

Equality and Freedom in Educational Institutions: An Overview of Religious Tolerance in Indonesia

U. P. Charles Silalahi

Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University,
Jl. Olahraga, Caturtunggal, Kec. Depok, Kabupaten Sleman, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 55281.

Corresponding author

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to examine religious tolerance in educational institutions from the perspective of John Locke. The main question that guides this research is: how to create religious tolerance in educational institutions in Indonesia? Using an objective historical approach to John Locke's thoughts, the author will review the issue of equality and freedom of religion in Indonesian educational institutions. The main results of this study state that there are still several facts of intolerance in educational institutions in Indonesia. Moreover, political forces deliberately maintain intolerance in educational institutions for the continuity of political power. Politicians exploit social differences as a means of attaining political populism. Thus to avoid intolerance in educational institutions, there must be a strict separation between political power and religion. Religion must be encouraged in the private sphere. Likewise, with religious attributes that should be private, their interests are accommodated in an educational institution within the limits of respecting freedom and equality. Thus, any regional regulations in the form of uniformity according to certain religious symbols must be repositioned because it is not in the spirit of togetherness and diversity.

Keywords: Educational Institutions, Equality, Freedom, John Locke, Religious Tolerance.

Introduction

The conflict based on the uniformity of these religious attributes exists in circularity. Incidents like this keep happening and never stop. Their appearance often causes tension in society. Moreover, this tension exists because of the debate about how to structure a good education. However, the state has regulated this through law.

Nevertheless, in practice, each region applies it differently. Local governments apply these different rules to maintain local content in the curriculum (Hamdi 2020). Therein lies the beginning of the application of excess value over others. Local content, which is part of this curriculum, meets political interests for the sake of populism.

Moreover, when the local government makes local content based on religion as a rule for heterogeneous coexistence, it will create tension (Azra 2018). This phenomenon requires an

excellent attitude to reach a common consensus. That the nation's life has been built based on the agreement of the nation's founders. Moreover, since the beginning of independence, the life of the nation and state has been built because of multiculturalism. The tension in society does not undermine the awareness of living together and becomes a dangerous trap in the state's life. Thus, equality and freedom in education are absolute requirements amid the complexity of the population. Is uniforming religion-based concepts in the world of education the best way out, or is there still a way out that can be thought of as a shared concept rather than just the arrogance of local wisdom which requires excessive explanation?

Because segregation in education institutions discriminates against people belonging to specific categories to enjoy the full right to education, this violation violates fundamental human rights. Discrimination in these educational institutions can

be in the form of ethnicity, gender, age, gender, race, economic condition, disability, and religion (<https://www.kemenkumham.go.id>). Moreover, the tension that has occurred recently in West Sumatra and Bantul based on the uniformity of school uniforms based on religious attributes has spurred us to rethink diversity in educational institutions (Afifa 2021; Hendaradi 2021; Wargadiredja 2019). Has education so far been directed towards its fundamental goal, to encourage dignified humanity, which sees others as unique entities with equality and freedom before the Creator? Therefore, the author is interested in exploring Locke's thoughts about education, political power, and fundamental human rights to find ways to tame religious fanaticism in educational institutions. So from an early age, students learn to live side by side without destroying the identity and culture they want to promote (Dirgantoro 2021).

Locke's thoughts are still relevant as a formal basis for seeing how should place religion concerning educational institutions. John Locke was a philosopher and politician. He had experienced the dark times in the civil war in England, where politicians used religion to maintain political power (Forster 2005). As a result, millions lost lives over the two civil wars. Politicians have polarized religious people and used these differences for their interests (Donagan 1994). Moreover, Locke wrote his views on political philosophy based on this context.

Moreover, trying to tame religious fanaticism to find a balance point in harmony with common interests. The question is, how to create religious tolerance in educational institutions in Indonesia? The author tries to find a common concept so that cases of intolerance do not recur. So it is also necessary to consider the extent to which political power and fundamental human rights meet in educational institutions and when political power as an authority can force citizens to submit to it. Has uniformity in educational institutions crossed the boundaries of students' rights? The author investigates this to find a meeting point connecting local wisdom with students' fundamental rights. Moreover, the results of this research can be a

reference for stakeholders in drafting rules and society in general as a basis.

