

Mystical Relationships and Sustainable Development: A Case Study of Tolerance

Abstract

Development, especially sustainable development, is one goal that all countries strive to achieve. Among the facilitators of the move towards development, culture and culture building are very important. Given the vital role of religious beliefs in this area, it seems that developing theoretical frameworks based on accepted theoretical assumptions can serve governments' practical plans and policies in achieving the development. Among Islamic schools and sciences, mysticism has unique capacities to formulate specific conceptual frameworks and prepare theoretical presuppositions and practical solutions in culture building.

Among the propositions, principles, and foundations of Islamic mysticism, tolerance is one of the key concepts in the service of culture-building to move towards sustainable development. The present study, using by documentary method and relying on written sources and libraries, tries to analyze the written heritage of Muslim mystics and explain the intellectual foundations of tolerance as the foundation of culture based on the ontological position of the unity of existence, the one hand, and mystical anthropology, on the other hand, and take a step in solving the macro-cultural problems of today, and moving towards the best possible realization of sustainable development.

Keywords: Sustainable Development; Tolerance; Unity of Existence; Mystical Anthropology.

Introduction

Today, the topic of sustainable development and related categories is one of the subjects that many developing countries are trying to achieve. This category can be studied from different aspects. It can not simply be measured by quantitative indicators alone or studied this phenomenon experimentally only with the help of first-rate sciences in social and human issues such as sociology, political science, psychology, and so on. Setting and formulating

theoretical frameworks is on the shoulders of secondary epistemological research, the knowledge that, in addition to conceptual enlightenment, identifies the possible shortcomings of the theories that underlie individual or collective action.

Considering the role of culture in sustainable development, on the one hand, and the vital role of religious beliefs in the category of culture, on the other hand, it seems that by posing theoretical questions in the field of religion in developing an appropriate indigenous model, macro-cultural programs and policies can be explained to achieve development.

Among Islamic schools and sciences, mysticism has unique capacities in this regard. The present study intends to address the concept of tolerance as one of the cultural concepts derived from the mystical teachings of Islam, among the influential religious components focused on sustainable development.

What is the mystical truth of tolerance and how it plays a role in achieving sustainable development is one of the main questions of this study, and the research hypothesis is that the application of tolerance derived from this approach can, along with competing theories based on mystical principles, indicate human as the supreme manifestation of God, regardless of religious, cultural, climatic supremacy; make people the main issue of tolerance instead of ideas and beliefs. While it leaves the person epistemologically critical of wrong beliefs and practices, it keeps him ontologically tolerant of those who hold those beliefs or the perpetrators of those actions. In this way, to emphasize human dignity in terms of anthropology without being contradictory in opinion or pluralism in the field of action.

The present study first examines the concept of development in western culture and its differences from the concept of growth, evolving this concept from economic growth to human development and its harms from the perspective of Islam, and finally achieving a model of sustainable development. Then, by explaining the concept of tolerance in mysticism and its cultural capacities, present a proposed model at the level of individual relations to the social field to achieve sustainable development.

What is development?

The evolution of the concept of development in the West began with the approach of economic growth. After passing from the basic needs approach and then the development of human resources, it led to human development in the modern sense. Development in this sense is a multidimensional process that is not based purely on economic considerations and emphasizes the need to preserve human identity. This new attitude towards human beings is seen as the starting point of societal change. It relies on building a development indicator based on human, moral and spiritual identity and value (Nazari, 2006: 31). Today, experts in this field believe that human beings are the axis, means, and goal of development to show that the orientations in all levels of activities of society should be towards the welfare and well-being of human beings to achieve a better life (Dialameh and Baradaran Haqhir, 2010: 42). Hence, the ultimate goal of development is to improve the quality of life of human beings to the extent that they can live in security and peace and enjoy their individual and social life (Nawabakhsh, 2013:13).

It should be noted that in popular literature. However, growth is a necessary condition for development, and it should not be considered development because, as an indicator, it can not cover all aspects of human life.¹ Perhaps in the meantime, sustainable development can be considered an attempt to reconcile growth and development in society. But in general, it can be said that human beings are the goal and, at the same time, the axis of sustainable development.

