

# John Locke and Islam

Rawaa Mahmoud Hussain (Ph.D.)

USA

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.11.02.2021.p11026  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.11.02.2021.p11026>

**Abstract-** John Locke is one of the most leading European philosophers of modern times. His books on political philosophy, tolerance, and criticism of the mind had a profound impact on the development of European thought and its transmission from medieval thought to the modern era. It is striking that John Locke had taken an interest in the Islamic religion in his books and criticized the conditions of Muslims in his period. The comparisons he made between Europe and the Muslim world, and between Christianity and Islam, were prominent discussions in his overall philosophy. In this article, I seek to reveal John Locke's position on Islam as a religion and the Islamic world to gain a greater understanding of Locke's philosophy on the one hand and the historical relations between the Islamic world and the Western world on the other.

**Index Terms-** John Lock, Islam, Christianity, Philosophy, Criticism, Human Rights.

## I. INTRODUCTION

John Locke (1632-1704) involves a conspicuous situation in the political way of thinking of Europe. As a private secretary of Lord Shaftesbury, the organizer of the Whig party, Locke increased some understanding of down to earth legislative issues. His *Essays on Civil Government*, which contains the substance of political way of thinking and which depicts, by and large, the Whig (Liberal) reasoning of the day, is a statement of regret for the Revolution of 1688.<sup>1</sup>

Locke's contention from the disutility of bigotry had another and diverse angle. This may be named the "correspondence" or "Snow-capped contention." Truth, Locke watched, can be distinctive on each side of the Channel, the Alps,

and the Bosphorus. "Each sovereign is standard to himself." Protestantism is the state religion in England, Catholicism in France, and Islam in Turkey. He differentiates the destinies of religions under various systems: the prevailing religion is adept to mistreat the minority. Henceforth, it is absurd to permit the state to uphold "truth," on the grounds that a similar contention will be utilized somewhere else against our co-religionists. In a universe of separated religions and confession, the booth expresses, the individuals who endure are not mistaken but rather the feeble. Protestants will endure in France and Christians in Turkey. Locke offers the master math of reasonability: if you wish to advance genuine conviction, do not arm justices the world over with the blade of nobility. The example of oppression is, therefore, a marker of the circulation of intensity instead of the provenance of strict truth. Abuse has no utility for propelling the reason for reality if the case for compulsion can so effectively be prepared by any system that trusts it has reality.<sup>2</sup>

Locke is very certain that strict assessments of any kind cannot give ground to common separation. "Neither agnostic, nor Mahometan, nor Jew, should be rejected from the social equality of the province, in light of his religion." A groundbreaking product of Locke's position is that toleration must be stretched out to non-Christians. Since the district is not, in its tendency, Christian, at that point its ambit is broad. Moreover, "not even [Native] Americans . . . are to be rebuffed . . . for not grasping our confidence and love."<sup>3</sup>

Tolerance is ingrained through information, receptiveness, correspondence, and opportunity of thought. Tolerance is not just a virtue that each individual ought to have. However, it is likewise a political necessity. Adaptability can change the way of life of hostility or ill to a culture of harmony. It is observed that is a battle in the cases of strict tolerance in this 21st century AD, which is proportional to the multi-year of the Hijrah. Cases are battled

<sup>1</sup> Ziauddin Ahmad Suleri, *Influence of Islam on World Civilization* (Karachi: Royal Book Co., 1994), p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, edited and with an Introduction by Mark Goldie (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2010), p. 10. 12/5/2017. <<http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/2375>>

<sup>3</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 8. John Locke's part on the property in the Second Treatise of Government subverts the medieval hypothesis of residency and heritage winning in English law and reestablishes old-style allodial regular property rights to all people. Locke's previous works show no commonality with legal writing aside from Grotius and Dubendorf; toward an incredible finish, he deliberately applied traditional

hypothesis while maintaining a strategic distance from the presence of doing as such by adjusting it to the Protestant idea of work as a naturally significant action. It changes that action into a semi-material element equipped for a mix with other material substances. At that point, to clarify the change of the regular property into private property, Locke proposes his "work hypothesis" of allocation. It is a somewhat stressed adjustment of the old-style lawful hypothesis of the responsibility for and blended substances, which can be found in Justinian's Institutes and Digest. See: Roger T. Simonds, "John Locke's use of classical legal theory," in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* (March 1997), 3, Issue 4, p. 424. Simonds, R.T. *Int class trad* (1997) 3: 424. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12138-997-0009-3>

among the followers of religions who are looking for direction to live in harmony and amicability and to have a shared comprehension of living, respectively. Claims and battles in the strict resistance have been addressed by numerous either exclusively or in gathering and association. Elements of harsh life appear to be encouraging acceptable focal points yet, at the same time, to have a few downsides. It is upon the devotees of various religions to set a benchmark in delivering a positive result or the other way around. Tolerance is inverse of narrow mindedness, which can be meant by detrimental conduct and rejects the perspectives and activities of others. Bigotry begins from the conviction that one's actions and lifestyle are prevalent or superior to other people. The negative impacts of prejudice incorporate abuse, ethnic purifying, politically sanctioned racial segregation, and decimation that deny the requirements and privileges of others.<sup>4</sup>

For strict social orders in contradistinction to the common, are called houses of worship, as the others are called states. It is not in the judge's capacity to constrain any man to be of either religion or to decide for him whether his approach to satisfy God and be spared be to be a Christian, Mahometan, and Jew. And as meager can a Christian officer endorse to him that is a Christian whether he will be a Papist, Lutheran, or Calvinist, or order him to be of some other specific Christian culture. It being the benefit of each Christian just as each man to pick off what strict social orders he will be for the salvation of his spirit. Man is still as he at any point was at freedom about the universal justice to pick what religion he judges the likeliest for the salvation of his spirit, thus to join into strict (or as they are called) church social orders about it.<sup>5</sup>

David Hollenbach brings up that exchange with three significant Muslim creators shows that Islam can take a favorable position toward human rights while additionally introducing contrasting understandings of the importance and extent of rights.

