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The Hizmet (Gülen) Movement is a transnational phenomenon. In the last two decades, the participants of the movement have managed to establish a large number of educational institutes, interfaith and intercultural dialogue centres, humanitarian aid organizations, media institutions, and business associations functioning around the globe. The Hizmet movement is to date an evidently admirable faith inspired movement interacting with diverse religious traditions, secular ideologies, and cultures in more than 150 countries. Questions arise here: what motivates and enables the participants of the Hizmet Movement to engage with the religious, cultural, and ideological “Other” so successfully? How do they perceive the Other? And how do they justify their construction of the Other in relation to their faith? To help answer these questions, this article aims to provide a preliminary research on and critical analysis of how Fethullah Gülen, the inspirer of the Hizmet Movement, constructs the Other in his writings.
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The idea of the construction of the religious, ideological, and cultural Other as a partner in dialogue and in constructive collaborative social and political activism, is a much discussed topic. There are differing theoretical and practical approaches to the problem. Some argue that such constructions are an expression of practical needs in today’s pluralist world. Daniel Yankelovich, for example, describes the increase in dialogue activities between faith groups and individuals in the United States as a response to the individualising and isolating effects of technological advancements and political necessities on the one hand, and to the compartmentalising influences of modern ways of life and economic prerequisites on the other. “We find ourselves facing problems that require more shared understanding with others than in the past” (Yankelovich 1999: 12). The construction of the other as a dialogic partner is important not only to develop personal attachments but also “to solve problems” in the increasingly intertwined and complex world.

For Martin Buber it is our essential nature to establish relationships with the Other. It is, however, important to develop what he calls an I-You (Ich-Du) relationship to abstain from the pitfalls of I-It (Ich-Es) relationships. In the former, the two things expose their authentic existences and they live in the presence of each other without imposing any pre-constructed mental image on one another. Ich-Du relationships require a total openness and waiting for the Other to come. In Ich-Es relationships, however, the perceiving subject sees the other in terms of itself. It thus
transforms the Other into a tool to be used and experienced. In Buber’s account, the construction of the Other is an inescapable process. That is to say it is not only a necessity dictated by the complexities of the modern world but also, and more importantly, an essential aspect of human condition (Buber 1958: 19-23).

Emmanuel Levinas emphasizes the importance of face-to-face encounter (rapport de face à face) with the Other. Such encounter negates all imposed “sameness” and unearths nuances. For in the “destitution and nudity” of the face one realises the uniqueness of the Other in a way that cannot be negated. The face of the Other “resists possession” (Levinas 1979:197). “The face is what forbids us to kill” (Levinas 1985: 86) the Other to an extent that one cannot be “able to be deaf to that appeal” (Levinas 1975: 200) The impossibility of exhausting the Other or, in other words, the realisation of the “infinity” of the Other leads to a more responsible, compassionate, and humble interaction with the Other.

Others approach the question of the construction of a dialogic relationship with the Other from the perspective of its process and consequences. These approaches value the dialogic relationship of diverse groups because in an environment where different tendencies learn from each other the feasibility of interaction increases. Muslim philosopher al-Fârâbî gives an early expression of this perspective in his famous Virtuous City (al-Madîna al-Fâdila). In his ideal state, he envisages a complete freedom and equality. To this state “people from outside flock” and this would result in “a most desirable kind of racial diversity.” Al-Fârâbî values the idea of the encounter with the equal and diverse Other in a free environment because it would guarantee the flourishing of talented individuals such as philosophers, scientists and poets. There is nothing like the harmonious coexistence of different minds for artistic, philosophical, and scientific production (Rosenthall 1960).

Similarly, Jurgen Habermas emphasises the role of rationality and transparency in the process of the encounter with the Other and its effects on “the structural transformation of the public sphere.” Such a dialogic encounter that is based on the assumption that the Other is a rational and equal partner is what renders the activity itself a socially and politically productive one. This “communicative action” has a transformative effect on the political sphere for it is the basis for rendering information available to the wider public and allows their input into the system (Habermas 1998).

