Review and Critique of Exclusivism, Inclusivism and Pluralism of Legitimacy and Salvation in Islam and Christianity

Abbas Abbaszadeh[*,1], Abdullah HosseiniEskandian[2], Ali Babaei[3]

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Philosophy and Theology, University of Tabriz (Corresponding Author); aabaszadeh@tabrizu.ac.ir

2. PhD student, Department of Islamic Philosophy and Theology, University of Tabriz

3. Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Philosophy and Theology, University of Tabriz

Abstract

The issue of legitimacy and salvation is one of the cases that every human being thinks about. The vast majority of Christians and Muslims are religiously exclusive about legitimacy; they are of two kinds in terms of saving others; some believe in Exclusivism here as well, and some believe in religious inclusion. Among these two quotes, Inclusivism is rationally and religiously defensible; because, first of all, the factors of prosperity and salvation are all subject to doubt. Secondly, there are those who have absolutely no benefit from the criteria of salvation, and therefore it is not possible to give them a share of salvation and claim that everyone is a savior. In contrast to exclusivists, some believe in Inclusivism or pluralism. These two categories do not need to discuss the issue of salvation; because the pluralist considers all religions, including religion, to be equally benefactors and saviors and Inclusivism, which holds that every religion or denomination has more or less the benefit of the truth, believes in relative salvation. While expressing what Christian and Muslim theologians believe about the issue of legitimacy and salvation, the present article critiques and evaluates this issue using descriptive and analytical methods.

Keywords: Righteousness, Salvation, Religious Exclusivism, Inclusivism, Pluralism.

Introduction

Righteousness, salvation, livery, prosperity, and well-being are among the religious, theological, and philosophical concepts that are desirable for everyone and every human being wants to take a share of them. The issue of legitimacy and salvation is one of the issues that every human being in any religion thinks about himself and others and wants to know whether his religion or that of others is right? and will he be among the saved in the hereafter or not? And is there a coincidence between righteousness and salvation, or do the two have opposite meanings?

In the present age, when the mass media have built a village of this magnitude from the world and informed everyone about the situation, the sense of truth-seeking has reached its peak and has doubled the importance of this discussion; because, first of all, one must defend one's religion rationally against all religions and sects of the world; second, to determine one's duty to believers of other religions. Thirdly, there is a difference of opinion about what is right, the savior, and who is from hell? Throughout history, it has led to bloody wars and excruciating suffering. Perhaps in the present age, the lack of clear and acceptable positions in this regard will increase the scope of conflicts. This article seeks to provide a brief and descriptive account of what Christian and Muslim theologians believe and to evaluate it extensively. Unfortunately, those who have discussed this subject have not specified exactly who they are talking about or claiming their religion; sometimes, a religious person comments on a religion contrary to his own religion. On the other hand, most of the issue of legitimacy is not exactly separated from the issue of salvation, while it is necessary to distinguish between the two and find out what the relationship is between the two of the four genealogies. Therefore, in order to somewhat equate the words of religious people with the words of religion, the author has tried to present his speech as a religious person, quoting religious texts, and to separate the two issues of legitimacy and salvation as much as possible and discuss it.

The Concept of Legitimacy and Salvation

The vast majority of Christians and Muslims are religiously and even religiously exclusive about legitimacy; that is, they consider themselves the absolute right and introduce other religions and sects as false; because, firstly, they know very well that truth and reality cannot be more than one, and secondly, if they saw the other as the absolute right, they would believe in it anyway. Thirdly, if they are righteous, they will certainly be saved (Wainwright, 1999, 203). Of course, such a claim is practically unacceptable at the same time and by everyone; because how can it be accepted that the claims of different religions, while contradicting, and conflicting with each other, are all true and following reality? Therefore, it is appropriate for religious exclusivists, by setting a common standard and index, to discuss their doctrinal and practical propositions and submit and be the servants of reason in the face of the result. Of course, we are not currently trying to explain this part of the debate and prove that a particular religion or denomination is right.

Others believe in Inclusivism or pluralism. They do not need to discuss the issue of salvation; because the pluralist considers all religions, including religion, to be equally benefactors of the truth and is equally considered a savior and sees no need at all to discuss the validity of religious propositions (Leibniz, 2005, 301) and it does not matter to him which religion he belongs to. Inclusiveists, on the other hand, believe that every religion or denomination has more or less the benefit of truth; they also believe in relative salvation in the matter of salvation and do not feel the need to discuss the correctness of religious propositions; however, they believe that they can take a step towards promoting justice and salvation.

But religious monotheists who do not consider themselves right except themselves have to discuss the issue of salvation and answer the question: if you are exclusively right, then what will be the duty of others to save?

In terms of salvation, they are divided into two groups; some here also believe in religious monopoly. They do not consider anyone but themselves to be saviors, and they believe in equality and coincidence between righteousness and salvation. Some believe in religious inclusion; even though some of the followers of other religions or denominations do not know the truth, they are considered saviors by circumstances and see a connection between righteousness and salvation. That every rightful owner is a savior; but not every savior is necessarily the righteous; that is, some of the people of salvation are the people of truth, and some of the people of salvation are not people of truth, and in other words, some are not people of truth; but they will be saved.

The Relationship between Righteousness and Salvation

There can be no distinction between righteousness and salvation from the fourfold lineage; because the contrast is delivered to two negative propositions, and it should be said that no righteous person is a savior and no savior is a rightful owner, both of which are false.

Nor can the relationship between the two be reciprocal; because from the documents of these two generals to each other, three detailed theorems are obtained, of which two theorems, negative and one case, are causal; in this way, some of the rightful owners are the ones who are saved (or some of the righteous ones are the righteous ones), and some of the rightful owners are not the ones who are saved, and some of the saved ones are not the rightful owners. Though the first and third are true of these three theorems, the latter is definitely incorrect (Taliafro, 2003, 76).

