

# RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCE AND THE COMMON GOOD: REFLECTION ON TOLERATION AND PARTICIPATION IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICA AND INDONESIA<sup>1</sup>

*Muhamad Ali*

**Abstract:** *This paper seeks to discuss the extent to which religious differences can contribute to the promotion of the common good. It asks if the religious difference is sufficient for the states and the societies to attain the common good across religious and ethical persuasions in multi-faith countries such as America and Indonesia. It is primarily an ethical-philosophical question, but it is also related to historical, sociological, anthropological, and political contexts. For many religious people, religious particularity and distinction -including its truth and superiority claims- is a significant element of identity and sense of morality, but religious difference alone is insufficient for attaining the common good. Religions provide motivations to act good or evil. Religions offer rich resources, be doctrinal, narrative, experiential and emotional, ethical, legal, social, material, or political, but because there are many, often conflicting religious and ethical values from within the same and across religious traditions, it is not enough for everyone to share their beliefs and accept each other's exclusive claims. For religions to help improve the public good, religious agents have to negotiate their particular and distinct identities and universal moralities and reinterpret their beliefs and norms contextually in light of the plural societies in which they live. The governments should also allow multiple voices, including the religious, by ensuring toleration, freedom of conscience and worship, and right of assembly.*

**Keywords:** *Religious; Toleration; Religious Identity*

**Abstrak:** Makalah ini berusaha untuk membahas sejauh mana perbedaan agama dapat berkontribusi untuk mempromosikan kebaikan bersama. Pertanyaan yang muncul adalah apakah perbedaan agama cukup bagi negara dan masyarakat untuk mencapai kebaikan bersama lintas keyakinan agama dan etika di negara multi-agama seperti Amerika dan Indonesia. Pertanyaan kunci ini merupakan pertanyaan etis-filosofis tetapi juga terkait dengan konteks sejarah, sosiologis, antropologis, dan politik. Bagi banyak orang beragama, kekhususan dan pembedaan agama -termasuk klaim kebenaran dan superioritasnya- merupakan elemen signifikan dari identitas dan rasa moralitas, tetapi perbedaan agama saja tidak cukup untuk mencapai kebaikan bersama. Agama memberikan motivasi untuk bertindak baik atau jahat. Agama menawarkan sumber daya yang kaya, bersifat doktrinal, naratif, pengalaman dan emosional, etika, hukum, sosial, materi, atau politik, tetapi karena ada banyak nilai agama dan etika yang sering bertentangan dari dalam tradisi agama yang sama dan lintas agama, itu tidak cukup. Setiap orang semestinya dapat berbagi keyakinan mereka dan menerima klaim eksklusif satu sama lain. Agar agama dapat membantu meningkatkan kebaikan publik, agen-agen agama harus menegosiasikan identitas mereka yang khusus dan berbeda serta moralitas universal kemudian menafsirkan kembali keyakinan dan norma mereka secara kontekstual dalam masyarakat yang majemuk di mana mereka hidup. Pemerintah juga harus mengizinkan perbedaan pendapat, termasuk agama, dengan memastikan toleransi, kebebasan hati nurani dan ibadah, dan hak berkumpul.

**Kata Kunci:** Agama; Toleransi; Identitas Agama

## Introduction

In this paper, I seek to discuss the extent to which religious differences could contribute to the promotion and attainment of the common good. Ilhan Omar –of Somali-Arab descent, and Rashida Tlaib of Palestinian descent, were sworn in using Thomas Jefferson’s copy of the Qur’an, as the first American Muslim congresswomen. Both represented the new voices in the nation’s politics marginalizing and demonizing Muslimness, Arabness, and people of color. Both Omar and Tlaib have been open with their racial and religious difference, with the headcover for Omar and the use of the Islamic phrase *alhamdulillah* (all praise to God), and the Palestinian-American identity for Tlaib. Tlaib voiced plans for a \$15 minimum wage and Omar wants universal health care and tuition-free colleges. Many Christian leaders delivered a welcome letter to the two Muslim representatives signed by 7,000 Christians.<sup>2</sup> Rep. Ilhan Omar was appointed to Foreign Affairs, Education & Labor Committees, overseeing all foreign assistance, and national security affecting the country’s foreign policy, treaties, peacekeeping, and war powers. Most recently, Omar’s critical comments on U.S. foreign policy toward Israel were regarded as being anti-Semitic while she’s been the target of Islamophobia (including a

poster connecting her to 9/11). Rashida Tlaib was in the House Committee on Financial Services, overseeing the banking industry, insurance, housing, and urban development, among other important sectors. In this case, race and religion are salient not as an obstacle to the struggle for representation and participation in public policy. This case also is an example of the recent form of religious pluralism's aspect of participation, including the Muslim minority, after the Puritans' selective tolerance toward other Protestant denominations in the early centuries, to the inclusion of Catholics, then Jews and other Protestants in the late 18<sup>th</sup> to the early twentieth centuries, and then Black-Americans in the 1960s.<sup>3</sup>

