

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.12126103

# FROM RELIGIOUS FANATICISM TO POLITICAL DOMINATION: THE DEEP ROOTS OF THE CRISIS OF TOLERANCE IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETIES

Nizar Smida<sup>1\*</sup>, Bassem Jemal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Tolerance and Coexistence, College of Social and Human Sciences, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi 26262, UAE.

Email: nizar.smida@mbzuh.ac.ae, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2960-9932>

<sup>2</sup> Professor, Department of Tolerance and Coexistence, College of Social and Human Sciences, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi 26262, UAE.

Email: bassem.jemal@mbzuh.ac.ae, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-3677-4695>

Received: 07/08/2025  
Accepted: 08/01/2026

Corresponding Author: Nizar Smida  
(nizar.smida@mbzuh.ac.ae)

## ABSTRACT

*This research paper undertakes the essential task of investigating the origins and evolution of intolerance, delving into its historical roots and their enduring influence on contemporary human consciousness. We argue that the human being is inherently a tolerant creature, but that external circumstances have transformed them into one incapable of tolerating others. In our view, religious fanaticism, the claim to exclusive ownership of truth, salvation doctrines, and the pursuit of happiness – alongside the political agenda aimed at consolidating power, expanding authority, and extending global influence – represent, in our estimation, a pivotal shift from coexistence, familiarity, and tolerance to violence, exclusion, and alienation. Our study is framed by a clearly defined research question:*

- *How does examining forms of religious fanaticism and political conflict lead us to conclude that these are the primary drivers of intolerance?*

*To address this question, we have relied on historical, inductive, and comparative methodologies, which have led us to the following conclusions:*

- *Intolerance is a symptom of alienation and the loss of original human identity.*
- *Ignorance of the true objectives and unifying spirit of religion is a central cause of violence and intolerance.*
- *The dominance of self-interest and utilitarian goals in political agendas has led to the erosion of core values – chief among them, the value of tolerance.*

---

**KEYWORDS:** Intolerance / Tolerance / Alienation / Religion / Politics.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Despite our era's proclaimed emphasis on human unity, the expansion of common ground, and the rejection of all forms of extremism and violence, the current state of humanity reveals quite the opposite. We are witnessing a growing fragmentation (Maykel Verkuyten, Levi Adelman, and Kumar Yogeewaran /2020), (<https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420924763>), an intensification of divisive and hateful rhetoric, and the emergence of a new condition we term intolerance. Recognizing the depth of this condition—its risks and its ethical and practical consequences—compels us to investigate its roots and underlying motives, to uncover what lies hidden and to articulate what remains unsaid.

Since the early days of political philosophical thought among the Greeks, there has been a clear trend toward affirming the foundations of peaceful coexistence among people—an ideal devoid of conflict, disrespect, and violence. For instance, Aristotle emphasized what he called the cooperative effort between human beings to establish a virtuous and happy existence, one in which people become friends sharing the joy of a life built on mutual harmony. (Aristote, 1989)

The call for coexistence and the establishment of a lasting peace has not been the concern of philosophy alone. Religions of various kinds have also taken up this imperative, grounded in their affirmation of the human right to live free from corruption, harm, and violence. This is clearly evident in ancient legal systems as well as in the Abrahamic faiths, which have spread widely across the globe. Religions have sought to answer a persistent human question: How can we encounter the other, live together, and foster a dynamic of interaction that enables human beings—regardless of their races and cultures—to live as servants of God, collectively working toward an exemplary model based on the honoring and dignifying of the human being? (Mircea Eliade, 2007 / 1997).

Religions are grounded in a fundamental purpose often described as the pursuit of “divine happiness”—a notion emphasized by the German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, who argued that the human being cannot attain the fullness of existence without a divine providence that safeguards him from evil (Leibniz, 1710/1985). This ultimate state is realized when individuals transcend pain and sorrow and distance themselves from all manifestations of harm, particularly the destructive consequences of war and violence (Almond et al., 2008). Accordingly, religions should not be reduced to mere devotional practices expressed through

rituals, ceremonies, and acts of worship; rather, they constitute profound communicative and meaning-making experiences through which human beings articulate their self-understanding, redefine their relationship with others, and situate their existence within the broader order of the world (Ricoeur, 1995; Smart, 1998).

