

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

التسامح والمواطنة في الدولة الحديثة - جون لوك أنموذجا

Dr. Zerroukhi Abd Elwahab¹, Dr. Tounsi Mohamed²

¹ Amar Telidji University of Laghouat (Algeria), zerroukhi@lagh-univ.dz

² Amar Telidji University of Laghouat (Algeria), m.tounsi@lagh-univ.dz

Received:09/01/2024 Accepted:20/01/2025 Published:01/02/2025

Abstract:

Europe witnessed a reform movement in the foundations of the modern state after the Enlightenment revolutions against the Church, to liberate man from religious guardianship. John Locke is considered one of the philosophers who were interested in tolerance and citizenship and their relationship to religion. This study seeks to investigate the mechanisms by which the state of law and citizenship is built according to John Locke, and the justifications for separating religious and political practices.

The study concluded that the state of citizenship according to Locke is linked to freedom, property, and justice, to preserve the citizen and achieve security and peace.

Keywords: Citizenship, tolerance, religion, natural state.

ملخص:

شهدت أوروبا حركة إصلاحية في مسعى لبناء الدولة الحديثة بعد ثورات التنوير ضد الكنيسة ، وهذا لم يحدث الا بعد تحرير الإنسان من الوصاية الدينية، ويعتبر جون لوك من الفلاسفة الذين اهتموا بالتسامح والمواطنة وعلاقتهما بالدين. تسعى هذه الدراسة الى البحث في الآليات التي تبني بها دولة القانون والمواطنة عند جون لوك، ومبررات الفصل بين الممارسات الدينية والسياسية.

خلصت الدراسة الى ان دولة المواطنة عند لوك ترتبط بالحرية، والملكية، والعدالة، للحفاظ

على المواطن وتحقيق الأمن والسلام.

كلمات مفتاحية: كلمة المواطنة، التسامح، الدين، الحالة الطبيعية.

1. Introduction

Tolerance goes beyond being just kindness to others and peace in the relationship with them, and is a moral principle, for the will to live together within the framework of recognizing what difference, diversity and plurality impose, because the philosophy of tolerance is based on the values of freedom of opinion and equality before the law, as well as respect for cultural diversity, and it also paves the way for a culture of citizenship and human rights as necessary elements to serve peace and social development in all parts of the world. In this regard, the philosophers of the Enlightenment in the second half of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century adopted a proposal that it is necessary to elevate man to make him the center of the universe, by building a state of citizenship, justice and right, and certainly one of the most prominent philosophers who adopted this proposal is the English philosopher (John Locke 1632-1704).

Locke believes that tolerance is one of the most important principles on which the state should be based. We also find that tolerance, for him, is linked to belief and religion, as he confirms that no one has the right to interfere in the lives and decisions of others in the name of religion, civil rights, and worldly affairs... and that the art of government should not be based on religion, which means that religious tolerance requires that the state not adhere to a religion, because “the salvation of souls, their life and death, is the business of God alone... and God has not permitted anyone to be his representative, by imposing his religious ideas and orientations on any person... and the strength of true religion lies in the conviction of the human mind of what should be done or avoided” .(Locke, 1998, p. 24)

For these rational ideas, Locke was subjected to great criticism, so he wrote a second letter on toleration in 1690, and then a third letter in 1792. John Locke’s call in his letter on toleration can be summarized by saying: “No man has the power to impose on another man what he ought to believe or do for his salvation, because this is a private matter and does not concern

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

another person. God has not given such power to any man or any group, and no man can give it to another man above him at all,” for two reasons:

First: People everywhere may be exposed to error, whether they are rulers or ordinary citizens, and it is unreasonable to put a person under the absolute guardianship and guidance of a ruler who may make a mistake, as it is a very dangerous matter, because if the rulers mislead the people, they will not be able to compensate them for what may result from following what was asked of them.

Second: There is no benefit in using force to force people to follow the straight path towards salvation, because it is not permissible to force a person to believe in what contradicts their essential beliefs that are hidden in their hearts and minds, as these are personal matters for which the person alone bears the consequences. Therefore, it is not permissible to force anyone to enter into a partnership or project that he judges in advance and in the depths of his conscience that it contradicts his goal in entering into this partnership or project.

Through what we have mentioned, in this article we will try to answer the problem that can be formulated in the following pivotal question: What are the mechanisms and mechanisms for building a state of law and citizenship according to John Locke? And how do we justify the separation between religious and political practices in light of the idea that religious tolerance is a mechanism for building the state and establishing citizenship?

