpretations of divinity have practical consequences in the management of religious diversity.

Analysis of survey data and social psychology research shows that exclusive religious interpretations correlate with polarization of group identity. A study by Setiawan et al. (2020) of nearly two thousand respondents in Indonesia found that strong religious identification, when combined with threat perception, was associated with increased support for exclusive acts and inter-group violence. These findings are consistent with Tajfel's (1979) social identity theory, which suggests that "we–them" categorization reinforces bias and discrimination. In the Indonesian context, the Wahid Foundation report (2023) shows that religious minority groups are more likely to experience social stigma in regions with high levels of religious identity mobilization. Empirically, this data reinforces the idea that intolerance is a structured, not incidental, social phenomenon.

Other findings suggest that intolerance practices are also mediated by structural contexts such as local policies and political dynamics. The Surbakti and Harahap study (2022) documented that religiously nuanced regional regulations often directly restrict the activities of minority groups. A similar pattern emerged in international studies, showing that regulation grounded in religious morality tends to result in social exclusion when it is not accompanied by a mechanism to protect minorities (Crouch, 2012). This data shows that the interpretation of the first precept is not only present in symbolic discourse, but is also institutionalized in legal and administrative practice. Overall, this subsection's results show that religious intolerance in Indonesia is closely related to how the One Godhead is understood and translated into social structures and public policy.

4.3. The Role of Social Actors and Digital Media in the Production of Intolerance

The analysis of documents and literature shows that social actors play a significant role in producing and spreading intolerance discourse. Religious leaders, local political elites, and community organizations often serve as opinion leaders who shape how the public understands issues of divinity and diversity. A report by the Center for the Study of Religion and Democracy (2022)

noted that public statements by influential figures often trigger escalation of tensions between groups. These findings are consistent with international research that shows that the social legitimacy of religious actors increases the reach and impact of religious discourse (Hefner, 2020). Empirically, these data show that intolerance is produced not only by individuals but also by networks of actors with symbolic and social capital.

Digital media has emerged as the main arena for the production and circulation of intolerance discourse. Analysis of media reports and studies shows that social media platforms are accelerating the spread of religion-based hate speech. Research by Bakshy et al. (2015) shows that algorithms and user choices together limit exposure to alternative views, reinforcing polarization. In the Indonesian context, Siregar (2023) and Wahyudi (2024) documented an increase in hoaxes and hate speech with religious nuances, especially ahead of political momentum. These findings show that the digital space reinforces the already prevalent exclusive narrative in society.

In addition to reinforcing polarization, digital media also facilitates the normalization of intolerant discourse through repetition and social legitimacy. The study of Ibrohim and Budi (2023) shows that hate speech is often packaged in moral and religious language that is difficult to distinguish from ordinary expressions of faith. These empirical data show that intolerance is not always present in the form of physical violence, but also as a repetitive and socially accepted discursive practice. Overall, the results in this subsection show that social actors and digital media are important elements in the social construction of religious intolerance in Indonesia.

5. Discussion

The results of this study show that *the One Godhead*, as the first precept of Pancasila, is produced and practiced through a diverse spectrum of interpretations, with different social implications. Empirically, the findings identified two dominant patterns: exclusive interpretations, which correlate with intolerance practices, and inclusive interpretations, which are present in academic discourse, education, and interfaith dialogue. Data from the Setara Institute, Komnas HAM, and the Wahid Foundation show that restrictions on religious freedom are often legitimized through normative references to public religious morality. In addition, the results also show that intolerance does not stand alone, but is mediated by structural factors such as local policies, identity mobilization, and digital media dynamics. These findings are consistent with the international literature, which views religion as a symbolic source that can both strengthen cohesion and spark social conflict, depending on how it is interpreted and institutionalized (Hefner, 2020). Thus, the study's results provide an empirical picture of how the first precept functions as a discursive field in the social construction of intolerance in Indonesia.

Reflection on the findings of this study shows that the problem of religious intolerance in Indonesia cannot be understood as a mere deviation from the value of Pancasila, but as a consequence of a layered social process. The fact that exclusive interpretations *of the One Godhead* appear in administrative policy and practice indicates a gap between constitutional norms and social implementation. The literature on the sociology of religion shows that state religious norms often undergo *recontextualization* in response to political interests and moral majoritarianism (Casanova, 2018). In this context, reflection on the research results leads to the understanding that the first precept is not only an ideological text but also a social instrument that can be selectively mobilized.

Data on the role of social actors and digital media further confirm that intolerance is produced through the interaction between structures, agents, and technology. Thus, this reflection situates the research results within a broader framework of the relationship among religion, power, and public space in a pluralistic society.

