

Dialogue Between Christian Love and Pancasila Values According to Driyarkara

Dialog Cinta Kasih Kristiani dan Nilai-nilai Pancasila Menurut Driyarkara

Fransiskus S. Bembid

Sekolah Tinggi Tinggi Filsafat Teologi Widya Sasana, Paper received : 25th July 2023
Malang, Indonesia Paper revised : 30th October 2023
embitfranki@gmail.com Paper approved : 20th December 2023

ABSTRACT

This article discusses Christian love and the essence of Pancasila values according to Driyarkara. This secondary research (desk research) uses a qualitative approach with Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutic analysis method. This research critically examines Driyarkara's writings regarding the Pancasila and the Christian Religion. Driyarkara reflected deeply on the essence of the Pancasila as being love for God. Driyarkara's findings regarding love as the essence of the Pancasila will be used as a starting point to explain the relationship between the Pancasila and Christian love. The synthesis of the dialogue between the two becomes the basis for explaining how to become a Pancasila Christian. This article finds several things. First, the point of convergence between Pancasila and Christian love lies in love itself. In the light of the church's faith, Christian love which comes from Christ is the soul, while love as the essence of the Pancasila is its embodiment in the life of the nation and state. Second, the implementation of the Pancasila by Christians is a manifestation of their duty to take part in Christ's mission in the world, namely to proclaim the Kingdom of God which is nothing other than the complete welfare of humans. The research concludes that for a Christian there is no other way to become a Pancasilaist than by truly being a Christian who fundamentally implements Christ's love for others.

Keywords: Christian Love; Convergence; Pancasila Values; Pancasilaist Christian

ABSTRAK

Tulisan ini mendialogkan cinta kasih Kristiani dan intisari nilai-nilai Pancasila menurut Driyarkara. Penelitian sekunder (desk research) ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan metode analisis hermeneutik Paul Ricoeur. Penelitian ini mengkaji secara kritis tulisan Driyarkara mengenai Pancasila dan Religi Kristiani. Driyarkara merefleksikan sedalam-dalamnya bahwa intisari Pancasila adalah cinta kasih akan Tuhan. Temuan Driyarkara tentang cinta kasih sebagai sari pati Pancasila akan dijadikan titik tolak untuk menjelaskan hubungan antara Pancasila dan cinta kasih kristiani. Sintesa dari dialog keduanya menjadi pijakan untuk menjelaskan bagaimana menjadi kristiani Pancasila. Tulisan ini menemukan beberapa hal. Pertama, titik konvergensi antara Pancasila dan cinta kasih kristiani terletak pada cinta kasih itu sendiri. Dalam terang iman Gereja, cinta kasih kristiani yang berasal dari Kristus merupakan jiwa, sedangkan cinta kasih sebagai intisari Pancasila merupakan perwujudannya dalam kehidupan berbangsa dan bernegara. Kedua, pelaksanaan Pancasila oleh umat kristiani merupakan perwujudan dari tugasnya untuk mengambil bagian dalam misi Kristus di dunia, yaitu mewartakan Kerajaan Allah yang tidak lain adalah kesejahteraan seutuhnya manusia. Simpulan penelitiannya bahwa bagi umat kristiani tidak ada cara lain untuk menjadi Pancasilaist selain sungguh-sungguh menjadi kristiani yang melaksanakan secara mendasar cinta kasih Kristus bagi sesama.

Kata Kunci: Cinta Kasih Kristiani; Konvergensi; Kristiani Pancasila; Nilai-nilai Pancasila

INTRODUCTION

Christians are not only those who have finished their lives on earth and live before God in His kingdom. Christians are also the family of God in the world, that is the physical world (*Deus Caritas Est [DCE]*, art. 25). The physical world where Christians spread, live, and journey is in reality the political world (the political world in a geopolitical sense). This vast physical world is divided into the territorial boundaries of countries, whereas Christianity does not exist outside these boundaries but stands and moves within them. So, Christians in the world are God's people living in different countries.

The logical consequence of the existence of Christians in a certain country is that Christians have two statuses inherent to them, namely as members of a church and at the same time as citizens of a country. Christians are a church community and

at the same time the people of a state. This dual status also applies to Christians in the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI). As members of a church, they are required to live based on their faith, whereas as Indonesian citizens they are required to live based on Pancasila. Pancasila is the basis of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, to explain the relationship between the Christian faith and Pancasila it is necessary to find a meeting point (convergence). Therefore, the practice of the two in the public space does not clash or even cancel each other out but complements and supports each other.

There are many explanations regarding the harmony between Pancasila values and Christian faith. Many researchers argue that the meeting point between Pancasila and the Christian faith is ethics with an emphasis on respecting human dignity (Borgias 2021; Madung 2012), community development (Hadiwardoyo 2013; Rukiyanto 2017; Seda 2013), and religious harmony (Setiawan and Panjaitan 2021; Singgih 2022)

Dr. J Leimena's speech at the General Assembly of Indonesian Churches in Istora Senayan, Jakarta in 1964 asserted that what the churches in Indonesia want is parallel to what the state wants (Kustini and Arif 2016). The Statutes of the Indonesian Bishops' Conference (KWI) of 1987 explains that in the light of the Catholic faith, the church accepted the Pancasila (Widharsana 2018). This acceptance did not just occur for political and tactical reasons, but because the Pancasila has noble values that are in line with those taught by the Catholic Church. Practicing Pancasila means implementing Jesus' commandments. For this reason, implementing Pancasila values is a call for Catholics based on faith. Cardinal Julius Darmaatmadja stated that Pancasila values and Christian values are not only complementary but also synergistic. Both things lead to a sense of shared well-being by placing a high value on respect for human dignity. Therefore, through several books he wrote, namely "Umat Katolik Dipanggil Membangun NKRI" (Catholics Are Called to Build Up the Republic of Indonesia) (2019) and "Menjadi Katolik, Nasionalis, dan Pancasilais Sejati" (Becoming Genuine Catholics, Nationalists, and Pancasilaists) (volumes 1 and 2) (2020), he encouraged Christians to practice Pancasila.

