RELIGIOUS PLURALISM : A CRITICAL REVIEW

Eva Sadia Saad[*]

Abstract

[One of the most commonly used concepts in contemporary Religious Studies is Religious Pluralism. As the term indicates it is closely related to religious tolerance and minority rights. In recent times it has gained considerable importance because of the increasing diversity of religions in various communities of the world and also because of increasing restlessness in to day's world due to religious conflict. The long tradition of philosophical thinking to strive and achieve a world community of mutual trust and harmony is another reason for sustained investigation in this area. There are, however, various thoughts and ideas which point towards the common goal of religious pluralism; but more often than not such efforts are jeopardized by a variety of different and contradictory theories and hypotheses which makes consensus difficult if not impossible. In this paper an attempt has been made to enumerate all the different view points particularly those related to Christianity and Islam. It will also attempt to analyze religions in their different roles and manifestations. In this sense, we hope, we can identify the different aspects of religion so as to find out the nature of their convergence and divergence.]

* Assistant Professor, Department of World Religions and Culture, University of Dhaka. E-mail: ess_du@hotmail.com

Introduction

Religious pluralism is defined as reconciliation of different beliefs. It indicates also an attempt at the level of a community of multi-religious habitation to live in peace and harmony. However the commonly accepted notion of religious tolerance of the minorities is not necessarily the spirit of religious pluralism. In fact, it is a kind of religious modernism and liberalism which not only prohibits religious persecution but also encourages the mitigation of the differences among different religions through debates and dialogues. It may also be viewed as a form of social obligations of the majority towards the minority. But, here again, the obligations do not belong to the majority alone; it also calls for equal or proportional response from the minorities. The question then arises as to what mechanism can ensure such pluralism to survive? Or to put it differently, how can the belief system of one religion be accommodated with another? The answer to these questions leads us to further involvements in the sense that various world religions have divergent beliefs which defy substantial reconciliation. The question is all the more perplexing when the moral and political structure or a particular religion poses serious threat to another religion. The ultimate question then is whether a particular religion can be divorced from its political or moral belief system? Thus the whole gamut of social, political and religious issues is opened up for renewed assessment. In other words it is an exploration of the possibility of a new type of society which has its genesis in the historical development of western liberalism.

Western liberalism and tolerance

The concept of religious pluralism gained considerable popularity in the face of entrenched intolerance of our contemporary times. But we should bear in mind that pluralism is not an equivalent of tolerance. In fact, tolerance of different opinions about religion lies at the very foundation of political liberalism. Historically in the West political development is closely connected with religious schism, conflicts and wars. In the wake of the religious reform movement of 16th century Europe, reorientation and reorganization of different European states both economically and politically, took place in quick succession. Wars and conflicts totally changed the outlook of the people of this region. Thirty Years War, Glorious Revolution and French Revolution are important milestones. In all these conflicts religion has been profoundly affected in the sense that there had been a steady but radical theological shift from religious bigotry to secular legislation. The religious acrimony among the different sects of Christianity since the days of Reformation led many social and political philosophers to find ways and means to dissipate the hostility. British political philosopher of the 17th century, John Locke, in a prolonged exegesis made strong plea for co-existence and tolerance of different faiths within Christianity. He of course, left 'Jews' and 'Mahometan' out of the orbit of his toleration network since politically those theological precepts are not in consonance with liberalism and freedom of thought of the Western World. It is worth quoting Locke from the original text where he reasoned most forcefully this exclusion of minorities:

> "It is ridiculous for any one to profess himself to be a Mahometan only in his religion, but in everything else a faithful subject to a Christian magistrate, whilst at the same time he acknowledges himself bound to yield blind obedience to the Mufti of Constantinople, who himself is entirely obedient to the Ottoman Emperor frames the *feigned oracle* of that religion according to his pleasure. But this Mahometan living amongst Christians would yet more apparently renounce their government if he acknowledged the same person to be head of his Church who is the supreme magistrate in the state.

