Mystical Relationships and Sustainable Development: A Case Study of Tolerance

Mohammad Reza Rajabi[1] | Hossein Saberi[2*] | Mohamad Hossein Montazery[3]

1. Department of Religions and Mysticism, Faculty of Theology, College of Farabi, University of Tehran, Qom, Iran. E-mail: rajabi.mr@ut.ac.ir

2. Corresponding Author, Department of Religions and Mysticism, Faculty of theology, College of Farabi, University of Tehran, Qom, Iran. E-mail: h_saberi_v@ut.ac.ir

3. Department of Philosophy and Theology, Faculty of Theology, College of Farabi, University of Tehran, Qom, Iran. E-mail: montazery.hosein@ut.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Article type: Research Article **Article History:** Received: 19 December 2023 Revised: 23 April 2024 Accepted: 01 May 2024 Published Online: 11 June 2025 **Keywords:** Sustainable development, Tolerance, Unity of existence, Mystical anthropology.	Development, particularly sustainable development, is one of the goals every country strives to achieve. Among the facilitators of the move towards development, both culture and culture building are deemed significant. 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 sustainable development. Among Islamic schools and sciences, mysticism has unique capacities to formulate specific conceptual frameworks and prepare theoretical presuppositions and practical solutions for 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 documentary method and relying on written sources and libraries, aims to analyze the written heritage of Muslim mystics and explain the intellectual foundations of tolerance as the basis of culture based on the ontological position of the unity of existence one the hand, and mystical anthropology on the other hand. The study also seeks to take steps in solving the macro-cultural problems of today while moving towards the best possible realization of sustainable development.

Introduction

Today, sustainable development and its related categories are among the objectives that many developing countries try to fulfill. This category can be studied from different aspects. It cannot be simply measured by quantitative indicators alone or simply studied experimentally using the prominent fields of science such as sociology, political science, psychology, and so on. Setting and formulating theoretical frameworks is on the shoulders of secondary epistemological research, which, in addition to conceptual enlightenment, identifies the possible shortcomings of the theories that underlie individual or collective actions.

Considering the role of culture in sustainable development on the one hand, and the vital role of religious beliefs in the context of culture on the other hand, it seems that by posing theoretical questions in the field of religion to develop an appropriate indigenous model, macro-cultural programs and policies can be formulated 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 the mystical truth of tolerance is and how it plays a role in achieving sustainable development are the main questions of this study. The research hypothesis is that the application of tolerance derived from this approach can, along with competing theories based on mystical principles, represent humans as the supreme manifestation of God, regardless of religious, cultural, or climatic supremacy; and 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 those who perpetrate those actions. In this way, it emphasizes human dignity in terms of anthropology without being contradictory in opinion or pluralistic 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, tracing its evolution 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, the study presents a proposed model at the level of individual relations within the social field to achieve sustainable development.

What Is Development?

The evolution of the concept of development in the West began with the focus on economic growth. After transitioning from the basic needs approach and then to the development of human resources, it culminated in human development in the modern sense. Development in this sense is a multidimensional process that is not based purely on economic considerations, emphasizing the need to preserve human identity. This new attitude towards human beings is regarded as the starting point of societal change. It relies on building a development indicator based on human, moral, and spiritual identity as well as values (Nazari, 2006). Today, experts in this field believe that human beings are the axis, means, and goal of development to argue that the orientations in all levels of activities in society should be oriented towards the welfare and well-being of human beings (Dialameh & Baradaran Haqhir, 2010). 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 (Navabakhsh, 2013).

However, growth is a necessary condition for development, and it should not be considered synonymous with 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, while, in general, it can be argued 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; however, the concept of development implies the emergence of another phenomenon and an increase in production. It can be considered a qualitative concept, so every kind of increase in something is not the same as development, as development implies growth (Dialameh & Baradaran Haqhir, 2010).

Development and Human Being in Western and Islamic Attitudes

In the prevailing view of Western countries, human development stems from the theory of liberal democracy[1] and the values that govern it. Liberal democracy has an individualistic orientation; this means that an individual is the most original and fundamental member of society and its institutions and is considered to be 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 broaden one's choice to align with society's definition of a new citizen in a developed country (Dialameh & Baradaran Haqhir, 2010). The result is that the dominant view of the concept of development in the West is a materialistic in nature, and Western development, by focusing on humans in this world, denies any divine narrative of development. By considering human intellect as a factor of building development, this view seeks solutions and the process of its realization. On the other hand, the Islamic view of development has taken a different path.

