

## **RELIGIOUS PLURALISM AND ITS PSYCHO-PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH AND RELEVANCE**

By

Philip Osarobu ISANBOR

St Albert Institute for Higher Education

Fayit-Fadan, Kagoma. PMB 1006, Kafanchan, Kaduna State, Nigeria. Email:

[osarobuisanbor@yahoo.com](mailto:osarobuisanbor@yahoo.com)

### **Abstract**

*With the upsurge of religious intolerance, violence and conflict, and coping with conflicting and disharmony of religious beliefs and imposition of false or faulty doctrines and foreign faiths, there is an urgent need to check or re-evaluate the modes, practice and absurdity of religious convictions which are plausibly evidenced in the domain of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism. With conflicts, peace and justice are denied, and if these are not realised, meaningful development is utopic, even when God is called upon. Hence, the paper explicated the valuation of religious pluralism which seems to suggest the accommodation of religious freedom and tolerance of beliefs or convictions that are situated in the respect of human rights and dignity. In religious freedom, God is expressed in faith and worship in accordance with individual conviction and understanding of the "Beingness" and personhood of God. The paper concluded that adherents of religions should allow the thriving of religious pluralism with its ingredients of religious freedom and respect for human rights and dignity against the weighty negative effects of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism, all for the attainment of integral human development that promotes the religiosity of the wholeness of human person.*

### **1.0 Background: Considering the Value of Religion**

The study of religion shows the nature and attitude of humanity toward the worship of the Supreme Deity, object or a particular ideology that it believes on. This has brought us to the understanding of our interest, purpose and closeness to certainty on that particular reverential entity which we believe in and willing to convince others to follow by our outward and inward enthusiastic mentality in the light of salvation and earthly wellbeing. We discuss the weights of religion on human development have been vast because there are a lot of violence of human rights, freedom and dignity, even as a result of the practice of religion. As Kimball (2008) asserts that;

*The record of human history shows that noble acts of love, self-sacrifice, and service to others are frequently rooted in deeply held religious worldviews. At the same time, history clearly shows that religion has often been linked to the worst examples of human behaviour. It is*

*(A Publication of the Augustinian Institute in collaboration with AATREPSCHOLARS)*

*somewhat trite, but nevertheless sadly true that more wars have been waged, more people killed, and these days more evil perpetuated in the name of religion than by any other institutional force in human history (p. 87).*

Many interests have been invested to monitor these developments and to wright the aberrations, so that there will be meaningful integral development. It is contemporarily certain now that we are recognising that our destructive behaviour is always an outgrowth of incongruence. That is, we do destructive things when we are out of touch, rather than in touch, with our authentic self (Kimball 2008, 50). That is, a communal humanity. On this course of action and interest for integral human development through proper internalization of religion, Benedict XVI (2011, no. 13) explicates that;

*despite the lessons of history and the efforts of states, international and regional organizations, non-governmental organizations and the many men and women of good will who daily work to protect fundamental rights and freedoms, today's world also witnesses cases of persecution, discrimination, acts of violence and intolerance based on religion.*

This is emphatically about the faulty promotion of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism. On the contrary, it should be taken that man is fundamentally religious. But human religiosity should be aimed at promoting a sound spiritual relationship with its Creator and fellow creatures. To achieve this feat is by upholding some values of justice, love and fairness in his dealing with them. The constant effort to achieve this situation leads to mutual understanding and tolerance, especially in a multi-cultural and pluri-religious society like Nigeria (Ukaonu 2013, 35). This is about wrong internalization of religious conviction, vesting it imposingly, as an act of indoctrination upon others. And then, Campbell (1971, 27) observes that;

*Those who come to believe that their own radical beliefs are so unacceptable as to constitute irreligion may in fact be mistaken, and a wider knowledge of their own religious tradition may later lead them to the realisation that they have been espousing an acceptable, if unorthodox, interpretation of the faith.*

The aim of the paper is to understand the effectual reality of religious fanaticism, fundamentalism and pluralism. This is to relate these concepts in understanding religion itself more properly. One needs the proper assessment on the causes of the multiplicity of religious groups or sects and their assessable

investigation of their system in relation to societal peace and harmony. In the history of man, religion has been a very part of his life, so man cannot do without religion or been religious. Man is at the middle of God and nature.