The traditionalist school, represented by such luminaries as Rene Guenon, Fritjof Schuon, and S. Hossein Nasr, exhibits a rather unique approach to the question of the construction of the Other, provided that the perspective seems to be limited to those inspired by the spiritual and universal core of religious traditions. The traditionalist school sees religion as a totality of exoteric and esoteric teachings.
There is a transcending unity in esoteric teachings but necessary divergences in the exoteric expressions. The differences in the symbolic languages of religions make them adaptable to different cultural environments. There is no hierarchical relationship between religions for they are all capable of realising the desired “discernment” between the relative and the Absolute and “attachment” of the relative to the Absolute by means of spiritual contemplative practices. Accordingly these writers see the dialogic relationship with the Other as a form of polite encounter resulting from the discernment of the deeper commonality, not a disguised attempt to convert the Other, or even teach (Nasr 2005: 14-5).

How can one locate Gülen’s views on the construction of the dialogic relationship with the Other in this discussion? Gülen speaks as a Muslim scholar and formulates his ideas by departing from the fundamental sources of Islamic tradition. In accordance with the majority of Muslim scholars Gülen sees Islam as a continuation of the Abrahamic tradition and the unsurpassable culmination of all previously revealed religions. The Qur’anic revelation is a supersessionist event abrogating (naskh) prior religions. Islam is, at once, continuation and unsurpassable culmination of the revelatory process. These are obviously absolutist claims that could easily pave the way for theological and eschatological exclusivity. It is important to recall that such absolutist claims constitute the core aspects of self-understanding of not only Islam but almost all major religions.

What is interesting in Gülen’s case is that while religious absolutist claims are usually followed by intolerant and belligerent attitudes towards the Other, Gülen’s belief in the uniqueness of Islam does not lead him to a theological hubris and a confrontational encounter with the Other. But how? Can the absolutist claim to finality be reconciled with an authentic esteem toward the Other within an Islamic framework? Gülen’s answer is in the affirmative. Without renouncing the core aspects of Islam’s vision of itself as a final and complete religion, Gülen constructs an inclusive Islam, because that vision of itself does not entail the adoption of a Manichean world view and dehumanisation of the Other. His strategy is to accentuate the inclusive potential of the Qur’an and Sunna. He also frequently turns to Islamic spiritual, exegetical, theological, and jurisprudential tradition to bolster his claims. In Gülen it is interesting to observe how socially and religiously expansive and embracive a theologically absolutist position can be.

I. The Essentiality of the Other

As a devout Muslim scholar, Gülen sees the Qur’anic contextualisation of the Other as essentially important. To this end one of the most cited verses by Gülen is the following: “O mankind! Lo! We have created you male and female, and have made you into nations and tribes that ye may know one another (not that you despise
each other).” (Qur’an 49:13) This and similar verses allow Gülen to see diversity as essential. The primary message Gülen draws from the content of the verse is that we will never be homogeneous, and more importantly, diversity is not a curse from God. It is a blessing and a source of richness. In diversity we are challenged, and usually only after we are challenged do we discover our hidden potentialities and we flourish. Diversity breathes fire into life, vibrates life, and creates synergies. There is nothing like harmonious coexistence and interaction of creative minds fuelling innovation and discovery, outwardly and inwardly (Gülen 2002a). Engage with the Other in a spirit of learning (Gülen 2002b: 40). Be authentically curious, leave your cognitive comfort zone, challenge your misconceptions, break the intellectually suffocating routine of life, and emancipate yourself from prejudices (Gülen 2002b: 39-40).

Thus, Gülen interprets the existence of the Other as an inescapable aspect of creation. Pluralism is irreducible and uniformity is impossible. For in diversity we are saved from the withering effects of uniformity, from the boredom of sameness. Diversity dynamises the world and enriches us.

2. Coexistence and Collaboration with the Other

In accordance with these thoughts, Gülen often cites one of the ecumenical calls of the Qur’an: “O People of the Book! Let us come to a formula common between us- that we shall not serve anyone but God, that we shall associate none with him.” (Qur’an 3:64) For Gülen the idea of unity expressed in this verse seems to exist in the essence of all religions, providing the widest grounding “on which members of all religions could agree.” (Gülen 2002b: 38) That is to say, in accordance with the content of the verse, the essential message of Islam and other religions (especially Christianity and Judaism) includes that there is one Absolute Being and everything else owes its existence and continuation of its existence to it; and that we should live our lives in this consciousness; and that we should attach ourselves to this One Absolute Being through contemplative and spiritual practices. If the followers of religious traditions live in accordance with these principles, then we have the much needed common ground on which we can build coexistence and collaboration. If not, we can still be polite to each other, but we will definitely lack the powerfully uniting alchemy of acknowledging and appreciating the truth in the Other.

