

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY
PEER REVIEWED

**CAN UNIVERSAL RELIGION RESOLVE CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS
CONFLICTS? EXAMINING SWAMI VIVEKANANDA'S PHILOSOPHICAL
MODE**

Dr. Sharmili Mukherjee

Introduction:

Religious identity is both a source of deep meaning and a cause of terrible strife in today's global society. This is a paradox that has never been seen before. In the twenty-first century, sectarian violence, tensions between religions, and religiously driven extremism have all grown, which challenges traditional ways of resolving conflicts. In his groundbreaking work on religion's dual nature, Appleby (2000) says, "The ambivalence of the sacred" shows how religious traditions can inspire both extraordinary compassion and catastrophic violence. This means that we need to look at different philosophical frameworks for understanding religious diversity right away (p. 8). This lack of clarity is especially troublesome in today's conflicts, as Huntington (1996) says, "the fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future," with religious identity being the main way to tell the difference between them (p. 13). In a world where religious conflict is still common, Swami Vivekananda's ideas about universal religion from the 1800s are an important but little-studied intellectual resource for building peace today. At the World's Parliament of faiths in Chicago in 1893, Vivekananda spoke out against religious exclusivism by calling for radical acceptance instead of just tolerance: "We believe not only in universal tolerance, but we accept all religions to be true" (Sharma, 2020, p. 42). This statement was more than just diplomatic language; it was based on a complex philosophical framework called Advaita Vedanta. This framework sees religious diversity not as a theological error that needs to be fixed, but as a valid reflection of people's different ways of understanding ultimate reality. New research on religion conflicts shows that the ways they are usually solved aren't always effective. "Conflicts with religious dimensions are more difficult to resolve through negotiated settlements than conflicts without such dimensions," according to Svensson's (2013) systematic study. This suggests that religious claims make conflicts harder to solve (p. 87). This result shows that political or economic approaches alone are not enough to solve conflicts that have religious meaning. Even though the traditional models of religious inclusivism and religious pluralism try to deal with religious variety, they are still not good enough for resolving conflicts.

John Hick's religious pluralism (1989) goes further than inclusivism because it says that all major faiths are culturally shaped responses to the same transcendent Real, and each tradition offers valid ways to be saved or set free (p. 240). But Hick's phenomenological-noumenal distinction, which comes from Kantian epistemology, puts all positive religious claims in the phenomenal world and says that the Real is completely transcategorical. This makes all religious truth claims less important. The universal religion of Vivekananda is a unique alternative that goes beyond both Hick's radical relativization and inclusivism's implicit order. Based on

Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedanta theory, Vivekananda's ideas don't support making a new religion. Instead, they support finding the universality that is already present in all real religious traditions. Sharma (2020) says, "Universal religion is a discovery of universality in all religion excluding the particularities of creed, dogma, beliefs, rituals and convention" (p. 46). This discovery comes from the

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

Vedantic idea of non-duality, which says that ultimate truth is one even though it seems to have many forms. This idea gives us a philosophical basis for accepting different religious expressions without reducing them to cultural relativism. Vivekananda's idea of a universal religion is important for resolving conflicts today because it is able to respect the uniqueness and validity of each religious practice while also pointing out their deep unity. So, this study takes a critical philosophical look at whether and how Vivekananda's universal religion can help solve modern religious conflicts. It looks at both how well it makes sense theoretically and how well it works in real life to deal with interfaith tensions in the twenty-first century, while also recognizing its inherent flaws when dealing with the political and structural aspects of religious violence.

