Research Paper   **Open   Access**

Contextual Theology Approaches: Urgency to Multiculturalism & Pluralism

Justiani Liem[1]

Student of Doctoral Program, IAKN Kupang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT:- Indonesian society is essentially pluralistic from perspective of religion and belief, and multicultural in terms of ethnic groups. As a diverse country, Indonesia has the largest number of Muslim adherents in the world. Founding fathers has managed to unite these differences by setting off the foundation of *Pancasila* and symbolizing *Bhineka Tunggal Ika*. The motto refers to the unity in diversity of Indonesia, a nation consisting of various cultures, regional languages, races, ethnicities, religions, and beliefs. The country commits itself on religious tolerance, democratic transformation, and the promotion of human rights. Religion and belief play an important role in the everyday life of Indonesians, and are part of a person's identity and the nation's identity. However, many Indonesians face religious discrimination. Laws, policies, and practices contrary to international human rights continue, and the State has been accused of failing to protect its citizens in the face of religious intolerance and violence. One of the reasons is the lack of spreading the urgency of contextual theology to be used in interpreting the various religious affairs. This paper is aimed at presenting several different approaches of contextual theology and explains how it is useful to bridge the gaps in variety of religious understanding. This must be addressed seriously to maintain Indonesia's commitment to human dignity, and to safeguard the harmony which guarantees Indonesia's unity and democratic future.

Keywords: *contextual theology, religious discrimination, integration of meaning, knowledge and belief.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Globalization does have many sides. It can be seen as a symptom of homogenization and at the same time forming hegemony (Barevičiūte, 2010). Homogenization is a symptom of increasing similarity at the global level. Meanwhile, hegemony is the concentration of power in a country or civilization that creates a centre (core), which is the result of the consolidation of a hegemonic centre, with a periphery that experiences marginalization (Almeida & Chase-Dunn, 2018) (Barevičiūte, 2010) (Browne & Fishwick, 1999) . This phenomenon can be seen clearly in the Republic of Indonesia. The gap between Java and Outside Java (Dixon, 2009), between Cities and Villages (even Suburbs) (Pamungkas, 2015), between the Super-rich and the Super-poor (Banerjee & Duflo, 2011), between the Majority vs. Minority, between Modern vs. Indigenous (Mander & Tauli-Corpuz, 2006), between Bureaucracy vs. the People, who run separately. These symptoms were clearly visible on the face of the Republic of Indonesia in the last decade, which was marked by number of incidents of violent clashes in several areas with a background of religious and/or racial discrimination (Pamungkas, 2015). The burning of the Yasmin church in Bogor (Sirait, 2019), the massacre of the Shia sect in Sampang Madura (Ramadhan, 2022) (Wahid, 2015), large protests that wanted to tear down the statue of Dewi Kwan Im in Tuban (Marta, 2017), the ban of Ahmadiyah sect in East Java (Rahim, 2014) (Nasution, 2008), violence experienced by Papuans in East Java (Dispatch, 18 Agustus 2019), and many others.

In Indonesia, religions have become increasingly astray on its rituals, forgetting the roots and the contexts, which causes religious conflicts in any regions. It was *Samuel Huntington* (Huntington, 1996) who saw the potential for a clash of civilizations, namely among the eight great civilizations, of which the most important were the West (Judeo-Christian-Ancient Greece), Islam and Confucianism which dominated the Chinese-Japanese civilization (although Huntington forgot the Buddhist, Taoist and Sinto factors which, together with Confucianism, dominated civilizations in that area). *Lesslie Newbigin* sharpens the problem of disintegration above through the distinction between knowing and believing (Newbigin, 2019). Talking about knowing and

---

[1]*Doctoral candidate from the Kupang State Christian Institute (IAKN Kupang), the Executive Director of GoGreen and GoClean Indonesia Foundation*

believing, means we are talking about religion and science. But the problem, according to Newbigin, is how and where the boundaries between what is known and believed. There are indeed times when that line need not be drawn, for theology is part of science. Newbigin said that pluralism is in the sense of beliefs, not pluralism in facts, quoting *Descartes*' opinion about *Cogito ergo sum (I think, therefore I exist)*. Through knowing and believing, faith and knowledge, we are invited to see every problem in a different way.

Newbigin's conclusion is that when reason and tradition are confronted as criteria for truth, a wide gap will be formed. Rationality or reasoning should be developed in real history which is called experience which then crystallizes into tradition. Civilization is a continuous process not a disparity. Reason can only really operate within a social tradition that continues to apply in experience, so that theology is not born or built from truth which is limited by reasoning alone, regardless of the roots of experience and tradition. Theology must emerge from the reflection of experience through an analysis of the situation, or the facts of what God is doing in the midst of life. It becomes clear that reason, joined with the Bible and its tradition in upholding truth, and all is an inseparable unit in forming an understanding.

The reality of the existence of chasms separating various thoughts, which is caused among others by religions, nowadays, is increasing in Indonesia severely, even though essentially (intrinsically) the teachings of religions which refer to the same spirituality. Why is this happening more and more and how should the teachings be disseminated? In different expression, borrowing Bourdieu's Habitus (Bourdieu, Forms of Capital: General Sociology, Volume 3: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983 - 84, 2021), in which religious understanding as dominant factor, is strongly influenced by an individual's social class and cultural background, and this can create barriers to multicultural understanding. Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital and its role in producing and reproducing social inequality is important. The unequal distribution of cultural capital creates a system of cultural domination, which can hinder multicultural understanding and perpetuate social injustice (Bourdieu, Language and Symbolic Power, 1992).

This paper discusses how religious understanding shapes individuals' perceptions of the world around them and how this can influence their ability to understand and appreciate other cultures. Pierre Bourdieu's ideas about cultural capital, habitus, and symbolic violence provide a valuable framework for understanding the contestation of multiculturalism in contemporary societies. By emphasizing the importance of cultural capital, habitus, and symbolic violence, Bourdieu challenges traditional notions of cultural diversity and provides a more nuanced understanding of the ways in which multiculturalism is contested and shaped in modern society (Bourdieu, The Forms of Capital, 1986). One of the many ways is through the perspective of contextual theology approaches in understanding the various religious affairs, which is the focus of this paper.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The methods used in analysis and problem solving include qualitative methods, literature studies, comparative studies, involvement in various dialogues and seminars on human right violation cases ang minorities advocacy, as well as textual, constructive, and reconstructive interpretation methods theoretically and contextually. For enrichment and accuracy purpose it also involves various resource persons who are qualified in their fields, both internal and external of the domain being examined, as well as different backgrounds, but have a reputation in their community to ensure credibility and integrity of the study. This research is done through field visits, interviews, participatory actions, and advocacy as well as court/legal process involvements helping the victims in various ways often mentioned as praxis (Singgih, Bergereja, Berteologi dan Bermasyarakat, 2007).