¹ The difference between development and growth is in the breadth of its meaning. In economics, growth means increasing production, so it has quantitative meaning. But the concept of development implies the emergence of another phenomenon and an increase in production. It can be considered a qualitative concept, so every increase is not production, but development implies growth (Dialameh and Baradaran Haqhir, 2010: 43).

Development and human in Western and Islamic attitudes

In the prevailing view of Western countries, human development stems from the theory of liberal democracy¹ and the values that govern it. Liberal democracy has an individualistic orientation; this means that the individual is the most original and fundamental member of society and its institutions and is considered prior to them. The individual is a goal in itself and not a means. In the view that carnal desires and gratification are the basis for fulfilling human needs, one can extend one's choice that is compatible with society's definition as a new citizen in a developed country (Dialameh and Baradaran Haqhir, 2010: 47). The result is that the dominant view of the concept of development in the West is a materialistic view and Western development by focusing on humans in the world denies any divine narrative of development and only by the criterion of human intellect as a builder factor of the development path seeks solutions and the process of its realization. On the other hand, the Islamic view of development has taken a different path from this view. In this view, development has a transcendent end and based on this, all the cultural indicators of development in Islam have been designed for that goal² because the criteria of growth and development can be indicative of sustainable development in society when it can provide sufficient explanation to maintain spiritual and material balance in the field of various social areas and practice introduce indicators that indicate qualitative and quantitative aspects and consider it as a prelude to the growth of moral perfection in human.

Among the valuable collections of Islamic teachings aimed at achieving the desired development, the concept of tolerance has a special place. The application of this concept, in addition to developing a moral model in individual relationships, can be used as a desirable behavioral model in socio-political systems.

¹ Liberalism is one of the most common and oldest philosophical-political teachings of the present age. In the political dictionary, liberalism is a philosophy based on the belief in the principle of freedom, which lies in the Renaissance and religious reform (Qaderi, 2001: 17).

² See Rezaei, 2010: 134-140 for the characteristics of development from the perspective of Islam.

Tolerance in Islam

The school of Islam has always relied on the verses of the Holy Quran. The biography of the Holy Prophet indicating the universality of human nature (Qur'ān 30:30) has emphasized the dignity of the position of humanity and religion and faith can not be achieved not only by reluctance and coercion of the people (Motahari, 2009: 71), rather, inviting people to religion is never a license for violence, even verbal violence, insult, ridicule, and humiliation (Mesbah Yazdi, 2000: 65). In the verses of the Qur'an, it is important to emphasize that differences in creed and thought are permissible and accepted, and it is the tradition of God that there be such differences of opinion; otherwise, God would have been able to create all people on a single religion.⁵ (Qur'ān 10: 99).

Mystical foundations of tolerance

Before entering into this discussion, it is necessary to make two clear points:

- ✓ Tolerance is a moral virtue, and there is a kind of prohibition of action towards the opposite thought at the core of its semantic structure, so it has a negative nature. In such a way, it requires peaceful coexistence with an idea or action that is considered invalid or morally wrong by the individual (Paya, 2002: 33). In other words, tolerance means recognizing the wrong right (Naraghi, 2011: \). Of course, the virtue of tolerance in this sense is not unconditional. In cases where the effects and results of a person's actions are not only his income but also the income of another person or persons, wrong right is bound by conditions, but of course, mentioning those conditions and defending the necessity of their existence is related to the topic of freedom and its limits and has nothing to do with the topic of tolerance (Malekian, 2005: 6).
- ✓ Tolerance belongs to action and not to a belief or belief that is of the carnal and esoteric states and naturally can not belong to tolerance because, first of all, a person has no way to penetrate the realm of mind and other conscience to know his belief and then tolerate with it with the knowledge of the possible change or conflict of that

⁵”و لو شاء ربك لآمن من فى الارض كلهم جميعا“

belief with his own belief, and secondly, assuming the possibility of knowing another belief or believing, it can do nothing but give in, because according to Rumi: Thoughts are not inward; And inside the world is freedom.[°] Therefore, if in the definition of tolerance, beliefs are also presented as objects that can be tolerated, it is necessarily meant to express those beliefs from the category of action (Malekian, 2005: 1).