> "The reason is because they are not prejudicial to other men's rights, nor do they break the public peace of societies. Nay, even the sins of lying and perjury are nowhere punishable by laws unless, in certain cases, in which the real turpitude of the thing and the offence against God are not considered, but only the injury done unto men's neighbours and to the commonwealth. And what if in another country, to a Mahometan or a Pagan prince, the Christian religion seem false and offensive to God; may not the Christians for the same reason, and after the same manner, be extirpated there?"[1]

He of course pleaded for inclusion of Jews, Pagans and Muslims within the civil rights of the Commonwealth only as a citizen, thus making a distinction between private and public life. In effect it is an assertion that individuals enjoy a number of rights in the state. Foremost among the individual rights in protecting private realm is freedom of opinion especially religious opinion which gradually turned into notion of freedom of expression. Here we should bear in mind that the Locken concept of tolerance is the basis of western liberalism still today. In actual practice of these liberal principles today causes an incipient Judeo-Christian unity which is so pronounced that it creates in a subtle manner perceptible hostility towards the Muslims communities in the Middle East.[2]

Individual liberties were protected not only by social or traditional customs; it required constitutional government, nation states, rule of law and representative democracy. Utilitarianism is possibly the political philosophy which provided the initial momentum to the nineteenth century liberalism. Contemporary liberalism range from libertarian views according to which the role of state is to be minimized. In the western world the process continued from the nineteenth century down to the present time which entails the essential features of liberal Protestantism. Liberal Protestantism has a receptive attitude towards unorthodox interpretation of Christian scriptures and dogma which leads to a general skepticism towards traditional explanation of theology.

Christian theology and John Hick

Liberal Protestantism is sometimes identified with modernism. Most influential form of modernism is traceable in the religious reform movements focusing on the need for religions to accommodate with realities of modern world. Viewed as such we may assert that "Religious Pluralism" is also an attempt to provide a basis in Christian theology for tolerance of non-Christian religions.[3] John Hick the most celebrated proponent of this thesis has come up with very specific suggestions for implementation of Religious Pluralism.[4] In his definition of religion he delineated universalism of all religion by acknowledging their diversity as various understanding of the same universe. In his analysis Hick entered into details of the theoretical and doctrinal debates and controversies which, in his opinion, lead to a common goal, namely the common concept of the Divine or the Ultimate. Different religion arose in different societies to cater to different needs of those societies. In his own language: "… many different accounts of divine

reality may be true though all expressed imperfect human analogies, but… none is the whole truth. May it not be that different conceptions of God, as Jehweah, Allah, Krisna, Paramatma, Holy Trinity, and so on; and likewise the different conceptions of Hidden Structure of Reality, as the eternal emanation of Brahman, or as an immense cosmic process culminating in Nirvana, are all Image of the Divine, and yet none by itself fully and exhaustively correspond to the infinite nature of the ultimate reality?"[5] Religious Pluralism thus may be viewed as a recent innovation which seeks to provide a theological basis for tolerance in spite of diversities. Hick believes human beings imagine the divine through their respective cultural and individual mediation which results in the different concept of divine in different societies. Revelations received by prophets and sages at different times have been tested by long experiences of the followers and ritualized through long traditions of worships. It is therefore very likely that a genuine encounter with the divine reality will take multifarious forms.

Orthodox view of Christianity- John Dupuis

The acceptance of religious pluralism by Catholic Church is an indication of increasing popularity of this concept. However religious pluralism as envisaged in the writings of Hick has not been fully reflected in the Vatican Council to Document *Nostera aetate* which focuses on the commonality between the Catholic faith and other religions. It states that Catholic rejects nothing which is true and holy.[6] This line of pluralism has been eminently highlighted by a famous Jesuit scholar, Jacques Dupuis in his book *Toward a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism.* He examines the issue of Religious Pluralism with the paradigmatic shift from icclesiocentrism *i.e* church centered

to christocentrism *i.e* Christ-centered and then to theocentrism *i.e* God-centered. Thus he prepared a ground for the recognition of the words of God in other sacred books with their religious traditions. However, he believes that the fullness of divine revelation is found in Jesus Christ since he is the son of God made in to a man and can express the mystery of God more deeply than prophets of the Old Testament and the prophets of others religious traditions.[7]