Abdolkarim Soroush's sure help for the job of reason in Islamic confidence and his more positive evaluation of the West led him to progressively energetic support for the human rights plan. This investigation brings up the issue of whether the lowliness required in relative morals and the regard for others at the base of human rights are permanently connected. Appleby has contended that the interior pluralism of strict customs is one of the conditions that empower these conventions to create favorable positions toward human rights. Her attitude of conscious listening drives her to a great extent to abstain from making decisions about which of the three creators gives a superior or progressively sufficient Islamic way to deal with human rights.<sup>6</sup>

Locke's contention from the disutility of narrow mindedness had another and diverse perspective. It may be named the "correspondence" or "High contention." Truth, Locke watched, is adept at being diverse on each side of the Channel, the Alps, and the Bosphorus. "Each sovereign is conventional to himself." Protestantism is the religion in England, Catholicism in France, and Islam in Turkey. He differentiates the destinies of religions under various systems: the prevailing belief is well-suited to aggrrieve the minority. In a universe of isolated creeds and confession, the booth expresses, the individuals who endure are not the wrong but rather the powerless. Protestants will stay in France and Christians in Turkey. Locke offers the implementer math of judiciousness: on the off chance that you wish to advance genuine conviction, do not arm justices the world over with the blade of uprightness. The example of mistreatment is a pointer of the appropriation of intensity as opposed to the provenance of strict truth. Abuse has no utility for propelling the reason for reality if the case for pressure can so expertly be assembled by any system that trusts it has existence. Thus, it is silly to permit the state to uphold "truth" because a similar contention will be utilized somewhere else against our co-religionists.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Nur Farhana Abdul Rahman & Khadijah Mohd Khambali@Hambal, "Religious Tolerance in Malaysia: Problems and Challenges," in *International Journal of Islamic Thought* 3: (June) 2013, pp. 81 – 83.

<sup>5</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 131. David Durst endeavors to show how in Locke's liberal idea, the individual is dependent upon an unpredictable activity, including freedom and enslavement. In *A Letter on Toleration* (1685), Locke contends that the person's internal convictions ought to be liberated from the compulsion of Church and State. The person's spirit ought to be established by and by – not organized by brutality yet haggled by profound influence. Subsequently, the person's inner voice is to be liberated from outward savagery of a minister and ordinary powers directly after first, in youth, being dependent upon the moral order of regard, disrespect, and disgrace, the internal brutality of which unveils constrains in Locke's talk on toleration. Notwithstanding, the authority of reason is not built up without the dissolution of viciousness. In his works on instruction, Locke keeps up that the option to think about one's spirit ought to be delighted indirectly after proper, thorough preparation. See: David Durst, *The Limits of Toleration in John Locke's Liberal Thought*, in *Res Publica* 7,

Issue 1 (January 2001), pp. 39. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009603216167>

<sup>6</sup> David Hollenbach, S. J., "Comparative Ethics, Islam, And Human Rights Internal Pluralism and the Possible Development of Tradition," in *Journal of Religious Ethics* 38 no 3 Sep 2010, p. 580 – 585.

<sup>7</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 10. Daniela Bianchi contends that it ought to be noticed that the Toleration Act of 1689 does not stretch out tolerance to, among others, the individuals who preclude the doctrine from securing the Trinity. Until 1813, that the Unitarians could rehearse their faction. The Trinity Act (An Act to soothe people who reprimand the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity from specific Penalties. 53 Geo. III, c. 160) of that year absolved the Unitarians from the punishments set somewhere around the Toleration Act and by the Blasphemy Act cited previously. Bianchi sees that in 1697, the Presbyterian, William Bates, introduced a location, for the benefit of some disagreeing pastors, to William of Orange. His call is against the Socinians and Deists, and for the restricting of the distribution of Socinian works. Bates' location was distributed in JOHN HOWE, *Sermon Preached on the Day of Thanksgiving* (1698). On seventeenth February 1698, the House of

Incredible cases of resistance and bigotry portray the whole authentic advancement of man. The contemporary world-society is likewise seen to vertical and even activities exuding from positions of strength and prejudice. Tolerance is a perpetual estimating pole of thoughtfulness and soundness. The account of 'resistance' is personally connected to the changes of human advancements all through the ages. The Greeks, the Romans, the Indians, the Jews, the Muslims, and others having a place with various religions demonstrated their open-minded and bigoted conduct as per their understanding of their sacred writings, as did non-devotees moreover.<sup>8</sup>