Methodology

This research is library research which refers to the factual historical research model to explore the texts, manuscripts, and books of John Locke's philosophy. The data from this research also comes from other texts, manuscripts, and books, especially from Lockean as a response to John Locke's thinking. Then the author investigates equality and human freedom to provide a solution to religious tolerance in educational institutions. (Bakker and Zubair 1990). The author describes John Locke's thoughts precisely by collecting scattered materials regarding texts, manuscripts, books, and monographs (Bakker and Zubair 1990). This research seeks to see equality and freedom from its fundamental nature. Also, see how the best relationship between political power and religion. Then try to make it relevant in the Indonesian context. The author attempts to find a new way to address the issue of equality and freedom in educational institutions in Indonesia based on elements and assumptions from John Locke's perspective.

Results and Discussion

Laying Out the Fundamentals

John Locke (1632 – 1704) was a philosopher and social-political thinker who lived during the turmoil of the civil revolution in England, where the revolution had shattered the foundations of everyday life. The Puritan revolution in 1642-1646 brought Locke's awareness that religion was also used as a political vehicle to control government. Furthermore, the second civil war occurred in 1648, and the third in 1650-1651 became a starting point for Locke's thoughts about people and the world in which they live. From this contextual foundation, Locke begins to understand what is most needed by humans in living life after much bloodshed has occurred. The dimensions of his thoughts touch on many aspects, including education. The core

thought that he put into the social contract rests on human rights as a place guarantee for individuals and the state (Locke 1980; Hall 2011). Locke explained that the idea of a state based on a social contract would foster a relationship of mutual respect and respect between those who agree with it. This social contract was, at the same time, an answer to many cases of intolerance that occurred at that time between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Church. The Puritan Reformers had written a bad history in England and Europe then (Dunn 1995). In contrast, the persecution, destruction, torture, and killing that occurred also used religion as justification, even though they came from the same teachings (Locke 2003; Bradstock 2011). Whereas religious dogmatics entering the public sphere has dangerous potential, the cases of Giordano Bruno and Galileo Galilei, as described by Sudiarja, are one example of the ferocity of religious dogmatics entering the public sphere (Sudiarja 2018).

Locke's thought is a criticism of the views of Sir Robert Filmer, a supporter of Charles 1 who based his insights that power does not come from agreements, nor is it a consideration of the public good, but the full authority of the father over his son. For Filmer, the king is the heir to Adam's throne, and the natural rights of a king are the same as those of a father. Therefore, the king has the right to rule because his power comes from the divine nature (Butler 1978). He poured Filmer's thoughts into Patriarcha, who opposed public opinion then. Patriarcha herself assumed an atmosphere of conflict about the origins of government, the need for obedience, prerogatives, oaths, and the like (Wallace 1980). For Locke, the inheritance of power from father to son cannot be a basis for legitimizing political power. Suppose the basis for giving power is the father's lineage. In that case, there will be an injustice to the eldest son, which is difficult to avoid because the inheritance system has based on the monarchy. For Locke, the power of parents over their children, which Filmer uses to stretch his thoughts, is absurd. However, the father's power over the child is temporary, only within certain age limits. This kind of power does not extend to the property the child acquires when he releases himself from parental authority (Russell

2020). In the Second Treatise On Government, written shortly before the 1688 revolution, Locke provides a systematic and comprehensive answer to Filmer's views. He accepts the concept of inheritance from father to son from an economic perspective because it is private. Locke opposed the political dimension of the inheritance of power from father to son as a symbol of divine power. The primary purpose of establishing a discussion with Filmer is to prove the difference between parental power and political power (Locke 1989).

Locke provides a solid foundation for managing political power in terms of multiple interests. The idea of separating the private and public spheres for Locke is due more to part suppositions. These part suppositions caused the excessive claim of a group from others as a climb to achieve power over others (Locke 2003). This kind of domination gives birth to tyrants who justify any means for their political goals. Moreover, based on this description, we can recognize Locke's building of thought based on separation of powers, belief in government representatives, resistance to all forms of tyranny, insistence on the rule of law, how to build tolerance, and limited government powers.