In his book *Toward a Christian Theology of Religious Pluralism.* Dupuis attempted to make an organic treatment of salvation theology which essentially meant for him the primacy of Christianity with its trinitian character. Thus he advocated the preservation and continuation of Christian identity while engaging in interfaith dialogues and conversations. He insists that "the theology of religions must be studied within one's own personal faith perspective and within the presuppositions which faith implies. This theory interprets the data in the perspective of faith commitment. Although theology must necessarily be confessional, Dupuis argues that a Christian theology must adopt a global view that incorporates in its vision the entire religious experience of humanity.[8] Some commentators on Dupuis's religious Pluralism misinterpreted this position with the Hickian principal of equal validity to the path of salvation; but religious pluralism in principle, according to Dupuis, may also mean acknowledging that God is present to people through the spiritual riches that their religions embody and express. The presence and activity of the spirit touch the cultures and religions of humankind everywhere. Thus the spirit's activity in various religions implies some kind of religious pluralism which exists in principle. It is for this reason that Gerald O'Collins insists we need to differentiate between the Hickian "pluralism" and the kind of pluralism that Dupuis endorses.[9]

Essential futures of Religious Pluralism as Summed up by Diana L. Eck[10]

Plurality of religion, in its essence is the plurality of religious tradition and culture. As a statement of objective conditions, Religious Plurality is a reality which exists in all countries and regions where there is multi-religious habitation. But as a theoretical exegesis it involves several contents and commitments which is characterized as Religious Pluralism. Diana L. Eck a renowned scholar of Religious studies in her elaborate analysis of the American society emphasized the need for a concerted effort to build up pluralistic societies in America as also elsewhere. In her opinion the response evoked by the people all over the world after every ugly incident of communal violence makes it clear that multi-religious and multi-cultural fabric is too strong to rend by random violence. In the backdrop of this analysis by Diana L. Eck the essential tenets of Religious Pluralism may be summed up in following terms:

First, it is energetic engagement with diversity which essentially involves continuous communality and relationship dissipating tensions and acrimonies.

Second, it calls for active perusal of understanding across the lines of difference. This is significantly different from passive tolerance which is of course necessary for Religious Pluralism but not sufficient.

Third, commitments to ones own religion is not loosened rather crystallized with increasing knowledge of each others belief.

Finally, Pluralism is based on dialogue leading to criticism and self-criticism. This does not mean giving away

ones commitments to ones own Religion but taking an enlightened view of others beliefs.[10]

Pluralism in Islam, Hickian View

In to day's world Religious Pluralism has gained a new dimension because of protracted bloody conflict and confrontation between Muslims and Jews in the Middle East. Because of the continuous and unstinted support of the West for Israel, the wrath of militants Islamists have also fallen on the Christians. However irrational the attitude may seem, it created a deep sense of distrust among these three Abrahamic religions. It is possibly in this backdrop that John Hick made some important observation on pluralism on Islam. In a lecture delivered in the Institute of Culture & Thought, Tehran in February 2005 John Hick discussed at length Religions Pluralism in Islam. He poses a serious question in his deliberation as to what can be the *true faith.* Since each religion claims to have the `truest and the best,' is it possible then to find a common ground so as to delineate right or wrong either in absolute or relative terms? A more critical question arises from the fact that *faith* is largely inherited which hardly leaves any scope for conscious rational decision to choose one or the other faith. Hick mentions that Abrahamic Religions are the product of Middle Eastern and Mediterranean world but now having followers scattered all over the world has multifarious culture and ritualistic manifestations. Thus these revealed religions have varied exposition in different times and places. In spite of their close similarity these religions are constantly engaged in conflicts and contradictions which defy any rational and conscientious understanding. In terms of the relationship with the belief of each of these religions, Hick's understanding is that there is very little difference in their outlooks on the nature

of salvation. However, on the question of the life of the hereafter there is substantial difference among each of these religions as to who will go to heaven. According to him there are three different schools of thought which has come to be called exclusivism, inclusivism and pluralism"[11]

