

---

# CALVIN'S IDEAS ABOUT THE CHURCH-STATE RELATIONSHIP AND IMPLICATION FOR THE CHURCHES AND THE PEDAGOGY OF THE PANCASILA-BASED STATE IN INDONESIA

Morris Philip Takaliuang<sup>1\*</sup>, Erni Maria Clartje Efruan<sup>1</sup> and  
Zummy Anselmus Dami<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Institut Injil Indonesia, Department of Theology, East Jawa, 65313, Indonesia*

<sup>2</sup> *Universitas Persatuan Guru 1945 NTT, Faculty of Education, East Nusa Tenggara, 85119, Indonesia*

(Received 28 May 2020, revised 1 October 2020)

---

## Abstract

In the pedagogy of Pancasila-based State, the Church recognizes the existence and function of State as the instrument of God to prevent/punish evil and strive for justice of all people. Church and state relationships inherently contain potential conflicts. This is because both the Church and State have a thorough claim on human life, in the sense that all the facets of human life have a spiritual and political dimension. The tension of the relationship between Church and State should not be extinguished by subordinating one to the other, both in the form of 'Church-State' and 'State-Church'. Therefore, in addition to rejecting totalitarianism and authoritarianism, Church and State must also reject theocracy, ecclesiocracy and a secular State. Responsibilities of the State's responsibility to the Church are mutual responsibilities and reciprocal cooperation and compatible with the pedagogy of Pancasila-based State in Indonesia, while the responsibility of the Church to the State is not mutual responsibilities and reciprocal cooperation, but asymmetric (being-for not being-with).

*Keywords:* ideas, Church, state, relationship, pedagogy

---

## 1. Introduction

The problem of Church and state relations was a significant concern during the Reformation. An examination of the views of *Caesaropapism* or *Erastianism* shows a state-controlled Church, while looking at the view of papal supremacy indicates a Church-controlled state. Different views arose from the Anabaptists, who advocated separation between Church and state. However, unlike the Anabaptists, who rejected the participation of Christians in government offices, Calvin argued that the relations between the Church and the

---

\*E-mail: [takaliuangmorris@i3batu.ac.id](mailto:takaliuangmorris@i3batu.ac.id)

state include mutual assistance and reciprocal cooperation [1]. The Bible teaches that the Church belongs to the Lord, and that Christ became the Head of the Church and source of all authority on Earth and in Heaven. However, a Church that consists of those who are sanctified by the Lord is also commanded to submit to the control of the state.

Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that Church and state relations in the state of *Pancasila*, Indonesia, are not easy to formulate; indeed, this relationship has raised profound concerns for the stakeholders. In the last years, *Pancasila* is not mentioned in the discourse on national and state life. However, we ‘agree’ that *Pancasila* is the philosophy and ideology of the Republic of Indonesia as, and in the IV<sup>th</sup> amendment of the constitution, or *Undang-Undang Dasar* 1945, it has been agreed that the opening of the constitution includes the formulation of *Pancasila* as it has been until now and that it has not been altered. However, in practice, some many policies and regulations do not reflect *Pancasila*. With the repealed laws requiring political and civic organizations to include *Pancasila* as one of the foundations of the articles of association, a greater number of political and community organizations are now adhering to and championing other ideologies, especially those with religious nuances.

On June 1, 1945, Soekarno made a speech explaining the five principles of *Pancasila*. *Pancasila* is a combined word in *Sanskrit* and *Pali* that means five (*Panca*) principles (*Sila*) [2]. Soekarno delivered his speech in the session of the Investigating Body for the Preparation for Indonesian Independence (*Badan Penyelidik Usaha-Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia*) proposing the adoption of the following five principles (known as *Pancasila*): nationalism, internationalism or humanitarianism, deliberation or democracy, social welfare, and the belief in God. From December 27, 1949, to August 17, 1950, *Pancasila* was modified to a shorter and different formulation that read as follows: the belief in the one and only God, humanity, nationalism, democracy, and social justice [3]. Soekarno defined *Pancasila* not only as the conviction or the consciousness of a people who are united in one group and one nation, but also as the unity between people and their homelands. He emphasized internationalism because Indonesia is only one of many nations throughout the world. He also confirmed his view that, as we can see from his concept of *Pancasila*, he equated the notion of internationalism with that of humanitarianism. In making the principle of democracy, it is clear that Soekarno believed in democracy, and this meant that he rejected dictatorship in any form in his political thinking. He did not propose, for example, such antiquated systems as autocracy and oligarchy, or others, that in his opinion were not suitable for a free and modern Indonesia. As for the principle of social welfare, which he ranked fourth in the order of his *Pancasila*, Soekarno expressed his reasons for its inclusion by saying that ‘there shall be no poverty in a free Indonesia’. The principle of his *Pancasila*, the belief in God, was formulated by Soekarno in recognition of the reality that the Indonesian people were religious no matter to which religion they belonged. This principle seems to have been intended by Soekarno as an acknowledgement of all religions existing in the

country. He thought that all religious groups could cooperate with each other and that religious tolerance could be achieved so that national unity and integrity would flourish in the atmosphere of an independent state [4].