All religions of the world are in one way or the other pointing to the fact that human beings do not, and cannot, stand alone, that they are related to and dependent on powers external and beyond them. Broadly put therefore, religion is a belief based on a person's ultimate relation to the universe, to a god or gods (Okelezo and Nwosu 2008). The religious quality of man is highly needed to maintain this relationship, which everything is channel to reverence the Supreme Being and for the wellbeing of the existing realities, including man.

Now, the psycho-philosophical study of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism will make us to understand the propelling force of interest in humanity, which makes him/her behaves in certain ways which classified him/her to be a religious fanatic, and why he adopts the belief system and conviction with great enthusiastic spirit. Psychology is the science for the study of mind and behaviour of the human person will lead us to accept the facts that there are always propelling forces and interests for such developments. The relevance of this discipline cut across all works of life, and which religion is not an exception.

Using philosophical coloration, this paper will necessarily lead us to assess the understanding of human person in relation to the outcomes of its religious conviction, especially conflicts that ensue from its fanaticism and fundamentalism. We remembered that Benedict XVI has aligned his interest for global harmony with the thrust of religious freedom, and he said that, "in a particular way, in Asia and in Africa, the chief victims are the members of religious minorities, who are prevented from freely professing or changing their religion by forms of intimidation and the violation of their rights, basic freedoms and essential goods, including the loss of personal freedom and life itself" (2011, no. 13). Benedict XVI believes that the easiest way to achieve global harmony is mainly through the workability of religious tolerance and the positive exactness of religious freedom. It is obvious that there are negative results of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism in the face of religious conflicts. But there is need to understand the effects of religious fundamentalism and fanaticism, and in relation to pluralism

## **2.0 Clarifying Terms and their Explanatory Objective Notations**

Here, for the purpose of the comprehensive grasping to the tenet of the discourse, we clarify some concepts in some details. They are: religious fanaticism, religious fundamentalism and religious pluralism.

**2.1 Religious Fundamentalism:** the word “fundamentalism” is derived from the word ‘fundamental’ which means the basic, serious and important parts of something. But fundamental in relation to religion is defined as “the practice of following very strictly the basic rules and teachings of any religion, most especially, as in, dogmatically.” Religious Fundamentalism and dogmatism are seen to be the same. Both are centred on the teachings and doctrines of a particular sect or religion in which an individual belongs and hopes to uphold the teachings and doctrines strictly. With the words for the advocacy and solicitation of peace, Benedict XVI affirms that;

*It should be clear that religious fundamentalism and secularism are alike in that both represent extreme forms of a rejection of legitimate pluralism and the principle of secularity. Both absolutize a reductive and partial vision of the human person, favouring in the one case forms of religious integralism and, in the other, of rationalism. A society that would violently impose or, on the contrary, reject religion is not only unjust to individuals and to God, but also to itself. God beckons humanity with a loving plan that, while engaging the whole person in his or her natural and spiritual dimensions, calls for a free and responsible answer which engages the whole heart and being, individual and communitarian.*

Also, the views of Peter Clarks (1982) on the issues of religious fundamentalism is understood as a long term religious methodology of interest, which although very selfish or sectional, when he asserts that;

*With the expansion and development of Islamic education system, of literary in Arabic, and the more frequent contacts with the Muslim world of North Africa and the middle East brought about by the pilgrimage, study abroad and increasing supply of book and writing on Islam, an increasing number of Muslims in West Africa in areas with a long tradition of Islam.*

The above assertion or observation was on Islamic religion, and which could be likening to other religions as well. Religion fundamentalism lies on the placidity of belief of an individual, which other religious are not excluded. This is basically on the attitude of the religious participants, when we limit God by our own restricted understanding we often are conformed to this world. We are trying to force the Lord into the mould of our limited knowledge whether it is based upon our education and science or our interpretation of the scriptures. This is the problem of dogmatic perception of God, limiting the freedom of human intellect in the perceptive multiplicity of realities.