He also writes that this inclusivist spirit has been manifested in Muslim societies in their tolerant behaviour towards other religions, especially in the early periods of Islam. One must also acknowledge that it was occasionally ignored due to the socio-political context in which Islamic Jurisprudence evolved (Gülen 2002b: 41).

Aside from purely religious and spiritual content, Gülen’s referral to this verse to
encourage the followers of different traditions to seek the common ground stems from very practical and immediate concerns as well. There is instability, inequality and injustice in this world. Problems like environmental crisis are threaten us all. One group of people, one nation or one sect cannot face the challenge. Global problems require global action. To act collectively we need to stand collectively on a common ground. For Gülen this seems to save a soteriological space for the followers of other traditions.

His message can be summed up as the following: it seems that if only we learn to accept the Other as oneself, without denying the particularity of the Other as Other, we may be able to cultivate a culture of coexistence and collaboration between cultures, religious traditions, and civilizations to address these problems. Here the Other emerges as the co-healer of the world.

3. Peace with the Other

Verses such as “God does not forbid you to be kind and just to those who had neither fought against your faith nor driven you out of your homes. In fact Allah loves the just.” (Qur’an 60:8) allow Gülen to depict peace with the Other as the norm of the human condition, as the ideal state of being (Gülen 2002b: 17, 40). Once he centralises the aforementioned verses, conflict becomes an aberration and deviation from the norm (the ideal). Conflict with the religious Other is an abnormality, an incidental, disdained condition. He establishes peace as a substantive value. He cites from the Qur’an: “Establish, all of you, peace.” (Qur’an 2:208)

But it is also important to come to terms with seemingly exclusive verses which are sometimes harsh in tone and highly critical of other traditions, such as “O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another.” (Qur’an 5:51; see also verses 2:191, 4:89, 9:23 as example) Gülen resorts to different exegetical possibilities to construe these verses. First of all, he contextualises and localises them to an extent that they no longer indicate universal moral injunctions regulating our interaction with the Other at all times. They are functional in their highly specified contexts. For example, the verses allowing war for self-defence against the oppression of Arab polytheists should be understood in their context, and should not be universalised or conflated over their boundaries. Some verses which criticise the people of the book for wrong behaviour should be seen as directed towards the hostile acts and thoughts of some Jews and Christians not to Judaism or Christianity per se. In other words, Gülen reads these verses as descriptive but not prescriptive. He reminds his readers of an important exegetical principle that one should seek both sübût-u kat‘iye (the certainty of authenticity) and delâlet-i kat‘iye (the certainty of indication) in these verses. Although we are certain about the authenticity of the verses, we do not know
whether these verses indicate, indiscriminately, all Jews and Christians. Here, he locates these verses in their highly specified contexts, that is to say he affirms their contextual value and, at the same time, allows a certain flexibility where one can navigate and develop a constructive relationship with the religious Other (Gülen 2000: 111). He also indicates that the Qur’an’s criticism does not target ‘people’ but ‘characteristics’ that can be found in any person and religious group. The distinction is important because in the first case the animosity is directed towards people themselves and in the second case towards abstract characteristics (lying, dishonesty, etc.). An individual who carries these negative character traits cannot be reduced to them and is embraced with even more compassion. This is exactly why the Qur’an, occasionally, states condemnations against the nascent Muslim community. Moreover, the Qur’an also uses very gentle words for the people of the book to “plant hope.” (Gülen 2002b: 40)

In a recent interview, as a response to a question regarding the highly critical statements he made in his early sermons concerning Jews he said: “I sincerely admit that I might have misunderstood some verses and prophetic sayings. I realized and then stated that the critiques and condemnations that are found in the Koran or prophetic tradition are not targeted against people who belong to a religious group, but at characteristics that can be found in any person…He (the Prophet) was the one who stood for a funeral procession of a Jewish resident of Medina, showing respect for a deceased fellow human being. It is a fact that I criticized certain actions of Israel in the past. But in my mosque sermons, I also categorically condemn terrorism and suicide bombings that target innocent civilians.” (The Atlantic 2013)