III. DISCUSSION

Contextual theology is a branch of Christian theology that examines how Christian teachings can become relevant in different contexts. This theology is part of liberation theology. Contextualization is a term popularized around the end of the 20th century associated with the goals of theological education in the third world. Previously known as Indigenization. But it seems that the term indigenization cannot accommodate all that is to be achieved regarding the efforts to spread good news in the local context. There are groups that use and maintain the use of the term contextualization. However, there are also those who use other terms, such as local theology, inculturation theology, and indigenous theology (Yewangoe, 2006).

In the understanding of process theology (Liem, 2022), contextual theology is interpreted as the various efforts made so that the Scriptures remain meaningful throughout the ages and in any place, because their relevance can still be accepted by the minds and cultures of people who are geographically different, because it has an intrinsic value in the form of universal truth. This means that the Bible, for example, must be acceptable to all people, not only Christians. Likewise, the Koran must also be accepted by all people, not only Muslims. Contextualization of the search for the meaning of teachings becomes obligatory if the Holy Scriptures are considered as guidelines for the order of human life in this universe, not just books that offer the "lure" of heaven or hell after death (Kadi, Mengutamakan Rakyat, 2008), (Liem & Barsamian, 2008).

According to Raimundo Panikkar (Panikkar, 1994), a pastor who is expert on "Comparative Religions" who has lived in India for a long time and researched ancient Hindu texts, said briefly but very effectively, "Jesus was here long before Jesus was born". In another expression, Pastor Gregor Neonbasu's term, it becomes a necessity for efforts to contextualize theology so that it doesn't happen again like "Jesus was brought in a suitcase by missionaries or missionaries and then introduced to a new society" (Neonbasu, 2011).

Different Approaches

In its application, contextual theology has several approaches that have been widely discussed and implemented in various countries such as: Kyai Sadrach in his *Javanese Christian* preaching works (Sariman, 2019), deepened by contextualizing teaching material of Vengal Chakkarai's *Theology of the Cross* in India (Burbank, 2017), *Min Jung's Theology* in Korea (Moon & Hŭi-sŏk, 1985), "*Theology of the Pain of God*" from Kazoh Kitamori in Japan (Singh, 1965). To summarize, here is the models:

1. Accommodation Model

Accommodation is an attitude of respect and openness to indigenous culture. This attitude is expressed in the form of behaviour, actions, and words, both in the scientific and practical realms. The object of accommodation is the overall cultural life of a nation, both in terms of physical, social and ideal. In this approach, there is a takeover of cultural values and their integration with Christian values. Thus, there is a positive view of the Bible unlike before where the Bible was seen as destroying values in a culture. For example the *Jawi Wetan Christian Church* (GKJW) which uses the Javanese language in its religious processions, or the *Batak Protestant Christian Church* (HKBP) which uses the Batak language, and so on.

2. Adaptation Model

This model is different from the accommodation model. This model does not assimilate cultural elements in Christian values. This model uses forms or understandings that exist in a culture to explain an understanding in Christianity. The aim of this model is to express and translate the Bible in local terms (indigenous terms). This is done so that the Christian term can be understood by a society with a different context. For example, the term "true vine" is adapted to a type of tree such as coconut or sago etc. which has essentially the same value as the vine at the scene described in the Bible.

3. Processio model

Processio is an attitude that responds negatively to culture. The processing process occurs through selection, rejection, reinterpretation, and rededication. Groups that adhere to this model understand that culture is something that has been corrupted by sin. There is no goodness in culture. This model also understands that only Christianity and the Bible are holy and sinless. For example, the culture of "mengayau" (cutting off people's heads) in the Dayak people of the interior, or the culture of Metamba Deata (calling on the spirits of ancestors to help solve problems) which is still practiced in Toraja society in Sulawesi, is often considered to be contrary to Christian teachings.

4. Transformation Model

This model is rooted in Richard Niebuhr's understanding of God and culture. God is understood to be above culture. Through culture, God interacts with humans. When a person is renewed by God, then the culture is also renewed. An example that can be taken to illustrate this model is the tradition of "*mengayau*" (cutting the head a human being for a reason) which is transformed into a model of "non-violence" diplomacy, for example bartering livestock or matchmaking couples from different tribes for the purpose of stopping war.

5. The Dialectical Model

This model emphasizes the dynamic interaction between text and context. This concept is supported by a strong understanding that culture also brings change. Not only does Christianity bring change to context, but context also changes Christianity. For example, in theology, culture gives a new colour to theology in its efforts to present Christianity in the existing context. An example that is often taken to explain this is *wayang* as a means of preaching in which verses of the Scriptures that are relevant to the theme being played are included, on the other hand the teachings contained in *wayang* characters can also enrich the repertoire of the Scriptures. For example, the figure of *Semar*, whose body is chubby, *Gareng*, whose legs are lame, *Petruk*, who is tall, his nose is too long, and *Bagong*, who is short, his mouth is too wide, are figures of clown-servants (servants) without boundaries/totality of dedication who are completely selfless. The form of appearance that is made flawed here and there, but the quality of the soul is selfless dedication to others, they have succeeded in abandoning all worldly attributes which are actually just mirages, have found "being the pure of self", in their plays, they are always in entertaining, advising, and full of atmosphere. joy, heaven on earth manifests itself in the lives of these clowns, in fact they give a lot of advice (*pitutur*) to the *Pendawa* Knights when facing life's difficulties. Often associated with the story of the prophet Ayyub in the Bible who managed to face all trials (both abundant wealth and disease and all forms of adversity) (Kadi, Restorasi Keluarga Modern, 2022) is a worldly attribute which turns out to be the same, namely only a means for the process of seeking identity "being the pure of self".