In this perspective, contemporary engagement with religious experience has increasingly become intertwined with its ability to contribute to what is commonly referred to as the humanistic mission. This mission, as articulated in modern philosophy, seeks to uphold human dignity and safeguard humanity against the forces that drive alienation and social disintegration—what Jürgen Habermas describes as “technocratic domination” and the pathological conditions of modernity (Habermas, 1987 / 2012). It emphasizes the need for a coordinated integration of diverse fields of knowledge to counter the tendencies leading societies toward collapse and fragmentation, a phenomenon Edgar Morin conceptualizes as a “descent into the abyss,” manifested in escalating violence, ecological crises, and the erosion of communication among human beings (Morin, 1999/2015). Within this framework, religious experiences are not merely remnants of traditional spirituality; rather, they serve as dynamic ethical resources that reinforce practical values—such as solidarity, dialogue, and mutual recognition—ultimately shaping a more constructive, future-oriented understanding of human existence (Bourdieu, 1998, Morin, 2022).

Today, the value of tolerance occupies a pivotal position within anthropological, philosophical, religious, and political scholarship. These disciplines increasingly inquire into the cultural and social conditions that allow tolerance to become firmly embedded in human consciousness and translated into tangible practices—whether in contexts of intercultural dialogue, interfaith engagement, or international cooperation (Taylor, 1994; Hollenbach, 2002). The prevailing assumption is that societies advance toward an inclusive pluralism when individuals acknowledge the legitimacy of difference and uphold the Other's right to their own identity and worldview. Such pluralism rejects the exploitation of difference as a justification for fanaticism, social isolation, or identity-based hostility—a concern raised early on by Franz Boas, who emphasized the importance of cultural self-appreciation while warning against “identity seclusion,” which fosters fear or contempt toward those outside one's group (Boas, 1938; Benhabib, 2002).

Tolerance, as a value, only acquires true meaning when it is freed from anything that may undermine or distort it. In this sense, tolerance is not sought for its own sake, but rather should be understood as a condition for the viability of a positive and humane global reality. This perspective compels us to examine the factors that hinder the realization of this value by investigating the roots and causes of divisive thinking, exclusionary discourse, and rhetoric of discrimination—in short, anything that reinforces tendencies toward supremacy, violence, and the marginalization of tolerance as a transformative force in building a human civilization rooted in closeness between individuals.

On this basis, we have chosen to investigate the deep-rooted causes and distant origins of negative practices that obstruct interaction and communication, foster cultural centralism and hierarchy, and promote discourses of superiority and exclusion. We consider the search for these roots to be essential in charting a path toward overcoming or at least mitigating such obstacles. Accordingly, this study begins by addressing the following central question: How does the decline of tolerance in our contemporary world point to its entanglement with deeper historical roots and various forms of ideological and practical manifestations?

This leads us to adopt the following approach: we will begin by examining the concept of tolerance and its origins, then proceed to uncover the roots or underlying causes that hinder the realization and active presence of this value in our contemporary world. Finally, we will present a set of conclusions that may serve as a foundation for further inquiry into the issue and for expanding its dimensions within a framework of constructive academic discourse—one that contributes both to identifying the challenges facing humanity today and to proposing solutions for them.

### ***1. On the Meaning of Tolerance and the Mechanisms of Its Realization***

When we return to linguistic dictionaries and examine the origin of the term "tolerance" (*al-tasāmuh*), we find that it signifies allowing the other—who is different—to be as they are, without requiring them to conform to what we are. The root *samḥa* in Arabic denotes acceptance and acknowledgment without implying concession or the erasure of the other's distinct existence.