Moreover, private gain serves the common good and the free development and application of knowledge (Tarcov 1984). For Locke, the idea of sharing political power builds a healthy democracy. Thus, any dimension that intersects with education, be it ideology, politics, or belief in certain religions, must be privatized and is more aimed at regulating the person in terms of virtue and piety. An action must not be born by forcing others to admit something they did not believe (Locke 2003). The social contract becomes a kind of religion without revelation to become the basis for the existence of diversity which can be the foundation for the state to manage many interests.

For Locke, natural law is a universal principle that regulates how humans should behave. Locke's essay on The Laws of Nature derives from his predecessors, such as Pufendorf, Grotius, Hooker, and Suarez. This natural law essay is the primary norm of human behavior (Stuart 2016). In this, natural law attached one's obligations to others (Fink 2019). It was on the things above that Locke founded his liberal politics that everyone naturally

has freedom and equality. Locke's political views in recent decades have inevitably become demands because the separation of powers is an attempt to avoid totalitarianism, which ascribes royal power to divine law. Locke laid the foundation for political liberalism by guaranteeing individual rights and freedom of speech.

This political view has been elaborated in many countries on the demands of human rights and found its best form in America (Locke 1993). In England, Locke's thought was a philosophical justification for political designs. Locke's thought was a justification for revolution against tyranny (Fink 2019). However, only a few Lockean thinkers have replicated Locke's thinking and contextualized these ideas according to the times. The most compelling examples of Locke's thought are related to religious intolerance, proposing and separating a civil and religious government. The civil government only refers to the civic affairs of citizens because it refers to the present dimension in which people live and live and not to eschatological matters of believing in heavenly promises (Locke 2003).

Separation of Political and Religious Powers.

This separation is meant to avoid political interests that use religion to smooth out interests. However, the idea of separation between religion and the state still encounters difficulties due to the tug-of-war of interests. In the educational institutions themselves, Indonesia adheres to multi-ideology, which still maintains conservatism to underlie the building of its thoughts, where morality remains the cornerstone of educational attainment. Besides that, ethnic diversity is a lever for implementing ethnic nationalism and adopting the language and cultural diversity into the curriculum (Law Number (No) 20 of 2003, article 37 paragraph 1 and article 38 paragraph 2). In several places in this country, there are still homogeneity-based overriding values originating from elements of religion and ethnic nationalism.

For Locke, in a pluralistic society where beliefs vary, it is not permissible for a person or group to force their interpretation of certain scriptures by bringing them into the public domain. Stuart's obsession with forcing the uniformity of religious

populations with different beliefs and dogmatics at that time became the background for Locke's views (Stuart 2016). For Locke, no individual has the right in any way to harm other people to enjoy their civil rights. The privileges that belonged to him as a human were inviolable, and he had to maintain them as his own. Therefore, no violence or injury can damage the identity of someone who adheres to a particular religion or dogmatics. Therefore, no violence or injury can damage the identity of someone who adheres to a particular religion or certain dogmatics. We must not be satisfied with narrow measures of injustice because equality and freedom are the natural rights of every human being (Locke 2003; Fink 2019).

Furthermore, religion should be the foundation that strengthens this necessity by not widening differences into an impassable chasm. Thus, humanity-based education is inevitable as a necessity to accommodate ethnicity so that uniformity does not castrate the most fundamental human rights. For Locke, religious institutions are free from any political affiliation anywhere. Moreover, peace, equality, and friendship must always be obeyed by these institutions in the same way as people without domination over one another do.

For Locke, civil power has the same style everywhere, that every right inherited from a king should not be a justification for imposing choices not left to the state. Provisions of faith must not enter the public domain, and eschatological studies of right and wrong in a particular religious perspective must not become a reference for imposing will in the name of regulation in the public domain. For Locke, this kind of policy is philosophically flawed even though it has legality according to the law (Locke 2003). This view reflected the British situation, where religion and culture separated people (Stuart 2016). The defenders of religion, who build a warm relationship with God, are violent people, who oppose differences and are willing to do anything for the sake of uniformity, and think this is the only correct method. For Locke, religious authority arises from religion, must be limited within religious boundaries, and cannot be extended in any way to interfere with civil affairs because

religious institutions have a structure and purpose different from the state. Therefore, no one, even with a dignified religious position, can take away the rights of other people, both from their faith group and those who are not from their faith group. Moreover, public officials must be able to distinguish the distinction and clarity between their duties as public officials and their duties as adherents of religion (Locke 2003).