6. The Transcendental Model

The Transcendental Model is an approach to Contextual Theology which sees that reality is not something that "exists" and is detached from human recognition, but is in the dynamics of self-awareness. The Transcendental Model is not focussed on evangelism or tradition but is based on religious experience and experiences that concern oneself. There are several prejudices about the transcendental model, namely that the transcendental model invites a person to return to living his life as a Christian who has a unique cultural, religious experience and expression of faith according to the circumstances of the subject. Another prejudice is that according to the transcendental model, divine revelation does not lie "outside" but occurs in human experience. Besides that, there is also a prejudice that even though the reality of subjectivity is different, the process of understanding remains the same. Therefore, the transcendental model is understood as a process of self-disclosure of a person or us (subjects) based on the results of an analysis of historical, geographical, social and cultural situations. In other words, this model emphasizes the authenticity of the subject in finding his identity "being the pure of self".

Perspective of Richard Niebuhr on the Relationship between Christ and Culture

The book "*Christ and Culture*" (Niebuhr, 1951) discusses the relationship between Christianity and culture and social systems. Where matters relating to the relationship between Christianity and culture will develop into something that can be debated when humans know that Christ or Christianity itself is holy, perfect, and sinless, meanwhile, culture is man-made, where humans themselves are full of sin. Then, the question arises, how can Christ survive in the midst and mix with these imperfections? This is even more problematic considering that there are many Bible verses that require us not to be like the world, while there are also many verses that require us to remain in the world, as humans are. To show how Christianity responds to this problem, Richard Niebuhr introduces his five views regarding the relationship between Christ and Culture, which include: Christ against Culture, Christ of Culture, Christ above Culture, Christ and Culture in paradox, Christ transforms culture.

As an introduction, Niebuhr begins with their respective definitions of Jesus and Culture. Regarding Jesus, Niebuhr argues that the human definition of Jesus is not enough (remembering that humans will never be able to reach and understand the essence of Jesus totally, with the fact that the concept of Jesus himself has been greatly influenced by the existence of culture that has stuck in the journey of life). humans from birth). Culture, by Niebuhr, is defined as the total process of human activity and all its manifestations, which refers to the environment or secondary things (such as customs, social systems, norms, etc.) that humans implement in their lives.

A. Christ against Culture (Christ vs culture)

This is a view that strongly affirms Christ's sole authority over culture and rejects everything that culture believes. According to this view, fidelity to Christ is a rejection of the environment or cultural system, and that there is a sharp line that separates the world from the children of God.

B. Christ of Culture

In this view, humans position Jesus as the Messiah in their social environment, a figure who can fulfill all their hopes and aspirations, complete their beliefs, source of their holy spirit. People who adhere to this view tend to be more open to making friends or relationships not only with those who believe but also with those who do not believe. Nor could they find any significant differences between the church and the world, between social laws and belief in God, between salvation ethics and social ethics. On the one hand, they interpret culture through Christ, where those aspects most similar to Jesus receive greater respect and appreciation. On the other hand, they interpret Christ through culture, selecting from Christian teachings the most harmonious with their social and cultural systems, that is what they will apply in their lives.

C. Christ above Culture (Christ and Culture).

This view in no way presents a conflict between Christ and culture. What is presented is precisely the conflict between the holy Christ and sinful humans. Adherents of this understanding emphasize that it is Christ who is above all culture, who shapes and allows it to happen, therefore culture cannot be said to be bad, but it cannot be said to be good either. When a human commits a sin, then expresses his rebellion against God through some cultural forms, that also does not mean that culture is something bad. They say that culture exists because Christ fully created it, and they see that harmony between Christ and culture is the right answer to all the questions. According to Niebuhr, adherents of this view cannot distinguish between human work (which is culture) and God's glory, because all human work can also happen because of God's glory. But they also cannot separate the experience of God's glory from their cultural activities, because how can one love God who is invisible, without serving their visible brothers?

D. Christ and Culture in paradox

This is an understanding that is more or less similar to Christ above culture. The difference is, when followers of this ideology wish to maintain loyalty to Christ and on the other hand also want to maintain

responsibility for culture together, they believe that this integration is not something that is balanced and enjoyable, as adherents of above-culture feel. They emphasize that there is a paradox, where the conflict that occurs between Christ and culture is caused by the assumption that there is "sin" in culture.

E. Christ transforms Culture (Christ who transforms into culture)

This is an understanding most suggested by Niebuhr, where theologically, this view has 3 main lines, namely seeing God as the creator, realizing that humans fall from something good, and seeing that we feel the interaction between God and humans in the journey of human life. historical. Therefore, adherents of this understanding believe that human culture is human life that has been transformed into and in the glory of God. In practice, this view means that we work within a cultural sphere to strive for something better, because God has basically given humans creativity, and that is good (and can definitely be good). We can also contribute to this transformation work, because when in culture there is often something labelled as "sin" (although this is debatable), there is still hope through Christ, for the salvation of the culture itself. Furthermore, we will defeat "sin" not by avoiding it or by fighting it directly, but with the help of human eyes fixed on Jesus, and our positive and oriented intentions towards Him, will enable us to defeat "sin".

Perspective of Gerrit Singgih Concerning "Practice" and "Praxis"

Gerrit Singgih's (Singgih, Dari Israel ke Asia, 1982) elaborated regarding contextualization are not practical but practical, it can be understood that the problem of contextualization is not just how to apply a pattern to a local situation, but also whether this pattern has a meeting point with a local view of life or world view. Apart from that, the local context must also be seen as having seeds of salvation.

The praxis model offers a new way of theology that is able to pay adequate attention to past experience (gospel, tradition), as well as present experience (human experience, culture, social location and social change). In this praxis method, past and present experiences always hold action and reflection: reflection on action and action on reflection, both of which revolve. The praxis model sees the important role of culture in a context in developing an understanding of faith.

The theology of praxis is a serious theological study. The practical orientation in the life of the church and society does not mean that this study can ignore the theoretical-theological framework and scientific approach. The dialogue between normative theoretical and practical matters is a key concept in praxis theology. Gerrit Singgih also introduced an empirical approach in practical theology.