Widharsana's writing (2018) turns out to be referring to Yudi Latif's research which says that the principles of the Pancasila are united by love and that love is the essence of the Pancasila (Latif 2017). However, if you scrutinize it, what Yudi Latif conveys is a brilliant finding that had been put forward by Driyarkara previously. In his writings on Pancasila and Religion, Driyarkara explicitly and deeply explains that love is the unifying principle of the Pancasila (Sudiarja et al. 2006). In his writing, Driyarkara squeezed the five principles of the Pancasila into *duisila* (the two principles), then squeezed them again into *ekasila* (the only principle), as was done by Soekarno, the first President of the Republic of Indonesia. He discovered that the essence of the Pancasila is love for God (Sudiarja et al. 2006).

Previous research shows that Pancasila and the Christian faith have common ground. However, it is not explained in depth where the synthesis was obtained. This article explains the relationship between Pancasila and Christian love. Therefore, this paper presents the findings of the research conducted on these specific questions: 1) What are the meanings and characteristics of Christian love?; 2) What is the essence of Pancasila values according to Driyarkara?; 3) What is the point of convergence between Christian love and Pancasila values according to Driyarkara?; 4) How to become a Pancasilaist Christian based on the synthesis between Christian love and the essence of Pancasila?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Two theories are used in this research. *First*, convergence theory. KBBI (Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language) (Pusat Bahasa - Depdiknas RI 2007) defines convergence as a state that leads to a meeting point. As an approach, convergence theory is used in many fields with different accentuations. In the field of educational psychology, convergence theory pioneered by William Stern (1871-1939) is a concept that integrates two opposing extreme points (nativism and empiricism) in understanding human development (Stern 1935). Convergence theory explains that human development is influenced by heredity and environmental factors.

Symbolic convergence theory, originally commonly used in the study of communication, was initiated by Ernest Bormann (1925-2008), an American communications expert. This theory explains the phenomenon of message exchange which produces shared meanings, motives, and similarities between one individual and another in the group (Bormann 1982). In the social and cultural world, convergence theory was developed by Barnett and Kincaid (1983) which explains the phenomenon of collective intersection that occurs between various interacting individuals from different cultures.

Convergence theory which is applied to the various fields above has a synthesis, namely that convergence theory is an approach to explain the common meeting point of two or more different or even conflicting variables. Convergence theory in this sense is used in this research to explain the meeting point between Christian love as the basis for the existence of Christianity and Pancasila values as the basis for the existence of Indonesian society. The point of convergence of the two becomes the basis for explaining how to become a Pancasila Christian who truly lives as a Christian without losing Indonesianness and truly lives as an Indonesian citizen without losing Christianity. In short, "to be 100% Catholic, 100% Indonesian" as said Mgr. Soegijapranata.

Second, the hermeneutical approach in Paul Ricoeur's text. Paul Ricoeur explains that text is a discourse that is standardized through writing because standardization through writing is a constitutive characteristic of the text itself (Fithri 2019). The text by Paul Ricoeur is seen as something autonomous, independent of the author's horizon, the original situation, and the original reader (author). In studying a text, readers expand their horizons, but at the same time, they are also limited by the text which has its horizon (Ricoeur 1991). Ricoeurian text hermeneutics is a philosophical activity that aims to explore, reveal, and explain the objective meaning of the text as implied by the text itself.

There are several steps involved in interpreting a text according to Paul Ricoeur (Riyanto 2020). First, explanation, namely explaining the meaning expressed by the text. Ricoeur views texts have their internal world that can be accessed and explained by readers. Second, is interpretation, namely the process in which the interpreter considers the significance of the meaning that has been expressed by the text. This stage shows the encounter between the reader's horizon and the internal world of the text. Third, self-appropriation, namely the process of taking and bringing the results of text interpretation into the reader's awareness and life. At this stage, the reader draws out the relevance and implications of the text's interpretation for everyday life.

In this research, Paul Ricoeur's text hermeneutical approach is used for the analysis of the Encyclical *Deus Caritas Est* written by Pope Benedict XVI in the framework of understanding and explaining the concept of Christian love. The hermeneutics of Paul Ricoeur's text is also used as an approach to examine

Driyarkara's thoughts regarding the essence of Pancasila values in Driyarkara's writing entitled "Pancasila dan Religi" (Pancasila and Religion). Driyarkara's writing is in the context of preparations for the formation of Guided Democracy as a means of implementing Pancasila in national and state life (Sudiarja et al. 2006).

RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a qualitative approach. Bogdan and Taylor explained that qualitative research aims to explore the meaning of a phenomenon and produce descriptive data (Moleong 2000). Charmaz (2006) defines qualitative research as an effort to understand social concepts and constructions through data interpretation and analysis. So, qualitative research is research that aims to obtain meaning or concepts through data analysis.

