

Human Free Will and God's Sovereignty in Biblical and Human Rights Perspectives

Vianny Bere

Fakultas Teologi, Universitas Kristen Artha Wacana, Nusa Tenggara Timur, Kupang, Indonesia

Delorens Lorentje Naomi Bessie

Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Persatuan Guru 1945 Nusa Tenggara Timur, Kupang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: naomybsi@gmail.com

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0370>

Published December 23, 2023

Citation: Vianny Bere and Delorens Lorentje Naomi Bessie (2023) Human Free Will and God's Sovereignty in Biblical and Human Rights Perspectives, *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences* 4 (6),50-64

ABSTRACT: *Research with the theme of human free will and God's sovereignty in the perspective of the Bible and Human Rights examines two things, namely whether God gives freedom to humans to seek their salvation without God's supervision or control? Does the State give freedom to humans (citizens) to live their lives and activities without the supervision and control of the State? The purpose of this study is first, to find and examine the basis of the Bible and the views of theologians, regarding human freedom in seeking salvation and God's sovereignty in the efforts made by humans. Secondly, to find and examine the views of experts, laws and regulations on human free will as Indonesian citizens from the perspective of human rights. The research method used is qualitative research. Using this method, the author examines the literature traced, namely books, articles, research results related to the issues discussed. The results of the search were analysed descriptively. The results of the research show: first, from a biblical perspective, God created humans with free will in choosing, as a reflection of God's granting of sovereignty to humans. But human free will in no way negates God's sovereignty and omnipotence. God's sovereignty over man's free will is related to God's providence that man acts and is responsible for taking care of himself according to God's will. Secondly, in the perspective of human rights, Indonesian citizens cannot freely follow all their wills. The free will of citizens in individual and social life is limited. There are values, norms, rules, to limit it. There is an obligation to respect and honour the freedom of other citizens reciprocally. So the author comes to the thesis that from the perspective of the Bible and human rights, human free will as a creature of God and as a citizen of Indonesia remains limited, meaning that its limits have been determined and should not be exceeded.*

KEYWORDS: free will, bible, human rights

INTRODUCTION

God created the heavens and the earth and all that is in them according to His plan and will, meaning that none of creation is outside of God's plan and will. Then God claimed that everything He created was very good (Genesis 1:31). If God created all of His creation, then all creation belongs to God and He has full power and sovereignty over His creation. Of all God's creations, concerning man God created in His image (Genesis 1:27). Man was created in the image of God in the understanding that man would place himself rightly as a creature of God. Human beings are created and will honour their Creator as the one who has full power in their lives. By misunderstanding the concept of human creation, humans will make themselves gods towards themselves and everything around them (Wijaya, 2011). Therefore, humans must reflect the nature of God in terms of distinguishing between good and evil. Man must do the will of God, which is good, because when He revealed Himself, God loves good. His will is for man to do good, meaning that man as God's creation must submit to and obey God's sovereignty.

When God created all of His creation, He created according to His will and plan. None of His creation was outside of His control; He had complete power and sovereignty over His creation. God governs the entire universe and the living things in it, God governs the planets according to His plan and will, and God governs it all to achieve His eternal purpose (Tanyit, 2004).

God also gave man the freedom to rule (Genesis 1:26) over and manage the rest of creation responsibly with the ability to make decisions for himself, including the freedom to produce good so that by his own efforts man can attain salvation.

God created humans with free will, meaning that humans were made by God to be able to have their own will. In the sense that humans are free to choose everything in their lives according to their wishes. For example, humans are free to have religion and beliefs, humans are free to embrace their respective religions and to worship according to their religion and beliefs. (Article 29 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia). So that humans who have free will in its implementation claim the salvation bestowed by God is only for themselves and not for others?

Regarding free will Martin Luther interpreted it not as something as simple as someone having the free will to drink coffee or tea and to go from one place to another. Luther understood and linked his teaching of free will to the doctrine of salvation by God's grace, and then through that

doctrine Luther explained what free will meant. In this statement, Luther describes the ideal condition of human beings, that is, human beings before the fall into sin and redeemed human beings are totally dependent on God's grace and become servants of God, so that as a result they are able to reflect and manifest God's will in their lives. In the above statement, the philosophers are scholastic theologians who have argued that human beings after their fall into sin remain human beings who have the power of free will can still produce merit to participate in salvation (Pranoto, 2006).

