

Understanding Religious Tolerance in Islamic Perspective

M.I.M. Thowfeek

American National College (ANC), Sri Lanka

Abstract

This paper attempts to explore religious tolerance through the lens of Western and Islamic philosophy. Understanding tolerance and peaceful coexistence is an urgent need in this pluralistic and conflict-ridden world. Tolerance and respect toward others' right to practise one's religion is even considered an important aspect of the human rights issue. The concept of tolerance is clearly developed in Islam and the teachings of Prophet. But the 09/11 attack in the US and the emergence of Islamic extremists / terrorists groups such as Taliban, Al Qaeda, Boko Haram and ISIS and their atrocities show to the world that the philosophy of Islamic teachings basically lead to intolerance, disharmony and extremism and rejects religious diversity and pluralism. Further, those groups defend their actions based on literal or extreme interpretation of Islam. As a result it raises the question whether Muslims can fit into the modern or pluralistic society? On the contrary, in reality, other Muslim scholars argue that those interpretations are in twisted forms but the world hears little from these alternate voices. It shows that Islam is interpreted in both extreme and tolerant manners. This article is divided into two parts; the first part focuses on the concept of tolerance in the Western philosophy. The second part analyses Islamic philosophical perspective of religious tolerance based on the writings of philosophers who are seen as either extreme or moderate.

Key terms: tolerance, coexistence, Tawhid, Kuf, bid'ah, hizmat, Wahhabism, Millet system, hakkimiya, Sharia Law, utopia, pluralism, harm principle

Introduction

“You have your way. I have my way. As for the right way, the correct way, and the only way, it does not exist”. *Friedrich Nietzsche* (as cited in Kunkle, 2009)

Many wars or conflicts in this contemporary world are related to belief of religion, in other words, intolerance between beliefs or faith. This is apparent in conflicts with Muslims and other ‘western’ societies and sometimes within – sects. It leads to the question whether Muslims can fit into the pluralistic society. The recent attack on the *Charlie Hebdo* magazine, the debate over wearing hijab, the banning the *burka* in France, outlawing minarets in Switzerland, controversies of using religious symbols in Germany show intolerance of religious behaviours or the lack of religious tolerance. Therefore, the concept of tolerance enables people who are from different ethnic, religious, racial, or national groups to live in peace.

Tolerance is a deliberate choice of non-interference in the conduct that one disapproves. In other words, it is an attitude of not opposing the different beliefs and practices of others that evoke the disapproval in oneself. Some political philosophers such as John Rawls, Ross Harrison and Jean Hampton view tolerance as a liberal concept or as the basis for liberalism. In this view, tolerance can flourish in the state or government that safeguards the rights of all religions and differences. But in the Islamic word, it is not viewed as a liberal political concept. Further, in the Western view religious tolerance has distinct characters; individual freedom of thinking, worshipping freely, propagation of one’s religion or renunciation of one’s religion. Controlling of one of these is considered as violation of rights. In the book of *the Difficulty of Tolerance* (2003) T.M. Scanlon describes tolerance as;

“Tolerance requires us to accept people and permit their practices even when we strongly disapprove of them. Tolerance thus involves an attitude that is intermediate between wholehearted acceptance and unrestrained opposition.” (Scanlon, 2003).

Still the concept of tolerance is puzzling. Certain behaviours can be tolerated and certain cannot be tolerated. We should accept that tolerance leads to costs and dangers to all of us but it is considered something that should be necessarily followed.

Methods and Materials

The researcher uses content and comparative analysis in examining (religious) tolerance in Western and Islamic philosophical perspectives. In addition to the content and comparative analysis the

researcher uses historical method in writing this paper. Upon using the historical method the researcher will reinterpret information gathered through the following materials; books, journals and magazines, autobiographies, and various websites.

Analysis

Religious tolerance in the Western Philosophy

Raphael argues in the article “*The Scope of Tolerance and Its Moral Reasoning*” (2004) that tolerance consists of three components;

1. A strong disapproving attitude toward a certain conduct, action or speech;
2. Power or authority to curtail the disturbing conduct, and
3. Moral overriding principles, which sway the doer not to exert his or her power or authority to curtail the said conduct. (Raphael, 2004).

These components show that tolerance cannot be equated with indifference but neutrality which is considered as the prime requirement for justice in the contemporary liberal politics.