1. Unity of existence

Undoubtedly, one of the most important and influential theoretical factors in the belief in tolerance among mystics is the theory of the unity of existence, followed by the idea of a perfect man. In a general division, theoretical mysticism can be divided into two parts: knowledge of God (unity of existence) and cognition of the monotheist (the perfect man), in the sense that none of the issues of theoretical mysticism is outside these two topics.

- The first section is discussed under the title ontology. Muslim mystics have interpreted their mystical and psychic mystical experience in the form of the concept of being and existence and have expressed the finding of plurality in unity and unity in plurality with these interpretations (Rahimian, 2011: 114). The most fundamental issue in mysticism is the issue of the unity of existence. So far, many interpretations have been presented from this theory. The term unity encompasses the existence of a wide and sometimes heterogeneous range of schools and opinions of different thinkers, as it is called in the West as Pantheism.[‡] Simply put, the unity of existence means that the mystics in the house of existence do not believe in another existence other than one being and existence, which is God, and at the same time do not deny

[°] See Rumi, Jalāl ad-Dīn Muhammad Balkhī, *Fihī Ma Fihī*, edited by Badi' al-Zamān Furūzānfar, fifth edition, Amir kabir Publications, Tehran, 1983, p. 98.

[‡]The term pantheism is a combination of the Greek words pan (all) and Theo (God). Pantheisms are monistic, derived from the Greek word singular or solitary. They believe that there is only one being and that other forms of reality are manifestations or the same.

plurality. Hence, they believe that God has different manifestations at different levels. So the discussion of God leads us to discuss the levels of existence (Kakaei, 2014: 61 and 103). In a different interpretation of theologians, Mystics believe that it is God who is present and manifested in his essence, attributes, and actions and reminds us of the presence of God in each of these levels of existence. The whole set of the system of existence has been drawn in the form of a circle of existence and is divided into five Hazrats^Y based on distance and proximity to the unseen world. They also believe that God is present on all these levels and, at the same time, is behind them all.

2. Perfect human

The term perfect human was first used by Ibn Arabi (560-638) as the basis of another tolerance and axis of culture. Ibn Arabi and his followers believe that the summary of all worlds in Hazrat khams is present in human. According to this, the perfect human (monotheist) is the second basic element of theoretical mysticism.

Ibn Arabi examines human on two levels: one is the formative level, and the other is the individual level (Izutsu, 2017: 259)[^], which due to the close connection with the subject of this study, we will briefly describe each of them:

- In the formative (existential) realm, human is considered a perfect human (a kind of human being) who is the perfect manifestation of existence and has been created divinely, the smallest universe, the soul of the greater universe. The explanation of the perfect human in the universe, the necessity of his existence, and his relation to truth and creation is based on the two basic theories of manifestation and the science

^YHazrat Khams is the first and second appointments as the first Hazrat, the world of intellect as the second Hazrat, the world of example as the third Hazrat, the world of matter as the fourth Hazrat, and the perfect human who is the fifth and comprehensive Hazrat of all the previous Hazrats.

[^] Of course, in different cases, other divisions have been given from human by Ibn Arabi, most of which can be a kind of drawing of the theoretical basis of mystical tolerance, which the present study has based on the above division.

of names. In the mystical view of the secret of the creation of the universe, the divine love for the emergence and manifestation of the essence of truth in the form of manifestations, names, and attributes of truth in the mirror of others is known as the fervent journey. Therefore, the Almighty appears in every object as much as it. The universe beings are each a manifestation of the manifestations of the truth, which skeptically assume the manifestation of the truth. However, no one can show the greatest (Divine) name, which is the sum of all the attributes of truth, so there must be a perfect being for God Almighty to appear in him as he is. Because of its infinite capacity, that being can express all the names, attributes, and perfections of God. An example of such a creature is a perfect human (Rahimian, 2011: 237). This process of emergence and manifestation is called incarnation³ in popular mystical literature. Therefore, if the principle of creation is the incarnation, the human creation is the perfection of incarnation; that is, human is the ultimate manifestation of God (Ibn Arabi, 1987: 48, Qaisari, 1996: 331, Tarkeh, 2003: 439-445). As a result, at the formative level, what is meant by human is the perfect human.