## II. IDOLATRY

Avarice, Uncharitableness, Idleness, and numerous different things are sins, by the permission all things considered, which yet no man at any point said were to be rebuffed by the Magistrate. The explanation is that they are not biased toward other men's privileges, nor do they break the open Reconciliation of Societies. Even the Errors and Perjury are no place deserving of Laws, except if in specific cases in which the genuine turpitude of the thing, and the Offense against God, are not thought of, however just the injury done unto men's Neighbors, and to the Commonwealth. Worshipful admiration is a Sin, and in this manner, not to be endured. On the off chance that they stated, it

---

Commons introduced a position to the King, We do further, in all modesty, entreat Your Majesty, that Your Majesty would provide such useful request, concerning Your Royal Wisdom will appear to be fit. For the smothering, every single vindictive book and leaflets, which contain in them profane teachings against the Holy Trinity, and other significant articles of our Faith, keeping an eye on the disruption of the Christian Religion; and that the writers and distributors thereof might be limited and rebuffed. See: Bianchi, D., "Some sources for a history of English Socinianism a bibliography of 17th century English Socinian writings," in *Topoi: An International Review of Philosophy* (1985) 4: 91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138653>

<sup>8</sup> Syed Latif Hussain Kazmi, "An Essay on the Place of Tolerance in Islam," in *Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies* (Winter 2009), II · No. 1., p. 27.

<sup>9</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 54. Locke's hypothesis of apportionment is a hypothesis of equity. Locke's answer is made conceivable by the methodological improvement, which permits a reasonable division between the specific law and the recorded and experimental states of its application: this improvement is an outcome of the qualification among modes and substances built up in Locke's Essay. As indicated by the custom of 'characteristic law,' equity is inalienable to, and ought to consistently be seen in, every single relational connection: the study of common law is not all that much or not precisely the statement of such standards of equity. The hypothetical quirks that yield up regarding the legality of the assignment are dictated by the circuitous relational relations that occur inside the procedure of apportionment. However, allotment is an activity coordinated not towards someone else or his

was, consequently, to have stayed away from, the Inference was acceptable. Yet, it does not follow that since it is a Sin, it should, therefore, be rebuffed by the Magistrate. For it does not have a place unto the judge to utilize his Sword in Punishing everything, apathetically, that he takes to be a Sin against God. Furthermore, imagine a scenario wherein another nation, to a Mahometan, or a Pagan Prince, the Christian Religion appears to be bogus and hostile to God; may not the Christians, for a similar explanation, and after the same way, be extirpated there.<sup>9</sup>

The notoriety man meets with on all hands of a temperamental if not skeptical individual, and an affecter of oddity and change; these, and a thousand bothers, do so essentially go-to men in the changing their religion or places of worship (even where the authority of the judge forces not), have so incredible an impact upon men that I think those by themselves keep an extraordinary piece of men so fixed to their congregation fellowship; and we see the Jews in all nations, Christians in Asia and Africa, Mahometan slaves in Christendom, Protestants in Papist, and Papists in Protestant nations don't so somewhat change their religions, however they have the free leave of the justice as well as his support to do it; but then vast numbers of these, if their actual reasons were known, would be seen as limited by those outward contemplations, and it is sure that the individuals who are decisively administered by the salvation of their spirits and any desires for paradise would be significantly less given to change.<sup>10</sup>

property, yet towards unmistakable outside products, this activity may have significant ramifications for others. See: Francesco Fagiani, "Natural law and history in Locke's theory of distributive justice," in *Topoi: An International Review of Philosophy* (1983) 2: 163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00142490>

<sup>10</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 132. Vicki Hsueh takes up and challenges the Lockean origination of sound judgment and basic right to property in two different ways: first, through a basic examination of Locke's verifiable association with imperialism, and second, by going to contemporary indigenous originations of good judgment. Locke's reasonable encounters in the establishing of Carolina serve not just to clarify the problematical frontier driving forces of the Second Treatise, however, to be sure to help fix the believability of that content's ideological case to obtain and absorb. Vicki Hsueh abandons an inward historicized study of the Second Treatise to a contemporary outside test, looking at current indigenous viewpoints de-legitimized constantly Treatise. I battle that traditionalized originations of indigenous information and comprehension give a key rejuvenation of sound judgment in manners that re-characterize and re-portray the word's foundations in the normal as well as in the faculties themselves. Vicki Hsueh finishes up by addressing whether these revived 'traditionalisms' — as much as they challenge exclusionary Lockean originations of the 'normal' and presence of mind. See: Vicki Hsueh, "Cultivating and Challenging the Common: Lockean Property, Indigenous Traditionalisms, and the Problem of Exclusion," in *Contemporary Political Theory* (May 2006) 5, Issue 2, p. 193. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300233>

We ought to watch requirements against abusing individuals in specific manners, where an imperative is an ethical rule that we ought not to disregard, in any event, when that is the best way to forestall further, comparative infringement or other, more noteworthy indecencies. However, despite its natural intrigue, the view that there are requirements has drawn impressive analysis and endeavors to give a reason to limitations that have been, best case scenario, significantly inadequate. As such, it is ordinary that there are cutoff points to the manners in which we can passably treat individuals, even in the administration of good closures: we may not take somebody's wallet, regardless of whether we intend to give the substance to starvation alleviation; break a guarantee to enable a partner to move, regardless of whether we experience another person en route whose need is to some degree progressively dire; or reap organs from one individual to spare other people who need transplants.<sup>11</sup>