J.S.Mill and John Rawls regarded tolerance and liberty as fundamental values and virtues for developing humane societies. In other words, tolerance and freedom cannot be limited or bordered. In Mill’s view tolerance, modern society, the issues surrounding tolerance is not restricted to religious harmony or religious differences but should be also expanded to other forms of irreconcilable cultural and social differences, and political plurality. Mill’s explained further about tolerance in his ‘*harm principle*’. It says political or social power is only appropriate to use to prevent serious harm done to one person by another and not to impose some good idea in an authoritarian manner. Tolerance related to opinions is justified by the utilitarian consideration that not just true, but also false opinions lead to productive social learning processes. Further, tolerance towards unusual ‘*experiment of living*’ is justified in a romantic way emphasising the values of individuality and originality (Forst, 2012).

Rawls provides pragmatic explanations for tolerance which are best for achieving political unity and justice among different groups. In his book, “*Theory of Justice*” (2003) he discusses tolerance and liberty and their boundaries. In his view, political theory must include pluralism, including religious diversity, which is related to tolerance as one of the historical roots for liberalism is

religious tolerance. His book “*Political Liberalism*” (2005) talks about religious pluralism pointing out that it does not threaten the rectitude of religious belief. He says;

“Political liberalism does not question that many political and moral judgements of certain specified kinds are correct and it views many of them as reasonable. Nor, does it question the possible truth of affirmations of faith. Above all, it does not argue that we should be hesitant and uncertain, much less sceptical, about our beliefs. Rather, we are to recognize the practical impossibility of reaching reasonable and workable political agreement in judgements of certain specified kinds are correct and it views many of them as reasonable.” (Rawls, 2005).

Similar to Kant, Rawls emphasized unique character of individuals is freedom to choose their own ends. It leads to the idea that state should respect its citizen’s autonomy. That is, state should let its citizens let them live based on their own views. It can be said in Kant’s words as

“If only rational beings can be ends in themselves that is not because they have reason, but because they have freedom. Reason is merely a means... the incomparable dignity of human beings derives from the fact that they are free with regard to all laws of nature, obeying only those laws which they make themselves.” (Guyer, 2004)

Rawls liberalism can be compared with Ottoman Empire’s Millet system, which can be called pre modern religious pluralism and tolerance. This system was a separate legal court system related to personal law that falls under a confessional community was able to rule itself under its own system, e.g. Muslim Sharia, Christian Canon Law or Jewish Halakha Law. The Millet system gave the opportunity for Christians and Jews to improve their lives and to live without discrimination. This type of system shows that religions can coexists through the creation of a natural form of religious tolerance. Today, this form of system is used in varied forms around the world; Sri Lanka, India, Bangladesh, Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, USA etc. In some of these countries there are even reserved seats in parliament. It shows that individuals cannot impose their way as the right way intolerantly.

A leading aspect of Rawls philosophy is the priority, which is given to ‘the right’ over ‘the good’. He defines it as;

“We should not attempt to give form to our life by first looking at the good independently defined... For the self is prior to the ends which are affirmed by it... We should therefore reverse the relation between the right and the good proposed by teleological doctrines and view the rights as prior,” (Rawls, 2003)

It shows that primary duty of liberal state is to protect the individual's basic liberty rights and losing freedom for some cannot be right by a greater good shared by others. Basically this is opposed to utilitarianism that emphasis majority's happiness. Michael Walzer (1999) explained that tolerance in the political perspective of "regimes" is an institutionalized arrangement of social co-existence. What types of political arrangements make people who are from different ethnic, racial, religious or national levels to live in tolerance and peace? He answers this question by examining "five regimes of toleration" varying from multinational empires to immigration societies. His discussion on tolerance is not about political differences rather it is related to religious, cultural, and way of life differences (Walzer, 1999). The five regimes of toleration as follows;

1. Multinational empire
2. The International society
3. Consociation
4. Nation state
5. Immigrant society (Walzer, 1999)

These regimes of tolerance show two different types of tolerance; tolerating individual (creates assimilation) and group tolerance (creates recognition). Today's forms of tolerance include both forms that democratic inclusiveness and communal autonomy. In other words, individuals move to regimes as individuals or individuals form as groups to separate from the regime as a group. Walzer (1999) makes the point in the examination of tolerance that tolerance does not mean harmony but it means lower classes can compete and they can move forward. Further, in highly enriched multiculturalism, minorities demand leads to the new democratic learning of tolerance.

