

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY
JOHN W. RAWLINGS SCHOOL OF DIVINITY

**Chaplaincy Upholds the West's Value of Tolerance
Not Acceptance**

A Thesis Project Report Submitted to
the Faculty of the Liberty University School of Divinity
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Community Chaplaincy

by
Monique K. DeCandido

Lynchburg, Virginia
May 2022

Copyright © 2022 by Monique K. DeCandido.
All Rights Reserved

Liberty University John W. Rawlings School of Divinity

Thesis Project Approval Sheet

Mentor: Dr. Donald Q. Hicks
Assistant Professor of Practical Studies

Reader:
Assistant Professor of Practical Studies

MASTER OF ARTS IN COMMUNITY CHAPLAINCY THESIS PROJECT ABSTRACT

Monique K. DeCandido

Liberty University School of Divinity, 2022

Mentor: Dr. Donald Q. Hicks

Throughout history, the differences between humanity led mankind to experience many hardships, even wars. These differences include religion or beliefs, tribal differences, racial differences, and geographical differences. Over time, and after much bloodshed and despondency of life, critical thinking men began to develop a strategy for humanity to get along together despite their differences. The question and the challenge of how mankind can get along together without engaging in conflicts about their differences became the chief thinking cap throughout the West. Humanity realized that the answer to their question and challenge was tolerance. Now forwarding into the 21st century, the Western world has long seen a bloodshed battle over religion, beliefs, or race, as some of the other continents experience daily. The greatest praise the Western culture can celebrate for such harmony is the teaching of tolerance. Today, the Western definition of tolerance (to put up with or respect), which helps prevent wars, is being corrupted. People whose lives exercise tolerance daily have a calling to magnify the most outstanding Western teaching ever (TOLERANCE) and call on others to help maintain the cultural practices so that history does not repeat itself. As chaplains demonstrate tolerance in their daily calling, they are strategically positioned to reflect the West's harmony module and remind its citizens how we got here. For the Western culture to be sustained and prominent, the true concept of tolerance must be upheld.

Thesis project topic abstract length: 234 words

Key words: chaplains, tolerance, Western culture

Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: THE ARGUMENT FOR TOLERANCE	4
The Essence of Values in the Western World	7
The Importance of Freedom to the West	9
The Heart of Diversity	11
Without Tolerance, Western Principles are Shattered	12
CHAPTER 2: THE BIRTH OF TOLERANCE	15
The Role of Truth in the Birth of Tolerance	17
Religion in the Eyes of Tolerance	19
Pluralism Contribution to Tolerance	21
Cultural Diversity Role in Tolerance in the West	24
CHAPTER 3: WESTERN SOCIETY JOURNEY TO TOLERANCE	27
The West Concept of Tolerance	30
Chaplains Role in Upholding Tolerance	35
CHAPTER 4: INTOLERANCE ROLE PLAY IN THE WEST	39
Society Bias That Contributed to Intolerance	41
Post-Modernism, Secularism, and Today’s Intolerance	44
Values Connection to Intolerance	46
Political Liberalism, Multiculturalism, and Intolerance	49
Intolerance Effects in Chaplaincy	55
CHAPTER 5: IS TOLERANCE IN THE WEST ON LIFE SUPPORT	58
Tolerance Threats Within the Public Sectors	60
The Battles in the Classroom	62
Tolerance in a Progressive West	67
The Redefinition of Tolerance in the Millennial Era	72
Illustrating Acceptance in Two Formulas	74
Cancel Culture: Tolerance or Intolerance?	77
Today’s West Level of Intolerance is Questioning	79
Millennial Progressive Era Movements Undermine Concrete Truths	82
CHAPTER 6: THE CHAPLAIN’S ROLE IN UPHOLDING TOLERANCE IN THE WEST	90
The Rejection of Concrete Truth Impact on Chaplaincy	90
Chaplaincy Art in Demonstrating Diversity	92
A Profound Illustration	95
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION	97
BIBLIOGRAPHY	107

INTRODUCTION

A few years before 2020, the Western world saw some outbursts contrary to Western philosophies' teachings, particularly in the United States of America. It is crucial to highlight that no society understood living together and embracing each other's differences. At one point in time, every society faced crucial battles that led to wars before the discovery of TOLERANCE. During colonization, Keith P. Feldman and Leerom Medovoi highlight that "racial enemies are subjected to the holy war of a civilizing mission that treats them as potential combatants, and as political threats precisely because they are not yet sovereign equals."¹ This is a reminder to show that the Western world was not always tolerant, and they faced numerous battles that included religion, race, and wars. The Western society moved from a "pagan worshipping" lifestyle to a society that embraced Christianity and its teachings. Christianity's practice helped shape the West's concept of tolerance, even if it is a pluralistic society.

Three fundamental ways to highlight how tolerance through the teaching of Christianity helps shape our western world are: 1) the value of human life; 2) all man is created equal; 3) the need for humanity to live in a state of peace. These are alluded to in Genesis 1:27-28a, "So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. Then God blessed them."² Through the knowledge of the Christian Bible the foundation of the West was set, in which it holds the integrity of all human life. These attributes to life in the Western culture, particular to the USA, are written in its history in the country's Declaration of Independence, stating, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,

¹ Keith P. Feldman, and Leerom Medovoi, "Race/Religion/War: An Introduction." *Social Text* 34, no. 4 (2016): 3.

² Unless otherwise noted, all biblical passages references are in the New King James Version (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997).

that their Creator endows them with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”³ When a stranger encounters the Western world, especially America, he experiences a world shaped by the beliefs that uphold the dignity of human life. However, it is crucial to highlight that those words in Congress on July 4, 1776, were birthed out of the Revolutionary war between the Americans and British.

Although Christian teachings helped structure the Western view to embrace tolerance, it is noteworthy to highlight that Christianity faced many backlashes when it began to disseminate through the Roman Empire. Most of the first Christians faced persecution for their faith through the Roman Empire, leading many Christians to become martyrs. To emphasize the significance of the treatment Christians met under the Roman Empire, especially under Nero, Walter Hyde writes about the religion coming under police surveillance for years to come and introduces Christian persecution.⁴ Government controlling is an effective form of a tyrant society, one in which the people are oppressed and not celebrated. It took years, blood, and sweat before Christianity became a prominent religion within the Empire so that it could shape Western societies’ understandings of “human-hood.”

Looking at the Western world today, the battle to remain a tolerant world is at stake. Citizens of the Western world are constantly being told that the way Western societies were developed should no longer be a part of the future. Sadly, these norms are being exchanged for practices, beliefs, and ways of life that praise intolerance and tyranny. People who dare to stand up against this abusive culture continue to jeopardize their livelihood and even their lives. If

³ Declaration of Independence: A Transcription, (1776). *National Achieves*, <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>.

⁴ Walter Woodburn Hyde, “*Progress of Christianity*.” In *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, 164–92. (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946), 168.

Western societies forget how tolerance helped shape their world's prosperity, then the new approach of intolerance may prompt a repeat of history. The potential of history repeating itself is detrimental since it threatens every religion and belief against the norm. The Western world has come too far to allow attitudes and behaviors to revoke a practice that has been in place for centuries, possibly resulting in a devastating nightmare and something the Western world has never seen or experienced before.

As the Western world took its course to shape as one of the most tolerant societies, the Church played a crucial role in designing the culture and beliefs. Today, the church needs help to continue pointing out the benefits of tolerance and its critical functions within society. Therefore, believers who play vital roles within the society as chaplains should educate the population about tolerance, its importance within Western culture, and how it shapes the Western world.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ARGUMENT FOR TOLERANCE

Valuing a belief that meant a lot to the existence of humanity has always been a part of the Western world. Even if the belief is not in line with Western cultures, such as polygamy, polyandry, human sacrifice, etc., Western society always took the time to listen, appreciate, and learn from the presenter of the view. The Western culture in no way tries to isolate those who believe differently from its practice and way of life. Besides, the Western world is well-known for adapting or giving others the freedom to practice their beliefs, if it upholds human dignity. This results in the Western world becoming one of the most prominent pluralistic societies.

In a short piece, Bre Sonnier-Thompson exclaims one of the foundational principles of Western societies like America, highlighting that “the rule of law and protecting the rights of the individual are two tenets of Western Liberalism and democracy.”⁵ These underline tenets came through many hardships. If one should take a good look at Western world history, he will see that all its current prosperity was achieved through pain. Today, living in a country such as America helps millions of people to enjoy the pain of others; it also makes others want to protect the Western world and what it stands for.

Nevertheless, within a few short years, everything the Western world stood for began to find itself on shaking ground. Western societies like America are seeing that the millennial progressive era movements (an increase in cancel culture, political correctness, and ill-treatment to the human pursuit of happiness and beliefs) have never been shaken up in such a drastic manner. It is crucial to note that America’s folly grounds received many disturbances. But most of these shakings were for the better of the society and helped the country to stir in directions

⁵ Bre Sonnier-Thompson, "The Uncertain Future of Western Civilization," *International Politics Reviews* 5, no. 2 (2017): 125.

outlined by its Declaration of Independence. These include the ending of slavery, the Civil Rights Movement, and equality under the law. J. Scott Kenney outlines the beauty of the Western culture in the following discussion:

I would submit that the long history of the Western intellectual tradition contains both the historical depth and the broad intellectual diversity of what I would call a Meta-Paradigm... Certainly, its rich history already contains thorough consideration of inequality, which today's students, with little sense of history, could learn from. For example, slavery, racism, gender, and class exploitation have been most strenuously challenged in Western societies. The Western tradition also contains debates around social cohesion, truth, beauty, knowledge, varying ethical frameworks, political philosophies, varieties of justice, authority, religion—the list goes on...students are exchanging a broader, relatively diverse, historically rooted Meta-Paradigm for either confused disconnection, or a shrunken 'pretense' that is comparatively narrow, frequently focused on present concerns, and intolerant of the intellectual variety found in the former. Given their strong penchant for "diversity," this is perhaps the greatest irony of all.⁶

One of the significant highlights in Kenney's viewpoint about the Western culture is that its history has already debated many of the growing issues. It is why the Western world is one of the most enduring societies with little to no mega civilian wars. Kenney also helps to show that the Western glorification one sees today did not come overnight.

Before the Western world like America rose to glory, prestigious men, some of whom were preachers, publicly preached what is right in the eyes of the Lord. These men were not afraid to reprove unfair practices such as slavery, and even though they knew that they could have been killed or alienated for what they believed, their brave hearts led them to demand changes. Not long after, the Western culture matured so much that men could stand in the town square and speak their minds without the fear of dying, losing their families, being alienated from their communities, or losing their livelihood. As Kenney stresses, Western societies had debates; these debates helped make the Western world a beauty over time. These actions that

⁶ J. Scott Kenney, "Western Civilization, Inequality, and the Diversity Shell Game," *Academic Questions* 32, no. 3 (2019): 357.

played out within Western history should not be ignored and must be tools to help continue highlighting what worked and what did not. Kenny, in the argument, points out that too much of the West's students are disconnected from its history, even though some may be under a shallow pretense, too often, more than a hand load shows obliviousness about the West's history. It must be addressed for the societies to move forward in tremendous success.⁷

Looking at America's history, two organizations have become critical components of the Western world: Christianity and the military. Christianity helps shape Western beliefs, while the demand to be independent and a free democracy pushed America to embrace a strong military. When the country combines both components, it creates a stronger sense of purpose for the nation and its people. It is to be noted that the combination of the two components is not an involuntary force on Americans, but instead, it is a way for the people to have faith in the Supreme Being and the country. However, recently there was a solid blow to both the components. It happened when an Air Force Christian chaplain got fired when he agreed with the teaching of the Bible about sexual morality.⁸ This incident shocked American society to see that a man who served one of the most outstanding components of the society for 30-years lost his livelihood because of a belief he had which was once a part of the significant rationalization of American society. Questions such as how we got here began to roll out in the minds of many Americans, and many media casts began to shed light on the significant problem society began to face.

The Air Force chaplain incident is not an outburst of an irrational cry. According to one survey on the Medium.com blogging site, over 60% of Americans fear losing their job if they

⁷ Kenney, "Western Civilization," 357.

⁸ *Harbingers Daily*. <https://harbingersdaily.com/30-year-military-chaplain-fired-from-air-force-his-crime-biblical-views-on-sexual-morality/>

disclose their political and other beliefs.⁹ America set an example in humanity, debating, and fighting for what is right. The country encourages listening to the opponent and attacking the views and not the person. As the West, including America, began to fall away from these principles, it created panic for one to take a stand, forcing them to be a part of the growing numbers of Americans who live and work in fear, just to have food on the table.

The Essence of Values in the Western World

Having a set of principles that governs one's life is an essential part of the Western world. These principles can be viewed as an individual's values, and commonly found in the Western world, one's values may not be in line with the population at large. However, the Western world is the only place where individual values and beliefs are being held and respected. Western societies view individual rights as a golden opportunity that motivates one's daily life. Countries in the West create an atmosphere for celebrating people's well-being. The Western society does not separate individuals from their values; instead, Western beliefs see the citizens and their values worthy of protecting (even if it is not in line with society's majority).

When people in the West fight for causes, whether for or against social issues, the citizens in the Western world's eyes have a right to exercise their beliefs and fight for them. Values can be observed as the kerosene oil that fuels Western individuals' lives. It guides them to be willing to fight for the values they believe in. The Western world creates a haven for people to develop their own set of beliefs and to uphold them if they are not in violation of their neighbors. The West understands that values are the critical element that makes people want to live and pursue their heart desires, knowing that life can be better tomorrow.

⁹ *Medium*, <https://medium.com/discourse/over-60-of-americans-are-afraid-to-express-their-political-beliefs-c2619746c7f1#:~:text=Almost%20a%20third%20of%20employed%20Americans%20said%20they,worry%20about%20their%20political%20opinions%20harming%20their%20career.>

Developed Western societies such as America, allow citizens to provide services to each other and the government pays for many of these services. One example is service to the public by an LPC, a Licensed Professional Counselor or LMHC, Licensed Mental Health Counselor, a more popular term. Before paying for the service, the government has a few requirements according to the organization that oversees mental health counseling, the American Psychology Association (APA). One of the core principles is that the LPC does not impose their values on the client. Lenn E. Goodman, the author of *Religious Pluralism and Values in the Public Sphere*, highlights that Rawl's writings underline the closeness of the individual and their values. When looking at Western politics and its politicians, Rawl shows that there is "the trouble one might have proposing policy ideas without reference to one's core values and sincere beliefs."¹⁰ In the Western world, it is understood on many levels that the separation of the individual and his values is a challenge. Whether the individual is in politics or counseling, they are asked to evaluate their values and ensure they can work for the public interest. In the field of mental health, the understanding that the individual comes with his values is well understood, so whenever primary debates occur concerning how the counselor's values influence the client, experienced counselors in the field like Michael M. Kocet and Barbara J. Herlihy express "counselors bring their professional, personal, and cultural values into their relationships with clients and are not expected to be value-free in their counseling practice."¹¹ The Western world holds the importance for the citizens to have and express their values close to its existence. With such understandings, the civilians of the West weren't trained to live in fear about any values

¹⁰ Lenn Evan Goodman, *Religious Pluralism and Values in the Public Sphere*, (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 62.