Before answering the problem raised, we will try to extrapolate the forms of political action throughout the history of political philosophical thought, because the conception of the purpose of the state's existence is what determines the existence of moral values within civil society, such as citizenship, freedom, and tolerance. Accordingly, the existence of the aforementioned values leads us to say that the state is a means and not an end in itself, which prompts the inferrer of these forms to imagine that the state has gone through four stages that differ from each other, which leads to raising questions: Did the state exist to serve individuals? Or did

Dr. Zerroukhi Abd Elwahab, Dr. Tounsi Mohamed

individuals exist to serve the state? In other words, is the state made by individuals? Or are individuals made by the state?

1.1. The period of virtue (Greek):

Here the vision of both Plato and Aristotle emerges, as the vision of the state in this period was linked to virtue, or another conception of happiness, because the state in Plato's view is considered the spiritual aspect of man, and thinking about justice, and it does not exist except by the gathering of the human race, and on this basis the Platonic state arose due to man's inability to be self-sufficient and take care of himself, due to the abundance of his needs and requirements for living.

In this regard, Aristotle's vision did not differ from the vision of his predecessor and teacher Plato in the emergence of the state and the purpose of its establishment, as he considered the state to be the indivisible whole that makes the part (citizens) achieve their desires and live in prosperity, provided that these desires are in harmony with the system of the city, and the occurrence of this harmony provides quality of life and human happiness.

1.2. The Middle age:

In this period, political action, like other modes of thinking, became linked to theology, especially in the Christian tradition, because Christian political thought supports the idea of the state being subject to the law prevailing in the universe, which is divine law. Therefore, submission to the king becomes submission to the divine will, and for this reason, Saint Augustine believes that the condition for achieving human happiness is only by living in the City of God, a city in which justice is achieved, in which every individual respects the duties he is obligated to perform, and at the same time obtains his rights, which is the same approach of Muslim philosophers, such as Al-Farabi, Al-Mawardi, the Brethren of Purity, and others, who tried to reconcile the Greek and Islamic concepts of the state, it is the same concept in Al-Farabi's political philosophy, as the philosopher ruler in Plato's Republic corresponds to the imam ruler in Al-Farabi's, this stage was characterized by the religious-political connection, which formed

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

another concept for some values such as citizenship, freedom, and tolerance.

1.3. The third stage: The Renaissance era, where political action was linked to power, and this controversy arose about the relationship between ethics and politics, and of course if ethics are absent, power is present, which is what the Italian philosopher Machiavelli adopted, as the state, according to him, is an entity that must be preserved in any way, and the ruler must use all moral and immoral methods to preserve his state, thus, the values of citizenship, tolerance and freedom collapsed, and the existence of individuals within the state became formal, to preserve this political entity through recruitment and preparation for the wars that broke out.

1.4. The fourth stage (the period of modernity and enlightenment): In this stage, the idea of the social contract appeared, and political science was linked to various other sciences, such as psychology and anthropology, because politics was no longer viewed as merely organizing people's relationships, but rather became a moral and political contract between a group of people, who were driven by human nature to gather for a better life. At this particular stage, concepts such as freedom, citizenship, and tolerance became the foundations on which the modern state must be built, especially after the religious reform that the church experienced at the hands of Martin Luther, as getting out of the cycle of intolerance that Europe experienced, prompted many philosophers to find a formula that prevents the church and the clergy interfering in politics without affecting tolerance, freedom, and citizenship within the state, which we find in most modern philosophers such as Spinoza in his book "A Treatise on Theology and Politics", John Locke in his book "An Essay on Civil Government", Jean-Jacques Rousseau in his book "The Social Contract", and Voltaire and his "Essay on Tolerance".

2- The state according to John Locke began with the individual and ended with civil society:

As we mentioned earlier, Locke is considered one of the philosophers of the social contract, along with Hobbes and Rousseau, so human society,

Dr. Zerroukhi Abd Elwahab, Dr. Tounsi Mohamed

in their opinion, went through two stages: The first stage is known as the natural stage, while the second stage is called the civil stage, as the transition takes place by concluding a political contract between individuals. We will review John Locke's position on the first natural state, as well as the reasons for the transition and the conditions of its contract.

2.1- John Locke and the State of Nature:

John Locke disagrees with Thomas Hobbes, where the former sees that the first state of nature is the state of complete freedom and equality among individuals, where they are subject to the authority of reason and the law of nature, as he confirms in this context that: "In order to understand the nature of political authority, we must examine the state of nature in which we find people, which is complete freedom to carry out activities and freedom to dispose of property, as required by the law of nature. (Locke, 1959, p. 139)

Accordingly, an individual has no right to harm another individual, because it is considered a violation of the principle of equality, which requires preserving the public good, while if a person assaults another, he has violated the law, and the wronged person has the right to defend himself, so the right to take revenge on the criminal is legitimate according to Locke, because the criminal violated the authority and followed his aggressive instincts.