- But in the individual realm, every human being (an example human being) has the potential to have existential comprehensiveness simply because he is human; that is, at the existential level, human is the perfect human, and the disparities among human beings are the result of differences in the degrees of consciousness of individuals (epistemological). Some have such a clear awareness of this comprehensiveness that their degree of awareness approaches the degree of awareness of the Almighty concerning his names and attributes, and some have so little use of this comprehensiveness that they practically descend to the degree of stupidity. It is only in the highest degree of transparency and epistemological clarity that the human psyche can play the role of a full-fledged mirror. (Izutsu, 2017: 260), and this is how Ibn Arabi classifies human beings with various criteria in different ways. Naturally,

³Mystics believe that the creation of the world of incarnation and the creation of human is the perfection of incarnation. In his view, human is the ultimate manifestation of God.

the first category (actually perfect human) are those whose psyche has a structure outside of this world. The second category (ordinary human beings) are those whose psyche has a structure of this world. The representative of the first category is a human being who, regardless of his psyche and heart and free from bodily desires, can see inside objects and understand the truths beyond them. As for the second category of human beings, whose psyche is deeply dependent on physical attachments, he is completely in control of his desires and, as a result, cannot see the truths of objects (Izutsu, 2017: 264). Therefore, his knowledge of the world is based solely on conjectures and assumptions, along with conjectures and assumptions of other human beings.

Qunawi also believes in the interpretation of Umm al-Qur'an: The difference between perceptions and diversity of perceptions in human beings depends on the difference of attention in the perception of those who perceive. According to him, different attitudes cause that when faced with a single phenomenon, the opinions and views of the observers are drawn to the status and aspects of the phenomenon. The person pays more attention to that status than other aspects. This difference in attention in individuals is also a function of different goals, which is related to the difference in temperaments and relationships (Qunawi, 2002; 22). In another of his works, he analyzes the factors of differences between religions and sects and points to two types of factors of differences between religions and sects; one is epistemic factors which are of the type of reason, and the second is the non-epistemic factors which are of the type of cause. Of course, Qunawi ultimately refers to epistemic factors as non-epistemic or causal factors (Qunawi, 2004: 189, quoted by Yousef Thani, M., 2010: 82).

Tolerance and the issue of religious pluralism

In addition to the conceptual dilemma of tolerance and the contradictory nature of this term in its various applications, it seems that this term in some schools is also subject to consideration and perception so far if some intellectual and cultural schools have neglected it in practice. Explain that as it is clear, the absolutist schools make a clear distinction between right and wrong and consider the wrong to be rejected, not tolerance, and the pluralists also

believe in the diversity of rights; they consider the appropriate approach to different objects as acceptance and recognition, not tolerance. Therefore, if matter A is wrong, it is not tolerable from the point of view of absolutism and should be rejected. If matter A is not wrong, then it is worthy of acceptance and recognition from pluralism, not tolerance (Naraghi, 2011: 1). Hence, the absolutist and pluralist individuals both believe that there is no such object as a wrong matter but tolerable. However, religious beliefs have always been one of the causes of positive individual and social actions and behaviors of human beings in the issue of tolerance, and this has found its main place in mysticism and is based on epistemological, ontological, and mystical anthropological principles. To prove this claim, tolerance needs to be re-read and considered from the point of view of these two currents.

In the philosophy of religion, the existing views on the diversity of religions are divided into three categories: exclusivism, pluralism, and inclusivism (Peterson et al., 2009: 402-415). However, inclusivism¹ has found less opportunity for thought than exclusivism and pluralism in these differences. However, the theory of pluralism seems to have more evidence among Muslim mystics. This apparent evidence has led to misunderstandings that people like Hick² and his followers have confiscated the view of mystics in this regard in favor of the theory of religious pluralism and considered people like Ibn Arabi and Rumi as pluralists. Proponents of this inaccurate expropriation have always emphasized two important hypotheses as an explanation: first, the distinction between the two approaches of first-degree and second-degree studies, and second, the assumption of limiting human cognition. In the

¹Religious inclusivism is the modified answer and approach of the exclusivism theory to the problem of the multiplicity of religions. According to it, a particular tradition, law, and religion carry the absolute and ultimate truth, and other religious traditions merely reflect other manifestations, aspects, and approaches of the same ultimate truth (Hick, 1985: 331). Hence, the most effective and surest way of salvation belongs to that particular religion, but other religions can also, to some extent, lead to salvation and salvation (Quinn, 1998: 260). A similar view is abundantly observed among Islamic mystics. For example:

Ahmad's name contains the names of all the prophets because if you reach one hundred, we have the number ninety (Masnavi, First Booklet/ 62).