In Indonesia, the case is comparable but different. Basuki Thahja Purnama or commonly called Ahok, failed to become the governor of the Muslim majority capital of the Republics, Jakarta, because he was Chinese and Catholic (a double-minority status) and was charged with a "hate speech" against Muslims who according to him misuse the Qur'an to prevent him from running the governor's position— despite his good records in improving the economy and the public services when he was the vice-governor and a major in Sumatera.

For the purpose of my discussion in this paper, questions remain. To what extent does religious difference contribute to the construction and promotion of the common good? Is religious difference sufficient for the states and the societies to attain the common good across religious and ethical persuasions in multi-faith America and Indonesia? It is primarily an ethical-philosophical question, but it is also related to historical, sociological, anthropological, and political contexts.

My argument is that for many religious people, religious particularity and distinction – including its truth and superiority claims – is a significant element of identity and sense of morality, but religious difference alone is insufficient for attaining the common good. Religions provide motivations to act good or evil. Religions offer rich resources, be doctrinal, narrative, experiential and emotional, ethical and legal, social, material, or political, but because there are many, often conflicting religious and ethical values from within the same and across religious traditions, it is not enough for everyone to share their beliefs and accept each other's exclusive claims.

At the same time, as Aristotle says, "Good is not a general term corresponding to a single idea."<sup>4</sup> These conflicting ideas and contestations of what constitutes the truth and the good do not necessarily lead us to contend that religions do not have contributions to the formation and attainment of the good in public discourse and policy. In order for the religions to help improve the public good, religious agents have to

negotiate their particular and distinct identities and universal moralities and reinterpret their beliefs and norms contextually in light of the plural societies in which they live. The governments should also allow multiple voices, including the religious, by ensuring toleration, freedom of conscience and worship, and right of assembly.

### **The Significance of Religious Identity**

Religions have tended to be seen as the source of conflict, violence, and war, more than the source of peace and good. Religion and evil are more often intertwined in the minds of many. Political scientist Samuel Huntington's clash of civilizations is another phrase for the ideological clash, and ideological clash for the religious clash. Religion is a multifaceted force and seldom becomes the primary cause of social conflicts and wars. The struggle for scarce economic resources between people happens to come from different religious backgrounds. Religious identity is also a political identity.

Religious actors can contribute to the public dialogue on things that matter to them and others. Religions may serve as the force of checks and balances. In his book, *The Naked Public Square* published in 1988, American Protestant-turned Catholic priest late Richard John Neuhaus (d.2009), "When religion in any traditional or recognizable form is excluded from the public square, it does not mean that the public square is naked."<sup>5</sup> He writes, "In a democracy, the role of cooperation is not to be deemed morally superior to the roles of checking and competing... Contenders are striving with one another to define what the play is about – what are the rules and what the goal..."<sup>6</sup> Neuhaus continues to argue, "The notion of moralities in conflict is utterly essential to remedying the problems posed by the naked public square. Those who want to bring religiously based values to bear in a public discourse must "translate those values into terms that are as accessible as possible to those who do not share the same religious grounding."<sup>7</sup> But Neuhaus focused on the mainstream Protestants, with few mentions of Jews and Catholics, overlooking the growing religious minorities such as Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, Buddhists, atheists and the nones. For Christian theologian-scholar Diana Eck of Harvard University, America, a Christian country, has become the world's most religiously diverse nation, with American Hindus, American Buddhists, and American Muslim's contributions to the common life.<sup>8</sup>

From many, one, as expressed in its national slogan *E Pluribus Unum*. The laws, the constitution, along with the amendments, served as the legal compromise of the goods expressed publicly by the diverse mostly religious

and but also secular orientations. Some people argue that “It is important for the common good for religious people to join the political conversation and get involved... but the contention must be civil...”<sup>9</sup> The important thing is not so much the content of the conversation as the method by which the conversation takes place.