**2.2 Religious Fanaticism:** Fanaticism is the belief in politics, religion, or other areas that greatly exceeds the norm in enthusiasm and includes a willingness to sacrifice all else to realise its ends. Religious fanaticism is a state of “wild and excessive religious” mentality with great enthusiasm. Fanatics in the context of this discourse too, are the religious adherents who hold tenaciously to the absolute truth claims of the founder of their religions and ensure that such claims are maintained and never diluted (Atoi 2013). According to psychologists; religious fanaticism is a psychological deviant behaviour since it always tends as negative factor against peaceful environment of the people. The notion of religious fanaticism is on the nature of the relationship between God and man, and how man has interpreted it. Reiterating the thought of Mala, Ubruvhre affirms the propelling conviction of religious fanatics, that;

*To them, the belief in a religion other than theirs runs foul of the injunctions handed down through a messenger or prophet as the case may be. The fanatics see other “believers” as those who have gone astray and who need some sermon or preaching to make them fall in line with their doctrine, which to them is always the best and most reliable basis for redemption on the judgment day.... They believe rather wrongly that those who do not share their mode of worship or the doctrine of their religion were better dead than alive.*

More succinctly, on the same platform, Omoregbe (2002) points that; “religious fanaticism is the product of ethnocentricity and narrow-mindedness which prevents the fanatic from ‘seeing that there is no essential difference between what he is doing and what the other person is doing, no essential difference between his own religion and of the other person.” So, he is psychologically stereotype and philosophically and sociologically limited and imbalance in accessing his religious sentiment. This was in the line of thought with Baum (1975) that;

*Even classical theology was well that despite its highly conceptual understanding of revelation and faith, what really counted was the vital assimilation of religious truth. In scholasticism this was expressed by insisted that faith must be alive with hope and love before it mediate divine justification.*

Consolidating this psychological conviction of position, Fredrick Feuerbach expounded that; this conviction on the assimilation of religious truth was that it was not God who created man; rather man has succeeded in creating God in his mind in images he likes God to be seen, for there was no such God.

And he said that; the reason why God has always been seen to be the superior is that man himself as incapacitated in the light of natural forces and human power. And man in that estranged state turned all his wishes/ desires to God. It was man who created God in man's image. So, the object of religion is dictated by man in his psychological conviction on whom or what he considers God to be. Now it is time to dismantle that oppressive fabrication of man, for man to be liberated, has created psychic fixation to be fanatic in his conviction.

**2.3 Religious Pluralism:** With the development of human mentality towards the transcendent, there is simultaneous polarisation of other religions, on which background, David Moberg in his book *Wholistic Christianity*, published in 1985; associated polarisation of religion with: accompanied by selective church membership as people gravitate towards the religious groups that stress whatever they believe to be the 'correct' position on issues that they believe are crucial. Before now, just like the trends of humanism, it was a revolt against the monopoly of theology and church dogma in the theory and practice of medieval life. It was not directed not directed against Christianity, on the contrary. Humanism accepted its close connection with the Christian tradition and Christian morality. The universal validity of Christian teaching and its international character was taken by humanists as the foundation of their ideas. In its original setting humanism meant the liberation of reason from the shackles of dogma and a critical study of nature and humanity through and observation of actual facts (Mistra, Sharma and Bernsal 2007, 5).

Religious plurality is the situation in a globalising world that helps to create, brings together traditions with irreconcilable differences. Understandably, the modern mind is bemused with this unsettling politico-religious diversity, hence the growing suspicion with institutionalised religion (Selmanovic, 2009). Religious pluralism presupposes or suggests religious freedom. Only in freedom can man direct himself toward goodness (Vatican II Council, *Gaudium et spes*, 17). Even nature respect the freedom of man and it expects him to be responsive. To be responsive means that he has to manage his freedom in order to maintain the person's freedom. Men can understand themselves properly only in reference to the relationship established between them at the time of his creation. Being created in His image, God places man in that special relationship with him; and enters into a partnership with man by entrusting the whole created world to his care. Man effectively becomes the presence of the Creator in the world (Kusumalayam 2008, 195). It behoves on man to make good use of his reason and associates it with the application of freedom. At the same time, two categories become increasingly central to the idea of progress: reason and freedom.

For Benedict XVI, progress is primarily associated with the growing dominion of reason, and this reason is obviously considered to be a force of good and a force for good. Progress is the overcoming of all forms of dependency – it is progress towards perfect freedom. Likewise freedom is seen purely as a promise, in which man becomes more and more fully himself. In both concepts – freedom and reason – there is a political aspect (2007, no.18). In another occasion, Benedict XVI (2009, no. 56) goes further to assert;

*Denying the right to profess one's religion in public and the right to bring the truths of faith to bear upon public life has negative consequences for true development. The exclusion of religion from the public square – and, at the other extreme, religious fundamentalism – hinders an encounter between persons and their collaboration for the progress of humanity. Public life is sapped of its motivation and politics takes on a domineering and aggressive character. Human rights risk being ignored either because they are robbed of their transcendent foundation or because personal freedom is not acknowledged. Secularism and fundamentalism exclude the possibility of fruitful dialogue and effective cooperation between reason and religious faith.*