Some view tolerance as mutual respect while others view it more pragmatically. But Rainer Forst explains away from these ambiguities and views toleration as a virtue of justice and a demand of reason (Forst, 2003). In other words, it plays an important role for cultural and minority groups in the current clash of civilizations. For some, tolerance helps to secure a peaceful and cooperative way life based on mutual recognition and political equality; for others this word is related to power, dominion and exclusion. In this view, in his article *Toleration, Justice and Reason* (2003) mentions about four definitions of tolerance, which gives different understanding to tolerance (Forst, 2003).

- 1) Permission conception

Toleration is between an authority or majority and a minority group. Majority gives permission to minority to have life based on their beliefs on the condition that they accept dominant power of majority. It shows that as long as the minority accept their inferior state and they are not going to challenge the majority, they can be tolerated. The relationship is based on power and subordination. So, tolerance is related to power, domination and exclusion.

2) Co-existence conception:

Though it is similar to the permission conception, tolerance is related to a peaceful coexistence, which is preferred to conflict. In this model, the relationship is not between dominant majority and subordinate minority. In this case, individuals are equals and in view of social peace and self-interest tolerance is viewed as best option. This type does not contribute to stable social situations that help in developing trust between groups. But it is related to *modus vivendi* (agree to disagree), which can help in developing a stable system for living together. It has a view of accommodating disputing parties to live on. In political context, it is used for informal and temporary arrangements where two conflicting groups live based on *modus vivendi* related to disputed areas, though there are political, cultural inconsistencies.

3) Respect conception

Though, there are differences between citizens, they morally respect others as having equal legal and political conditions. Everyone accepts that there are a set of values that apply universally. There are two models in this conception; *Formal equality*: it shows division between the public and private spheres. Universal values are applied in the public sphere in a way to treat everyone equally but cultural related activities, identities and differences are limited to the private sphere. *Qualitative equality*: For some it is difficult to differentiate between the public and private spheres related to the cultural practices and moral rules associated with identities, which cannot be left in the public sphere. In this case, groups get exemption related to rules and behavioural codes that apply to all.

4) Esteem conception

It is beyond the respect and associated with appreciation of others though there are differences. It is similar to reserve esteem, which is a kind of positive acceptance (Forst, 2003).

Religious tolerance in Islamic Philosophy

The Islamic philosophy of tolerance is derived from the Quran and the practise of Prophet. Though, the concept of tolerance is clearly developed in the Holy text and the teachings of Prophet, in the

contemporary world, Islam and Muslims have become a visibly intolerant. The 09/11 attack in the US and the emergence of Islamic extremists / terrorists groups such as Taliban, Al Qaeda, Boko Haram and ISIL and their atrocities gives different perception to the world that the philosophy of Islamic teachings basically leads to intolerance, disharmony and extremism and rejects religious diversity and pluralism. It appears that such misapprehensions and misunderstandings of Islam are growing increasingly.

The father of modern rational Islam, Abu Hamid Muhammad al- Ghazzali emphasized equilibrium in one's behaviour which is similar to Aristotle's means between two extremes. This world, usually, pulls humans to one or another level of extreme behaviour that is he believes is not one of the characteristics of successful Muslims. When he explained about the concept of Jihad against non-Muslims, he insisted Muslims cannot express their anger or rage against others but that it should be guided or controlled by intellect. That is, he described about moderate rage relating to Prophet's life "When Prophet face became red in anger.... Would never say anything but the truth, from which anger never caused him to diverge," (Highland, 2004). It shows that Ghazzali emphasizes a peaceful and intelligent manner in relating to others. And tolerating all the wrongs is done to you by others helps in disciplining one's mind, spiritually. The Quran also emphasize the proper balance in behaviours to reach the 'correct path'. It says "We have made you a moderate nation" (Al Quran, al-Bagarah: 143)

Ghazzali shows the manner in which others should be respected based on the *Tawhid* (the belief in the Oneness of God). He emphasized mutual respect and love on others. He says;

"Know that the world is one stage of the stages of the journey to God Most High. All in this station are travellers. Since the destination of journey of this caravan of travellers is the same, they are all as one. There must be friendship and unity among them and mutual aid." (as cited in Schlubach, 2005).