This reveals that one of the semantic dimensions of the word "tolerance" is that it expresses a psychological and ethical stance that the self (*al-anā*) adopts toward the other. It does not carry any

implication of violence, exclusion, or rejection. Indeed, the terms *samḥa* (to allow) and *tasāmaha* (to be tolerant) lead to meanings of relativity and the rejection of severance or negative emotional reaction toward those who differ from us in outlook, position, or values.

In common usage, the concept of tolerance refers to an intellectual and civilizational value that signifies the possibility of coexistence amid difference and diversity. It has been prominently present in contemporary philosophical and anthropological contexts (Maykel Verkuyten, Kumar Yogeeswaran, Levi Adelman (spssi Volume13, Issue1 2019) (<https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12051>), which focus particularly on the various possibilities that help purify human relationships from all forms of alienation—especially the distancing among peoples and cultures, the lack of communication among members of the human family, and the persistence of superiority complexes and attempts to exclude the other or cast them outside the bounds of humanity. (Claude Lévi-Strauss, 1961)

The historical roots of the concept of tolerance can be traced to developments within Christian thought, especially after theological disputes among Christian sects escalated from doctrinal disagreements into violent confrontations. These tensions became tragically evident in episodes of reciprocal aggression among Catholics and various other Christian communities throughout Europe (Sullivan, 2014). In reaction to such turmoil, numerous theologians and reform-minded clergy advocated the adoption of tolerance as an ethical and political imperative capable of containing sectarian rivalry, constructing a shared framework for coexistence, and putting an end to the cycles of violence and persecution that had bred deep hostilities and extensive bloodshed. The St. Bartholomew's Day massacre stands as a dramatic example of the catastrophic consequences of religious fanaticism—an event later powerfully condemned in Enlightenment discourse, most notably by Voltaire, who argued in his *Philosophical Dictionary* that tolerance is foundational to preventing religious hatred and safeguarding civic peace (Voltaire, 1764/2017; Zagorin, 2003).

Today, the concept of tolerance holds great significance in the context of promoting fruitful universality and globalism—frameworks that emphasize the importance of human rapprochement and the pursuit of common ground among peoples. This concept also supports efforts to resist globalization insofar as it attempts to impose a singular model that does not tolerate differences and

seeks to eliminate otherness by advocating for the superiority of a particular civilizational paradigm—namely, the Western one. Such tendencies pose a threat to the meaning of tolerance, which fundamentally reflects a conviction that humanity possesses two dimensions: one individual, expressing diversity and distinctiveness; the other universal, expressing unity and encounter. (Claude Lévi-Strauss, 1961)

On this basis, the meanings and connotations of the term tolerance are diverse, yet collectively they point to this noble moral value upon which the future of humanity must be built—a future that ought to be one of perpetual peace, as Immanuel Kant envisioned in his concept of cosmopolitanism (Voltaire, 2017). According to the perspective we adopt here, tolerance becomes a vital aspiration or long-term goal that can only be achieved by rethinking the concept of identity—its interaction with otherness and the conditions for its continuity—while preserving both its universal human dimension and its particular, distinctive character. This, in turn, requires concerted efforts to establish tolerance as a framework of thought, a mode of practice, and a deeply held conviction grounded in the fraternal bond of humanity (Pierre Bourdieu, 2010).

## 2. *The Roots of Intolerance in Contemporary Societies*

There is a consistent principle in the methods of analyzing and addressing civilizational issues, namely that no phenomenon—whether negative or positive—emerges all at once, nor does it arise in isolation from the causes and factors that explain its origin, emergence, continuity, or decline. Human phenomena are always governed by a set of causes that reflect their roots, development, and evolution.

This is the very approach we shall adopt in our treatment of intolerance, which we consider to be an old yet recurring phenomenon—sometimes receding, other times resurfacing—whenever the conditions for its emergence are present or when it is reproduced for political reasons. These reasons often relate to the exploitation of whatever serves the interests sought by political actors when Machiavellian (Immanuel Kant, 1952), motives dominate their decisions—motives that prioritize practical outcomes and immediate results over principles and values.