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 goal. This is because the criteria of growth and development can be indicative of sustainable development in society when they provide sufficient explanations to maintain spiritual and material balance across various social areas. Additionally, it is important to introduce indicators that reflect both qualitative and quantitative aspects and consider them as a prelude to the growth of moral perfection in humans.

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.

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. Religion and faith cannot be achieved through reluctance and coercion of the people (Motahari, 2009); rather, inviting people to religion is never a license for violence, including verbal violence, insult, ridicule, and humiliation (Misbah Yazdi, 2000). 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 (Qur'ān 10: 99).

Mystical Foundations of Tolerance

Before starting the discussion, it is necessary to make two clear points:

- Tolerance is a moral virtue, and it entails a prohibition against action toward opposing thoughts at the core of its semantic structure, which gives it a negative nature. In this context, it requires peaceful coexistence with ideas or actions that are considered invalid or morally wrong by the individual (Paya, 2002). In other words, tolerance means recognizing the "wrong right" (Naraghi, 2011). However, the virtue of tolerance in this sense is not unconditional. In cases where the effects and results of a person's actions involve not only their own rights but also the rights of other individuals, the concept of "wrong right" is bound by conditions. Furthermore, discussing those conditions and defending the necessity of their existence relates to the topic of freedom and its limits, different from the topic of tolerance (Malekian, 2005).
- Tolerance is associated with action, not with beliefs that are of the carnal and esoteric states. First, an individual has no way to penetrate the realm of the mind and other consciences to know their own beliefs, and then, to tolerate the knowledge of the possible change or conflict of that belief with their own belief. Second, assuming the possibility of knowing another belief, one can do nothing but give in, because, according to Rumi: "Thoughts are not inward; and within the world is freedom." Therefore, if beliefs are also presented as objects that can be

---

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).

tolerated, it necessarily means to recognize those beliefs as belonging to the category of action (Malekian, 2005).

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). None of the issues of theoretical mysticism is outside these two topics.

- The first section is discussed under the title of ontology. Muslim mystics have interpreted their mystical and psychic experiences in terms of the concept of being and existence, expressing the discovery of plurality in unity and unity in plurality through these interpretations (Rahimian, 2011). The most fundamental issue in mysticism is the issue of the unity of existence. So far, many interpretations have been presented of this theory. The term unity encompasses the existence of a wide and, sometimes, heterogeneous range of schools and opinions of different thinkers, as called Pantheism[1] in the West. Simply put, the unity of existence means that the mystics do not believe in another existence other than one being and existence, which is God, and at the same time, do not deny plurality. Hence, they believe that God has different manifestations at different levels. Therefore, the discussion of God leads us to discuss the levels of existence (Kakaei, 2014). 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 system of existence has been totally drawn in the form of a circle of existence and is divided into five Hazrats[2] 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 beyond them all.

2. Perfect Human

The term perfect human was first used by Ibn Arabi (560-638) as the basis of tolerance and axis of culture. Ibn Arabi and his followers believe that the encapsulation of the whole world in Hazarat khams is present in human. Accordingly, the perfect human (monotheist) is the second basic element of theoretical mysticism.

Ibn Arabi examines human on two levels: formative and individual levels (Izutsu, 2017)[3], which due to the close connection with the subject of this study, we will briefly describe each of them:

- In the formative (existential) realm, a human is considered a perfect existence (a kind of human being), as the perfect manifestation of existence, created divinely, representing the smallest universe and 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 onomastics. 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 to the extent that it exists. The beings of the universe are each a manifestation of the truth. However, no one can represent the greatest (divine) name, which is the sum of all the attributes of truth; therefore, there must be a perfect being in whom God Almighty can appear as He is. Because of its infinite capacity, that being can manifest all the names, attributes, and perfections of God. An example of such a being is the perfect human (Rahimian, 2011). This process of emergence and manifestation is

---

1. The term pantheism is a combination of the Greek words pan (all) and Theo (God). Pantheisms are monistic, derived from the Greek word meaning singular or solitary. They believe that there is only one being and that other forms of reality are its manifestations.
2. Hazart 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.
3. Of course, in different contexts, Ibn Arabi has provided various classifications of humans, most of which can be seen as a representation of the theoretical basis of mystical tolerance. The present study is based on the classifications mentioned above.

called incarnation in popular mystical literature. Therefore, if the principle of creation is incarnation, then human creation is the perfection of incarnation; that is, the human is the ultimate manifestation of God (Ibn Arabi, 1987; Qaysari, 1996; Tarkeh Iṣfahānī, 2003). As a result, at the formative level, what is meant by "human" is the perfect human.