Gerrit Singgih, based on his understanding of Choan Seng Song's writings (Song, 1979), emphasized that theology is not just the science of God, as if it were detached from matters concerning humans and this world. But basically theology is the study of God and how God makes people with problems become less problematic in this world. Theology talks about the relationship and understanding of humans with God, and at the same time is the relationship between humans and humans and the entire creation. Here we realize that theology does not have to be trapped in a normative – practical dichotomy, or another dichotomy as shown by Gerrit Singgih, namely spiritual/spiritual – academic/scientific. Theology must have an academic-scientific nature but not lose its practical side (cf. Habermas 1990). At the same time, theology is related to spiritual matters, with normative values that are built, without losing academic and practical enthusiasm. Both, normative-theoretical and practical dialogue and walk together without eliminating or ignoring each other. That means that theology cannot be separated from various issues, problems and continuous changes that exist in the practical world. Theology must be able to show a concrete relationship, or it can also be called a process of communication, between normative understanding and the everyday life that Christians and churches live in the midst of a changing society (Mander & Tauli-Corpuz, 2006).

Theology in this sense is described as more than just *scientia* but also as *sapientia* (wisdom, life values) which communicates and is communicated to the context in which theology itself lives. In line with the description above, Gerrit said that theology should be a dialogical science, which is willing to pay attention to important matters in history but at the same time departs from concrete needs of the present (E.E., 1960). An open and critical attitude is needed here, so that the theological process truly becomes a creative endeavour.

Supporting this attitude and understanding of theology which must be practical, in his many writings, Gerrit never stops emphasizing concrete dialogue with the context of society, especially Indonesian society and churches. Many of Gerrit's writings become very lively and close to their readers, because they consciously begin with descriptions of observations on the concrete situations and conditions of Indonesian society or other global issues (Singgih, Bergereja, Berteologi dan Bermasyarakat, 2007). Strong interpretations of various Bible texts are raised consciously as part of the discussion on issues and many problems surrounding the life of the church and society. For example, the issue of the vocation of the church, issues of violence and human rights in Indonesia, education, relations between religions, gender justice, the environment, faith and science, faith and culture, etc. (cf. Singgih 1999; 2009b). Without losing his sensitivity as an interpreter, practical and concrete issues become a kind of initial observation of various practical conditions.

Thus, there are two processes that run simultaneously, which can be called a hermeneutical process in practical theology. First is the process of understanding (Versthehen), namely how the praxis of a community is understood from a certain theoretical perspective. The second is the process of explaining (Erklären), in which the results we get need to be viewed critically, and researchers or practical theologians need to maintain their objectivity so that they can make a correct assessment of what happened. In this sense, practical theology is a theological discipline that seriously develops and builds theological theory on the basis of and in the midst of the concrete experiences of human beings (Aritonang, 2020).

In relation to this concept of praxis, the important thing that Van der Ven (2002:20 etc.) reminds us of is that practical theology does not tend to merely produce directions or tips or practical indications. Praxis shows the encounter of concrete and specific actions in the midst of various situations. So that practical theology that pays attention to praxis is not just talking about one particular practical matter, but rather general praxis processes in the church or society. For example, the relationship of faith in God in social domains (economic, political, social and cultural domains) or amidst the dimensions of cultural and church structures, etc. so the main critical question that must be asked by practical theology is: how is the Christian faith manifested in a varied and dynamic world? How are the things that are theological normative produced by the Christian community in various existing situations? And how are these theological values fulfilled in changing experiences and contexts, such as pluralism or suffering? In this case Gerrit reminded that the concept of praxis also contains an empirical approach in practical theology.

The explanation is as follows: If we agree that all disciplines in theology have a practical and communicative dimension, then the question that arises is, what exactly distinguishes the existing theological disciplines from the practical theological disciplines themselves? In history, initially practical theology was often understood or functioned as applied theology, in which research results from existing theological disciplines, such as the Bible - exegesis, history and systematics, were then forwarded and applied in practical matters such as sermons, pastoral counselling, church management techniques etc. and also usually closely related to the work of pastors or pastors. Because of this, practical theology is usually equated with pastoral theology in the sense of theology about the functions of the ecclesiastical office of a pastor (Heitink,1999:33). And in this sense one can understand the criticism that practical theology is not a critical theory and is considered to be less academic (Ballard & Pritchard 1996:9). But in later developments (starting in the 1960s) scholars began to see that practical theology could actually be more than just applied theology (ven, 1993). The main orientation of practical theology is still practical matters, not just the actions of ecclesiastical officials, but also things that are also done by the church in particular and even humans in general.

Seeing Gerrit Singgih's thoughts (Singgih, Bergereja, Berteologi dan Bermasyarakat, 2007), we are invited to rethink the contextualization that fit around us, which needs more on the content and not just lips service. The deep meaning and what is covered by this contextualization is sometimes overlooked by many people, namely grounding faith in everyday life through practical things that happen around us to self-reflect so that our lives are not covered by hypocrisy (lies that are covered by ourselves), because of the out of sync between dreams and reality, between thoughts, speech and behaviour) which causes stunted hypocritical humans (Paul Tillich in Barbour, 2015).

Perspective of Bevans: The Necessity of Contextualization of Today's Theology

Stephen B. Bevans uses classical theology which identifies Christ with the sun symbol. The sun for Westerners is something to miss, especially in the snowy winter. For Indians to see the analogy of Christ with the symbol of the sun is completely inappropriate and completely out of context. Bevans' sermon was criticized by Indians, as for the reason that the sun is an enemy to them because the sun's rays have burned the skin of the Indians so that it looks black, the sun brings thirst, turns off many water sources and so on. This is a problem in theology which in fact teaches about symbols that are true and that survive in all ages for people with other cultures. Theologically, the application of the title of Christ as "saviour" can be viewed completely upside down as an "enemy" because of the issue of symbols. For Italians and surrounding European countries, understanding the sun symbol is a teaching analogy that is truly actual, contextual and radical according to their situation and conditions. However, not for Indians or Africans. And this symbol of identification has been widespread and rooted in Catholic theology for centuries. However, for the Indians this symbolism was not crowning but teaching that disappointed them. It is these different points of emphasis that become a problem in theology. The way of theology is no longer centralized but rather decentralized with an emphasis on the local cultural situation, regional topography and so on so that the message of Christ becomes more meaningful and contextual. Contextual theology according to the perspective of Stephen B. Bevans offers six theological models such as: Translation, Anthropological, Praxis, Synthesis, Transcendental and Counter-Cultural models. Bevans' theology rests on contextual reflection in the Basis, the local Church, and in academic institutions (Bevans, 2002).

