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Abstract
It was a project from the inception of democracy to put all people on an equal footing with the rest of society. But in actuality, both in the state and in everyday political practice, segregation between citizens is an unavoidable fact of life that cannot be ignored. This research investigates how the political reality of soundness is viewed within the framework of political theory when it comes to the daily practice of democracy in the context of political theory. This research, which takes a phenomenological perspective, not only explains how the reality of civic politics is in the fight for accessibility and equality of citizens, but it also attempts to comprehend it as a collaborative endeavor to overcome the segregation that exists in everyday civic politics. This study also takes into account cultural discourse in the development of equal citizenship politics.
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Introduction
Transformation of historicity as Political Processes
The public sphere cannot be termed as something that the public without the active involvement of the community. Therefore, the public sphere must always be open access to every member of society. Liberalism is an ideological guarantee that every individual is free to express issues and opinions that are considered important and urgent for the government during the response do not injure another individual freedom. The habit of thinking that is built liberalism makes the particular experience of a group becomes irrelevant to talk about in public, let alone to be a demand. Hopes for the privilege of government as the dispensation of the bad luck which has long experience will be seen as a breakthrough right action other subject. Sharing the experience of kinship only considered rational by members of the majority group. As a result, injustice only groups that experienced a problem and not a problem of a collective society. The problem in the community ranges of power resources and jobs is a problem individual.

Moreover, liberalism also sees that particular experience just about attributes. Someone put in the category of a particular group just because of external sees that
there is a suitable characteristic of individual categories (Hikmawan, 2017b). These individuals are members of the group as an aggregate, classification ignores the subjective experience of experiencing "An aggregate is a collection of individuals based on one or more attributes, the process of aggregate formation occurs from an outside perspective, and do not express the subjective point of experience social (Young, 2000) The birth of the movements of the black racial groups and feminist groups in Latin America, and gay groups in the period 1960 is proof that injustice beyond distribution problems occur. Members of these movements demanding justice on the United States government as it has for centuries should receive unfair treatment of people due to certain stereotypes that are subject to them. Bodily attributes justify by social practices that restrict self-determination and development (Hikmawan, 2017b). In general, these groups can be said to suffer injustice. If we transcendental perspective and viewed from the perspective of classical Marxism, the struggle can be regarded as a struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeois culture because these groups are complicated access to achieve economic establishment. However, the view that blacks are criminals, women are internal household welfare committee, and gays are people with low moral level is the concrete conditions experienced by members of the group. Injustice abstract concept offered by Marxism obscures the real experience of member groups oppressed. The groups are formed not merely because both have certain attributes, but more because of the sense of camaraderie (Young, 2000). The members of a social group are bonded to each other due to feelings of similarity that will be experienced by the particular social response to the attributes possessed. Two people with the same attributes do not necessarily have the same experience if it is in the context of a different time and space.

Different experiences will result in a different sense of belonging among other social groups. The difference is the mark that distinguishes a group with other social groups. Humans are born in a world that will never be absent by fluctuations and found himself living in a social condition and certain cultural norms (Hikmawan, 2017a). Before realizing it, social conditions are accepted as belonging to them have established ways of thinking and modes of expression of a person. Similarly, Young described how one can get involved in a group or social group. Borrowing mindset regarding Existentialism Martin Heidegger, one does not choose to enter into a social group, a person finds himself as part of specific experience (Young, 2000). Constitution of a social group in contrast with an organization that is certainly the reason and purpose of its establishment. Association established based on the conscious consent of its members (Hikmawan, 2014). The vastly different circumstances show that the anthropological assumptions between social groups and associations across from (Young, 1990). Association constitution is the result of individuals, social groups constitute the opposite individuals.

Therefore the association members cannot be referenced social experiences based on their respective associations (Hikmawan, 2014). For example, the struggle against the practice of apartheid in South Africa, who was born on the fact that local residents are black mistreatment because of political segregation which is run by the white population Explicitly, the movement said they want social change. Things Noteworthy of these examples is that the group of blacks in South Africa is a social group with experience be subordinated, whereas the struggle against apartheid as an
association also involves the active participation of non-blacks, one of which is Frederik Willem de Klerk - South Africa's president before the leadership Nelson Mandela (Hikmawan, 2014).

Method
This research uses qualitative methods with a phenomenological approach. As a qualitative research, this research tries to make a deeper sense of the meaning that some people consider coming from social and humanitarian problems (Creswell, 2013). Why the researcher using the phenomenology approach in this research, because this research tries to elaborate on the phenomenon about discrimination in Indonesia and to perceive that we need the intention to know deeper either the condition or complexity in power relation of multi-extreme-culture in Indonesia. To obtain valid and accurate data, this research will also open as much as possible to various possibilities. The important things are the literature from the previous paradigm or ideology about inclusion and democracy. The Phenomenology Approach will be used as an approach to be able to better understand how the possibility of understanding all the cases involved in the issues examined in this study is revealed and reveals itself so that the understanding obtained becomes comprehensive.