In his deliberation Hick was very eloquent in his assertion that limited inclusiveness is pervasive in Islamic religion, which however he did not clearly delineate from the Holy Scriptures. He on the other hand sought to vindicate his position through an excerpt from Kwaja Abdullah Ansari who in a prayer to God said, "You are far from the mystery we imagine you to be;" and "… The mystery of your reality is not revealed to any one".[12] "Developing the implication of this, he mentioned Ibn al- `Arabi who distinguishes (like Maimonides) between the divine essence, which is ineffable, and God as humanly known. In *The Bezels of Wisdom* he says, "The Essence, as beyond all these relationship, is not a divinity… it is we who make Him a divinity by being that through which he knows himself as Divine. Thus He is not known [as Allah] until we are known" [13]

Hick's observation about pluralism in Islam is permeated by a subtle epistemological issue relating to the perception of the Ultimate. As he points out, in general conceptualization of God or the Ultimate Reality by each individual is the way he seeks him; so long the Reality is presented to him according to the way he used to recognizing Him he affirms Him; but if presented in a different form he denies Him. Hick thus concludes, "So we have a distinction between the Ultimate as it is in itself and that same ultimate reality as it impinges upon us and is conceived by our little human minds. Our awareness of the Ultimate is thus a mediated awareness, receiving its form,

and indeed its plurality of forms, from the human contribution to our awareness of it. The basic critical realist principle, that in our awareness of anything the very activity of cognition itself affects the form in which we are conscious of it, is well established today in epistemology, in cognitive psychology, and in the sociology of knowledge".[14] from this assumptions Hick sought to establish the pluralism of world religions including Islam in their propensity to be oriented to the same Ultimate reality. These may manifest within their thought worlds in spite of their forms of experiences in different ways.

Hick finally urged upon the Muslim community to feel the pangs and sufferings of the whole human kind with the scourge of continuous conflict, tension and wars with each other leading to the possibility of total extinction of humanity. Here he made a fervent moral appeal, as he says; there can be no stable peace in the world without peace in the world religions. And peace among different religions cannot be conceived of, with each religion claiming *absoluteness*. Solution lies his, "in acceptance of the world religions as different but *equally valid relationship* to the ultimate reality"[15]

Critique of Hickian Pluralism by Islamic Theologians

One of the astute critic of John Hick's religious pluralism, Hasnain Walji points out from Islamic viewpoint that "God's damnation does not arbitrarily apply to all who lack faith in his revelations nor does His salvation reach all and sundry. This strikingly contrast with Hick's compromising view where he made no distinction of different faiths. What Walji seeks to establish is that the decision lies with God alone and He may pardon whom He pleases. However in his opinion a distinction is to be made between the incapable (qasir) and the negligent

(muqassir). Another Islamic scholar Syyid Muhammad Rizvi criticized Hick for his failure to distinguish between Social Pluralism and Religious Pluralism. "Social Pluralism", he says, "in the sociological sense means a society which consists of multi –faith and multi-cultural mosaic." "Religious pluralism" on the other hand, "in theoretical sense is a concept in which all religions are considered to be equally true and valid." Social pluralism enjoins on every Muslim to do justice and show kindness to non-Muslims in spite of their different beliefs. He quoted a statement from prophet as saying: "Whoever does injustice to a protected non-Muslim I will be his enemy on the Day of Judgement." Religious pluralism Rizvi claims, is formulated in recent times by John Hick in the seventies of the last country who abandoned his "Catholic exclusivist view and formulated his specific theory… that each religion in its own way represents an authentic revelation of Divine World and a fully authentic means of salvation."[16]