- However, in the individual realm, every human being (a representative human) has the potential for existential comprehensiveness simply because they are 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 enjoy the awareness of this comprehensiveness to the extent that their degree of awareness approaches the degree of awareness of the Almighty, concerning his names and attributes. Conversely, some have such little understanding of this comprehensiveness that they practically descend to the level of ignorance. 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), and this is how Ibn Arabi classifies human beings using various criteria in different ways. Naturally, the first category (actually, perfect human) includes those whose psyche has a structure outside of this world. The second category (ordinary human beings) includes 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 comprehend the significance of objects and understand the truths beyond them. Regarding the second category, those whose psyche are deeply dependent on physical attachments, are completely in control of their desires and, as a result, cannot see the truths of objects (Izutsu, 2017). Therefore, their knowledge of the world is based solely on their own conjectures and assumptions, along with others'.

Qunawi (2002) 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 specific statuses and aspects of the phenomenon. Individuals pay more attention to these statuses than to other aspects. This difference in attention among individuals is also a function of their differing goals, which is related to variations in temperaments and relationships. In another of his works, he analyzes the factors contributing to differences between religions and sects and identifies two types of factors: the first is epistemic factors, which are based on reason, and the second is non-epistemic factors, which are causative. Ultimately, Qunawi (2004) refers to epistemic factors as non-epistemic or causal factors.

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 even though some intellectual and cultural schools have neglected it in practice. The absolutist schools make a clear distinction between right and wrong, considering the wrong to be rejected rather than tolerated. In contrast, pluralists also believe in the diversity of rights; they view the appropriate approach to different objects as acceptance and recognition, not tolerance. Therefore, if matter A is wrong, it is not tolerable from the perspective of absolutism and should be rejected. If matter A is not wrong, then it is worthy of acceptance and recognition from a pluralist standpoint, not tolerance (Naraghi, 2011). Hence, both absolutist and pluralist followers believe that there is no such object as a wrong matter that is tolerable. However, religious beliefs have always been a significant cause of positive individual and social actions and behaviors regarding tolerance. This concept has found its primary place in mysticism and is based on epistemological, ontological, and mystical anthropological principles. To substantiate this claim, tolerance needs to be re-examined and considered from the perspectives 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). However, inclusivism[1] has

---

1. Religious inclusivism is the modified answer and approach of the exclusivism theory to the problem of the multiplicity of religions. Accordingly, 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). Hence, the

found less opportunity for scrutinization than exclusivism and pluralism. However, the theory of pluralism seems to have more evidence among Muslim mystics. This apparent evidence has led to misunderstandings that people such as Hick and his followers have confiscated the view of mystics in this regard in favor of the theory of religious pluralism, and considered people such as 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; second, the assumption of limitation of human cognition. In the following, while explaining these two hypotheses, some points will be pointed out in this regard.

The first hypothesis refers to a methodological viewpoint that has been overlooked and 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 follow this theory, on the other hand, believe that pluralism is merely an extra-religious philosophical theory (second-degree studies) and is not logically associated with the inter-religious theological discussion (second-degree studies); that is, the legitimacy and invalidity of religion suggest that a philosopher of religion can believe in pluralism while simultaneously defending 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 heights of meaning, aiming at their sincere followers. From this perspective, all religious books are essentially one and have only one goal (Soroush, 1999).

According to Dorninger (2007), it is unreasonable to expect that we should accept the opinions and beliefs of others or give up our true beliefs. The call to tolerance is not the result of relativizing one's beliefs but rather limiting their practical effects. As a result, the validity of different paths for a set of people does not lead to tolerance in a negative sense. However, the summary of the second hypothesis is a limitation of human cognition, which is taken from one of the important epistemological principles proposed by the important philosopher of the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant. He believes 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 seeing through various lenses; thus, 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). Hick and others later used this important epistemological principle in the field of philosophy of religion to confirm the theory of pluralism[1]. Moreover, 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.

At the same time, there is a big gap between the meaning of tolerance among mystics and 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 the same as the one 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 argued 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

---

most effective and surest way of salvation belongs to that particular religion, but other religions can also, to some extent, lead to salvation (Quinn, 1998). A similar view is abundantly observed among Islamic mystics.