### III. CHURCH:

It is absurd for anybody to claim himself to be a Mahometan just in his Religion yet in everything else an unwavering Subject to a Christian Magistrate. Simultaneously he recognizes himself bound to yield dazzle submission to the Mufti of Constantinople, who himself is wholly devoted to the Ottoman Emperor, and edges the pretended Oracles of that Religion as indicated by his pleasure. Be that as it may, this Mahometan living among Christians would more obviously repudiate their Government if he recognized a similar person as Head of his Church, the Supreme Magistrate in the State. The church can reserve no option to be endured by the Magistrate, which is comprised upon such a base. Every one of the individuals who go into it, do in this manner, ipso facto, convey themselves up to the Protection and Service of another Prince. For by this implies the Magistrate would offer a route to the settling of an outside Jurisdiction in his own Country, and endure his People to be recorded, so to speak, for Soldiers against his Government. The silly and fraudulent who do not differentiate between the Court and the church do not bear the cost of any solution for this Inconvenience. Mainly when both the one and the other are similarly dependent upon the outright Authority of a similar Person. He has not just capacity to convince the Members of his Church to the records, either as merely Religious or as all together thereunto can likewise appreciate it them on the agony of Eternal Fire.<sup>12</sup>

Tolerance is closer to equity and suggests a reasonable mentality towards humanity on the loose. It empowers an individual to act normally, dispassionately, and with more prominent responsibility to nobility. It is a finished authority over one's interests, feelings, and assessments. It is to work inside given social, political, and ideological settings with a reasonable demeanor. It need not demonstrate an absence of promise to what is ultimately Real. Be that as it may, a methodology of resistance loans existential happiness and exclusive fulfillment to its experts.

Tolerance has positive, social, political, and financial ramifications in the continuous walk of human progress. When we talk about tolerance, we have ideas like persistence, receptiveness, absence of partiality, unprejudiced mentality, broad-mindedness, progressivism, and self-control. We also have charitableness, typical getting, good cause, mercy, guilty pleasure, tolerance, agreeableness, levity, carelessness, unbiasedness, reasonableness, and objectivity. Likewise, there are other endless parts of tolerance, which can be shown among the individuals having a place with various religions, statements of faith, socio-political gatherings, or inside a similar network. It likewise mirrors the philosophy of an individual both at the individual and relational levels.<sup>13</sup>

### IV. ENTHUSIASM:

John Locke finds that Christians, Mahometans, and Brahmins all claim to it (and he told the Chinese as well. In any case, inconsistencies and deceptions cannot emerge out of God, nor can anybody. The genuine religion is guaranteed of anything by away whereby those of false religion might be and are similarly affirmed in theirs. Eagerness is a shortcoming in the brain inverse to brutish sexiness, as far in the other outrageous, surpassing the fair proportions of reason as considerations cowering just in issue and things of sense miss the mark concerning it. A stable and firm influence of any recommendation identifying with religion for which a man hath either no or not adequate verifications from reason but instead gets them as realities fashioned in the psyche exceptionally by God himself and impacts coming promptly from him appears to me to be excitement, which can be no proof or ground of confirmation at all nor can be using any means be taken for information. On the off chance that such unfounded musings as these worry current issues, and not a religion, have the psyche firmly, we call it raving, and everybody thinks it a level of franticness. However, in faith, men acclimated with the considerations of disclosure, offering a more prominent leeway. However, to be sure it is a progressively hazardous frenzy, men are well-suited to feel that they may and should stop their explanation in religion.<sup>14</sup>

A more detailed contention for the opportunity of conviction is found in crafted by Abdulaziz Sachedina. Such data is useful in deciphering the stanza, and Sachedina finds in the old-style reporter al-Tabari the story behind the gathering of refrain 2:256: "a Muslim belonging to the tribe of Salim b. 'Awf of Medina, whose two sons had embraced Christianity before Islam was preached . . . grieved for them [when they came to visit him] and asked them to convert to Islam. They refused to do so. The father brought them before the Prophet and asked him to intervene in the controversy. It was on this occasion, according to al-Tabari, that the 'No compulsion' verse was revealed, and the father, apparently on the advice of the Prophet, left his two sons alone." Some classical commentators limited the right granted in this verse to

<sup>11</sup> Ryan Preston-Roedder, "Civic Trust," in *Philosophers' Imprints* 17, NO. 4 (FEBRUARY 2017), p. 1. Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3521354.0017.004>

<sup>12</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 60.

<sup>13</sup> Syed Latif Hussain Kazmi, "An Essay on the Place of Tolerance in Islam," in *Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies op. cit.*, pp. 27 -28.