*Pancasila* asserted that Indonesia is neither a secular nor a theocratic state. Therefore, as good and loyal citizens, the Indonesian people have accepted and defended *Pancasila* as the basis and ideology of the Indonesian state [5]. Furthermore, Intan stated that, in fact, “as a way of life, *Pancasila* calls on Indonesian citizens to build a nation constructively based on human values characterized by the ideas of inclusiveness and non-discrimination” [6]. In line with this, Ismail stated that *Pancasila* had proven itself to have the capacity to function as an inspiring, guiding, integrating and unifying force that can accommodate the flourishing of people’s various aspirations in the country as well as bind and unite all segments of Indonesia as a nation, regardless of the people’s religious, political, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. In short, *Pancasila* serves as a common platform in allowing all segments of Indonesian society to coexist and work together to build their country and in struggling to achieve their national goals and ideals [5].

In the development of the world’s history is seen ‘races’ of religion (Church) and ruler (state) who dominates one another. Since Constantine the Great (4<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) became a Christian, the tendency of the state to participate determines what is right and not right, which is proper and improper for the Church to be true. Kierkegaard in Denmark faced a similar issue when the Lutheran Church became the official Church in the state; the Church became state institutions, pastors became civil servants, Christians are identical with citizenship, without any tension between the two. That is the reason why Kierkegaard was very anxious and held a ‘rebellion’. The core of the rebellion is: “Every person cannot be existentially standing before the Lord and also in the presence of the world?” [7]

In Indonesia, especially during colonial times, we also faced similar cases. The colonial government governs some Churches (the appointment/dismissal of the priest through *Besluit*), but then the Churches (especially the state-Church) have the right to govern themselves. The current problem relates to sorting the Church as an object of faith and the Church in its historical reality. These two issues are very relevant and related to each other. That is why this paper seeks to trace, analyse, dig, interpret, respond to and reformulate the ideas and practices of Calvin regarding the relations between Church and state relations, and their implications for Church and the pedagogy *Pancasila*-based State which is multi-ethnic and multi-religious.

## **2. Methods**

This research is a qualitative study with a literature approach. The authors gather primary data corresponding to the focus of research and analysed them at the same time to understand the meaning and capture the substances contained within the categories of data that have been collected. The data collection

process is: (1) records the data in the quotation, or records data from the primary source directly and accurately, and then records using paraphrase; (2) drafting sentences by authors; and (3) create a summary [8].

All this process is done with Schleiermacher's grammatical interpretation to understand what Calvin intended objectively relates to the relationships between the Church and the state [9], and this stage is to explain and declare the meaning contained within the research object. Interpretation is also used to understand the context behind the ideas, motives and ideology.

Based on the grammatical interpretation, the authors perform analysis and argument. The analysis will be discussed in the history of the relations between the Church and the state, according to Calvin. An analysis is followed by an objective and critical thinking analysis of concepts, writings and conversations based on the meaning of the word. An analysis is purely based on truth and critical consideration. Furthermore, the authors will demonstrate an argumentative need to see similarities and the application of Church and state relations concepts according to Calvin in the pedagogy of the *Pancasila*-based State, and the role of the Church in the context of these relationships.

### **3. Results**

#### ***3.1. Historical analysis of the relations between Church and state***

In the I-IV century (30-250 A.D.), Church and state problems were only slightly discussed. The Church still formed an underground Church. The state has suspected the Church and there are so many Christian martyrs from this period. Resistance is only committed to the worship of the emperor, in other matters not [10]. In 250-311, the Roman government attempted to obliterate the Church.

In the fourth century, under the reign of Emperor Constantine (272-337), separation as a dominant theme had been said to change into assimilation. Eusebius (260-340) was the main character in this concept, disclosure of the idea of realized eschatology [11]. Emperor Constantine was understood as an absolute ruler who often intervened in the affairs of the Church; consequently, many people entered the Church due to political considerations.

Subordination of the Church under the emperor soon ended with Constantine's death. Many protests arose on the fusion of empires, between sacred and political power. These protests came from: (1) nationalist groups in the Church demanding their regional autonomy, which is reflected in various divisions, such as quarrels of Monofisit or Nestorian, (2) the dualist group renewing the views of separation (Athanasius and Ambrosius), (3) teachings of nuns and monks.

In the middle ages, the relations between the Church and the state were intertwined with one another. Nevertheless, a dispute arose later between the Pope (Church) and the emperor (the state) because the Pope attempted to liberate the Church from the state. The disputes between the Pope and the emperor were

closely related to Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) and Emperor Henry IV (1056-1106). The dispute exploded because Gregory VII prohibited the adoption of Church officials by the state (public investiture). Emperor Heinrich IV fought against the actions of the Pope. Consequently, he experienced excommunication. The emperor's office was revoked from him, but fifty years later there was a compromise in the Concordat of Worms (1122), which stipulates that the Church raises the bishop through the emperor's approval. In an effort to rule the world, the Pope was assisted by the law of the Church.