²John Harwood Hick (1922 in Yorkshire- February 9, 2012) is a philosopher of religion and theorist of religious pluralism. He had a trip to Iran in March 2004.

following, while explaining these two hypotheses, some points in this regard will be pointed out.

The first hypothesis refers to a methodological point that rightly lacks attention and has caused misunderstanding in various subjects, including pluralism. Regardless of this distinction, many scholars consider this theory to be associated with skepticism or relativism and consider its acceptance as a violation of religious faith and beliefs. Those who followers of this theory, on the other hand, believe that pluralism is merely an extra-religious philosophical theory (second-degree studies) and logically has nothing to relate with the inter-religious theological discussion (second-degree studies); that is, the legitimacy and invalidity of religion and a philosopher of religion in terms of being a philosopher can believe in pluralism and at the same time defend the theological and intra-religious position of the legitimacy of his religious beliefs. The various religions are each a valid path and a stepping stone to the sky of meaning, and they aim at their sincere followers; from this point of view, all religious books are not more than one and have only one goal (Soroush, 1999: 229).

According to Hermann Dorninger, it is unreasonable to expect intolerance that we should accept the opinions and beliefs of others or give up our true beliefs and beliefs. The call to tolerance is not the result of relativizing one's beliefs but limiting their practical effects (Dorninger, 2007: 88). As a result, the validity of different ways for a set of people does not lead to tolerance in a reprehensible sense.

But the summary of the second hypothesis is a limitation of human cognition, which is taken from one of the important epistemological principles of the important philosopher of the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant. He believed that a direct connection with reality is not possible for man, and we usually know the world through the concepts and categories we derive from cultures and traditions. Because these concepts are different, we see the world differently, and according to some, we even live in different worlds. It is impossible to know reality without having special glasses of a certain color on the eye, so it must be acknowledged that the human ability to know is relative and limited. One cannot attain absolute truth because it is beyond our relative and imperfect cognitions. This limitation and

relativity of cognition are also true in theology (Soroush, 1999: 224-226). Hick and others later used this important epistemological principle in the field of philosophy of religion to confirm the theory of pluralism,¹⁵ and tolerance was introduced not only in the field of religion but in all individual and social relations as one of the important results of this principle.

All this while there is a big gap between the meaning of mystics from tolerance and the meaning of pluralist philosophers. The sharpness of this distinction is reflected in the stability or instability of tolerance as the foundation of development.

Mystical tolerance, from similarity to distinction with philosophical pluralistic tolerance

As mentioned, the apparent similarities between the views of mystics and pluralists on the issue of tolerance have led some to consider mystical tolerance as the same tolerance derived from the theory of pluralism. At the same time, there are important differences between the two tolerances that, if ignored, can lead to such concerns and misconceptions.

It is said that the prerequisite for accepting pluralism in religions is not to doubt or relativize the legitimacy of one's own beliefs or to consider the opinions of others' rights. This common point with mystical tolerance has led some to present evidence of the legacy of Muslim mystics to equate mystical tolerance with pluralistic tolerance. However, although we are methodologically required to distinguish the results of first-degree studies from second-degree studies, we believe that pluralistic tolerance is not logically the cause of epistemic skepticism or relativism but still exposed to the non-epistemic and practical effects of this theory in the form of ideological laxity or negligence in one's religion while these works are not in mystical tolerance. In other words, some beliefs:

¹⁵ Inspired by Kant's epistemological principles (Noumenon and Phenomenon), Hick provides an epistemological and philosophical basis for the theory of religious pluralism, claiming that religions are phenomena that emerged to respond to absolute reality as required by geographical and special cultural conditions. As a result, from a human point of view, they are our images of God. From a divine point of view, they are identifications of God in different religious traditions. The great religious traditions express the various human conceptions and perceptions of infinite absolute truth and reaction to it, not the absolute truth itself.

Because the king was very upset with him, his infallibility and understanding were no longer effective?