<sup>14</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 132.



the People of the Book— i.e., Jews, Christians, and Zoroastrians— but Sachedina believes the verse is applicable to all human beings. He finds additional support for his position on toleration in the thought underlying verse 49:14: “The Bedouins say: ‘we believe.’ Say: ‘you do not believe. Instead you may say: ‘we surrender,’ but faith has not entered your hearts.”<sup>15</sup>

## V. MAHOMETANISM:

John Marshall accepts that most Islam and Muslims' conversations in seventeenth-century England were firmly negative, and vast segments of Philo-Hebraic feelings were hostile to Islamic. Yet, there were significant wellsprings of what may be called Philo-Islamic notion somehow or another resembling Philo-Hebraic assessment.<sup>16</sup>

For few Qur'anic refrains, there is writing portraying the events of disclosure, i.e., the conditions in the Prophet's life that offered ascend to the gathering of a Qur'anic stanza. Free qualification in this entry between “give up/accommodation” (Islam) and “confidence” (iman), Sachedina sees the unmistakable contrast between a constrained and constrained accommodation to exalted position and willful confidence liberated from the coercive impedance. Finally, Sachedina points to the verses mentioned above (10:99 and 11:118), as well as 6:107 (“Had God willed, they would not have worshipped idols. But we did not appoint you their keeper, nor are you their guardian”) and 50:45 (“we know best what they [unbelievers] say, and you are not a tyrant ruling over them”), What's more, finds in the Quranic ideal of “heart” (qalb) a nearby Islamic comparable to the Christian thought of soul— something that propels one with the power of power but then isn't through and through inside one's control, and thus not helpless to intimidation from different people. (see Quran 18:57 and 13:28).<sup>17</sup>

In his conversation to ‘The Civil Rights of Jews and Muslims,’ John Locke shows that to legitimize the Author's Toleration's hugeness, who might not have Jews, Mahometans and Pagans barred from the Civil Rights of the Commonwealth, due to their Religion. He dreaded it will scarcely be accepted, that we supplicate decisively for their Conversion, if we prohibit them from its standard and gainful Means, either by driving them from us, or oppressing them when they are among us. Live among you

then Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans may, yet endenizon'd not be. Yet why? Are there not the individuals who are Members of your Commonwealth, who do not grasp the Truth that must spare them, anything else than they? What consider you Socinians, Papists, Anabaptists, Quakers, Presbyterians?<sup>18</sup>

As to Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans, if any of them couldn't care less to live among us, except if they might be admitted to the Rights and Privileges of the Commonwealth; the rejecting them that Favor isn't to be viewed as driving them from us, or barring them from the customary and plausible Means of Con form; yet as an equitable and fundamental Caution in a Christian Commonwealth, in regard to its Members: Who, if, for example, proclaim Judaism, or Mahometanism, or Paganism, were allowed to appreciate similar Rights with them, would be a lot of the more at risk for being enticed by them; seeing they would lose no common Advantage by such a Change of their Religion: Whereas on the off chance that they couldn't go to any of those Religions, without relinquishing the Civil Rights of the Commonwealth by doing it, it's likely they would consider a long time before they did it, what ground there was to expect that they ought to get anything by the Exchange, which would countervail the Loss they ought to support by it.<sup>19</sup>

John Locke inquires as to why this regular Private of human instinct should make Judaism, Mahometism or Paganism more getting than such a Non-congruity, which blocks Men from grasping the genuine Religion; so Jews, Mahometans and Pagans must, inspired by a paranoid fear of contaminating others, be closed out from the Commonwealth, when others are not, I would fain know? What the State of Religion was in the primary Ages after the Flood, is so incompletely referred to now, that as I have demonstrated you in somewhere else, you can make little Advantage to your Cause from thus. Also, since it was a similar Corruption at that point, which as you own, pulls back Men now from the genuine Religion, and upsets it from winning by its own Light, without the Assistance of Force; and it is a similar Corruption that keeps Dissenters, just as Jews, Mahometans and Pagans, from grasping of the Truth: why various Degrees of Punishments ought to be utilized to them, till there be found in them various Degrees of Obstinacy, would require some better Reason.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Joy Samad, “John Locke and Muslim Liberalism,” in *Journal of Church and State* (Winter, 2011), 53 Issue 1, p. 93.

<sup>16</sup> John Marshall, John Locke, *Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 388.

<sup>17</sup> Joy Samad, “John Locke and Muslim Liberalism,” in *Journal of Church and State* (Winter, 2011), 53 Issue 1, pp. 93 – 94.

<sup>18</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 72. The ideas of the ‘inalienable rights of human beings’ and of “limited sovereignty” are attributed to John Locke. Locke is seen as the pioneer in Western thought of such concepts as “trusteeship of power for the benefit of the governed” and the “removability of the ruler if the ruler fails to keep to his trust. But these ideas were basic propositions of Islamic political thought hundreds of years before John Locke and Maitland popularized them.” Shad Saleem Faruqi, *Islam*,

*International Law and War against Terrorism* (Kuala Lumpur: University Publication Centre, Universiti Teknologi MARA), p. 6.

<sup>19</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 72. In 1689, the great English philosopher John Locke published A Letter Concerning Toleration, in which he argued that “neither Pagan, nor Mahometan, nor Jew, ought to be excluded from the civil rights of the commonwealth because of religion.” He gave a classical formulation of an idea which helped to inspire both the French and American revolution. Bernard Ellis Lewis, Buntzie Ellis Churchill, *Islam: The Religion and the People* (New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008), p. XV.

<sup>20</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 73.