In addition to this, there is the issue of misunderstanding religious devotion and misapplying or misinterpreting its purposes and objectives. Religious belief often turns into a form of absolute conviction in the truth of one's own creed,

accompanied by a compulsion to impose it on others through various means and methods. For this reason, we argue that both political and religious factors—whether acting separately or in conjunction—are the decisive drivers behind the spread of intolerance. They obstruct dialogue, hinder interaction and communication, and give rise to a type of thinking rooted in dogmatism and fanaticism, as well as a mode of conduct founded on superiority complexes and claims of exclusivity and exceptionalism.

### **A. Religious Fanaticism as the Foundation of Intolerance**

Humankind has experienced religiosity since the dawn of history, as evidenced by the emergence of rituals and religious practices in all corners of the world—a fact confirmed by philosophical and anthropological studies that highlight the historical and geographical continuity of religious phenomena (Gandhi, 1969). According to many scholars, the human being is inherently religious, and this trait inevitably influences their modes of thinking, worldview, and attitudes toward others.

Religious belief often becomes imbued with a sense of superiority and an inflated sense of identity, (Towards Immigrants – Social Identities (2025), DOI: (<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13504630.2025.2453158>), wherein the self is perceived as saved or entrusted with a redemptive mission. This perception frequently links religious faith to efforts aimed at its expansion and wider dissemination, under the premise of a divinely ordained message capable of elevating humanity as a whole.

Since the interpretation and manipulation of religious texts are often subject to vested interests, power dynamics, and the pursuit of dominance, it becomes essential to closely examine how religious experience has been transformed—from a spiritual endeavor rooted in self-purification into an instrumental force exploited for pragmatic ends. This transformation is largely due to the powerful influence that religion exerts over human consciousness, emotion, and behavior (Gandhi, 1969).

Throughout history, humanity has suffered significantly from the instrumentalization of religion to fuel fanaticism and promote ethnocentric and cultural supremacist ideologies. This is evident in numerous historical instances: the bloody conflicts between Jews and others, driven by the belief in their status as the chosen and superior people; the persecution and attempted extermination of Jews under the Pharaohs due to religious differences; the internal disputes over the interpretation of the Torah; the transformation of Christianity into the official

religion of the Roman Empire, which led to coercive efforts to convert subjected peoples and to suppress their original faiths through violence and hatred; the widespread conflicts among Christian denominations themselves—particularly between Catholics and Protestants; the Crusades, during which religion was weaponized to justify wars against the Muslims of the East by exploiting ecclesiastical rhetoric and promoting enmity between Christians and Muslims; and, within Islamic civilization itself, the absence of tolerance between sects and groups, which resulted in numerous ordeals and bloody conflicts that spread across much of the Muslim world.

While these historical sufferings have long been the focus of historians and scholars interpreting religious texts, the association between religion and the promotion of intolerance continues to persist even in our contemporary civilization—a civilization we had often assumed had transcended the realities of war, division, and conflict, and had instead ushered in a world built on the recognition of the other's right to difference and uniqueness. However, the present moment is marked by violent rhetoric and increasing calls for radical alterity, reflecting a modern human (Niccolò Machiavelli, 2004). condition increasingly shaped by religious fanaticism and exclusionary practices.

The contemporary individual appears more intolerant than ever, more inclined to marginalize others under various pretexts, the most prominent being the defense of a perceived threatened identity. This manifests in two primary forms: either through isolationism and the rejection of all forms of intersubjectivity—wherein individuals of the same ethnicity and culture are encouraged to resist openness, promote intolerance, and view engagement with the other as a threat—or through active aggression, whereby the different other is not only rejected in theory but also attacked in practice. This is exemplified in the actions of extremist movements and their violent behaviors, commonly labeled as terrorism, which have led to a resurgence of violence, discord, and intolerance as defining features of our present era (Blaise Pascal, 1972) (Henri Bergson, 1971).