Desk research, also known as secondary research, involves collecting data from literature relevant to the research topic through reading, note-taking, and analysis (Sugiyono 2010). Arikunto (2006) states that the library method is used to obtain a strong theoretical basis for research. By referring to relevant literature, researchers can detail the concepts that support research. The aim of the bibliographic method is twofold. First, research to understand certain concepts from a religious community by referring to literature from that religious community. Second, research to analyze the thoughts of certain characters in works written by themselves and works written by other people about that character.

This research is directed at explaining the meeting point between Christian love and the essence of Pancasila values according to Driyarkara. The explanation of Christian love refers more or less to the Encyclical *Deus Caritas Est* from Pope Benedict XVI. Meanwhile, the study of Driyarkara's thoughts on the essence of Pancasila values refers to Driyarkara's writings on "Pancasila dan Religi".

A hermeneutic analysis of Paul Ricoeur's text can be carried out by following certain steps. The first step is to explain the meaning expressed by the text, where the text has its internal world that can be accessed and explained by the reader. The second step involves interpreting the significance of the meaning expressed by the text to show the encounter between the reader's horizon and the internal world of the text. Lastly, the third step is to take the results of text interpretation and bring them into the reader's awareness and life through self-appropriation. This helps to draw out the relevance and implications of text interpretation for everyday life.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Christian Love

In the Encyclical *Deus Caritas Est*, Pope Benedict XVI emphasizes the nature of Christianity as a communion of love. This can be seen from the structure of the encyclical, which is divided into two parts. The first part (art. 2-18) explains the Unity of Love in Creation and Salvation History. The second part (art. 19-39) focuses on Charity; The Church's Service of Love as a Community of Love. This scheme implicitly shows that God is love and this love is demonstrated through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As such, love is seen as the defining characteristic of the Christian community. Christians are called to love one another as Christ has loved them, to serve others with selflessness and compassion, and to seek the well-being of all people. This message of love is central to the Christian faith and is what binds the community together.

For Christians, love is the first and foremost law. It is the foundation of their faith and the guiding principle for their actions and interactions with others. Love includes two inseparable things, namely as the basis and at the same time as the embodiment. Love is not only a principle, but it is also the expression and manifestation of that principle.

According to Christian teachings, Jesus Christ presents the fullness of God's love for humanity and the world. Christianity emerged from this encounter with the event of God's love in the person of Jesus Christ (*DCE*, art. 1). Because of this, the experience of God's love in Christianity does not occur outside of Jesus Christ. Emanuel Martasudjita expresses it in sentences "All experiences of God's love in our lives as Christians are always God's love which is realized and occurs through Jesus Christ" (Martasudjita 2015).

Therefore, Christian love is not just love in general which is bound to certain boundaries such as family relationships, kinship, work relationships, and relationships that exclude God (Martasudjita 2015). Christian love also goes beyond the love commanded in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, it says "Love your neighbor as yourself" (cf. Lev 19:34). Here, the measure of love for others is humans, namely the perpetrators of that love. The specificity of Christian love lies in the love of Christ, namely "... Christian love originates in the love of God experienced through Jesus Christ" (Martasudjita 2015).

Jesus Christ, in the Gospel of John, gave His disciples a completely new commandment, which was different from the commandments in the Old Testament. He said, "This is My commandment, that you love one another, as I have loved you" (John 15:12). The orders are very clear that the basis, paradigm, and parameters of Christian love are the love of Christ. Christ's love is "the basis of why I should love, the example of how I love and the measure to which I should love" (Go 2007). It means that "If I love God, that love is a manifestation of Christ's love for God His Father. And if I love others, it is an exercise of Christ's love for humans and the world."

Christian love has five characteristics. First, relational (*DCE*, art. 31). From a Christian perspective, no one is called to love only himself. New love can be understood in relationships. Christian love is directed towards God and others. Love for Allah means loving Allah above everything. Meanwhile, love for others means loving others for the sake of love for God. Love for others cannot be separated from love for God. Loving God becomes real in loving others. Jesus Christ manifested love for His Father through love for humans through the sacrifice of the cross. Fellow humans in Christianity are all creatures called humans, without exception. With that said people who hate and persecute Christians are not an exception. The fellow human beings who are most prioritized to be loved (without neglecting others) are the weak and suffering. They need it right here, right now. Christian love is the answer to immediate needs and special situations.

Second, totality. Christian love involves the whole self, a personal-integral involvement. "Mature love engages all human powers, integrating man into his whole" (*DCE*, art. 17). Pope Benedict XVI's reflections are based on Scripture. It says "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind" (Mt 22:37).

Third, radical. What is meant by radical here is the unconditional and limitless nature of Christian love. Jesus taught His followers to love without limits and conditions. Regarding the radical nature of Christian love, Benedict XVI said that love becomes truly Christian in the sense that love must be given to all people without

distinction and that love must reach its most extreme consequences, that is, it has no limits other than infinity (*DCE*, art. 15-16).

Fourth, desire, not mere feelings. Feelings are spontaneous, inconsistent, and usually based on likes and dislikes, attraction, and disinterest. Feelings indeed provide tremendous power in acts of love. But love is a conscious action that unites feelings with the will and knowledge of God. So, Christian love means "I also love fellow humans whom I don't like or even don't know, based on God. That is only possible based on an inner encounter with God which becomes a communion of wills and extends to feelings" (*DCE*, art. 18).