On the other hand, religious institutions have to repress sectarian egos, the fiery desire for the recognition of truth. Discourses of peace and tolerance should fill the pulpit. Religious institutions must be capable of resisting violence and avoiding things that are not good, even for those who are ungrateful (Locke 2003). The duty of religious leaders is not to educate their faithful caught up in narrow fanaticism that does not have the patience to abstain from violence. However, the maintenance of each person's soul belongs to himself, and everyone is responsible for it and bound according to the way they choose (Locke 2003). Respect for these private rights will provide a limit for someone not to be a judge of others. In a broader context, the state may not interfere in matters of private nature as long as this does not interfere with the rights of others and tarnish common interests. As described by Locke, the history of England has provided an example of how religion used to destroy togetherness (Locke 2003).

Good medicine is not only able to heal, but there is acceptance in the body of the drug. John Locke uses this analogy to a ruler who wants to impose rites on a particular religion on his people through rules. Locke wrote *The Two Treatises of the Government* shortly before the English Revolution in 1688 to combat absolutism. (Fink 2019). Coercion is not good because it damages the conscience. For Locke, let everyone do something of their own free will, not at the authorities' insistence through regulation (Locke 2003). That is good from the authorities' perspective and should recognize fundamental human rights elements. Even though the rules are coercive and become a reference for shared behavior, the rules must consider the common consensus. Local governments must discuss it before enacting it so that the rules are

more accommodative, moving from the bottom up and not vice versa (Finlayson 2005). Therefore, forcing things on everyone else would be against their judgment. Moreover, imposing specific attributes on others is an act that is contrary to human equality and freedom (Locke 2003).

What Locke meant by freedom certainly touches on the dimension of the free will of the fully autonomous individual and the efficient cause of his actions. The coercion of certain beliefs and rituals gives rise to actions not based on personal interest directed at something. Political power can force certain religious rites and rules in the name of local wisdom. However, it hurts the conscience because it was born based on a formality of action that overrides individual rights (Locke 2003). Locke opposed tyranny and arbitrary political power as a safeguard against the civil rights of citizens (Tarcov 1984).

Locke corrects this kind of spirituality by asking the question: can we incorporate into religious worship and formal rules born of compulsion? Someone who worships God, of course, by design to please Him, to serve Him. Nevertheless, if the idea of doing so is not from self-autonomy, but from the determinism of power through regulation, can it be said that the action is good for him? For Locke, this kind of action is not to please God, but to voluntarily and knowingly provoke God and is an absolute insult and utterly disgusting to the very nature and purpose of worship. So the homogenization of school uniforms which affirms their devotion to religion must consider the dimension of the action, which is designed to please God, but ignores the dimension of human autonomy, which is free to determine its actions. That means the purpose of his dedication to religious rules failed on his own because he neglected the dimension of human autonomy.

Political power also does not have the power to prohibit the use of rituals accepted, approved, and practiced by a place of worship. Political powers must know that the purpose of spiritual institutions is limited to worshiping God and preparing their people in eschatological terms. So the rules regarding religion are limited to control over private rights, which cannot harm and injure the fundamental rights of humans or other

religious groups (Locke 2003). For Locke, religion has the right and freedom to regulate its way of worship. Moreover, political power should not interfere in private matters because the mixing of private affairs is prone to exploitation by political interests. So, political power with the power it has must always be careful so that it does not abuse its authority, to suppress any religion under the pretext of local wisdom. In his Letter on Toleration, Locke uses his treatise against religious persecution by emphasizing that the authority of civil government is limited to the body concerning one's life, freedom, freedom from pain, health, and property. At the same time, the soul or the truth about it is not the domain of power. In this respect, Locke's idea against patriarchy is that the authorities treat adults as children, ignoring their rationality as independent and autonomous adults (Tarcov 1984).