The famous theory used in the struggle for power between the Church and the state in the Middle Ages was the theory of two swords. Pope Gelasius I (492-496) is the one who first raises the idea of these two swords [12]. The view comes from the Gospel story of Luke 22.35-38. The two swords are interpreted as spiritual power (Church) and earthly power (state). According to the papacy, the two powers were given by Christ to the Pope. However, the emperor did not accept the theory. According to him, Christ gave only the sword (spiritual) to the Pope, while the earthly sword was directly given to the emperor so that the emperor was only accountable to Christ.

The Pope's power reached the climax of Pope Innocentius III (1198-1216). Problems arose when the Pope's authority was not recognized. It was experienced by Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1308). The Pope prohibited the state from attracting taxes from the Church, while the king forbade the Church to expose money to the Pope in Rome. Consequently, the Pope issued the *Bulla Unam Sanctam*. The Pope's conclusion that all who would gain salvation had to submit to the Pope, but the king of France was not subject. Consequently, the papacy was ruled by France.

### ***3.2. Church and state relation by Calvin***

Geneva chose reform before Calvin's arrival. A thousand ministers or Church workers had been expelled from Geneva, replaced by 19 ministers and one of them was John Calvin. He and his friends were not allowed to political positions. Not long afterwards, were all dismissed except Calvin. However, eighteen months later, Calvin was also laid off. With this background, it can be understood that after Calvin was asked to return to Geneva to carry out his reformation program, until his death, Calvin did not put his full conviction on the rulers.

Calvin (1509-1564) was a scholar of the French law of Swiss descent, who was interested in Theology in France (Geneva). His understanding of the relations between the Church and the state was not detached from the early 16<sup>th</sup>-century reality. His role in the doctrine of the relations between the Church and the state should also be contextually understood. Calvin's most mature thoughts on the relations between the Church and the state, pay attention not only to fundamental things but also practical things. The highest principle in Calvin's theology is God's will, and all the things that commanded should be done, to the last detail [13].

The ideal concept of Calvin is a Church “not independent of the state but autonomous and free to act in its scope”. He tried to define the distinction between the Church and the state clearly [14]. For Calvin, there is a separation between church and state but no total separation. There is no total subordination or separation, but coordination. The theological basis of this notion of Calvin is because, despite the separation, both Church and state gained authority from God. Although they perform different functions, they serve the one plan of God, for one world and humanity one [15]. The Church’s spiritual government, built people to gain eternal salvation, while the civil administration organized by the state, fosters life together in this world [16]. The understanding of the government’s differences is formulated in the *Institutio*. However, the meaning of difference does not indicate that civil government is a dirty thing and not the responsibility of the Church.

Calvin saw the state with one dominant importance - what service it could do for the Church and the Kingdom of God. At the same time, Calvin gave us a glorious view of the state, evidenced in the way he spoke of the princes - they were the ministers of God, the adoptive fathers of the Church and they were ‘god’ (Geneva confessions 1536) [17]. He defended the state against the papacy, which he believed had seized many of the state’s temporal authorities, as well as against the Anabaptists group as promoters of anarchy. Calvin argued that the state received a direct mandate from God, and at some point, emphasized the divine right of the kings. He believed that this was a case study, even with the ruler of tyranny [18]. The Lord’s hands are working even through non-Christian rulers, who secretly direct the duties and responsibilities of a man. God is the main cause of all things happening in the world, and the providence of God stands above all [19]. Calvin hoped that most of the rulers would be marred by the positions they held. However, the judgment of the tyrannical ruler must be left in the hands of the Lord, which may raise a man to overthrow the tyrant.

Calvin was steadfast in his belief that an individual had no right to rebel against a cruel ruler [20]. For Calvin, the ruling way was determined by each government. The Church ruled with spiritual power, which is love. The state ruled with power and force, even if necessary with the power of the sword. According to him, the position of the Church in society must be defended by the government. In addition, Calvin denied the possibility of applying the Torah of the Old Testament directly in the state in his day, including the Christian state. Thus, theologically, Calvin refused or avoided the state of theocracy [16, p. 272]. For Calvin, the term of theocracy was only appropriate for the system of government, and he hoped for, that the government should be subjected to God who created it and obeyed the will of God which could be known from the natural law and by the Christian government, also from the Bible.

From the previous description, it is clear that Calvin emphasized that everyone must obey the government, even to honour him as a servant of God (Exodus 18.20-21, Matthew 17.24-27, Romans 13, 1 Peter 2.13-14). For him, obedience is reasonable if the government does its job according to God’s will. This does not mean that the government should be Christian. The pagan

government ruled by law reflecting the natural law should be obeyed, but not with blind obedience. If the ruler is contrary to God's commandment, the person "must be more obedient to God than to man" (Acts 5.29) [21]. On the other hand, Calvin prohibits Christians from wearing any violence if he becomes a government officer. He can only kill under applicable law and that is only for the sake of the public and must conform to the commandments of God. Government officials should not impose the death penalty for the sake of personal revenge only.