John Locke asserts that this first natural stage, although it is the stage of freedom, does not mean that it is the stage of permissiveness, because according to him, man enjoys the freedom to dispose of himself and his property, but he does not enjoy the freedom to destroy his life or the lives of the creatures he owns, unless a nobler purpose than merely preserving them calls for it, accordingly, the natural stage is a natural law to which everyone is subject, represented by reason (Locke, 1959, p. 140), and if people consulted reason, it would acknowledge that they are all equal and free, and therefore none of them causes harm to the life, health, or property of another.

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

2.2. Reasons for transition according to John Locke:

Freedom and equality are the most important features of the state of nature according to Locke, so why move to the civil state? Locke admits that the state of nature is not without obstacles that threaten freedom and equality, and the major scourge for him is that every person in it is the opponent and the judge in all cases related to him (Locke, 1959, p. 140), and accordingly, people think about moving from this state of nature to the civil state to establish a general political authority that dominates everyone, and applies the laws of natural law with all fairness and objectivity.

John Locke believes that the most prominent obstacles that affect the state of nature can be summarized in three scourges:

- The absence of a fixed, common law that the members of society agree upon, which clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of the individual, and although the natural law that dominates this stage is very clear, people often exceed it due to their selfishness;
- The absence of a fair and impartial judge who judges between them and settles their disputes based on the law, as humans are naturally selfish and it is impossible for them to be free from personal whims during judgment, especially in cases in which they are a party;
- The absence of an authority capable of implementing the provisions of the law strictly and fairly, because the perpetrator of the offense does not voluntarily deter, which requires the ruling authority to be able to force him. (Fakhri, 2005, p. 14)

In addition, one of the reasons for the transition from this natural stage is the inability of man to provide a certain amount of necessary things, by providing a living befitting human dignity, as humans are driven by nature to rely on participation and cooperation with each other, to correct those shortcomings and defects in them, because individuals living in isolation from their peers, which is the reason for humans uniting in political societies from the beginning, and here we find John Locke agreeing with Aristotle in the reasons for the emergence of states is the lack of human self-sufficiency in providing his necessary living needs.

2.3 The nature of the contract according to John Locke:

John Locke believes that the social contract is implemented when all individuals meet and decide to leave the natural phase, which results in the establishment of a legislative body that adopts the majority system in issuing laws and legislation, and preserving the natural rights of individuals. It is also assumed that another contract is established between the legislative body that was formed and an executive authority appointed to enforce the law by force in certain cases (the judicial authority), and the government that depends according to this pattern on the consent of individuals is the only legitimate rule (Cranston & others, 1981, p. 63), which is what happens when individuals give up their rights to the delegated authority.

John Locke says, "Everyone who releases the natural phase to merge into a group must give up the authority necessary to achieve the purposes for which it was formed, to the majority of that group, if it is not expressly agreed to imitate it by a number greater than the majority, and this is the only contract that is binding on individuals who join a state" (Locke, 1959, p. 197). But an important question arises in this context: Is the ruling government in the civil society that Locke envisioned an absolute authority or not? In other words, can individuals disobey the authority if it violates the contract?

If the government wants to maintain its legitimacy, according to Locke, it must limit its interests to the public interest and protect the rights of individuals, and it must reconcile its laws with the laws of nature, as the government cannot confiscate the property of an individual without his consent, nor can it delegate its legislative powers. If the government adheres to these conditions, individuals must obey this authority, while if the authority violates these limits, it will be resisted (Cranston & others, 1981, p. 63), and here he means opposition, or revolution against the authority to which the rule was entrusted.

Locke believes that it is foolish for individuals to remain silent about the usurpation of their rights by the ruler because the purpose of their transition from the natural to the civil system is to improve their condition and

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

preserve their natural rights, as the natural system is more merciful than a corrupt civil authority.

In general, the people are the source of power in the state, so John Locke stressed the necessity of the legislative authority being in the hands of the people, and being the final authority in civil society, while the executive authority is concerned with implementing the laws set by the legislative authority, so that the role of the judicial authority remains limited to resolving disputes and differences that may occur between individuals.