This act of stewardship demands that man should not be violent to what entrusted to him, including himself, because the Creator does not intend him to mismanage anything, but to be humane with nature and explore, not to exploit, the gifts in/of nature for his comfort and development. This is the bedroom of developmental peace which humanity cannot but do with. Yet it should be added that, as well as religious fanaticism that in some contexts impedes the exercise of the right to religious freedom, so too the deliberate promotion of religious indifference or practical atheism on the part of many countries obstructs the requirements for the development of peoples, depriving them of spiritual and human resources.

### **3.0 Psychology of Religious Fundamentalism and Fanaticism**

There will be always the connection of human' psychological state of mind or his mental conviction to his level of religious development, rather than its religiosity. The question about God's existence and the internalization of His attributes can also contribute to such psychological development, and if not properly channelled to respect other people's conviction; may be lead to mental and social debasement, which may be classified as religious fanaticism and fundamentalism, even the culture of religious bigotry and particularism. On this, Carl Jung observes that; "they offer their soul to God, but do not know what they

are doing and never have known. They do it, motivated by the same preconscious archetype which the ancient Egyptians, on their monuments, who to the sun worshipping dog-headed baboon, albeit in full knowledge that this ritual gesture was in honour of God" (Jung 1997, 471-452). From the assertion by Carl Jung, who based his observation on human behaviour towards religions and its involvement, and which support the notion of Sigmund Freud in his psychoanalytic theory, he is of the opinion with great conviction that religious behaviour of a man is traceable to the personality development at the phallic stages in personality formation as a result of Oedipus and Electra complex as the case may be. As Baum (1975, 244) explicates;

*For vast numbers of people in western culture, the Oedipal story is still a central model of self-knowledge and personal deliverance, nevertheless by investing the story with universal validity, orthodox Freudian psychoanalysis become an ideology that subjects people to a preconceived image and possibly imprisons them in a false imagination.*

So the tendency to rectify the failure has crated in the psyche of man a patriarchal reverence of God whom he claimed to be his Supreme Being and develop the fanatic mentality to be faithful to Him and never to fail Him again, which he had done in his phallic stage. In this, Sheen affirmed that; "your false sense of guilt is due to an Oedipus complex if you are a man and an Electra complex if you are a woman." Thus, many of the psychologists supported this viewpoint which was developed from Freudian theory of psychoanalysis, and believed that religious fanaticism is bore out of it and the freedom of man to believe anything and holds on to it brings the religious complexity and psyche mentality to religiously faithful to his belief system, and ever ready to convince others to do and behave the same way. In the light of this, Maurus (2007, 136) supported the works of John W. Young and Rene Descartes, on the religion and its psychological mentality, and the human consciousness towards it, and he said;

*Yet our experience of everything is partial. It means the reality of human limits and human brokenness. We have a taste for the infinite and the hole. We are finite with a limitless openness that can be filed only by our surrender to God.*

The mind-set is out of the hope which resides in man on his God, whether the hope is faulty or not, deceptive or realistic, man believes the end period of the earthly events will be positive if he is faithful to the end of time, or suddenly

when he died. So the fear not to miss hopeful end, brings about his animalistic nature of him to be dogmatic in his religious thinking and be fanatic in his religious actions and participation. Carl Jung (p. 449) vehemently stated that; “it remains blissfully unaware of the philosophically surmise, and is convinced that with this opinion it has established the essential *instinctuality* of all psychic processes.” This philosophical assertion in the study of human religious mentality was supported by Sheen, who approached it from a theological angle, and believes that;

*The supreme adventure is religion. By religion is not meant the sterile sitting in comfortable pew, but the response to the promise of the God-man, I have come that you may have life and have it more abundantly. That is the point- more abundantly; it challenges us to liquidate our unruly wills, our egocentrism, our petty search for aloneness, and our selling a field to buy the pearl of great price. This adventure loves not the spark but the flame.*

Since man is hopeful creature and he believed that he does have power to save himself from any predicaments and he cannot derive peace all by himself, he seems to be religiously fixated, on which Karl Marx asserted that: “religion is the sigh of the oppressed, and religion is the opium of the people.” This disposition is on human conviction that all hopes should be based on the supremacy of God and less to his own ability. Again in an abortive protest, Marx has it that the crime of religion and God is that they have canonised man’s suffering which could have been avoided. He was not trying to condemn religion totally but the attitude of man in which he has resign his fate to his God to be of help and dispensable solution to his problems; and ever ready to worship and reverence Him as long he believes his solutions come. This was the background for his dictum: Religion is the opium of the people.