¹¹ Michael M. Kocet and Barbara J. Herlihy, "Addressing Value-Based Conflicts within the Counseling Relationship: A Decision-Making Model," *Journal of Counseling and Development* 92, no. 2 (2014): 183.

they have that may not be in line with the society's majority. So far, the West is the only significant place on earth that allows the citizens to express their values, even if the government or most of the people disagree. For the people living in the West, values are the principles they use to govern their lives and motivate them to face each day.

The Importance of Freedom to the West

The 2020 pandemic due to the Covid-19 Virus caused the West to embrace many debates and mild fights. It would be hard to separate the individual from his values, as it would equivalently be challenging to separate the West from freedom. Freedom is the bloodline for a country like America. It is impossible to separate freedom from the country since the nation was birthed out of men's sincere hearts to have and maintain liberty. In one of the Founding Fathers— (Patrick Henry, to be exact) speech at the Virginia Convention in 1775, one of the nation's memorable quotes was birthed at this Convention. Henry stood his ground and boldly declared:

It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry, peace, peace—but there is no peace. The war is actually begun! The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!¹²

The seven words of Patrick Henry's speech, "give me liberty or give me death," have become the blood running in the veins of America. Indeed, America was birthed through a battle, a revolutionary war according to history, wherein men could have the liberty to live without the total control of others, including a government system. Many men stood up to fight and die for

¹² Patrick Henry, "Speech to the Second Virginia Convention" <https://www.owleyes.org/text/speech-to-the-second-virginia-convention/read/text-of-henrys-speech#root-28>.

the freedom Americans have today. To uphold this form of freedom, the American military has men and women in other countries today for two primary reasons: one is to maintain freedom in America, and two, is to help the country uphold its own freedom. This form of attitude manifested throughout the presidency of Bush in the early 2000s. Peter Lawler points out, “The January 2005 inauguration speech of George W. Bush, ‘centered’ on a quasi-theological evocation of a radical, neo-conservative activist foreign policy dedicated to the universal realization of ‘freedom,’ was just the most recent of a series of proclamations from the heart of Western power to shake a long-standing presumption.”¹³ The West’s deep belief in freedom affects how the citizens live and how they desire to see other nations and their citizens live.

At the pandemic’s beginning, Americans’ understanding of freedom was at center stage. The questions citizens began to ask were what the Constitution says, and is it lawful for the federal government to do this? There was no simple answer. And while other countries’ governments took the stand and did what they saw was best, Americans went into battle with their State and Federal government. According to The Constitution, American citizens wanted answers to their questions about how much of their freedom the government, both State and Federal, could legally infringe on. When many of the country’s men and women saw that the government was going too far, Patrick Henry’s “give me liberty or give me death” speech began to sound the alarm in the ears of many American politicians. While some states citizens trust the local politicians to do what is correct and best, other states called on their leaders to uphold the individual rights to freedom, even if the person’s life was at stake.

As America reviews its history, it shows that the lives citizens enjoy today were paid with blood, sweat, and pain. Many would angrily discuss the past and display the nation as evil

¹³ Peter Lawler, “The Good State: In Praise of ‘Classical’ Internationalism,” *Review of International Studies* 31, no. 3 (2005): 428.

because of its actions. When writing about how America arrived to where it is today, Tracy Fessenden points out Samuel Williams' text about the treatment of the Indians and how they were reduced to a "state of infancy, weakness, and the greatest imperfection."¹⁴ However, Williams could not hold back himself from highlighting that despite such an awful history, "The freedom to which it led, was its greatest blessing."¹⁵ Indeed, agreeing with Williams, the greatest blessing living in America is the freedom citizens enjoy daily. Today, because of the mutating of the Covid-19 Virus, many nations continue to limit the people's freedom; however, Americans get to enjoy their individual freedom given to them by God. This type of freedom is well documented in the country's constitution.

The Heart of Diversity

Today it is impossible to go throughout America and not find one individual from a particular country. In the game of football (known soccer in America), the FIFA (Federation of International Football Association) gives every nation that has a football team an opportunity to compete against each other. The top teams make it to what is known as the World Cup. Even the Olympics are known for such competition. America gives every nation the opportunity for its citizens to come and live within the borders of the USA. America's approach to accepting and celebrating diversity cannot be easily undermined. Not just America, but the West allows people who are sincere from all over the world to come and live within their borders, which provides substantial evidence that diversity is at the heart of the West.

Although America battled with ways to incorporate and celebrate diversity, authors such as Elson Szeto delight in indicating that the country's "democratic leadership promotes respect

¹⁴ Tracy Fessenden, *Culture and Redemption: Religion, the Secular, and American Literature* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2014), 56.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 56.

for diversity and acts to reduce cultural and material inequalities.”¹⁶ Over time, Americans realized that what they have to offer humanity supersede many nations, if not all the nations; therefore, people all over seek to be a part of the great nation. In the process of these individuals becoming Americans themselves through citizenship, the country began to reeducate itself about what the Founding Fathers and the revolutionary warriors stood for by creating a haven for people all over to enjoy diverse values, diverse beliefs, diverse religions, and diverse backgrounds. Through patience and development, the West presents to those who are interested the opportunity to be different and live free of harassment because of one’s differences; these accommodations are extremely hard to find outside of the borders of the Western hemisphere.

Living in a diverse community requires a lot of education, patience, and understanding. The position America is in today did not happen overnight. It took a lot of debates, a lot of quarrels, a lot of upsets, and even some bloodshed. However, the country can mobilize itself for people worldwide to be comfortably accommodated despite their differences. One evidence of this diversity within the country is that even after an attack such as 911, today, men and women of all religions and ethnicities, who believe in the founding principles of America can freely live and serve in the country’s government. America has set itself to embrace diversity and celebrate it within its citizenry. This form of acceptance towards diversity is not seen on such a large scale in other nations and it will take great measures to maintain such beauty and values.

Without Tolerance, the Western Principles are Shattered

The West’s desire to continue to be the leader in values (especially that of individual values), diversity, and freedom, depend solely on the art of tolerance. These three major

¹⁶ Elson Szeto, "How do Principals’ Practices Reflect Democratic Leadership for Inclusion in Diverse School Settings? A Hong Kong Case Study," *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership* 49, no. 3 (2021;2020;): 474.

components of the Western world continue to flourish once the citizens reach the point where they can live with each other and not let their neighbors' differences become barriers to effective relationships. Previously in the West, especially in America, people on opposing sides of an issue would stop, listen, and give the opposing side time to explain and present their opinion of the case being discussed, without attacking others for thinking differently. The recent shift in behaviors among the West, especially those living in America, is questioning. These behaviors were once played out in the West, which "elides a history of violence against outsiders"¹⁷ manifested in cultural wrongdoing such as slavery, Nazi Germany, Jim Crow, etc. The West fought many battles to become the most tolerant hemisphere to live in. If citizens manage to destroy what the previous generations worked for, they open the door for history to repeat itself.

Zygmunt Bauman and Aleksandra Kania, in an essay about the declining of the West, discuss some interesting points:

The 'certainty' of things that are important to life happening or not is the most avid of dreams dreamed by people harassed and oppressed by their uncertainty (though that certainty might also be, as William Pitt the Younger observed already in 1783, 'the plea for every infringement of human freedom' and 'the argument of tyrants'). Politics guided by the decisionist principle are the meeting point between the tasty arguments of tyrants and the ravenous appetite of their acclaimers. The new era of liberal democracy (whose imminent advancement Pitt was one of the first to adumbrate) was to be, we may say, dedicated to preventing such a meeting, for the sake of reason and genuine human interests, from happening.¹⁸

In this section, Bauman and Kania highlight some of the West's major underlying principles: free from tyrants, freedom to express the individual desire, the genuine desire of the human interest, and the flourishing capabilities of the West moving forward without oppression. However, it is noteworthy to stress that the West achieves values, freedom, and diversity by understanding the

¹⁷ Fessenden, *Culture and Redemption*, 52.

¹⁸ Zygmunt Bauman and Aleksandra Kania, "That West Meant to be Declining," *Thesis Eleven* 149, no. 1 (2018): 96.

power behind being tolerant.

America's history is embedded in the Pilgrims fleeing persecution and religious oppression to come to a place in which they could practice their beliefs freely. Joe Wolverton II highlights, "One of the most impressive stories from our history is that of the small band of brethren who fled their homes seeking a place where they could worship freely. This courageous congregation is known as the Pilgrims."¹⁹ The desire to worship freely for these men and women became the principal value to why they traveled in danger along the seashores. Nevertheless, these individuals met the land inhabitants and had many clashes, which led to many being killed. Still, amid these battles, both sides were able to sit at a table and forever penciled in a historical practice that continues today, called Thanksgiving. Wolverton continues to remind Americans that "It is true, as we all remember from lessons that were once taught in school, that the Pilgrims and the Indians sat down together and partook of the fruits of their labors, ate turkey and venison, and benefited from mutual instruction and genuine fellowship."²⁰

For the Western world to flourish, citizens must be willing to sit at the table like the American Indians and Pilgrims and have genuine fellowship. For productive fellowship, citizens must come back to the point wherein they are not disgusted by their neighbors' differences and uphold the true meaning of the West, which is to ensure that each citizen gets a seat at the table to freely express his heart without the fear of being ostracized because of his different values. For centuries, the West developed this mentality through the patience of tolerance.

¹⁹ Joe Wolverton II, "Faith in the Face of Skepticism: The Pilgrims, the Indians, and the Truth about the First Thanksgiving. (HISTORY--PAST AND PERSPECTIVE)," *The New American* (Belmont, Mass.) 25, no. 24 (2009): 36.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 38.

CHAPTER TWO

THE BIRTH OF TOLERANCE

I was seldom whipped by my old master, and suffered little from anything else than hunger and cold. I suffered much from hunger, but much more from cold...I had no bed...The children were then called, like so many pigs, and like so many pigs, they would come and devour the mush. I looked for home elsewhere, and was confident of finding none which I should relish less than the one which I was leaving. If, however, I found in my new home hardship, hunger, whipping, and nakedness, I had the consolation that I should not have escaped any one of them by staying. From my earliest recollection, I date the entertainment of a deep conviction that slavery would not always be able to hold me within its foul embrace; and in the darkest hours of my career in slavery, this living word of faith and spirit of hope departed not from me, but remained like ministering angels to cheer me through the gloom. This good spirit was from God, and to him I offer thanksgiving and praise.²¹

The above discourse is an excerpt taken from a prominent slave and abolitionist, Fredrick Douglass. Douglass was unfortunate to be born when differences in diversity and beliefs controlled the West. Living life as an enslaved person, he painted the condition people of African descendants faced under the ignorance and intolerance of European men. In Douglass' era, differences created a significant barrier, controlling individual freedom. Despite the challenges, men such as Douglass fought many battles for the West to develop and implement a nature that calls for all men worldwide to be tolerant of their neighbors.

Douglass' experience of men's intolerance is one of the many battles in the West. Other significant examples are the killing of Indians, Nazi Germany atrocities, and religious battles within Christianity. Not to forget that the Americans Indians were embedded in a society that elevated tribal wars and rulings. All these practices of intolerance led to much bloodshed, even the American Indians killing of the European descendants. Other religious battles such as The Crusades are noteworthy to indicate the West's hardship before arriving to a position wherein

²¹ Fredrick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave, Written by Himself*, (Simon & Schuster 2004), 22, 23, 26.

differences flourished (ideology, etc.). The pains and the sorrows the West encountered through history caused societies to develop mechanics on how to live together as humans and not allow their differences to become a turning point to contribute to wars and hatred. Within these hardships of life, the West contributed to the birth of tolerance, which citizens encounter today.

One of the past worlds that had many influences on the West, especially America, is the Roman Empire. Rome is one of the forerunners in these principles and ideologies when it comes to tolerance and willingness to entertain all man's values and beliefs. The Roman Empire flourished in a pluralistic setting. Even when limiting the practice of certain ideologies and practices (those that include sexual rites), the Romans exercised patience to understand their neighbor's viewpoint. They were not afraid to allow the opponent an opportunity to sit at the table, that they could find cohesive fellowship.

For tolerance to give birth, sectors including religion, cultural diversity, and the role of truth and values played a foremost part. In all these task forces, religion plays a significant role in helping birth tolerance. Taking the Christian religion for an example which is the core contributing beliefs to the West's values, Jesus commanded His disciples saying, "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another; as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all will know that you are My disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 15: 34-35). Through this practice of the majority of Christians displaying love to others, a part of the West exercises tolerance towards their fellow citizens. Religions help to shape how people create values and live out beliefs—and even when people are not connected to any religion, their summaries of all ideologies contribute to the individuals' beliefs. Second, cultural differences shape tolerance for people to live together in communities without conflict over their differences, especially ethnicity. The concept of being willing to understand others through their

diversity over time became a key artwork taught in the West to battle intolerance and overcome wicked acts such as Jim Crow, lynching, and terrorism. As mentioned before, the fight was not easy. Still, it helped make the West one of the most desirable places for humans to live and flourish, without worrying about the potential of being killed for expressing different thoughts and beliefs, or becoming a target because of the way one looks or because of one's religion.

The Role of Truth in the Birth of Tolerance

The West endures many debates and quarrels regarding truth. Many ask if there is only one truth or multiple truths. Today, the West has not finalized the issue; however, a major part of the belief system is that all truths are equal (relativism), which helps maintain peace within a pluralistic society. Truth brings some concrete measures in an individual's life and culture. Without some form of truth, society is traveling towards a disaster. Nonetheless, in the West, truths can be diverse. One good outcome of this diversity, in truth, is that it upholds all of them. It weakens anyone's desire to have internal conflicts or wars because of one set of people believing that their truth is superior to another. The role truth plays in tolerance is that they Western societies understand that the people will have some form of truth within their hearts, which allows them to be strong in their values.

During the many debates over truth in the West, Lenn Evan Goodman points out some of these arguments, writing, "Do the claims of truth forbid all lies? And if lying is countenanced to spare a fugitive, can we debar other appeals to expedience – to aid others, say, in this world or help them toward the next? Do we guard verbatim truth but condone prevarication? Or does truthfulness die the death of a thousand cuts and survive in lip service but not in life?"²² It is still a challenge to answer Goodman's questions about truth for the West. However, Western societies

²² Goodman, *Religious Pluralism and Values*, 103.

developed an approach that encourages individual citizens to embrace their truth and not encourage behaviors that ostracize others because of their truth.