In sum, we can assert that religion—when approached negatively, that is, when it becomes associated with the production of closed-minded thinking and a sense of supremacist identity, and when it gives rise to doctrines that demonize the other and perceive them as an enemy rather than a friend—becomes one of the primary drivers of intolerance and a foundation for various forms of

violent behavior, both theoretical and practical. This is precisely the condition humanity is experiencing today, as a result of the growing influence of divisive rhetoric, ideological propaganda, and the expansion of takfir (excommunication), which has come to dominate much of religious thought. This type of thinking cloaks itself in the guise of truth-seeking and claims that the perfection of humanity is achievable only through adherence to one exclusive religious path to the exclusion of all others (Nasser Hamed Abu Zayd, 1995).

## **B. The Deviation of Political Action and Intolerance**

It is commonly held that political action, at its essence, is an ethical undertaking oriented toward the realization of foundational human values—chief among them justice, peace, and the prevention of conflict, violence, and systemic injustice (Morin, 2012; Sen, 2009). From this perspective, politics possesses the constructive capacity to elevate human consciousness and curb destructive tendencies, particularly when practiced within democratic frameworks grounded in pluralism, diversity, and tolerance toward ideological or cultural opponents (Rawls, 1993). Such political structures strive to dismantle mechanisms of exclusion and domination, while simultaneously fostering a civic environment defined by encounter, interaction, and active participation. Within this context, the rejection of “radical alterity”—the perception of the Other as wholly irreconcilable with the Self—becomes essential to maintaining an inclusive and dialogical public sphere (Morin, 2012; Mouffe, 2013).

However, a closer examination of the outcomes and various manifestations of political action throughout history—and continuing to the present day—reveals that politics has been, and continues to be, one of the main roots of intolerance. Politics has often operated on the basis of domination, conflict, and efforts to eliminate the other, whether through accusation or by presenting them as obstacles to the achievement of political and social goals. This typically leads to the decline of rational discourse and the ascendancy of coercive consensus, while sidelining tolerance as a moral and civic value.

Consequently, political discourse often tends to become rigid and absolutist, advancing claims of exclusive access to truth while discrediting competing perspectives. This results in presenting the political actor's agenda as the only legitimate pathway to fulfilling human aspirations (Mouffe, 2005). Such tendencies are particularly visible in certain defenses of the liberal democratic model, which some of its proponents have elevated to the

status of the “final” and universally valid political framework—implicitly delegitimizing alternative models and framing them as inherently conducive to social, economic, or cultural regression (Fukuyama, 1992; Brown, 2015). In contrast, theorists like Jürgen Habermas emphasize that deliberative democracy—rooted in communicative rationality—can serve as a safeguard against intolerance by promoting inclusive dialogue and consensus-oriented public reasoning (Habermas, 1986 / 1996).

Intolerance is, in fact, a hallmark of political action that aligns itself with colonial agendas and various forms of domination over peoples—justified by the claim that these populations have not yet reached the level of full humanity and thus require elevation or advancement. This approach reveals that, despite political actors’ professed focus on values, their actions often contradict those very claims. They operate from reductionist convictions and ideological frameworks rooted in the assumption of possessing the truth and the mission to disseminate it, often under the guise of promoting a so-called “universal project.”

Such a project aspires to achieve a unified humanity through the imposition of a single political, economic, or cultural model—most visibly reflected today in certain globalization paradigms that are promoted as the exclusive route to development and shared prosperity. The underlying claim is that no alternative trajectory should diverge from this prescribed path (Fukuyama, 1992). Within this dynamic, what Jean Baudrillard describes as “violence against alterity” emerges: a form of symbolic, epistemic, and cultural coercion that works to erase difference, neutralize diversity, and ultimately suppress any authentic expression of tolerance toward the Other (Baudrillard, 1993; 2001). Such homogenizing pressures render pluralistic coexistence fragile, reducing tolerance to a superficial gesture rather than a principled recognition of distinct identities.