Just as political power does not have the power to force rites in any context against a particular religion, political power does not have the power to prohibit the use of rituals that a place of worship has accepted. Political powers must know that the primary goal of spiritual institutions is to prepare their people in eschatological terms. So the rules regarding religion are limited to controlling private rights and may not injure fundamental human rights (Locke 2003). For Locke, every religion has the right and freedom to regulate its worship because the mixing of private affairs is prone to exploitation by political interests. Thus, political power must always be careful so that it does not abuse its authority to suppress any religion under the pretext of local wisdom. In his Letter on Toleration, Locke used his treatise against religious persecution by emphasizing the authority of civil government confined to the body concerning one's life, liberty, freedom from pain, health, and property. Meanwhile, the soul or the truth about it is not the realm of power. Locke's idea against patriarchy is also linked to this, that power treats adults as children, ignoring their rationality as independent and self-sufficient adults (Tarcov 1984).

Every religion certainly requires the duty of kindness by promoting the salvation of other people's souls based on their religion. However,

every form of coercion must be derived from the conception of the people's thinking that no one is obliged in that way to obey anyone's orders, so long as he is not convinced to do so. Everyone within that limit can judge himself and produce actions based on that assessment (Locke 2003). This provision guaranteed everyone's private property for peace and their rights from invasion by others. Thus, we must understand that political power is directed at the good of the world and the external prosperity of society. This prosperity of a society is the only reason humans enter society and the only thing they seek and aim for in it without denying their spiritual dimension (Locke 2003).

Equality and Freedom and Their Relevance to Indonesianness.

The government makes legal rules to regulate the public interest, but the rules made by the government must follow one's conscience. So, we can consider two things. First, the rule must not exceed its authority. In this case, the people must obey these rules. However, if the government makes rules that exceed its authority, forcing someone to follow procedures other than their beliefs, then the people are not obliged to obey these rules. According to Locke, a Fiduciary government can be resisted if the government has dissolved by undermining its trust (Stuart 2016). Political society is institutionalized for other purposes, namely securing everyone on matters related to their existence in the world.

Moreover, religious eschatological affairs are ultimately left to themselves, and political power may not enter that area (Locke 2003). Restrictions on complying with these rules as a criticism so that people obey the law following the philosophical framework that composes it. The people also have the right to fight against the rules that suppress their natural freedom. Political power cannot judge whether religion is right or wrong, sinful or innocent, because this measure is biased and subjective, depending on the structure of interests that compose it. Political power has a role in ensuring civil rights in the life of the nation and the state.

For Locke, the pulpit is not a breeding ground for factions and sedition from which objections to

the doctrine of tolerance stem. All these forms of accusations will soon stop and not develop if the law of tolerance is appropriately resolved. So that all religions are obliged to put tolerance as the basis of their freedom and teach that freedom of conscience is the natural right of every human being, which people with different opinions own just like themselves (Locke 2003). Because if someone is involved in a seditious conspiracy, it is not their religion that inspires them, but their suffering and oppression that makes them want to relieve themselves. In any part of the world, if the government is fair and moderate, countries are safe and happy. Oddly enough, religious Indonesia ranks, 82nd in the index of the happiest countries in the world issued by the world happiness report (Helliwell et al. 2022). That means there is an inappropriate relationship between happiness and religion. Religion should be able to encourage the happiness of its adherents unless religion is used to silence people so they do not fight against power over poverty and oppression. For Locke, this oppression drives turmoil to occur, and this situation makes humans struggle to get rid of the uncomfortable yoke of tyranny. Furthermore, unfortunately, sedition often appears by using religion as a strategy and a tool to achieve goals. Moreover, the frenzy of opinion that is created does not come from the unique character of a particular religion or a particular religious society, but from the general nature of human beings, who, when groaning under a heavy burden, try naturally to throw off the yoke that weighs down their necks (Locke 2003).

Diversity is not a source of conflict and cannot be used as a basis for uniformity because diversity is necessary (Silalahi 2022). Locke's argument is built based on the *Principium individuationis*, namely the principle of individuation which is an intrinsic factor evident in a single object and causes the individuality of that object, meaning that each existence has a unique value from the others (Locke 1999). So diversity cannot be used as a basis for conflict and hostility. The rejection of tolerance comes from differences as the reason people are busy taking up arms to fight. In Western history, wars used religion as a justification as political leaders were eager for power (Locke 2003).

Religion and power can go hand in hand if there are clear boundaries between them, and the objectification of it goes to advance human beings from two different sides, physically and spiritually. Political power must not ignore that its task is to regulate civil society toward justice and social welfare and to develop human beings from a physical perspective.