Both Walji and Rizvi abundantly referred to the writings of Shahid Syalullah Murtadha Mutahhari, the renowned Persian scholar whose work was translated in English by Sayyid Sulayman Ali Hasan.[17] In this volume Mottahhari made some important observations of Islamic faith as he perceived in terms of good and bad deeds. For him good deeds by themselves do not earn recompense in the hereafter unless it is performed with the intention of achieving nearness of God. Secondly the statement of Holy Quran regarding the prophethood of other religions with the assertion that 'we do not make any distinction in truth of any prophets; all are equally true in their claim', does not necessarily imply , according to Mutahhari that prophet Muhammad's (s) message should not be conveyed to them. On the contrary, prophet Muhammad(s) himself sent 25 letters to

various rulers and tribes many of whom were followers of Ahl-lil-Kitab(Sacred books accepted by Muslims)[18] It is clear from these activities of the prophet that the message of the Holy Quran is to be preached to Jews, Christians and idolaters alike and hence salvation or perdition is not determined by merely belonging to any of these religions. But on the question of salvation and perdition he is clearly opposed to the concept of equal validity of all religions as Hick's pluralism implies.

Mutahhari's pluralism in terms of theology is consistent with his former belief in the essence of Islam. Thus he concluded "if individuals believe in God and the hereafter, perform activities with the intention of seeking nearness to God sincere in their activities, they are acceptable to God and they deserve their reward in heaven whether they are Muslims or non-Muslims."

Another Muslim scholar Dr. Muhammad Legenhausen in a brilliant article made detailed analysis of Pluralism in Islam with particular reference to Hickian assumptions.[19] Legenhausen *criticised Hick for his attempt* to reconcile the irreconcilable religious experiences. Legenhausen points out that if spiritual experience of an individual "conveys him the information that God is the Greatest, while another person claims that he spiritually perceives that Brahman is the greatest, one might attempt reconciliation by showing that Brahman is the name Hindu use for God. The concept of God and Brahman is really different, and must be understood in terms of vastly different theological worldviews of the Vedas and Semitic scripture."[20] However Legenhausen appreciated the voluminous works of Hick particularly the thoroughness of his attempt, in the context of Christian theology, to accommodate radical diversity of belief and even of mystical experience as

stemming from ineffable reality. Many of those who are imbued with mystical experiences tend to believe that experience of mystics transcend religious and cultural boundaries. The convergence in this regard may impinge upon the structure of belief which may in the opinion of some thinkers as causes for dissimilarities.[21]

However, Legenhausen is skeptical of full scale of religious pluralism not because of its inability to bring the different faiths together through spiritual experience but its incompatibility "with the ideas of revelation found in Abrahamic religions."

Universalism versus Pluralism in Islam

Puritanical Islamic belief professes universalism as a religious principle which among other things preaches coexistence of other religions within a state dominated by Muslims. It is in a way equivalent to religious tolerance but at the same time it demands a kind of obligations on the part of the followers of other religions. Some verses of the Holy Quran clearly argues for tolerance of those who believe in one God even though they may have different scriptures. Here of course a substantial difference is noticed even among the orthodox Muslims. While a good number of Islamic theologians and philosophers preach universalism only to Abrahamic religions, a more modern outlook is to include all religions within the fold of universal tolerance. Kazi Nurul Islam in an article entitled "Universalism and Religious Pluralism,[22] points out that the Holy Quran advocates rational thinking, promotes scientific reasoning, abhors terrorism and condemns fanaticism and extremis. Thus Islam advocates universalism and religious pluralism.[23] He argues with quotes from the Holy Quran by mentioning not less

than twelve verses to substantiate that there is no confusion in religions , that the believers (in Islam) ,the Jews, the Christians and the Sabians and all those who believe in God and do good will have no fear nor regret. He also quoted some verses from the Holy Quran, which categorically mentioned that God had sent messengers for many others people before, and had assigned laws and directions to each of them but they differed amongst themselves subsequently. If it were God's will he would have settled their differences at once.[24] Again some other verses warn the Muslims neither to rely on Jews and Christians as patrons, nor to take them as friends particularly who take Islamic religion as mockery. Finally Sura Al-Imran (3) in verse number 19 says that the only true religion in the sight of God is Islam.[25]

K.N. Islam, however, points out that there is likelihood of misinterpretation of these verses if they are read out of context. To quote him:

"Starting from the early period of the Muslim Caliphate till today there have been innumerable interpreters of the verses of the Quran. Unfortunately, some of them have misunderstood the real meaning and spirit of some verses. At times they were even misguided and some translations are even with certain motives. Their misguided and motivated interpretation often created misunderstanding and that went against the real spirit of the Quran."[26]

