Journal of Modern Education Review, ISSN 2155-7993, USA
July 2017, Volume 7, No. 7, pp. 519–527
Doi: 10.15341/jmer(2155-7993)/07.07.2017/007
© Academic Star Publishing Company, 2017
http://www.academicstar.us

Social Interaction Pattern in Plural Society

Josef Dudi
(Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Study Program, Palangka Raya University, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia)

Abstract: This study aims to assess the pattern of interaction of religion in a plural society SeiGohong Village, Bukit Batusubdistrict, Palangkaraya, Central Kalimantan Province. Focus studied is the interaction patterns of cooperation, accommodation, assimilation, and conflict. The method used in this study is a qualitative approach grounded. The findings show: (1) the nature of the cultural and religious of Kaharingan beliefs had the cooperation space and into ongoing field harmonious social interaction; (2) Ethnic Dayak embraced some religions like Hinduism, Islam, and Protestant. The situation really supported accommodative attitude and their willingness to accept other tribes who came from various regions in Indonesia; (3) A unique view of society SeiGohong is as good as any religion, religion is not the destination, but the path. Therefore, inter-religious intermarriage became commonplace. This is an amazing assimilative attitude in SeiGohong; (4) SeiGohong is not a community without conflict. It can be seen through the attitude of fanaticism and ethnocentrism particular group. That situation threatens the continuation of inter-religious harmony in SeiGohong.

Key words: social interaction, plural society, ethnic Dayak

1. Introduction

Interaction is a necessity of human nature as social beings, especially in the life as a society, without the interaction of society into chaos and fall victim to the cruel law of the jungle. Abubakar (2009, p. 9) said that social interaction is a key element of all social life, because without it there can be no life together. In short, all of the social activities happen in the relationship and interaction.

In the realm of ontological, social interaction is not only a relationship, but also as a statement of human existence in the presence of one another. Therefore, the social space is a process of interaction endlessly either to fulfill existence needs (statements and topicality themselves) or to fulfill the pragmatic needs.

Littlejohn (1996) said interaction is a central element for social individual. Our world depends on what we learn from others in social communities and cultures. Reality is socially constructed within the group so there is no universal reality found. Therefore, a simple social interaction is built socially through interaction.

Social interaction always implies three things; they are cooperation, competition, and conflict. These three things are not in operation gradually, in the sense of social interaction always start from cooperation, then competition, and finally conflict, but happen randomly and depend on the social context of the people concerned.

Each community or group of people has the shape or pattern of interaction that is typical. The typical pattern in interaction distinguishes between one to other community groups. Generally, the pattern of interactions every

Josef Dudi, Dr., Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Study Program, Palangka Raya University; research areas/interests: SeiGohong, tangkiling and central borneo. E-mail: bernadetha_boli@yahoo.com.

group of society is determined by the relevant social processes that form the social characteristics that happen "here" and "now".

An important part of social interaction is a condition in people's daily reality is constructed by individuals in the communities concerned. Berger and Luckmann (1990, p. 15) describes the individual is never born as member of society. He was born with a predisposition toward sociality, and he becomes a member of society. In other words, society is formed because the human need to interact with each other. Thus, any form of social reality is the result of inter-subjectivity construction.

In such relationships, the pattern of social relationship of a community is not only determined by social processes, but also determined by the level of diversity of the social element that characterized the social process. For example, the diversity of ethnicity, religion, class, race and other forms of diversity greatly affect the social relationship of the people concerned.

Diversity contains dialectics. That is, a plurality of a social reality which is mesmerizing and frightening. At one end of the spectrum, the plurality is a natural truth, a universal law, a legal view of life, and one from the Lord (O'Dea, 1996, p. 61).

Gudykunst and Kim stated that cultural and ethnic diversity is necessary for a community to exist (Tubbs & Moss, 2000, p. 61). However, at the other end of the spectrum, many social experiences of nation show a plurality is a threat. Difference is an existential reality that seems more often painful than pleasant (Juliawan, 2004).

Jonathan Wift said sarcastically: "We have the only religion to make us hate each other, but not enough to make us love each other" (O'Dea, 1996, p. 141). This anxiety drove John Hick to write, "If God is the God of all humanity why is the true religion, the right approach to God, confined to a single strand of humanity, so that it is has not been available to the great majority of the Thousands of millions of human beings who have lived and died from the earliest days until now? If God is the Creator and Father of all, can God have true religion provided only for a chosen minority?" (Mahmut, 2001, p. 332).