To specify Islam as Muhammadanism or to consider it as Semitic Religion is to misconstrue its essential character and substance. It is not named after Prophet Muhammad, just like the case with other incredible religions like Christianity, Buddhism, and so forth Islam is the all-inclusive religion of humanity. It is essentially founded on tawhid (solidarity of God). All couriers of Allah in this sense were the couriers of Islam on the grounds that their call or greeting to individuals was, "Submit to Allah (God) in worship and obedience, and associate nothing with Him." Muhammad is not the originator of Islam, yet the remainder of the prophets and the couriers of God. Islam is one of the significant religions of the world. It is a religion of harmony, tolerance, and kindness. It has influenced the psyches and hearts of a huge part of humankind. 'Islam' from a genuine perspective connotes 'accommodation.' In like manner, Islam is a religion (upheaval) that relies upon the overall standard of convenience to God. A Muslim, promptly, is he 'who completely submits himself to God (Allah)'.<sup>21</sup>

This most likely would offer more to the Conversion of Jews, Mahometans and Pagans, if there were proposed to them and others, for their Admittance into the Church, just the plain basic Truths of the Gospel important to Salvation, than all the pointless Talk about joining Christians in Matters of less Moment, as indicated by the Draft and Prescription of a specific arrangement of Men anyplace. An Agreement in Truths important to Salvation, and the keeping up of Charity and selfless Kindness with the Diversity of Opinions in different things, is what will comprise with Christian Unity, and is all potentially to be had in this world, in such a hopeless Weakness and Difference of Men's Understandings.<sup>22</sup>

We find as a part of Muhammad's character both the ethical law and strict qualities, which are in fact God's orders. He strongly and devotedly attempted to decipher Allah's Words (the Qur'an) energetically and his own direct is a 'amazing guide' to be trailed by the mankind as he shows been introduced to be benevolence for all the domains of being by the Qur'an. He clarifies hypothetically and shows essentially, the significance of leniency, equity, consideration, goodness, and resistance to humankind and to other non-human living animals of God. As indicated by the Islamic lessons, Muhammad as an individual must be viewed as resistant from genuine blunders. Truth be told, his general conduct is viewed by the Muslims as sunnah or the 'wonderful model', and its psychological internationalization by Muslims may turn out to be so intense thus sharp as to make their cognizance indistinguishable with the ethical law itself.<sup>23</sup>

The Gospel orders nothing of the sort. The Church, which decides about not those that are without, 1 Corinthians 5:12-13, needs it not. Also, the Commonwealth, which grasps detachedly all men that are straightforward, quiet, and innovative, requires it not. Will we endure a Pagan to arrangement and exchange with us, and will we not endure him to implore unto, and love God? If we permit the Jews to have private Houses and Dwellings among us, for what reason would it be a good idea for us to not permit them

to have Synagogues? Is their Doctrine falser, their Worship more odious, or is the Civil Peace more jeopardized, by their gathering out in the open, than in their private Houses? Be that as it may, if these things might be conceded to Jews and Pagans, the state of any Christians should not to be more terrible than theirs in a Christian Commonwealth. Those that are Seditious, Murderers, Robbers, Adulterers, Thieves, Slanderers, &c. of at all Church, regardless of whether National, or not, should be rebuffed and stifled. In any case, those whose Doctrine is tranquil, and whose Manners are unadulterated and chaste, should be upon equivalent Terms with their Fellow Subjects. In the event that Solemn Assemblies, Observations of Festivals, Public Worship, be allowed to any one kind of Professors; every one of these things should be allowed to the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Arminians, Quakers, and others, with a similar freedom. Nay in the event that we may transparently talk the Truth and as becomes one Man to another; neither Pagan, nor Mahometan, nor Jew, should be avoided from the Civil Rights of the Commonwealth, in light of his Religion.<sup>24</sup>

#### VI. JOHN LOCKE, THE ORIENTALIST, AND THE CITY OF CONSTANTINOPLE:

Let us guess two Churches, the one of Arminians, the other of Calvinists, living in the City of Constantinople; Will anybody say, that both of these Churches has Right to deny the Members of the other of their Estates and Liberty, on account of their contrasting from it in certain Doctrines or Ceremonies; while the Turks in the mean while quietly hold on, and snicker to see with what coldhearted Cruelty Christians consequently rage against Christians? In any case, in the event that one of these Churches hath this Power of treating the other sick, It will be addressed without a doubt, That it is the Orthodox Church which has the Right of Authority over the Erroneous or Heretical. This is, in extraordinary and plausible words, to state only nothing by any means. For each Church is Orthodox to itself, to other people, Erroneous or Heretical. At all any Church accepts, it accepts to be valid; and the opposite thereunto it articulates to be Error. With the goal that the Controversy between these Churches about the Truth of their Doctrines, and the Purity of their Worship, is on the two sides equivalent; nor is there any Judge, either at Constantinople, or somewhere else upon Earth, by whose Sentence it very well may be resolved. The Decision of that Question has a place just with the Supreme Judge, everything being equal, to whom likewise alone has a place the Punishment of the Erroneous. In the then, let those men consider how grievously they sin; Who, including Injustice, if not to their Error, yet surely to their Pride, do thoughtlessly and egotistically take

<sup>21</sup> Syed L Atif Hussain Kazmi, "An Essay on the Place of Tolerance," in *Islam Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>22</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 74.