In his opinion the confusion arises from differential interpretations of two important verses of Sura *Al-Imran* which ran as follows: '*Behold, the only true religion in sight of God is (man's) self surrender unto Him….*' (Surah 3: *Al-Imran:* 19) '*For, if one goes in search of a religion other than self-surrender unto God, it will never be accepted from him, and in*

the life to come he shall be among the lost.' (Surah 3: A*l Imran 85)*

In his opinion: to understand the real meaning of the term 'islam' the Quran is very clear in giving the definition of the word Islam. As he points out: "It means total surrender or submission to God. In fact the art of surrender or submission to the will of God is Islam. Therefore, anybody who surrenders to God, sincerely and whole-heartedly, is a follower of Islam." In a foot note K.N. Islam adds: "The Holy Quran: *Tex,t Translation and Commentary*, Lahore, 1934 Vol. 1, pp. 126 and 145 Mahmoud M. Ayub, one of the most dependable (Arab-American) Muslim scholars of the contemporary world, did not use the upper-case 'I' while translating these two verses, because he wished to avoid creating confusion between 'Islam' – submission to the will of God- and 'Islam' the name of a religion."[27]

K.N. Islam argues forcefully that the true spirit of Islam is pluralistic, though there are substantial differences of opinion among the theologians and interpreters of religion. The confusion according to him is more due to the erroneous belief that Islam upholds the concept of absolutism in its belief system, whereas according K.N Islam Islamic belief is more akin to universalism. Such outlook is criticized by Islamic scholars belonging into orthodox school. It may not also be acceptable by many of the western thinkers as the may consider Islamic ideas of salvation as exclusive and not pluristic.

Conclusion

In conclusion it is necessary to dispel some of the confusions and misconceptions which are due to a variety of ideas and interpretations given by eminent scholars. We feel obliged to

mention at least two important areas of discourse in this regard. First, a distinction is made by Rizvi between social pluralism and religious pluralism. By social pluralism he implied the multi-religious and multicultural societies where different religions live in harmony. While religious pluralism according to him is the theory of equal validity of all religions. In our opinion such distinction leaves the main issue in out of sight; that is to say, it does not address itself to the different levels of analysis where the concept of religious pluralism applies. For example there is always an element of local variation in beliefs and practices in almost all religions. But when a particular region is faced with a problem of religious plurality and intermingling of faith and rituals, that religion tends to ascribe novelties to its original beliefs and practices. It is in this context we find that religious pluralism is to be investigated and analyzed both at the level of variations as it obtains in different religion as well as at the level of religious pluralism as envisaged in the original scriptures of each religion

Secondly, changes in the religious pluralistic behavior as reflected in the historical development and cultural dynamics of different geographical locations have both socio-political as well as economic causes and consequences. In order to find out the meaningfulness of these actions and intractions it is somewhat perfunctory to take one or the other aspect of religion for sustained research. Following Johnstone and Mc Guire, [28] an attempt has been made to identify four elements which may lend themselves to differential evaluation of the impact of religious pluralism. These are "a) faith and belief system b) rites and rituals leading to common practices and community life, c) ethical norms and moral values and d) spiritual experiences which may cover wide-ranging epiphenomena."

Viewed as such we find that theories of religious pluralism have mainly concentrated on the belief system of different religions and sought to find consequences on the basis of their original scriptures or revelations. On the other hand if we take the whole gamut of religious behavior in its various ramifications we may be able clearly delineate the areas of convergence or divergence so as to find proper basis for pluralism both in practice and in theory.

References

1. *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, By John Locke 1689 Translated William Popple. While the logic of Locke\s argument is sound and almost irrefutable, his scornful comment on the prophethood of Islam certainly smacks of a total intolerance. It may be that such feelings at that time among the people in the West was widespread and is still lurking, as is manifested in the recent Afgan NATO army camp, where an American soldier spitefully burned the Holy Quran

2. See Richard Veronon, "John Stuart mill and Pornography: Beyond Harm Principle" *Ethics* vol-106 No-3, 1996.

3. 5.M. Legenhauhan, "Islam and Religious Pluralism" in *Al-Tawhad* Vol-XIV no-3.]