In his famous book, *Truth, and Tolerance: Christian Belief and World Religions*, Pope Benedict XVI (Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger) emphasizes the close relationship between culture and truth. Benedict XVI wrote,

To lay claim to truth for one religion's particular expressions of faith appears today, not merely presumptuous, but an indication of insufficient enlightenment. Hans Kelsen was expressing the spirit of our age when he represented the question of Pilate, "What is truth?" as being the sole appropriate attitude for determining the structure of society within the state, in the face of the great religious and moral difficulties of mankind. Truth is replaced by the decision of the majority he says, precisely because there can be no truth, in the sense of a binding and generally accessible entity for man. Thus, the multiplicity of cultures serves to demonstrate the relativism of all cultures.²³

Pilate's question about truth may still hover over the heads of many of the West philosophers and thinkers. Still, Benedict XVI was able to show that the majority influences the ways truth is being presented, and no society can escape the impact of the majority. Although the West manages to uphold the individual's truth, the citizen majority contributes to how society operates and believes what a functioning society is. These numerous debates about truth help shape the West to develop an understanding that for the citizens to live in peace, everyone needs to know that their truths are cherished. In so, they have an earthly paradise to express these truths without the disturbance of their neighbors publicly. As Goodman points out, "Most familiar is a division of faith from practice and, correspondingly, of ritual from pragmatic action: What we do – if it affects others – is potentially a public concern, of possible interest to the law."²⁴ Although the West is open to individual truths, it still calls for cohesiveness measures in operations so that no

²³ Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *Truth and Tolerance* (Ignatius Press, 2004), loc 764.

²⁴ Goodman, *Religious Pluralism and Values*, 20.

one living in the West would be in danger or fear because of his neighbors' truths. The limits the West places on individual truths have nothing to do with tyrants, total control, or oppression; instead, they are mindful of the rights of every citizen and the desire to uphold individual rights.

Religion Role in the Eyes of Tolerance

Looking at the religion facts data from 2014, it shows that there are over eight main religions in America, including those who are atheists and agnostics.²⁵ It is essential to mention that the statistic did not include the religious practices of the Native Americas, which is a well-known understanding that some of these individuals have a closely different culture and religious tradition. Upon examination, it is interesting to note that many different religions function together within other countries such as Nigeria, China, and the Middle East. Nigeria battles with religious cohesiveness, which creates many wars, China has a stand against religion being a communist society, and the Middle East has zero-tolerance for religion practices outside of the Islamic majority.

Identifying some of the significant hiccups with religions in the past, Robert A. Dowd highlights that "Christian and Islamic communities have at times persecuted and sought to outlaw the existence of rival religious communities or at least greatly limit their ability to attract converts and influence the wider society."²⁶ Throughout history, wars have come to the surface of society many times due to the disagreement of religious beliefs. Over time, these differences become the dominant religion in the region, or due to weariness, the people learned how to live with each other without allowing religious differences to become the leading cause for them to destroy lives, cities, communities, and the country. One of the major battles in history due to

²⁵ Religions in the USA, <https://religionfacts.com/usa>.

²⁶ Robert A. Dowd, "Religious Diversity and Religious Tolerance: Lessons from Nigeria," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60, no. 4 (2016): 618.

religion manifested between India and Pakistan due to the religious belief of the Muslims and the Hindus. The primary fight between the nations happened because of religion. Essayist Michael Hirsh and friends pinpoint the following:

Understanding the use of religion and religious symbols is crucial in making sense of the complex relations within and between these two states. For example, soon after Partition, a senior Congress leader K.M. Munshi called for the restoration of the Somanath temple attacked by Mahmud of Ghazni in the Tenth Century. Though the Indian government insisted and continues to insist on the secular nature of its state, the temple was nevertheless reconstructed. Pakistan's nuclear missiles are named for prominent conquerors and rulers from the past (e.g., Ghazni, Ghauri, Babar, and Abdali) who represent Muslim victories over the Hindus.²⁷

Religion differences tore the West apart before. This can be seen in the battle between the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformation. Over time, the West saw that the wars were not bringing any substantial meaning, prosperity, or happiness to the people's lives. Therefore, the West developed a strategy in wherein people could learn to live and understand their religious differences and not allow it to become a problem in their lives. In America, this kind of philosophy is written in the First Amendment, which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion..."²⁸ This ideology became the turning point for America to stand and be a place where people can worship or not worship freely, based on their choice. Even when India and Pakistan toil through much pain, tears, and hardship because of their differences, Hirsh shows how the nations realized that the way they were functioning needed some form of change. Hirsh highlights, "Since Partition both countries have had to address their respective multi-ethnic and religious communities. Within both the Hindu and Muslim traditions there exist multiple variations."²⁹ The key phrase that pops out of Hirsh's statement is that the

²⁷ Michael Hirsh, "India and Pakistan: Outlining a Path Towards Peace." *Policy Perspectives (Islamabad)* 15, no. 1 (2018): 27.

²⁸ Constitution of the United States. <https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-1/>

²⁹ Michael Hirsh, "India and Pakistan," 28.

countries had to address their need to see that there was not any benefit in focusing on their differences, but instead they must establish measurements to allow their differences to flourish without creating conflicts that might lead to blood baths.

Pluralism Contribution to Tolerance

As the West became mature in its beliefs and principles concerning people living together cohesively, it settled on the understanding that pluralistic countries need the viewpoints of all its people brought forth in order to function peacefully. The rational thinking and mature standing the West has reached today was birthed through much trial and error. Before the West became such a mature pluralistic place, there was always a fear of losing the country's identity and creating societies where the majority ruled the nations as the church did in Europe.

In the concept that pluralism can be a challenge for the countries' identity, Pope Benedict XVI highlights that "Pluralism in its radical form ultimately denies the unity of mankind and denies the dynamic of history, which is a process of various unions."³⁰ Many individuals who hold firmly to religious beliefs, whether it be Christian or Islamic principles, would agree with the Pope that the process of pluralism helps to eliminate specific aspects of history, or it contributes to the weakening of a society's history, which plays a massive role in the constructive development of that society. Yet still, we cannot overlook the harmony that pluralism helps to construct in a society when everyone is told that their truth is valid. Indeed, this approach contributes to de-escalating any tension between the people who have different beliefs, which runs a risk for the citizens to face conflicts within the society. However, unlike the Pope, other scholars identify the beauty of pluralism and its contribution to society.

Lenn E. Goodman, who struggles with the concept that pluralism undermines societal

³⁰ Ratzinger, *Truth and Tolerance*, loc 864.

identity and struggles, defines the concept as:

Pluralism, in my view, is neither quite as hard as finding a lowest common denominator among incommensurables nor as easy as positing the solution to a problem that ex hypothesis has exactly that solution. It is a real-world problem, not a mathematical puzzle. It demands real, ongoing work – good will, intelligence, open-mindedness, yes – but also work, domestically and internationally. It means making allowances, seeking understanding, knowing a bit about oneself and a bit about the others too. It does not demand the sacrifice of logic or common sense, declaring differences unreal or bracketing as inconsequential what matters most to others. It does not mean chucking our values or giving up what we think or know or hope to accomplish. It does not demand squaring the circle to make everything and everyone fit together neatly and nicely.³¹

Goodman, unlike Pope Benedict XVI and others who are in the same belief, demonstrates that if a society takes the time out, pluralism is not asking for them to sacrifice any of the main success or beliefs of the society; however, it is asking for them to have an open heart towards others and what they have to bring to the table, and seek ways in which society as a whole can have meaningful conversations without becoming hostile towards each other. Goodman's painting of the concepts is enticing, but for a society to fully grasp Goodman's position, it takes a lot of maturing. Maturing is possible, but it takes time, and in the process the citizens still must come to a mind-frame of willingness to meet each other at the center. This meeting of the center in a society shaped by a pluralistic setting relies on tolerance to get them to arrive at the position in which the citizen can have this openness Goodman exclaims about. Without the desire to be open about one's neighbor's views and principle for life, a pluralistic society can face great danger; however, pluralistic societies like the West, paints the individual in a positive manner which shows individual happiness with the way he views life and is only asking for his neighbors' respect regarding his beliefs.

After the 20th century diaspora of the people living in the Jewish faith, they fled to

³¹ Goodman, *Religious Pluralism and Values*, 10.

America to escape the wickedness of Nazi Germany. At the time, America was already developing mechanics to accommodate different religions. To express the beauty of what America was maturing to do, Fessenden in a text exclaims the welcoming Jews received in the New World writing, “Jewish immigrants found this Protestant landscape of denominational pluralism hospitable above all those who (engaged) their Judaism as a mode of religious practice and belief.”³² The West was developing attitudes to tolerate pluralism practices and many individuals across the globe had never experienced such freedom. Just like the Jews, many people groups were proud to be in a country such as America, which provided freedom to accommodate their beliefs and be hospitable to their practices. America is a melting pot for people globally.

Pope Benedict XVI and other scholars who are embedded in the tradition of Western beliefs in Christian practices have a logical concern about what pluralism creates in a society, which is to undermine the work of the inhabitants over time and tend to forget the history of the country. Upon examination from a Christian perspective, the Word of God teaches believers, to “...have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather expose them” (Ephesians 5:11). Therefore, Christians in the West have a right to speak against cultural practices, (just like John the Baptist), which go against the ways of God. However, there can be measurements taken to ensure that the citizens know and uphold their true history. On the account that the West would risk being transformed into a strange hemisphere if it does not stand up for its foundational principles and beliefs, fears can be overcome with the proper education, especially Christian teachings such as Sunday Schools and mental attitude. One point Goodman indicates which is appealing to the situation is that “Tolerance is the minimum demand of pluralism in any

³² Fessenden, *Culture and Redemption: Religion, the Secular, and American Literature*, 191.

healthy society. But tolerance has limits... A pluralistic society has moral choices to make: It cannot tolerate just anything.”³³ The point that the pluralistic society has moral choices to make is crucial for the West since its foundation is firmly rooted in Christian beliefs. With these measurements, Christians such as Pope Benedict XVI and conservative Americans should not have anything to fear as the society matures in its tolerance towards other practices and beliefs.

Cultural Diversity Role in Tolerance in the West

The State of New York is one of the places wherein one of its cities (New York City) is a place one can visit and see a geographical location for Jews, Indians, Caribbean individuals, Muslims, Russians, and the list goes on. Even though New York City is quite diverse, hardly one would hear of any intensified tensions between different diverse communities. This kind of fellowship between people of different backgrounds is a true demonstration of tolerance in the West. New York City contributes as one of the most flourishing economic cities in American society, with the growth and success of many businesses. In one research on the benefit of cultural diversity in business, author J. Félix Lozano in his first few pages of the results writes that “From our point of view, "respect" is a well-founded concept for dealing with cultural diversity by integrating the business case with the ethical perspective, thereby making a positive contribution to corporate profits and creating a fairer society.”³⁴ The West is a great success to show that cultural diversity is possible on two levels; one being the level that people can live together without having intensified conflicts because of their differences, and the second level is that cultural diversity helps to contribute to the financial success of the diverse people and the diverse companies they form. For any society, cultural diversity challenges the identity of the

³³ Goodman, *Religious Pluralism and Values*, 3, 26.

³⁴ J. Félix Lozano, "Cultural Diversity in Business: A Critical Reflection on the Ideology of Tolerance." *Journal of Business Ethics* 142, no. 4 (2017, 2016): 680.

nation and how the nation would like to present itself on a global scale; however, it is important to look at the matter from a large lens.

Through tolerance, the West established one of the most prominent forms of cultural diversity with little to no animosity. Although animosity towards cultural diversity does not elevate to the surface of Western societies, the level at which America and other Western cultures have developed over time took a process. When reflecting on the process, especially in the educational settings, Antonio J. Castro writes that “findings about the lack of understanding of multicultural issues, the general intolerance held by preservice teachers for cultural diversity, and gaps in multicultural education justify the need for expanding multicultural education in teacher education programs. Most of these studies uncovered the attitudes of preservice teachers toward culturally diverse students but did not account for the root of these attitudes and perceptions.”³⁵ Castro’s research shows that cultural diversity can be a major hiccup and battle in any society. However, the West proves to the global hemisphere that it is workable.

Today there is much conversation about emotional and cultural intelligence. Researcher Kerri Anne Crowne points out the definition of the concepts:

Emotional intelligence defined it as an ability which focuses on the perception and expression of emotion accurately and adaptively; along with the ability to understand emotional knowledge, use feelings to facilitate thought, and to regulate emotions, in not only oneself, but also others (Salovey et al., 2003) “and” Cultural intelligence, defined as a ‘multifaceted competency consisting of cultural knowledge, the practice of mindfulness, and the repertoire of behavioral skills’ (Thomas and Inkson, 2004: 182–3), is considered a capability that allows individuals to understand and act appropriately across a wide range of cultures (Thomas, 2006). Components of cultural intelligence have been found to predict cultural judgment, decision-making, cultural adaptation, and task performance (Ang et al., 2007).³⁶

³⁵ Antonio J. Castro, "Themes in the Research on Preservice Teachers' Views of Cultural Diversity: Implications for Researching Millennial Preservice Teachers." *Educational Researcher* 39, no. 3 (2010): 201.

³⁶ Kerri Anne Crowne, “Cultural Exposure, Emotional Intelligence, and Cultural Intelligence: An Exploratory Study.” *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 13, no. 1 (April 2013): 6.

Today's development of emotional and cultural intelligence is the forward success of the West when it comes to the issue of cultural diversity. Before developing the concepts of emotional and cultural intelligence, tolerance of other cultures was always a route in which the West grew and became a primary success. Through these tolerance practices embedded with Christian beliefs, the West was able to profess a foundation of calling on its citizens to live out Christ's teachings on being their brothers' keeper, being a peacemaker, and remembering that their neighbors are wonderfully and marvelously made by the Lord. Cultural and emotional intelligence are men's way of calling for humanity to get along. However, it falls short because it leaves out the very essence of mankind, and it is God Himself. Tolerance, on the other hand, rooted in Christian principles calls on humankind to reflect their Creator by treating each other as the image of God and as the scripture states, "He has shown you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God?" (Micah 6:8). The level of tolerance the West displays reflects just, mercy, and humility.

CHAPTER THREE

WESTERN SOCIETY JOURNEY TO TOLERANCE

Before the Western world became as developed as we know it today, there was a world called the Roman Empire or formally the Roman Republic according to history. Today many of the West's philosophical thinking and even thinkers came through the Roman Empire. It is not a surprise that America is well-known as a Republic. All this is to be credited to the accomplishments of the Roman Empire to develop great society growths and success. These successes were highly excellent, in so, they reflect in the Post-modern Western worlds.