Calvin emphasized that only the state has the power of coercive jurisdiction, while the Church does not require physical strength but is satisfied with the power of the Word of God [20]. However, over the years civilian authorities rejected Calvin even this power. In a solid community union in Geneva, the impact of a citizen's exclusion has a significant value. This situation makes the person to become a *persona non grata* in society, without further action by the state. This is a condition in which the strict separation of power as the one opposed to Calvin became somewhat unreal.

Calvin assumed that the Church and the state would border - the king and the judges would be Christians and the whole nation with them. Calvin also has a dualistic view relating to human nature. This makes it possible to talk about the spiritual forces of the Church directed to the spirit and the worldly powers directed toward the person's personal body and possessions. Modern theologians rejected this dualistic view of the human character as being in line with Christian tradition.

John Knox brought a Calvinistic pattern of renewal to Scotland, and it where it was very effective. Calvin's influence was also strong among the smaller Protestant groups in England and later in North America. Through Scottish Presbyterianism and on the lower level of non-conformist groups in England, Calvinism had impacted the development of colonies in Australia.

Calvin's insight into civil administration and the relationship between the Church and the state is not detached from the concrete reality he is experiencing. The state supports religion and opts out those who commit transgressions in life and doctrine. The priest of Geneva did not hesitate to submit a response to the things that occurred in the civil administration (politically).

Government support of the Church seemed to be from the government's decision to dispose of those who would not receive the Church's rebuke out of the city because they did not approve the Church's teachings. This fate, among others, was experienced by Michael Servetus (1553) because he rejected the teachings of the Trinity. This Servetus act, according to Calvin, was evil. Calvin consented to the death penalty for Servetus. The case of Servetus was made evidence for the intolerance of Calvinism.

Calvin's understanding of the relations between the Church and the state was very influential in the history of the Calvinistic churches. Rebellious Puritans in England (± 1640-1660) adopted the theory of Calvin's reign [22]. History shows that Calvinism is suitable for people who were oppressed around the world and used as a source of political liberation. Calvin's teaching on the

relationship between the church and the state entered Indonesia through the Dutch colonial (*Verenigde Oost Indische Compagnie/VOC*, 1602-1799). The Dutch colonial government placed what it called *Commisariissen* in the assemblies of *De Indische Kerk*, which at that time was a Church-state [10, p. 218-220]. The Church officials had to get *Besluit* from the colonial government. This is the effect of Calvin's teachings, where the state subordinated the Church. Calvin intends that the government (the state) must assist the Church to impose the sovereignty of God.

Although the Church in the VOC period lacked the success of making Protestants in Indonesia righteous and chaste believers by the Calvinistic ideas held in the mother state, it is worth noting that the Church remained *Gereformeerd*. It means that the forms of religious life brought to Indonesia were forms used in the Church of *Gereformeerd* in the Netherlands. Therefore Indonesians who enter Christianity (Protestantism), are influenced by these forms, at least in the ecclesiastical centres such as cities in Java and outside Java (GPIB, GPM, GMIM and GMIT).

In 1935 there was an administrative separation between the Church and the state; the Protestant Church had the right to take care of its problems. After the surrender of sovereignty, in 1950, the financial relations between the Church (GPI) and the state (Republic of Indonesia) are separated [23].

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. Response to Calvin

Calvin's teachings about the Church and the state were born amid the context of the state and Christian society (different from Indonesia's majority Muslim). Society is a unity, the Church as the soul, and state as the body (*Corpus Christianum*). Theologically, Calvin avoided the theocracy of the Old Testament model and the ecclesiocracy. However, in practice at the time he was a priest in Geneva he practised these two things with the help of the city council. Facing the case of Servetus, Calvin asked the city council for help to handle it, because, for Calvin, the Church's position in society had to be defended by the government. The Church has opened the possibility of state intervention in ecclesiastical affairs. According to law No. 8/1985 on the Community Organization (*Ormas*), the Church in the eyes of the government is a mass organization.

Reid summarises Calvin's political thought as "that of mutual independence, but also of mutual helpfulness and support" [24]. In other words, although they are separate from each other, the Church and state have a mutual responsibility for each other. Nevertheless, how should the state and Church fulfil these mutual responsibilities? Calvin argues that along with peace and public decency, civil government is ordained to take care of 'godliness', that is, "to promote religion, to maintain the worship of God, and to take care that sacred ordinances be observed with due reverence" [25]. It is important to note



that this role of the government - known as the care of religion (*cura religionis*) - has to be fulfilled indirectly, for Calvin considers the state's responsibilities to relate only to the outward, external manifestation of religion. He points out that the state should have concerned for "the outward worship of God", "public offences against religion", "a public manifestation of religion' and a 'public sacrilege" [26]. Thus Calvin would not entrust civil authorities "to make laws according to their own decision concerning religion and the worshipping of God" [26]. In brief, civil authorities have a responsibility toward religion, but their power remains outward and temporal. They could not usurp the spiritual functions of the Church.