A. Translation Models

Translation must be done with a functional or dynamic equivalent. Second, revelation is interpreted as a proposition or formulation, directed at the content. Third, context is seen as something good and worthy of respect (Bevan, 1938). The translation model means translating the Bible into the language of the local culture so that it is more relevant. However, there are some serious problems regarding the use of this translation model which tends to be exclusive and often takes precedence. One of the criticisms focuses on the idea of culture which is the background of the theological method in this translation model. The assumption is that every culture is like every other culture, and that what is important in one culture is also important in another. As Robert Schreiter observes, "it is seldom questioned whether such parallels really exist, whether the parallels are meant to have the same meaning in the new culture, or whether more meaningful patterns are to be found there" (Schreiter, 1985). In short, the translation model is a model of contextual theology that must be developed in the future while remaining critical so that the Bible is more meaningful for believers.

B. Anthropological Model

This model is "anthropological" in two senses. First, this model is focussed on the value and goodness of the human being. In every person, and every society and social location and every culture, God manifests His divine presence, and thus the theologian is not simply a matter of connecting a message from outside—however super-cultural or super-contextual—with a particular situation. Second, this model is anthropological in the sense that it uses the insights of the social sciences, especially anthropology. Using this discipline, a practitioner of the anthropological model seeks to understand more clearly the web of human relations and values that make up human culture, and in which God is present, offering life, healer and wholeness. The anthropological theology model is very suitable for local indigenous peoples because from the start they have had an original awareness of their cultural customs. "Therefore, by applying anthropological and sociological techniques, a practitioner of the anthropological model seeks to listen to a particular context in order to hear the Word of God himself amidst his own structure (especially in the midst of a pluralistic cultural structure), which is hidden in there like a seed that has been dormant from the beginning of time and is ready to germinate and grow to its fullest. (E.E., 1960)"

C. The Praxis Model

This way of doing theology of praxis is a model that is usually compared to so-called liberation theology, but is also starting to be commonly used in the branch of knowledge of "practical theology". The praxis model is a theological way that is shaped by knowledge at its most intensive level—the level of action based on reflection. This model also involves scanning meaning and contributing to a series of social changes, and thus does not draw its inspiration from classical texts or classical behavior alone, but from present realities and future opportunities that occur in real society. Praxis is a technical term which has its roots in Marxism, in the Frankfurt school (eg J. Habermas, A. Horkheimer. T. Adorno), and in Paolo Freire's philosophy of education. This model works on the belief that "truth lies at a historical level that is grounded in the real problems of society, not in mere ideas". Philip Berryman characterizes this model with reference to its use by Paulo Freire, namely praxis is "action and reflection". It is reflecting on action and acting on reflection, the two turning into one. The praxis model is more ethical and polite than the so-called liberation model. This praxis emphasize fulfilment not only in "right thinking" (ortho-doxy), but especially in "correct action" (ortho-praxis). The praxis model uses a method that is "in" meaning that the most basic is understood as a unity between knowledge as activity and knowledge as content.

D. Model Synthesis

This model is a continuation of the praxis model, where the interaction of theory and action in the field often demands a process of synthesis, namely a completely new and unprecedented current for solving problems, which is a synergy that emerges from theory and field facts that produce a a must if you want a solution.

A theology with a contextual face realizes that culture, history, contemporary forms of thought, and the questions of people and society must be considered, simultaneously, along with Scripture and tradition, as valid sources for theological expression. Thus, today we say that theology has three sources or *loci theologici*: Scripture, tradition and present-day human experience-or context.

E. The Transcendental Model

This transcendental model focuses more attention not on the content to be articulated, but on the subject being articulated. It does not begin with the belief that reality is "out there", which is independent of human knowledge, but emphasizes that the knowing subject is fully involved in determining the essential form of reality.

Humans as personal (identity) and communal (profession) who have sensitivity to the Divine, understand theology as a reasoning process to understand faith authentically. Critical review of the model, namely; ignoring the relativity gap, seeing and assessing that each concept has personal experience and presupposes the similarities in the process of reasoning in humans, even though the context is different. The weakness of the transcendental model is that there are often different opinions due to freedom of thought, even

though they both analyse one thing, different understandings will still be born. Everything is supposed to be the same when it's not. Accept all opinions without considering and without limiting which creates opportunities for misunderstanding. Every individual in his life consciously or not actually carries out or applies the cyclic process "Action – Analysis - Text Analysis - Context Reflection - Produces New Actions" transcendentally.

F. The Countercultural Model

Culture in any place and in any situation is never free from social change. Contextualization as something new as well as traditional. Classical theology is understood as a reflection on faith regarding two *loci theologici* (sources of theology), namely the Scriptures and traditions whose contents cannot and never change, and are above culture historically. However, it should be realized that theology becomes truly contextual when it recognizes the legitimacy of other "*locus theologicus*" based on current human experience in a particular cultural context.

The counterculture model is not anti-cultural, but offers a critical function that is played in a human context. If we want to communicate the gospel accurately then it should be done using the language of the people for whom the gospel was proclaimed, and dressed in symbols that are full of meaning for them. It is necessary to emphasize the two sides of the coin regarding culture. On the one hand, culture is not something bad or evil, but it should also be remembered that the work of humans in the form of culture itself carries a human tendency to fight and violate the rules of the creator of the world. This countercultural model can be referred to as the encounter or engagement model, it can also be referred to as the prophetic model, or the contrast model, or the confessional model. Although there are various names for this model, Bevans still chooses the term counterculture to describe this model. According to him, this model best captures real contextual interactions between dynamic and challenging biblical congregations in very strong, even hostile environments.

Andreas A. Yewangoe (Aritonang, 2020) mentioned there are several factors of the existing global debate that are currently developing worldwide, include:

1) The debate factor that compares "Traditional Reproductive Theology" which only repeats stories from the past with the flow of "Contextual Productive Theology" which tries to reinterpret teachings to fit the present era both spatially and temporally and even cultural context.

2) The debate factor which questions the need for a balanced understanding of theology between "*sapiensia*" (humans and humanity) and "*sciensia*" (theology as science).

3) Factors that oppose "theologians vs laymen", where this school believes that every human being (layman) is also capable of formulating the meaning of theology in everyday life according to different challenges. In this view, theologians are required to dedicate their expertise in social processes that provide added value.

4) Factors that place between "subjective vs solidarity" in understanding the teachings. Subjective in the sense that the teachings are felt real in life, while solidarity is a group which because of its romanticism gives birth to the meaning of the teachings.

