

Models of church-state relations

Main points of reference

- ▶ Friendly/radical separation
 - ▶ Collaboration
 - ▶ Autonomy
 - ▶ Relationship
 - ▶ Historical background (e.g. legal historical position of churches)
 - ▶ Socio-cultural background
 - ▶ Religious tradition
- 

2004 Human Development Report

- ▶ ***Non-secular states :***

- a) *state[s] governed by divine law* (theocratic states), e.g. Iran ruled by ayatollahs and Afghanistan of the Taliban
- b) *state[s] where one religion benefits from a formal alliance with the government* (certain confessional communities/denominations are officially established and supported by the state), e.g. Islam in Malaysia, Hinduism in Nepal, Catholicism in Argentina, Bolivia and Costa Rica, Buddhism in Thailand

2004 Human Development Report

c) *state[s] that [have] an established church or religion, but that nonetheless respect more than one religion, i.e. Great Britain, Denmark, Norway (see e.g. the system of education)*

2004 Human Development Report


- ▶ ***Secular states:***

- a) *anti-religious, secular states* (secular authorities interfere in religious matters, a church's freedom of activity is limited), e.g. China and historically Soviet Union (and other East European countries of that period)
- b) *neutral or disengaged states* with radical separation of church and state, accompanied by their mutual distance and autonomy; both confessional communities and the state have no opportunity to intrude into each other's areas of activity; e.g. the United States (especially after the first amendment to the constitution in 1791) and France (since 1905)

2004 Human Development Report

- ▶ c) *secular states asserting equal respect and principled distance* (the idea of separation in a less radical sense than in the laic concept); autonomy of both the states and churches; forms of collaboration) e.g. state financial support of confessional schools, which is combined with state control e.g. in the context of preventing gender discrimination); the state does not officially privilege any religion or worldview; legal opportunities of state interference is justified by the need to protect equality and freedom; e.g. according to H.-M. ten Napel: the Netherlands after 1917;

Other classifications

- ▶ States which proclaim a strict separation between the state and religious groups (France, Turkey)
 - ▶ States with established majority churches (England and Scotland, Denmark)
 - ▶ States that have signed concordats/ agreements with churches and religious communities (Italy, Spain, Germany)
 - ▶ States with 'conditional pluralism' (Belgium, the Netherlands)
- 

- ▶ Laic state?
- ▶ Secular state?
- ▶ Non-secular state?

vs.

- ▶ multiculturalism

Stouthuysen's model

	Passive state	Active state
The position of communities (groups)	Passive pluralism	Active pluralism
The rights of individuals	Formal secularism	Substantial secularism

- ▶ Freedom vs. equality
 - ▶ Neutrality
 - ▶ Separation vs. Collaboration
 - ▶ Individual vs. collective rights
-
- ▶ State financial support, tax exemptions
 - ▶ Religious instructions, prayer at schools
 - ▶ Religious symbols in the public space