On the other hand, Calvin believes that the Church should play an important role in the state. The main responsibility of the Church is to set forth the biblical teaching concerning to the state and its function. Calvin frequently reminds the Church that in administering its role toward the state it should not interfere in its operations. The Church may advise the state as to what God's law says, but it cannot determine how that law is applied in civil jurisdiction since the Church does not have, as Calvin explains, "the authority to force" through "the sword" which tire state "commonly inflicts" [26, p. 11]. However, Calvin realizes that some issues of civil affairs, such as sexuality, marriage and family, have civil as well as ecclesiastical dimensions. In cases like drunkenness and prostitution, for example, both state and Church ought to be involved in rendering punishment, such as imprisonment by the state and if there is no repentance - excommunication by the Church. In this case, the Church would be able to 'help the magistrate in order that not so many may sin', so that Church and magistrate can be so joined that each serves to help, not to deter each other.

In conclusion, Calvin's view of the Church and the state were quite different from the other positions. He argued for a Christian involvement and participation in holding offices in the civil government. Calvin asserted that not a total separation of the temporal and spiritual kingdoms, but rather their cooperation and reciprocal collaboration, in which each is free in its own sphere.

The authors argue that Calvin's concept of the relations between the Church and the state characterizes mutual responsibilities, and reciprocal collaboration is more appropriate to be applied to the state or the government, not to the Church. The concept of Calvin's mutual responsibility or reciprocal was impressed and seemed to be trapped in the concept of I-thou Buber. According to Buber, one of the characteristics of the relationship 'I-Thou' in the context of human relationships is reciprocity or mutuality. Buber writes, "relations are reciprocal. My neighbour acts on me as I act on him." [27] Buber calls 'covertness' 'the gateway to our existence'. By this Buber means that through mutual relations, we will find our own existence [28].

In the relationship between the Church and the state, the responsibility of the Church to the state is not mutual or reciprocal, but asymmetrical. Asymmetrical means the Church is responsible and gives something to the state without expecting and demands something back [29]. The concept of responsibility is like this author of adoption of Emmanuel Levinas. Levinas did

not see the responsibility of two directions. The Church is responsible for the country without expecting a reply. Whether the state will be responsible also for the Church or not, it is a state affair. Levinas stated that I am responsible for the other without waiting for reciprocity, were I to die for it. Reciprocity is *his* affair. It is precisely insofar as the relationship between the other and me is not reciprocal that I am subjected to the other, and I am 'subject' essentially in this sense [30].

Levinas' statement indicates that interpersonal relationships between the Church and the state are always asymmetric and not reciprocity or mutuality. This means that the Church can provide service for the state without demanding the state, and the Church does not take a profit from the state. The Church is always an unconditional relationship. Briefly, if the reciprocation or mutuality always has a pattern of *being-with*, then asymmetric always has a pattern of *being-for* because it is asymmetrical. The Church may provide a ministry for the state, but the Church is not entitled to make the state to acquire a profit. This indicates that if at any time the state is committing injustice to the Church, the Church is not replying to injustices as well, but the Church still provides service to the state.

#### **4.2. Implications for the Churches**

Indonesia is pluralistic religious. The founders of the state, since the beginning, have fully realized the dangers of majority religious domination. Thus, they paid careful attention to religious and state issues. Their concerns are expressed in chapter 29 of the 1945 constitutions or *Undang-undang Dasar*, stating that "the state was founded on the principle of one Lordship and the state guarantees the freedom of each citizen to embrace his/her own religion and to worship in accordance with his/her religion and beliefs". This statement contains three basic thoughts. *First*, Indonesia is not a theocratic state because no religion is explicitly mentioned in the constitution. This means that the state will be fair to all religions, and not take sides with any one religion. *Second*, based on the One Lordship principle, the state appreciates and encourages contributions from diverse religions to the life of the nation. *Third*, the constitution must guarantee the freedoms of individuals to change their beliefs or religion. Intan revealed that in reality, Indonesian politics does not live like this. Religions willing to accept intervention from the state in their internal affairs may initially have a good and glorious intention to encourage believers to be more faithful to their religion. However, in reality, state intervention develops hypocrisy and tarnishing the image of religions [1]. For example, during the Soekarno period, Confucianism was recognized as an official religion, along with Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism and Buddhism. However, in 1978 a ministry decree announced that Confucianism was no longer recognized as an official religion and was therefore banned in Indonesia [31]. Just after the reign of President Abdurrahman Wahid in 2000, Confucianism was revealed again as an official religion.

This situation illustrates the submission of religion to the state in the form of religious politicization will eventually result in 'state religion'. If the Churches consider Calvin's view of the relations between the Church and the state as normative, the Churches of Indonesia must reject the attitude of *Caesaropapism* or *Erastianism* in which religion is subordinated to the state's authority. Likewise, based on Calvin's teachings on the relationship between the Church and the state, the Indonesian Churches are supposed to reject the view of papal supremacy in which the state is subordinated to the Church's authority. In brief, the relations between the Church and the state must never be totally fused. The religionization of politics in the form of 'theocratic state' and the politicization of religion in the form of 'state religion' should be considered illegitimate options. This does not imply, however, that the Churches in Indonesia should support a total separation of the Church and the state. Although Calvin agreed with the Anabaptists that the relations between the Church and the state are distinct, he rejected total separation. A secular state, which promotes the absolute separation of relations between the Church and the state, and thus marginalizes religion to the private domain, should also be rejected by the Indonesian Churches.