5) Factors Historical studies that criticized missionaries who carried out Christianization in the colonies of European countries later gave rise to controversies over modern and primitive meanings "it was assumed that missionaries represented their culture, a dissertation on Primitive Culture was rejected at Leiden University (1939). This understanding was reinforced by Raimundo Panikkar (a priest who is an expert on comparative religions) in India, who compiled ancient Hindu texts and concluded that: "Christ was here long ago" before Jesus was born.

6) The factor that sees religion should be universal teachings (applies to all human beings) so in fact all humans are Christians even though they are anonymous (not labelled as Christians) (Suginatoro, 2019). It is assumed that the teaching of "nature vs grace" needs to be interpreted that nature (divine) exists in all people, not only in Christians (Aritonang, 2020), while mercy (redemption) comes later for various reasons. The notion that "nature underlies grace" originated with the philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment

(aufklarung/renaissance/enlightenment) who later realized that the difference in human belief lies in the diversity's sense of absolute dependence on the divine. Not on dogma (religion) and not on teachings (theology), so the understanding of mercy/grace (redemption) as "the ultimate concern" can be understood as a personal spiritual journey (Yewangoe, 2006), (Kadi, Mengutamakan Rakyat, 2008), (Liem & Barsamian, 2008).

An Example: When Israel entered the Land of Canaan, there was a process of Canaanization. Read Deuteronomy 12:29-32. What should be rejected according to the text. Compare with 2Kings3:27, Judges 11:30-31.

The book of Deuteronomy 12:29-32 Context: Warning against idol worship and false worship

12:29 "When the LORD your God has cut off from before you the nations whose territory you have entered to occupy it, and when you have occupied its territory and are living in its land, 12:30 then be careful lest you fall into a trap v and follow them, after they have been exterminated from before you, and lest you question their gods, saying, How do these peoples serve their gods? ; for all that is detestable to the Lord, what he hates, x this

is what they do to their gods; even their sons y and their daughters they burn with fire for their god z. 12:32 All that I commande you must do it faithfully, do not add to it or take it away.

Bible 2 Kings 3:27

3:27 Then he took his firstborn son who was to be king in his place and offered him as a burnt offering on the wall. But great anger came over the Israelites, so that they left him and returned to their land.

Bible Judges 11:30-31

11:30 Then Jephthah made a vow to the LORD, saying, "If you truly deliver the Ammonites into my hands, 11:31 then what comes out of my door to meet me when I return safely from the Ammonites, that shall be the LORD's, and I will offer it as a burnt offering."

REFLECTIONS: HISTORICAL & LEGENDARY STUDY PERSPECTIVES

Some modern scholars see the Curse of Canaan in Genesis 9:20-27 as the beginning of the Hebrew rationalization for Israel's conquest of the land of Canaan. When Noah cursed Canaan in Genesis 9:25, he used the expression "Cursed be Canaan, A slave of servants he shall be against his brethren. The expression "servants", if translated "slave of slaves", emphasizes the level of the extreme bondage that Canaan would experience in relation to his "brother." In the next section, "Sem...let Canaan be his slave,"[9:26] the narrator has predicted Israel's conquest of the promised land. Bible scholar Philip R. Davies explains that the narrator used Noah to curse Canaan, in order to provide justification when later Israel expelled and enslaved the Canaanites (Davies, 1992).

And Canaan saw the land from Lebanon to the river Egypt, that it was very good, and he did not enter into the land of his inheritance to the west (to) the sea, and he dwelt in the land of Lebanon, eastward and westward from the border of Jordan and the border of sea. And Ham his father, and Kush and Misraim his brothers said to him: 'You have settled in a land which is not yours, and which did not fall to us by lot: do not do it; for if you do, you and your children will fall on that land and (become) accursed through sedition; by sedition you have settled, and by sedition your children will fall, and you will be driven out forever. Do not stay where Shem lives; because for Shem and for her children the lot was given. Cursed are you, and cursed will be you beyond all the children of Noah, by the curse with which we bound ourselves by oath before the holy judge, and before Noah our father.' But he would not listen to them, and dwelt in the land of Lebanon from Hamath to the entrance to Egypt, he and his children to this day. And for this reason that land was called Canaan.—Jubilee 10:29-34.

Etymologically, the English term Canaan (pronounced /ˈkeɪnən/ since ~1500 AD, because of the Great Vowel Shift) is derived from the Hebrew כנען (knʿn), via the Greek Χαναάν Khanaan and Latin Canaan. It appears as ki-na-ah-na in the Amarna letters (14th century BC), and knʿn is found on coins from Phenicia in the last half of the first millennium. It is first encountered in Greek in the writings of Hecataeus as Khna(Χνᾶ). Scholars link the name Canaan with knʿn, Kana'an, the common northwestern Semitic name of this region.

The etymology of this name is uncertain. One explanation is that the original meaning of "lowland", from the Semitic root knʿ "to be lowly, lowly, depressed", is different from Aramaic, "plateau". An alternative suggestion is derived from the Hurrian term Kinahhu, supposedly referring to the color purple, so Canaan and Phenicia would become synonyms ("Land of the Purple"), but it is common to assume that Kinahhu is only the Hurrian condition for the Semitic term knʿn.

REFLECTIONS: THEOLOGICAL STUDY PERSPECTIVE/ TEACHING INTERPRETATION

In the ignorant society (in Islamic terms) who have not received enlightenment about the news of salvation, besides worshiping idols is a common thing, offering humans to the gods in the form of burning is also still common, as well as the custom of making slaves for other nations who are conquered or their areas controlled, including the habit of having hundreds of wives is common, because the system of society is still nomadic. As an analogy in the Koran, in the Arabian peninsula it was even worse because of its geographical conditions which were desert as far as the eye could see, so that the struggle for power in that region was which tribe succeeded in controlling the oasis (water source) by fighting against other tribes. Many men died in the war, and then the widows were married or made slaves. The price of a female slave is equivalent to seven camels. With such a geographical background, it is understandable when the verses of the Al-Quran contain many mentions that heaven has flowing rivers, while in Java the abundant rivers actually make people miserable if they cause floods. When Muhammad freed slave women, for example, there were difficulties regarding the symbols of the social status of the freed women, because at that time there was no social status for career women, so only two positions were possible. First, as a wife and second as a daughter for those under the age of puberty. So, it's understandable when a man's wife can be in the hundreds, when most the women slaves were widow and mostly not under-age, then being freed as wives.