Fifth, love is an act of service to the Church (*DCE*, art. 31). As a work of service, Christian love is the actual answer to hunger, poverty, and suffering. Christian acts of love are also free from party and ideology. This means that love is not a tool for world change that is controlled ideologically and partisanly. Acts of loving service are the best testimony to God who is love itself so that when love is exercised people see God's presence. Apart from that, the Church's work of charity is also not a form of proselytism, or a movement motivated to convert people to Christianity.

Those who practice charity in the Church's name will never seek to impose the church's faith upon others. (...) A Christian knows when it is time to speak of God and when it is better to say nothing and to let love alone speak. He knows that God is love (cf. 1 Jn 4:8) and that God's presence is felt at the very time when the only thing we do is to love (*DCE*, art. 31).

Christian love has a social-universal goal because it is relational. Love aims to take part in the mission of Jesus Christ in the world, namely establishing the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God is a kingdom of love where humans live in complete prosperity. Benedict XVI said this as follows:

The entire activity of the church is an expression of a love that seeks the integral good of man: it seeks his evangelization through Word and Sacrament, an undertaking that is often heroic in the way it is acted out in history; and it seeks to promote man in the various areas of life and human activity (*DCE*, art. 19).

The Essence of Pancasila According to Driyarkara

Soediman Kartohadiprodjo, Notonegoro, and N. Driyarkara are among the philosophical figures who have explored and formulated the essence of Pancasila, following the work of Soekarno (Arif 2016). In this article, the figure whose philosophical thoughts are explored is Prof. Dr. Nicolaus Driyarkara SJ (13 June 1913 – 11 February 1967). He is a Catholic clergyman and philosopher. He has given seminars on Pancasila several times, both domestically and abroad.

A brief note on Nicolaus Driyarkara's career journey is as follows: He started as a lecturer at Girisonta in 1941-1942 and later became a philosophy teacher at the Yogyakarta Higher Seminary from 1943-1946. In 1952, he received his Doctorate in Philosophy at Gregorian University, where he wrote a dissertation on Nicolas Malebranche. After his Ph.D., he became a philosophy lecturer in Yogyakarta from 1952 to 1958. In 1960-1967, he served as an Extraordinary Professor at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia. He also worked as a lecturer at Hasanuddin University, Ujung Pandang (Makassar) from 1961 to 1967 and was a guest lecturer at St. Louis University, United States from 1963 to 1964. Additionally, he served as a member of MPRS from 1962 to 1967 and was a member of the Supreme Advisory Council of the Republic of Indonesia from 1965 to 1967.

The following presentation will first briefly describe Soekarno's thoughts on the essence of Pancasila, before delving into Driyarkara's thoughts. Soekarno and Driyarkara used the same method in finding the basic principles of Pancasila, namely the reduction method, but the approach is different. Soekarno used a historical and socio-cultural approach, because the material sources of Pancasila, said Notonegoro, are the customs, traditions, and culture that exist throughout the archipelago (Arif 2016). Meanwhile, Driyarkara uses a philosophical-anthropological approach (Purwosaputro 2015).

Soekarno's speech (1901-1970) dated June 1, 1945, contains a proposal about five principles that became a solid basis for an independent Indonesian state. The five principles are as follows: 1) Indonesian Nationality; 2) Humanity or internationalism; 3) Consensus or democracy; 4) Social welfare; 5) Cultural divinity. To find the essence of the five principles above, Soekarno condensed them into three principles (trisila), namely: 1) Socio-nationalism. This principle is derived from national and humanitarian principles; 2) Socio-democracy. This principle includes the principles of democracy and social welfare; 3) Cultural divinity (Wedakarna and Suyasa 2022).

Trisila above, according to Soekarno, can still be squeezed again into ekasila. Finally, he discovered that there was one principle that supported the five or three principles above, namely what he called gotong royong (cooperation). That is the content of ekasila referred to by Soekarno. This principle could not be squeezed by Soekarno to become even more fundamental. Therefore, gotong royong is the essence of Pancasila which contains all the precepts (Wedakarna and Suyasa 2022).

According to Soekarno, gotong royong is "slamming bones together, sweating together, fighting to help" (Mutiarra 2020). So, gotong royong is a joint act for others. According to Thomas Aquinas, action is the actuality of something behind it (Ohoitumur 2006), then gotong royong is the actuality (appearance) of something that is behind it. Therefore, "the action of gotong royong" there must be something underlying it. The basis of gotong royong is not gotong royong itself, but something that is behind it.

It seems like Driyarkara was trying to understand the reasons behind gotong royong and believed that Pancasila, a philosophical principle in Indonesia, arises from human nature itself (Sudiarja et al. 2006). This means that the values contained in Pancasila are rooted in the essential characteristics of humans. Because of that, he began his search for the essence of Pancasila from humans. He placed human nature as the axis of his philosophical reflection. According to Driyarkara, humans are autonomous creatures (personal beings) as well as creatures whose autonomy relates to other realities outside themselves (personal becoming). Humans are creatures who are completely connected to external reality. Driyarkara said that Heidegger reflected human nature as "being together" because of this relational nature (Sudiarja et al. 2006).

For Driyarkara, Heidegger's thought on human nature is "not enough" details. "Not enough" means that Heidegger does not explain the basic principle of "being together". The basic principle in question is something that connects humans as individuals with others as individuals, or that connects I-Thou to become Us. Humans can't be understood as being together if there are no basic principles that enable this togetherness to occur. Therefore, he argued that the basic principle of human co-existence is none other than love (Sudiarja et al. 2006). That is the basis of human relations as co-existence. Therefore, citing Ludwig Binswanger (1882-1966), he concluded that human nature is Being-with-love.