The Church rejection of the theocratic state, the religious state, and total separation of the relationship between the Church and the state must be based on what the Lord Jesus taught in the Bible. The Bible puts the Church (believers) in a paradoxical position, a responsibility to God and at the same time to the government (Jeremiah 29.7). Israel, as a people (Church), was institutionalized into a kingdom (state). The consequence of the existence of the kingdom (state) is the use of power, which in many ways can be abused. In the institutionalization of people into kingdoms (state), the king (state) does not always have harmonious relations with the priest or the prophet. God often uses the prophet (Church) to convey His intent to the king (state) (2 Samuel 7.1-17, 12.1-25). Likewise, God uses the state to convey His intentions to the church (*Qahal*). Even foreign kings were used by God to save His people (the story of Koresy in Ezra 1.3). King Ahasyweros (through Esther) prevented the people of Israel from being destroyed from Earth as a result of Haman's genocide plan (Esther 3.1-5, 14). Thus God is using the hand of 'state' to save his people in a very critical state, but this is not a new pattern.

In the New Testament, Christian citizens are obliged to be faithful to the government (Romans 13.1-7), but Paul's paradigm of obedience to government is not above all, for the Church must be more obedient to God, in all things. The call of the apostle Paul to submit to the government is a piece of advice to humble themselves and willing to place oneself lower than the rulers, so far as not contrary to Christian faith. Although the government was corrupt or tyrannical once the Church was obliged to pray for all state officials (1 Timothy 2.2). The responsibility of the Church to the state should be able to be realized in concrete actions and patterned being-for so that it becomes I (Church)-for-You (state - asymmetrical), should not be reversed into a being-with so that it becomes You (state)-to-I (Church - reciprocity/mutuality) [32]. The leaders

(nations) were appointed to punish the transgressors and honour the good people (1 Peter 2.13). God sends the Church into the world. The task of the Church was to be “salt” and “Light” (Matthew 5.13-16) and to live as a Church devoted to God (Hebrews 13.8). The Church must also have compassion on the state or government. Through ‘compassion’, there will be a shift from self-independent to self-interdependent, which is to be there-for-others (Church-for-state). The Church must be able to use the principle that the relationships between the Church and the state are distinct, but rejects the total separation of both. The Church and state can take on some of each other’s responsibilities within an asymmetrical relationship, without being trapped in the discourse of the religionization of politics and the politicization of religion.

As Calvin said, the Church can convey the biblical principles of the country and its functions. In this case, religion may, for example, “lay a strong moral, ethical, and spiritual foundation for nation-building as an implementation of *Pancasila*”, as mandated by the 1998 ‘Guidelines of State Policy’. In doing so, the Church and the state can be involved in some civil matters such as sexuality, marriage and family.

#### **4.3. Implications for the pedagogy of Pancasila-based state in Indonesia**

The author added the term pedagogy is intending to assert that the spirit of *Pancasila* is not only in the level of orthodoxy (teaching) but also orthopraxis (devotion to society). Pedagogy to be targeted is about educating people into global citizenship. Pedagogy of the *Pancasila* has not stopped on the ethical philosophy that emphasizes the truth but more than it emphasizes the directional togetherness of common good. Another reason, the actualization of *Pancasila* can be done by means of epistemological revitalization, which is to make it a foundation of ethical knowledge, to socialize it through education and to make *Pancasila* a source of legal material in Indonesia. *Pancasila* can be actualized through educational channels which is a contextualizing mediation that implementation of *Pancasila* must be through interpretation, internalization of socialization [33].

*Pancasila* is the foundation of the state and the view of the nation that serves as a pluralistic state. *Pancasila* has a tremendous influence on the people of Indonesia because the history of *Pancasila* affects the diversity of tribes, religions, regional languages, customs, culture and skin colours that make it a symbol of agreement in bringing these things together. The history of *Pancasila* is a part of Indonesia’s core history so that it is considered very sacred and must be memorized and obeyed by all Indonesians [34].

*Pancasila* has been accepted as a state foundation for the Indonesian society. *Pancasila* contains five principles or values, namely: the value of divinity, humanity, unity, democracy and justice. These five values are contained in the Indonesian constitution, namely in the opening of the 1945 constitution paragraph IV [35]. *Pancasila* refers to the theory of citizenship and structural functionalism that can be said to be the idea of establishing good

citizenship, is the result of a community agreement, sharing the social value that contributes to life, and can be a source of social integration [36].

The first principle of *Pancasila* recognizes unequivocally that the state will be based on religious beliefs and that Indonesian society believes in 'God'. This 'religious state', according to Soekarno, should promote what he calls "the interests of religion" [37]. In the words of Simatupang, the *Pancasila*-based State is responsible "not only for ensuring religious freedom but also for promoting the role of religions in society" [38]. In accommodating the state, religious communities not only maintain their autonomy but are also encouraged to make an indispensable contribution to the state's public life by their particular beliefs [39].