Discussing human free will, there have been previous studies with various themes studied from various perspectives such as Providensia God and human free will (Tanyit, 2004), Free will in Martin Luther's theology (Pranoto, 2006), Human free will according to Augustine and Calvin in relation to God's Sovereignty (Sitanggang, 2018). The concept of free will according to Henri Bergson in Time and Free Will (Wikanarko, 2016), Christianity's View of Human Rights (Khesed, 2019).

In accordance with the title, the author examines human free will from the perspective of the Bible and Human Rights by presenting the problem: Did God give man the freedom to work out his salvation without God's supervision or control? Does the State give freedom to humans (citizens) to live their lives and activities without State supervision or control?

The purpose of this research is:

1. Discover and examine the biblical basis and views on man's freedom to seek his salvation and God's sovereignty in his endeavours.
2. Find and review expert views, laws and regulations on human free will as Indonesian citizens.

METHOD

Research methods are important for a researcher, the method chosen is closely related to the procedures, tools, and research design used (Nasir, 2005). This research is qualitative research. According to Ferdiansyah, qualitative researchers seek meaning, understanding and understanding of a phenomenon, event or human life by being directly or indirectly involved in the setting under study, contextually and thoroughly (Ferdiansyah, 2015).

Qualitative research, researchers do not just collect data once or all at once and manage it, but rather step by step and the meaning is concluded during the research process from the beginning

to the end of the activity, is narrative Raco, formulates qualitative research as a scientific activity that is planned, structured, systematic and has certain practical and theoretical objectives (Raco, 2010). So that Sharan B. Merriam argues that qualitative research, focuses on meaning in context and data collection and is sensitive to the underlying meaning when collecting and interpreting data (Hakh, 2021).

Using this method the author reviews the literature traced, namely books, articles on research results related to the problems discussed. The problems discussed in this article gradually start from: Does God give freedom to man to seek his salvation without God's supervision or control? Does the State give freedom to humans (citizens) to live their lives and activities without the supervision or control of the State? The results of the search were analysed descriptively and holistic (Muri, 2013).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Human free will in the perspective of theologians

Marthin Luther

Luther understood and linked his teaching of free will to the doctrine of salvation by God's grace. Through this doctrine Luther describes what free will means. Luther's description is preceded by the teaching of the fall of man into sin. Following the traditional teaching on the fall of man into sin, Luther revealed that all human beings under heaven have fallen into sin. This happened because the first man, Adam, had followed Satan's deception rather than God's will. Consequently, mankind has inherited sin through Adam. Luther argued that man could be saved from sin only through the grace of God that culminated in salvation in Jesus Christ. Before the fall of mankind into sin, Adam had followed the good and righteous will of God, as a result Adam's life had reflected the good and righteous will of God and manifested the will of God. Before the fall, Adam's life had produced goodness and righteousness in accordance with God's will. The goodness and righteousness manifested in his life before the fall into sin were the fruits of his life with God and as a result of his total dependence on God. From the theological point of view of man's dependence on God as the owner of free will, according to Luther, as a result it can be said that man has free will. Without dependence on God, man loses his free will. After man fell into sin, as a result, man could not reflect and manifest the will of God. Sin makes the human condition, whether of mind or intellect, will, or conscience, tainted and under the influence of Satan's power. In this state, according to him, man loses the free will that he had previously received from God. He asserts, "Free will, after the fall, exists in name only, and as long as it does what it is able to do, it commits a mortal sin." This happens because free will is separated from grace as a result of which free will loses its freedom. Man's free will has

been lost because it is confined by the power of sin and forced to serve sin as a result it cannot do good and righteous will. To prove this statement, Luther quoted the Gospel of John 8:34, "Most assuredly, I say to you, everyone who commits sin is a slave to sin;" John 15:5, "I am the vine and you are the branches. He who abides in me and I in him bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing." To strengthen his opinion, Luther also agreed with Augustine's theology who asserted that, "Free will without grace has the power to do nothing but sin" and "You call the will free, but in fact it is an enslaved will" (Pranoto, 2006). Man after the fall into sin cannot reflect and manifest the will of God through his free will anymore, because his free will is in a passive capacity. Furthermore, there is Luther's view on free will and the doctrine of salvation, Luther believes that a person can obtain salvation by the grace of God alone or *sola gratia*, which he receives through faith in Jesus Christ or *fides Christi*. God justifies the sinner not based on his merit but based on His grace and his faith in Jesus Christ. In the relationship between grace and free will, Luther said that free will cannot be separated from grace. He asserted that if free will is separated from grace, it will lose its freedom because it will be forced to serve sin. If free will is separated from grace then free will is in the captivity of sin. Conversely, if man is in the grace of God, man will rediscover his free will to do something that is in accordance with God's will. From this description, it can be concluded that according to Luther's theology, people who are justified by God are people who have free will to do good and right things in accordance with God's will and commandments. The free will they have is not a free will that is without the corridors of God's laws but instead their free will is a free will that precisely carries out the laws and commands of God (Pranoto, 2006).