Volf (2002, p. 8) answered a series of basic questions by saying, "The lamps are different, but the light is the same. Today, religious diversity is a given, but pluralism is not a given; it is an achievement. More diversity without real encounter and relationship will yield increasing tensions in our societies."

Kimball (2003, p. 84) said in every religion, claim to truth is the foundation that underlies the whole structure of the religion. However, when a particular interpretation of the claim into propositions that require a single truth and treated as rigid doctrine.

Coward (1989) stated that every religion appears in a pluralistic environment from the point of religion and establish itself as a response to such pluralism. According to Tracy (1987) among the religions that exist in the world is no one single essence, there is no single charge of enlightenment or revelation, there is no single way of emancipation or liberation built in all plurality. There are different interpretations of God himself: God, Emptiness, Suchness, the One, Nature, and the Many.

Scott (2002) wrote "Forty years ago, the Catholic theologian John Courtney Murray asked a question that seems particularly subject relevant for Flushing: How much pluralism and what kinds of pluralism can a pluralist society stand? The extreme case of Flushing Suggests that there is no limit. Indeed, the great importance of this community may be its example to the rest of the country and the world an update of sorts on John Winthrop's notion of 'a city that is set upon a hill' and what church historian Sidney E. mead called the 'lively experiment'" (Hanson, 2002).

Harman (2004) conducted a study on the Beyond Talk: The Dialogue of the hive as the Locus Nonverbal

Interreligious Dialogue. Harman research result is both the villagers help each other whenever conducting religious ceremonies. Even both communities build a house of worship together. “Everyone respects Fr. Antonio. He has given us so much, like the water pump. He gives more than he takes. He gives us the potential to become Christians. We believe him, so we believe in Christianity.” Carey (2004) wrote, “A ritual view of communication is directed not toward the extension of messages in space but toward the maintenance of society time; not the act of imparting information but the representation of shared beliefs.”

2. Research Methods

This research used methods grounded (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). This research was conducted in SeiGohong, Bukit Batu, Palangkaraya in Central Kalimantan Province. Data collection techniques were depth interview, participatory observation, small group discussions, and documentation.

The collected data were analyzed using two stages of analysis, namely (1) the first order understanding of actors according to perspective actors that is the subject of research; (2) the second order understanding of social scientist, basing itself on the interpretation of the first level and correlated with specific contexts (Dey, 1993).

Analysis was done by basing itself on the results of interviews with a number of informants in SeiGohong, held discussions with several informants. In fact, an informant was often visited twice or three times in order to get accurate information.

The researcher tried to give the interpretation to the observations on daily life or situation naturally in SeiGohong in various places such as in coffee shops, at the port, at school, on the street, in the village hall, anywhere and anytime as long as the place and the opportunity it has the potential to earn information and data for this study.

3. Research Result

3.1 The General Description of the People in SeiGohong

SeiGohong, Bukit Batu, Palangkaraya include the areas that have a significant level of diversity both ethnically and religiously. Ethnically, there are Dayak, Java, Madura, Bugis, Batak, Flores and other tribes. The various religions of the people are Islam, Hindu, Christian, Catholic and Kaharingan Trust.

One thing that makes a unique and fascinating in SeiGohong is pluralistic religion society; survive together in diversity until today. Besides that, there is survival of harmony, harmonious, and managing diversity in the form of favorable interactions. It would seem that the social world in SeiGohong is a pattern of interaction that is supported by Dayak social institutions. Continuity of interaction and harmony are maintained through belombahadat sourced from religious tradition of Kaharingan as a frame of reference morality in SeiGohong.

This situation is reinforced by the fact that long time before outsiders came to SeiGohong to bring their respective religions; In an environment of ethnic Dayak (SeiGohong) it has long embraced some religions like Hinduism, Islam, and Protestant. Dayak is one tribe with many religions. The situation is very strong supporting the accommodation attitude and willingness they receive other tribes who come from various regions in Indonesia.

SeiGohong people constructed their social reality in the most basic ways as an effort to make their harmonious world. They are not only citizens of different religions, but also individuals who make up the difference and interpret knowledge while matching their actions with one another. They earned the distinction as a consciousness and experienced collectively.