Philosophical Foundations of Vivekananda's Universal Religion:

Swami Vivekananda's idea of a universal religion comes from the non-dual metaphysics of Advaita Vedanta. This metaphysics says that reality is ultimately one, even though there seem to be many religious forms. The Rig Vedic saying Ekam Sat Vipra Bahudha Vadanti is at the heart of this framework. It means "Truth is one; the sages call it by different names." Vivekananda sees this as both a poetic emotion and a metaphysical axiom (Sharma, 2020, p. 43). This Vedantic understanding goes against the idea that some religions are better than others because they say that differences in doctrine are not opposite truth claims but different ways of expressing the same transcendent reality in different cultures. Medda (2017) says, "Vivekananda's universal religion does not try to combine religious teachings into a new dogma; instead, it seeks to find the ontological unity that lies at the heart of all genuine spiritual traditions" (p. 38). Vivekananda was against both religious homogenization and radical relativism. He did this because of the Advaitic concept of non-duality (Advaita). Unlike pluralistic models like Hick's (1989) Kantian-based theory, which says that each religion exists in the phenomenal realm and the Real is an ineffable noumenon, Vivekananda's framework says that there are many ways to reach ultimate truth. "The same Brahman shines forth through the temple of Buddha, the mosque of Muhammad, the church of Christ, and the synagogue of Israel," says Sharma (2020, p. 45). This claim means that all religious groups have the same

way of knowing things, which gets rid of any hierarchical values that put one faith above another.

Advaita Vedanta is turned into a useful spiritual method by Vivekananda, who combines four different yoga paths—jnana (knowledge), bhakti (devotion), karma (action), and raja (meditation)—so that they can work for people with a range of personalities and abilities (Sharma, 2020, p. 47). He says that "no single spiritual method is universally effective; rather, each religion offers best practices that are best for different types of people" (Medda, 2017, p. 40). This pedagogical pluralism makes sure that universal religion can include differences in how people pray, follow rituals, and follow moral rules, while still keeping their spiritual importance. The shift from tolerance to acceptance of religious variety is a key philosophical innovation in Vivekananda's model. Tolerance means putting up with things you think are wrong, but acceptance means recognizing the worth and truth of different faith traditions. Vivekananda said, "Tolerance is good for a short time; acceptance is the only thing that can last forever" (Zaheer et al., 2020, p. 109). In Vivekananda's view, accepting others as they are changes the meaning of interreligious interaction from a kind act to a statement of real moral and intellectual recognition.

Vivekananda's idea of a universal religion also takes a negative view of beliefs and rituals. He

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

says there is a difference between the basic idea of religion and the extraneous parts that are specific to a group. He says that these extraneous parts often get in the way of real spiritual understanding. Medda (2017) says, “By leaving out specifics of creed, dogma, and ritual convention, universal religion articulates a transcendental core that can be found in all traditions” (p. 39). Vivekananda could support religious diversity without endorsing the often- controversial doctrinal details that have generally led to sectarian violence. Vivekananda’s idea of a universal faith makes philosophical sense because it has moral and social implications. Vivekananda’s framework tries to destroy the cultural roots of sectarian conflict by using Galtung’s (1997) criticism of cultural violence, which he defines as the function of beliefs that make violence acceptable. Universal religion fights against the in-group/out-group divisions that lead to direct and societal violence by encouraging acceptance of religious diversity as normal. In this way, Vivekananda’s ideas and Galtung’s call for changing cultural norms to make peace last are similar.

The Ethical and Practical Dimensions:

Swami Vivekananda’s universal religion has moral and useful aspects that come from its changing view of interreligious dialogue and its focus on moral behaviour rooted in spiritual unity. Vivekananda said, “The division of mankind because of religion is one of the most heinous barriers to human progress.” He said that universal religion should promote moral unity that goes beyond sectarian loyalty (Sharma, 2020, p. 48). The idea behind this moral unity comes from the Vedantic view that everyone has the same divine nature, which gives everyone the same moral worth. On page 41 of Medda (2017), he says, “Recognition of spiritual oneness compels adherence to compassion, altruism, and justice as universal ethical imperatives.” These kinds of general ethics don’t focus on specific doctrines, but on principles that all faiths share in a deep way. Vivekananda thought that active service and social reform were the best ways for faith to show up in real life. He famously said, “Those who live for others are the only ones who live; all others are more dead than alive.” He made loving action (karma yoga) the most important test for religious truth (Vivekananda, 1895/1993, p. 75). Galtung’s (1997) critique of culture violence is similar to this service-oriented ethic because it sees structural injustice (the denial of basic human needs) as a form of violence that is allowed by dominant ideologies (pp. 444–445). Vivekananda’s idea of a universal religion directly fights societal violence by supporting community service projects like health camps, educational programs, and interfaith community projects that make the idea of spiritual oneness real in real life situations.