Augustine and Pelagius

The Church Father, Augustine of Hippo (Herawati, 2012), emphatically states that without God's grace, human free will cannot turn to God or make progress in God (Geisler, Ed, 1982). For Augustine, free will is a gift from God (Harun, 1980). This opinion was later opposed by Pelagius, an English monk, who stated that human nature does not need grace to fulfil its obligation to obey God's law. Humans have free will that can produce goodness so that by their own efforts humans can obtain their salvation. Thus began the debate on human free will that continues to this day.

Augustine and Jhon Calvin

Neal says, "Augustine's concept of freedom cannot be addressed without also examining his understanding of sin and grace" (Neal, 1984). Therefore, in formulating his soteriology, Augustine began by explaining the state of man before and after the fall. In the beginning, God created man good, without blemish. Man was created with a free and good will, voluntarily serving God and with great satisfaction. Hence Augustine states, "the choice of the will, then,

is genuinely free only when it is not subservient to faults and sins" (Augustine, 1984).

Augustine defined free will as "the ability to make voluntary decisions. Free from external constraint or coercion." Actually, in Augustine's concept, man in his sinfulness is free and bound at the same time. Man is free to act according to his own will, but his will is only evil. Basically Augustine distinguishes between *arbitrium* as a choice and *voluntas* as a will, where humans do have *voluntas* but only when the human is turned by grace to the good, making the human choose (*arbitrium*) the good (Reid, 1997).

The fall of man has actually committed "suicide." The "dead" man could not possibly revive himself. Augustine uses the analogy between biological death and spiritual death. Man who is spiritually dead is still biologically alive and still makes decisions. But because he is spiritually dead, his choices are spiritually corrupt (Reid, 1997). The sinful man has no ability to do any good, hence he needs God's grace to free himself from the bondage of sin (Augustine, 1984). Augustine based his opinion on John 8:36 "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Man cannot keep God's law and do any good work without grace. God works through man's free will and acts upon it, in order to free the human will from its bondage to sin. So that man is no longer enslaved to the lusts of his flesh and is enabled to use his free will to choose the good and then only by grace is the free will enabled to act in the good part (<http://homepage.mac.com>).

John Calvin expressed his opinion on divine sovereignty in discussing human free will. Calvin cites Augustine's views in explaining this passage. The total depravity of man due to sin, like Augustine, Calvin saw the need for divine initiative to free man from his moral bondage. Man cannot free himself by relying on his carnal desires because "...that man's natural gifts were corrupted by sin, and his supernatural gifts withdrawn ... Man, when he withdrew his allegiance to God, was deprived of the spiritual gifts by which he had been raised to the hope of eternal salvation" (Sitanggang, 2018).

According to Calvin, God repairs or even destroys man's corrupt will and replaces it with a good will of his own. Calvin rejected the opinion Chrysostom that grace cannot do anything without the will, and vice versa (Sitanggang, 2018). God reveals His grace to those who are chosen and grants faith and then renews the will and deeds of the elect to good.

Calvin's thoughts on human free will are summarised in four points, namely: (a) The corruption of the whole nature, based on Romans 7:18 states "there is nothing good in my flesh," where the mind of the flesh becomes an enemy against God. (b) There is no human preparation for grace because all human repentance comes from God. (c) The effectiveness of grace Calvin states as

follows: It is entirely the work of grace and a benefit conferred by it that our heart is changed from a stony one to one of flesh, that our will is made new, and that we, created anew in heart and mind, at length will what we ought to will ... Likewise I determine that our will is effectively formed so that it necessarily follows the leadings of the Holy Spirit, and not that it is sufficiently encouraged to be able to do so if it wills. (d) Perseverance is a gift of God and so man should be wary of two things: not imagining that man, with his own strength, is co-operating with God when he obeys the direction of the Holy Spirit. Not to think of the grace that is then given to him as a gift with the thought that he deserves it. Man has no ability to earn salvation unless it is given to him. Even if man can come to God, it is because God Himself draws him to Himself (See John 6 verse 44). This is the divine work of moving the human will. Once justified, man's will becomes free, but that freedom is limited by the sovereignty of God (Sproul, 1995).