The important thing of meeting a number of adherents is to raise awareness of solidarity and a distinctive personality of SeiGohong. On the other hand, social institution of Dayak (SeiGohong) is very strongly characterizing the behavior of social interaction plural religious communities in that area.

SeiGohong formed by the other tribes and civilizations Dayak. SeiGohong is a plurality of entities not only religious, but also ethnic or tribal. In the formulation which is more concrete can be said that SeiGohong refers to the plurality of religions and tribes living in it.

What the most important of religious plurality in SeiGohong is the phenomenon of interaction built in the diversity of religions. Every religion takes a part in that difference. In many ways, the development of religions took place without overlapping.

3.2 The Pattern of Interaction in Cooperation Form

There are three important findings with respect to patterns of interaction in the form of cooperation in SeiGohong subdistrict. First, history and how to convert a non-exclusive (or not through special missions) provide space for receiving and understanding between one another. In the context of that cooperation is a natural social process and not on the basis of particular interest. In other words, the regulation of social attitudes of any religion is sublimated in daily life without the exclusivism attitude. Thus, cooperation is a social mechanism that grows naturally, without any pretending suspicious mind or vulgar.

Second, Dayak civilization (friendly, courteous, helpful, respectful to others) is a very potential Dayak institution supporting cooperation regardless of religion professed by someone or group. Dayak Ngaju social institutions is as the central orientation of values, norms, attitudes into a frame of reference for people to behave and interact in order to match their actions in order to create a harmonious interaction.

Third, the cultural character of religious Kaharingan belief gave good cooperation space to plural society in SeiGohong. This means that, Kaharingan belief as a culture enable social institutions to be part of the social religiosity itself.

Based on the findings above, it can be formulated preposition for patterns of interaction in the form of cooperation as follows: 1) The manner and history of religion which do not enter through special missions or through social interaction in the form of cooperation do not physically build an exclusive community. Circumstances are very open space to cooperate between religious communities in SeiGogong. 2) Dayak social Institution is the precondition of the cooperation between religious communities in SeiGohong subdistrict, and 3) Kaharingan belief which becomes the orientation of religiosity value of Dayak Ngaju people in SeiGohong have a character who are very open and more practical as a religious ritual that can be followed by all religions.

3.3 Interaction Patterns in Accommodative Form

There are three findings in respect of interaction patterns that manifest in the accommodations. First, open attitude and view outsiders as part of our family is a potential for inter-religious cooperation.

Second, in Kaharingan belief, it must be gorgeous one to everyone, including strangers. Receiving, helping and gorgeous to everyone is the key of Kaharingan awareness. The indicator of accommodative attitude of SeiGohong people is also seen on the ease of building a house of worship. Until now the establishment of houses of worship don’t have problems in SeiGohong. The establishment permission of houses of worship is not complicated. It is only through headman. Accommodative attitude among the people is also seen on the location of the place of worship they build. The mosque and the Protestant Christian church are adjacent.

Third, it is how their views of other faiths. For example, Catholics, categorizing Muslims, Protestants and Hindus not base on religious, but as neighbors who always do interactions every day. So, the basic daily life as neighbors orients their interaction on routine matters and puts religion in a private room.

Based on the findings above, it can be formulated in the following proportions: 1) accepting an outsider as part of the family becomes an important aspect in the accommodative attitude of the people in SeiGohong, 2) Kahringan belief as the center value for the Dayak Ngaju becomes a keyword of interaction patterns in the accommodating form of religious plural society in SeiGohong, and 3) looking at someone not base on his religion but because he is a neighbor.

3.4 Interaction Patterns in Shape Assimilation

Dayak civilization is the source of morality (values, norms, attitudes and worldviews) the people in SeiGohong. Social institution is experienced by all people either Dayak or non-Dayak who profess different religions namely Islam, Protestantism, Hinduism (Kaharingan) and Catholic. Social institutions that allow assimilation in real terms experienced by non-Dayak ethnic communities with their respective religions in the form of customary marriage, intermarriage between religious and economic assets and land ownership.

Based on the description of the traditional values of the people in SeiGohong as mentioned above, first, assimilative process refers to their world view. For them, living in the world (Lewu) is the world to express the virtues and try to do good thing to everyone. SeiGohong society is persons who are belombahadat (knowing manners appropriately). Everyone is asked to behave belombahadat to be a good one.