4. John Hick *An Interpretation of Religion (*New Haven : Yale University Press 1989) p233

5. John Hick Lecture delivered to the Institute for Islamic Culture and Thought, Tehran, in February 2005. In his elaborate lecture Hick empathetically denied that religious pluralism is a product of post-enlightenment western liberation. This statement obviously is a response to Hasnain Walji's (who dealt at length with Religious Pluralism in Islam) observation that religious pluralism as propounded by western thinkers is a subtle defense

of the salvation through Christ. Hick on the other hand argues that Religious Pluralism dates back to 2nd century B.C. when the Buddhist emperor Asoka in his noble edicts preached non-violence for other's belief. He also points out that it was "taught by such thinkers as Rumi and Al-Farabi in the thirteenth century, and Kabir, Nanak and many others in 15th century India.

6.   Declaration on the Relations of the Church to non-Christian Religion, *Nostera Aetate*, proclaimed by his Holiness Pope Paul VI on October 28, 1965, no-2

7.   "Father Jacques Dupuis," *The Times*, January 12, 2005.

8.   Ambrose Mong Ih-Ren "In Many and Diverse Ways: Examining Jacques Duputis' Theology of Religious Pluralism" in *Dialogue Alliance* A Journal of the Universal Pace Federation Winter 2011 P-73

9.   Gearald O'Collins "Jaques Dupuis: His Person and Work",in Daniel Kindall &Gerald O'Collins eds. *In Many and Diverse Ways:In Honour of Jaques Dupuis*(ManyKnoll,N.Y.; Orbis Books.2003)25

10.   See Diana L. Eck, *A new Religious   America*, HarperCollins Paperback Edition Published in 2002

11.   *Lecture* p-13 exclusiveness is the belief that the followers of other religion are destined to be lost in the other world, inclusiveness conceders limited numbers of beliefs to be salvaged in the other world, and pluralism is the ideological acceptance of the validity all religions

12.   Quoted by Hick from *Intimate Conversation* trans. W. Thakston, N. Y, Paulis Press London. SPCK, pp 1983 & 2003

13.   *The Bezels of Wisdom*, trans. Austin, N.Y: Paulist Press and London: SPCK, p, 92

14.   Ibid P14

15.   *Ibid* p.15, Itallies mine

16.   Rizvi, S.M., Introductory note by Rizvi in *Islam and Religious Pluralism* Sayyid Muhammad Rizvi (Introduction), Imam Ali Zainul Abedin, Risalatul Huquq.tr.S.S. Rizvi (Vancuver VIEF,1989) p.36.

17.   Published 2004 Islamic publishing house (Canada) entitled *Islam and Religious Pluralism*.

18.   Quoted by Mutahhari from Muhammad Ibrahim Ayati,Tarikh–e-Payghambar-e-Isdlam (Tehran: Tehran University Press.n.d) pp 480-82.

19.   Dr. Muhammad Legenhausen 'Islam and Religious Pluralism' in *Al Taohid* vol. XIV no.03

20.   Ibid

21.   See articles by Katz in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis* [N.Y.: Oxford University Press (1878) and *Mysticism and Religious Tradition* (N.Y. Oxford University Press 1983)

22.   "The Quranic Message of Universalism and Religious Pluralism", in *Quest for Islamic Learning__*ed.Md. Akhteruzzaman, Asiatic society of Bangladesh, Dhaka, 2011

23.   Ibid p.49

24.   The *Holy Quran* stats in Sura Yunis (10) verse 19 "If it not been a world from your Lord the pre-ordained judgment would already have been passed between them regarding their difference."

25.   Opcit p.61

26.   Ibid p.63

27.   Ibid p.64

28.   Johnstone Ronald L. 1975 *Religion and Society*: *The Sociology of Religion*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pretice-Hall and Maguire, Meredit *Religion*: *The Social Context*. 5th ed. Grove, IL: Waveland Press.