Therefore, there must be equality between righteousness and salvation, or the absolute public and private, the general of which is the people of salvation and the specific of which are the people of truth. Those who are monopolistic or inclusive or pluralistic in both righteousness and salvation, whether religious or not, believe in inequality between the two. The difference is that the exclusivists consider themselves only the righteous and the people of salvation. The inclusivists believe in legitimacy and salvation on the basis of skepticism. The pluralists consider

everyone equally the people of truth and, consequently, equally the people of salvation and those who are monopolistic in religious or religious legitimacy but inclusive of religious salvation believe in an absolute public-private relationship between the two; that is, even though they only consider their own religion or denomination to be right. But followers of other religions or denominations are considered saviors under certain conditions. In theory and in practice, the vast majority of Muslims and Christians agree. Among all these statements, the present study seeks to prove the recent theory: an absolute public-private relationship between righteousness and salvation, not equality.

Monopoly in Religion or in Legitimacy and Salvation

Religious Exclusivism refers to the same religious or religious monotheism used against Inclusivism and Pluralism (Spinoza, 1987, 34). As has been said, the vast majority of followers of religions and sects are, in legitimacy, monopolistic; because, firstly, truth and reality are not more than one, and secondly, if they do not consider their religion to be true, they could not remain religious to that religion, and they certainly changed their religion or belief, and thirdly, they definitely consider the people of truth to be the people of salvation. They consider their religion or denomination to be right and other religions or sects to be false and excommunicate them; however, some Christians and Muslims are in legitimacy, Inclusivism, or pluralism, some of which will be mentioned.

The general Christian community, and even any branch of Christianity, considers itself to be right; In the Christian world, in the early third century AD, it was stated that "outside the church, there is no salvation" (Eliade, 2000, 320). They believe that Adam committed a sin that afflicted the children of Adam, and this sin will be cleansed only by the redemption of Jesus (pbuh) as the incarnation of God.

They cite the words of Jesus (pbuh) in the Gospel of John "Jesus said, I am the way of truth and life; no one comes to the Father except through my way "(Bible, 2001, Chapter 14, Verse 6). They ask how we can take another path in spite of the way of salvation and the appearance of God, with the difference that Catholic Christianity also emphasizes the observance of the religion and the law, but Protestants consider faith in Christ to be sufficient (Michel, 1998, 108). Carl Barthes (1886-1968), a Protestant theologian, sees the "law" as an arrogant attempt by man to save himself, as opposed to "manifestation." In his view, the Shari'a cannot overcome one's separation from God. Salvation depends solely on the true manifestation of God. Without Jesus Christ and independence from Him, we cannot say anything about God, man and their relationship to each other (Hordern, 1989, 110 -115; Patterson et al., 2000, 403).

The Holy Quran reports the Exclusivism of Christians and Jews: "And they say: "None shall enter Paradise unless he is a Jew or a Christian." Those are their [vain] desires. Say: "Produce your proof if ye are truthful." Nay, -whoever submits His whole self to Allah and is a doer of good, - He will get his reward with his Lord; on such shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve" (Surah Al-Baqarah, 111-112). Of course, the Quran responds to them by proposing the criterion of salvation: faith and righteous deeds (Tabatabai, 1973, vol. 1, 258).

The majority of Muslims, and even any religion of the Islamic sects, consider themselves to be only on the right path. Muslims believe that Islam is the only undistorted and life-giving religion that is geographically universal and historically immortal. According to them, the Holy Quran has claimed exclusive legitimacy for Islam in many verses and declared other religions obsolete, and they cite these verses: "The Religion before Allah is Islam [submission to His Will]: Nor did the People of the Book dissent therefrom except through envy of each other after knowledge had come to them. But if any deny the Signs of Allah, Allah is swift in calling to account" (Sūrah Āl 'Imrān, 19); "If anyone desires a religion other than Islam [submission to Allah], never will it be accepted of him; and in the Hereafter He will be in the ranks of those who have lost [All spiritual good]" (Surah Āl 'Imrān, 85); "For me, I have been commanded to serve the Lord of this city, Him Who has sanctified it and to Whom [belong] all things: and I am

commanded to be of those who bow in Islam to Allah's Will" (Sūrah al-Naml, 91); "Nor canst thou be a guide to the blind, [to prevent them] from straying: only those wilt thou get to listen who believe in Our Signs, and they will bow in Islam" (Sūrah al-Naml, 81); "And this was the legacy that Abraham left to his sons, and so did Jacob; "Oh my sons! Allah hath chosen the Faith for you; then die not except in the Faith of Islam" (Sūrah al-Baqara, 132); "But if ye turn back, [consider]: no reward have I asked of you: my reward is only due from Allah, and I have been commanded to be of those who submit to Allah's will [in Islam]" (Sūrah Yūnus, 72); "Verily, this is My way, leading straight: follow it: follow not [other] paths: they will scatter you about from His [great] path: thus doth He command you. that ye may be righteous" (Sūrah al-An'ām, 173) and other verses like these. These people have also cited hadiths such as "The actions of a person who does not believe in the Imamate of the Imam appointed by God are not acceptable and God considers his actions as an enemy" (Koleini, 1983, Vol1, 375).