The results of this study confirm that the social construction of religious intolerance operates through mechanisms of symbolic legitimacy and identity categorization. The findings on the correlation between exclusive interpretations and identity polarization align with social identity theory, which posits that affirming group boundaries reinforces bias and exclusion (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In this framework, *the One Godhead* serves as a moral symbol that provides normative justification for restrictive practices. The biblical-theological perspective evident in the study's results suggests that monotheism does not inherently entail social exclusivism, as noted in international public theology studies (Bauckham, 2021). This interpretation presents the research findings as evidence that conflict does not originate in faith itself, but in the ways it is interpreted and articulated in the social space. Therefore, the study's results strengthen the argument that the normative reinterpretation of the first precept is directly relevant to social practice and public policy.

Compared with previous research, this article's findings broaden understanding of religious intolerance by treating Pancasila, especially the first precept, as the main analytical variable. Previous studies have tended to emphasize economic, educational, and religiosity factors as predictors of intolerance (Yusuf et al., 2020) or highlight the role of state laws and policies (Crouch, 2012). This study complements these findings by showing that the interpretation of state ideology also plays an important role in shaping social attitudes and practices. Moreover, unlike the study of normative theology, this article uses biblical theology as a comparative analytical lens rather than as a claim to truth. This approach aligns with recent trends in religious and political studies that encourage cross-cultural dialogue to better understand pluralism (Ferrara, 2019).

Based on the results and discussion, this study has important implications for further research and policy practice. Academically, these findings open the door to advanced empirical studies that examine the relationship between interpreting the first precept and attitudes of intolerance, using surveys or comparative case studies across regions. In practice, the study's results show the importance of developing multireligious education that emphasizes an inclusive interpretation *of the One Godhead*, as supported by the global religious education literature (Jackson, 2014). In addition, the findings on the role of digital media underscore the need for digital literacy strategies and platform policies that are sensitive to religion-based hate speech. Thus, the follow-up to this research is not only theoretical, but also relevant for efforts to strengthen pluralism, democracy, and social cohesion in Indonesia.

6. Conclusion

This study confirms that *the One Godhead*, as the first precept of Pancasila, does not operate as a single neutral concept, but is present through various interpretations that have real social consequences. Empirical findings suggest that exclusive and literalist interpretations of the first precept correlate with the practice of religious intolerance, including restrictions on religious freedom, identity polarization, and the legitimacy of discriminatory policies. Data from institutional reports and academic studies show that normative references to the divine are often used as a basis

for moral and administrative justification in the public sphere. Conversely, this study also found that an inclusive interpretation *of the One Godhead* is developing in academic discourse, multireligious education, and interfaith dialogue, although its influence has not been dominant in policy practice. Overall, these findings confirm that the dynamics of religious intolerance in Indonesia are closely related to the social construction of the meaning of the first precept, rather than solely to the existence of religious plurality.

Scientifically, this article makes an important contribution to the interdisciplinary study of religion, state ideology, and intolerance by placing the interpretation of Pancasila as the main analytical variable. Unlike previous studies that focused on economic, educational, or individual religiosity factors, this study shows that state ideology—especially the first precept—plays a symbolic role as a symbolic resource that shapes social relations and public policy. Another contribution lies in the use of biblical theology as a comparative, rather than normative, analytical lens to show that monotheism does not inherently result in social exclusivism. By integrating social construction theory and group identity, this article expands the understanding of how philosophical and theological norms translate into social practice. Therefore, this research enriches the global discourse on pluralism and democracy by offering perspectives from the Indonesian context that are relevant to other multireligious societies.

Based on the limitations and findings of this study, further research is needed to deepen the understanding of the relationship between interpreting the first precept and religious intolerance. Survey-based empirical research or cross-regional comparative case studies can be used to test, quantitatively, the relationships among interpretations of the One Godhead, religious attitudes, and support for exclusive policies. In addition, longitudinal studies are needed to assess the long-term impact of multireligious education grounded in an inclusive interpretation of Pancasila on changes in social attitudes. Further research can also expand theological approaches by engaging other religious perspectives on an equal basis, thereby strengthening interfaith dialogue. With the development of this kind of research, the study of Pancasila, religion, and intolerance is not only reflective but also contributes to the formulation of social policies and practices that are more inclusive and just.

References

Aliansi Demokrasi untuk Papua. (2024). *Laporan tahunan kondisi kebebasan beragama di Papua tahun 2023*. Jayapura: Aliansi Demokrasi untuk Papua.

Azra, A. (2023). *Islam Indonesia: Dinamika intelektual dan transformasi sosial*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.

Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science, 348*(6239), 1130–1132. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160

Bauckham, R. (2021). *Gospel of glory: The forgotten testimony of earth's witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589–597. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Casanova, J. (2018). Public religions revisited. *Religion, 48*(1), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/0048721X.2017.1408604

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crouch, M. (2012). Law and religion in Indonesia: The Constitutional Court and the blasphemy law. *Asian Journal of Comparative Law, 7*(1), 1–46. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2194607800000582

Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 6*(2), 80–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186

Effendy, B. (2020). *Islam dan negara: Transformasi gagasan dan praktik politik Muslim di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Paramadina.

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368

Ferrara, A. (2019). Religion and democratic pluralism. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 24*(2), 131–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2019.1603815

Goldingay, J. (2009). *Old Testament theology: Israel's life with God*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Hassan, R. (2022). *Radicalism and fundamentalism in Southeast Asia: The challenge of Islam*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003277704

Hefner, R. W. (2020). *Civil Islam: Muslims and democratization in Indonesia* (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hoon, C.-Y. (2018). Putting religion into multiculturalism: Conceptualising religious multiculturalism in Indonesia. *Asian Studies Review, 42*(3), 476–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2018.1473332

Ibrohim, M. O., & Budi, I. (2023). A systematic review of hate speech and abusive language detection. *Heliyon, 9*(8), e18647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e18647

Jackson, R. (2014). *Signposts: Policy and practice for teaching about religions and non-religious worldviews in intercultural education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107449367

Jannah, R. (2023). Pembentukan karakter toleransi melalui pendidikan multikultural berbasis agama di sekolah. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama, 12*(1), 45–62.

Juergensmeyer, M. (2017). *Terror in the mind of God: The global rise of religious violence* (4th ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia. (2023). *Laporan tahunan kondisi HAM di Indonesia tahun 2022*. Jakarta: Komnas HAM.

Madjid, N. (2021). *Islam, kemodernan, dan keindonesiaan*. Jakarta: Paramadina.

Magnis-Suseno, F. (2020). *Etika Jawa: Ajaran-ajaran filosofis dan wawasan hidup orang Jawa*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Maarif, A. S. (2021). *Islam dan politik: Mencari makna di tengah badai*. Bandung: Mizan.

Mujiburrahman. (2020). *Jejak langkah pemikiran liberal Islam di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Müller, J. (2020). Human dignity and *imago Dei*. *Journal of Reformed Theology, 14*(1), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.30965/15697312-01401003

Nasution, H. (2021). *Islam ditinjau dari berbagai aspeknya*. Jakarta: UI Press.

Notonagoro. (2022). *Pancasila secara ilmiah populer*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Pusat Studi Agama dan Demokrasi. (2022). *Laporan tahunan indeks toleransi beragama di Indonesia*. Jakarta: PSAD.

Said, A. (2021). *Teologi pluralisme: Membangun kerukunan antarumat beragama*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Setara Institute. (2024). *Laporan kebebasan beragama/berkeyakinan (KBB) di Indonesia tahun 2023*. Jakarta: Setara Institute.

Setiawan, E., Scheepers, P., & Sterkens, C. (2020). Interreligious conflicts in Indonesia: Social identity, religious ideologies, and support for intergroup violence. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 23*(3), 331–345. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12397

Setiawati, E. (2022). Integrasi pendidikan multikultural dalam kurikulum pendidikan agama Islam. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam, 7*(2), 115–132.

Simanjuntak, H. (2021). *Pancasila dan pluralisme agama di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.

Siregar, R. (2023). Peran media sosial dalam penyebaran hoaks dan ujaran kebencian berbasis agama. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi, 15*(1), 67–84.

Supriatna, E. (2023). *Filsafat Pancasila: Kajian ontologis, epistemologis, dan aksiologis*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.

Surbakti, N., & Harahap, N. (2022). Implementasi perda bernuansa syariah dan dampaknya terhadap kebebasan beragama di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan, 52*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol52.no1.2996

Suryadinata, L. (2020). *Pribumi dan Tionghoa: Beberapa perspektif dan masalah*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 18*(1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1979.tb00734.x

Wahid Foundation. (2023). *Laporan indeks kualitas kehidupan beragama di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Wahid Foundation.

Wahyudi, J. (2024). Literasi digital dan tantangan radikalisme agama di era disrupsi informasi. *Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi, 18*(1), 1–18.

Wright, N. T. (2006). *Simply Christian: Why Christianity makes sense*. New York, NY: HarperSanFrancisco.

Yusuf, A. A., Shidiq, M., & Hariyadi, H. (2020). The determinants of religious intolerance in Indonesia. *Religions, 11*(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11010021