#### **4.0 The Check on Religious Fundamentalism and Fanaticism**

The check is based on what we conceived religions to be, especially in the social, ethical and spiritual development of humanity. It should be taken in line with thoughts of Cooper and Epperson (2008) that;

*Unlike Freud and Marx, we do not believe that religion is intrinsically destructive, neurotic or a distraction from social change. Yet like Freud and Marx, we believe that religion should be asked rigorous questions concerning its own healthiness. We do not believe that simply because persons claim to be religious that they are necessarily more ethical, more*

*righteous, or more holy than their secular counterparts. Healthy religious commitment will manifest itself in healthy attitudes and behaviour towards others.*

For the reason that there are structures which at least implicitly open up the range of meaning beyond the confines of a closed religious system (Robley 1971, 151) and since anything can be questioned with contemporary inquisitive mindset that guarantees private or individualistic conviction, there is need for checks of such development. According to relativist culture, the individuals acquire their own “truth” and “reality” solely from their specific culture. Simply disagreeing with someone else’s point of view or questioning their moral values are seen as judgmental and intolerant. Those who evangelize on behalf of a particular religion are said to be ‘imposing their narrow beliefs on others. This is basically the primary of religious pluralism. According to the Fathers of the Vatican II Council in the Document for the Declaration of Religious Liberty (*Dignitatis humanae*), it should be accepted that;

*Contemporary man is becoming increasingly conscious of the dignity of the human person; more and more people are demanding that men should exercise fully their own judgment and a responsible freedom in their action and should not be subject to the pressure of coercion but inspired by a sense of duty.*

From the very before, contemporary developmental conditions posit that we should understand that the cause of religious pluralism are traceable to the: struggle for leadership; involvement in competition between the ideas by false and true teachings; question of conducts and ideological supremacy; issue of personnel appointments; scruples over convictions about diet or other details of personal morality; elements of religious systems of little religious understanding and agreeable explanation; and linkage of religious and political ideas. On these grounds, religious pluralism is constantly ne dynamic, that is on-going especially in the generation of individuals who are very sensitive to the quest of power, liberation , individualism, supremacy, acquisition of wealth and of recognition and possessed by the spirit of the talked-dog syndrome.

Religious pluralism is mostly and recently seen in this modern society as the manifestation of churches especially under Christianity and been classified as Pentecostalism, which are prominent in Western Europe and Africa. The other phase of religious pluralism is the development of distinctive religious sects or groups. The manifestation of religious is outcome from the individualistic

spirituality and in most recent cases as a result of social interest among the reason of religious pluralism given initially. The check will be on the decentralization of a particular belief system as claimed by particular set of individuals of the same mind-set of religiosity, on the attainment of salvation and blessings from the supreme deity.

So, “religious pluralist’s check is very much evident in the redundancy of the speed of religious fundamentalism on the part of diehard religious individual who believed their faith and religion only possess the truth of salvation and liberation” (Wilson, Ibid). All religions are directed to achieve the same goal which is to worship the Supreme Being, in peaceful and loving conviction, the effect of religious pluralism has checkmated the excessiveness of religious fundamentalism and fanaticism in general aspect of religious feeling, when the human religious freedom is respected. In this Bryan Wilson asserted that each religion has become a continual check to others, he posits that;

*The jealous god of Judaism, and subsequently of Christianity and Islam, provided directives for the prescription for social order.... In comparison, eastern religions provided no such social dynamic. The passivity of Buddhism and the indeterminacy and tolerance of Hinduism, and the lack of sustained zeal in proselytizing, appear to bear a relationship to the absence of that rigour which monotheism has encouraged in western religion.*

More straightforwardly, there is a great need for proper religious pluralism on the ground on the increase of existing religions of different belief systems and approaches in relationships to the convinced supreme Deity. On this, the Vatican II Council Fathers (1965) posit that; “it is largely because of more frequent contacts with each other; men have become aware of pluralism and indeed have come to see it as the hallmark of our age. True pluralism, however, is impossible unless men and communities of different origins and culture undertake dialogue.” For the purpose of ecclesiological emphasis, the Vatican II Council Fathers go further to assert that: “it is demanded by the dynamic course of action which is changing the face of modern society. It is demanded by the pluralism of society, and by the maturity man has reached in this day and age..., and to conduct a dialogue with dignity.” It could be ascertained that amidst the growing numbers of religions, there is a necessity of distinctive qualities of any religions to show its uniqueness, and channel them towards attaining the needed understanding of other religions.