Thomas Aquinas

Aquinas argued that humans have both a physical and a spiritual side. The source of man's free will is his spiritual side. Will is what leads humans to realise their desires. Like animals, humans are also driven to realise their desires. What distinguishes humans from animals is their intellect. Only rational desire can be said to be free will. The intellect, in conjunction with the will, provides knowledge regarding one's reasons for acting. Aquinas stated that the free will of the individual needs to be directed towards righteous things, such as love, peace, and holiness. He saw this orientation as the path to happiness, and it is evident in the structure of his work on the moral life that revolves around the idea of happiness. In this process, man's free will is mobilised so that he can carry out actions that are in accordance with God's will (Harun, 1980).

Author's Opinion: The debate or controversy of theologians regarding free will is explained

Luther argued that humans still have free will as long as they remain dependent on God because human free will is confined by the power of sin. According to Luther's theology, those who are justified by God are those who have the free will to do good and right things in accordance with God's will and commandments. Augustine, states that free will is a gift of God so that without God's grace, human free will cannot turn to God or even make progress in God. Unlike Luther and Augustine, Pelagius argued that man has a free will that can produce good so that by his own efforts man can obtain his salvation. Calvin said man's free will is inseparable from divine sovereignty. Man can come to God because God himself draws him, this is the divine work of moving the human will. Once justified, the human will becomes free, but that freedom is limited by the sovereignty of God.

The author agrees with Luther, Augustine, Calvin, Thomas Aquinas that although humans have free will, it is still under the control of God as the owner of life. God created human beings with

free will in choosing, as a reflection of God's granting of sovereignty to human beings. But human free will in no way negates God's sovereignty and omnipotence. Based on Galatians 5:13, the author argues that although man is called to live in freedom, he should not use his free will to live in sin, which can ruin his own life. Instead, this freedom should be used to serve and build one another up on the basis of love in accordance with God's will. Romans 8:28, God works in 'all things', shows that God works, God is sovereign in man's free will. God's sovereignty over man's free will is related to God's providence that man acts and is responsible to take care of himself according to God's will.

Human free will in view of human rights

Human beings and human rights are two things that are difficult to separate. Since their birth on earth, humans are born with natural rights that are integral to their lives. Basically, humans are free beings, as Jean Jaquas Rousseau argued that humans will develop their potential and feel human values in an atmosphere of natural freedom (Wilujeng, 2013).

Concept and Characteristics of Human Rights

Mahfud, defines Human Rights as rights inherent in human dignity as a creature of God and these rights are brought by humans from birth to the face of the earth so that these rights are fitri (nature) not a gift from humans or the state (Mahfud, 2001). The team of authors of the book Law and Human Rights, Centre for the Study of Human Rights of the University of Islam Indonesia Yogyakarta, (Team of the Centre for the Study of Human Rights of the University of Islam Indonesia, 2008) formulates Human Rights as rights owned by humans, human being have them not because they are given to them by society or based on positive law but solely based on their dignity as human beings. In this sense, even though every person is born with different skin colour, gender, language, nationality culture he still has that right. This is the universal nature of rights. According to Mangunwijaya, in the concrete context of Indonesia, he sees the defence of human rights as an appreciation of the dignity of Indonesian people as human beings. He writes, regardless of rank or descent, free from the power he has, healthy or disabled, smart or stupid, any human being must be respected, his dignity respected, protected by applicable law, indiscriminately. Even without being defeated under the pretext of "development" (Forum Keadilan, 1993).

In Law number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights Article 1 paragraph 1, it is written that Human Rights are a set of rights inherent in the nature and existence of humans as creatures of God Almighty and are His gifts that must be fulfilled respected, upheld and protected by the state, law, government and everyone for the sake of honour and protection of human dignity.

An important element of the definition of human rights is : Human rights, a gift from God Almighty, cannot be limited or revoked by anyone, The State/Government is obliged to respect, uphold and protect Human Rights, There is an obligation for everyone to respect and value human rights.