In the Muslim-majority nation of Indonesia, local indigenous religions had to interact with religions and cultures from India, China, Arabia, Europe, other parts of Southeast Asia, and the Pacific. The founding fathers of the Republic declared its birth in 1945 and chose the Five Principles called Pancasila as the state’s philosophy, incorporating monotheistic ideas of religion, the ideas of just and civil humanism, nationalism, democracy, and social justice.

Albeit not found in the Constitution, the government policies continue to maintain official recognition of currently six religions: Islam, Protestant Christianity, Roman Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. Being colonized by the Dutch, the British, and the Japanese, Indonesia offers a case of contested histories regarding the role of different religious communities in national building and its development. Indonesia selects its national slogan *Bhineka Tunggal Ika* (Diversity in Unity, comparable to the American slogan *E Pluribus Unum*, from Many One). Indonesia does make Islam the state religion but it has a governmental department of religions, which oversees religious matters, recognizing and supporting the religions to develop. The Islamists seek to challenge the secular nature of the state by Islamizing the laws, regionally in the provinces, if not nationally. Others, especially human rights activists, Muslim and non-Muslim, want to make it more secular: they want to remove the policy of “official religions” because it is discriminatory against non-official religions and atheism. Some seek the column “religion” on the Identity Cards. They reject the “1966 Blasphemy Law” which restricts “religious interpretations and practices contrary to the beliefs of the mainstream” (the article that was used to reject the Christian Chinese Ahok mentioned above from running the governorship) and to restrict new religious movements considered heterodox by the mainstream religious authorities which tend to be supported by the Government officials.

In America, contestations on the common good continue. “Culture war” has taken place between the Liberals and the Evangelical (broadly speaking) on the issues of abortion, gay marriage, the Iraqi war, terrorism and foreign policy, global warming, immigration, and more.<sup>10</sup> In contemporary Indonesia, contestations between the conservatives and the liberals have centered around the issues of the formal vs substantive role

of Islam in politics, pornography in the public and the media, monogamy vs polygamy, moral decay vs moral progressivism, politicians' corruption and nepotism, the Christian-Muslim ethnoreligious clashes, and the Sunni mainstream vs Shi'a minority. Interfaith issues concern interfaith marriage, Christmas greetings by Muslims, the regulation on the building of houses of worship, the legality of foreign aid to religious institutions, the non-Muslim as the president, governor, or majors in Muslim majority provinces, and the question of indigenous beliefs as being regarded as religion or culture. In America, freedom of religion may include freedom from religion whereas, in Indonesia, freedom from religion in the public arena is considered illegal although conversion from one to another religion is legal.

Religions have been resources for the good and the evil in society, but many religious believers and communities have used these resources as inspiration and guidance to help them live their lives and benefit them individually and socially:

Textually, for example, Muslim and Christian scholars have interpreted and emphasized inclusive teachings from within the traditions. Muslim theologians, such as Abdulaziz Sachedina, in his *The Islamic roots of Democratic Pluralism* – select and promote the following Qur'anic passages: “O humankind, We have created you male and female, and appointed you races and tribes, that you may know one another...” (Quran 49:14); Surely they whom believer, Jews, Christians, Sabaeans, who believes in God and the Last Day, and works good – their reward awaits them with their Lord and no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow (Q. 2:62). For everyone one of you, Jews, Christians, Muslims, We have appointed a path and a way. If God had willed, He would have made you but one community, but that He has not done so that) He may try you in what has come to you. So compete with one another in good works. (5:48) Other scholars quote a hadith: Wisdom (goodness) is a lost property; from whomever it is found it belongs to the believers.