The politician’s persistent promotion of a singular worldview and his deliberate defense of cultural centralism have historically laid the foundation for conflict and confrontation. These actions have shaped intercultural encounters as inherently driven by domination and expansionist ambitions. Rather than fostering mutual understanding and agreement among nations and peoples, and rather than adopting the principles of cultural relativism, such approaches have led to the proliferation of intolerance. In this context, war and the logic of power come to dominate human relations, replacing dialogue and cooperation with exclusion and conflict

(Jürgen Habermas, 1986) .

In conclusion, it can be affirmed that politics—despite its humanistic appearance as an endeavor to liberate people, organize their lives, and replace primitive violence with the authority of law and legitimate force—always harbors a logic of domination and the imposition of opinion and consensus. As such, it tends to exclude the values of tolerance, even within democratic systems, where the violence of the tyrant and his absolute authority is merely replaced by the violence of the majority, even if only a relative one. This reinforces the conviction that the political actor—regardless of his claims to tolerance—often leans, in practice, toward all forms of power, coercion, and the marginalization or denigration of dissent and difference (Jürgen Habermas, 1986).

### ***3. On the Possibility of Overcoming the Obstacles to Tolerance: From Understanding to Resolution***

Indeed, identifying the problems related to the value of tolerance—by tracing both their distant and proximate roots—only becomes truly meaningful when this analysis expands to include the formulation of practical solutions aimed at limiting or neutralizing those causes and their effects. Civilizational and historical studies must therefore take on a pragmatic dimension, grounded in the principles of relevance, applicability, and effectiveness.

Contemporary academic research is no longer confined solely to analytical, explanatory, or inductive purposes. Rather, it lays the foundation for what may be termed a “decision-making model”—a form of inquiry that equips actors across various fields to make appropriate decisions and adopt necessary positions in response to pressing challenges (Francis Fukuyama, 1993).

Accordingly, our engagement with the central research question has led us to a number of conclusions and results that can be summarized as follows:

- The pursuit of tolerance represents a fundamental need and a key objective that humanity strives to achieve today, particularly in its effort to overcome all forms of violence in its various manifestations, exclusion under diverse labels and justifications, and intolerance grounded in unethical rationales defended by certain groups.
- Overcoming the various forms of intolerance cannot be achieved merely through empty slogans, rhetorical proclamations, or elite discourse that tends toward abstraction and theorization. Rather, it requires the formulation of

practical strategies developed and implemented by progressive forces rooted in the unity of humanity, while simultaneously acknowledging its diversity, multiplicity, and differences. This means working toward the establishment of a “global civil society” that functions as a countervailing force compelling states to uphold the values of tolerance and peaceful coexistence, and pushing toward the moralization and humanization of politics – surpassing its negative dimensions linked to the desire for the perpetuation of power, tendencies toward authoritarianism, exploitation, and violence.

- What is required is not merely the identification of those responsible for promoting the values of intolerance, nor targeting them or specifying the victims. Rather, the essential task is to work toward establishing consensuses that extend beyond existing states and, more importantly, include the diverse peoples inhabiting the world. These consensuses are necessary if humanity truly seeks to transcend its current state of suffering and misery, and to move toward the establishment of a condition of shared happiness from which all people may benefit without exception.
- There must be an intensification of intellectual forums, conferences, and meetings among civil society organizations and human rights associations, aimed at forming a global public opinion committed to condemning any attempt to justify or defend intolerance under religious, ethnic, or cultural pretexts. This is because the fight against moral deviations is fundamentally tied to the exposure of what is actually happening – making visible the forces behind such phenomena and identifying who benefits from them. This process requires deep archaeological inquiry to uncover the roots, origins, and structural determinants of the issue (Jean Baudrillard, 2006).