1. 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 various human conceptions and perceptions of the infinite absolute truth, as well as reactions to it.

distinguish the results of first-degree studies from those of second-degree studies, we believe that pluralistic tolerance is not logically the cause of epistemic skepticism or relativism. Nonetheless, it remains exposed to the non-epistemic and practical effects of this theory, manifesting as ideological laxity or negligence in one's religion, while these works do not pertain to mystical tolerance.

In other words, some beliefs assert that the existence of rival theories, from both a philosophical perspective and the history of science, holds equal validity. This should logically not weaken our beliefs regarding the correctness of our theories within our religion (Soroush, 1999). It is merely a logical assertion and methodological advice that, despite being correct, lacks practical guarantees in the text. However, there is ample evidence throughout history of non-epistemic effects that underlie this field of study.

Perhaps the lack of a clear distinction between two different positions of pluralists (pluralism in thought and Christianity in practice), such as Hick, Smith, Nitter, and Pinker, supports this claim. Undoubtedly, the Christianity of these individuals differs from that of an exclusivist or inclusivist person, at least, in terms of their degree of prejudice against the Christian religion. Their philosophical basis, while not the reason for this difference, may be the cause. While the main origin of mystical tolerance is not exposure to the aforementioned non-epistemic influences, belonging mystical tolerance is fundamentally different from belonging philosophical tolerance. Belonging philosophical tolerance is the diversity and plurality of beliefs, while belonging mystical tolerance is the human and not beliefs influenced by culture, climate, or, according to Qunawi, temperaments, and relationships. In other words, belonging tolerance in this approach recognizes and respects the other as an ontological reality, akin to the divine manifestation, which is referred to as the main principle and perfection of creation. This feature is one of the important differences between these approaches. Moreover, the abundance of poetic and prose evidence in the great heritage of Muslim mystics, based on the centrality of man in mystical tolerance, serves as strong support for this theory. Rumi, for example, criticizes the idea of crucifixion in Christianity as one of the driving forces behind the subject of tolerance, doing so without falling into contradiction while advocating for tolerance with others, particularly regarding religious differences.

In addition, the famous advice of Sheikh Abu Al-Hassan Kharghani emphasizes the principle of respect for individuals as manifestations of divine creation, regardless of their beliefs. Another manifestation of this methodological distinction, referred to in the second pluralist presupposition, is the limitation of human cognition. This presupposition has also been accepted in Islamic mysticism as a detailed theorem; however, the result of such a presupposition in pluralism leads to the severance of the relationship between the mind and external reality. 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 are seen as phenomena that arise in response to absolute reality, shaped by specific geographical and cultural conditions. According to this perspective, absolute reality does not belong to science or ignorance because it is incomprehensible. Therefore, there is no alternative but to accept and tolerate the views of other religions regarding religious experiences. This issue has also been addressed in theological studies under the title of absolute transcendence in the discussion of simile and transcendence, with some scholars leaning toward this theory. On the other hand, Muslim mystics have offered a different interpretation of this issue compared to pluralists and theologians, without resorting to absolute simile or absolute transcendence.

Simile and Transcendence in Mysticism and Creating a Platform for Tolerance

It has been 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 the 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). Thus, mystics believe that the more transcendent or purer we perceive God to be from creation, the less it becomes possible to truly know Him. Any religious belief that merely emphasizes transcendence is inherently imperfect. For example, Ibn Arabi does not reject absolute transcendence; in a challenging discourse, he labels those who believe in absolute transcendence as ignorant or ill-mannered (Izutsu, 2017) because he believes that such views ultimately lead to the denial of the existence of God. He analyzes the apostasy of many individuals due to an incorrect invitation to God framed solely in terms of mere transcendence. He posits that one of the reasons for the failure of Noah's mission in inviting people to God was this absolute transcendence, or what he refers to as intellectual transcendence. In contrast, the Prophet always invited people through different names, referred to as Jame Allah or Rahman (Ibn Arabi, 1987).