Among the religious exclusivists, we can mention Ibn Hazm Zaheri, who says: "Whoever denies or mocks one of the duties of religion or denies Khatamiyyah is a disbeliever (Ibn Hazm, 1957, Vol. 3, 256). Elsewhere he refers to Jews and Christians and states: "Jews and Christians, together with all Muslims, are infidels. If anyone doubts their infidelity, he is also an infidel" (Ibid., 98). On the other hand, Fakhr al-Din al-Razi, referring to the deviations and distortions that have taken place in the religions of Zoroastrianism, Judaism, and Christ, states that belief in the mission of the Prophet of Islam and his finality is one of the principles of religion and therefore they are infidels. However, according to what the Prophet said, "Whoever turns to our qibla (Ka'ba) and prays and eats our slaughter is a Muslim," introduces all Shia and Sunni sects as Muslims. And considering that the Prophet did not ask about the principles or sub-principles of his religion in individuals' beliefs, he discovered that knowing and practicing the details of the principles and sub-principles is not a condition of faith (Yazdani and Valinejad, 2010, 18).

Abdullah Ibn Shabar, one of the religious exclusivists, states that the Imams agree that whoever denies the Imamat of one of the Imams or denies the obedience of a deed is a misguided infidel and deserves to be punished and burned in the fire (Shabar, 2002, Vol. 2, 189). And Seyyed Morteza Alam al-Huda, in addition to monotheism, mission and Imamat, condemns even those who disagreed with the Imams in the branches of religion; because he believed that these issues are so famous that not believing in them is a sign of guilt and shortcomings and not negligence (Alam al-Huda, 1902, 535-536). Shahid Thani also believes that Imamat is involved in faith; because not believing in it calls into question the mission and therefore considers the Sunnis and the People of the Book outside the religion (Ameli, 1990, 143).

Sunnis and Jama'at also emphasize the need to believe in the province of the Righteous Caliphs in order to be saved; because the companions of the Prophet have pledged allegiance to them. Abu Mansour Abdul Qahir Baghdadi, one of the scholars of the fifth century, states: "The Sunnis and the congregation are the same as the people of salvation; because only they agree with the companions; while other sects have opposed or mocked the Companions" (Badavi, 1985, Vol. 1, 24). After enumerating the principles of faith such as monotheism, mission, resurrection, Quran, and Sunnah, he says: "Anyone who believes in all of this and does not mix his faith with the innovations of the Kharijites, Rawafiz, Qadriya, etc., will be considered a savior and will be from Paradise (Baghdadi and Mashkur, 1988, 14). Al-Ghazālī, an Iranian philosopher and theologian, was a religious monopolist at one point in his life. After counting the principles of religion, he considers believing in the superiority of the First Caliph (Abu Bakr) as a condition of faith (Ghazālī, 2005, 93-94). Thus, he excludes all Shia and Mu'tazilite sects from the circle of faith; but in the later period of his life, he became a religious monopolist and declared that leaving the consensus would never lead to takfir; rather, what causes *takfir* is the belief in the existence of a prophet after the Prophet of Islam or the belief that Islamic law is abrogated (Ghazālī, 2004, 148). Under the hadith, "Soon my ummah will become seventy-three sects," he says, adding that two statements have been made, both of which are correct. "Their savior sect is

only one" and "their destructive sect is also one," the former of which indicates the monopoly of truth in one sect and the latter of the legitimacy of all but one (Ghazālī, 2002, 106).

As has been said, monopolists in legitimacy, both in religion and in a cult, have to discuss the issue of salvation and consider themselves saviors and do not consider others to be right. The question arises for them, what is the duty of others in terms of salvation? If they believe in Exclusivism in salvation, it will be what Master Motahhari says in expressing their condition: "They consider almost all people deserving of punishment; because a Muslim monopolist seems to believe that non-Muslims and non-Shia are all from hell; because if others are supposed to go to paradise like Muslims and Shia, then what is the difference between them?" (Motahhari, 2005, 255).

Critique and Review

A. In the critique of religious Exclusivism; whether it is Christianity or Islam or religious Exclusivism within these two great religions, about legitimacy, it must be said: There are claims of Christian and Islamic Exclusivism, though; but since they are in conflict with each other, they cannot be both right at the same time; because many of the teachings of these two religions are in conflict, and the truth cannot be more than one. But proving the legitimacy of one's religion and the invalidity or obsolescence of other religions requires another opportunity. How can it be accepted that the claims of different religions, while contradictory, are all true and in accordance with reality?

B. Regarding the critique of the claim of the salvation of religious monopolists, it must be said: First, the claim of religious monopoly, and especially religious monopoly in salvation, is not justified by the extent of God's mercy "and My Mercy pervades all things" (Sūrah al-A'rāf, 156) and the precedence of His Mercy over His Wrath; Because it is not acceptable that out of all the people who have lived in the past or are living now or will come to life in the future, only Muslims or Christians, or a sect of their sects, will be saved, and the rest of the people, even though they are sincere in their religiosity, in their sincerity, and in their individual, family, and social behavior, [through their religion] they cannot attain prosperity and salvation, and they are all from hell. In other words, the requirement of religious and especially religious Exclusivism in salvation is the allocation of the majority; this means that God wants to guide man and include divine mercy with them, and then the vast majority of people who lived before Christianity or did not hear the call of Christianity or Islam, are an exception to divine mercy; this is rationally ugly.

Second, although most Christianity was initially monopolistic, in the second proclamation of the Vatican Council, those who sincerely seek God but are ignorant of Christ and His church are described as saviors (Michel, 1998, 111). It is also true that there are verses in the Holy Quran that indicate Exclusivism; but according to the Quran, Islam includes the Abrahamic religions; such as where he introduces Ibrahim (AS) as a Muslim (Āl 'Imrān 67) and the apostles of Jesus (AS) ask him to testify that they are Muslims (Māida 111). Ya'qub bequeathed to his children that Muslims should die (Baqara 132). Some verses show that some followers of other religions are saved because of their sincere intentions and acting according to what they think is right. Allameh Tabatabai, regarding the verse "Religion with God is only Islam," has taken Islam in the literal sense, which is a sign of religious Inclusivism and not Exclusivism (Tabatabai, 2004, Vol. 3, 126).