Vivekananda’s model is also different because it stresses acceptance over patience in real life. According to Zaheer et al. (2020), “tolerance can easily turn into condescending attitudes, whereas acceptance means genuinely acknowledging that someone else’s religious identity is just as valid” (p. 109). This change has real effects on interaction between people of different faiths, moving conversations from polite coexistence to working together to solve problems. Atkinson (2019) says that for interfaith involvement to work, there needs to be “dialogical spaces where disagreement is explored creatively rather than stifled for the sake of harmony” (p. 53). Vivekananda saw this coming and pushed for places where people could share their different spiritual practices, like jnana, bhakti, raja, and karma yoga. This way, everyone could learn from each other and grow morally without putting all of the different faiths under one umbrella. Today, Vivekananda’s morals and practical methods are used in projects that bring people of different faiths together to build peace. A study by Svensson (2013) on how to settle civil disputes found that “religious actors who frame their interventions in terms of

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY**PEER REVIEWED**

shared spiritual values are more effective mediators in sectarian disputes” (p. 92). This finding backs up Vivekananda’s idea that spiritual beliefs shared by everyone can help build trust. Case studies from South Asia also show that when religious teams work together on service projects like disaster relief, they reduce misunderstandings between communities and build long-lasting networks of cooperation. This is what Vivekananda meant when he said that service should be seen as worship (Sharma, 2020, p. 49).

But there are big problems with putting this into practice. Using religious identities for political gain can hurt service-oriented projects by turning them into political tools. Galtung (1997) says that “cultural violence sustains structural violence by normalizing hierarchical power relations.” This means that the moral appeals of religion may not work if systemic changes are not made (p. 447). Extremist groups that don’t accept diversity also make it hard to have a conversation. In their 2020 study, Zaheer et al. say that “radical ideologies often dehumanize religious others, making acceptance impossible without addressing the underlying dehumanization processes” (p. 111). To deal with these problems, people who follow a universal religion need to preach morals and push for changes in institutions, like laws that protect the rights of minorities, open school programs, and economic policies that lessen inequality. Atkinson (2019) suggests that interfaith dialogues should include critical reflection on power dynamics. This would encourage people to question not only religious claims but also social and political systems that keep injustice going (p. 55). Vivekananda had a holistic view that said spiritual awakening and social change go hand in hand. These kinds of methods are in line with that view.

Universal Religion as a Model of Religious Pluralism:

The global religion of Swami Vivekananda is a unique example of religious pluralism that goes beyond the usual ideas of exclusivism, inclusivism, and relativistic pluralism. Traditional exclusivist approaches say that only one religion can save people, which pushes other faiths to the side. Rahner’s “anonymous Christianity” is an example of inclusivism. It says that other faiths are only good if they share the good graces of the dominant tradition (Sharma, 2020, p. 44). Radical relativistic pluralism, on the other hand, as explained by Hick (1989), says that all religions have the same level of knowledge, but all positive truth claims belong to the phenomenal realm. It says that the Real is an unknowable noumenon and that “behind the many forms of religion there lies an ineffable Real which cannot be grasped by any particular religious symbol system” (p. 235). This relegation could make religious statements seem like nothing more than cultural items, which would be against their claims of being transcendent and morally necessary. Vivekananda’s model finds a middle ground by supporting both the accuracy of certain religious truth claims and the unity of the ultimate reality that these claims are trying to reach. In 2017, Medda wrote, “Vivekananda’s universal religion finds the unity within diversity without destroying the uniqueness of individual traditions” (p. 37). Based on Advaita Vedanta, this way of thinking says that the same Brahman, which is the ultimate non-dual truth, shows up in different religious forms while keeping the integrity of each one’s teachings and practices. Vivekananda said, “the temple of Jesus, the mosque of Muhammad, and the synagogue of Israel are all altars to the same divine presence” (Sharma, 2020, p. 45). This quote shows how unity and difference work together.