## **5.0 Psycho-Philosophical Consideration of Religious Pluralism on Present Humanity**

The whole process of human socialisation must be properly internalised and ordered. It must involve the avoidance of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism. Religious tenets must be fully integrated to avoid religious, social and environmental frictions. Religion has been the product of man's existence, and it has been one of his major tools of social and spiritual integrations, if and when properly adopted (see, Wankar 2015 and Otonko 2015). The central message of any religion is on peace, love and the avoidance of conflicts among humans which the founder of any religion had taught his/ her followers for the attainment for happy end.

The goal of every religion should be permanently ordered along the respect of natural law with universal morality which is to "do good and avoid evil". With this, peace and justice have become stills that must be acquired by every individual who desires the symbiotic living, limiting the culture of conflicts and violence, even in the name of faulty religious convictions (Fasuyi and Isanbor 2014). The patrimony of principles and values expressed by an authentic religiosity is a source of enrichment for peoples and their *ethos*. It speaks directly to the conscience and mind of men and women, it recalls the need for moral conversion, and it encourages the practice of the virtues and a loving approach to others as brothers and sisters, as members of the larger human family (Benedict XVI 2011, no. 9). The concern of man is the concern of the human family. The development of humanness of man is the presupposition of the development of the human family, and this development must be sustained for integral growth of human society, even in the domain of religion.

Here, the enduring words of Shakespeare come to mind: "strong reasons make strong actions." This is about man's behavioural tendency. Now that the nature of man is understood to be hopeful being, which has sharpen his thinking and to be religiously rigorous in finding solutions to his problems and most of the time relying on God for his pitiable state of living, his religious mentality will remain fanatic always. The fanatic approach to God is based on his hopeless state of his life, so he tends to please the belief that will help to achieve that which he cannot get on his own. So he places every necessary apparatus to worship that the figure irrespectively what people interpret his action to be, and try to coarse to embrace the same methodology. In modern times phenomenology and hermeneutics have proposed a radically new philosophical approach to the phenomenon of religion, which refuses to philosophically "surmount" it; this

trend attempts to interpret religion by tracing its inner logic, its specific invariants and language, its attitude to humanity.

Researchers so far have found shortcomings in these new approaches, in which - they believe - the philosophical horizon is lost. These authors stress the imperative need for a multi-dimensional approach to the complexity of religion; that the principle of religious pluralism should be grounded through a philosophical approach that transcends specific religions; and that, on this basis, an “ethics of dialogue” between religions should be built, of the kind that could hardly be achieved in the framework of the separate branches of specialized study of religion, nor within the limits of theology, which is usually connected with a specific religion (Bogomilova 2007, 60). Obviously, the changes and varieties in religion due to pluralism are very pronounced. Religious fundamentalism should be seen as been decentralised and put in check by the approaches developed and yet to actualise the needed principles in religions.

## **6.0 Evaluative Conclusion**

From the foregoing, it should be understood or adopted that religious pluralism is a necessary or better “evil” for the check of the negative effects of religious fanaticism and fundamentalism. It is when the adherents of religions understand the importance of religious freedom that we will understand the true tenets of religions- which are peace, justice and love (charity), all cumulate ultimately to the attainment of salvation. The psychic- philosophical consideration of human religiosity sought that the true religiosity should accommodate the psychological and spiritual growth and conviction of others, in freedom, common good and love.

More straightforwardly, religious pluralism presupposes the adaptation of religious freedom. It is the willingness to express one’s conviction without coercion. It should be understood that no single model of religion can accommodate the multiplicity of human intellectual veracity of interest and human religious vitality of transcendental projection, all towards the knowledgeable relationship with their creator- God. This is due to vast population of humanity and it will be monotonous if everyone is under singular religious modelling. This is because, it is in variety of purpose and conviction that the *Beingness* of God is universally expressed or known, and even these varieties, God remain fully unknown. That is He is God, not any other referential being. With religious pluralism or plurality, the perceptive varieties of the *Beingness* of God are envisaged, and the beauty of such development should be expressed in purposeful freedom.