Thirdly, the monotheistic belief of Christianity is based on the doctrine of redemption (salvation of humanity through the suffering of Jesus on the cross) and the Trinity (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), and none of these beliefs are true. Redemption is not compatible with divine justice, and people like Thomas Aquinas and Thomas Michel have opposed it. Thomas Aquinas about incarnation says: "The existence of God can be proved by reason and logic, but the trinity and the incarnation and the dissolution of divinity (God) in the world (Jesus) cannot be" (Barbour, 1995, 23-24). Michel also says that God demands the blood of Christ, while he was

completely innocent, to atone for the sins of others. No human being accepts this. How can it be attributed to God?! (Michel, 1998, 81-91). The Holy Quran also denies this in verses and says: "And a burdened soul cannot bear the burden of another and if one weighed down by burden should cry for [another to carry] its burden, not aught of it shall be carried, even though he be near to kin. You warn only those who fear their Lord in secret and keep up prayer; and whoever purifies himself, he purifies himself only for [the good of] his own soul; and to Allah is the eventual coming" (Sūrah Fātir 18).

On the other hand, transferring the sin of Prophet Adam (PBUH) to human beings is not acceptable; because until the task is notified to anyone and he does not act against it, he will not be punished.

Four, is it possible to blame the disobedient people who are stubborn after the completion of the argument and the presentation of evidence and proof with the ignorant people who are either "weak" by the end of the argument or due to intellectual weakness, according to the Qur'an (Nisa, 97) compared.

Fifth, the law is not against the manifestation of God on man; rather, it is an action guide to draw closer to God. The manifestation of God is not limited to the manifestation of Christ; rather, God is revealed to all divine prophets.

Sixth, if religious figures are quoted as expressing religious Exclusivism, they have other expressions that indicate they are inclusive of salvation. For example, some Christian theologians use the phrase "anonymous Christians" to indicate that non-Christians who live honestly and morally sound lives are saved (Patterson, 2000, 417). Abdullah Ibn Shabar and Sayyed Murtaza Alam al-Huda believe in the inherent goodness and ugliness of actions and refusing to do more than they can bear, and the prerequisite for such a belief is Inclusivism in salvation, not Exclusivism; because the duty of the ignorant, to whom the duty has not been communicated, is ugly, and such a person is the one who is saved, not rebuke and hell. They have introduced innocent children and infidels as survivors of Hell. In the interpretation of verse 62 of Surah al-Baqarah, Shabar says:" The Sabeans will be saved if they correct their faith and do righteous deeds, and there will be no fear or sorrow for them" (Shabar, 2002, 197). Shahid Thani also considered the ruling on the infidelity of the disbelievers, both outwardly and inwardly, as unreasonable and unacceptable, which even exists against it, and considers them to be Muslims in appearance (Ameli, 1990, 132-133). This phrase also appears in Inclusivism and not Exclusivism. Therefore, in resolving the contradictions between the sayings of these scholars, it is better to say that they are monopolists on the issue of religious legitimacy. Still, on the subject of salvation, they are inclusive.

In contrast to the narrations that consider the belief in Imamat or the belief in the justice of all the companions of the Prophet as a condition for accepting deeds, some narrations only emphasize action. At the end of his life, the Prophet said, "O people! between no one and God, there is no kinship or anything that brings good to him or repels evil from him, except action" (Ibn Abi Al-Hadid, 1959, vol. 10, 184).

Pluralism in Religion or in Legitimacy and Salvation

"Plural" as a noun or adjective means more than one, such as political pluralism, moral pluralism, epistemological pluralism, etc., which here speaks of religious pluralism.

In the case of legitimacy, pluralists present all religions or denominations as equal benefactors of the truth and, as a result, as equals of salvation. Belief in religious Pluralism has been attributed to the Ikhwan al-Safa; because he has stated in the first part of his phrase: "Truth exists in every religion and it flows in every language" (Ikhwan al-Safa, 2000, vol. 3, 501). As for salvation, pluralists believe that salvation can somehow appear in all religions and even religions (Hick, 1989, 34). They believe that salvation is not limited to one reading of a religion or denomination and that other readings can bring happiness to believers. It is said that the first person to raise this issue in the Eastern world was Yohaná Dameshghi, a physician at the court

of the Abbasid and Christian caliphs, and it is speculated that he planned to reduce Muslim Exclusivism and align Christians with Muslims and their peaceful coexistence (Sobhani, 2004, Vol. 2, 291).

In the contemporary period in the world of Christianity, Kant constructed the structure of Pluralism by separating religion and knowledge with the plan of separating knowledge and reality. John Hick is one of those people who, considering Kant's theories, allows anyone to enter heaven, regardless of belief, race, etc., provided that from within a religious tradition, he left "self-centered" and turned to "God-centered" (Hick, 2002, 20-21). He believes that teachings are not the essence of religion. The essence of religion is to change the personality of human beings (Patterson, 2000, 408-409). Hick believes that the world's great religions form different conceptions of an ultimate and mysterious divine truth (Eliade, 2000, 301). Elsewhere, referring to the elephantology of several blind people, each of whom gives a specific description, he says that they were all right, but each referred to a part of the whole reality and stated their destination in the form of incomplete examples. (Hick, 2002, 243-245). William James believed that "emotion" was the deeper source of religion and that philosophical and theological elaborations were secondary products, like translating a text into another language (James, 1902, 434).