(Masnavi, second booklet/2020)

Or the famous advice of Sheikh Abu Al-Hassan Kharghani to observe the principle of respect for individuals as a manifestation of divine creation without considering their beliefs;¹ another manifestation of this methodological distinction referred to in the second pluralist presupposition was the limitation of human cognition. This presupposition has also been accepted in Islamic mysticism as a detailed theorem; the difference is that the result of such a presupposition in pluralism leads to the severance of the relationship between the mind and external reality, and as a result, the transcendent reality becomes an inexpressible and unknowable truth. Thus in their view, the essence of truth is essentially distinct from its manifestation. Teachings will all be phenomena that have arisen in response to absolute reality as required by specific geographical and cultural conditions. According to this basis, the absolute reality does not belong to science nor ignorance because it is incomprehensible. Therefore, there is no other way but to accept and tolerate the views of other religions regarding religious experiences. This issue has also been raised in theological studies under the title of absolute transcendence in the discussion of simile and transcendence, and some have tended to this theory. On the other hand, Muslim mystics have offered a different interpretation of this issue from the point of view of pluralists and theologians, without resorting to absolute simile or absolute transcendence.

Simile and transcendence in mysticism and creating a platform for tolerance

¹Referring to the famous historical advice of Sheikh Abolhassan Kharaghani, which was hung in the form of an inscription on his head in his monastery. "Whoever enters this house, give him bread and do not ask about his faith, whether he is precious in God's sight or Abolhassan's house, it should be worth the reception.

It was pointed out that the unity of existence is one of the two basic pillars of theoretical mysticism. Some important accusations against mystics are related to this issue of unity of existence. The contradictory nature of this theory is that in the popular literature among mystics and as an explanation of the idea of the unity of existence, this contradiction manifests itself in various forms such as the paradox of emergence and transcendence, emergence and ventricle, unity and multiplicity, nearness and dimension, time and place, and so on.

One of the most important paradoxes that the unity of existence faces is the paradox of right and creation. The mystic person considers both the truth as reality and the creation as such and, at the same time, does not realize more than one existence in the universe. In his view, existence can be attributed to both truth and creation. This is where the paradox of truth and creation becomes the paradox of transcendence and simile (Kakaei, 2014: 397). Regarding the connection between transcendence and simile and the discussion of the limitation of human cognition, mystics believe that although intellects are incapable of knowing the truth of the divine essence, it is not that God is unknowable but is still recognizable by his manifestations and attributes. Therefore, the distinction between the transcendent reality and his creatures is meaningless in the views of mystics. Ibn Arabi summarizes the paradox of transcendence and simile: The transcendent right is the same as the similar creation, although the creation is distinct from the right. The creator's reality is the creature, and the creature's reality is the creator (Ibn Arabi, 1987, 1: 78, quoting by Kakaei, 2014: 398). Therefore, mystics believe that the more transcendent or purer we know God from creation, the less it will be possible to know him. Any religious belief that merely emphasizes transcendence is inherently imperfect. For example, Ibn Arabi is someone who does not reject absolute transcendence and, in a challenging speech, calls those who believe in absolute transcendence ignorant or ill-mannered (Izutsu, 2017: 71) because he believes that the result will be the denial of the existence of God. He analyzes the apostasy of many people due to an incorrect invitation to God in the form of mere transcendence. He believes that one of the reasons for the failure of Noah's mission in inviting people to God has been this absolute transcendence or the same intellectual transcendence. In contrast, Prophet always invited

people through different names called Jame Allah or Rahman (Ibn Arabi, 1987: 71, quoted by Kakaei, 2014: 625, and Izutsu, 2017: 79).