Moreover, the pulpit, which builds humanity from a spiritual point of view, should be filled with a dream to promote tolerance and harmony among people and not excite people with a desire to arm themselves and fight against those who are different. Because when he has finished fighting different things outside himself, different ones will reappear in that part of him. Self-control for the welfare of others is needed as an ethic in the context of living together.

For Locke, this foundation of religion-based morality plays an essential role in education. The goodness of God must be instilled in schools in the form of love and obedience to Him (Tarcov 1984). However, each person or group can express their way of worship. Moreover, the state should facilitate such things and not go too far to deal with the inner life of a person or another group. Whether they kneel or stand or wear black or white clothes, as long as they do not interfere with the rights of others and public order, let them have independence in managing their spiritual household (Locke 2003). The task of political power, in this case, stakeholders, is to promote the clarity of these boundaries to other groups so that they do not break through barriers in any name, including domination. The state has to regulate all aspects of life together to run in harmony, so political power must guarantee that the pulpit is not a place for weak and vulnerable people to be incited by the interests of a few people who use religion as a way of resistance.

However, Locke cares about education because it can develop the human potential for the better, but on the other hand, it can happen the other way around. Bad things can damage education. One of these philosophical aspects is, of course, born from Locke's concept of humans who are born as *tabula rasa*: blank sheets that gradually develop due to experience. These concepts explain why Locke saw

education as an essential activity that merits particular attention: education means helping to fill the void with knowledge and morality. Education, in turn, means that educators must maintain knowledge and behavior because it will be helpful both for the students and society (Locke 1693).

Education must develop aspects of kindness or love towards others, and politeness is an expression of goodwill towards others or a disposition not to offend them. In contrast, freedom is the readiness to give to others and humanity, which rests on the reluctance to cause pain to others. There is a relationship between virtue and freedom as the basis of justice (Locke 1779; Tarcov 1984). The foundation of Locke's educational value point is self-denial which must be built because of dependence on habituation and the power of reason that encourages actions to be carried out based on rules, principles, knowledge, and moral education. Applying the concept of divinity as the foundation of morality in education must recognize the natural side of humans, where it originates and is attached to the rights given. The divine principle should not be used as a basis to castrate the rights of others. Nevertheless, on the contrary, it must uphold human beings as God's creatures who have autonomy and freedom based on their right to life.

The foundation of this divinity-based morality contains recognition of the general principles of diversity and is the ethical foundation in the world of education. Meanwhile, its philosophical foundation must rest on freedom, equality, and social justice. That action and rule must recognize the natural dimension of man to be free to determine certain rites that he believes in and various dimensions of the beliefs that he believes in. Furthermore, to avoid bringing up religion-based persecution in the world of education, regional regulations in the form of local regulations and other regulations may not include the principles of one religion as a basis for uniformity for adherents of other religions. The author encourages the application of religion in the world of education to the private sphere so that there is no excessive application of values, which often disrupts diversity. Regional regulations should be more aimed at regulating coexistence by being a

limit to fundamental human rights. Based on those regulations, they create an understanding through rules so that those differences of opinion are not used as a basis for judgment and persecution. That means that claims of religious exclusivity are placed in the private sphere, accommodated in regional regulations as the state's recognition of equality, freedom, and social justice.

Conclusion

This study departs from the central question: how to create religious tolerance in educational institutions in Indonesia? Based on the description of the main questions, the authors found the following things. Whereas interests deliberately treat the symptoms of intolerance in the world of education as an effort to gain opinion and maintain domination and power by processing existing differences as a way for political populism. Politicians also use this religious image as an effort to build their self-image. For if the image of his religion is good, it will have a bearing on the continuity of his political power. On the other hand, religious dogmatics is also used to silence the failure of political power to eradicate poverty, oppression, and economic injustice, so that people accept the fate that has been outlined. Furthermore, to justify its failure, political power lulls the people to sleep by accommodating religious-based rules into the public sphere in the name of local identity.