In the Islamic world, complete Pluralism has not been reported; but as mentioned, thinkers such as the Ikhwan al-Safa, as well as mystics such as Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi, have been accused of Pluralism in legitimacy because of their thought-provoking statements in this regard, which is not unlike Inclusivism (Sobhani, 2004, Vol. 2, 292). Sufi works also emphasize the issue of general peace and peaceful living.

Motahhari argues in the language of pluralists that God has an equal relationship with all beings and human beings and that the good and bad deeds are not conventional but real. Therefore a good man must receive a reward for his deeds (Motahhari, 2005, Vol1, 298). In defense of pluralism, Abdolkarim Soroush writes that the first person to sow the seeds of Pluralism in the world was God Himself, who sent different prophets and appeared to each of them, and sent each of them into a community of messengers and placed them on the mind and tongue of each. Thus, the furnace of Pluralism was heated (Soroush, 1998, 18).

Pluralists have relied on the emergence of some verses of the Quran, including:

1. "And We prescribed to them in it that life is for life, and eye for eye, and nose for nose, and ear for ear, and a tooth for tooth, and [that there is] reprisal in wounds; but he who foregoes it, it shall be an expiation for him; and whoever did not judge by what Allah revealed, those are they that are the unjust" (Sūrah al-Māida, 48). By stating that the Holy Quran is the authenticity of all the previous books and for every nation, there is a way in which everyone should surpass each other in good deeds.

2. "Your religion for yourself and my religion for myself" (Sūrah al-Kāfirūn 6). By arguing that everyone's religion is self-respecting and that everyone can remain in their religion.

3. "Surely those who believe, and those who are Jews, and the Christians, and the Sabians, whoever believes in Allah and the last day and does good, they shall have their reward from their Lord, and there is no fear for them, nor shall they grieve" (Sūrah al-Baqara 62). By stating that the followers of other religions have no more than three conditions for salvation: faith in God, resurrection, and doing righteous deeds.

4. "It is not righteousness that you turn your faces towards the East and the West, but righteousness is this that one should believe in Allah and the last day and the angels and the Book and the prophets, and give away wealth out of love for Him to the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer and the beggars and for [the emancipation of] the captives, and keep up prayer and pay the poor-rate; and the performers of their promise when they make a promise, and the patient in distress and affliction and in time of conflicts—these are they who are true [to themselves] and these are they who guard [against evil]" (Sūrah al-Baqara

177). By stating that the direction of the qibla is not important and important is faith in God, the Day of Judgment, angels, books and prophets.

5. O Messenger! let not those grieve you who strive together in hastening to unbelief from among those who say with their mouths: We believe, and their hearts do not believe, and from among those who are Jews; they are listeners for the sake of a lie, listeners for another people who have not come to you; they alter the words from their places, saying: If you are given this, take it, and if you are not given this, be cautious; and as for him whose temptation Allah desires, you cannot control anything for him with Allah. Those are they for whom Allah does not desire that He should purify their hearts; they shall have disgrace in this world, and they shall have a grievous chastisement in the hereafter. [They are] listeners of a lie, devourers of what is forbidden; therefore if they come to you, judge between them or turn aside from them, and if you turn aside from them, they shall not harm you in any way; and if you judge, judge between them with equity; surely Allah loves those who judge equitably" (Sūrah al-Māida 44-45). By stating that light indicates legitimacy.

Critique and Review

Pluralism in legitimacy, while satisfying everyone; is not epistemologically correct because, first of all, relativity in understanding, truth, knowledge, and religion, requires the belief that the truth is more than one and every degree of salvation, with degrees higher and lower than itself, is considered one. By accepting relativity, the teachings of religions will not be true or false and will only play a transformative role; although they are false, they are also devoid of any valuable meaning. The doctrine of the Christian trinity becomes as acceptable as Islamic monotheism. The elephant example is not for establishing relativity; rather, it is because there is no more than one truth, and these different descriptions are the result of a person's blindness or the darkness of the environment; conditions to be met; not to be satisfied and the role of the prophets is the same enlightenment (Rabbani Golpayegani, 1999, 82-83). Therefore, Rumi goes on to say that if each of them had a candle in his hand, the difference between them would disappear (Rumi, Book III, 395).

It is interesting to know that Rumi's difference from John Hick is that John Hick, in the example of the elephant, imagines the person to be blind so that he can never be assumed to be able to know the truth; but Rumi assumes that a person sees in the dark so that the truth can be shown to him by turning on the light.

Secondly, the commitment to religious Pluralism cannot be combined with the commitment to a particular religion and the claim of Exclusivism, and everyone, at least in the case of their own religion, is a religious or religious monopolist, and the result is that they cannot be religious pluralists unless anyone is volunteering to come up with a pretty template? Because he believes that all religions and denominations enjoy equal legitimacy and, consequently, salvation.

Thirdly, from the point of view of pluralists, especially Protestants, religion is a religious experience that is purely personal; while religion is a set of beliefs, rules, and ethics that God has revealed, and through the prophets, through revelation to guide human beings and ensure the happiness of this world and the hereafter (Javadi Amoli, 2002, 111). Also, if the teachings of the prophets are their different interpretations of the existing intuitions, then why did they say that what we say is divine revelation and we do not have the right to change it (Sūrah Yūnus 15; Sūrah al-Isrā' 39, and Sūrah Fātir 31).

Fourthly, if religious Pluralism is accepted, there is no room for the issue of abrogation; whereas the later religion abrogates the former religions, and the two religions of truth do not make sense at the same time; so even when the two prophets were at the same time, one was obliged to obey the other; like Ibrahim and Lot (AS) and this shows that the straight path is not more than one.