Human rights have certain characteristics or characters, according to Barker, human rights have characteristics: Inherently, people have Human Rights because they are human beings : Universal, human rights apply to all people regardless of status, ethnicity, gender, or other differences, Undeniably, Human Rights cannot be revoked or surrendered, Indivisible, all people are entitled to all rights whether it is civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, Interdependent, the enjoyment of one right is affected by the enjoyment of other rights (Baker, 2006).

There are three characteristics or traits of human rights according to Byrne, namely: (1) Universal, shared by every human being regardless of ethnicity, race, gender, sex, age, religion, political beliefs or form of government. (2) Undisputedly, the absolute under birth is not a gift from the state and cannot be revoked or denied by the sovereign and does not depend on or relate to any obligation. (3) Subjective, owned by each individual due to the capacity of the intellect of the role and is independent (Byrne, 2004).

Basically, according to Wiranata, there are two basic rights in humans, namely first, human rights, which are rights inherent in humans and inherently exist since humans were born. It is related to the existence of human life, is permanent and primary, cannot be revoked, does not depend on the presence or absence of other people around it. Second, legal rights, which are rights granted by law specifically to the human person. Because it is given, the nature of the regulation must be clearly stated in a number of laws and regulations (Wiranata, 2005).

Variety of Human Rights

Karel Vasak in Smith et.al uses the term generation to designate the substance and scope of rights prioritised in a particular period of time. This jurist categorised generations based on the French Revolution's famous slogans of liberty, equality and fraternity. The generations of rights referred to by Vasak are:

The first generation of human rights

"Freedom" or first-generation rights are often referred to to represent civil and political rights, the classic human rights. These rights arose from the demand to break free from the absolutist power of the state and other social forces as seen in the rights revolutions that took place in the United States and France in the 17th and 18th centuries, which is why first-generation rights are referred to as classical rights. These rights essentially seek to protect the private life of human

beings or honour the autonomy of each person over his or her own person (individual sovereignty). Included in The first generation of human rights are: the right to life, physical integrity, freedom of movement, asylum from oppression, protection of property, freedom of thought, religion and belief, freedom of assembly and expression, freedom from arbitrary detention and arrest, freedom from torture, freedom from retroactive laws, and fair trial. These first generation rights are often referred to as negative rights, meaning that they are not associated with bad values. Rather, they refer to the absence of interference with individual rights and freedoms. These rights guarantee a space of freedom where the individual alone has the right to self-determination. These first-generation rights demand the absence of interference by the state or other social forces in the sovereignty of the individual. The fulfilment of these first-generation rights depends on the absence or lack of state action on these rights. So the state should not play an active role in them because it will result in a violation of these rights and freedoms. This is what distinguishes the second generation of rights, which on the contrary demands the active role of the state.

The Second Generation of Human Rights

"Equality," the second generation of rights, is represented by the protection of economic, social and cultural rights. These rights arise from the demand that the state provide for the fulfilment of everyone's basic needs, from food to health. These second-generation rights are therefore formulated in the positive language of the *right to*, rather than the negative language of *freedom from*, which is what distinguishes them from first-generation rights. Included in this second generation are: the right to work and decent wages, the right to social security, the right to education, the right to health, the right to food, the right to housing, the right to land, the right to a healthy environment, and the right to protection of scientific, literary and artistic works. Second-generation rights are essentially demands for social equality. These rights are often referred to as positive rights. Positive rights mean that the fulfilment of these rights requires the active role of the state. This state involvement must show a plus sign (positive) and must not show a minus sign (negative). Therefore, in order to fulfil these second-generation rights, the state is required to develop and implement programmes to fulfil these rights. For example: to fulfil the right to work for everyone, the state must make economic policies by opening up employment opportunities.

The third generation of human rights

"Fraternal," third-generation rights are represented by demands for solidarity or common rights. These rights arise from the persistent demands of developing or third world countries for a just international order. Through the demand for the right to solidarity, developing countries want an international economic and legal order that is conducive to securing the following rights: the right to peace, the right to development, the right to one's own natural resources, the right to a

decent living environment, the right to one's own cultural heritage. These third generation rights actually re-conceptualise the value demands associated with the previous two generations of human rights (Smith, 2008).

Human Rights in the Indonesian Constitution

The 1945 Constitution does not directly contain the words Human Rights, the human rights that appear are the right of all nations to be free (first paragraph of the preamble), the right to equality before the law and in government, and the right to be equal before the law.