Vivekananda’s idea of plurality is based on the Rig Vedic saying Ekam Sat Vipra Bahudha

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

Vadanti, which means “Truth is one, sages call it by different names” (Sharma, 2020, p. 43). Unlike Hick’s noumenal Real, Vivekananda sees the ultimate reality as having a part that is already here and can be reached through the different ways that faiths offer to find salvation. This ease of access supports the truthfulness of religious experiences across all faiths. This is what Medda (2017) calls “identity-in-difference,” which means that each religion keeps its own language and rituals while sharing a common metaphysical ground (p. 39). From an ethical point of view, Vivekananda’s diversity requires acceptance, not just tolerance. Zaheer et al. (2020) say that tolerance can keep people in a hierarchy: “Tolerance often means enduring what one considers inferior; on the other hand, acceptance requires recognizing the equal validity of other faiths” (p. 109). Appleby’s (2000) call for moral clarity in the ambiguity of religion is similar to Vivekananda’s insistence on acceptance: “The capacity of religion to underpin compassion depends on recognizing the sacred other as fellow bearer of the divine” (p. 15).

In real life, Vivekananda’s pluralistic model promotes dialogue through shared spiritual practices while upholding the purity of doctrine. Atkinson (2019) says that “effective interfaith dialogue happens when people bring their whole religious selves into the conversation, critiquing and changing each other” (p. 52). Vivekananda put this into practice by holding symposia where people from the jnana, bhakti, karma, and raja yogic paths talked about how their ways of reaching self-realization were just as true as the others. These kinds of forums show pluralism that doesn’t try to make everyone the same or less important; instead, it encourages dialogue and helps people understand how each religion adds to our knowledge. This model also looks at the societal aspects of religious conflict. Galtung’s (1997) idea of cultural violence describes the ideas that support hierarchical power structures and hatred between groups. Vivekananda’s pluralism fights against this kind of cultural violence by presenting a metaphysical story that sees variety as a sign of divine creativity rather than a sign of mistake. It is important to change the symbolic world of meaning in order to get rid of the reasons why violence is okay, as Galtung says (p. 444). So, Vivekananda’s idea of a universal religion changes religious worldviews so that they are more open to everyone. However, putting Vivekananda’s idea of pluralism into practice is hard in modern times, where religion is used for political purposes and extreme ideas reject pluralism completely. “Religious actors committed to shared spiritual values can mediate sectarian conflicts more effectively,” according to Svensson’s (2013) empirical study. However, “their efforts fail when political elites co-opt religious narratives for divisive ends” (p. 192). To solve these problems, we need to combine philosophical pluralism with structural changes like economic equality, legal protections for religious minorities, and inclusive education. This way, unequal power structures won’t be able to go against pluralistic ideas.

Contemporary Relevance: Addressing Global Religious Conflicts

At a time when sectarian violence, radicalization, and mistrust between religions are on the rise, Swami Vivekananda’s universal religion offers important philosophical insights for easing modern religious conflicts. The fact that religiously motivated violence keeps happening, like communal riots in South Asia and sectarian insurgencies in the Middle East, shows that security-focused and secular methods to building peace aren’t enough. Galtung (1997) says that cultural violence— “those aspects of culture, the symbolic sphere of our existence...that can be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence” (p. 441)—keeps making it possible to dehumanize and legitimize violence against religious minorities. Vivekananda’s universal religion, which is based on the Vedantic idea of non-

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

duality, directly questions these stories by presenting a metaphysical vision in which all faiths are part of the same transcendent reality (Sharma, 2020). Values-based interfaith projects that are in line with Vivekananda's framework have been shown to work in real life by recent empirical studies. Svensson (2013) shows that religious mediators who use shared spiritual values like compassion, service, and mutual recognition are more likely to be successful than secular mediators at reaching peace agreements in civil disputes. By focusing on spiritual unity in conversation, these mediators build trust across sectarian lines, making it easier for people to work together to solve problems. As Vivekananda said, "we believe not only in universal tolerance but we accept all religions to be true" (as quoted in Sharma, 2020, p. 42), and these findings back that up. It suggests that acceptance, not just tolerance, can lead to lasting peace.