Further, Ghazzali insisted on tolerance as an element to achieve love for others and this love and friendship with others go beyond religious boundaries. He says;

"Do good with everyone you are able to; if that person is not of that disposition, you should be so... The basis of intelligence, after faith, it showing friendship to people and doing good deeds to the chaste and the unchaste." (as cited in Schlubach, 2005). In his view, friendship and brotherhood for the sake of God is the most worthy form of worship.

Further, Ghazzali, in his book, *On the Boundaries of Theological Tolerance in Islam* (2004), questioned the criteria in distinguishing belief and unbelief (*kufir*) in an intolerant way that was not

based on reasoned and logical proof. He argues some are being intolerant and hurry to judge others as unbelievers. In his view, *kufr* is related to a matter of rejecting the truthfulness of the Prophet but not related to an individual's moral or religious constitution. Based on this interpretation recent attacks on Charlie Hebdo should not be justified based on Islam. Also, in his view, theology functions as a *category of exclusion* (Ghazzali, 2004). In other words, conflicting theologies can coexist based on mutual recognition. This provides room for tolerance as well as the acceptable interpretation of theology. Islam is not against religious diversity as long as Muslims share basic beliefs. Further, *bid'ah* (unsanctioned innovation) should not be considered as an act of disbelief. In his words;

“Not everyone who embraces senseless hallucinations must be branded an unbeliever, even if his doctrines are clearly absurd.” (Ghazzali, 2004). He criticised Islamic scholars that they are intolerant in judging others as unbelievers.

To counter Islamic extremists or fundamentalists, Fethullah Gulen (2004) emphasizes liberal and tolerant and moderate views of Islamic ideas and proposes to use reasoning in Islamic issues which is similar to Ghazzali's view. He proposed '*Anatolian Islam*' which is based on tolerance. It is suitable for pluralism and excludes harsh restrictions or fanaticism. Everyone should be offered freedom for worship and thoughts. Similar to Ghazzali, Gulen explains tolerance metaphorically as;

“We all live in this world and we are passengers on the same ship” (Erol, 2012)

“As we are all limbs of the same body, we should cease this duality that violates our very union. We should clear the way to unite people; this one of the greatest ways in which God grants people success in this world, and how He transforms this world into a paradise. We should remove all ideas and feelings that pull us apart, and run to embrace one another.” (Gulen, 2004).

Gulen insists that society should support tolerance. If we do not announce jihad for anything else, we should announce it for tolerance (Pratt, 2007). Tolerance is basis for dialogue. In his view, the Prophet was guided to look for common things with the people of the Book. He mentions the following verse from the Quran;

“O People of the Book, Come to common terms as between us and you: that we worship non but God; that we speculate no partners with Him; that we take not some from among ourselves for Lords other than God.” (as cited in Gulen, 2004).

It shows that viewing others with enmity, anger or labelling them as infidels can be considered as non-Islamic. So, in his view, tolerance is inherent in the spirit of Islam and mentioned in the Quran and by Prophet.

Further, Gulen's view on tolerance is that it is not a political tool for power, unlike the Western view but a tool for love to include others and it cannot be equalised with attitudes of negative 'putting up' but that it is intentional and active. He proposes two necessary elements for peace in society, which are tolerance and dialogue. He says;

“We can build confidence and peace in this country if we treat each other with tolerance...

No one should condemn another person for being a member of a religion or scold him for being an atheist.” (as cited in Aras and Caha, 2003).

He broadens the concept of tolerance, similar to Ghazzali (2004), to secularists and non-believers and he believes this view will create stability and prevent conflict in a country. Further, through the term *hizmat* that refers to service, he insists that service that has no end should be done in building a peaceful and coexisting society.

He uses the term tolerance in a way to allow other's points of view and it can be achieved through dialogue. Tolerance allows rightness of others over one's own understanding. It is also related to relativism. In this case, tolerance hinders hostilities and conflicts. Therefore, borders disappear between others and oneself. Mutual understanding and open mindedness lead to dialogue that creates harmony between different parties. People who dissolve boundaries between others and oneself avoid using divisive thoughts such as 'they', 'we', 'ours, etc. As such it can be said that Ghazzali's influences can be seen in Gulen.

Contemporary Islamic thinker Tariq Ramadan (2013) relates tolerance to the integration of West. Some Muslim youth think they have to make decision between going with the western culture and therefore deviating from their own culture. It leads to the idea of being intolerant to change since they feel tolerance means secularization of Islam and secularization is considered as the western concept.