Pancasila in Driyarkara's mind is a recognition of human nature as existing together in love. However, this affirmation was not formulated explicitly in the form of philosophical postulates. Driyarkara saw that Pancasila was indeed in its finished form, especially when it was still in the form of items of thought that had not been unified, which had lived throughout the archipelago for a long time and had not been formulated philosophically. Perhaps it is accurate to say that Pancasila for Driyarkara is a philosophy with an implicit philosophical formulation. Because Driyarkara clearly explains the philosophical postulates of Pancasila as a recognition that it will exist with love.

First, I am an Indonesian human being, admit that my existence is in existence together with love. So I have to carry out my existence as love too. Love towards fellow human beings is generally called: Humanity.

Second, I must carry out humanity in jointly creating, owning, and using world goods that are useful as conditions, tools, and equipment for life. The incarnation of humanity in this sector is called social justice.

Third, I also have to practice humanity in society. Socializing means creating unity of work. For the unity of the work to truly be an implementation of humanity, each member must be respected and accepted as a person with equal rights. The way to implement humanity in this sector is called democracy.

Forth, Humanity must also be carried out about unity, which is a gradual process created by history, local conditions, ancestry, culture, shared civilization, and other factors. This unity also determines and shapes me as a concrete human being with his feelings, spirit, thoughts, etc. Being together actually means living in unity. So my life in unity must be an implementation of humanity. That great unity, in which I must first exercise humanity, is called nationality.

Fifth, I acknowledge that I exist together, all connected, all supported, all dependent. So my existence is not perfect, not by my strength. So I am not the source of my existence. All things that are limited, precisely because they are limited (the same as me) cannot possibly be the source of my existence, but may provide the ultimate explanation of my existence. What can be the source of my existence in the end is only the Absolute Being, the Almighty. The Almighty is not something, but the Most Perfect Person. That is God Almighty. My existence in the form of love is love for the most loving, the most merciful. In this thought of mine I find the basis of my existence; becomes the basis of all my actions, the basis for implementing humanity, social justice, etc. (Kumpulan Tulisan Driyarkara 1980; Purwosaputro 2015).

The basic principle of human relation is love. The direction of human love expressed in Pancasila is God and others. Because of this, Driyarkara squeezed the five principles in Pancasila into two principles, namely love for God and love for others (Sudiarja et al. 2006). The explanation of the duality is as follows.

Love for God

This principle put in its load of civilized divine precepts which philosophically, is a recognition of divinity. Recognition of divinity does not only mean recognizing the existence of God as a person but recognizing God with everything that concerns Him. Recognition of divinity cannot possibly arise from a relationship with God and everything related to Him. The basis of relationships is love, so recognition of divinity is an expression of love (Indonesian people) for God. The basic criterion for a right relationship is love for God Almighty, as Driyarkara said above. Love for Almighty God is the basis of the other four precepts.

Love for others

These principles include the principles of humanity, nationality, democracy, and social welfare. These four precepts place fellow humans as the target of relationships. The essence of these four precepts is humanity. Meanwhile, the other three precepts are the elaboration and implementation of humanitarian precepts. In the principles of humanity itself, there is a recognition of the existence of "others" with all their noble dignity as human beings. Even though individuals have various natural and cultural differences, their dignity is the same as human beings. Because they have noble dignity, humans' attitude towards their fellow humans is to defend, appreciate, and respect. Such an attitude is a form of love for others. So, humanitarian principles in all their details are the implementation of love for others.

Two principles above were further refined by Driyarkara into *ekasila*, namely love for God (Sudiarja et al. 2006). Love for God is the basis of love for others. In other words, love for others is an implementation of love for God. This can be understood from the following logic: Humans are creatures and God is the Creator. Because humans as creatures have the nature of love, then God as the Creator must have the nature of love. Therefore, the nature of love that is inherent in every human being does not come from the human being himself but comes from God the Creator. So, nature in this sense is grace (given without being asked). The consequence is that human love is the crystallization of God's love. In other words, God's love is incarnated in human love. Finally, what used to be divine principles, humanitarian principles, national principles, democratic principles, and welfare principles are the implementation of one principle, namely love for God. However, Driyarkara is not proposing Indonesia as a religious state. Far from that, he was discussing Pancasila at the level of principles and philosophy, not in the sense of being the basis of the state. In essence, divine precepts are the basic principles and objectives of the Pancasila building. But these divine precepts are not at the same time the principles and direct goals of the state. The state does not directly implement divinity, but directly implements general welfare.

Convergence Point

Driyarkara, an Indonesian philosopher, has stated that the essence of Pancasila, the five principles that were formulated by Soekarno and are part of the Indonesian Constitution, is love for God. In other words, cooperation among people is seen as a way of showing love for God in society, according to Driyarkara. However, it should be noted that the love referred to by Driyarkara cannot be directly claimed as Christian love. The love that Driyarkara means is love "in general" which is inherent in every human being, regardless of their background. Nonetheless, it must be acknowledged that when Driyarkara conveyed this idea, philosophy, and Christian faith were closely intertwined in his mind.