Fifthly, the verses presented do not confirm pluralism; rather, it can be the reason for Exclusivism in the legitimacy of Islam or at least Inclusivism in salvation, thus;

The first verse wants to remind man of his freedom in choosing a religion, as well as the necessity of the successive appearance of prophets and the abrogation of the false law, not to approve of multiple religions at the same time. In interpreting this verse, Allameh Tabatabai has also referred to the passage of time and human evolution to receive a new religion (Tabatabai, 2004, Vol. 5, 252).

The second verse does not want to acknowledge polytheism and say that everyone has religion for himself and they are all valuable; rather, it wants to rebuke the insistence and stubbornness of the polytheists and say that your religion is never acceptable to us. Javadi Amoli has an interesting expression in the description of this verse; he believes that the verse says that right mixed with falsehood loses its truth. The right must be pure. Adding falsehood to truth invalidates truth, not justifying falsehood. It does not mean that both your religion and my religion are right. You are stubborn and will not accept my religion, and I do not consider your religion right to accept (Javadi Amoli, 2002, 223).

The third verse is not a reason for pluralism; rather, it wants the apparent Muslims, Christians, Jews, and Sabeans to turn to the true Islam, which is the same as believing in God and the Day of Resurrection and doing righteous deeds (Ibid., 235-236). Since at the end of the verse, we are talking about rewards and wages, and in the matter of salvation, we are talking about excuses, then this verse has nothing to do with the subject of salvation (Ibid., 227) and in the position of denying the false claims of the Jews and Christians who considered themselves the children and friends of Allah (Sūrah al-Māida 18).

The fourth verse mentions the "nabīyin (prophets)" as one of the attributes of faith collectively and therefore cannot be the reason for pluralism; because it is only in Islam that faith in all the prophets exists and is obligatory.

The fifth verse does not first say that the whole Torah and the Bible are light; rather, it says that there is light in both of them, and therefore it says about the Quran, "And certainly We have sent down to you a clear light" (Sūrah al-Nisā' 174). This verse also says the true Torah and the Bible, not the distorted present.

It is worth mentioning that what emerges from the verses of the Holy Quran is the design of a path as a straight path (Sūrah al-Fātiha 6, Sūrah al-Anʿām 153, Sūrah Maryam 43, and Sūrah Saba' 6) and calls everyone to Islam (Sūrah al-Baqara 170) and opposes many practices and beliefs of Jews and Christians (Sūrah al-Māida, 18, 51, 64 and 73, Sūrah al-Baqara 120, Sūrah al-Tawbah 30 to 32; Sūrah al-Nisā' 153 and 171, and Sūrah Āl ʿImrān, 69 to 72) and forbids the adoption of Jews and Christians as saints (Sūrah al-Māida 57) and the religion of Islam as a religion for all human beings (Sūrah al-Baqara 167, Sūrah al-Nisā' 79 and 174, Sūrah Yūnus 108, Sūrah al-Aʿrāf 158, and Sūrah Saba' 28) and universal (Sūrah al-Furqān 1) introduces.

Sixthly, pluralism, even if it can find an acceptable interpretation, can only be proposed among those who believe in God and the Resurrection and does not include material schools; because the meaning of salvation is the absolute goodness of God and the happiness of the Hereafter and entering Paradise, and s/he who does not believe in the origin (God) and resurrection, does not want anything and does not seek anything, and it is obvious that such a person will never find anything and will not be given anything.

Seventhly, this attitude is not correct unless all atheists and polytheists can be considered saved. Some do not have the slightest bit of faith in the heart and righteous deeds. If all are saved, what is the philosophy of hell?

Thirdly, Soroush's statement is also not true; because different sharias have been in accordance with the requirements of time, place, and the development of human talents, and the following religions have been copies of the former religions, and not all of them can be considered righteous and saved at the same time, despite conflicts.

It is necessary to ask John Hick how contradictory teachings, and as a result, at least one wrong one, can bring about a positive and correct change in human personality?

Tenthly, likewise, if the essence of religions is the infinitely different manifestations of the prophets, and this justifies the difference in beliefs, which are prophetic and descriptive propositions, then what is the source of the difference in the rulings which are compositional and prescriptive propositions? How can different and even contradictory rulings, which are considered the oyster of religion, lead man to a single essence?

In short, there is no room for dialogue; because everyone believes that everyone is right.

6. Inclusivism in Religion or in Legitimacy and Salvation

Others are inclusive, meaning that other religions and faiths also benefit from legitimacy and salvation in addition to themselves. Inclusivism can be considered as the middle ground between the two theories of Exclusivism and Pluralism of religion or faith; because it claims that in addition to my religion, other religions and sects also have legitimacy or salvation; but this legitimacy and salvation have a level that is most common in my religion, and other religions and sects have relative legitimacy and salvation and are not deprived of it at all. Motahhari introduces George Jordan and Gibran Khalil Gibran as a pluralist (Motahari, 2005, 330-334).

Christians called non-Christians anonymous Christians, and Muslims considered the People of the Book to be the people of salvation. Inclusionists in legitimacy do not need to discuss salvation, for it that is righteous shall surely be saved, and they shall know that all are partakers of the truth and therefore shall be saved. But monopolists in legitimacy must take a stand for the salvation of others, and most of them here are inclusive.

6-1 Critique and Review

Inclusivism in legitimacy, even in all propositions, cannot be true; because, firstly, the truth is not more than one, and secondly, the laws are presented to human beings throughout, and the prophets asked the former law-abiding people to believe in the new religion in order to be guided (Baqara, 137). Thirdly, according to the words of Jesus Christ, the Prophet can analyze some of the prohibitions in the former Shari'a (Sūrah Āl 'Imrān, 50), and fourthly, religions are sometimes distorted and attribute their manuscripts to God (Sūrah al-Baqara, 79). Still, Inclusivism in salvation is more compatible with God's vast mercy. Motahhari, in this regard, states: "If you look at this distorted Christianity . . . God is among them, seventy hundred and eighty of them, people with a sense of faith, piety and purity that in the name of Christ and Maryam, how much truth, piety and purity they have given to the people. They are not to blame either. They go to heaven" (Motahari, 1996, 427).