## References

- Akomolafe, A. C. & Usifoh, E. E. (2014). Pluralism of Spiritual Transformation and Moral Change: Heralds of a New Opportunity for Social Action. *Enwisdomization Journal*, 6(1), 46-78.
- Atoi, N. E. (2013). The Philosophy of Religious Pluralism and the Security Question in Nigeria. *Department of Religious Studies: Biannual International Religious Studies Conference*. University of Ibadan, Ibadan, 14-17<sup>th</sup> May.
- Benedict XVI (2005). *Spe Salvi*. VC: Libreria Editrice Vaticana
- Benedict XVI (2007). *Message for the World day of Peace*. VC: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Benedict XVI (2009). *Caritas in Veritate*. VC: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Benedict XVI (2011). *Message for the World Day of Peace*. VC: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Baum, G. (1975). *Religion and Alienation: a Theological Reading of Sociology*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Bogomilova, N. (2012). Philosophical Approaches to Religion in the Perspective of the Concept of Human Essence. *Postmodernism Problems*, 2(1), 54-60.
- Campbell, C. (1971). *Towards a Sociology of Irreligion*. London: The Macmillan Press
- Comblin, J. (1989). *The Holy Spirit and Liberation*. NY: Burns & Oates.
- Cooper, T. D. and Epperson, C. K. (2008). *Evil: Satan, Sin and Psychology*. Mumbai: St Paul Press.
- Ekstrom, R. R. (2002). *The New Concise Catholic Dictionary*. Mumbai: St Paul Press.
- Feuerbach, L. (1957). *The Essence of Christianity*. NY: Harper Torch Books.
- Fasuyi, A. O. and Isanbor, P. O. (2014). Educating Socio-philosophical Nature of Religion for National Symbiotic living, *Enwisdomization Journal*, 6(1), pp. 23-45.

- Isanbor, P. O. (2012). Evaluation of the Meaning and Working of Religion. *The Social Scientist*, 2(1), 78-86.
- Flannery, A. (ed, 2004). *Vatican II Council documents*. Mumbai: St Paul.
- Jung, C. G. (1997). *Selected Writings*. NY: Bollingen Foundation.
- Kimball, C. (2002). *When Religion Becomes Evil*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.
- Maurus, J. (2007). *Make the Most of your Potential*. Mumbai: Better Yourself Books
- Mistra, R. C., Sharma, P. and Bernsal, H. (2007). *International Encyclopaedia of education*, Vol. 2. New Delhi: APH Publication.
- Moberg, O. D. (1985). *Wholistic Christianity*. Elgin: Brethren Press.
- Okelezo, S. and Nwosu, W. (2008). Religion and the Human Quest for Pleasure. *Apostolos Magazine*, Vol. 6, pp. 6-8.
- Otonko, J. O. (2015). Rethinking our Togetherness as Nigerians in the Face of Crises: Towards Nation Building. *The Aquinas Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 67-89.
- Peter, C. B. (1982). *West Africa and Islam*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Robley, W. E. (1971). *The Coming Convergence of World Religion*. NY: Newman Press.
- Selmanovic, S. (2009). *It's all Really about God: Reflections of a Muslim Atheist Jewish Christian*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sheen, F. J. (2004). *Guide to Contentment*. Mumbai: St Paul Press.
- Ubrurhe, J. O. (2000). The Integrative and Disintegrative Functions of Religion: The Nigerian Experience. In S. U. Eriwo and M. P. Adogbo (eds). *Contemporary Essays in the Study of Religions*. Lagos: Fairs and Exhibitions.
- Ukaonu, A. E. (2013). Nostra Aetate and the Necessity of Dialogue in Nigeria's Unending Religious Crisis. *West African Journal of Ecclesial Studies*, Vol. 10, pp. 22-37.

Ukwamadua, N. (2005). God and the Question of his Existence: the Panacea of Pantaleon Iroegbu. In G. Ukagba (ed). *Philosophy and Theology of Pantaleon Iroegbu*. Ibadan: Hope.

Wilson, B. (1983). *Religion in Sociological Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wankar, G. T. (2015). "The One Who handed me over to you is Guilty of Greater Sin" (John 19:11): Examining the Violence of the Tiv/Fulani Crisis. *The Aquinas Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 90-109.