Driyarkara has opened a clear path to find the relationship between Christian love and Pancasila by saying that love for God is the essence of Pancasila. Because the relationship between the two can be placed in Driyarkara's line of thinking. Now, his way of thinking is given a Christian nuance. The specificity of Christian love lies in the love of Christ. Apart from the love of Christ, it is not Christian love. Because the name Christian itself means follower of Christ. Being a follower of Christ means being like Him in feeling, word, and deed. This means, that if Christians love other people, whoever they are, it is a continuation and implementation of Christ's love for humans (the world). If Christians love God, it is a manifestation of Christ's love for God the Father. So, whether it is love for others or love for God, Christ is the center and

measure. What about hatred? Hating others means a violation of one's essence or identity as a Christian.

Pancasila and Christian love can now be connected using the Driyarkara way of thinking. Pancasila is the implementation of love for God. Love for God for Christians is participation in the implementation of Christ's love for His Father. In that sense, Pancasila is the implementation by Christians of Christ's love for His Father. Therefore, the relationship between the two can be concluded like this; The love of Christ is the basis for Christians in practicing Pancasila. Meanwhile, the embodiment of Pancasila by Christians is a form of implementation of Christ's love for His Father which (must) be shown by Christians through love for others in state life.

The meeting point between Christian love and Pancasila love lies in the vision of humanity, namely religious humanism. Both Christian love and the essence of Pancasila values emphasize the integration of love for God with love for others. Love for others is a manifestation of love for God. Driyarkara reflects that Pancasila is a formulation and affirmation of human nature as individuals of love. Christian love provides the reason why humans are called individuals of love and must be the goal of state administration, namely because they were created in the image of God. He is the living image of God.

The relationship between Christian love and Pancasila in the context of the humanitarian vision also lies in the implementation goals of both. The aim of implementing Pancasila is none other than for the sake of general welfare. Meanwhile, the aim of implementing Christ's love by Christians is none other than the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the world. The common good is political-worldly language for the situation of the Kingdom of God. So for Christians, Pancasila is a means to take part in Christ's mission in the world, namely building the Kingdom of God. This does not mean that specific ecclesial love (inward) can be equated with social love (outward), even though both are driven by the same soul, namely the love of Christ (Apostolic Constitution *Fidei Depositum* 1998).

The values contained in Pancasila are not something foreign to the Christian faith. These values are not outside the church's teachings, let alone contradicting them, but are within them and confirm them. KWI Statute of 1987, Article 3 said that the Indonesian Church was grateful because the Indonesian state chose Pancasila as its basis. By accepting Pancasila, the church does not receive additional burdens but receives additional support from the state in carrying out Christ's commands. Even if Pancasila did not exist, the church would still uphold the values of divinity, unity, democracy, and social justice (Widharsana 2018).

The church practices Pancasila not just for political reasons, but for reasons of faith. Practicing Pancasila means practicing the teachings of Christ. Therefore, practice Pancasila is a Christian calling. Regarding this, Msgr. Ignatius Suharyo says:

Pancasila has noble values that are in line with those taught by the Catholic Church. Therefore, the church is committed to practicing it, not for political and tactical reasons, but because living and practicing the values of Pancasila means living and practicing the teachings of Christ (Widharsana 2018).

Pancasilaist Christian

Pancasilaist Christians do not want to express a dichotomous idea as if there are Pancasilaist Christians and there are those who are not. As explained above, basically the values contained in Pancasila are the values taught and fought for by the church. The use of the term "Pancasilaist Christian" is intended to display the dialogue

of the motto "100% Catholic, 100% Indonesian" from Mgr. Soegijapranata, SJ. Because the motto does not clearly state the extent to which integrity as a Catholic and integrity as an Indonesian are being dialogued with.

Even though Christian love and Pancasila love have a strong relationship, they cannot replace each other. The love of Christ specifically as the basis of Christian life cannot replace the position of Pancasila as the basis of the state. Because the case will be trapped in the identification of religious law with civil law, on the other hand, Pancasila cannot be used as the basis of Christian life, even though Pancasila contains universal values, all of which are emphasized by Christian teachings. Because Pancasila explicitly contains fundamental ethical principles and not dogmatic principles of faith (Magnis-Suseno 2020).

Becoming pancasilaist Christian can be implemented with two model Christian attitudes towards "others" ("others": non-Christians) proposed in this paper. This proposal departs from awareness of the ethical truth in Pancasila which is in line with the social and moral teachings of the church, namely that recognition of others and myself as human beings with noble dignity is an absolute requirement for involvement in life and government of the country (Gaudium et Spes, art. 73). Respect for the human person is the basis for creating democratic participation. Recognition of the sublime dignity of the human person not only makes civic participation possible but makes social and political engagement effective (Kongregasi Suci untuk Ajaran Iman, 2002, art. 3). Further explanation regarding the position or placement of "others" and the placement of Christian people in "others" is as follows.

The Others as Neighbors

The others as neighbors is a matter of how I as a Christian view "others" in front of me in the country. The statement "others as neighbors" means that I, as a Christian, acknowledge that others who are not Christians are also human beings (subjects) just as I am a human being. So, both I and "others" have the same noble dignity, namely as the image of God.

The consequences for Christians in general are; that I must be responsible for the lives of "others" just as I am responsible for my own. I must respect and accept "others" in collective life, as a nation. I must not marginalize or even eliminate "others" from national life. Because, those outside the polis are creatures whose nature is lower than humans, such as animals that live in the forest, or creatures that are higher than humans, such as gods or angels (Riyanto, Christy, and Widodo 2011). Eliminating "others" from shared life (statehood) means considering them not as fellow human beings.