3. Citizenship is manifested in the people's choice of government::

John Locke believed that sovereignty belongs to the citizens in society, but since the citizens had agreed to the social contract, they must abide by the will of the majority, so his position was clearly against absolute, tyrannical rule, the will of the king who believed that his authority was a mandate from God, instead of the collective will of all citizens, and with this position Locke is considered one of the philosophers who challenged the credibility of the royal authority in Britain.

In his book *Civil Government*, specifically in Chapter Eleven, Locke presents to us the ideal political system of government for managing the affairs of the state, which is the republican system, which is based primarily on the legislative authority that is in the hands of the people, as the people are the source of authority in the state. Locke says: "And since the first purpose of the integration of men in society is to enjoy their property in peace and security, and laws are how society establishes them, the first and main positive law of all states is to establish a legislative authority" (Locke, 1959, p. 218), and Locke believes that the legislative authority may be represented by a group or a person emanating from the group.

The legislative authority, according to Locke, whether it is related to one person or several people, does not have absolute power to dispose of people's lives and property, but must be subject to them, and thus the individual's submission to this authority is submission to his will, and

Dr. Zerroukhi Abd Elwahab, Dr. Tounsi Mohamed

Locke sets restrictions for this legislative authority, commitment to them achieves the goal of establishing the state, and these controls can be presented in:

- a. This authority does not have the right to destroy the governed, enslave them, or impoverish them intentionally, as these actions are contrary to the goals of the transition from natural life to civil status, because individuals have relinquished their rights to live in safety, peace and freedom, not in chaos and slavery.
- b. The legislative authority does not have the right to claim to rule by arbitrary and unjust decrees, but it is obligated to adopt justice and decide on people's rights, based on established and just laws (Locke, 1959, p. 219), as the purpose of individuals resorting to civil society is to preserve their rights that were threatened in the natural system.
- c. The supreme authority must not usurp the property of individuals against their will, because the protection of property is the task of the government. (Locke, 1959, p. 222).
- d. The legislative authority has no right to relinquish the power to make laws to any other body, because this authority is a delegated authority emanating from the people (Locke, 1959, p. 224).
- e. The ruling must be based on fixed objective laws that do not change in special circumstances, so the judge has no right to look at personal considerations while issuing the ruling (Locke, 1959, p. 225).
- f. These laws must aim to serve the people (Locke, 1959, p. 225), as the purpose of the emergence of the state according to Locke is to preserve the public interest of individuals.

4. The purpose of the state is to protect the citizen:

Locke believes that the purpose of the state is to ensure peace, and its ultimate goal is to protect individual property. Here, Locke's point of view

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

completely contradicts the common view in ancient and medieval times, which states that the state's mission is primarily a moral mission, to secure a good life and allow man to achieve moral self-realization. Guaranteeing individual property, according to the traditional point of view, is less important than the basic moral mission, as protecting private property is not a primary goal, therefore, Locke's approach to the state's obligation to protect property is striking and exciting from the traditional perspective, given the priority that Locke gives to that point as a reflection of the prevailing view of his time, as protecting private property is paramount (Sekerbek & Gilje, 2012, p. 468).

5. The state of citizenship is the land of tolerance according to John Locke:

Tolerance raises many problems related to its content, history, religious, political, and philosophical relations, its limits, areas, and potential, as it is moral, religious, philosophical, political and legal, with many contents and different levels, represented mainly in freedom of belief, reason, and expression, and recognition of difference and diversity, with the necessity of coexistence and cooperation, and after the development of civilization, the concept of tolerance has evolved to combine a group of moral, philosophical, religious, and political values, which the international community has formulated in recent decades in various international laws.

Tolerance is a moral value first and foremost, as it can only be understood as the opposite of fanaticism, and a philosophical value refined by human experiences of coexistence, and it is also a religious value that cannot be understood apart from the concept of love and brotherhood. It is a political value that accepts argument and difference, and a legal value that legislates non-discrimination and defines rights and duties within the framework of citizenship, as tolerance accepts dialogue, and it is a basic condition for practicing true democracy.

Living in a tolerant society means living in a society that accepts criticism and respects it, and in which each individual freely expresses his

Dr. Zerroukhi Abd Elwahab, Dr. Tounsi Mohamed

or her thoughts without imposing them on others, tolerance presupposes also caution and critical thinking, as tolerance cannot coexist with racism, bigotry, and violence. Accordingly, we pose the following question: How did Locke justify the existence of tolerance in a state that separates theology from political practice?

5.1 John Locke, philosopher of tolerance par excellence:

Tolerance became a prominent moral topic in the studies of philosophers starting from the Enlightenment in Europe, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, after the development of humanism, which was founded on the principles of respecting reason in the face of theology and supernatural ideas.