(Article 27 paragraph 1), the right to work and livelihood worthy of humanity (Article 27: 2); the right to freedom of association and assembly, to express one's thoughts orally and in writing (Article 28); the right to embrace one's religion and to worship according to one's religion and belief (Article 29 paragraph (2)); the right to participate in the defence of the country (Article 30); the right to education (Article 31 paragraph 1); the right to the advancement of one's culture (Article 32); the right to obtain the greatest possible prosperity (Article 33); and the right for the poor and abandoned children to be cared for by the state (Article 34).

Meanwhile, human rights in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in Chapter XA consist of: the right to life and to defend life and life (Article 28A); the right to form a family (Article 28B paragraph (1); the right of children to grow and develop and the right to protection from violence and discrimination (Article 28B paragraph (2); the right to fulfilment of basic life (Article 28C paragraph (1); the right to self-development (Article 28C p a r a g r a p h (2); the right to recognition, guarantees, protection and certainty of a just law and equal treatment before the law (Article 28D paragraph (1); the right to work and decent remuneration (Article 28D paragraph (2); the right to equal opportunity in government (Article 28D paragraph (3); the right to citizenship status (Article 28D paragraph (4); the right to freedom to embrace religion, obtain education, choose a job, choose citizenship, choose a place of residence (Article 28E paragraph (1); the right to believe in beliefs, express thoughts (Article 28E paragraph (2); the right to freedom of association, assembly, and expression (Article 28E paragraph (3); the right to communicate and obtain information to develop personal and social environment information (Article 28F); the right to protection of self, family, property, and security (Article 28G paragraph (1); the right not to be tortured and to obtain political asylum (Article 28G paragraph (2); the right to a good and healthy environment and health services (Article 28H paragraph (1); the right to facilities and special treatment to obtain equal opportunities and benefits in order to achieve equality and justice (Article 28H paragraph (2); the right to social security (Article 28H paragraph (3); the right to own private property (Article 28H paragraph (4); the right to be prosecuted under applicable law (Article 28I paragraph (1); the right to be free from discriminatory treatment (Article 28I paragraph (2); and the right to cultural identity (Article 28I paragraph (3).

Human rights in Law No. 39/1999 are the right to life (Article 9), the right to family and offspring (Article 10), the right to self-development (Articles 11-16), the right to justice (Articles 17-19), the right to personal freedom, to participate in government (Articles 20-27), the right to security (Articles 27-30,38), the right to welfare (Articles 36-42), the right to participate in government (Articles 43-44), women's rights (Articles 45-51) and children's rights (Articles 52-56).

Looking at the variety of Human Rights in various opinions and regulations, Human Rights include Civil, Political and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (See, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ratified by Law Number 12 of 2005) and International Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights ratified by Law Number 11 of 2005).

At the level of implementation, human rights are categorised into non-derogable and derogable rights. The term non derogable rights means that there are rights that cannot be suspended or restricted (reduced) by the state, even in emergency conditions.

Two conventions on human rights, namely the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, are in fact. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights contains types of rights that differ in the nature of their implementation. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights includes rights such as the right to life, the right to be free from slavery and servitude, the right not to be subjected to torture or cruel punishment, the right to be treated humanely and not to be degraded as a human being, the right to a remedy under the law, the right to be protected from the application of criminal law because of debt, the right to be free from the retroactive application of criminal law, the right to be recognised as a person before the law, freedom of thought and religious belief. These rights are non derogable rights. Derogable rights are defined as rights that can still be suspended or restricted (reduced) by the state under certain conditions (Nurdjayasakti, 2003).

As an example of the implementation of derogable rights, Article 40 of Law No. 36/1999 on Telecommunications stipulates that "Every person is prohibited from tapping information transmitted through telecommunications networks in any form." In the explanation, what is meant by tapping in this article is the activity of installing tools or additional devices on telecommunications networks for the purpose of obtaining information by unauthorised means. Basically, information owned by a person is a personal right that must be protected so that wiretapping must be prohibited.

Law Number 19 of 2019, Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission, Article 12 paragraph (1) stipulates that in carrying out the tasks of

investigation and investigation as referred to in Article 6 letter e, the Corruption Eradication Commission is authorised to conduct wiretapping.