The first form of “tolerance” practice among Western societies happened through the Roman Empire. Besides, the Empire had and embraced a pluralistic society in some forms. Although, it is noteworthy to point out that the Empire did question a few of the practices and would at times limit them if it seems like a form of threat or “immoral” practices. Immoral in this sense would not be as our Post-modern understandings, but rather according to the majority principles of Rome. When discussing the ways of Rome in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire: Volume I*, Edward Gibbon stresses:

The policy of the emperors and the senate, as far as it concerned religion, was happily seconded by the reflections of the enlightened, and by the habits of the superstitious, part of their subjects. The various modes of worship, which prevailed in the Roman world, were all considered by the people, as equally true; by the philosopher, as equally false; and by the magistrate, as equally useful. And thus, toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious concord.³⁷

Post-modern Western societies preserve this form of toleration, which shows mutual indulgence and religious concord. This form of belief directly flows outside empires such as Rome to what is currently experienced in Western countries like America. Rome did not set the stage for just

³⁷ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Volume the First* (London: Electric Book Co., 2001), 49.

religious worshipping but also for cultural freedom. According to Gibbon,

Rome, the capital of the great monarchy, was incessantly filled with subjects and strangers from every part of the world, who all introduced and enjoyed the favorite superstitions of their native country. Every city in the empire was justified in maintaining the purity of its ancient ceremonies; and the Roman senate, using the common privilege, sometimes interposed, to check this inundation to the foreign rites.³⁸

The Roman Empire's actions towards its citizens were open and welcoming. The empire knew that each citizen had beliefs and practices embedded in the way they lived their daily lives; therefore, the Empire worked to satisfy the people as best as it could.

An examination of the Western world in the Post-modern era shows that the Western cultural philosophy and teachings, which the citizens exercise, teach and uphold others' desires to practice their beliefs, just as Rome has always been in line with the majority beliefs. Therefore, practices such as child marriage and polygamy are not perceived as “moral” views of the citizens' majority within the West. These forms of rejected practices are not a result of Western intolerance but instead have a lot to do with the solid Western belief in feminism and children's innocence. Apart from these beliefs, people who come to the West get to exercise their freedom as they wish, if they are not being a problem to their neighbors.

Western toleration is a system that helps with the integration of the people. Many individuals who settle in the West come from various backgrounds, which was previously discussed about New York City. The people who live in New York City are not just descendants of the early European settlers or African (slaves); millions of people have their roots springing up from practices in Asia, the Caribbean, Africa, and other continents. Some of these people came from countries where tolerance is not practiced; therefore, they understand and appreciate the freedom to worship and exercise their beliefs freely without the oppression of others,

³⁸ Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 54.

especially the leadership. This can be said of Christians who fled the Middle East or the early Jewish settlers who fled the horror of Nazi-Germany. Since the West is genuine in upholding its practice of tolerance, it is encouraging for those who decided to migrate to be open towards the West's views, beliefs, and teachings to avoid persecuting one's neighbor for being different.

When looking at the West's accomplishment with tolerance, a great illustration can be seen in the country's relationship between Jews and Muslims. Indeed, it is essential to point out that there are incidents in which these relationships can be bitter at times when there is an attack on the Jews by the Muslims. However, most Jews and Muslims learn to adopt the practice of tolerance within the West and not let the animosity they have in the Middle East be a barrier towards their success and relationship. It can also be said for those coming from countries where Christianity is oppressed. These individuals may leave their country to migrate to the West, which they know is embedded in Christian beliefs, practices, and morality. Many of them may not know how they would perceive their new home; however, for some, the welcoming and the freedom to continue to practice their way of life enables them to adapt to the West's perspective on tolerance.

The West's presentation of tolerance demonstrates that there can be "world peace." The illustration of New York City can be used to validate such view since literally most of the citizens who live there migrated from all over the world. They live peacefully with each other and do not let different cultural beliefs and practices be a hindrance to the way they live with each other. New York City is an example of how the West's approach to tolerance works. It enhances the growth of the people and the country in the context that the nation is not embedded with civil wars because of diversity and diversity of beliefs, unlike other nations.

The West Concept of Tolerance

In the 1600s, when European settlers began to make America (New World) their new home, their encounters with the native settlers led the European men into deep philosophical discussions on approaching the differences in culture. One of the famous thinkers who wrote to the leadership, which was a part of the English Monarchy on the subject matter, was John Locke. In his text, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, Locke writes:

No private person has any right in any manner to prejudice another person in his civil enjoyments because he is of another church or religion. All the rights and franchises that belong to him as a man, or as a denizen, are inviolably to be preserved to him. These are not the business of religion. No violence nor injury is to be offered him, whether he be Christian or Pagan. Nay, we must not content ourselves with the narrow measures of bare justice; charity, bounty, and liberality must be added to it.³⁹

When evaluating Locke's perspective, it shows that the men had challenges when dealing with the Native American culture and practice, and the differences in Church beliefs, which started in Europe. Some historical reports indicate that the European men who mostly had beliefs embedded in Christian teachings and principles, had a negative view of the native lifestyle and at times ill-treated the inhabitants. However, thinkers like Locke and his letter to the government show that they sought appropriate ways to handle the matter. Locke, in the letter, points out to the leadership that the private citizens have rights, and these rights include them not being prejudiced against their neighbors.

It is essential to highlight that most of the first migration of the European men coming to the New World were escaping the control of worship and the limitation of life. They were also faced with internal religious battles, which had a lot to do with the faith of Christianity. A few years before the migration, a widespread reform occurred, known as the Reformation Period. Lutheran and Calvinistic beliefs competed with the Roman Catholic teachings and caused a

³⁹ John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, *The Federalist Papers* (1689): 9.

battle for religious tolerance in Europe. With these battles, Locke saw his letter as a plea to encourage the leadership not to hinder the way the civilians live if it inspired peaceful living within society. In the letter Locke highlights, “It is the duty of the civil magistrate, by the impartial execution of equal laws, to secure unto all the people in general and to every one of his subjects, in particular, the just possession of these things belonging to this life.”⁴⁰ Such thinking shapes the American belief that people should be free to experience life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Apart from the philosophical thinkers who helped the West to embrace a form of tolerance that celebrates civil togetherness, Christian beliefs played a significant part in the process. Locke writes, “The toleration of those that differ from others in matters of religion is so agreeable to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”⁴¹ The majority of the European men who migrated to the New World had an encounter with Christianity. Some of these men may not have embraced Christianity as their religion, but their lives were embedded with Christian principles. Therefore, through the Christian teaching, one central philosophy became popular with these new inhabitants of the New World, which is the teaching that men should treat others just as they would like to be treated. Today, many still refer to this as a golden rule. It shapes how the West can be a society of tolerance. When it comes to how Christianity works and forms the West as a tolerant society, its teachings encourage peace, love, and being one’s brother’s keeper can be credited to the Western societies’ beliefs in tolerance. Looking back at Locke’s writing that tolerance is embedded in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, there are sections in the Christian Bible where Jesus tells the disciples that they should love. This teaching about loving oneself, and one’s neighbors,

⁴⁰ John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, 4.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

encourages Western citizens to exercise this kind of love to their neighbors even if they are different from them in skin color, culture, or religious beliefs.

From the successful teaching of Christian beliefs taking over the Roman Empire up to today's Post-modern society, people living in the West quickly embraced Christian teachings that people should be free to enjoy the life that the supreme Creator ordained for them. Although the Post-modern West is currently striving towards a secular society, the Christian influence on tolerance is still evident in the way most citizens treat their neighbors.

The concept of tolerance in the West is defined as “a willingness to ‘put up with’ those things one rejects or oppose.”⁴² It can also be said that “Tolerance is a straightforward attitude that allows people to have freedom of expression even though one may feel that their ideas are incorrect or even immoral.”⁴³ To illustrate how tolerance plays out within the West, Marie A. Eisenstein and colleagues share a result from a 1987 Gibson survey nationwide within America. The survey was titled “least-liked,” and according to the results, the group the citizens indicated that they liked the least was the Ku Klux Klan, known widely as the KKK. The Klan is well-known for its killing and hatred towards people living in America of African descendants. The West concept of tolerance in this form indicates that one, the law has a duty to secure citizens from being killed because of their differences, and two, those who are a part of the Klan have the right to exercise their freedom of hatred but cannot bring harm to their neighbors. Therefore, an American who practices tolerance can live among the Klan members although he or she does not share the same beliefs as the Klan; however, he respects their rights to voice their opinions and beliefs. The same can be said about the conservative Christian community within the country.

⁴² Marie A. Eisenstein, *Religion and the Politics of Tolerance: How Christianity Builds Democracy*, (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 15.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 15.

These individuals' beliefs come directly from the Bible; therefore, they try their best to ensure that their lives align with what it teaches. However, when it comes to their neighbors who disagree with the Bible, the Christian believer tolerates their choice of living, knowing that the Bible teaches that the Creator gives humankind choices.

Further analysis on tolerance, Ioana Boghian's writes

Tolerance (lat. *tolerantia*, "endurance, bearing") is a social, ethical and religious notion that may describe a group or individual, denoting respect of the freedom of others, their way of thinking and behavior, and opinions of any kind (political, religious, etc.) (Cojocariu, 2006). The current paradigm of the pedagogy of tolerance is asserted in contemporary society by the active promotion of the values of the culture of tolerance in the last decade: humanistic coexistence, respect for differences, free choice of value orientations and nonconflictual acceptance of the rights of others in the context of the Declaration on the principles of tolerance (ref).⁴⁴

Examining Boghian's point of view, it is vital to stress that for the West to maintain the kind of society it has successfully formed, people of all different beliefs and principles can live and get along. Tolerance is the critical backbone structure that helps uplift Western societies to stand firm. The West has proven to the world that for humanistic coexistence to occur, especially when it comes to diversity in culture, beliefs, and practices, tolerance is the central tool. Through tolerance, the West citizen can develop a mechanism that involves respecting and not violating. In so much as the Gibson report shows that the majority of American citizens dislike the KKK, one does not see this majority calling on the government to eliminate all the members of the Klan so that people who are Black in America and those who openly rebuke the actions of the group will be freed to live without the fear of the Klan. Tolerance, as Boghian shows, is a form of respect that helps the citizens develop a form of resilience for the things that are against their beliefs.

⁴⁴ Ioana Boghian, "Psycho-Pedagogical Approach to the Concept of Tolerance," *Journal of Innovation in Psychology, Education and Didactics* 21, no. 1 (2017): 97.

Boghian, in her text, continues to analyze that,

The actuality of the theme is determined by the contemporary social processes characterized by confrontational and disintegration tendencies occurring in the context of the spiritual crisis of society, reflected also in the field of education. Under these circumstances, tolerance is more necessary than ever, because confrontations, which are widespread, constitute a potential universal threat to any person or region. Researchers in the field of education combine their efforts to demonstrate that tolerance is a universal value and axiological form of human coexistence and, at the same time, one of the most contradictory values of the contemporary world (interpreted as patience and self-sacrifice) and describe the content of tolerant consciousness, thought, action and mentality.⁴⁵

Before diving into the “spiritual crisis of society” (civil wars), one of the most remarkable points

Boghian emphasizes in this text is the role mentality plays in the West concept of tolerance.

Looking back at conflicts between Pakistan and India in which religious and social practices drove them to many wars, today, in cities like New York City, both Pakistanis and Indians can live in the same community and not feel threatened by each other. This kind of mental change takes effect on both communities in two ways; one is that some of them may have lost grandparents back home because of those wars, but after educating themselves and retraining their minds to the Western concept of tolerance, the individuals may find it comfortable to live among each other. Secondly, these individuals may adapt to the Western principles regarding the pursuit of happiness and may see it helpful for their mental hygiene while realizing the importance to let go of cultural conflicts, which caused pain.

In Boghian’s concept of the spiritual crisis of the society, this can be referred to as the nation’s civil war due to differences. If a society does not maintain peace among the citizens, then the spiritual level of the society to thrive, grow, and experience success is at risk. The spiritual crisis of society opens the door for wars, leading to multiple shedding of blood, rape, poverty, and the mental decaying of the citizens. When a society is experiencing such levels of

⁴⁵ Boghian, "Psycho-Pedagogical Approach," 97.

hardship, it will not be able to see any economic success and will open the door for other transgressions such as stealing and gang living. Societies that experience spiritual crises do not have a bright future for the youth and lessen the life expectancy of the older population. People who live in a society that does not have room for growth and expansion because of the spiritual decay of the land face only two major choices: die or leave. Many would take the journey to come to the West and begin a new life, even if it means changing their beliefs and adapting to some of the West's teachings, like tolerance.

The West has become a safe haven for many people in spiritual crisis societies. However, the West can only give one substantial praise to the reason why its societies are not on edge to experience wars and poverty to a level in which many of the migrants did; it is the West's understanding and upholding of tolerance in the sense of one may disagree, but he can live. This is the teaching that encourages all the citizens of the west to develop respect for their neighbors' choices (if it is not causing harm) and to establish a mechanism of how to put up with beliefs they disagree with. Due to this principle of tolerance, the West has created a flourishing society for all humanity, no matter where they migrated from in the world.

Chaplains Role in Upholding Tolerance

Since the West's embracement of tolerance leads to having spiritual flourishing and people can find success in their everyday lives, including where they desire to work, many career choices help Western countries to remind their citizens of the role of tolerance in the daily functioning of the society. One example of one of those careers is Chaplaincy. These men and women can be of any religion, as well as an atheist. One of the most outstanding examples of the West using careers such as Chaplaincy to help the citizens continue to uphold the practice of tolerance is when schools such as Harvard, which was built as a Theology School for Christians,

can today have an atheist as the head of the Chaplaincy Department.⁴⁶

Within the society of America, the career of Chaplaincy is prominently acquainted with the Christian religion. However, just as Harvard shows, Chaplains can be anyone with a belief, even if that belief is God does not exist. Chaplains in the West can be of any religion or no religion at all; however, these individuals have one purpose: to be there for people. In the effort to be there for the population, a Muslim chaplain can be found at the bedside of a dying individual who is Jewish. This can especially be seen in the hospital settings of America. Currently, outside the borders of America, one will find conflict within the Middle East between the Arabs and the Jews; however, the West's fundamental teaching on tolerance allowed the two cultural enemies to meet without any animosity at a time when one needs another.

Through chaplaincy, the West fundamental principle of tolerance is exercised daily. Chaplains face people daily in their jobs, and these individuals at times do not share anything in common with the chaplain. Still, they understand the chaplain's underlying promise to bring them comfort in any way possible according to the institution guidelines. Chaplains meet with people of the institution where they work daily and develop relationships with them, even when the individual is a Christian, and the chaplain is an atheist. The Western principle of tolerance makes these relationships a possibility. It is a continuous effort by the West to remind its citizens that this spiritual flourishing of the society is mainly possible by the efforts of the citizens to be respectful of each other, even when they don't have the same beliefs.