In the 21st century, religious conflicts are often complicated by political, economic, and ethnonationalist goals, which makes it harder to find answers that are only theological. Huntington's civilizational clash thesis from 1996 warned that "religious identity will be a central axis of conflict in the post-Cold War world" (p. 13), showing how powerful religious stories are at uniting people. Huntington's analysis identifies the issue, but Vivekananda's global religion presents an alternative story by creating a new identity based on spiritual unity rather than societal division. Medda (2017) says, "Vivekananda's universal religion does not negate cultural or religious specificities; instead, it reinterprets them as different expressions of a single metaphysical ground" (p. 37). This alternative story breaks down one-sided ideas about religious identity and makes room for multiple types of connection. Engaging in ethical behaviour is a key part of being relevant today. Appleby (2000) talks about how religion can both help and hurt: "The ambivalence of the sacred" means that it can lead to both hospitals and asylums and wars and persecution (p. 8). The moral imperative of universal religion, which is based on service and kindness, makes the healing potential real by supporting grassroots projects like interfaith relief efforts, collaborative educational programs, and worship places for people of all faiths. These real-world examples show that "those who live for others are the only ones who live; all others are more dead than alive" (Vivekananda, 1895/1993, p. 75), turning spiritual solidarity into actions that build peace.

Still, the modern effects of universal faith have to deal with big problems. "Political instrumentalization of religious pluralism can render universalist rhetoric hollow if not accompanied by structural reforms" (p. 111) is what Zaheer, Durrani, Shah, and Rukhsana (2020) say is wrong. Extremist ideas, policies that support majoritarian identities, and school systems that teach hegemonic stories can all work against acceptance-based methods. Atkinson (2019) says that for interfaith dialogue to be successful, it needs to include critical reflection on power imbalances: "Dialogue that ignores socio-political structures risks reproducing the very hierarchies it seeks to overcome" (p. 55). To solve these problems, Vivekananda's moral and spiritual ideas need to be combined with institutional measures like economic policies that lower inequality, inclusive curriculums that teach pluralism, and legal protection for religious minorities. Vivekananda's worldwide religion is therefore a strong philosophical and moral example of how to solve modern conflicts. This framework fights the cultural normalization of violence and promotes lasting peace by laying out a metaphysical unity that underlies religious variety, putting acceptance over tolerance, and connecting spirituality to selfless service. It is still useful today because it not only inspires grassroots projects, but it also helps shape policy changes that make pluralistic ideals a part of education, the law, and government. Finally, combining

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

Vivekananda's ideas with important structural changes can turn global religious battles into places where people of different faiths can work together and benefit from each other.

Critical Evaluation: Philosophical Limits and Challenges

Advaita Vedanta's metaphysical non-duality is at the heart of Swami Vivekananda's world religion, which provides a visionary framework for religious harmony. But its logical coherence and usefulness in real life are criticized and limited in important ways. The conflict between universalist goals and specific religion beliefs is one of the most important problems. In their 2020 review, Zaheer, Durrani, Shah, and Rukhsana say, "Vivekananda's theoretical support for universalism shows inconsistencies when applied to his views on specific religions, especially Islam, where he vacillates between admiration and reductive characterization" (p. 110). This lack of agreement shows that universal religion, even though it is meant to be equal, may unintentionally reinforce hierarchical ideas by holding up certain practices as examples of universality. There are also theoretical problems with Universal Religion's use of Advaitic non-duality. John Hick's (1989) criticism of radical religious diversity says that non-dual frameworks might merge doctrinal differences into a single Real, which would make certain religious stories less powerful at changing people's lives (p. 238). Vivekananda's model may weaken the different moral teachings and promises about salvation that drive people to seek spiritual change by focusing on a deeper unity. This is something that Medda (2017) says: "while universal religion tries to respect diversity, its abstract metaphysics can hide the concrete moral and ritual practices that make up religious identity" (p. 41).