Results And Discussion
Majoritarianism: Monologism in Consensual Democracy Debate
The dominance of majority brings us to the tradition where the problem is solved by domination. This dominance in terms of freedom includes physical and non-physical. When we refer to an idealization in politics consensual-deliberative, deliberative democracy Habermas has not been able to answer the model of collective consensus (majority), which also agreed to be the domination of the minority, because generally, we understand democracy as a fusion of ideas about the power of the people and the idea of rights individual guaranteed by the law. The purport is the result of individual discourse sovereignty so that the people understood as a collection of individuals (Danujaya, 2012: xvi).

Oppression and domination that took place in the social life are causing a gap so that people in the social sphere is divided into a majority and minority communities. Some cases in Indonesia describe things that are coercive and repressive. For example, in the book Human Rights Watch report of 2013 issued by the National Commission on Human Rights in Indonesia (In Religion’s Name: Abuses against Religious Minorities in Indonesia., 2013), the report provides an overview of how violence in the name of religion prevalent in Indonesia between religions majoritarian and minority, when you see the report of the instigators of equality in Indonesia, namely Equivalent Jakarta Institute released the results of their research are at least about 216 cases of attacks on religious minorities in 2010, 244 cases in 2011 and 264 cases in 2012. This data shows us that the least violent minorities based on religious differences continue to increase every year. This means that there is something social phenomena experienced our daily lives in faces difference, especially in terms of more private that is religion.
In other cases, the resistance to worship in Indonesia is very worrying. The dominant identity or religion always makes the resistance movement to the other worship especially the minority religion in Indonesia. It makes the conflict between religion happen (Hikmawan, 2017a). There are other interesting reports regarding issues of discrimination in matters of religion. From the data released by the Wahid Institute, the organization monitor issues of human rights violations in Jakarta, at least there had been about 92 cases of violation of freedom of religion and 184 events of religious intolerance in 2011, this event is an increase of 64 cases of violations of religious freedom and religious intolerance 134 events in 2010. the high rate of violence illustrates that violence against religious minorities in the category becomes very vulnerable in Indonesia.

In some cases, the majority and minorities, discrimination against minorities is not only true, or occurs in the form of violence or repressive course, But the discrimination that occurs through the opportunity to contend for the minority (K Anthony Appiah & Gutmann, 1996). Ways of dialogue in resolving problems in the refinement. Because what happens is the domination of the majority against the minority. We can see in some cases, for example, the first minority to blame and succumb to the situation which is constructed by the majority.

Monologism majority against minorities occurs because of domination itself. There are indications that the use of space by the majority of procedural democracy in resolving a problem. When the dialogue between the majority and the minority was clogged the procedural democracy through consensus of the majority is always in force in resolving the problem. Then there is the domination of the majority again. Indications in the use of procedural democracy and misconceptions about the substance of democracy itself which makes the way of solving the problem very monologue. Each group or identity in a democratic system must be given the same space or access, including space equal dialogue. Although similar dialogue spaces do not guarantee the achievement of a fair decision, at least begin a dialogue that is not dominated by the majority. To guarantee equality in the space of dialogue and awareness of democracy than when no consensus at least avoid the occurrence of violence (violence) and avoiding the imposition of the majority against the minority.

Transformation Between Approval and Struggle
The deal is very central in the process of deliberative democracy. The process of discourse would not have a significant impact on justice if it cannot result in a decision to solve the problem together. However, joint problems simply understood as the experience of the problems that are shared problems, problems that are equally experienced (Hikmawan, 2020), either real or in analog. The viewing angle was eventually escorted to achieve the common good agreement regarding the rights of every individual. Have been described in the foregoing discussion that is too focused on reaching consensus on common rights tends to ignore the various viewpoints and also ignore other problems in society (Więclawski, 2020).

The discourse would involve the exchange of ideas. Various claims of ideas about justice delivered to persuade others to agree with those claims. "Therefore, people are reasonably obliged to persuade others about the claims of justice hers and showed a willingness to persuaded also by others (Hikmawan, 2020). In the case of
plurality, reasonable enables all interests to have the opportunity to be presented and considered its sustainability by countries. Competition interest to gain approval by the public in deliberative democracy is commonplace (Ian O’Flynn, 2006). Therefore, ideally, there should be no threat to harm or eliminate those who disagree or challenge parties’ privilege or whose beliefs are dominating or oppressive or even wrong. (Young, 2000).