The work of chaplaincy in the West demonstrates the principle of tolerance within disagreements but relying on each other in times of need. People in the West often remember the warmest of the chaplains when they are faced with challenging situations such as death, rape,

⁴⁶ The New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/26/us/harvard-chaplain-greg-epstein.html>

abusive spouse, or a divorce. These ailments and disruptions happen to everyone, regardless of one's beliefs, looks, or way of life. They affect Muslims and Christians alike in the same way and affect those with white or dark skin tone in the same manner. No one is excluded from these destructions. With this truth, chaplains have the opportunity through the flourishing of Western societies to demonstrate the country's ideology of tolerance in public places. When the Western society citizen encounters a chaplain who does not share his or her belief (i.e., a gay chaplain visiting the hospital room of a Muslim man), the two individuals can easily have a conversation without any hatred towards one another. Tolerance in the Western world helps everyone develop mechanisms on how to function and not let their differences become a challenge that will lead to wicked acts.

Using the demonstration that most chaplains are of the Christian faith and that when deep analysis of Christian scripture is examined, it shows that the faith leans towards an exclusive principle, rather than a pluralism or inclusivism. With this in mind, many Christian chaplains are immediately judged to be intolerant. In his text on chaplains who work in public settings, Peter W. Youngblood expresses that "Pluralist or more progressive inclusivist theologies are favored by mainstream theologians as these are seemingly more tolerant and open to dialogue."⁴⁷ When analyzing the chaplains calling in public settings such as hospitals, Youngblood passionately notes that within the "normative systems such theologies can be intolerant or hostile, they do describe the full spectrum of theological positions that a scholar or practitioner will bring with them into any interreligious relationship."⁴⁸ The normative systems in the context are equated with that of a hospital. Youngblood's indications that chaplains of the Christian faith can be a

⁴⁷ Peter Youngblood, "Interfaith Chaplaincy as Interpretive Hospitality," *Religions (Basel, Switzerland)* 10, no. 3 (2019): 2.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

barrier to interreligious relationships in normative systems are examples of the severe judgment that Christian chaplains are incapable of tolerating others' beliefs. Such assessments are not in line with the chaplain's promise to be there for others. Chaplains leave their houses daily to go to the public settings knowing that their faith will be challenged; however, they seek something more cherishing: to develop an interreligious or non-religious relationship with their fellow Americans who do not share their views. A chaplain's work in the normative systems is a profound example of the West principle of tolerance.

CHAPTER FOUR

INTOLERANCE ROLE PLAY IN THE WEST

Throughout history, one thing that continues to hinder humanity is their differences. Men continue today to battle because humankind does not speak the same languages, look alike, or behave alike. The differences among humanity continue to be a challenging and at times creates contentions that lead to devastating wars. History shows that people question their differences and often these questions lead to hierarchy systems and a mentality that influences the operation of each society.

When analyzing Rome and the significant influence it had on the West, especially that of America, it is praised for up-holding tolerance and producing one of the best pluralistic societies. However, the road to tolerance was not paved with gold. When analyzing Rome's struggles, H.A. Drake pinpoints, "For historians of late Rome or early Christianity, a single word long sufficed to explain this dark turn: intolerance."⁴⁹ In every instance in which intolerance took place in history, whether through slavery, Nazi Germany, the massive killings of the Native Americans, South African Apartheid, etc., intolerance always took a dark turn within society.

Rome is well-known for being a pluralistic society; however, it had few controls over its citizens. These controls lead to the harshness of intolerance, which most of the time leads to human wickedness. Before Christianity grew to become a dominant religion in Rome, it went through the fire. Although Rome is well-known for freely accepting religions, there was a common denominator within all these religions—it is the fact that they all believe in a polytheism belief, which had multiple gods. Christianity, which is a monotheism religion, was not the typical belief system of the Romans. In so, its differences made the citizens of Rome who

⁴⁹ Drake, H.A. "Intolerance, Religious Violence, and Political Legitimacy in Late Antiquity." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 79, no. 1 (2011): 195.

believe in a polytheism religion extremely uncomfortable. Their discomfort with the faith of the people (Christians) made them call on the leadership to intervene and do something drastic. The early Christians found themselves living in fear. Many were given alive to wild animals, and others were burned to death. The Romans at the time could not accept the existence of a monotheism religion. They could not sit at a table to discuss their beliefs with their fellow citizens; rather, they stood their ground and called for the eradication of the Christians.

If tolerance is the concept defined by putting up with or showing respect even if you disagree, then intolerance is an unwillingness to put up with or show any respect when there are disagreements. However, intolerance may be analyzed as to how citizens of a democratic society have challenges with putting up with the free will of the people to exercise their rights, have free speech, or live and believe in what makes them happy. Whenever citizens of a society find it hard to leave room for their fellow neighbors to live and be free as they like (if they are not being harmful to others), then intolerance will come to the surface of the society and create havoc.

Intolerance blinds the eyes of the people within a society. It contributes to society's spiritual crisis and creates pathways that create unrest and barriers. These barriers make it hard for the people and the society to find progress, and many times, any success that is found within the society is limited. When critically analyzing intolerance, James Gibson and colleagues reveal that "A great deal of research has attempted to understand why some citizens extend civil rights to groups they dislike, while others do not."⁵⁰ Although the researchers could not come up with any concrete answer since intolerance happens in every society for many different reasons, it shows that intolerance is a significant plague; therefore, societies must consciously address the problem to help with the peaceful co-existence of the citizens.

⁵⁰ James Gibson, "Deplorables: Emotions, Political Sophistication, and Political Intolerance." *American Politics Research* 48, no. 2 (2020): 252.

Society Biases That Contributed to Intolerance

The West, just like Rome, went through many battles before it became the tolerant society it is known for today. After the Reformation movement by Martin Luther and John Calvin, the ruling Church was afraid that the uprising would bring threats to their power structure in Europe. In all honesty, the battles that arose between the Roman Catholic Church and Reformation Church had little to do with the society bias, but rather the citizens' differences in belief.

Differences in beliefs can contribute to societal intolerance, leading to the society's spiritual crisis. This is shown between the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformation churches, battles between Muslims and Christians, Muslims and Jews, and Hindus and Muslims. Religious differences can cause people within a society to not exercise tolerance for others' differences, leading to society's decay. When analyzing the battle between the Roman church and the Reformation churches, which all belong to the belief of Christianity, the first thing that must be addressed is the truth that if Christian beliefs promote tolerance, then how is it possible for wars to emerge within the religion due to intolerance of beliefs and interpretations? When explaining the dynamic challenges between the two churches, Wilhelm Pauck paints the answer to the question writing,

Medieval religious uniformity received its death blow at the time of the Reformation. Although it was not the intention of the Reformers to destroy the unity of Christendom, they actually did so. A variety of Christian churches came into being. Even then the practice of religious intolerance persisted and primarily for social and political reasons.⁵¹

Social and political motives lead to societal biases that contribute to intolerance. Therefore, differences in beliefs are not a matter of social bias only, but motives behind making differences

⁵¹ Wilhelm Pauck, "The Christian Faith and Religious Tolerance," *Church History* 15, no. 3 (Sep 01, 1946): 222.

a problem come to the surface within society through the biases of the people. Since both the Roman church and the Reformation church are of the same faith, why did they have to battle against each other? The closest answer is what Pauck highlights; it is the motivation and greed to gain power through social and political structures that contribute to the battle of intolerance.

A society structured around social and political motives will lead to intolerance. After the fight evolved between the churches, many people who wanted to worship freely fled to the New World. The battle between Christian people is a reflection of James 2:8, which states: "If you really fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself,' you do well." Indeed, they would have done well and set an earlier and smoother path for tolerance in the West, instead it all became a struggle to establish God's teaching that humanity should treat each other with Godly love.

It can be systematically argued that since these Christians who faced persecution for being different and believing differently from the church in power, they would be more tolerant of those who are different from them. However, history demonstrated something different. Many of the first settlers within America had a Christian foundation. On a large scale, Christianity set the foundation for tolerance, especially tolerance of how people choose to live their lives. However, many first settlers saw the Native Americans as pagans deserving of death. Knowing that Christianity promotes tolerance, it is best to associate these behaviors of the early settlers as ignorant to Christian truth or having a motive for social and political power.

One foundational idea contributing to a society's social and political motives that bring forth intolerance was an ideology embedded in chosen versus not chosen, pure versus impure, or superior versus inferior. In all cases, the oppressor put on the hats of the chosen, the pure, and the superior. When looking deeply in the battle between the early settlers and the Native Americans,

John Corrigan and Lynn S. Neal analyze that,

English settlers in the Chesapeake found themselves, like New Englanders, periodically in conflict with Native Americans. The colonial enterprise in the Chesapeake differed from that of New England, however, in that the people who settled Jamestown, and their Virginia Company overseers in England, were not infused with zeal born of a sense of religious destiny. The prospect of commercial profit weighed more heavily than religion in their calculation of reasons to carry forward the colonial enterprise.⁵²

According to what Corrigan and Neal highlight, intolerance can be born through a society's desire to have political and social strengths. In the West, this form of intolerance also took place between those of European descent and African descendants. Besides, many Africans who found themselves in the New World in 1600s upwards, came there through the horror of slavery. In this time, the oppressor creates a wedge between themselves and those of African descendants on the ideology of superiority and inferiority. With this belief, Whites who had the mind of being superior, exercised their beliefs and developed intolerance beliefs towards Africans because of the labeling that they were inferior. This social bias contributes a lot to political and social motives that create wealth for the oppressor. Corrigan and Neal emphasize that profit became a foundational motivation behind the early settlers towards the Native Americans, which can be also said about their treatment of Africans.

Although social biases through social and political motives fuel many of the West's intolerance actions, some have a lot to do with ideologies and nothing to with wealth and profit. One of these actions is between the Jews and Nazi-Germany. The manifestation of what took place in Germany, which led to the Second World War, was embedded in the German's intolerance of the Jews. At the time, it can be said that Germany had political and social motives; therefore, they drove forward to invade other countries such as France. However, the killing of

⁵² John Corrigan, and Lynn S. Neal, *Religious Intolerance in America a Documentary History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 22.

Jewish men, women, and children was fueled by their intolerance for the people as a whole and nothing about them gaining profit and wealth in killing these individuals. The Nazi-German's intolerance came to the level of hatred; history shows that practiced intolerance leads to pain, horror, and blood-shedding. Therefore, to avoid such a sinister manifestation of history, the West must be successful in retraining the center of their existence and embracing a form of democracy that involves tolerance.

Post-Modernism, Secularism, and Today's Intolerance

Despite the progress the West made to become a tolerant society, as history goes by, people become too comfortable and slowly forget the horrors of intolerance and how much pain it brought to the West. The West's major success as a social and political power is embedded in freedom, free speech, and the freedom to express themselves according to their values and beliefs. The West's post-modern era continued to enjoy the foundation of tolerance the societies grew upon; however, how long this enjoyment can continue is the question.

Questioning the level of intolerance the West is experiencing today, has its roots in many different sectors. Before the impact of slavery on the West, Christian teachings show that the entire world is subjected to chaos, because of the failure of Adam. Amid humankind being separated from the Lord, wickedness became rampant within the world. The West's history in being the world super-power and some of their actions such as slavery come back and haunt the new civilization of society; however, it cannot and will never define the true existence of the West today. The next sector is the race to remain a superpower, which creates enemies on all sides. Another area that contributes to an enormous uproar with the new form of intolerance coming to the surface of the West, comes from the people's new approach to life, beliefs, and values. This new way of living and approaching life is contributed to secularism.

As the West grew and became influential, some underlying principles have contributed to

societies having such a high level of spiritual festivity. These principles include the belief in a Superior Power (Creator), treating one's neighbor as oneself, embracing one's neighbor's right to freedom, life, and pursuit of happiness. Faith, especially that of the Christian belief, has been embedded in the cultural development and empowerment of the West for centuries. It has been embedded to such a level that every country outside the West looks at societies such as America as a Christian nation. The freedom that encourages the people of the West to pursue happiness as they see fit challenges the foundational principle of the West, which involves faith and Christianity. This opens the doors for people to become more secular in their everyday lives and for citizens in the West to forget and undermine history.

In the 1980s, when secularism began to rise on the surface of Western societies, especially that of America, prominent Christian men such as Jerry Falwell and other religious men called out for action, debating that “‘secular humanists’ (is where) hell bent on destroying the spiritual, political, and civil liberties of god-fearing citizens.”⁵³ Looking at the condition of the states today, one might be tempted to add to the statement that it helps to destroy god-fearing nations as well. History teaches a valuable lesson, and it is that people who forget the past, risk making the same mistake of the past. When analyzing the concept of secularism, a few scholars “‘explored the links between Western modernity and the decline of traditional religion.”⁵⁴ Secularism is mainly attributed to declining faith or the belief in Western modernity, which includes the nuclear family (dad, mom, and children), freedom principles, democratic values, believing and empowering oneself, and hard work. More certainly, for the many discussions that argue the West's decline, when dealing with the question about secularism and what it entails,

⁵³ Mark Edwards, "Can Christianity Save Civilisation?: Liberal Protestant Anti-Secularism in Interwar America," *Journal of Religious History* 39, no. 1 (2015): 51.

⁵⁴ Fenella Cannell, "The Anthropology of Secularism," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39 (2010): 86.

the rejection of religious values and beliefs that helped structure the West are always on the table. According to the Pew Research Center survey in 2019, Christianity has been declining in the States at a rapid pace;⁵⁵ also, Pew Research exclaims that many in the West continue to identify themselves as non-religious or no-religion.

Regarding the connection between secularism in the West and religion (Christianity being the prominent religion of the West), many scholars will argue that the speculations come from White Christian men who are bigots and refuse to mature with the progressive development of the West. This argument may have some validity, but it is naïve about the entire matter facing the West. As secularism rises and faith within the West declines, the West faces increasing intolerance acts such as censoring free speech, freedom on the expression of ones' beliefs, and declining religious freedom, especially that of Christianity. This increased intolerance in the West can replay the wickedness of Nazi-Germany if the West is not careful.

Values Connection to Intolerance

When evaluating the fuel that blazes intolerance, Goodman pinpoints that “Tolerance rests on respect for human dignity, so it precludes promoting values.”⁵⁶ This questions whether values can be separated from human dignity, but shouldn't the two walk hand in hand? One way to analyze the matter is to look at the West value of freedom of expression; doesn't it promote human dignity? If yes, then can the two be truly separated. Another way to examine the two is to question whether people without values can uphold human dignity? The counterargument, which is in line with Goodman's writing, is that values can be an opposition to one's choice of their

⁵⁵ Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/#:~:text=Self-described%20atheists%20now%20account%20for%204%25%20of%20U.S.,%E2%80%9Cnothing%20in%20particular%2C%E2%80%9D%20up%20from%2012%25%20in%202009.>

⁵⁶ Goodman, *Religious Pluralism and Values*, 21.

way of life, which can become a hindrance to human dignity. However, it questions that values challenge respecting human dignity. In contrast to Goodman's argument, it calls for values and beliefs for human dignity to be respected.