There are also philosophical and practical problems with the moral necessity of acceptance over tolerance. Atkinson (2019) says that real acceptance requires critical engagement and a deep understanding of each other. He says, "Acceptance becomes superficial if participants in interfaith dialogue are unwilling or unable to interrogate power dynamics and historical grievances that underpin religious antagonisms" (p. 55). If we don't fix these imbalances of power, universal religion's call for acceptance could be used as an ideal way to make everyone happy while hiding real wrongs. Political instrumentalization makes the model even less useful. Galtung (1997) shows that cultural violence—ideological systems that make exclusion okay— maintains direct and structural violence even when there is no direct hostility. No matter how complex the philosophical counter-narrative of universal religion is, it may have a hard time going up against powerful political interests that use religious identity to win elections or keep people in line. An empirical study of civil conflicts by Svensson (2013) backs up the idea that "religious actors invoking shared spiritual values can facilitate dialogue but their impact diminishes when political elites manipulate sectarian sentiments for strategic purposes" (p. 89).

Another problem with the model is that it can't be used in situations of violent extremism. Extremist ideas often don't accept pluralism at all, seeing faith difference as a threat to one's very existence. Appleby (2000) says that "the ambivalence of the sacred allows religion to be used for totalizing ideologies that prevent any reconciliation with religious enemies that are seen as enemies" (p. 12). In these situations, the philosophical ideas of universal religion might not be enough to fight against stories that make people seem less human and militant movements that want safety and identity closure instead of metaphysical thought. Additionally, the universal religion framework assumes that people of all religions are ready to talk to each other. But schools and other training methods often teach exclusivist views, which makes the change to acceptance hard. When faced with deeply rooted

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

communal prejudices that resist cognitive dissonance, Sharma (2020) says that “the conceptual elegance of universal religion may falter” (p. 49). To get rid of these biases, long-term educational and cultural changes are needed that go beyond intellectual discussion.

Finally, Vivekananda’s lack of a well-thought-out institutional model makes it harder for universal religion to spread. He supported community service and forums for people of different faiths, but he didn’t say how universalist ideals could be built into the law, schools, or government policies. This lack leaves a space between philosophical ideas and how they are put into practice in the real world. Atkinson (2019) says, “Philosophical models need to be translated into institutional practices in order to bring about lasting social change” (p. 56). Vivekananda’s idea of a worldwide religion is a strong philosophical and moral vision for religious diversity, but it has a lot of philosophical and practical problems. There are problems with universalism and particularism, the risks of non-duality in terms of knowledge, the shallowness of ethics, political co-optation, extremist rejection, educational resistance, and a lack of institutional design that all limit its ability to change things. To get around these problems, we need to combine the philosophical insights of universal religion with a critical look at power, major changes to education, and strong institutional frameworks that turn metaphysical goals into real social structures.

Conclusion:

Swami Vivekananda’s universal religion as a philosophical approach to religious problems has great potential but also serious drawbacks. Universal religion reframes religious variety as multiple paths to the same ultimate reality rather than mutually exclusive truth claims. Vivekananda’s paradigm, based on Advaita Vedanta’s non-dual metaphysics, emphasizes the ontological unity of all existence while respecting individual traditions’ epistemic integrity. Universal religion stands out from exclusivist, inclusivist, and radical pluralist paradigms by affirming both unity and plurality, offering a philosophically coherent alternative that reframes interreligious engagement as an ontological imperative rather than a sociopolitical concession. The ethical aspect of universal religion emphasizes its relevance. Vivekananda’s ethical paradigm requires compassion, service, and mutual recognition to go from superficial tolerance to true acceptance. His belief that “they alone live who live for others” turns spirituality into unselfish service and ecumenical cooperation. Collective relief efforts and interreligious community projects show how global religion’s service-oriented ethic can reduce structural and cultural violence by promoting human dignity and basic needs. Religious mediators use shared spiritual principles to foster trust across sectarian divisions in modern peacebuilding. Conflict negotiation success rates are greater for metaphysical and ethical solutions than secular ones, according to empirical studies. Universal religion inhibits societal legitimization of violence and fosters sustainable reconciliation by expressing a metaphysical narrative that values difference as divine expression rather than wrong.

However, this ambition faces enormous obstacles. Politically instrumentalizing religious identification can pervert universalist values, turning acceptance into rhetorical window dressing for unresolved injustices. Extremist ideologies that deny pluralism raise hurdles that metaphysical arguments cannot overcome. Learning and socialization in exclusivist worldviews impede the cognitive transformation needed for genuine acceptance. Universal religion’s abstract metaphysics can obscure lived religious identity’s doctrinal, ritual, and ethical practices, risking disconnection from the

SKBU JOURNAL OF PHILOSOPHY

PEER REVIEWED

communities it aspires to unite. We need global religion's conceptual insights and institutional reforms to solve these problems. Doctrinal acceptance must be complemented by pluralistic principles in education, minority rights in law, and inclusive policies that alleviate economic and social inequality. Interfaith conversation must critically address power dynamics and historical grievances to make acceptance a reality rather than an ideal. Institutionalizing service-oriented ethics through state-supported social programs and faith-based community partnerships can turn metaphysical unity into human welfare benefits, strengthening the relationship between spiritual solidarity and social justice.

Universal religion can address modern religious disputes if it inspires collective action across numerous societal domains and is philosophically coherent. Its greatest strength is its capacity to recast religious diversity as a source of social enrichment, urging followers to see the divine spark in religious others and act appropriately. Universal religion can revolutionize society by fostering a shared spiritual worldview and selflessness. Finally, Swami Vivekananda's global religion offers a convincing intellectual and ethical framework for resolving today's complex religious problems. The underlying idea—that unity and variety are complementary elements of the same reality—provides a potent counter-narrative to sectarian divide, but it requires careful contextualization and pragmatic execution. Metaphysical acceptance, structural fairness, educational change, and inclusive policy are needed to realize this promise. Universal religion can only become a peacemaker by changing interfaith coexistence into genuine collaboration and mutual development.

Bibliography:

1. Appleby, R. S. (2000). *The ambivalence of the sacred: Religion, violence, and reconciliation*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
2. Atkinson, M. (2019). Interfaith dialogue and comparative theology: A theoretical approach to a practical dilemma. *The Journal of Social Encounters*, 3(1), 47–57. <https://doi.org/10.69755/2995-2212.1028>
3. Galtung, J. (1997). Religions, hard and soft. *Cross Currents*, 47(4), 437–450.
4. Hick, J. (1989). *An interpretation of religion: Human responses to the transcendent*. Yale University Press.
5. Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Simon & Schuster.
6. Medda, G. (2017). Swami Vivekananda's philosophy of universal religion. *Anudhyan: An International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2, 36–43.
7. Sharma, S. (2020). Universal religion of Swami Vivekananda: A way towards religious integration. *International Journal of Research in Humanities & Social Sciences*, 8(9), 40–50.
8. Svensson, I. (2013). *Ending holy wars: Religion and conflict resolution in civil wars*. University of Queensland Press.
9. Vivekananda, S. (1993). *Karma yoga*. Advaita Ashrama. (Original work published 1895)
10. Zaheer, N., Durrani, A., Shah, M., & Rukhsana. (2020). Exploring Vivekananda's pluralism and universalism in the context of Islam: A critical analysis. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(6), 107–113.