The conclusion is that morality is essential and forms the basis for a civilized human being. So humans must be educated to know who created the universe in which they live. Furthermore, the religious dimension that intersects with education cannot be separated from the natural law attached to individuals as the basis for their natural rights. It means that acknowledging God as the foundation of morality in education must not ignore the diversity of ways of approaching God. Furthermore, political power must understand that the history of the uniformity of rites and specific ways of approaching religion has given rise to prolonged conflicts. So, political power must make clear boundaries for the diversity that occurs and not play in this realm for the sake of political

populism. They must be able to distinguish between their position as a public official in charge of various beliefs and their position as followers of a particular religion. So the aspirations they accommodate must touch the dimensions of shared life, which do not ignore the genuine interests of individuals.

The contribution that can be made to this research is: that regional regulations must touch the dimensions of respect for equality and human freedom. Furthermore, every rule that does not carry that spirit must be repositioned. Because the state was born from a shared consensus, the consequence is that the state must accept the diversity that shapes it. The state must remember the historical and philosophical foundations of its existence. Thus, as a diversity foundation that adopts local values, local wisdom must recognize the human ontological structure. Humans have autonomy and freedom to determine how they approach their creator. This understanding must be promoted and grounded at the level of educators as a condition that tolerance is a shared religion that complements personal beliefs in communal life. From this respect was born the attitude of respecting differences as a characteristic that forms togetherness. So, within this framework, John Locke's thought can be elaborated as a straightforward way to separate religion from political power to tame religious fanaticism, even though the road to get there is still steep. However, religion must be pushed into the private sphere to enter its rightful place. Therefore, even religious attributes should be private and accommodated in education with respect for human equality and freedom. A person has autonomy and freedom to determine what he wants to use to represent his beliefs. Thus, the description of the author's thoughts resulted from the development of John Locke's views. Considering that this research is only limited to three components, the authors hope there will be further research to develop and perfect this research.

Conflict of Interest: By my ethical obligations as a researcher, I report that I have no financial or business interests that may influence research reported in this paper.

References

- Bennett, Martyn. 2000. *The Civil Wars Experienced Britain and Ireland, 1638–6*. Routledge, London.
- Bradstock, Andrew. 2011. *Radical Religion in Cromwell's England: A Concise History from the English Civil War to the End of the Commonwealth*. I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, London.
- Butler, Melissa A. 1978. Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy. *The American Political Science Review* 72: 135-150.
- Crowley, John E. 1986. Inheritance and Generational Privilege in Locke's Two Treatises of Government. *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques* 13:377-392.
- Donagan, Barbara. 1994. Did Ministers Matter? War and Religion in England, 1642-1649. *Journal of British Studies* 33:119-156.
- Dunn, John. *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of the Argument of the Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fink, Hans. 2019. *Filsafat Sosial Dari Feodalisme Hingga Pasar Bebas Cetakan Ke IV*. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- Finlayson, James Gordon. 2005. *Habermas, A Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Forster, Greg. 2005. *John Locke's Politics of Moral Consensus*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Locke, John. 1693. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*. J and R. Tonson, London.
- Locke, John. 1980. *Second Treatise of Government*. Hackett Publishing Company, Cambridge.
- Locke, John. 1989. Locke on Parental Power. *Population and Development Review* 15:749-757.
- Locke, John. 1993. *Political Writings* Edited by David Wootton. New American Library, New York.
- Locke, John. 1999. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* edited by Jim Manis. The Pennsylvania State University Press, United State of Amerika.
- Locke, John. 2003. *Two Treatises of Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration*. Yale University Press, London.
- Morrill, John. 1984. *Stuart Britain: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Russell, Bertrand. 2020. *Sejarah Filsafat Barat Edisi V*. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- Silalahi, U. P. C. 2022. *Sejenak Memikirkan Seyyed Hossein Nasr*. OSF Preprints.
- Sudiarja, A. 2018. *Bayang-Bayang Kebijakan Dan Kemanusiaan*. Kompas, Jakarta.

Stuart, Matthew. 2016. *A Companion to Locke*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, West Sussex, United Kingdom.