<sup>23</sup> Syed L Atif Hussain Kazmi, "An Essay on the Place of Tolerance," in *Islam Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>24</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 63.

upon them to abuse the Servants of another Master, who are not in any manner responsible to them.<sup>25</sup>

An Infidel, who has himself no Authority to rebuff Christians for the Articles of their Faith, cannot present such an Authority upon any Society of Christians, nor give unto them a Right, which he has not himself. This would be the Case at Constantinople. What is more, the Reason of the thing is the equivalent in any Christian Kingdom. The Civil Power is the equivalent in each spot; nor would that be able to Power, in the Hands of a Christian Prince, give any more noteworthy Authority upon the Church, than in the Hands of a Heathen; or, in other words, only none by any means. On the off chance that it could be show which of these two contradicting Churches were in the correct manner, there would not gather in this way to the Orthodox any Right of obliterating the other. For Churches have neither any Jurisdiction in common Matters, nor are Fire and Sword any legitimate Instruments wherewith to persuade men's Minds of Error and illuminate them regarding the Truth. Allow us to assume, all things considered, that the Civil Magistrate slanted to support one of them, and to place his Sword into their Hands; that (by his assent) they may reprimand the Dissenters however they wanted. Will any man say that any Right can be inferred unto a Christian Church over its Brethren, from a Turkish Emperor?<sup>26</sup>

We should depend on the trustworthiness of the amanuensis, or of those people that pass on them to us, and those are absolutely not trustworthy, and we know there are Indices Expurgatory, [and] foisting in and obliterating of compositions. Locke concedes every one of these questions were plainly settled and a committee (in their own sense legal) sitting and deciding issues in contention, yet by what means will we know surely that these are their judgments, particularly since the Greek Church almost a long time since

---

<sup>25</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, pp. 43 – 44. Athanasia Glycofrydi-Leontsini begins from the fifteenth century, when the Ottoman Turks vanquished Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, and the Greek savvy people went into oust in the West. Managing issues of instructive changes and with philosophical and semantic debates (seventeenth–nineteenth hundreds of years), Athanasia Glycofrydi-Leontsini looks at, efficiently and specifically, the Western impacts that made conceivable the recovery of conventional way of thinking in Greek idea just as the restoration of Greek social character that prompted the Greek War of Independence (1821–1827) and into the cutting edge time of Greek history and scholarly idea. Athanasia Glycofrydi-Leontsini endeavors to present, both verifiably and systematically, the manner in which reasoning had been practiced and created in Modern Greece from the center of the eighteenth century to the furthest limit of the nineteenth century regarding its way of life and history. It intends to acquaint the peruser with Neohellenic theory and its particular attributes, and to familiarize her with the undertakings of numerous exceptional Greek educated people to proceed with the Hellenic philosophical and social convention, returning to Greek Antiquity that had been sent through the Byzantine learning, while, simultaneously, to join into their reasoning Western philosophical customs. Athanasia Glycofrydi-Leontsini, Neohellenic Philosophy from

charged the Roman for driving a standard into the Nicene Councils for benefit of the pope's being top of the all-inclusive church, which would never be found in the true duplicates, however the African religious administrators shipped off Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch to look for them.<sup>27</sup>

Yet, finally it was figured fit that on the off chance that they would proceed in that benefit they should come and get the ceremony in his house of prayer directed there by his clergyman to the order of the Church of England. Of which they are having notice they likewise came. A few Protestants not of the Church of England occupant at Constantinople, had leave of Sir J. Finch, the English representative there, to have a room in his home to meet to ask in, they are by and large generally of the French church. Yet, introduced themselves to get it as indicated by the few designs of their holy places or influences of their own personalities, some sitting and some standing, however the representative and all the typical assemblage of the English there had gotten it stooping.<sup>28</sup>

Islam, whenever considered and decided with no predisposition or bias, can legitimately profess to have dispatched and drilled an all-inclusive mission of common liberties; particularly of opportunity, equity, poise, and regard for human life, over fourteen centuries prior. The Qur'anic lessons strongly stress the importance of human reality in all parts of existence with no racial, strict, or socio-political biases. Truth be told, Islam in various settings underlines the requirement for teaching of tolerance. Its' prime qualities, for example, opportunity, equity, balance, sympathy, regard forever, nobility of man, goodness, and so forth, are personally connected to man's chronicled journey for a culture of tolerance. Indeed, these qualities are equally fortified by the way of life of tolerance. The trademark highlights of the Islamic religion are grounded in harmony and altruism. It appoints us to

Enlightenment to Romanticism", in *Journal of Philosophical Research* 40, Issue Supplement (2015), Selected Papers from the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy, p. 339. DOI: 10.5840/jpr201540Supplement40.

<sup>26</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 44.