Peace, as alluded to above, is a substantive, essential norm. As-sulh hayrun, peace is good, as the Qur’an states. Gülen sees inclusivist verses as essential and fundamental departing points towards peace, inclusivism and coexistence. These verses, and some practices of the prophet of Islam, are teaching us how to deal with the hostile Other and how to domesticate violence which in some circumstances seems to be unavoidable. This has something to do with the Qur’an’s “earthly realism.” The Qur’an does not shy away from dealing with the reality of war. Other options would be merely pointing towards the moral ideal without appreciating the complexities of life (Gülen 1979). It locates itself on the interface of realism and idealism, and endorses a strategy which at once encounters the ugly realities of human individuals and societies, teaches how to walk through these problems with the least possible harm, and strongly encourages moral ideals. Multi-layered modes of discourse are due to the multi-layered complexities of the world.

Gülen also frequently refers to some successful historical examples of coexistence to instil an ethics of peace with the Other. He establishes his message of peace and coexistence as an Islamic norm practiced throughout the ages since the inception
of Islam in a way that is measured favourably not only by medieval norms but also some modern practices. For Gülen the message of peace and coexistence is not a “new invention” forced by modern social and political contexts. It has always been in the perennial core of Islam as a trans-historical, context-independent ideal, and sometimes successfully realised (Gülen 1993). Among the examples frequently visited by Gülen are the first peaceful encounters between the nascent Muslim community and Christians and Jews, the first immigration to Abyssinia, the visit of Nejran Christians, and the Madina Constitution - a pluralistic text offering a multi-legal system (he reads it as an attempt to coexist peacefully). Some examples indicate the pluralist and relatively tolerant atmosphere in Muslim ruled lands, such as Baghdad in 8th-9th centuries, Andalucía in 9th-11th centuries (la covivenca), and especially Ottoman in the 13th-19th centuries.

4. The “Divine Breath” in the Other

Gülen is an optimist when it comes to valuing human nature. He holds that our “goodness endures despite passing evil” (Gülen 2013: 10) he advocates the “acceptance of human nature with its complexities.” (Gülen 2013: 19) Evil is accidental and goodness is essential in human nature.

Gülen’s unflinching optimism has everything to do with the Qur’anic teaching that we are “created in the best form (ahsan at-takwîm)” (Qur’an 95:4), and that we carry the “divine breath” within our souls in a mysterious way (Qur’an 32:9). The Qur’an also uses rather gruesome terms to describe human nature, such as ignorant, hasty, vicious, heartless, etc. However, in Gülen’s reading this pessimist depiction is rather decentralised or construed in the light of more essential verses which envisage profound potential in human nature.

For Gülen, once we recognise our own profound inwardness we will recognise the same inner potential in the Other. Or in other words, seeing the divine breath in the Other makes him an object of respect and love. This message is in accordance with one of the primary concerns of the spiritual tradition: to recognize the Divine in the world and in the Other. This obviously provides a grounding to establish the essential dignity of each individual. (Gülen 2013: 5, 13, 31)

Along the same lines, Gülen emphasises the Qur’anic idea of the continuity between (Abrahamic) religious traditions. The idea of continuation between religious traditions allows Gülen to see the Other not as an isolated, self-enclosed entity, but as a fellow practicing a perennial message (Gülen 2013:176) The idea of the unity of the source of religions gives him a very important tool to cultivate fellowship between distinct religious traditions, and establish peaceful coexistence as the norm. It also instils a sense of “familiarity” with the Other. “We are brothers under
the authority of the One.” (Gülen 2013:101,162)

For Gülen, however, continuity does not necessitate homogeneity of religious traditions. He admits authenticity of the origin of other religious traditions that might contain divine light and truth despite posterior distortion of their message (Gülen 2002c: 33). Consequently, he sees the existence of some profound and even irreconcilable differences between religions in practice as well as in theory, while at the same time provides motivation for tolerance, coexistence and cooperation (Gülen 2002b: 19). Thus his strategy allows him to appreciate the profound differences yet commonality between religious traditions, to not impose an artificial homogeneity on religions, and allows for installing love and responsibility for the Other in the self. In refraining from imposing an artificial homogeneity on different religions, he allows for the possibility of rational deliberation on religious differences, hence a creation of hierarchy between religious traditions.