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), 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 has known God as they should, and they lack knowledge, which is the source of attaining the status of amazement, the position which in mysticism is considered the ultimate knowledge and, of course, is obtained after attaining annihilation (Kakaei, 2014). This amazement is metaphysical because human, by nature, has exhausted what they see in the world by considering the universe as one or as many (Izutsu, 2017). The amazement caused by accepting the truth in contradictory forms brings the followers of theoretical mysticism, especially Ibn Arabi, to a stage where they believe in all the creators' beliefs about God and do not deny any of them. In this way, they create a solid foundation for a kind of tolerance in belief (Ibn Arabi, n.d.) 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 society towards more endurance and tolerance and place it on the verge of flourishing. Ibn Arabi (1987, pp. 113-136) confirms this belief as well by saying, "beware that you are bound by a particular belief and do not disbelieve in otherwise, that if you do so, much good and knowledge of the matter as it is will be away from you." Anthropologically, according to the relationship 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 towards its desired perfection; therefore, every object, while being the manifestation of truth in its own size and skeptically representing this manifestation, is subjugated to the total divine manifestation, that is, human. Human, by looking at all beings, leads each to their desired perfection. Growth occurs by fertilizing the capacities and bringing the potential talents of objects to actuality and leading each creature to its perfection.

Conclusion

Considering the capacities of Islamic mysticism, the purpose of the present study was 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 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. 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, addressing the war of seventy-two nations within the dynasty of the universe, the conflict of human beings from Arabs to Turks, from Romans to Iranians, and the struggles of human from Jabulga to Jabulsa that call for coexistence and allow human to be critical of ideas, beliefs, and practices. It encourages them to dig into creation and not block the way of tolerance with those who hold different beliefs. It teaches human, as the caliph of God, who must attain the transcendent attributes, to sit in the

sight of the unwise to practice, and if, apart from Lily's goodness, they cannot see, at least they should 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 to 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 theoretical and epistemological understanding and acceptance of the other. This was the purpose of this research on tolerance in the mystical approach. Tolerance in this model would be able to develop a moral framework in individual relationships in terms of laws and regulations to be used in socio-political systems, especially for the realization of sustainable development.

References

Dialameh, N., & Baradaran Haqhir, M. (2010). The concept of human growth and development in the perspective of Islam and the West. *Journal of Science and Religion Research, 1*(2), 45-71. https://elmodin.ihcs.ac.ir/article_443.html?lang=en

Dorninger, H. (2007). Critique of the word tolerance function in intercultural and inter-religious dialogue. *Journal of Human Studies; Imam Hussein University, 16*(72), 81-96.

Hick, J. (1985). *Problems of religious pluralism*. St. Martin's Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40018842

Hick, J. (1988). *Philosophy of religion*. Prentice Hall.

Ibn Arabi, M. (1987). *Fusus al-Hikam* (A. Afifi, Trans.). Al-Zahra Publications. (In Persian)

Ibn Arabi, M. (n.d.). *Al-Futuhat al-Makkiyya*. DarSader. (In Arabic)

Izutsu, T. (2017). *Sufism and Taoism* (M. Javad Gohari, Ed., 7th ed.). Rozaneh Publications. (In Persian)

Misbah Yazdi, M. T. (2000). Violence and tolerance. *Book Review, 4*(2-3), 48-65. (In Persian)

Motahari, M. (2009). *Jihad*. Sadra Publications. (In Persian)

Naraghi, A. (2011). *The paradox of tolerance*. Sedanet. https://3danet.ir/مدارا-پارادوکس/

Nazari, M. (2006). *Education and human development*. Sepideh Taban. (In Persian)

Navabakhsh, M. (2013). The necessity of social capital rehabilitation in urban space development. *Journal of Iranian Social Development Studies (JISDS), 5*(4), 7-17.

Paya, A. (2002). The riddle of tolerance. *Firoozeh Paul, 2*(5).

Peterson, M., Hasker, W., Reichenbach, B., & Basinger, D. (2009). *Reason and religious belief: An introduction to the philosophy of religion* (8th ed., A. Naraghi, Trans.). Tarh-e Noo Publications. (In Persian)

Qaysari, D. (1996). *Sharh Fusus al-Hikam* (S. Jalal-ed-Din Ashtiani, Trans.). Elmi Farhangi. (In Persian)

Quinn, P. L. (1998). *Religious pluralism*. Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Qunawi, S. (2002). *I'jāz al-Bayān fī Tafsir-e Umm al-Qur'an*. Boostane Ketab Publications. (In Arabic)

Rahimian, S. (2011). *Fundamentals of theoretical mysticism*. Samt Publications. (In Persian)

Soroush, A. (1999). *Straight paths* (3rd ed.). Serat Cultural Publications. (In persian)

Turkah Iṣfahānī, A. (2003). *Tamhīd fī sharḥ Qawāid al-tawhīd* (H. Ramezani, Trans., 1st ed.). Umm al-Qura Institute. (In Arabic)