In the context of the pedagogy of *Pancasila*-Based State, a different relation between the Church and the state determines the growth of public religion as being objectively normative. In a *Pancasila*-based State, there is neither a subordination of the Church to the state nor a subordination of the state to the Church. A *Pancasila* way of thinking strives to set up a non-overlapping relationship between the state and Church - "a free [Church] in a free state" in the tradition of Abraham Kuyper [40]. Darmaputera prefers to think in terms of the Church and the state being "separated but not completely separated" [41]. Welker actually does employ the term 'differentiation' to describe the relationship between the Church and the state in Calvin's thought [42]. In building upon this claim, Reid interprets Calvin's thinking on differentiation as one "of mutual independence, but also of mutual helpfulness and support" [23, p. 252]. In other words, although they are separate from each other, the state and the Church have a mutual responsibility towards each other.

Indonesia, based on *Pancasila*, is a state of law, not a state of power, not a totalitarian or authoritarian state. The state of *Pancasila* guarantees freedom of religion. GBHN 1988-1993 confirms that religious freedom is the most fundamental human right. The state of *Pancasila* is not a secular state and therefore does not recognize the absolute separation between the religion (Church) and the state. The state of *Pancasila* is not the state-religion and religion-state. Calvin refused not only the state of theocracy and the state of religion but also the state of secular. This means that Calvin's idea of the relations between the Church and the state are very compatible with *Pancasila* as Indonesia's ideology. Indonesia's founding fathers agreed that although Indonesia became the largest Muslim country in the world, it should not be an Islamic state. The influence of western education on founding fathers during the Dutch colonization did not make state secular. Moreover, Indonesia should be a state based on *Pancasila*, which is not a state of theocracy or secular. Becoming a non-theocracy state means the Church and the state are never combined in total. The state based on *Pancasila* will reject not only the possibility of the Islamic state but also ecclesiastical supremacy.

On the other hand, a non-secular state means that the Church and the state are never spotted separated. The state based on *Pancasila* will reject the total separation of the Church and the state. Principally, the state's supremacy to the

Church must be rejected. If the state ruled the Church and its intervention in the affairs of the Church (doctrine or organization) and its implications, the Church has lost its freedom, so the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, has become blunt (Ephesians 6.17).

The issue now is how the state must fulfil its responsibilities to the Church. This is mutual responsibility and reciprocal cooperation without being trapped in the discourse of the religionization of politics and the politicization of religion. This responsibility of the Ministry of Religion has a key role. The Ministry of Religion was established on January 3, 1946, as part of Soekarno's administration. Since then it has become a permanent part of the administration of all Indonesian presidents. When dealing with the responsibility of the state towards the Church, the Ministry of Religion must retain the state's primary tasks, as Calvin has put it, not only to establish peace and public decency but also to take care of godliness. This role of the government, however, must be carried out indirectly, that is, limited to the outward, external manifestation of religion. This means that when dealing with disrupting religious manifestations, the Ministry of Religion is only allowed to prohibit certain manifestations or interpretations of that religion but not to prohibit the religion itself. This regulative function of the Ministry of Religion should be based not only on considerations of public justice and public morality but mainly and primarily upon the requirement that the Ministry secures the fundamental rights of the adherents of all religions and freedom of belief. Thus the Ministry of Religion's regulative function should not usurp religion's spiritual functions. In this sense, the Ministry's interventions may not be imposed permanently and should be removed as soon as possible in order that a large measure of freedom can be assured [1].

## 5. Conclusions

After tracing the Christian roots of Calvin's teachings on the relations between the Church and the state, and its implications for the Church and the pedagogy of *Pancasila*-based State, there can now be drawn some conclusions. *First*, the state's responsibility to the church regards mutual responsibility and reciprocal cooperation as well as compatibility with the pedagogy of the *Pancasila*-Based State in Indonesia. In contrast, the responsibility of the Church to the state does not inact mutual responsibilities and reciprocal cooperation but is asymmetric (*being-for* rather than *being-with*). *Second*, the Church recognizes the existence and function of the state as a tool of God to prevent/punish evil and strive for justice of all Indonesians. *Third*, the Church must be conscious and vigilant to the potential of the state in abusing its authority that can turn into destructive and demonic power. *Fourth*, so that State can implement its function fairly and correctly, the state power must be governed and limited. *Fifth*, the Church and the state have to reject totalitarianism and authoritarianism, and the Church must also reject theocracy and ecclesiocracy. *Sixth*, the state's responsibilities to the Church relates only to the outward, external manifestation

of religion (the outward worship of God), public offences against religion, a public manifestation of religion and a public sacrilege.