In 1689, John Locke published his book "A Treatise on Tolerance" in Latin, then translated into English, in which he called for the elimination of the structure of absolute one-sided thinking, and the spirit of closed religious fanaticism, as well as establishing religion on reason and building a system of rights that establishes the concept of tolerance, adopting the principle of separation of duties between the role of the church and the role of the state, and the principle of equality of rights among all religious sects.

John Locke lived in a period of great religious congestion, where the church dominated all aspects of life and abandoned its true message, which created a kind of religious dogma among individuals, therefore, John Locke called on the church to adhere to its tasks, the first of which was to work to spread the virtue of tolerance in societies. In this context, Locke says: "Since you are happy to ask about my ideas about mutual tolerance between Christians of different faiths, I answer you without reservation that I consider tolerance to be the distinctive mark of the church (Locke, 1959, p. 19).

5.2 Tolerance is achieved by separating religion from politics:

The reader of John Locke's Epistle of Tolerance discovers at first glance a basic feature of modernity, which is secularism, because Locke is considered among the first philosophers who called for the necessity of separating religion and politics, due to the dogma that characterizes the clergy, and their claim to possess the truth and solve human problems.

Tolerance and Citizenship in the Modern State- John Locke as a Model

Every truth from the perspective of reason is a human truth, and the absolute is not within the reach of our cognitive abilities, and the claim of theologians to possess the absolute truth is a false and unfounded claim, which produced murder, bigotry, and violence.

On this basis, Locke called for defining the relationship between the state and religion, by adopting the law (civil religion) according to the concepts of the law of nature, because the law of nature is a rational obligation of freedom. (Hassan Khalifa, 2005, p. 11), which is a law before which all humans are equal in complete separation between theology and politics.

Locke justifies that the goal of the state is earthly life, while the goal of the church is heavenly life, because man is the property of the country, not the property of the church, and his entry into it is by his own free choice, so civil society is not based on the desires of the church, and the state has no right to take religious doctrine into account in legislation, so there is no room for talking about a Christian state. But in return, the state must permit and respect all external worship, and let the church govern itself regarding belief and worship according to the general laws, so that freedom prevails in civil society (Karam, p. 152).

We can summarize John Locke's basic ideas in his "Treatise in Toleration" as follows:

- A distinction must be made between the mission of the civil government and the mission of the church or religious authority, and fixed boundaries must be drawn between them;
- The salvation of the soul of every human being depends on him alone, and cannot be entrusted to any civil or religious authority;
- Every human being has absolute supreme authority in choosing his religious affairs;
- Freedom of conscience is a natural right of every human being;
- The resort of the clergy to civil authority revealed their ambitions to control civil life, by applauding the tyranny of the ruler. The alliance of the ruler with the clergy was always in favor of the ruler's tyranny,

Dr. Zerroukhi Abd Elwahab, Dr. Tounsi Mohamed

as they were never able throughout history to return him to the right path.

6. Conclusion:

Finally, we can conclude some important points, which we list as follows:

- The state of citizenship according to Locke is linked to basic concepts, on the ruins of which civil society was built, such as natural rights, justice and freedom;
- The goal of establishing a state, according to Locke, is to preserve the citizen while achieving security and peace, because the citizen's life is an end in itself.
- In true citizenship, the ruling authority is chosen by the citizens, and submission to authority is submission to the will of society. Accordingly, Locke called for the implementation of the liberal democratic system.
- The state will not be stable except by adopting tolerance in all its forms, religious, cultural, and even political;
- Tolerance depends on the separation of religion from politics, and it only grows in a secular state in which the role of officials and those charged with religion and politics is limited to performing their various tasks.

7. Bibliography List :

Cranston, M., & others. (1981). *Political Thought Figures*. Beirut: Al-Nahar House for Publishing.

Fakhri, M. (2005). *introduction to John Locke's Two Treatises on Civil Government*. Algeirs.

Hassan Khalifa, F. (2005). *Religion and Politics in the Philosophy of Modernity*. Cairo : Arab Egypt for Publishing and Distribution.

Karam, Y. *History of Modern Philosophy*. Cairo: Al-Maaref House.

Locke, J. (1959). *Two Essays Concerning Government*. (M. Fakhri, Trans.) Beirut: International Committee for the Translation of Masterpieces.

Sekerbek, G., & Gilje, N. (2012). *History of Western Thought - From Ancient Greece to the Twentieth Century*. (H. I. Haidar, Trans.) Beirut: Arab Organization for Translation.