When the West was embedded in values and beliefs, people upheld human dignity to ensure that their fellow citizens were treated fairly. They have the right to express themselves without any harsh judgment, such as being killed for having same-sex affections or performing abortions. The West's values, which were in line with life, freedom, and pursuit of happiness, paved the road for them to introduce actions such as fair treatment of Africans living in America, Native Americans, women, and lifestyle choices. These all promote human dignity.

Another aspect of the values that promote human dignity is free speech. When the West was going through the enlightenment period, there was a major fight for free speech. Leaders then, many associated with the church at the time, feared free speech and established ways to put away those who spoke against them. French Enlightenment writer, known as a historian and philosopher François-Marie Arouet, otherwise referred to as Voltaire, is famous for his quote, "I do not agree with what you say, but I will defend to the death for your right to say."⁵⁷ Men like Voltaire shows that a part of West values includes human dignity, upholding the right of one's neighbor to have freedom of speech.

As the West currently battles with upholding tolerance, one can suggest that when the Western societies had affirmed belief system values, especially those of religious values, tolerance gained ground in which it helped promote the West to the World. As secularism increased and Western citizens continued to decline in values, which had foundational standing in Western success, intolerance began to be a success. These intolerances create extremist

⁵⁷ Virginia Ngendo, <https://www.legit.ng/1276893-famous-voltaire-quotes-love-religion-government-more.html>

actions that are now questioning if the West is moving backward towards the ruthlessness it had in the past. It is hard not to see that values have been a part of the West commodities that paved the road to gold, promoting tolerance.

When analyzing values, intolerance, and emotional intelligence (focuses on the perception and expression of emotion accurately and adaptively), what it shows today in the West, when people with solid values or beliefs develop emotions that affect their ability to focus on perceptions accurately and adaptively—it leads to intolerance. This can be said for those who have conservative or liberal beliefs. Both sides are creating more and more barriers, leading the West into a trap that history shows can be very bitter, especially towards human dignity. Gibson, in his article, highlights researchers' findings that,

Intolerance has long been associated with psychological insecurity and the perception of threat (e.g., Gibson, 2006; Sullivan, Piereson, & Marcus, 1982). A particularly interesting—and fairly recent—extension to this classic model is to investigate individuals' emotional reactions to threatening and disliked groups (e.g., Haas & Cunningham, 2014; Halperin et al., 2009; Kuklinski et al., 1991; Marcus et al., 2005; Marcus et al., 1995; Skitka et al., 2004). Indeed, emotions have been shown to play a particularly important role when individuals engage in intergroup evaluations (Mackie et al., 2000), as is most certainly the case for the decision about whether to “put up with” one's political enemies.⁵⁸

From researchers, Gibson's highlighted indications show that emotional intelligence has a lot to do with one putting up with his opponents. This continues to display on a large scale for those living in the West in these times, where the problem became a significant increase during Trump's presidency and the havoc of the Covid-19 pandemic. Since 2016 in the West, everything about freedom, values, and religious values began to be at stake. More Americans began to call on their fellow citizens to be beheaded, canceled, lose their jobs, and even banned from performing in public places such as a university. These incidents have become so popular

⁵⁸ Gibson, "Deplorables: Emotions, Political," 253.

that it creates three open doors. They are staying quiet and not disclosing your religious and political values, risking one's livelihood, exercising one's right to freedom of speech, and praying that the situation does not get too bad that it replicates Nazi-Germany. The type of intolerance that the West began to face has created chaos in the citizens' lives, the country, and even family settings. Many family members find it hard to sit at the table and have a decent conversation about their beliefs and life choices. This level of intolerance was once a part of the West, it was not beneficial, and now one wonders why people would want to repeat history.

Political Liberalism, Multiculturalism, and Intolerance

Even after the terrors of 9/11, America had tolerance for those who were different from them. Many from across the world boarded planes, ships, and even walked towards the borders of America to experience the life of freedom and prosperity. The last thing these migrants had in mind was being treated ruthlessly because of their diversity. However, as the era of the 2000s began to uprise and with the terror attacks on America and the "West Values," it opened a new door for intolerance. Diversity has always become a challenge for the West; this diversity led to battles between ethnicities and contributed to Native Americans, Africans, and Jews in Germany. However, history shows that the West had successfully overcome its challenges that contributed to intolerance for others and created a new form of progress, a West tolerant of all people.

One of the greatest successes of the West is to establish nations that uphold freedom which includes speech, religion, and culture. As America grew, it understood that people would do well if they could adopt the West values, as they hold on to their religious beliefs and cultural ways of life. This form of freedom and practices of the West can be a little contradicting and raise questions regarding the success of having a multicultural society.

One belief and desire of any people living in a nation is that their country and way of life

will remain forever. People are very close to their culture; therefore, they cherish it, and no one would like their way of life to become extinct. History shows that this desire is not always promising, and at times it is not possible, looking at the ruling nations of Rome, Babylon, and even the USSR, if one should look not too far within history. Nations do come and go, and at times in the process, even the people of those nations are extinct; one example is the Taino Indians who once lived on Jamaica's island. Understanding this history, the West tries its best to preserve some of its values, which make it a great and tolerant society. However, as post-modernism rises, people, even Western citizens, begin to believe in an ideology that the world will be better if all cultures and beliefs can live together and be one. This ideology has become known as multiculturalism.

In the West, multiculturalism that undermines a country's cultural values and promotes every culture living within the country already shows that it is on the road to a disaster. The citizens of the West are concerned about losing their cultural values and principles. This is not an unreasonable concern, but sadly, many ignorantly dismiss the interest and label these citizens as intolerant. Multiculturalism can be a beautiful thing; however, it must promote every culture and uphold the country's cultural beliefs as well. When analyzing multiculturalism, especially in school settings and how it tries to undermine the cultural practices of the West, Linda C. Raeder demonstrates that “The goals of contemporary Multiculturalism, however, are entirely different. Multicultural education furthers a purpose quite unlike that of traditional cultural studies—a social and political purpose that involves, indirectly if not directly, the transformation, indeed the transmogrification, of Western civilization.”⁵⁹ Within the analysis of Raeder, she highlights a few touching interests; however, before going deep, it would be excellent to highlight the

⁵⁹ Linda C. Raeder, "Postmodernism, Multiculturalism, and the Death of Tolerance: The Transformation of American Society," *Humanitas* 30, no. 1 (2017): 69.

differences between traditional cultural studies and contemporary multiculturalism. Traditional cultural studies have always been a part of the West; the West has a value in tolerating other cultures. It opens its borders for people to come and be a part of the West and allows open discussions on comfortably accommodating migrants. Indeed, this was the value of the West, which upheld tolerance and helped with the peaceful flow of the citizens. The West has been practicing traditional cultural studies for centuries.

When looking at contemporary multiculturalism, it is questioning, creates a lot of barriers within the West, and opens the door for intolerance. However, before diving deeply into contemporary multiculturalism, consider that the West approach to have a society that is tolerant of all cultural values as long as it is not violating one's neighbor or degrading women and young girls, has always been too slack; therefore, it creates a challenge for Western cultures as they grow. One splendid example is that the West soars on the values that women have rights and are free to live as they like. However, many Middle Eastern cultures differ from the West and do not give women the same rights as Western civilization. With this, there is an open discussion about how much of one's culture the West can tolerate and how much one can let go of his cultural beliefs to live a comfortable life in the West. Contemporary multiculturalism does not answer these questions; rather, it seeks to create a society where people with all cultures and beliefs can live together without honestly analyzing cultural differences. These differences frequently contradict each other; therefore, it creates barriers that lead to intolerance. It also calls on people to forcefully eliminate a part of their cultural beliefs and practices. Since people are being forced, it seems like a violation of their rights; it makes them feel cheated and uprise fire within them to fight against any breaches of their values and beliefs.

When it comes down to contemporary multiculturalism, it fails to answer how much

should one “do as the Romans do?” When America opened its borders to take in many people from Europe in the 1930s, many of the men and women who migrated came here and respected the nation's culture. They saw it fit to adapt to the way of life and practices with an aim to learn the language. These people also knew that they had the right to keep their values and cultural belief, for they had the freedom to do so. They just were not allowed to mistreat their neighbors. America was not perfect; it had problems tolerating its own people, who were Native Americans and Americans of African descent. However, the society flourished to a level in which the core principle value and nature of the nation made it stand tall. In so, it does not matter where one migrated from, he is expected to behave at a level that is in line with the West’s cultural standards. All this was possible because America’s principle of tolerance, embedded within the society. Raeder, in the article, argues that “Contemporary multiculturalism is a popularized offshoot of postmodernist thought. Both constructs embrace radical relativism, perspectivism, and a denial of universal Truth that transcends particular historical experience.”⁶⁰ Today, there are two things contemporary multiculturalism does: forget history and deny truths.

In 2015, Europe (France) had a major outburst with its Muslim population about what is freedom of expression. In the battle, a Muslim student killed a French professor (Samuel Paty) because he believed the professor blasphemed against the Islamic prophet Muhammed. France also suffered an attack that killed over a hundred citizens in the disruption. When analyzing the incidents, Basheer Ahmed from the IslamiCity Organizations discusses that,

The French and Muslim cultures have different interpretations of freedom of expression. Muslims consider the humiliation of the prophet of Islam as a personnel humiliation of everything they hold sacred. Whereas, for the French, freedom of expression supersedes the sanctity of religious beliefs. French secularists believe that religion is an expression of ideas, and just like any philosophical idea, it should be open to criticism. It is only recently that such criticism has been applied to Islam. In response to the French public’s

⁶⁰ Raeder, "Postmodernism, Multiculturalism, and the Death of Tolerance," 70.

hostility towards Muslims and Mr. Macron's statement that 'Islam is in crisis.'⁶¹

Ahmed continued the discussion and highlighted how the French President's statement ignited the fuel between the Muslim community and the French community. Other Muslim leaders such as the Turkey government and the Pakistan government called to suspend any relationship with France. Ahmed points out that the battle on both sides must have led to some generated anger between the citizens and that "these statements made by leaders did not show the use of emotional intelligence where it is necessary to channel anger and hatred and express emotions to help resolve this serious conflict and work towards solving the problems."⁶² Ahmed also writes that "Mr. Macron could have played the role of a statesman by using emotional intelligence and initiating a dialogue with Muslim leaders to calm down their fears and issuing a joint statement that would have a positive effect and perhaps lead to peace and harmony among all people of France."⁶³

Ahmed's approach to the situation is excellent and open for discussions. Besides, one of his opening statements before diving into the issue was that "In western secular societies, an individual has a right to ridicule religion or revered religious figures. There is little sensitivity and wisdom, knowing that such freedom of expression creates incitement to hatred and group defamation."⁶⁴ Looking at all the points Ahmed made, the only discussion he failed to highlight was what Muslims should change to comfortably adjust to the West's way of life. In the earlier section of the article, Ahmed teaches that the actions of the Muslims who kill in the name of

⁶¹ Basheer Ahmed, "Freedom of Expression and Blasphemy Laws." <https://www.islamicity.org/79966/freedom-of-expression-and-blasphemy-laws/>

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

blaspheme were not in line with the teachings of the Quran. However, he believes that the West President should have used a form of emotional intelligence to de-escalate the tensions between the French and the Muslims. Still, Ahmed's indication about emotional intelligence is troubling if, indeed, the Quran does not call Muslims to kill blasphemers. If the Quran does not teach about the killing of blasphemers and Muslims going around in countries that are not dominantly Islamic, killing its citizens because of their right to exercise their freedom of speech, then wouldn't Mr. Macron's statement that "Islam is in crisis" a valid point?

Within the discussion, Ahmed highlights some valid points that many Muslims who are scholars and understand the Quran are calling on Islamic nations to abandon their law which kills blasphemers. However, what needs to be addressed is how Muslims and the West can meet each other in the middle for the West to continue flourishing in its values and beliefs that promote tolerance. The West values include the freedom of expression; however, in his article, Ahmed writes that what freedom of expression means in the West is totally different from what it means in the Muslim nations. If this is the case, what should be the idealistic approach to the matter? Many argue that when their family migrated to the West, they would put away some of their cultural practices (especially those that contradict the beliefs of the West) and adapt to the Western way of life. In so, they would be "doing what the Romans do." However, contemporary multiculturalism in the West calls for Western societies to review their beliefs and see what they can change or should change to accommodate other cultures. On paper, it reads well and sounds good, but, it creates problems. Ahmed, in the article, also highlights a form of contemporary multiculturalism, writing that, "In multicultural societies – cultural sensitivity ethnic and political awareness is a must for maintaining a harmonious relationship among all members of the

society.”⁶⁵ Contemporary multiculturalism trying to undermine every culture is one of the most significant failures of post-modernism. It also breeds intolerance by eliminating the Western value of *putting up with*, even if you disagree. Ahmed’s discussion that it is only recently Western beliefs began to criticize religions (especially that of Islam) is a firm example of Raeder’s point that contemporary multiculturalism tends to overlook history. If Ahmed looked deeply into Western accounts, he would see that it didn’t matter when religion was always on the debating table, even Christianity. In this post-modernism time, the Western cultural ideologies such as contemporary multiculturalism are helping to destroy the West, especially by undermining the tolerance it has been able to create to be an excellent society for people worldwide.

Intolerance Effects in Chaplaincy

In the West, professions such as chaplaincy benefit from the traditional definition of tolerance, which is to *put up with*. In these values, chaplains can meet with people in the West despite their beliefs. Chaplains are called on especially in times of need, and they do their jobs with understanding, emotional intelligence, and cultural freedom. In the post-modernism concept of contemporary multiculturalism, the profession of chaplaincy comes close to fulfilling the ideology, in that the chaplain exercises sensitivity in approaching individuals through their culture. It is essential to show that other careers such as professional counseling (those who are required to be licensed) apply this intelligence as well. However, chaplaincy overall is a profession in which those who practice have an understanding and a graduate education which emphasizes the need to meet people where they are, and for the chaplains to help the art of emotional and cultural intelligence is not done through force; rather, it is done through the

⁶⁵ Basheer Ahmed, “Freedom of Expression and Blasphemy Laws.”
<https://www.islamicity.org/79966/freedom-of-expression-and-blasphemy-laws/>

chaplains free will of wanting to help their neighbors.

Nevertheless, the post-modernism ideology of contemporary multiculturalism fails the work of chaplaincy because it undermines the field by erasing tolerance. It calls on chaplains to compromise their beliefs to meet the individuals they serve somewhere in the middle, while not asking for the individual to give up anything in return. All this is being done by force and not through respect. Chaplains cannot be effective in their jobs outside of tolerance.