In America, many, including orthodox theologians attempt to absorb and consecrate the good. For example, one cites Peter who confessed, “I now see how true it is that God has no favorites, but that in every nation the person who is God-fearing and does what is right is acceptable to him (Acts 10:34-5). Christian theologians, such as Paul Tillich (says, there is a point where particularity breaks through to spiritual freedom...). John Hick says whatever path men choose is mine, God is like the sun, the source of light and life, whom all the religions reflect in their different ways. Wilfred Cantwell Smith argues that it is not morally possible actually to

go out into the world and say to devout, intelligent, fellow human beings: "We are saved and you are damned." Paul Knitter proposes a hermeneutics of suspicion, meaning being suspicious of how interpretations of scripture and doctrine can become ideologies or means of promoting one's interests at the expense of others.... Although they may be no common ground or essence that we can evoke as the basis for dialogue, we could perhaps agree on a common approach, namely to opt for the poor and the non-person -the victims of this world- as a shared locus of our religious experience.<sup>11</sup>

Many Catholic theologians refer to the words of Vatican II, "Christians should recognize that various legitimate though conflicting views can be held concerning the regulation of temporal affairs. They should respect their fellow citizens when they promote such views honorably even by group action" Catholics "foster within the Church herself mutual esteem, reverence, and harmony, through the full recognition of lawful diversity."<sup>12</sup> In his book *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, Pope John Paul II has invited Catholics and Muslims, "to forget the past and to work toward mutual understanding, a well as toward the preservation and promotion of social justice, moral welfare, peace, and freedom, for the benefit of all mankind."<sup>13</sup>

More proposals have been put forward, emphasizing both the sacred and the commonality: Peter Berger's "sacred canopy", Robert Bellah's "civil religion", and Barbara McGraw's "sacred ground". For example, Professor of Law and Ethics Barbara McGraw has proposed America's "Sacred Ground", a "ground-up" approach to government in which God informs the government and the society. The government by the people for the people has the responsibility of preserving the natural rights of the people, in particular freedom of conscience and its expressions. So the people can build a good society, made up of laws that preserve natural rights", the voluntary actions of the people according to the people's communities of conscience. There is the civic public forum with its principles of No Harm and Consistency/No Hypocrisy and there is the conscientious public forum and its principles of "raising consciousness and participation. For Barbara McGraw, the religious right/secular left dichotomy presents itself as a choice between moral absolutism and moral relativism. There should be a middle ground and a fundamental political structure that frames the public debate for maximum participation by everyone in America's pluralistic society.<sup>14</sup>

American Sociologist Peter Berger offers what he says is "the Middle Path between Relativism and Fundamentalism." Berger defines relativism as the view that there are no absolutes whatever, that moral or philosophical truth is inaccessible, whereas fundamentalism pushes toward an uncompromising

affirmation of the absolute truth. Both formulas, Berger argues, preclude a common and reasoned quest for moral or philosophical agreement. For him, the middle path is through the cultivation of resources for an ethos of toleration and coexistence that can be found in each religious tradition.<sup>15</sup>

Some scholars-activists emphasize the objectives, rather than the formality of Islamic law (*shari'a*), making references to medieval scholars such as Imam Al-Mawardi and Al-Ghazzali. They emphasize the goals of Islamic law: protection of life, reason, faith, family, property, and the environment. Muslim scholars also express and promote the idea of “public good” (*maṣlahah 'āmmah*), above personal interests. They interpret the hadith saying that “I was sent with the kindly religion (*al-hanifiyah al-samḥah*).”<sup>16</sup> This hadith is included in the Bukhari’s “this religion is lenient”. Here, in this interpretation, a Muslim can be exempt from fasting when traveling or being ill; one is allowed to eat pork, blood, and thing prohibited in normal conditions when they don’t have any other food to save their life. The concept of “*al-samḥah*” has been interpreted to also mean tolerance toward other religions.

Many modern religious leaders and scholars use the classical seventh-century text of the so-called Constitution of Medina in which the Prophet Muhammad created a treaty with Jewish tribes and the peoples each representing “community” (or UMMA), instead of labeling them “non-believers” (*kāfir*), to protect the city from the enemies, seeking to maintain security and peace for all the residents.<sup>17</sup>

In public discourse, Muslim scholar-activists have reinterpreted textual references to slavery, polygamy, *jihād*, and *qitāl* in the Qur’an, and have reinterpreted them in light of their reconstruction and promotion of the idea of freedom, gender equality, and justice, and intellectual and spiritual struggle in creating the common good instead of promoting physical wars against enemies and violence against oneself and others.

Despite skepticism about the common good, the idea has its theoretical content and practical utility. It rests on important features of human life, such as social goods, social linkages, and joint occupation of various commons. The well-being of some people affects the well-being of others. If one family member is afflicted by mental illness, it disrupts the lives of others. Martin Luther King, Jr, said, “oppression damages the oppressors, not just their victims.”