In his view, tolerance and pluralism are condition of humility and a protection against potential excess, (Ramadan, 2013). Islam emphasizes tolerance in different ways; the Quran mentions that God has created people as different nations, societies, religions, etc. Diversity and pluralism may cause conflicts and strife but it is a condition for survival and helps in knowing about 'others'. This is the challenging form of pluralism that helps to be tolerant. It gives responsibility for individual commitments and it should be done in a particular way.

According to Ramdan, diversity and tolerance help in safeguarding humanity. Every individual follows the same way then there will not be questions and searching for truth. This living is basically for survival and similar to Utopia. But pluralism and tolerance gives priority to human living. He says;

“Others protect my humanity; their truth sustains my truth, and their difference enhances my singularity.” (as cited in Vemon, 2010)

Ramadan, like Ghazzali, agrees that reasoning helps to become reasonable. Diversity and equality are the prerequisite for respect. Further, he says;

“If I can tolerate and suffer the presence of what I do not know, I cannot respect others without trying to know them. Respect, therefore, calls for an attitude that is not passive but active, and proactive, towards others; Being curious of their presence and their being and attempting to know them after recognizing them.....Tolerance can reduce the others to the simplicity of his presence; respect opens us up to the complexity of his being. As in a mirror, it means recognizing the other to be as complex as oneself: He is the equal, the mirror, the question; the other in me and myself in him.” (Ramadan, 2013)

Tolerance is not passive philosophy but it is related to equality. People who live in diverse society want to be respected equally. That’s why he said “I don’t want a peaceful coexistence. I want a living together that is constructive and active.” (as cited in Vemon, 2010)

Some scholars see ISIS roots as being in Wahhabism, which is a form of Sunni Islam interpreted by Muhammad Ibn Abd al Wahhab in the 18th century. Similar to Martin Luther King, Wahhab requested Muslims to return to the earliest forms of teaching and rejecting later medieval developments in the religion. It led to intolerance against Sufism, Shiasm and Minarets worshipping which are considered as innovations, *bid’ah*. Wahhabism was basically built for political enforcement of religious beliefs by not allowing differences and insisting its followers should interpret the holy texts for themselves and to act on their interpretations in light of their own understanding, regardless of their understanding of fundamental principles or lack thereof. If an individual did not confess to this new ideology, he or she was considered as outsider of Islam or disbeliever (Understanding Islam, 2014). This type of interpretation of Islam led to intolerance among Muslims or groups. Further, the influence of Wahhabism led to the Fall of Ottoman Empire. This empire had the tolerant ruling system, the *Millet*. Basically Wahhabi Islam’s request of conformity, influenced by the multitude of voices within Islam and the intolerance it fostered of other cultures and religions, resulted in this situation.

On the contrary, some argue that Wahhab’s ideas are twisted to extremist point of views. He did weigh proper relations with others. In Wahhab words;

“If a person believes that a non-Muslim might go to heaven, he has become an apostate; if someone believes that it is all right to be friend or support or assist or ally oneself with infidels, he has become an apostate.” (as cited in Kearney, 2004)

Wahhab, like Ghazzali, advised the use reasoning in interpreting the Holy text. Some parts of the Holy text are not clear enough. In this case, using reasoning is unavoidable for the sake of public welfare e.g. if there is an overriding public need, almsgiving or zakat payment can be postponed. It shows inclusiveness and flexibility in his thoughts but some scholars did not agree with using reasoning over the Holy text.

Sayyid Qutb's thoughts are summarised in three steps which are fundamental to his ideas; first, he criticizes the current secular world and calls it *jahiliyya* (ignorance) and calls for the reversal of the state and the world order. Second, the conflict between good (Islam) and evil (*jahiliyya*) is the motivating force behind human history. Third, the way to fight prevailing *jahiliyyah* is *jihad* (struggle). In his view, Islamic states that do not follow God or Divine commands are also in a state of *jahiliyyah*. In other words, Qutb used the term *jahiliyyah* to criticize all systems of life that were non-Islamic. Non-Islamic ideas are not welcomed. In addition, he criticised the western world and governments that do not follow Islamic law. So, in his view, there are Islamic societies and *Jahiliyyah* societies. These *jahiliyyah* societies ignore God's guidance and follows man-made laws and life. Those should also be resisted and overthrown.