5. Metaphysics of the Other: Ma’rifah and Muhabba

Gülen is not a Sufi in the traditional sense of the word. Neither is the movement a Sufi order. But one can easily see the great influence of the masters of Islamic spirituality in his terminology and world view (The Atlantic 2013). A quick look at Kalbin Zumrut Tepeleri (Emerald Hills of the Heart) would reveal the great aspiration towards deep spirituality in practicing religion. Here I turn to a particular aspect of Sufi metaphysics, the theory of Divine names, which Gülen so masterfully uses in locating the Other in a thoroughly sacralised world. During this process the Other becomes sacralised too in the eyes of the beholder who sees everything in relation to the Divine.

Gülen describes metaphysics as an attempt “to comprehend existence as a unity of its observable and unobservable aspects” (Gülen 2013: 45). It goes beyond physical observations without contradicting them. The theory of the divine names that comprehend the world as a multiplicity of loci for constant and ever-changing manifestations (tajallî) of the divine names provides an overarching metaphysical structure which adequately “unites” the seen and the unseen.

Yet, from another perspective this metaphysics allows Gülen to relate every object and event to God as loci of the divine theophanies. “Every creature is a shining mirror” (Gülen 2013: 55) reflecting the divine qualities. The Qur’an states that “to God belong all the beautiful names” (Qur’an, 7: 180, 59: 24). These names include the Just, the Real, the Majestic, the All-Powerful, the Forgiver, the Giver of Death, the Reckoner, the Beautiful, the Gentle, Love. Alongside the general convictions of Sufi metaphysics, Gülen holds that both history and the cosmos are manifestations of the divine names. On all levels of existence various combinations of the divine
names are reflected.

What differentiates humanity is its comprehensivity. Herein the human individual emerges as the most profound nexus and the most comprehensive manifestation of the divine names (Gülen 2002d: 143-149, 153-158, 186-189, 213-217, 221-223; Gülen 2005). This is why humans are “vicegerents” of God on earth (Gülen 2002b: 44).

The theory of the divine names provides fertile ground for the construction of a universal fellowship and the Other as a sacred being. The Other is sacred because he has the traces of the manifestations of the divine names, thus he is a potential vicegerent. Clearly, attaching beings to God and to each other in such a sacred ontological framework leads to one of the basic tenets of religious worldviews things are more than they appear. Apart from their place in the cosmic order, beings also signify something greater than themselves. Therefore, beings as comprehensive mirrors of the divine manifestation are valued through their relationships with the Divine as well as with other beings. Both the physical/horizontal and the metaphysical/vertical significance of beings are celebrated.

Gülen frequently turns to the following famous sacred prophetic tradition to explain the mystery of creation: “I was a hidden treasure. I loved to be known and created the creation.” This is despite the fact that traditional scholars such as ibn Taymiyya stated that no chain of transmission is known for this hadith, whether weak or strong. For Gülen the same meaning can be inferred from a verse, which says: “I created Jins and humans only that they may worship me (Qur’an 51:56), meaning that “they may know (ma’rifah) me” as famous commentator ibn Abbas explains (Gülen 2001).

The key words here are ‘love’ and ‘know’. In accordance with Sufi metaphysics of creation, Gülen holds that the world emerges out of love (mahabbah) and the ultimate goal of creation is to attain knowledge of God (ma’rifah) (Gülen 2002d: 2005-17; Gülen 2002b: 41-3). God loves – in a way appropriate to His perfection- to manifest his perfection and beauty in the mirror of creation, as I alluded to above. Along the same lines Gülen describes metaphysics as the “ability of love to perceive reality as a whole” (Gülen 2013: 45). Here he seems to suggest that perception of reality as a unity of the observable and unobservable dimension is intrinsically linked to love. God knows his beauty and perfection but He also loves to know Himself, starting from other than himself. In short, God loves to be “seen and known.”

For Gülen, love is the central axis around which everything else revolves. He describes love as "the essence of the creation." His prose reaches to poetic heights
when he speaks of love. Creation is, for Gülen, “a festival of love”; Love is “the elixir of life.” The driving force of the cosmos is love. Every motion in this world is an attempt to get closer to God, whether things are conscious of it or not. We love things and move towards them; in actuality we love God in the beautiful quality of things (Gülen 2013: 3, 4, 59, 64, 85).