Post-modernism challenges many ways in which the West analyzes values and beliefs. One of the ways it goes about this is through experiments. Matthew D. Frierdich, in an analytical article, writes, “In the introduction to *The Affordable Care Act as a National Experiment*, Harry Selker and June Wasser insist that health policy researchers ought to embrace the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) through the narrative of experiment.”⁶⁶ The ACA is one of the biggest experiments in post-modern America. It introduces languages and ideologies that challenge how the West generally functions. With these abrupt changes in the health care system through the ACA, other scholars identify the challenge for chaplains, especially those who work in healthcare settings. According to these scholars, the ACA promotes the value of “spirituality,” which is not bad for the West since it is built on tolerance towards individual rights, and “spirituality” moves religious values and beliefs outside the hand of traditional religious practices and into the hands of the individual. This form of practice is valid in the context of the Western civilization belief. However, it challenges the chaplain’s “value” in the healthcare system since other professions such as doctors, psychiatrists, and social workers are already accounted with promoting the spirituality of the patients. However, one thing it shows in the ACA is that it undermines the values of traditional religious practices. Therefore, it

⁶⁶ Frierdich, Matthew D. "The Affordable Care Act and Hospital Chaplaincy: Re-Visioning Spiritual Care, Re-Valuing Institutional Wholeness." *Journal of Health Care Chaplaincy* 21, no. 3 (2015): 108.

creates barriers for all practicing religious institutions and those on behalf of the institutions. This is not a form of Western tolerance and opens doors towards significant uproar within the West, and for professions, the West promotes and elevates through the state of tolerance it preaches.

The West route to tolerance has been processed for a long time now. Its trials and errors help build the West for it to become a tolerant society as it appears today. What the West fought to have today should be seen as precious; therefore, each citizen who enjoys the benefit of the West's values should ensure that it remains and becomes a better place for generations to come.

CHAPTER FIVE

IS TOLERANCE IN THE WEST ON LIFE SUPPORT?

As post-modernism rises and presents useful discussions with a different way of viewing life at the table, the West societies' history on tolerance continues to be challenged. Today, this is manifested in the value of freedom of speech, expression, and religious practices. Post-modernism challenges tolerance, which the West has been able to establish through centuries of hard work. Today, it is questioning if Western tolerance practice is on life support. If the West fails to address the issues, it will become a different world one century from today. In this new world, one is afraid that it will be operated by total control and not uphold the West's belief in freedom.

It is essential to highlight that the post-modernism approach for the society to be "accepting" and for the citizens to practice emotional and cultural intelligence, while upholding multiculturalism, is not a negative issue for the West since it is birthed out of great philosophers putting their ideas out on the table providing open discussions. However, post-modernism fails to keep up with one part of the bargain that the West has had for centuries when having open discussions. It is the part in which the opponent and opposite viewpoints get a place to be at the table. The post-modernism approach is very un-Western. In so, it contributes a lot to intolerance. Indeed, this is troubling, primarily since post-modernism genuinely seeks to improve the quality of life and to make it possible for people to live together without any wars and conflicts.

When analyzing multiculturalism in the contemporary form, Raeder discusses how much it undermines truth and history. One way in which this is being manifested is that post-modernism seeks for all man to live together in peace and harmony, but one truth is that no society in the past has been able to achieve this. Therefore, the West has accomplished a form of

tolerance in which the citizens are trained to respect each other. Other societies apart from the West can establish some form of methods for the citizens to get along and avoid wars. For instance, China has the Communist Party in which the people exercise the rights to authority, and the Middle East have what one could refer to as a traditional religious practice society wherein the Quran guides the country, and the citizens are called on to obey the rulings of its teachings. For peace to exist in China, the citizens are expected to trust the ruling of the Communist Party. If they choose to live there, it is best to accommodate such ruling. It will be the same if someone decides to live in the Middle East. Even though these countries have some form of peace, it is accomplished through the population adhering to one ideology. A post-modernism experiment of all cultures coming together and living in harmony, through acceptance of each other's way of life has never been done before. The Roman Empire could not show how this ideology could be sustained. Nonetheless, one thing history continues to show is that human differences continue to create challenges for people to live together in peace. So far, only the West has significant success in bringing people from all cultures to live together without experiencing tremendous crises. If post-modernism seeks to include more truth, they will accept history and agree that having a society with people from all cultures, practices, and beliefs, will never be accomplished and cannot be achieved without asking the people to put away some of their values and principles.

One way to illustrate the default in post-modernism is that its only target is the Western world. A reason for this may be that post-modernism already knows that countries outside of the West practice little to no tolerance; therefore, it is impossible for them to work upon a society in which there is overall no acceptance of other cultures and values. One may believe that post-modernism is seeking to make the West a better place, but in a way, it destroys

the West values and is threatening. If the experiment does not work then it is a risk, taking the West backward into an intolerant society where wars can rise to the surface. The West cannot afford this to happen, for it will destroy and undermine centuries of pain, blood, and sorrows, which the West endured while becoming what it is today.

Tolerance Threats Within the Public Sectors

Since post-modernism dismisses its opponent even before they can speak, it becomes a significant strain on tolerance in the West public sectors such as schools, churches, and politics. This creates extreme ideologies which produce far-left and far-right citizens, and these individuals do not reflect the true beliefs and values of the West. In this uprising and change, political tolerance becomes a battle in the West, making it difficult for citizens to exercise their freedom of speech and expression.

As the post-modernism era began and secularism rose, people in the West started to criticize the government and the public sector regarding how much religion, especially Christianity, should be allowed. The people began to feel as if religion was having too much influence on their lives and the society was not free enough to live according to their pursuit of happiness. Erwin Chemerinsky, one of America's scholars who is passionate about the separation of the church and the state expresses that,

In 1947, when the Supreme Court first considered the issue of government aid to religion, it echoed the words of Thomas Jefferson and declared that '[t]he First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable.' The Court thus developed Establishment Clause doctrines that limited religion's presence in government—such as in forbidding prayers in public schools—and government's presence in religion—such as in limiting aid to parochial schools. I deeply believe that our government must be secular and that the presence of sectarian religious symbols on government property is incompatible with the Establishment Clause.⁶⁷

Chemerinsky's point on the issue is valid. Since the country had a foundation in which its

⁶⁷ Erwin Chemerinsky, "Why Separate Church and State?" *Oregon Law Review* 85, no. 2 (2006): 351.

founding leaders strived to separate the church from the state, it should be upheld. However, the same Amendment Chemerinsky highlights where Jefferson's point is taken, it is the same Amendment that gives American's freedom to express themselves. This could be if the person is liberal, conservative, Christian, Muslim, and spiritual. Every American has the right to freely express themselves about their beliefs and how they would desire the government to operate.

One of the problems with embracing a secular society and having a secular government is that it becomes a challenge for the people and the government to distinguish how the country should operate. Over the years, America established a freedom identity, which helped determine what the country and people stand for. Within this identity, people had the option to call out, accept, and reject whatever they believed did or did not represent the country's foundations. Today's attack on freedom of speech is questionable—do Americans want a society that truly separates church from state and upholds freedom of speech, or do they want an America that is free from religion and all expression that is not in line with the “so-called majority?” At this point, the West must be dire about the destination it desires to travel; the wrong turn can repeat history.

Erwin Chemerinsky and the law scholars who fought for the country to uphold its roots with church and state separation were on the correct route. However, when they were successful, such as taking out religion from school, etc., the primary failure was that they did not replace those moral teachings with something. Secularism cannot build a country; it is an ideology and needs to be challenged just like any other, according to the way of life in the West. Taking religion out of the public is one thing but failing to understand and know how the West became a fine dynasty is another significant risk. Over time many in the West grow up and do not understand the importance of the country's foundation and are not challenged enough to be firm

in debating the principles of the land. Some also are not aware of the country's history, failures, and success. One reason contributing to this failure is not just because the country is separating the state and church, but also because secularism hinges on leaving people to live the life they desire and there isn't any common ground. Finding this common ground has become the battle for the West and the direction it wants to travel.

The Battles in the Classroom

As shown, one of the greatest successes in upholding the country's foundation in separating the church from the state, religious ideas, practices, and principles, was taking them out of the classroom. One of the firm arguments for this is that "the government would be deemed to violate the Establishment Clause only if it literally creates a church, favors one religion over others, or coerces religious participation."⁶⁸ On the subject matter, such a statement cannot be undermined. But looking deeper into the matter, a few questions need to be answered. First, if post-modernism sees religious practices and teachings in the classroom as a violation of the Establishment Clause, then what other ideology and practices in the public sector would violate the clause? This requires much debating and voting from the citizens.

Many of the first schools' establishments in America came to fruition by training men to be good theological thinkers (Harvard University is one of these schools). While keeping this in mind, it shows that the foundational leaders, although they set up the separation of church and state in the country's principle, were not afraid to have them in schools. One of the reasons for this is that they cling to the founding principle of freedom of expression and beliefs in the life of each citizen. When a West citizen expresses his belief in a religion or not, he is exercising his right to be free. The post-modernism activist's movement should have never been to silent

⁶⁸ Chemerinsky, "Why Separate Church and State?" 354.

religious practices and beliefs within the country, but rather to enable the citizens to exercise their right to choose or not. One of the most significant battles in today's classroom is that one set of citizens wants certain ideologies to be taught in the school, while another group desires something else. However, the true principle of the country is for every belief to be expressed and challenged in the open. The West has been built on the principle that thinkers come to the table and argue their points, many of these discussions take place in Congress, but the beginning place has always been the classroom.

Ideologies should not be afraid of the classroom; better yet, the classroom should not fear ideologies, for they are the foundation of the West. If post-modernism aimed to have schools where students could freely express themselves and challenge ideas instead of shutting down some ideas and embracing others, then the West would not be in such a battle over freedom of speech and expression. Freedom of speech and expression includes listening and giving every belief a chance to express itself in the classroom. When the post-modernism movement on separating church and state started, the mistake was that they eliminated ideologies and embraced feelings. If activists such as Chemerinsky felt that religion (Christianity) should not be freely practiced and expressed in the public sector, then if they were honest, no ideology or belief should be freely taught in the public sector, according to how they utilized the Establishment Clause. If this had been the case, the West's freedom values, beliefs, and principles would have been destroyed. Obviously, they understood this; however, their calling to ban some freedom of expression and leave others makes them biased and creates conflicts within Western societies.

Chemerinsky had a strong belief that everything in the public sector should be secular; one of the movements of secularism is contemporary multiculturalism. If this is a heart truth movement, wouldn't it be better for men and women like Chemerinsky to call for the free

manifestation of all ideologies, beliefs, and religions to be represented in the public sector? If this were the case, then one set of Americans would not feel that their freedom to express and speak is violated. The answer to keeping up the Establishment Clause was never to silence any expression; instead, it should have been a call for all expression to be freely expressed in the public sectors and the schools. Public schools should have a segment in which the students can express their beliefs freely; this would have opened the door for students to learn about other practices, question them, and have debates like the men who found the West.

Since post-modernism exercises impatience with religions and religious ideologies, it opened the door for these institutions to have private structures of their own. These private structures can be exclusive to one ideology, promoting only their beliefs. This creates more barriers in society, making it unbearable for the citizens to express their freedoms and rights, have a solid foundation about the West principles, and develop their capability to continue to argue in favor of the West. For Western civilization, the classroom is an essential structure for the growth of each generation. The West has been using education for centuries to build strong men and women who uphold Western values. Today, many of the battles are fighting against the West and rejecting the Establishment Clause and other Western principles, it shows that there is a fight in the Western classrooms and it must be addressed swiftly for the West to continue to thrive.

In research that analyzes the impact political tolerance and openness have on students, especially those at the university level, author Zehorit Dadon-Golan and colleagues shows that one of the findings was that “the degree of political tolerance decreased very slightly from the

first year to the final year of study.”⁶⁹ Dadon-Golan, in the section of the research which analyzes political tolerance and higher education, discusses that,

Coenders and Scheepers (2003) have argued that universities provide environments that contribute to the reduction of ethnic prejudice by disseminating knowledge and information, empowering cognitive capacities, and introducing universal values and norms. In contributing to the shaping of political attitudes, the university experience would lead to a more open-minded, tolerant stance in relation to the socio-political views of others.⁷⁰

Coenders and Scheepers’ argument is not invalid. Indeed, the university would be where students get in contact with diverse groups and should be mature enough to be tolerant, open to ideas, and critical thinkers. However, Dadon-Golan’s findings that the student became less tolerant after their final year in college opens questions to what is happening in the schools.

One of the points Dadon-Golan and colleagues argue is that “the statistical relationship between higher educational attainment and political tolerance may reflect rather the effect of workplace connections, family, social networks or just maturation and life-experience, rather than the university experience, as such.”⁷¹ Their point is in tune with other critical thinkers on the matter, in which it is a well-known fact that outside influences, even the media, helps to structure one’s life. However, one thing the debaters left out is that if the schools starting from the elementary level is not creating a space in which the students can express their beliefs freely, and learn from each other without feeling offense, then it will be hard for the children in the university to be maturely open to differences. Indeed, Dadon-Golan and colleagues point out that the students became less political tolerant at their final year in college is mind-blowing; however,

⁶⁹ Zehorit Dadon-Golan, "Does University Attendance Impact Students' Political Tolerance and Open-Mindedness: The Atypical Case of Israel?" *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* 13, no. 4 (2021): 1144.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 1137.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 1138.

the findings show that the Western world needs to find ways to help future generations adapt to the principles of the West and to be open-minded and mature towards debates and other ideologies different from what they agree with. The Founding Fathers had many disagreements on how the new country should be. Still, they knew that not listening to their opponents or taking the time out to develop tolerance would jeopardize their freedom, leading them back to the British or creating a system that reflects England—this they could not afford.

Looking at Dadon-Golan and colleagues' findings, one point to be analyzed is if graduate-level students become less tolerant to specific issues, then when they become career professionals, especially in politics or in schools, they will have a significant effect on the destiny of Western societies. In the West, substantial efforts, money, and energy are directed to educate the citizens. The push to make education a major part of the West increases the individual's chances of obtaining a promising career, a comfortable life, and a strong foundation in Western principles and critical thinking. Having experiences with illiteracy and intolerance, the West knew how much it contributed to wars in their societies; however, moving forward, it successfully developed its people through proper schooling.

Today, the West must uphold its practice in using the schools as an institute to help the citizens develop critical thinking, develop tolerance, and understand the foundation of the West principles. The schools should not be an institution for fear. In that, it should not only be used to develop one kind of ideology, but rather to expose young minds to different beliefs and lead them to a mature level to understand what is in favor of the West and what will help them make the West continue to grow as a tolerant society, which protects individuals' rights to freedom.

Tolerance in a Progressive West

When the progressive era started in the states, it is said that the movement “aimed to reorder urban space toward both the changing needs of capital and the social reproduction of labor.”⁷² One thing that is essential to the progressive movement is that it fights to highlight social injustices in society and tries to implement mannerisms that will uphold human dignity. One of the biggest accomplishments that came through this movement was better working conditions for the West citizens and the drive to remove children from the workforce. Many of the social causes the movement fights for are needed within the society, and it helps to make the West a more prosperous place and one that reflects its foundation.