## CONCLUSION

Thus, we come to understand that every human, social, or ethical phenomenon has underlying roots and foundational causes that lead to its emergence and persistence. Nothing comes into existence from a

void, as specialized scientific studies in environmental and natural sciences affirm. In this sense, we cannot speak meaningfully about the future of tolerance – whether as a concept or as a lived practice – unless it is preceded by rigorous inquiry into its deep-seated causes and historical roots, particularly as they pertain to human behavior throughout time. Understanding these foundations is always the necessary starting point for accurate and effective treatment, one that ultimately seeks solutions and constructive projects capable of helping humanity overcome its pressing challenges.

Focusing our attention on the religious and political roots of intolerance allows us to truly grasp this phenomenon and contextualize it within the broader, recurring global discourse that surrounds it today – what we might refer to as a state of “descent into the abyss,” as Edgar Morin describes the current condition of humanity: a paradoxical advance toward regression, driven by the retreat of ethical values and the expansive spread of utilitarianism, pragmatism, and self-interest. Similarly, Pierre Bourdieu speaks of the “misery of the world” in his deconstruction of the consequences of globalization, which often masks itself behind slogans of unity and human harmony.

In our view, Morin and Bourdieu converge on a common premise: that the ethical setbacks and human failures facing the modern world are largely rooted in the decline of values such as tolerance and unity, and the rise of values of division, violence, and exclusion. These regressive dynamics are frequently justified by projects that present themselves as defensive responses to threats against identity – often reinforced by religious interpretations and political ambitions – or by attempts to universalize a particular identity, most notably through the assertion of Western cultural superiority. This imposition is carried out through various means, ranging from overt material power to more subtle forms of soft influence, all leading ultimately to the domination of the other, the imposition of the stronger party's will, and the marginalization of diverse cultures. Such approaches betray a profound arrogance and cultural centralism that regard other societies as still “barbaric,” lacking true civilization and incapable of attaining full humanity.

## LIST OF SOURCES AND REFERENCES

- **Alessandro, I., & Martín, J. C.** (2025). Exploring the interplay between religion, tolerance, fundamentalism, and attitudes towards immigrants: A semi-automatic literature review. *Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 31(3). <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13504630.2025.2453158>
- **Almond, G. A., Sivan, E., & Appleby, R. S.** (2008). *Strong religion: The rise of fundamentalisms around the world*. University of Chicago Press.