The God of mystics has existential transcendence and epistemic transcendence, but at the same time, he is present at all levels of existence and in all human beliefs. Therefore, in Ibn Arabi's view, transcendence is always mixed with simile from the cognitive and epistemological point of view (Kakaei, 2014: 630). Where there is an existential transcendence, that is a God who transcends all perceptions but is present in every belief in the practical manifestation. Thus, in the school of mysticism, even though all believers in God are miserable in their belief, at the same time, none of them have known God as they should, lack knowledge, which is the source of attaining the status of amazement, the position which in mysticism is considered as the ultimate knowledge and of course is obtained after attaining annihilation (Kakaei, 2014: 442). This amazement is metaphysical because man, by nature, has exhausted what he sees in the world from considering the universe as one or as many (Izutsu, 2017: 89). The amazement caused by accepting the truth in contradictory forms brings theoretical mysticism, especially Ibn Arabi, to a stage where he believes in all the creators' beliefs about God and does not deny any of them. In this way, he created a solid foundation for a kind of tolerance in your believing (Al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya, 2: 545 and 212, quoted by Kakaei, 2014; 446) because God is present in the general manifestation of every belief, and this is the mystical basis of the tolerance that is quite different from the tolerance of philosophical pluralists. If this view is accepted at least epistemologically as the culture of society and at least among the elites, it seems to lead the talents and capacities of the society towards more endurance and tolerance and put it on the verge of flourishing. This is the saying of Ibn Arabi: Beware that you are bound by a particular belief and do not disbelieve otherwise, that if you do so, much good and knowledge of the matter¹ as it is- will away from you (Ibn Arabi, 1987: 113-136; quoted by Izetso, 2017: 266) also confirms this. Anthropologically, according to the relationship

¹The world of matter or the world of abstractions is a world that is not perceived by the five senses, as opposed to the world of creation, which the five senses can understand. The root of belief in the world of matter has been considered as "الا له الخلق و الامر" (Qur'ān 7:54).

between the realm of creation and legislation, from the perspective of mysticism, this is the secret of the creation of the universe on the one hand and the result of divine love for the emergence of the essence of truth on the other and it is responsible for guiding creation for its desired perfection, therefore, every object, while being the manifestation of truth in its size and skeptically representing this manifestation, is subjugated to the total divine manifestation, that is, man, and man, by looking at all beings, leads each to their desired perfection. Development occurs in fertilizing the capacities and bringing the potential talents of objects to the actuality and delivery of each creature to its perfection.

Conclusions

Considering the capacities of Islamic mysticism, the purposes of the present study were the paying attention to its new functions in the individual and social life on the one hand and to maintain and promote this religious-cultural capital in order to benefit from the macro-plans of society for achieving sustainable development, on the other hand. Among the many issues of mysticism, the element of tolerance was included in this discussion due to its special place in mysticism on the one hand and its role in various aspects of human life on the other hand.

As mentioned, tolerance is a mostly perceptual virtue. They belong to those people, and the subject belongs to those people. Islamic mysticism, on the one hand, presents the main issue and the main concern of all schools, namely, the identity of existence and the truth of existence, by going beyond the conflict of simile and transcendence, while offering a collective way, apologizing for the war of seventy-two nations to the dynasty of the universe, the conflict of human beings from Arabs to Turks, from Romans to Iranians, and the punch of human children from Jabalga to Jabalsa called for coexistence and allowed man to be critical of ideas, beliefs and practices, and he digs into the womb of creation and does not block the way of tolerance with those who hold different beliefs, and teaches man, as the caliph of God, who must attain the transcendent attributes, to sit in the sight of the insane to practice, and if apart from Lily's goodness, he can not see, at least do not neglect some of

Lily's goodness, because "To Allah belong the east and the west. Whichever way you turn, there is the Face of Allah. He is the Embracer, the Knower." (Qur'ān 2:115)

It was pointed out that this attitude does not lead to fanatical exclusivism or value inclusivism and even pluralist philosophical tolerance. Rather, in this approach, the acceptance of the other is proposed as a divine manifestation and ontological reality. The result is the tolerance of the other in practice and the opportunity for the theoretical and epistemological understanding and acceptance of the other. This was the purpose of this research on tolerance in the mystical approach, and tolerance in this model would be able to develop a moral model in individual relationships in the form of laws and regulations to be used in socio-political systems, especially the realization of sustainable development.