According to the author, all rights are important, all rights are valued, respected, upheld, but not all rights are absolute/absolute because there are rights that can be derogated, meaning they contain flexibility. The author's opinion is based on Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia that: (1) Every person shall respect the human rights of others in the orderly life of society, nation and state. (2) In exercising their rights and freedoms, every person shall be subject to restrictions prescribed by law for the sole purpose of ensuring recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting just demands in accordance with moral considerations, religious values, security and public order in a democratic society.

Referring to Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, every person shall be subject to restrictions established by law. Dworkin, views human rights as trump cards held by individuals that can be used if collective goals are inadequate to justify denying individuals what they want to have or do or inadequate to justify harming or injuring them. Human rights can function in the same way that trump cards function in a game of bridge or a game of whist where each card continues to be always of higher value than the highest card in another series. Similarly, unless a good argument can be made that a right should not be used, the right will always trump any policy that is designed to defeat the general welfare. Dworkin says "individual rights are political trumps held by individuals. Individuals have rights when for some reason a collective goal is not a sufficient justification for denying them what they wish as individuals to have or to do, or not a sufficient justification for imposing some loss or injury upon them" (Dworkin, 1978).

Human free will from a Biblical perspective and Human (Citizen) free will from a Human Rights perspective

After discussing 2 important parts of this paper, namely free will in the perspective of theologians, theorists, (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2014) free will in the perspective of human rights, in this section the author answers the problem and research objectives as follows: Did God give man the freedom to work out his salvation without God's supervision or control? Human free will in the biblical perspective is God's gift or grace to humans so that humans are distinguished from the rest of creation. Humans receive free will from God for the purpose of glorifying God. In all things God gives freedom for man to do things and make his own choices, as long as what is done or chosen is not contrary to God's law. God still supervises and controls man's free will as written in Romans 8:28, "Now we know that "God works all things together" for good to those who love him, to those who are called according to his purpose." Man is accountable to God

with his inherent freedom. Man should be grateful for his free will and whatever he does will focus on the glory of God. Human free will is a free will that is accountable to God. Free does not mean as much as possible according to one's own will and desires but remains subject to God's sovereignty and omnipotence.

Does the State give freedom to humans (citizens) to live their lives and activities without State supervision or control? In the Big Indonesian Dictionary the word "free" means completely free (not hindered, disturbed, etc. so that you can move, speak, do, and so on freely). Freedom is the state of being free, independence. The word "will" means will, desire and strong hope (Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2014). When combined the word free will will be interpreted as a will or desire that is not hindered, disturbed. Tutupary argues that free will means a person's ability to make decisions and act with full control without coercion from any party (Tutupary, 2016). According to Nico Syukur Dister, the term "freedom" can generally be interpreted as a state of absence of obstruction, coercion, burden or obligation (Tutupary, 2016). From the concept of freedom, free will is associated with free will in the perspective of human rights, at the level of implementation there are still derogable and non derogable human rights. In Indonesia, free will still has its limits. As stated in Article 28J paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, "In exercising his rights and freedoms, every person shall be subject to the restrictions established by law..." Constitutional Judge Wahiduddin Adams at the National Seminar of the Faculty of Sharia UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten, (Public Relations of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2020) said that freedom of opinion and expression applies to all types of ideas, including those that may be very offensive or offensive, but comes with responsibility and can be legitimately limited by the Government. The government has an obligation to prohibit speech that encourages hatred and incitement. Such restrictions may also be justified where they are imposed to protect certain public interests or the rights and reputations of others.

CONCLUSION

From a biblical perspective, free will is man's ability to act under God's control because he is responsible to God's commands. Human free will in this case acts freely in order to do God's command, not to do human will freely.

Indonesia is a large and pluralistic nation that must maintain its unity. In the perspective of human rights, Indonesian citizens cannot freely follow all their wills. The free will of humans (citizens) in individual and social life is limited. There are values, norms, rules, which are made by humans themselves and the Government to limit them. There is an obligation to respect and honour the

freedom of other citizens, and vice versa.

From the perspective of both the Bible and human rights, human free will as a creature of God and as a citizen of Indonesia remains limited, meaning that it has set limits and should not be exceeded.