It should be noted that most of those accused or attributed to Pluralism are inclusive or have other motives. For example, Ikhwan al-Safa probably meant relying on the commonalities of the true religions, not pluralism, because he goes on to say: "Brother! Try to present the truth to every religious person and if you think that there is a religion better than the one you have chosen, do not be satisfied with your religion and ask for it better, and it is obligatory on you to choose the second religion which is better and to be transferred to it" (Ikhwan al-Safa, 2000, Vol. 3, 501) and the Sufis meant peaceful coexistence in this world and not legitimacy or salvation in the Hereafter. It is stated in the Qur'an that if the polytheists are not hostile to you, treat them justly (Sūrah Mumtahanah, 8).

Acceptable Theory

We are religiously exclusive in the matter of legitimacy and religiously inclusive in the matter of salvation; that is, while acknowledging the monopoly of truth and true salvation in our religion, we consider the followers of other religions or sects under certain conditions, to be saviors. This pen finds this theory correct since moderation is the middle ground and the straight path. If we are careful in reflecting on the statements of others, we can deduce Inclusivism in

salvation from it. We believe that a person who strives for the right and his efforts are in a conventional way, and after obtaining it, is sincerely committed to his understanding and his pure nature, and is not stubborn, even if his understanding is not in accordance with reality, will be saved; provided that their good deeds are not destroyed by memorization. Also, those who are mentally weak and face obstacles in understanding the truth are exempt from adherence to the true religion, and their command is referred to God, and the hope of forgiveness and mercy goes to them; but those who are stubborn and while understanding the truth, dodge adherence to it, will never be saved.

Religious Exclusivism in salvation can by no means be true; whether from us or from others; and its arguments were passed in the critique of the relevant section, but the promise of religious Inclusivism in salvation is rationally and religiously defensible; because, first of all, the factors of well-being and salvation, such as faith, righteousness, and non-disobedience, etc., are all subject to doubt. Secondly, there are those who have absolutely no interest in the criteria of salvation. Therefore, they cannot be given the slightest share of salvation and claim that everyone is a person of salvation, as it cannot be said that everyone has legitimacy and salvation. Of course, Exclusivism in legitimacy has been adopted by all, but by no means can everyone be honest in their claim; because the truth is not more than one.

The Holy Quran and the hadith of the Ahl al-Bayt also show that infallibility and purity show that we Muslims are religiously exclusive and that religious texts emphasize perseverance in religion. Therefore, it leaves no room for the monopoly of other religions in legitimacy; because contradictory or contradictory claims cannot be true at the same time. Of course, Islam introduces all religions as one; however, it recognizes the existence of Sharia and also never uses the word religion in the plural and introduces it according to the single nature of man and names other religions as Islam, and it rightly considers every religion in its time and place, which are now obsolete with the advent of Islam in the specific sense of the word. In salvation, we are inclusive; just as every Prophet in his time introduced his religion as an absolute right and lived peacefully with the owners of other religions and made a pact and remained faithful to his pact unless they narrow the space for him and be the source of conflict and strife, or have no interest in legitimacy and salvation.

In this regard, Motahhari states: "People who believe in God and the Hereafter and do deeds with the motive of approaching God, their deeds are acceptable to God, and they deserve reward and paradise; whether they are Muslims or non-Muslims. Non-Muslims are deprived of the blessings of Islam; naturally, they are deprived of the benefits of using this divine program. Acceptable good deeds, whether issued by a Muslim or a non-Muslim, have a series of plagues that may occur after the act and corrupt it. At the top of those plagues is stubbornness. The good deeds of those who do not believe in God and the Resurrection will alleviate and possibly remove their torment.

Verses and hadiths that indicate that the actions of the deniers of prophethood or Imamat are not acceptable to indicate that those denials are stubborn, but denials that are merely non-confessions and the source of which is negligence and not fault, are not considered in the verses and hadiths. According to Islamic scholars such as Ibn Sina and Sadr al-Muta'allehin, the majority of people who do not acknowledge the truth are incapable, not guilty. Such people will not be tormented if they do not know God. However, they will not go to heaven, and if they know God, believe in the resurrection and do pure deeds, they will receive their good reward. Only those who are guilty and not weak are drawn to cruelty (Motahhari, 2007, Vol. 1, 341-342).

Conclusion

An examination of the views of Christian and Muslim theologians shows that all of them have a firm belief in the legitimacy of their religion and do not consider other religions and sects to be right. They are exclusive in the matter of legitimacy; as for salvation, although some have been accused of Exclusivism or pluralism, but many of them are, in fact, inclusive, meaning that

in addition to monopolizing legitimacy, they also give other religions a share of salvation. Thus, the realm of the concept of salvation is much broader than the category of legitimacy; because everyone considers themselves righteous, because they see themselves as righteous, but they do not see other religions or sects as right, but for many of them, they also believe in the possibility of salvation. We believe that most of those who are theoretically known as exclusivists in salvation or pluralists in salvation can, in practice, be included in the ranks of inclusivists in salvation. Destruction and hell are limited to those who wisely and deliberately refuse to accept the truth and do not sincerely adhere to it and die without repentance and memorization of good deeds. Salvation, then, is not limited to the followers of the religion of truth and includes those who have researched conventionally but did not have access to the religion of truth and have sincerely demonstrated their understanding. This can promise the possibility of peaceful coexistence with all human beings.