The consequences for Christian politicians; If I am in the majority group (in quantity and influence) in a particular government area in Indonesia, I cannot close the space for political participation for "others" who are not Christians. I must give them as much space as possible to be jointly involved in advancing the nation and state because the state is not a Christian monopoly. Also, in making policies, I must not only pay attention to the welfare of Christians or certain groups but also to all citizens in the policy, especially the poor and weak.

The I as a Neighbor to Others

The I as a neighbor to others is a matter of how I as a Christian view (position) myself in front of others in the state, and society. The statement "I am a neighbor to others" means that I acknowledge that I am neither lower nor higher than others, but equal to them. The three can be described as follows.

Firstly, I am not inferior to others. This means that I am not outside the state (cf. the nature of humans as *zoon politicon* according to Aristotle). This awareness implies that as a Christian, even as a minority, I must not isolate or alienate myself from social life, national life, and political participation. I cannot run away from my obligations as a citizen. Guided by Christian values, I must fulfill my obligations as a citizen.

Reflecting on the involvement of Christian figures in the history of the Indonesian nation and the availability of access to adequate education for everyone, I as a Christian must not feel inferior in front of others. Second, I'm not taller than anyone else. That is, I am not above the state. This awareness implies that as a Christian I have no right to exclude, exterminate, or exclude others from national life. If that were to happen, I would "reject not only any promise of Christianity in public life or politics but also reject basic ethics themselves" (Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 2002, art. 6). Recognizing that I am not superior to others in the state or even to the state itself means that I am not immune to the laws and regulations of the state. It also means that I do not view the life of the country from afar.

Third, I am the same (equal) as "the others". This means that I, because of my nature as - to borrow Aristotle's term - *zoon politicon* must be together with "others" in the state because I am also a citizen. Therefore, I include and involve myself in all-state life. With the role that is inherent in me, I participate and contribute to building a shared living system. Not only a natural calling but I was also called by faith to participate in building the Republic of Indonesia. Christian faith compels and inspires my social and political involvement in society and the country.

The I as a neighbor to others does not only mean that I am equal to "others" as described above. But it also means that I am with "others". That is, if "others" are the ones suffering, I have to be with them, enter their lives and reality, feel what they feel, and then defend their rights. If "others" are people who are struggling to build a prosperous country, I don't watch but I also stand in their position. In short, I feel in the same boat and the same boat as "others". In a very Christian sense, this means that I, as a disciple of Christ, must be the executor of God's love for "others" in the state, not as a waiter to be given love by the state or others. I had to do something for "the others" for the country. Or as the 35th President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, famously said, "Don't ask the country what it has given you, but ask yourself what you have given the country."

CONCLUSION

The above discussion can be concluded as follows. First, Christian love refers to the love that is advocated and exemplified by Jesus Christ. It is a selfless and unconditional love that is modeled after Christ's love for humanity. Christian love has several characteristics, namely integral (integrates love for God and love for others), total (involving the whole self), radical (without limits and conditions), desired not just as a feeling, missionary (as a form of church testimony and not a form of proselytism), and aims to create complete human well-being. By practicing this love, individuals can better reflect the image of God and bring about positive change in the world. Second, the essence of Pancasila values according to Driyarkara is love for God. Love for God (first principle) is the basis and reason for loving others (second to fifth principles).

Third, the meeting point between Christian love and Pancasila values, according to Driyarkara, lies in love itself, which both promote religious humanism, namely respect for humans as a form of glorification of God. The identity of Christian love as the main law of Christianity is found in the love of Christ, while the essence of

Pancasila as the basis of the Indonesian state is the love of God. The common ground for Christians is precisely the love of Christ which is the basis for practicing the values of Pancasila. Apart from that, the implementation of Pancasila by Christians is a manifestation of the duty of Christians to take part in Christ's mission in the world, namely proclaiming the Kingdom of God which is nothing other than the complete welfare of humans.

The synthesis between Christian love and Pancasila shows that there is no more fundamental way to become a Pancasilaist Christian than to become a true Christian who carries out Christ's command of total and radical love for others. Being a Pancasilaist Christian can be demonstrated through two attitudes towards others in the country, namely viewing "others" as neighbors and making oneself a neighbor to "others". In essence, these two attitudes invite Christians to participate actively in the life and management of the state for the sake of realizing general welfare, so that the situation of the Kingdom of God exists on earth as in heaven.

REFERENCES

- Anditya Mutiara, Dian. 2020. "Pidato Soekarno 1 Juni 1945." Retrieved November 3, 2023 (<https://wartakota.tribunnews.com/2020/05/30/pidato-lengkap-soekarno-1-juni-1945-pertama-kali-ungkap-pancasila?page=1>).
- Arif, Syaiful. 2016. *Falsafah Kebudayaan Pancasila: Nilai dan Kontradiksi Sosialnya*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Metodologi Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Barnett, George A., and D. Lawrence Kincaid. 1983. "A Mathematical Theory of Cultural Convergence." *Intercultural Communication Theory: Current Perspectives* 171–79.
- Benediktus XVI, Paus. 2007. *Deus Caritas Est (Allah Adalah Kasih): Seruan Apostolik Paus Benediktus XVI 2005*, Terj. Piet Go. Jakarta: Dokpen KWI.
- Borgias, Fransiskus. 2021. "Agama dan Panggilan Mencintai Sesama sebagai Cara Pembumih Pancasila." *Pembumih Pancasila* I(1):37–48.
- Bormann, Ernest G. 1982. "The Symbolic Convergence Theory of Communication: Applications and Implications for Teachers and Consultants." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 10(1):50–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909888209365212>.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory (A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis)*. London: Sage Publications.
- Darmaatmadja, Yulius. 2019. *Umat Katolik Dipanggil Membangun NKRI*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Darmaatmadja, Yulius. 2020. *Menjadi Katolik, Nasionalis, dan Pancasila Sejati*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Fithri, Widia. 2019. "Kekhasan Heremeneutika Paul Ricoeur." *Tajdid : Jurnal Ilmu Keislaman dan Ushuluddin* 17(2):187–211. <https://doi.org/10.15548/tajdid.v17i2.125>.
- Go, Piet. 2007. *Teologi Moral Dasar*. Malang: Dioma.
- Hadiwardoyo, Purwa. 2013. "Pancasila dan Gereja Katolik Indonesia." *Jurnal Teologi* 2(1):17–26. <https://doi.org/10.24071/jt.v2i1.432>.
- Kongregasi Suci untuk Ajaran Iman. 2002. *Peranserta Umat Katolik di dalam Kehidupan Politik*, Terj. Ignatius Sumaryo. Jakarta: Dokpen KWI.