Secondly, one thing that shows the assimilative attitude of other faiths is the willingness of their children to be married by custom through the village headman. Marriage between tribes of different religions and fellow tribal religious differences with the stages were married by customary head, and then married in a registry. It is one form of appreciation and understanding of diversity within the gather context.

Third, the social life is characterized by communal feeling and bound by brotherhood fostered awareness and cultured in betang (long house). Thus, what at the core of the harmony of life in the whole village is obeying the command and parents' advice conveyed hereditary. In other words, obeying the command and parents' commands are packaged in custom and tradition.

Fourth, the traditional marriage is a social ritual for the bride and groom to enter into true citizens SeiGohong. The bride and groom customarily are baptized to be bahadat citizen. Intermarriage is a social process that encourages people to understand and respect others. Thus, religious sensitivity and truth claim does not have room to grow or develop.

Proposition on the findings: 1) Intermarriage between citizens of different religions is the key for growing attitude of assimilation in order to build harmonious social interaction of plural religion society in Gohong village, 2) customary marriage for all groups is the process of institutionalization of the assimilation attitude of different religion people in SeiGohong sub district, and 3) Betang (long house) as an institution that fosters a life way of pluralistic religion in SeiGohong society.

3.5 Interaction Patterns in the Competition and Conflict form

Pattern of interaction in the form of competition and potential conflicts occurs in Islam and Protestant Christianity. There is a small group of Islamic fanaticism and very closed to other religions. They feel that their religion is the most correct. It is a form of truth claim. It is also between Protestants and Kaharingan. Protestants claim that Kaharingan is not a true religion. Kaharingan is such a belief outside of Jesus' teaching.

The social experience of society in SeiGohong shows the dynamics of interaction in the form of latent conflict. That is, the conflict does not appear physically. Conflict is caused by: 1) the truth claim, especially by Muslim groups to Protestant Christians. Thus, there is the social distance causing irritation in relations and social interaction. 2) Stereotyping and ethnocentrism in certain circles cause latent conflict in society relation of plural religious in SeiGohong.

Proposition produced: 1) the truth claim becomes sensitive element that affects social interaction which is harmonious primarily adherents of Islam and Protestant in SeiGohong, and 2) Labeling stereotypes to Christian Protestants as pagan be elements of the trigger latent conflicts of religion plural society in SeiGohong.

4. Discussion

What the underlying mechanisms and harmonious social interaction in SeiGohong at least can be understood that the history and how to convert a non-exclusive (or not through special missions) provide space for receiving and understanding between one another. In the context of that cooperation is a natural social process, and not based on specific interests. In other words, the regulation of social attitudes of any religion sublimed in daily life without the exclusivism attitude. In addition, Dayak civilization (friendly, courteous, helpful, respectful to others) is a Dayak institution which is very potential for supporting cooperation regardless of religion professed by a person or group of people. Dayak Ngaju social institutions as the central orientation of values, norms, and attitudes become the frame of reference for people to behave and interact to match their actions in order to create a harmonious interaction. Similarly, the religious cultural character of Kaharingan belief gave cooperative space that is conducive to religious plural society in SeiGohong. This means that, Kaharingan belief as a culture enables social institutions to be part of the social religiosity itself. In the book TjilikRiwut (2003), Kaharingan is categorized as a religion. However, in the following descriptions Riwut used the word “belief” Kaharingan. The word “Kaharingan” comes from the word “haring”, meaning life.

Their view way of other faiths such as Catholics, categorized Muslims, Protestants and Hindus is not based on religious, but because as neighbors who always do the interaction every day. So, the basic daily life as neighbors orient their interaction on routine matters and put religion in a private room in order to grow the assimilative attitudes among individuals of different religions. Assimilative attitude refers to the world view of the village. For them, living in the village is a world to express the virtues and trying to do good to anybody.

SeiGohong society is a society that respects and understands the diversity about noble values of their tribe (belombahadat). Everyone is asked to behave in a culture to become a good person. One thing that shows the assimilative attitude of other faiths is the willingness of their children to be married by custom through the village headman. The pure traditional marriage is a process of assimilation to understand the differences in the gather context.