Some say that in the face of difference, the common good is an achievement, not a fact. Others suggest that the key elements of the good: are a more perfect union, justice, domestic tranquility, the common defense, the general welfare, and the blessings of liberty. Hence, America’s



common good does not explicitly include religious doctrines or a canon of virtues. But many argue that without religion and civil morality the common good is unattainable.<sup>18</sup>

At the experiential level, the hearts and minds of the diverse adherents: private, personal, social, and public engagements on why and how to live a good life. They build friendships, neighborhoods, road trips, Thanksgiving dinners, open mosques, visits to religious houses, interfaith marriage, and interfaith prayer. Many in Indonesia are proud of their “Pancasila” family because their family consists of different religious members. In Salatiga, some activists and theologians create a friendship called Sobat.

At the communal level, social organizations and networks have been established and expanded. In contemporary America, three New York women: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim, created *The Faith Club*. They were disturbed by the events of September 11, 2001, and the state and public reactions toward the events. They felt the need to understand one another, to speak and to listen, not to challenge others, and to let others and themselves develop spiritually and personally.<sup>19</sup> Other Americans, Christian, Muslim and Jewish, wrote a book entitled *Strangers, Neighbors, Friends – Muslim-Christian-Jewish reflections on Compassion and Peace*.<sup>20</sup>

In Indonesia, the modernist Muhammadiyah works on health care, orphanages, schools, and higher education, humanitarian programs, disaster relief programs, the traditionalist Nahdlatul Ulama’s works on traditional schooling, gender awareness, progressive Islamic interpretations. There are also interfaith networks such as DIAN-INTERFIDEI, the International Center for Islam and Pluralism, the Indonesian Conference on Religion and Peace, the Forum of Communication of Religious Communities, LAPAR and Forlog, and many others.

### **The Insufficiency of Religious Identity**

Every religion has exclusive norms and ultimate concerns: the goals of life, the nature of life, the path of life, God, Yahweh, Christ, Brahman, Nirvana, non-theism, salvation vs enlightenment, harmony with the divine vs harmony with nature. What is the good, and what is the common good varies from religion to religion, from religious groups to other groups within the same religion --- The Judeo-Christian nation, Christian nation, Abrahamic religions, Monotheistic religions, Spiritualities and the nones-persons not affiliated with established churches and religions, new religious movements.

In America, Muslim minorities feel that they should conform to majoritarian cultures. Muslims have emphasized certain norms from their

texts and traditions while deemphasizing other norms from the same texts, such as those issues regarding polygamy, physical fighting against the attacks of the infidels and the hypocrites, and the subjugation of the associationists or *mushrikun*. Muslims feel that they do not need to use loudspeakers for their call to prayer five times a day. They cannot slaughter animals publicly on their annual festival of sacrifice. They pray in various spaces not always in mosques. They can ask for religious accommodation during the Eid Festival but it is not a holiday.

In Indonesia, the Christian Trinitarian doctrine has to be adjusted to the monotheistic principle of the State's Philosophy Pancasila; Hindus have to create and emphasize one good (be it Vishnu, Siva, Brahma, or the localized name *Sang Hyang Widi Wasa*); Buddhists who are non-theists, have to have God of their own; Confucians have to make Tien their one god, and indigenous religionists (being seen by the state as non-religion but culture) should make their case for recognition in the official documents.

In America, many Muslims prefer strict secularism and struggle for the constitutional separation of church and state, promote civil liberties, and counter prejudice and hatred, often in collaboration with other ethnic, religious, and sexual, and gender minorities, including the Jews, and LGBTQ groups. In Indonesia, many Muslims feeling they are the majority, prefer a greater Islamization, seeking to Islamize more and more laws in the country regarding sexuality and family, religious education in the public schools, charity and pilgrimage, banking system, and even clothing and uniforms.

The part of the content of religious traditions may be regarded by the state and outsiders as being discriminatory and thus antagonistic to the idea of "equality before the law": regarding the right of life and death, sexuality and gender orientations, racial chosen-ness and supremacy, and religious supremacy over other religions.