After establishing love as the most fundamental reality of the world, Gülen turns to draw ethical conclusions that would organise one’s relationship with the Other. One loves God and “loves everyone and everything for God’s sake.” This deep sense of love manifests itself in one’s willingness to serve others. This is what Gülen calls “altruistic love.”

As such, defining the Other by using the metaphysical indications of the theory of the divine names provides Gülen with a grounding for a highly sophisticated ethics of respect, love, and coexistence. The following passage makes perfect sense within the framework of such metaphysics: “Love is the foundation of the world. God created is as such. Everything in the world is a magnificent art. To demean a piece of art is the same as demeaning the Artist. Everything deserves to be exalted, respected and loved due to their relationship to their Creator, God… We base our relation with the created order on the principle of loving them because of their Creator” (Gülen 2003: 146-7).

6. Ethics of the Other: Humility and Service

Another important aspect of Gülen’s construction of the Other has to do with the construction of the self, for we see the Other through ourselves. How does Gülen’s worldview lead to humility and regulates his relationship with the Other?

For Gülen “lā ilâha illâllâh,” the most fundamental and central statement for a Muslim, once understood and internalized correctly, leads necessarily to humility (Gülen 2002d: 112-9). This statement announces the absolute dependence of the self on God. The self who is absolutely dependent on a higher being cannot not be humble. Everything which can be categorized as good comes from God and everything which can be categorized as evil results from our own actions. To use an analogy, light filling the day cannot be attributed to us, although we benefit from it and enjoy it. But if we choose to close our eyes, we will be the primary cause of the darkness in which we will find ourselves. Opening the eyes however is not the cause of light, it can only be the cause our benefiting from light. Darkness can be attributed to human volitional act, but light cannot. In this theological reasoning you can see that good is primarily attributed to God, and evil to humans. If we do not play a role in acquiring good then there is no reason to have false pride. But this is also to say that human beings should recognise the good in their lives and
should be thankful. Thankfulness and humility are the correct answer, not vanity (Gülen 2013: 177-84).

Gülen bolsters his understanding of absolute humility before God by reading such verses as “servants of the Most Merciful are those who walk on the earth humbly” (Qur’an 25: 63) He frequently turns to the Prophet’s life for evidence of the beauty of humility (Gülen 2002e). Once humility is established it would be absurd to judge the Other. The accountability is for God only. Moreover, when we humble ourselves for God, we necessarily elevate the Other. Here is the crucial contribution of the concept of humility in terms of constructing the Other. By lowering one’s ego before God and thus the Other one perceives the Other as an object of respect. Hence, he writes that a humble man “recognizes all of God’s servants to be nobler than him and gives them his utmost respect” (Gülen 2002b: 32-3).

All of the preceding motives culminate in one of the most basic principles of Gülen’s ethical teaching: living for the Other. He holds that “true virtue is to live for the sake of others” This altruistic way of life is what truly establishes an authentic relationship between humanity and God. “In service our lives are directed towards God and through Him they touch everyone and everything.” Serving God is to maintain between man and nature and to be “in unison with the creation.” Serving God is tantamount to serving people. A true believer “loves everyone and everything for God’s sake...he suffers so that other may not suffer.” This way of life leads to contentment that comes from “sharing the joy of the other and freeing them from suffering” (Gülen 2002b: 20, 21, 95-6, 102).

**Conclusion**

There is no absolute Other in Gülen’s thought. He starts with the assumption of the Other, but subsequently transforms it, by drawing on the above mentioned practical, metaphysical, spiritual, and ethical principles, into a fellow, a co-healer, a sacred being towards which love, respect, humility, and service is the proper stance. The existence of diversity, thus the Other, is inescapable from the perspective of the divine purposes and, moreover, is a blessing. The most essential thing to recognize is the profound inwardness and inner potential of humanity in one’s own being and in the Other, in accordance with such Qur’anic teachings as the “divine breath” within us and “vicegerency” of man/woman. Gülen’s metaphysical perspective sees the One behind the appearance of multiplicity. Seeing the world as such offers novel possibilities for the construction of an ethics of coexistence and collaboration from an Islamic perspective. His call for *unity-in-diversity* and *diversity-in-unity* is a natural extension of these teachings.
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