Accepting everyone who comes in their village as part of the family becomes an important aspect in accommodative attitude of SeiGohong people. Receiving, helping and doing good thing to others are the key of Kaharingan awareness. The accommodative attitude indicator of the people in SeiGohong is also seen on the ease of building a house of worship. Until now the establishment of houses of worship has not got problems in SeiGohong. Lisence the houses establishment of worship is not complicated. Lisence the houses establishment of worship is only through headman. Accommodative attitude among the people is also seen on the location of the place of worship which they build. The mosque and the Protestant Christian church are adjacent.

However, SeiGohong society is not a holy community without conflict. Social experience of SeiGohong society shows the dynamics of interaction in the form of latent conflict. That is, the conflict does not appear physically. The research findings show that the conflict is caused by the truth claims, especially by Muslim groups to Protestant Christians. Thus, there is the social distance causing irritation in relations and social interaction.

However, the situation does not happen by itself. Interaction patterns of religious plural society in SeiGohong operate in a social institution that is highly conducive to live in peace and harmony. Personality of Dayak (open, kind, honest, friendly and willing to sacrifice, sensitive to the lives of others) who becomes a social institution is still very strong affecting on the social mechanisms and patterns of harmonious interaction in religion plural society in SeiGohong.

Kinship as a consequence of intermarriage is one of the factors which are capable of promoting harmony among the people in SeiGohong. For them, the family can overcome religious differences. Intermarriage becomes the most real assimilation of the experience of religious diversity in SeiGohong. Circumstances directly support the pattern of harmony interaction between religions in that area. The situation also produces knowledge naturally about religious diversities that slowly spread from family to the broader community.

The most important thing in marriage mechanism is MijaMisek (traditional marriage). Customary marriage through the village headman institution means giving legitimacy to a new family in order to live in accordance with customary guidance. Marriage customs are as a form of social christening the new bride to live under the guidance of belombahadat as requested by the Dayak social institutions.

Cleaning village is one tradition that gives space to the religious diversity in SeiGohong. Bahadat which in practical terms means deontology, politeness and ethics interact. Bahadat is a source of public morality of SeiGohong people.

Village is a regular space where they interact endlessly. In such circumstances the different situation becomes usual and natural. It also means exclusivism is hard to grow in a space like that. Village is a daily life world and means interacting endlessly creating knowledge about the differences and how they accept it as an arranged reality and then experienced.

Although betang (long house) does not exist anymore physically, but the mentality it is still very strong affecting Dayak people in SeiGohong. As understood, in betang lived several different tribes both personally and socially. Organizing mutual acceptance and mutual unity in diversity is a typical betang. Because even they have to live in diversity, but their lives are always harmonious, mutual accepting, mutual understanding, mutual respecting that are the values taught in humabetang. That mentality provided religious plurality space in SeiGohong.

However, people in SeiGohong do not live without a ripple or friction as a consequence of religious plurality. There is a dark cloud hanging accompany the condition of social interaction of diverse religious communities there. A handful of zealots show intolerance and defensive in the association. Circumstances occurred between Muslims and Christians and between Christians and Kaharingan. Islam sees Christianity as dirty and neither infidels, nor any Christians see Kaharinganas is claimed as a community that is not religious. In addition, very strong cultural changes affect religion plural interaction in SeiGohong. Civilization of long house (betang) that germinates plurality values began to fade along with the loss of betang. Similarly, village headman institution which has so powerful influence, now amputated governments and institutions to enter village headman institution integrated into modern government bureaucracy through regulation of region No. 8 of 1998. This phenomenon is a long-term threat to survival of the community of religious diversity in SeiGohong.

Theoretically, the findings of this study are expected to support and enrich the perspective of symbolic interaction, particularly on three things. First, how different societies or different religious beliefs regulate social interaction mechanism that build up a harmonious relationship. SeiGohong society accepts the differences as the power of togetherness that builds the personality of SeiGohong. Second, social interaction phenomena of religion plural society constructs values, norms, and the typical view in accordance with the history of the entry ways of religion and tribal into the region. Their movement and behavior are laid out in cultural cosmos which is acceptable to everyone. While the affiliation religious become a part that is oriented into it. Third, the mainstream of social interaction perspective is how different individuals plan their actions and predict the response of others to it. Of course, the theory is too technical to observe the phenomenon of a plural society. In a religious plural society, cultural element is the most important thing regulating and guiding behavior interactions. Thus, the difference is considered the important one as a social control tool and always tries to learn the important values and norms of other religions.