“If we look at the sources and foundation of the modern modes of living, it becomes clear that the whole world is steeped in jahiliyya... This jahiliyya is based on rebellion against the sovereignty of [God] on earth. It attempts to transfer to man one of the greatest attributes of [God], namely sovereignty, by making some men lord over others” (Qutb, 1990).

A true Muslim should reject man-made governments by submitting himself to God. In this sense, Qutb identifies the false Gods as the Western governments including their leaders, parliaments, and their constitutions and Non-Islamic rulers. A Muslim cannot follow God only if he or she accepts commands of these authorities. Qutb does not therefore; agree with the western idea of the separation of God and State. If it is separated then Divine law or *Sharia* law cannot be implemented and a Muslim cannot publicly live according to his faith. Living in a non-Islamic government is equal to slavery and those governments cannot provide liberty to people because they are *jahiliyyah* societies (Loboda, 2004).

The main goal of Muslims is to establish divine laws that will end suffering, suppression, and sin. Qutb explains this status through term of *hakimiyyah*. It has two elements; *sharia* law and the rule

of social justice. *Sharia* law establishes social and political system based on the Quran. Social justice is related to economics. In this view, Qutb criticises capitalism, which exploits people and communism which emphasizes materialism. So, Qutb proposes Islam or the Islamic state as an alternative solution for social injustice because Islam does not allow oppression but emphasis equality (Moussalli, 1993).

Findings and Conclusion

In the Western philosophy, concept of tolerance took an important place from Socrates Method, which allows diverse interpretations or opinions. During the Renaissance period it was considered as a liberal political concept to limit the coercive actions of government and church. This view insisted that humans should be considered as an epistemic modesty. And tolerance also is considered as a best way to know 'others' and best way to live with 'others.' During Modern time, when Locke emphasized, in his *Letter Concerning Tolerance* in 1689, religious plurality he meant that the state power should be separated from the Church. It will lead people to choose religions and their beliefs and diversity, freely. It shows that tolerance can be viewed as distinguishing power from the states to religious authority. This view contradicts with some Islamic thinkers view such as Qutb and Wahhab. They emphasized that religion and state should be together. It has created lack of tolerance and pluralism in the Middle East. This view contradicts with the primary teaching of Islam that insists the importance of tolerance and coexisting. Quran Says:

“Believers, when you are told to make room in assemblies, then make room; God will make room for you. And when you are told to rise, then rise; God will raise in ranks the believers among you and those to whom knowledge is given. And God is aware of what you do.” (Alquran, al-Mujadilah: 11). This shows how to be tolerant, respect others and place for others in one's mind. Further Quran provides the importance of tolerance as;

“O mankind! We have created you from a male and a female, and you into nations and tribes, that you may know one another”. (Alquran, Al-Hujurat: 13).

These verses emphasize the development of peace and the elimination of conflicts among others and show the inherent nature of diversity and pluralism in creation and the purpose of human beings of interacting and learning from others. Further, Islam accepts freedom of other religions or beliefs, which contradicts with Sayyid Qutb's view. The following verse verifies as;

“There is no compulsion in religion.” (Al Quran, al-Baqara: 256). This shows there is more than one religion or belief in this world. The Quranic view can be seen in John Rawls ‘*overlapping consensus*.’ It means diverse individuals or groups find reasons to agree about certain principles of justice that will include principle of toleration (Hedrick, 2010). This gives basis for analysing and accommodating others and supporting interfaith dialogues. It helps in solving their differences through pragmatic commitment to toleration. It is also similar to a *modus vivendi* and Ghazzali’s mutual recognition. This was also proven in Prophet’s life when he created the Islamic state in Medina. He acknowledged Judaism and declared which Jews and Muslims in Medina formed one nation. On the contrary, it is hard to find acceptance of others or pluralism in Qutb and Wahhab thoughts. In their view, life or state without the reference of God is unacceptable. It leads to belief that the Western liberalism which is base for tolerance is not acceptable.

Therefore, today, integration with other culture is the major problem for Muslims, particularly, in the West where can be seen lack of tolerance in Muslims’ behaviours. But it cannot be viewed as the result of Islamic teaching. This view leads to attack on Islam, including the Holy text and Prophet in the name of free speech. This so called human right which is base for the hate speech is seen as humiliating and disrespecting other religions and it leads to intolerance and violent attack by extremists though Islam does not allow this intolerant behaviour. Further, Muslim immigrants take Qutb and Wahhab intense version of Islam with them that demarcates Islam and other religions. This is in contradiction with the basic teaching of Islam.