<sup>27</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, pp. 123 – 124. John Locke believes that genuine religion is on all hands recognized to be so much the worry and enthusiasm of all humankind, that nothing can be named, which so much solidly bespeaks the support and favor of the general population. The very qualifying one's self for that sets a man on the correct side. This bit of leeway you have made sure about to yourself from scatterbrained perusers as much as by the regularly rehashed notice of the genuine religion is conceivable, there being scant a page wherein the genuine religion doesn't show up, as though you didn't have anything else in your considerations, however the carrying men to it for the salvation of their spirits. Regardless of whether it be so decisively, we will presently observe. John Locke, *The Works of John Locke in Nine Volumes*, (London: Rivington, 1824 12th ed.). Vol. 5, p. 317. 12/20/2017. <<http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/764>>

<sup>28</sup> John Locke, *A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings*, p. 129 – 130.



carry on earnestly and cordial with every single individual and has painstakingly explained upon common liberties and obligations since its commencement. As indicated by the Islamic lessons, tolerance advances equity and kindness towards Gods' animals. The profound edification of man, which is one of the prime targets of the Qur'an, cannot be advanced in a climate of narrow mindedness. With respect to the Qur'an stresses that we ought to receive it as an ethical ideal. Allah orders individuals to be simply towards each other and keeping in mind that deciding concerning man and man judge justly,6 for God cherishes the individuals who judge reasonably.<sup>29</sup>

Which critical affirmation that bowing was no basic piece of accepting the Lord's dinner and no fundamental piece of love, had so ground-breaking an impact upon them, that when he came subsequently to give them the cup, they of their own agreements got it each one bowing. Thusly, if it was somewhat more drilled, would maybe be discovered the most Christian as well as the most useful approach to carry men to congruity. In any case, the cleric figured he was unable to decline it [to] anybody that came gravely and genuinely to get it for any stance he introduced himself in, and hence regulated the bread to them all.<sup>30</sup>

## VII. CONCLUSION:

Through advanced research, the philosopher John Locke understood Islam that it is minimal and that he did not consider Muslims' situation in all parts of the world. Still, instead, he was satisfied with looking at Muslims in the Ottoman Empire in his time.

The other, more important matter, which we see as a weakness in the philosopher Locke's view on Islam, is that he did not examine Islam through its two primary sources, the Qur'an, the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad. The revelation in the Qur'an and the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad. Muslims are human beings who belong to Islam but do not represent the truth of Islam.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abdul Rahman, Nur Farhana & Khadijah Mohd Khambali@Hambal, "Religious Tolerance in Malaysia: Problems and Challenges," in International Journal of Islamic Thought 3: (June) 2013.
- [2] Kazmi, Syed L Atif Hussain, "An Essay on the Place of Tolerance in Islam," in Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies (Winter 2009), II, No. 1.
- [3] Bianchi, D., "Some sources for a history of English Socinianism a bibliography of 17th century English Socinian writings," in Topoi: An

- International Review of Philosophy (1985) 4: 91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138653>
- [4] Durst, David, The Limits of Toleration in John Locke's Liberal Thought, in Res Publica 7, Issue 1 (January 2001), pp. 39. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009603216167>
- [5] Fagiani, Francesco, "Natural law and history in Locke's theory of distributive justice," in Topoi: An International Review of Philosophy (1983) 2: 163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00142490>
- [6] Faruqui, Shad Saleem, Islam, International Law and War against Terrorism (Kuala Lumpur: University Publication Centre, Universiti Teknologi MARA).
- [7] Hsueh, Vicki, "Cultivating and Challenging the Common: Lockean Property, Indigenous Traditionalisms, and the Problem of Exclusion," in Contemporary Political Theory (May 2006) 5, Issue 2. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.cpt.9300233>
- [8] Hollenbach, David, S. J., "Comparative Ethics, Islam, And Human Rights Internal Pluralism and the Possible Development of Tradition," in Journal of Religious Ethics 38 no 3 (Sep 2010).
- [9] Glycofyridi-Leontsini, Athanasia Neohellenic Philosophy from Enlightenment to Romanticism", in Journal of Philosophical Research 40, Issue Supplement (2015), Selected Papers from the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy, p. 339. DOI: 10.5840/jpr201540Supplement40.
- [10] Lewis, Bernard Ellis, Buntzie Ellis Churchill, Islam: The Religion and the People (New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008).
- [11] Locke, John, A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings, edited and with an Introduction by Mark Goldie (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2010), p. 10. 12/5/2017. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/2375>
- [12] Locke, John, The Works of John Locke in Nine Volumes, (London: Rivington, 1824 12th ed.). Vol. 5, p. 317. 12/20/2017. <<http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/764>>
- [13] Marshall, John, John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- [14] Preston-Roedder, Ryan, "Civic Trust," in Philosophers' Imprints 17, NO. 4 (FEBRUARY 2017), p. 1. Permalink: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3521354.0017.004>
- [15] Samad, Joy, "John Locke and Muslim Liberalism," in Journal of Church and State (Winter, 2011), 53 Issue 1.
- [16] Samad, Joy, "John Locke and Muslim Liberalism," in Journal of Church and State (Winter, 2011), 53 Issue 1
- [17] Simonds, Roger T., "John Locke's use of classical legal theory," in International Journal of the Classical Tradition (March 1997), 3, Issue 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12138-997-0009-3>
- [18] Suleri, Ziauddin Ahmad, Influence of Islam on World Civilization (Karachi: Royal Book Co., 1994).

## AUTHORS

**First Author** – Rawaa Mahmoud Hussain (Ph.D.)  
Rawaahussain1@gmail.com

<sup>29</sup> Syed Latif Hussain Kazmi, "An Essay on the Place of Tolerance" in *Islam Journal of Shi'a Islamic Studies op. cit.*, p. 30

<sup>30</sup> John Locke, A Letter concerning Toleration and Other Writings, p. 130.