Once we look into the content of the various valued cultures and religions, we encounter problems. Should liberal democratic society respect those cultures whose attitudes of ethnic, racial, or religious superiority are antagonistic to other cultures? If so, how can respect for racial or religious superiority be reconciled with the commitment to treating all people as equals?<sup>21</sup>

As late anthropologist Saba Mahmood argued in *Religious Difference in A Secular Age*, how can we expect the modern state to ameliorate religious inequality when its institutions and practices hierarchize religious differences, enshrine majoritarian religious and cultural norms in the nation's identity and laws, and allow for religious inequalities to

flourish in society while proclaiming them to be apolitical? For Mahmood, secularism, like in Egypt where Muslims are the majority, and Coptic Orthodox Christians, and Baha'is are minorities, reduces religious equality to the politics of rights and recognition, strengthening the prerogative of the state to intervene in and reorder religious life, which often results in the exacerbation of religious polarization and inequality.<sup>22</sup> Secularism reinforces religious differences where majority religious sensibilities, institutionalized in the laws, are prioritized at the expense of minority religious beliefs and practices.

There is much disagreement about the role of the state in dealing with religious and ethical differences: Should the state be invoked to protect, ban, or otherwise regulate ethically based differences? If so, where and how should the state be involved? The role of the state has been translated as the role of ruling governments: who is in power decides which particular norms get promoted and which policy to be made and implemented for the majority and minorities. In other words, the religious difference may prove constructive for the greater if not common good if those in power representing the state think and act responsibly and justly for protecting both religious freedom and equality, upholding justice and coexistence among all the population without exception.

## **Conclusion**

There is no one monolithic explanation and answer to the question “How being religiously true and distinct can be translated into being socially and commonly good”. American and Indonesian cases offer different ways in which historical and sociological factors shape the different trajectories. A rather similar pattern in America and Indonesia is that in both democracies the state and societal attitudes and policies toward minorities perpetuate religious differences and inequality. An ethical question remains crucial: “People should work for the common good despite their differences”, or “people can bond not despite but because of differences”.<sup>23</sup>

Another ethical question may be posed: Is the ideal society one that aims for ethnical uniformity or one that emphasizes the accommodation of ethical pluralism? The challenge remains: how best to strike a balance between the accommodation of ethical pluralism (including religious difference) and the promotion of social cohesion and unity.

The election of Ilhan Omar and Rashida Tlaib and the Defeat of Ahok in Indonesia suggest that religious difference can be an important element of the public discourse, but for the attainment of the common good, it requires conditions in which the diverse religious and non-religious

peoples can share their understanding of the primary goods and the state ensure toleration, recognition, and participation. Majoritarian sensibilities and cultures may not go away, but these should not be at the expense of minority identities and moralities. Ideally, more and more people come to believe in and support equal citizenship based on fundamental values and common humanity.[]

## Endnotes

1. This paper was originally delivered as the Keynote Address at the Melon Advancing Intercultural Studies Conference: Polarity, Diversity, Confluence, at the Center for Ideas and Society, University of California, Riverside, held March 7, 2019.
2. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/religion/2019/01/03/americas-first-two-muslim-congresswomen-are-sworn-surrounded-by-women-they-inspired/?noredirect=on&utm\\_term=.3062acc9ae4e](https://www.washingtonpost.com/religion/2019/01/03/americas-first-two-muslim-congresswomen-are-sworn-surrounded-by-women-they-inspired/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.3062acc9ae4e)
3. William R. Hutchison, *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal* (Ann Arbor: Michigan: Sheridan Books, 2003).
4. Cited in John Kekes, *The Morality of Pluralism* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993), 38.
5. Richard John Neuhaus, *The Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), 80.
6. Neuhaus, 84.
7. Neuhaus, 125.
8. Diana L. Eck, *A New Religious America: How A "Christian Country" Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation* (NY: HarperCollins, 2001).
9. Martin E. Marty and Jonathan Moore, *Politics, Religion and the Common Good: Advancing A Distinctively American Conversation about Religion's Role in Our Shared Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000).
10. James K. Wellman, Jr , *Evangelical vs Liberal: the Clash of Christian Cultures in the Pacific Northwest* (Oxford, 2008).
11. Harold Coward, *Pluralism in the World Religions: A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2000), 32-42.
12. Martin E. Marty, "Religion and Public Discourse: An Introduction", in *Religion and Public Discourse: Principles and Guidelines for Religious Participants* (Chicago, Illinois: the Park Ridge Center, 1998), 9.
13. Cited in Majid Fakhry, "An Islamic Perspective", Chad Meister, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Religious Diversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 402.
14. Barbara A. McGraw and Jo Renee Formicola, *Taking Religious Pluralism Seriously: Spiritual Politics on America's Sacred Ground* (Baylor University Press, 2005), 1-23.
15. Peter Berger, "Introduction" in Peter Berger, ed., *Between Relativism and Fundamentalism: Religious Resources for a Middle Position* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2010),
16. Yohanan Friedman, *Tolerance and Coercion in Islam: Interfaith Relations in the Muslim Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
17. Frederick Denny, "The Umma in the Constitution of Medina", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 36, 1 (Jan 1977), 39-47; Uri Rubin, "The Constitution of Medina" Some Notes, *Studia Islamica*, 62 (1985), 5-23.
18. William A. Galston, "The Common Good: Theoretical Content, Practical Utility", *Daedalus*, 142, 2, *American Democracy & The Common Good* (Spring 2013), 9-14.