In conclusion, reality shows that though some Islamic thinkers reject exclusivist interpretation of Islam they do not support pluralist interpretations and there is lack of support for relativism among them, too. Generally, when a scholar gives superiority to his/her traditions it causes chaos, unlike religious tolerance and pluralism.

References

Aras, Bulent and Caha, Omer. (2003). Fethullah Gulen And His Liberal ‘Turkish Islam’ Movement.

In Barry Rubin, *Revolutionaries and Reformers: Contemporary Islamist Movements in the Middle East*, Albany: University of New York. pp.141-154.

Erol, Mustafa. (2012, August 28). *The Contribution of Fethullah Gulen on Christian – Muslim*

Relations. Retrieved February 20, 2015, from Fethullah Gulen Forum: www.fethullahgulenforum.com

- Forst, Rainer. (2003) *Toleration, Justice and Reason* in C.Mckinnon and D. Castiglione (eds.), *The Culture of Toleration in Diverse Societies*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.71-85
- Ghazzali, Abu Hamid. (2004) *On the Boundaries of Theological Tolerance in Islam*, Trans. Sherman A. Jackson, Oxford: University Press.
- (1909). *The Alchemy of Happiness*. Trans; Claud Field. London: J. Murrey
- Gulen, Fethullah. (2004). *Toward a Global Civilization of Love and Tolerance*, New Jersey: The Light Inc.
- Guyer, Paul. (2004). *Kant, Immanuel*. In E. Craig (Ed), *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, London: Routledge, Retrieved January 31, 2015 from <http://www.rep.routledge.com>
- Hedrick, Todd. (2010). *Rawls and Habermas: Reason, Pluralism, and the Claims of Political Philosophy*, California: Stanford University Press
- Highland, J. (2004): *Guidance, Tolerance, and the Reverent Mind set in the Thought of al Ghazzali and Symeon*. *The Muslim World*, Vol. 94, April 2004, p. 258.
- Kearney, John. (2004). *The Real Wahhab*, Retrieved February 15, 2015, from The Boston Globe: www.boston.com
- Kunkle, Brett. (2009). *Truth Never Gets Old*. In Sean McDowell *Apologetics for a New Generation*, Oregon: Harvest Publishing House, pp. 41 -44
- Loboda, L. (2004). *The Thoughts of Sayyid Qutb* . Retrieved May 3, 2014 , from Ashbrook organization : <http://ashbrook.org>
- Moussalli, A. S. (1993). *Radical Islamic Fundamentalism: The Ideological and Political Discourse of Sayyid Qutb* . Beirut: American University of Beirut.
- Pratt, Douglas. (2007). *Islamic Prospects for Interreligious Dialogue: the contribution of Fethullah Gülen*. In Ihsan Yilmiz *Muslim World in transition: Contributions of the Gülen Movement*,

London: Leeds Metropolitan University Press, pp. 391-406.

Qutb, S. (1990). *Milestones*. Indianapolis: American Trust Publication.

Raphael, Cohen-Almagor, (2004). “*The Scope of Tolerance and Its Moral Reasoning, Omaggio A Rawls*”, Retrieved January 31, 2015 from <http://works.bepress.com>

Ramadan, Tariq. (2013, September, 17). *Respect, Beyond Tolerance*. Retrieved February 15, 2015, from Tariq Ramadan: tariqramadan.com

Rawls, John, (2005). *Political Liberalism*, New York: Columbia University Press
(2003). *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press

Scanlon, T.M. (2003). *The Difficulty of Tolerance: Essays in Political Philosophy*, UK: University of Cambridge.

Schlubach, J.B. (2005). *Tolerance Is Love: Gulen, Ghazali, and Rumi*. Retrieved February 15, 2015, from fethullahgulenconference.org

Understanding Islam. (2014). *Islamic Radicalism: Its Wahhabi Roots and Current Representation*, Retrieved February 15, 2015, from The Islamic Supreme Council of America:

www.islamicsupremecouncil.org

Vemon, Mark. (2010, August, 6). *Tariq Ramadan's Pluralism*. Retrieved February 15, 2015, from The Quradian: www.theguardian.com

Walzer, M. (1999) *On Toleration*, Yale University Press