References

Books

١. Amini Nejad, Ali; Mahdi Babaei, and Ali Reza Kermani, (2011), *Principles and philosophy of theoretical mysticism*, Qom, Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute.
٢. Hick, John, (1985). *Problems of religious pluralism*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
٣. Hick, John, (1988). *philosophy of religion*, New Jersey: prentice Hall.
٤. Ibn Arabi, Muhammad; (1987), *Fusus al-Hikam*, Abo-el-Alaa Afifi, Tehran, Al-Zahra Publications.
٥. Ibn Arabi, Muhammad, (n.d), *Al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya*, Beirut, DarSader.
٦. Izutsu, Toshihiko, (2017), *Sufism and Taoism*, Mohammad Javad Gohari, 7th.ed, Tehran: Rozaneh Publications.
٧. Minovi, Mojtaba, (2006). *Freedom and intellectual liberty*, Tehran: Toos Publications.
٨. Motahhari, Morteza, (2009). *Jihad*, Tehran: Sadra Publications.
٩. Nazari, Morteza, (2006). *Education and human development*, Tehran: Sepideh Taban.
١٠. Peterson, Michael, William Hasker, Bruce Reichenbach, David Basinger, (2009). *Reason and Religious belief: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, 8th.ed, Ahmad Naraghi, Tehran: Tarh-e Noo Publications.

لِلَّهِ الْمَشْرِقُ وَالْمَغْرِبُ فَأَيْنَمَا تُوَلُّوا فَانَّمَّ وَجْهُ اللَّهِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيمٌ!

۱۱. Qaysari, Dawūd, (1996). *Sharh Fusus al-Hikam*, Sayyed Jalal-ed-Din Ashtiani, Tehran: Elmi Farhangi Publishing Company.
۱۲. Quinn, Philip L., (1998). *Religious pluralism*, London: Rutledge Encyclopedia of philosophy.
۱۳. Qunawi, Sadr al-Din., (2002). *I'jāz al-Bayān fī Tafsir-e Umm al-Qur'an*, Qom: Boostane Ketab Publications.
۱۴. Rahimian, Saeid, (2011). *Fundamentals of theoretical mysticism*, Tehran: Samt Publications.
۱۵. Soroush, Abdolkarim, (1999). *Straight paths*, 3rd. ed, Tehran: Serat Cultural Publications.
۱۶. Turkah Işfahānī, Alī ibn Muḥammad, (2003). *Tamhīd fī sharḥ Qawā'id al-tawhīd*, Hassan Ramezani, 1st.ed, Beirut: Umm al-Qura Institute.
۱۷. Tusi, Nasir al-Din, (2004). *Ajvebat al-Masael al-Nasiriyat*, Abdullah Nourani, Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies.

Articles

۱۸. Dialameh, Nikoo, Baradaran Haqhir, Maryam, (2010). "The concept of human growth and development in the perspective of Islam and the West", *Journal of Science and Religion Research*, 1 (2), pp 45-71.
۱۹. Dorninger, Hermann, (2007). "Critique of the word tolerance function in intercultural and inter-religious dialogue", *Journal of human studies; Imam Hussein University*, Abadullah Heidari, 16 (72), pp 81-96.
۲۰. Farzanehpour, Hosein, Bakhshayizadeh, Mohammad, (2011). "Tolerance and sufferance in Quran", *A Research Quarterly in Islamic Theology (kalam) and Religious Studies*, 7(25), pp 157-176.
۲۱. Haghighi, Ali Muhammad, (2009). "A study of the role of culture in sustainable development", *Journal of Muhandesi-e Farhangi*, 37 & 38, pp 76-86.
۲۲. Misbah Yazdi, Muhammad Taqi, (2000). "Violence and tolerance", *Book Review*, 4(2-3), pp 48-65.
۲۳. Movahed, Ziya, (1998). "Beyond tolerance", *Kian Magazine*, 8(45), pp 58-61.
۲۴. Naraghi, Arash, (2011). "The paradox of tolerance", *Sedanet Cultural Site*: <https://3danet.ir/پيازاندوکس-مدار/>.
۲۵. Navabakhsh, Mehrdad, (2013). "The Necessity of Social Capital Rehabilitation in Urban Space Development", *Journal of Iranian Social Development Studies (JISDS)*, 5(4), pp. 7-17.
۲۶. Paya, Ali, (2002), "The Riddle of Tolerance". *Firoozeh Paul*, 2 (5).

۲۷. Shekar Abi, Hossein, (2012). "Islamic mysticism and the claim of pluralism", *Journal of Zamaneh*, 25 & 26, pp 46-47.
۲۸. Zanganeh, Peyman, Hamidi, Somaiya. (2015). "Analysis of the effects of the policy of tolerance on the process of sustainable development in Iran", *The Islamic Revolution Approach*, 9 (30), pp 119-138.

Accepted Article