- **Aristote.** (1989). *Nicomachean ethics* (Ishāq ibn Ḥunayn, Trans.; ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī, Ed.). Dār al-Turāth al-‘Arabī. (Original work published ~350 BCE)
- **Baudrillard, J.** (2006). The infernal power. *Al-Fikr al-‘Arabī al-Mu‘āṣir*, (134–135), Fall.
- **Baudrillard, J.** (2008). *Simulacra and simulation* (Joseph ‘Abd Allāh, Trans.; Saud al-Mawla, Rev.). Arab Organization for Translation / Center for Arab Unity Studies. (Original work published 1981)
- **Benhabib, S.** (2002). *The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era*. Princeton University Press.
- **Boas, F.** (1938). *The mind of primitive man* (Revised ed.). Macmillan.
- **Bourdieu, P.** (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Stanford University Press.
- **Bourdieu, P.** (2010). *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (Muḥammad Ṣubḥ, Trans.; Fayṣal Darraj, Rev.). Dār Kan‘ān. (Original work published 1993)
- **Brown, W.** (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism’s stealth revolution*. Zone Books.
- **Constant, B.** (1980). *On the liberty of the moderns*. Éditions Pluriel. (Original work published 1819)
- **Eliade, M.** (1997). *The sacred and the profane*. Éditions Gallimard. (Original work published 1957)
- **Eliade, M.** (2007). *The quest for history and meaning in religion* (Saud al-Mawla, Trans.). Arab Organization for Translation. (Original work published 1972)
- **Foucault, M.** (1990). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (Arabic edition). Center for National Development. (Original work published 1975)
- **Fukuyama, F.** (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. Free Press.
- **Fukuyama, F.** (1993). *The end of history and the last man* (Fu‘ād Shāhīn, Jamīl Qāsim, & Ridā al-Shayyibī, Trans.). Center for National Development. (Original work published 1992)
- **Gandhi, M.** (1969). *All men are brothers*. Folio Editions. (Original collected writings mid-20th century)
- **Habermas, J.** (1986). *Morale et communication*. Éditions Flammarion.
- **Habermas, J.** (1987). *The theory of communicative action*. Beacon Press. (Original work published 1981)
- **Habermas, J.** (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press.
- **Habermas, J.** (2012). *The crisis of the European Union: A response*. Polity Press.
- **Hollenbach, D.** (2002). *The common good and Christian ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- **Huntington, S.** (1999). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order* (T. al-Shayyib, Trans.; Ṣ. Qīnṣū, Pref.). Sutoor Publishing. (Original work published 1996)
- **Ibn Manẓūr, J. al-Dīn M. ibn M.** (n.d.). *Lisān al-‘Arab*. Dār Ṣādir.
- **Kant, I.** (1952). *Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch* (‘Uthmān Amīn, Trans.). Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop. (Original work published 1795)
- **Lévi-Strauss, C.** (1961). *Race et histoire*. Éditions Gonthier. (Original work published 1952)
- **Machiavelli, N.** (2004). *The prince* (A. Mu‘min, Trans.). Ibn Sina Library for Publishing and Distribution. (Original work published 1532)
- **Morin, E.** (1999). *Homeland Earth: A manifesto for the new millennium*. Hampton Press.
- **Morin, E.** (2012). *La méthode* (J. Shaḥayyid, Trans.). Arab Organization for Translation / Center for Arab Unity Studies.
- **Morin, E.** (2015). *Complex thinking for a complex world: About reductionism*. Springer.
- **Morin, E.** (2022). *Toward a politics of humanity*. Polity Press.
- **Mouffe, C.** (2005). *On the political*. Routledge.
- **Mouffe, C.** (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the world politically*. Verso.
- **Abū Zayd, Naṣr Ḥamīd.** (1995). *Thinking in the time of takfīr: Against ignorance, deceit, and superstition* (2nd ed.). Madbūli Library. (Original work published 1993)
- **Pascal, B.** (1972). *Pensées* (Edouard al-Bustānī, Trans.). Lebanese Committee for the Translation of Masterpieces. (Original work published 1670)
- **Verkuyten, M., Adelman, L., & Yogeewaran, K.** (2020). The psychology of intolerance: Unpacking diverse understandings of intolerance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29(5), 467–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420924763>
- **Indelicato, A., & Martín, J. C.** (2025). Exploring the interplay between religion, tolerance, fundamentalism, and attitudes towards immigrants: A semi-automatic literature review. *Social Identities*, 31(3), 294–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2025.2453158>

- **Rawls, J.** (1993). *Political liberalism*. Columbia University Press.
- **Ricoeur, P.** (1995). *Figuring the sacred: Religion, narrative, and imagination*. Fortress Press.
- **Ricoeur, P.** (2005). *Oneself as another* (Georges Zennati, Trans.). Center for Arab Unity Studies. (Original work published 1990)
- **Sen, A.** (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- **Smart, N.** (1998). *The world's religions: Old traditions and modern transformations*. Cambridge University Press.
- **Taylor, C.** (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton University Press.
- **Thom, R.** (1998). *Probables et catastrophes*. Presses Universitaires de France (PUF).
- **Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L.** (2019). Intergroup toleration and its implications for culturally diverse societies. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(1).
- **Voltaire.** (2017). *Philosophical dictionary* (Y. Nabil, Trans.; J. 'Al-Din Ali, Rev.). Hindawi Foundation. (Original work published 1764)
- **Zagorin, P.** (2003). *How the idea of religious toleration came to the West*. Princeton University Press.