Tarcov, Nathan. 1984. *Locke's Education for Liberty*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Internet Source:

Afifa, Laila . 2021. Uniforms for Diversity. <https://en.tempo.co/read/1439414/uniforms-for-diversity>

Azra, Azyumardi. 2018. Perda Agama. <https://www.kompas.id/baca/opini/2018/11/29/perda-agama/>

Baraas, Ahmad and Ramadhan, Bilal. 2014. Komnas HAM: Pelarangan Jilbab Terjadi Hampir di Seluruh Bali. <https://www.republika.co.id/berita/n1c9xr/komnas-ham-pelarangan-jilbab-terjadi-hampir-di-seluruh-bali>

Dirgantoro, Ganet. 2021. Pengamat: Intoleransi Di Dunia Pendidikan Harus Segera Dihapuskan. <https://banten.antaranews.com/berita/172310/pengamat-intoleransi-di-dunia-pendidikan-harus-segera-dihapuskan>

Hamdi, Mujtaba. 2020. Laporan Tahunan Kemerdekaan Beragama/Berkeyakinan (KBB) Tahun 2019 di Indonesia. https://wahidfoundation.org/source/laporantahunan/Laporan_KBB_2019-eBook1.pdf

Hendardi. 2021. Laporan Kondisi Kebebasan Beragama/Berkeyakinan Di Indonesia Tahun 2020. <https://setara-institute.org/category/area-riiset/kebebasan-beragama/>

Helliwell, John F., Layard, Richard., Jeffrey D., De Neve, Jan-Emmanuel, Aknin, Lara B., and Wang, Shun. World Happiness Report 2022. <https://happiness-report.s3.amazonaws.com/2022/WHR+22.pdf>

Ramdani. 2022. Pencegahan Intoleransi di Dunia Pendidikan Tanggung Jawab Semua Pihak. <https://mediaindonesia.com/humaniora/512776/pencegahan-intoleransi-di-dunia-pendidikan-tanggung-jawab-semua-pihak>

Sanusi. 2014. Wamendikbud: Tidak Boleh Ada Larangan Menggunakan Jilbab di Sekolah. <https://www.tribunnews.com/nasional/2014/01/09/wamendikbud-tidak-boleh-ada-larangan-menggunakan-jilbab-di-sekolah>

Wargadiredja, Arzia Tivany. 2019. Kasus Sekolah Negeri 'Paksa' Pelajar Pakai Hijab Terdeteksi di 24 Provinsi Indonesia.

<https://www.vice.com/id/article/neayeg/kasus-sekolah-negeri-paksa-pelajar-pakai-hijab-terdeteksi-di-24-provinsi-indonesia>

Law Source:

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

UU No. 43 Tahun 1999 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1974 Tentang Pokok-Pokok Kpegawaian.

UU No. 22 tahun 1999 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.

UU No. 20 tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional.

UU No. 39 tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia.

Peraturan pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 tahun 2005 tentang Standar Pendidikan Nasional.

Landasan kurikulum muatan lokal diatur dalam Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 79 Tahun 2014 Tentang Muatan Lokal Kurikulum 2013.

Instruksi Walikota No. 451.442/Binsos-III/2005 tentang Pelaksanaan Wirid Remaja Didikan Subuh Dan Anti Togel/ Narkoba Serta Berpakaian Muslim/ Muslimah Bagi Murid/ Siswa SD/ MI, SLTP/ MTS Dan SLTA/ SMK/ MA di Kota Padang.

Surat Keputusan Bupati No. 9 Tahun 2004 tentang Seragam Sekolah SD, SMP, SMU di Kabupaten Pandeglang.

Peraturan Daerah No. 22 Tahun 2003 tentang Berpakaian Muslim dan Muslimah Bagi Siswa, Mahasiswa dan Karyawan di Kabupaten Pasaman.

Surat Edaran Bupati Tahun 2001 tentang Wajib Busana Muslim dan Pandai Baca Al Quran untuk Siswa Sekolah di Kabupaten Indramayu.

Instruksi Bupati No. 4 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemakaian Busana Muslim bagi Siswa dan Mahasiswa di Kabupaten Sukabumi.

Surat Sekda Nomor 450/1019-psk perihal penyebaran Instruksi Bupati Sukabumi Nomor.04 Tahun 2004 perihal pemakaian busana muslim bagi siswa dan mahasiwa di Kabupaten Sukabumi.

Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Pasaman Barat Nomor 07 Tahun 2007 Tentang Berpakaian Muslim dan Muslimah Bagi Siswa dan Karyawan.