## References

- [1] B.F. Intan, *European Journal of Theology*, **27(1)** (2018) 55-66.
- [2] J. Verkuyl, *Contemporary Mission: An Introduction*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1987, 383.
- [3] A.K. Pringgodigdo, *Tiga Undang-Undang Dasar*, PT Pembangunan, Jakarta, 1981, 19.
- [4] Soekarno, *Pancasila Sebagai Dasar Negara*, Inti Idayu Press-Yayasan Pendidikan Soekarno, Jakarta, 1986, 61-155.
- [5] F. Ismail, *Indonesian Journal of Interdisciplinary Islamic Studies (IJIS)*, **1(2)** (2018) 53-54.
- [6] B.F. Intan, *Public Religion and the Pancasila-Based State of Indonesia. An Ethical and Sociological Analysis*, Peter Lang, Bern, 2006, 222.
- [7] S.J. Paul, *Existentialism and humanism*, Methuen, London, 1948, 28.
- [8] M.S. Kaelan, *Metode Penelitian Filsafat*, Paradigma, Yogyakarta, 2005, 23.
- [9] A. Wahyudi, *Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, **2(2)** (2018) 54.
- [10] T. van den End, *Harta Dalam Bejana*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 1999, 47-50.
- [11] F.E. Cranz, *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, **45(1)** (1953) 47-66.
- [12] F. Copleston, *A History of Philosophy*, Vol. 3, Image, London, 1993, 80.
- [13] T.M. Parker, *Christianity and the State in the Light of History*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955, 156-157.
- [14] P. Mairet (ed.), *Calvin: The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, Collins, London, 1963, 64.
- [15] S. Quentin, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol. II, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012, 192-193.
- [16] C. de Jonge, *Apa Itu Calvinisme?*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 1998, 267-270.
- [17] J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, vol. IV, Library of Christian Classics, London, 1961, 4-5.
- [18] W.A. Mueller, *Church and State in Luther and Calvin: A Comparative Study*, Broadman Press, Nashville, 1954, 131, 137.
- [19] J. Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*, Vol. II, John Knox Press, Westminster, 2016, 205.
- [20] J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Vols. 20-21, Library of Christian Classics, London, 1962, iv, xx, 32.
- [21] C. Villa-Vicencio, *Between Christ and Caesar: Classic and Contemporary Texts on Church and State*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1986, 51-52.
- [22] C. de Jonge, *Gereja Mencari Jawab*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 1994, 47-48.
- [23] J. Verkuyl, *Etika Kristen: Ras, Bangsa, Gereja, Negara*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 1967, 225.
- [24] W.S. Reid, *Calvin and the Political Order*, in *John Calvin: Contemporary Prophet*, J.T. Hoogstra (ed.), Presbyterian and Reformed, Philadelphia, 1959, 252.
- [25] J. Calvin, *Commentary on 1 Timothy*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1979, 2.
- [26] J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, J.T. McNeill (ed.), John Knox, Westminster, 2006, 20.
- [27] M. Buber, *I and thou*, The Cromwell Press, Wiltshire, 1996, 30.

- [28] K. Sobon, *Jurnal Filsafat*, **28(1)** (2018) 69.
- [29] K. Sobon, *International Journal of Ethics Education*, **3(2)** (2018) 166.
- [30] E. Levinas, *Ethics and infinity*, Dusquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, 1985, 98.
- [31] F. Suleeman, A.A. Utama and A. Rajendra (eds.), *Bergumul dalam Pengharapan: Buku Penghargaan untuk Eka Darmaputera*, BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 2001, 463-464.
- [32] Z.A. Dami, I. Pandu, E. Anakotta and A. Sahureka, *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, **3(2)** (2019) 71.
- [33] J.A. Dewantara, I.F. Suhendar, R. Rosyid and T.S. Atmaja, *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, **1(5)** (2019) 400.
- [34] M.S. Kaelan, *Revitalisasi dan Reaktualisasi Pancasila sebagai Dasar Filsafat Negara dan Ideologi dalam Memaknai Kembali Pancasila*, Lima, Yogyakarta, 2007, 112.
- [35] W. Kymlicka, *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001, 78.
- [36] G. Ritzer, *Sosiologi Ilmu Pengetahuan Berparadigma Ganda*, Rajawali Press, Jakarta, 2004, 45.
- [37] G.M. Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1952, 124.
- [38] R.L. Tobing, *Christian Social Ethics in the Thought of T.B. Simatupang: The Role of Indonesian Christians in Social Change*, Doctoral Thesis, The Iliff School of Theology and the University of Denver, Denver, 1996, 166.
- [39] B.F. Intan, *International Journal of Public Theology*, **13(2)** (2019) 242.
- [40] A. Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1987, 99.
- [41] E. Darmaputera, *Aspek-Aspek Etis-Teologis Hubungan Gereja-Negara dan Implikasinya dalam Negara Pancasila*, in *Hubungan Gereja dan Negara dan Hak Asasi Manusia: Bunga Rampai Pemikiran*, W. Sairin & J.M. Pattiasina (eds.), BPK Gunung Mulia, Jakarta, 1996, 19.
- [42] M. Welker, *Calvin's Doctrine of the 'Civil Government: Its Orienting Power in Pluralism and Globalization*, in *Calvin Today: Reformed Theology and the Future of the Church*, M. Weinrich & U. Moller (eds.), T. and T. Clark International, London, 2011, 211.