Liberal democracy had been a lot of criticism because it restricts reasonable poured only at issue in the realm of overlapping consensus (Habermas J., 1996). Therefore, Young filed a renewal in the understanding of deliberative democracy. The most important thing in a democracy is not the final result of the approval, but the struggle. When in a society there are different social groups and injustice, a democratic political system should be a process of struggle (Amy Gutmann & Thompson, 2004). Not in the view of the opposition to the opponent, the struggle is a process of communicative engagement between citizens (Habermas Jurgen., 1998). People of social position or different interests have to struggle to raise their issues because the other party may feel threatened by these issues or they think other issues are more important. The democratic process will inevitably have to recognize and deal with the state of pluralism. Young agreed with Mouffe on agonistic pluralism as the basis of democracy today. He quoted Mouffe that democracy does not question their right to their ideas on the distinction between "enemy" (enemy) and "enemies" (adversary) (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985) (Mouffe, 2011). In the context of the whole political community should be understood that the opposite should be considered not as an enemy to be destroyed but as adversaries whose existence legitimate and should be tolerated. We will fight against the ideas of theirs but we did not injure his right to maintain its existence (Mouffe, 1993).

Deliberative democracy is the path chosen transformative Young to defend each party in defending the issues and interests that are considered private (Young, 2000). Deliberative in a democracy is a struggle for others involved in the debate on private but also social problems and their solutions. The actual effort is an attempt to involve other parties in clarifying and adjusting to their viewpoint. Deliberative democracy is conceived Young is the transformation of the private things become eligible for consideration as a public interest justice (Young, 1990). Based on the present situation which marred the perspective of liberalism, the public sphere is the main thing that requires a transformation within the various sides to change its capacity so it can accommodate private matters (Hikmawan, 2017a).

Civil Society and the Transformation of the Public Sphere

The public domain is a variable that has great power in deliberative democracy. With its function as a supervisor and controller of state policy, the public sphere also serves as the main liaison between the people and power. Practice justice received by the people is very dependent on the opinions submitted by public opinion (Fraser & Honneth, 2003). Public opinion is the result of the combination through the screening process and the synthesis of the various viewpoints in the information and deliberative network (Habermas J., 1996). Ideal public space is freedom for all individuals to be actively involved in the process of formulating a public opinion. Missed consideration is that the filtration and synthesis of information is none other
than the contestation of power in the community perspective (Fraser & Honneth, 2003). Although the formal availability of access for all parties is the same, the source of wealth, power, influence, and that more information would facilitate access for other parties (Young, 2000).

The hegemony of the dominant group in turn will have implications for the public spaces that are no longer a single ideal fit. Experience injustice of a social group will not be reduced if there is no change in the constellation of relations in the public sphere (Hikmawan & Hidayat, 2016). During the publicity in public space, access has the priority and public spaces are considered single, deliberative only takes place following streams with great force. The process in the public space will never stop even if some do not participate actively (Hikmawan & Hidayat, 2016). Although the formal availability of access for all parties is the same, the source of wealth, power, influence, and that more information would facilitate access for other parties.

It received as public opinion will eventually leave the reps publicity. Ignorance of the existence of the information the real experience of other social groups will alienate those different viewpoints. Although normatively all points of view should exchange ideas in the public sphere, the risk of a perspective not to be considered will always be there.

The freedom to get in and out of engagement in the public sphere was also accompanied by the possibility to be removed from the deliberative process, although subtly (Fraser & Honneth, 2003). The formation of subaltern counter-publics are things that must be accepted as a counterpoint large flow of public space (Jenssen, 2008). Members of a social group that was not heard by the public to find another way to be able to discuss the issues, particularly those close to their lives,

... the counter-publics can provide a place and space for members of the group subordinated to raise the issues between them and discuss, formulate analysis and their positions, and to develop ways of aesthetic and discursive in conveying the perspective of their social, separated from the dominant discourse .... Subaltern counter-publics also has an important function as a subordinate group members develop ideas, arguments, campaign, protest, intended to influence public debate in a wider scale, often with the goal of bringing legal or institutional changes (Young, 2000).

Activities such as resistance is a major contribution to deliberative democracy. It is appropriate to enable and promote diverse democratic discourse, opposition, forms of expression, and debate (Jenssen, 2008). The tendency to accept that public space is a singularity space or discourse must be expanded by the existence of civil societies. Subaltern counter-publics essentially the equivalent of which is accepted as the dominant public sphere, both are forms of civil society.

Conclusion

The recognition of difference requires the recognition of the functions of civil society (Kymlicka & Norman, 2000). "Civil society is enabling the emergence of a public space where new social differences can express thoughts and formulate their opinion (Hikmawan, 2020). The alternative to voice calls for justice in a complex society is through civil society. Awareness of subjects with an experience similar to formulate and articulate the experience is the first step in the process of fighting for social change. While we must feel humiliated and taken the right view, in a liberal
society (and sometimes in illiberal society) people who are disadvantaged or marginalized can find each other and form associations to improve their lives through mutual help and articulation of group consciousness (Kymlicka, 1995). Although they are short of money, expertise, and social connections than others, the poor or marginalized can exploit certain resources that are owned equally by all: time. (Young, 2000).
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