19. Ranya Idliby, Suzanne Oliver and Priscilla Warner, *The Faith Club: A Muslim, A Christian, a Jew – Three Women Search for Understanding* (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: Free Press, 2006).
20. Kelly James Clark, Aziz Abu Sarah, Nancy Fuchs Kreimer, *Strangers, Neighbors, Friends: Muslim-Christian-Jewish Reflections on Compassion and Peace* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018).
21. Amy Gutmann, in Amy Gutmann, ed., *Multiculturalism* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), 5
22. Saba Mahmood, *Religious Difference in A Secular Age: A Minority Report* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016).
23. Charles Taylor, cited in Richard Madsen and Tracy B. Strong, eds., *The Many and the One: Religious and Secular Perspective on Ethical Pluralism in the Modern World* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003), 11.

## Bibliography

- Berger, Peter, "Introduction" in Peter Berger, ed., *Between Relativism and Fundamentalism: Religious Resources for a Middle Position* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2010).
- Clark, Kelly James, Aziz Abu Sarah, Nancy Fuchs Kreimer, *Strangers, Neighbors, Friends: Muslim-Christian-Jewish Reflections on Compassion and Peace* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018).
- Coward, Harold, *Pluralism in the World Religions: A Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2000).
- Denny, Frederick, "The Umma in the Constitution of Medina", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 36, 1 (Jan 1977)
- Eck, Diana L., *A New Religious America: How A "Christian Country" Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation* (NY: HarperCollins, 2001).
- Hutchison, William R., *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal* (Ann Arbor: Michigan: Sheridan Books, 2003).
- Fakhry, Majid, "An Islamic Perspective", Chad Meister, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Religious Diversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Friedman, Yohanan, *Tolerance, and Coercion in Islam: Interfaith Relations in the Muslim Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Galston, William A., "The Common Good: Theoretical Content, Practical Utility", *Daedalus*, 142, 2, *American Democracy & The Common Good* (Spring 2013), 9-14.
- Gutmann, Amy, in Amy Gutmann, ed., *Multiculturalism* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994).
- Idliby, Ranya, Suzanne Oliver, and Priscilla Warner, *The Faith Club: A Muslim, A Christian, a Jew – Three Women Search for Understanding* (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: Free Press, 2006).
- Kekes, John, *The Morality of Pluralism* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- Madsen, Richard, and Tracy B. Strong, eds., *The Many and the One: Religious and Secular Perspective on Ethical Pluralism in the Modern World* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003).
- Mahmood Saba, *Religious Difference in A Secular Age: A Minority Report* (Princeton

- and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016).
- Marty, Martin E., "Religion and Public Discourse: An Introduction", in *Religion and Public Discourse: Principles and Guidelines for Religious participants* (Chicago, Illinois: the Park Ridge Center, 1998).
- Marty, Martin E. and Jonathan Moore, *Politics, Religion, and the Common Good: Advancing A Distinctively American Conversation about Religion's Role in Our Shared Life* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000).
- McGraw, Barbara A. and Jo Renee Formicola, *Taking Religious Pluralism Seriously: Spiritual Politics on America's Sacred Ground* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2005).
- Neuhaus, Richard John, *the Naked Public Square: Religion and Democracy in America*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1988).
- Rubin, Uri, "The Constitution of Medina" Some Notes, *Studia Islamica*, 62 (1985), 5-23.
- Wellman, Jr, James K., *Evangelical vs Liberal: The Clash of Christian Cultures in the Pacific Northwest* (Oxford, 2008).

**Muhamad Ali**, University of California, Riverside | [muali@ucr.edu](mailto:muali@ucr.edu)