References

- Augustine. (1984). *City of God*, trans. Henry Bettenson . London: Penguin
- Barker, B dkk. (2006). *Hak Asasi Manusia Dan Resolusi Konflik*, Jakarta : Sagric.
- Byrne,D.J.O.(2004). *Human Rights and introduction, First Indian Reprint Pearson Education*. Singapore.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2014.*Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia. Edisi ke 4*. Jakarta : PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Dworkins. R. M.(1978).“ *Taking right seriously*. Cambridge : MA. Harvard University Press.
- Ferdiansyah,M.(2015). *Dasar Penelitian Kualitatif* . Bogor : Herya Media.
- Forum Keadilan, (1993) No. 18, Tahun II, Tanggal,23 Desember.
- Geisler, N,S (Ed) (1982) “ *What Augustine Says* “ Grand Rapids : Baker.
- Hakh,S.B.(2021).*Perjamuan Kudus Virtual di Rumah Anggota Jemaat: Analisis Alkitabiah tentang Kehadiran Allah berdasarkan Yohanes 4:21-24*. Surakarta : Dunamis, Jurnal Teologi dan Pendidikan Kristiani, Vol. 5, No. 2.
- Harun,H.(1980). *Sari Sejarah Filsafat Barat 1*, Yogyakarta : Kanisius.
- Herawati. (2012).*Potret Sejarawan Masa Pertengahan Dan Kontribusi Bagi Kajian Sejarah Islam*. Yogyakarta : Jurnal ThaqĀfiyyĀT, Vol. 13, No. 1.
- Humas Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia, (2020) Jumad, Tanggal 11 Desember.
- Khesed,T.(2019).*Pandangan Agama Kristen Terhadap Hak Asasi Manusia*. <https://www.academia.edu/41037726/>
- Mahfud, M.D. (2001).*Dasar & Struktur Ketatanegaraan Indonesia*, Jakarta : Rineka Cipta,
- Muri, Y.A (2013). *Metode Penelitian; Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan Penelitian Gabungan*. Padang: UNP Press.
- Nazir, M.(2005).*Metode Penelitian*. Bogor : Ghalia Indonesia.
- Neal.G.S.1982.*Augustine's Concept of Freedom: The Dynamic of Sin and Grace*. <https://www.revneal.org/Writings/Writings/augustinegracesin.htm>
- Pranoto M.M.(2006).*Kehendak Bebas Di Dalam Teologi Martin Luther*.Malang : Jurnal Veritas.
- Raco,R.(2010).*Metode penelitian kualitatif, jenis, karakteristik dan keunggulannya*.Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Reid, J.K.S.(1997) “*Introduction*” dalam *Calvin, Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*. Trans.Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

- Sitanggang,M.H.(2018).*Kehendak Bebas Manusia Menurut Augustine dan Calvin dalam Kaitannya dengan Kedaulatan Allah*.Jember : Jurnal Teologi Gracia Deo Volume 1 No.1.Thn
- Slamet,M. CS. (2003). *Aneka Wacana tentang Hukum*, Yogyakarta, Kanisius.
- Smith, R.K *et.al.* (2008).*Hukum Hak Asasi Manusia*. Yogyakarta : PUSHAM UII.
- Sproul.(1995). *Kaum Pilihan Allah* .Malang : SAAT.
- Tanyit,P.(2004).*Providensia Allah dan kehendak bebas manusia*, Makasar : Jurnal Jaffaray,Teologi dan Studi Pastoral.
- Tim Pusat Studi HAM Universitas Islam Indonesia.(2008).*Hukum Hak Asasi Manusia*.Jogyakarta:PUSHAM UII.
- Tutupar,V.D.(2016).*Kebebasan Kehendak (Free Will) David Ray Griffin Dalam Perspektif Filsafat Agama* . Tangerang : Universitas Buddhi Dharma.
- Warfield, B. “*The Theology of Grace*,” <http://homepage.mac.com>
- Wijaya,H. (2011). *Eksposisi Gambar Allah Menurut Penciptaan Manusia Berdasarkan Kejadian 1:26-28* Makasar : Sekolah Tinggi Jaffray,
- Wikanarko, A A.(2016). *Konsep kehendak bebas menurut Henri Bergson dalam time and free will* Surabaya : Fakultas Filsafat Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala.
- Wilujeng,S.R.(2013). *Hak Asasi Manusia : tinjauan dari aspek historis dan yuridis*. Semarang : Jurnal Humanika.Jilid 18.Terbitan 2.
- Wiranata, I. G. A. B. (2005).*Hak Asasi (Anak) Dalam Realitas Qua Vadis?*, dalam Muladi (editor), *Hak Asasi Manusia, Hakekat, Konsep dan Implikasinya dalam Perspektif Hukum dan Masyarakat*, Cet. 1., PT. Refika Aditama, Bandung.