What's strange is what we see in today's reality, where the matter of "burnt offerings" is still commemorated every Eid al-Adha, where it is believed that Abraham because of his obedience to God willingly sacrificed his son (Islamic version Ishmael or Christian version Ishaq) which was then replaced with a sheep

brought by God after knowing the sincerity of Abraham. What an absurd thing (Liem & Barsamian, 2008). First. Was Ibrahim stupid and didn't understand God's intention that he should have the right of interpellation, the right to question or sue and not want to follow ridiculous orders. The second possibility is that the command is figurative, for example "slaughtering heads" means a person who is too smart to always use his brain (head) for all matters, so being warned to "cut off your head" means don't use your brain all the time, use your conscience. The third possibility is that the story is actually palace intrigues between the descendants of the first wife, second and so on who compete and slander each other, so that there is an order to kill or sacrifice one of the potential descendants to get the throne of power (Kadi, Restorasi Keluarga Modern, 2022).

There is something interesting about the verse we are discussing, namely the historical interpretation that the land occupied is not obtained by "lottery" will be disastrous for posterity. Therefore about the *Curse on Canaan*, in many Indigenous cultures, this is often associated with the connection between the living and the unseen (ancestral spirits or whatever the term is) (Durkheim, 1915), so that if there is no agreement with "Sang *Mbaurekso*" (the Javanese term for the guardian spirit of the area) there will be continuous disturbances (Woodward R, 1999). We still encounter this kind of belief in the archipelago (Neonbasu, 2011). In the Chinese tradition, this is known as "*chi* (energy) compatibility" with the terms *hongsui* or *feng shui* so that good fortune flows without stopping because the universe supports it (Baito, 2019). With the Prophecies of the Prophets, slowly but surely the civilization in the region is growing better.

IV.   CONCLUSION

Bevans' statement that contextual necessity for today's theology is very urgent. The reason why we add experience/context to traditional theological sources is because of a revolution in the way of thinking and understanding the world, which is characterized as a "return to the subject" that emerged at the beginning of modern times, and is increasingly needed in today's postmodernism era due to social changes, fast pace, as well as the global interest to seek meeting points of spiritual understanding which have been torn apart and collided with one another. In a chaotic world condition with so many experts in the social sciences declaring the failure of religions, including Sammuel Huntington in his book "Clash of Civilization" (Huntington, 1996), studies have developed which demand the contextualization of religious teachings, which is called Contextual Theology, previously there is the term inculturation, indigenization, but the term contextualization covers more of the intended meaning.

The statement of Prof. Andreas Anangguru Yewangoe as a pioneer and figure of Contextual Theology in Asia, and in writer's opinion very revolutionary and true, is that religion should contain universal teachings applicable to all human beings.

This is actually the task of contextual theology from era to era, from region to region, from one culture to a different culture throughout the world. A task that will not be completed will continue to exist, because according to Pastor Frans Magnis Suseno, "Religion does not need to be hostile to reason. Through the mediation of reason, religion itself can reach a deeper dimension. Only when Allah is the question, Allah can also be the answer." (Suseno, 2006) Therefore, contextual theology will be needed throughout the ages, especially in Indonesia where there are still so many religious conflicts occurred.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1].   Almeida, P., & Chase-Dunn, C. (2018). Globalization and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology Vol. 44:1*, 1-23.

[2].   Aritonang, A. (2020). Kebebasan Beragama Di Ddalam Pemikiran ANDREAS ANANGGURU YEWANGOE. *Jurnal NPTRS - The New Perspective in Theology and Religious Studies. Vol. 1, No. 2*, 35-46.

[3].   Baito, L. (2019). Teologi Guanxi: Sebuah Upaya Memahami Aspek Teologi Relasional dalam Budaya Tionghoa. *GEMA TEOLOGIKA Vol. 4 No. 2*, 155-174 .

[4].   Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2011). *Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty.* USA: Public Affairs.

[5].   Barbour, I. G. (1997). *Religion and Science (Gifford Lectures Series).* United States of America: HarperOne.

[6].   Barbour, I. G. (2002). *Juru Bicara Tuhan: Antara Sains dan Agama.* Bandung: Pustaka Mizan.

[7].   Barbour, I. G. (2002). *Nature, Human Nature and God.* Augsburg, USA: Fortress Press.

[8].   Barbour, I. G. (2005). *Menemukan Tuhan dalam Sains Kontemporer dan Agama.* Bandung: Penerbit Mizan.

[9].   Barevičiūte, J. (2010). The Loyalty of the 'Global Village' in the Aspect of Communication : Pro Et Contra M. McLuhan. *Limes: Cultural Regionalistics 3.2*, 184-194.

[10].   Bevan, E. (1938). *Symbolism and Belief.* London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

[11].   Bevans, S. B. (2002). *Models of Contextual Theology.* USA: Orbis Books.

[12]. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In e. John G. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for The Sociology of Education* (pp. 242-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

[13]. Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Language and Symbolic Power.* New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

[14]. Bourdieu, P. (2020). *Bahasa dan Kekuasaan Simbolik .* Yogyakarta: IRCISOD .

[15]. Bourdieu, P. (2021). *Forms of Capital: General Sociology, Volume 3: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983 - 84.* London: Wiley.

[16]. Browne, R. B., & Fishwick, M. W. (1999). *The Global Village; Dead or Alive?* Ohio: Bowling Green State University Popular Press.

[17]. Burbank, G. R. (2017). *Vengal Chakkarai: Indian Freedom Fighter and Christian Theologian.* Louisville: Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary.

[18]. Damanhuri. (2015). Relasi Sains dan Agama Studi Pemikiran Ian G. Barbour. *REFLEKSI Jurnal Filsafat dan Pemikiran Islam, 15 (1) http://repository.instika.ac.id/id/eprint/123*, 1-15.

[19]. Davies, P. R. (1992). *In Search of Ancient Israel: A Study in Biblical Origin .* London UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

[20]. Dispatch, P. (18 Agustus 2019). *Violent Repression of Papuans marks the eve of Indonesia's Independence Day.* Global Movement via Internet: People Dispatch.

[21]. Dixon, V. K. (2009). *Understanding the Implications of a Global Village*. Retrieved from INQUIRES VOL. 1 NO. 11 : http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/1681/understanding-the-implications-of-a-global-village

[22]. Durkheim, E. (1915). *The Elementary Forms of The Religious Life. Diterjemahkan oleh Joseph Ward Swain.* New York: The Free Press.