- Konstitusi Apostolik Fidei Depositum. 1998. *Katekismus Gereja Katolik*, Terj. Herman Embuiru. Ende: Percetakan Arnoldus.
- Kumpulan Tulisan Driyarkara. 1980. *Driyarkara tentang Negara dan Bangsa*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Kustini, and Syaiful Arif. 2016. “Kekristenan dan Nasionalisme di Kota Bogor.” *Harmoni* 15(2):96–108.
- Latif, Yudi. 2017. *Revolusi Pancasila*. Bandung: Mizan Media Utama.
- Madung, Otto Gusti. 2012. “Martabat Manusia Sebagai Basis Etis Masyarakat Multikultural.” *Diskursus - Jurnal Filsafat dan Teologi STF Driyarkara* 11 (2):160–73. <https://doi.org/10.36383/diskursus.v11i2.135>.
- Magnis-Suseno, Franz. 2020. “Panggilan Kristiani, Gereja, Filsafat dan Pancasila.” *Logos. Jurnal Filsafat-Teologi* 17(2):1–14.
- Martasudjita, Emanuel. 2015. *Karya Allah dalam Keterbatasan Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Moloeng, Lexy J. 2000. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Ohoitumur, Johanis. 2006. *Metafisika sebagai Hermeneutika*. Jakarta: Obor.
- Purwosaputro, Supriyono. 2015. “ ‘ Aku ’ dalam Pancasila (Refleksi Metafisika Pancasila).” *Jurnal Ilmiah CIVIS* 5(1):692–703.
- Pusat Bahasa - Depdiknas RI. 2007. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, Edisi Ketiga (2007)*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1991. *From Text to Action, Essays in Hermeneutics, II, Translated by Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thomp-Son*. Illinois: Northwestern University Press Evanston.
- Riyanto, Armada. 2020. *Metodologi: Pemantik and Anatomi Riset Filsafat Teologis*. Malang: Widya Sasana Publication.
- Riyanto, Armada, Marcellius Ari Christy, and Paulus Punjung Widodo. 2011. *Aku dan Liyan: Kata Filsafat Dan Sayap*. Malang: Widya Sasana Publication.
- Rukiyanto, B. A. 2017. “Peran Gereja Katolik dalam Membangun Bangsa Indonesia di Era Reformasi.” *Diskursus - Jurnal Filsafat dan Teologi STF Driyarkara* 16 (2):105–37. <https://doi.org/10.26551/diskursus.v16i2.58>.
- Seda, Francisia SSE. 2013. “Gereja dan Negara: Refleksi atas Tantangan Masyarakat Indonesia dan Pancasila: Suatu Pendekatan Sosiologis.” *Jurnal Orientasi Baru* 22(2):155–86.
- Setiawan, David Eko, and Firman Panjaitan. 2021. “Titik Temu Pancasila dan Etika Politik Gereja dalam Melawan Radikalisme Di Indonesia.” *Jurnal SMART (Studi Masyarakat, Religi, Dan Tradisi)* 7(01):43–56. <https://doi.org/10.18784/smart.v7i01.1234>.
- Singgih, Emanuel Gerrit. 2022. “Moderasi Beragama sebagai Hidup Yang Baik.” *Gema Teologika: Jurnal Teologi Kontekstual dan Filsafat Keilahian* 7(2):191. <https://doi.org/10.21460/gema.2022.72.911>.
- Stern, William. 1935. “On the Nature and Structure of Character.” *Journal of Personality* 3(4):270–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1935.tb02011.x>.
- Sudiarja, A., G. Budi Subanar, St. Sunardi, and T. Sarkim, eds. 2006. *Karya Lengkap Driyarkara*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

- Sugiyono. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif and RND*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Vatikan II, Konsili. 2021. *Gaudium et Spes (Kegembiraan dan Harapan)*, Terj. R. Hardawiryana, SJ. Jakarta: Dokpen KWI.
- Wedakarna, Shri I. Gusti Ngurah Arya, and Mahendradatta Wedastraputra Suyasa. 2022. "Perdebatan Hari Lahir Pancasila, *Trisila*, dan *Ekasila* Berdasarkan Pemikiran Soekarno dalam Perumusan Pancasila." *Jurnal Pembumian Pancasila* 2(1):22–35. <https://jurnalpembumianpancasila.id/index.php/jpp/article/view/12>.
- Widharsana, Petrus Danan. 2018. *Mengamalkan Pancasila dalam Terang Iman Katolik*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.