References
The Holy Quran
Bible
Ikhwan al-Safa (2000). *Rasāil Ikhwān al-Safā wa Khalān al-Wafā*. Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Islāmī, First Edition.
Alam al-Hoda (1902). *Ali Ibn Hussein, al-Zākhirah fī 'Ilm al-Kalām, Investigation of Sayyed Ahmad al-Husseini*. Qom: Islamic Publishing Institute, First Edition
Ameli, Zein Addin (1990). *Haqayeq al-Iman, Investigation of Sayyed Mahdi al-Raja'i*. Qom: al-Marashi al-Najafi Center, First Edition
Badawi, Abdul Rahman (1985). *History of Theological Thoughts in Islam*, translated by Hossein Saberi. Mashhad: Islamic Research Foundation, First Edition.
Baghdādī (al), Abū Mansūr (1988). *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, Translated by Mohammad Javad Mushkour. Tehran: Eshraghi Publishing, Fourth Edition.
Barbour, Ian (1995). *Science and Religion*, translated by Bahauddin Khorramshahi. Tehran: University Publishing Center, Second Edition.
Eliade, Mircea (2000). *Religious Studies*, translated by Bahauddin Khorramshahi. Tehran: Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies, First Edition.
Ghazālī (al), Abū Hāmid (2002). *Faysal al-Tafriqah bayn al-Islām wa al-Zandaqah*, Commentator: Sulaymān Dunyā, Beirut, Revival of Arabic Books, First Edition.
Ghazālī (al), Abū Hāmid (2004). *Fadhāih al-Bātiniyyah wa Fadhāil al-Mustazhiriyyah*, Commentator: 'Abd al-Rahmān Badawī. Cairo: Dār al-Qayyūmah, First Edition.
Ghazālī (al), Abū Hāmid (2005). *Ghavayid al-Aqayid*, Translated by Ali Asghar Halabi, Tehran, Jami Publications, First Edition.
Hick, John (1989). *An Interpretation of Religion: Human Responses to the Trancendent*. United States: Yale University Press.
Hick, John (2002). *Philosophy of Religion*, translated by Behzad Saleki. Tehran: al-Huda International Publications, First Edition.
Hordern, William (1989). *Guide to Protestant Theology*, translated by Taha Mikaelian. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications, First Edition.
Ibn Al-Hadid, Abdul Hamid (1959). *Explanation of Nahj al-Balāghah*, research by Muhammad Ibrahim Abu al-Fadl. Qom: al-Marashi al-Najafi Center, First Edition.
Ibn Hazm, Abū Muh}ammad (1957). *Al-Fisal fī al-Milal wa al-Ahwā wa al-Nihal*. Egypt: Adiba Printing House, First Edition.
James, William (1902). *The Varieties of Religious Experience: a Study in Human Nature*. Penguin Classics paperback: ISBN 0-14-039034-0.
Javadi Amoli, Abdullah (2002). *Theology*. Qom, Esra Publishing Center, First Edition.
Koleini, Mohammad Ibn Yaqub (1983). *Usūl al-Kāfī*. Tehran, Islamic Center Publication, First Edition.

Leibniz, Gottfried (2005). *Confession Philosophie*, Editor and Translators: Daniel Garber and Robert C. Sleigh Jr. United States: Yale University Press.

Michel, Thomas (1998). *Christian Theology*, translated by Hossein Tawfiqi. Qom: Center for the Study and Research of Religions and Beliefs, First Edition.

Motahhari, Morteza (1996). *Philosophy of Ethics*. Tehran: Sadra Publications, 15th edition.

Motahhari, Morteza (2005). *Divine Justice*. Qom: Sadra Publications, Fourteenth Edition.

Motahhari, Morteza (2007). *Collection of Works*. Tehran: Sadra Publications, First Edition.

Peterson, Michael (2000). *Religious Wisdom and Belief*, Translated by Ebrahim Soltani, Ahmad Ibn Mohammad Mehdi Naraghi. Tehran: New Design Publication, Third Edition.

Rabbani Golpaygani, Ali (1999). *Analysis and Critique of Pluralism*. Qom: Cultural Institute of Contemporary Knowledge and Thought, First Edition.

Rumi, Jalal al-Din (1983). *Masnavi al-Manavi*. Tehran: Pegah Publication, First Edition.

Shabar, Seyyed Abdullah (2002). *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Karīm*. Qom: Osveh Publication, Third Edition.

Sobhani, Jafar (2004). *Introduction of New Issues in Theology*. Qom: Imam Sadegh (AS) Institute, First Edition.

Soroush, Abul Karim (1998). *Straight Paths*. Tehran: Sarat Cultural Institute, First Edition.

Spinoza, Baruch (1987). *Ethics*, Translated by Mohsen Jahangiri. Tehran: University Publishing Center, Second Edition.

Tabatabai, Mohammad Hussein (1973). *Al-Mīzān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*. Qom: Ismailyyah Publication, First Edition.

Tabatabai, Mohammad Hussein (2004). *Translated of Tafsir al-Mizan*. Tehran: Islamic Publications, First Edition.

Taliafro, Charles (2003). *Philosophy of Religion in the Twentieth Century*, Translated by Insha'Allah Rahmati. Tehran: Suhrawardi Research and Publishing Office, First Edition.

Wainwright, William J. (1999). *Philosophy of Religion*. Belmont, CA: Wadworth Publishing Company, Second Edition.

Yazdani, Aabas, Velinejad, Zahra (2010). "The Hereafter Fate of Non-Muslims from the Perspective of Islamic Theologians", *Journal of Philosophical Reflections*, No. 5, pp. 7-22.