[23]. E.E., E.-P. (1960). Religion and The Anthropologists. *Blackfriars Vol. 41*, 104-118.

[24]. Geertz, C. (1973). *Intrepretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

[25]. Heitink, G. (1999). *Practical Theology: History, Theory, Action Domains: Manual for Practical Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

[26]. Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilization and The Remaking of World Order.* United States of America: Simon & Schuster.

[27]. Huri, D. (2019). Relasi Sains dan Agama: Studi Pemikiran Ian G. Barbour. *https://www.academia.edu/36579462/RELASI_SAINS_DAN_AGAMA_STUDI_PEMIKIRAN_IAN_G_B ARBOUR_,* 1-14. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/36579462/RELASI_SAINS_DAN_AGAMA_STUDI_PEMIKIRAN_IAN_ G_BARBOUR_

[28]. Jack, G. (1977). *The Domestication of The Savage Mind.* Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press.

[29]. Kadi, S. (2006). *Menata Ulang Sistem Demokrasi dan TNI Menuju Peradaban Baru.* Jakarta: Parrhesia.

[30]. Kadi, S. (2008). *Mengutamakan Rakyat.* Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

[31]. Kadi, S. (2022). Restorasi Keluarga Modern. *Musawa Vol 21 No 2 Tahun 2022 https://doi.org/10.14421/musawa.2022.2102.109-122*, 109-122.

[32]. Levi-Strauss, C. (1967). *The Savage Mind.* Chicago IL, USA: University of Chicago Press.

[33]. Liem, J. (2022). Teologi Proses ala Barbour vs Kepercayaan Timur. *Filsafat Vol 32 No 2 tahun 2022 DOI 10.22146/jf.72873*, 278-310.

[34]. Liem, S. L., & Barsamian, D. (2008). *Menembus Batas Damai untuk Semesta.* Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

[35]. Mander, J., & Tauli-Corpuz, V. (2006). *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization.* San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.

[36]. Marta, R. F. (2017). POLEMIK KEBHINNEKAAN INDONESIA PADA INFORMASI INSTAGRAM @INFIA_FACT TERKAIT PATUNG KWAN SING TEE KOEN TUBAN. *Jurnal Bricolage Vol. 3 No. 2 tahun 2017*, 63-71.

[37]. Moon, C. H., & Hŭi-sŏk, M. (1985). *A Korean Minjung Theology: An Old Testament Perspective.* Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

[38]. Nasution, K. (2008). Fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia (MUI) on Ahmadiyah. *Millah: Journal of Religious Studies, 7(2)* , 1-18.

[39]. Neonbasu, G. (2011). *We Seek Our Roots. Oral tradition in Biboki, West Timor.* Fribourg Switzerland: Academic Press.

[40]. Niebuhr, H. R. (1951). *Christ and Culture: An Overview of a Christian Classic.* San Fransisco: Harper.

[41]. Pamungkas, C. (2015). Global village dan Globalisasi dalam Konteks KeIndonesiaan. *Jurnal Global Strategis Tahun 9 No. 2*, 245-261.

[42]. Panikkar, R. (1994). *Dialog Intra Religius.* Jakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.

[43]. Rahim, I. R. (2014). KONTROVERSI PELARANGAN AHMADIYAH DI INDONESIA: PERSPEKTIF HAK ASASI MANUSIA (HAM). *PJIH Pajajaran Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Vol 1 No 1 Tahun 2014*, 19-37.

[44]. Ramadhan, G. (2022). Majority religious politics: The struggle for religious rights of minorities in Sampang, Madura. *Simulacra Vol 5 No 1 June 2022*, 17-28.

[45]. Sariman, S. (2019). Strategi Misi Sadrach Suatu Kajian yang Bersifat Sosio Historis. *Jurnal ABDIEL Vol. 3 No. 1* , 17-32.

[46]. Schreiter, R. J. (1985). *Constructing Local Theology.* New York: Orbis Books.

[47]. Schreiter, R. J. (1991). Anthropology and Faith: Challenges to Misiology. *SAGE Journal Vol 19 Issue 3 July 1991 https://doi.org/10.1177/009182969101900302*.

[48]. Singgih, E. G. (1982). *Dari Israel ke Asia.* Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia.

[49]. Singgih, E. G. (2007). *Bergereja, Berteologi dan Bermasyarakat.* Yogyakarta: Taman Pustaka Kristen.

[50]. Singh, S. (1965). *Theology of the Pain of God, by Kazoh Kitamori.* Richmond: John Knox Press.

[51]. Sirait, B. C. (2019). ANCAMAN DISKRIMINASI MINORITAS DAN HILANGNYA MULTIKULTURALISME DI INDONESIA: STUDI KASUS PENUTUPAN GKI YASMIN BOGOR. *POLITIKA Jurnal Ilmu Politik Vol.10, No.1 (April 2019)*, 28-39.

[52]. Song, C.-S. (1979). *Third-Eye Theology: Theology in Formation in Asian Settings.* New York: Orbis Books.

[53]. Suginatoro. (2019). *Kajian Kritis Terhadap Pemikiran Kristologi Pendeta Andreas Anangguru Yewangoe: Suatu Studi Apologetika.* Jakarta: Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Arastamar (SETIA) .

[54]. Suseno, F. M. (2006). *Menalar Tuhan.* Yogyakarta: Kanisius Yogyakarta.

[55]. ven, J. V. (1993). *Practical Theology: An Empirical Approach (Empirical Theology).* Online Open Librabry: Kok Pharos Pub House.

[56]. Wahid, J. W. (2015). PEMINGGIRAN MINORITAS DAN ABSENNYA MULTIKULTURALISME DI RANAH LOKAL (STUDI KASUS KOMUNITAS MUSLIM SYIAH DI SAMPANG) . *Jurnal Politik Profetik Vol 5 No. 1 Tahun 2015*, 65-81.

[57]. Woodward R, M. (1999). *Islam Jawa, Kesalehan Normatif Versus Kebatinan.* Yogyakarta: LKis.

[58]. Yewangoe, A. A. (2006). *Agama dan Kerukunan.* Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia.

Author: Justiani Liem[2]
Student of Doctoral Program, IAKN Kupang, Indonesia

[2]*Doctoral candidate from the Kupang State Christian Institute (IAKN Kupang), the Executive Director of GoGreen and GoClean Indonesia Foundation*