Religion as culture allows a social institution to be part of the social religiosity itself. Religion is a fundamental element in the culture. O'Dea (1995, p. 215) says religion is a central element in the culture, and the culture in the overall sense, the concrete contents contained in it may be in harmony or conflict with the existing situation in the community or with its forward transformation process.

Religion as a subculture is one form of construction of human experience. Northcott (2000, p. 267) says the human experience and cultural construction are also including religion. The objects of knowledge, practices and institutions in the social world are seen as a product of social interaction and social construction.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of research and discussion can be concluded that:

(1) Social Universe of the people in SeiGohong is a plural world that is arranged in Dayak social institutions. Continuity of interaction in religious diversity is kept through what is called the doctrine of Kaharinganbelomberbudaya, and it is the teachings of the noble values derived from Kaharingan religious tradition. The cultural character and religious of Kaharingan beliefs give the cooperation space and is a field of harmonious social interaction. It means religion as a culture enables social institutions to be part of the social religiosity itself.

(2) In the Dayak ethnic environment (SeiGohong), it has long embraced some religions such as Hinduism, Islam, and Protestant. Dayak is one tribe with many religions. The situation is very strong supporting the accommodative attitude and their willingness to accept other tribes who come from various regions in Indonesia. They are not only citizens of different religions, but also individuals who arrange the difference knowledge and interpret it while matching their actions with one another. They earn the distinction as a consciousness and experienced collectively.

(3) A unique view of society in SeiGohong is as good as any religion. Religion is not the destination, but the path. Therefore, intermarriage between religions becomes an usual thing in SeiGohong in which even a number of families live with the three religions. This is an amazing assimilative attitude in SeiGohong.

(4) However, SeiGohong is not a community without conflict. Religious plurality always has a dark side. In social experience of SeiGohong, they encounter competition and conflict. It can be seen through the attitude of fanaticism and ethnocentrism of particular group. That situation threatens the continuation of inter-religious

harmony in SeiGohong.

Acknowledgment

The results of this study will not be realized when there is no support from other parties. Therefore, thanks are extended to the village headman, the village device, community leaders, traditional leaders, religious leaders in SeiGohong, Bukit Batu, Palangkaraya. Thanks are also extended to the Promotor, Prof. Dr. I Made Weni, SH.MS; and Ko. Promotor: Prof. Dr. Eddy Lion, M.Pd.

References

Abubakar Muhammad H. (2009). *Interaksi Sosial Elite Agama dalam Pluralisme Agama*, Bandung: Global House.

Berger Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann (1990). *Tafsir Sosial Atas Kenyataan*, Jakarta: LP3ES.

Carey James William (2003). *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, transt. Luthfi Anshari, Jogyakarta: Jendela.

Coward (1989). *Pluralismedan Tantangan Agama-agama*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Denzin Norman K. and LincolnYvonna S. (1998). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Inc.

Dey Ian (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User Friendly-Guide for Social Scientist*, London and New York: Routledge.

HariJuliawan B. (2004). *Kutukan Menara Babel: Basis No 01-02 Tahun ke-53 Januari-Februari 2004*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Harman Gilbert (2004). *Moral Philosophy Meets Social Psychology Virtue Ethics and the Fundamental Attribution Error*, Princeton University.

Kimball Charles (2003). *Kala Agama Menjadi Bencana*, Bandung: Mizan.

Littlejohn Stephen W. (1996). *Theories of Human Communication*, California: Wadswarth.

Mahmut Aydin S. (2001). “Religious pluralism: A challenge for Muslims — A theological evaluation”, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 38, pp. 2–3.

O’Dea Thomas F. (2002). *Agama Empiris: Agama dalam Pergumulan Realitas Sosial*, Surabaya: Pustaka Pelajardan PUSTAKA LP2IF.

Riwut Tjilik (2003). *Maneser Panatau TatuHiang: Memahami Kekayaan Leluhur*, Palangka Raya, Pusakalima.

Scott Hanson R. (2002). *City of God: Religion Freedom, Immigration, and Pluralism in Flushing*, New York.

Tracy David (1987). *Plurality and Ambiguity, Hermeneutic, Religion, Hope*, University of Chicago Press.

Tubbs Stewart L. and Sylvia Moss (2000). *Human Communication*, Konteks-Konteks Komunikasi, Pengantar Deddy Mulyana, Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Volf Miroslav (2002). “Living with the other”, *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1–2, Summer-Fall, U.S.A.: Temple University.