When reflecting on President Wilson’s view of the progressive era, Samuel Stein writes,

Summarizing decades of Progressive political thought, he (Wilson) contextualized progress as a distinctly modern concept, because it looked toward the future rather than the past for solutions to social problems, and it privileged Darwinian strategies of adaptation over Newtonian laws of nature... Wilson admitted that “all progress depends on how fast you are going, and where you are going, and I fear there has been too much of this thing of knowing neither how fast we were going or where we were going.”⁷³

Wilson’s fear then is the same fear people who desire to hold up the West civilization have today. Progressives continue to be a fast movement that cannot show where they are going. Most dangerously, limited guidance and moral principles are a part of the movement. Progressives indeed have the heart to do good for human civilization; however, in the process it tends to disrupt the West civilization in such a manner that it causes uprisings in society, This causes society to wonder if the movement is here to continue to reflect the West or to make it a place that does not reflect the foundational principles for years to come.

⁷² Samuel Stein, "Progress for Whom, Toward what? Progressive Politics and New York City's Mandatory Inclusionary Housing," *Journal of Urban Affairs* 40, no. 6 (2018): 771.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 771.

The progressive movement is at such a speed that it blocks people from thinking critically and analyzing what will be the impact in the future. Since it is moving so fast and does not give people time to think, question, and find out the future impact, it creates room for intolerance due to confusion. Many today in the West do not disapprove of the social and political movement of the progressive; however, they are calling out for the movement to allow patience so that the West citizens can debate and continue to be open and tolerant, allowing time to position the countries in the direction that will continue to uphold foundational principles and success of the West.

Today's progressive movement does not allow time for critical thinking and honest, open discussions that exercise tolerance; therefore, the citizens are increasingly attracted to a more intolerant approach in the West's social and political life, which does not resonate with the foundation of the West. This intolerance that is on the rise in which freedom of speech and expression is being limited or banned (social media), contributes to more barriers in the West making it difficult for the West to know its direction.

Today, two popular uprisings caused by progressivism intolerance are “cancel culture” and “political correctness.” These problems make it difficult for the citizens of the West to effectively communicate and creates a hostile environment for them to solve conflicts easily. Such behaviors are a repetition of the West’s history and do not reflect the West's journey to be a free and prospering place for all.

When looking closely at political correctness (PC), it is a movement that gives people of one ideology the right to exercise their rights to freedom of speech and expression. It creates a blockage for anyone who disagrees with the ideas and wants to propose something different. Political correctness also is a mechanic to promote emotional intelligence, in which it creates a

space for one to express his beliefs but not honestly. If the West is not operating in honesty, then at one point it is going to break—dishonesty can only take a society so far. The people are obligated to know the truth about how their neighbors’ feel about issues, also about politicians and the “experts.” If the West citizens cannot be open about their beliefs and take the time to hear ideas and perspectives from others, then it is creating problems for the future of the West. Political correctness has a big desire—it is not to offend or be mindful of others who will be sensitive over the truth; in so, it creates a society in which lies can be the forerunner and lead Western citizens to become hostile towards each other.

When analyzing PC, Solveig Granath and Magnus Ullén indicate a few critical points that “PC very much affects public debate.”⁷⁴ Granath and Ullén also highlight that when some see PC as a political style, “others see it mainly as a tool for concealing the truth...a progression from honesty and clarity to dishonesty or a rhetorical device (a way of ‘stifling the ‘real’ debates’).”⁷⁵ Granath and Ullén also show that “much of the debate about PC is and has been about reforming language use, especially to avoid bias and to promote the use of more respectful language.”⁷⁶ Their analysis shows that PC is a tool that helps to alter the public conversation about taboo topics, including immigration, the West greatness, non-whites living in the West, gender, sexuality, etc. However, PC puts a chain on free speech and expressions in altering the discussions. One of the critical problems with PC is that it believes that it is a victory in society by changing public opinion and subjecting the people to be of one side or no side. However, what it does is that it creates barriers in the sense that when people are in public (work, school,

⁷⁴ Solveig Granath, “‘The Elevation of Sensitivity Over Truth’: Political Correctness and Related Phrases in the Time Magazine Corpus,” *Applied Linguistics* 40, no. 2 (2019, 2017): 266.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

etc.), they will adjust themselves to the public. Still, at home or in their circle, especially in the religious community, they are someone else. PC literally establishes a society with people who have more than one image, and one of these images is false—the citizens have it by force. Such a living will never reflect the proper foundation of the West, and if the West cannot be itself today, what it will become tomorrow is in danger.

One significant overview of PC is that it is a mechanical technique for bigots, fascists, those who are against women and sexual rights. In this same way, one can also say that PC is used by those against religion and religious morals. Therefore, they used it to force others, especially those affiliated with religious and strong moral beliefs, to be subject to one idea.

One example in which PC works is if group A believes that immigrants should be adequately examined before being allowed to live in the West. Group B believes that anyone should come without the proper evaluation. Then group B would, most of the time, accuse group A of being fascists. While there may be some individuals in group A who are indeed fascists, most of the group believes that proper evaluation of immigrants will help society be safer, protecting it from individuals who intend to hurt the people in the West. One form of PC in this scenario is that those who are fascist in group A can easily hide under the umbrella of desiring to protect the West citizens from outside danger, while in fact, they do not want individuals from certain places to be in their society. However, when group B accuses every member of group A of being fascist, without analyzing the concern and seeing if it is valid, then group B contributes to PC by creating fear in group A. This can lead to not being honest about how they would like the country to approach the issue and, in the future, affect their relationship with immigrants because they are unsure if the individuals would make productive citizens in the West.

When overviewing the scenario given above, Ronald S. Stade writes,

The term “political correctness” is now used to reinforce the idea that there is a deep divide between ordinary people and what is alleged to be a liberal elite. Fascists charge this “liberal elite” with policing language to prevent people from uttering inconvenient truths (Weigel 2016). The inconvenient truths contemporary fascists like to utter are that this or that ethnically defined group subverts the nation, eventually bringing about its downfall, and that “the elite” is complicit in this tragedy.⁷⁷

From Stadel's viewpoint, those who are being fascist in the subject matter are hiding their true objectives towards immigration as a whole and are blaming some individuals in society for promoting PC in rejecting a proper debate about the issue of immigration. However, critical thinking individuals who want to create an atmosphere of harmony and peace would first approach the matter in the context of what is good and what is not for the West, and not according to what they think about their opponents. PC has become a powerful tool for individuals of the West to accuse their opponents, instead of profoundly looking into the issues at hand and seeing what is best for people living in the West. These strategies are not helping the West continue to be a place of tolerance and are not promoting the West's values. PC needs to be addressed so that citizens in the West can comfortably investigate the issues at hand, share their honest opinions, and come to a compromise agreement that will promote harmony among the people.

When it comes to people being of degrading status in society, such as racist, fascist, etc., these are practical truths citizens should acknowledge because these individuals will always be a part of societies, even in the West. Trying to eliminate these individuals or protecting each other from citizens who have these tendencies is not possible and using a strategy like PC does more harm than good. When debating topics, people of the West must learn how to attract the ideas and not the viewer of the idea. Open discussions and debates are an art, and publicly referring to

⁷⁷ Ronald S. Stadel, "The Social Life of Fighting Words: The Case of Political Correctness," *Conflict and Society* 3, no. 1 (2017): 120.

opponents with derogatory names is a weakness that should not be celebrated. It does not help and it contributes to creating hostility, making the issue more polarizing. Moving forward, PC must be addressed early so that tolerance can continue to be one of the backbone principles of the West.

The Redefinition of Tolerance in the Millennial Era

Since political correctness (PC) has become such a significant part of the West and one of the major successes is to create problems in societies, another concept birthed is the phrase “acceptance.” Acceptance has become the rivalry of the West tolerance, and just like other progressive movements, no one knows where it is going in the future. In the progressive era with today’s millennials (especially those 35 years and under), there is an effort to make society more friendly and a “loving” place for humans. This motivated them to move away from tolerance (just putting up with each other) to coin the term “accepting” or “acceptance.”

As the millennial progressive era seeks to bring acceptance on the surface, there is a variable of discussions that come forward. These include the conclusion that tolerance and acceptance are the same and they can be used interchangeable; other belief that there are different forms of tolerance and acceptance would be the highest form (which will be the best approach to have a society without any violations of human rights). Finally, those who believe that tolerance and acceptance are different; therefore, for the society to co-exist tolerance should continue to be the model that set the stage.

When discussing acceptance in the context that it supersedes tolerance, those who favor this form of acceptance use many social issues to bring out their viewpoint. One of the points is that in a diverse society, it leaves the door open for people to be racist because it does not get them to evolve enough to “accept” people and cultures different from them. Using an example of

green and orange, those in the orange group may see themselves as tolerant since they put up with and respect the culture of those in group green. However, those in group green may feel as if they are not complete because group orange, instead of accepting them, is just putting up with them. Group green, in this context, is calling group orange to do more, evolve, and later learn to accept them as they are.

In observing the conflict between acceptance and tolerance from the scenario above, a few questions need to be answered. The first is what is the social definition of the concept of acceptance? The second is for co-existence to be possible, does it really need acceptance of others, their ways, and their choices. Since acceptance is such a new movement in the millennial progressive era, it is not yet developed to a point in which one can fully understand the meaning and see a demonstration of how it can be implemented in societies. Observation is required to know how it can do more than tolerance, which already reigns as the mutual way for citizens to live in harmony.

When discussing acceptance, people of different cultures, beliefs, or lifestyles would make statements such as, “I do not want to be tolerated, I want to be accepted.” So, group green people would be asking group orange not to put up with them but rather to accept them. However, the discussions become more complicated. Western societies have been able to develop a concrete definition of tolerance, which is *to put up with* or *show respect*, especially if you are against the culture or belief. However, when it comes to “acceptance,” there is not yet a given concrete definition; nevertheless, when those who are trying to promote acceptance present their points, they highlight the following:

Most LGBTQ Muslim organizers felt that the majority of non-hybrid groups neither accepted nor rejected them...It therefore appeared that, at least from their standpoint, some moderate or moderate-low accepting leaders tolerated queer and trans Muslims

rather than accepted them.⁷⁸

Society has become comfortable with tolerance as a scapegoat to avoid acceptance. It's this same principle that makes people uncomfortable with unpacking politically and racially charged conversations...The only way anyone can truly accept those around them, is if they actively work to observe others as more than the polished image they present to the world. Every individual is the summation of a lifetime of experience, so make the effort to learn about and know each person.⁷⁹

One thing both speakers of the subject matter had in common was that they failed to give a concrete definition of acceptance and demonstrate how it is different from tolerance. Because the millennial progressive era rejects tolerance, it seems as if they want others to do more than put *up with* their culture, life choices, and beliefs and instead “approve of it.” Acceptance sounds like a concept that asks others to agree with, no matter what. This new formed concept poses many problems within society and these problems create barriers between the citizens.

Illustrating Acceptance in Two Formulas

In this section there will be a demonstration of how acceptance was used by analyzing the cases of Golshan Golriz and Alejandro Ramirez. Starting with Alejandro Ramirez, his article highlights that as a student in school, whenever he reflected the Latino heritage, he did not receive an acceptance from his school peers. He was forced to adopt or behave like those reflected around him to feel accepted or tolerant. Ramirez's view brings forth many questions such as what should people do to make others feel accepted and what is the definition of feeling accepted? Also, is the feeling of accepting universal? Ramirez agrees that there was tolerance towards his different culture; however, he believes that tolerance is a scapegoat for people not to evolve to an accepting level.

⁷⁸ Golshan Golriz, "Does Religion Prevent LGBTQ Acceptance? A Case Study with Queer and Trans Muslims in Toronto, Canada," *Journal of Homosexuality* 68, no. 14 (2021): 2472.

⁷⁹ Alejandro Ramirez, "Tolerance vs Acceptance," *Washington University Political Review*, (2020) <https://www.wupr.org/2020/10/20/tolerance-vs-acceptance/>

In Golshan Golriz's research, the results show that those who were Muslims and a part of the LGBT groups found out that many Muslim leaders tolerated them rather than accepted them in their circle. Although Golriz had major success in showing that religious beliefs contribute a lot to this, it still questions why the LGBT groups wanted acceptance more than tolerance. In the case of Ramirez and others of racial groups such as Africans, they don't want their neighbors to be tolerant of their culture; instead, they would like for them to accept it. However, when it comes to appearance and being of a particular culture, there is a divine power and no one can control which group or culture he is born within. Therefore, when it comes to race and ethnicity, and using the above example of group green and group orange, who needs group orange acceptance for group green to be who they are? The best way to state the question is who requires group orange approval for making group green the way they are? If it is the divine power, then why would He need approval from group orange about the cultural ways of group green? Getting straight to point, in a cultural society of diversity, no group should need acceptance for how they came to earth since there wasn't any man intervention (apart from sexual contraction) that led to the group's existence in the world. Someone of African heritage should not need the approval or the acceptance of another culture to live in the world. If someone is not a supporter of those from African heritage in the West, the individual is free to his opinion. However, the West calls for such individuals to develop the mechanism to live and co-exist with those from an African culture without dehumanizing the individuals. Looking at Golriz's research, for those of the LGBT community and living in the West, it should be applauded for the tolerance level in which these Western societies have evolved. However, it is important to highlight that sexuality and sexual identities continue debating since one side believes that divine power creates people like this and another side sees it as a life choice. The greatest achievement

is respecting each other without violating one's dignity.

When analyzing religious beliefs and conviction beliefs, it is also essential to highlight that research down through various LGBT groups identifies that religious and conviction beliefs contribute significantly towards one not accepting someone of the LGBT community. However, these results show that these religious and conviction participators are tolerant of the community. Still, when analyzing the religious community and the LGBT community, many researchers continue to associate the religious community with being homophobic or not tolerant enough. When looking at religious institutions, researchers highlight that, "These organizations utilize religious teachings, spirituality, and God to condemn same-sex attractions and isolate and silence discourse on sexual and gender diversity in secular educational institutions. Such teachings and messages may foster internalized homophobia, and, for many religious SGMY,⁸⁰ yield internal conflict."⁸¹ One of the critical attributes of tolerance is that both sides will not get all their desires; therefore, they must learn how to live in the middle and respect each other's beliefs and ways of life.

Religious institutions guided by sacred text strongly believe that the text gives direction for living, what is morally right, and what is wrong. In the Christian sacred text, all sin is credited with being against God and deserving of His punishment; however, the God from the Christian Bible establishes a way for humanity to be saved from His judgment through His Son Jesus Christ. Therefore, there is no punishment on earth today for sin, as described in the Old Testament, but it will be in the Last Day when God executes judgment on the earth. God has

⁸⁰ Sexual and Gender Minority Youth

⁸¹ Peter A. Newman, "Pray that God Will Change You: The Religious Social Ecology of Bias-Based Bullying Targeting Sexual and Gender Minority Youth—A Qualitative Study of Service Providers and Educators," *Journal of Adolescent Research* 33, no. 5 (2018): 525.

given people free will to make their own choices until that day. Christians who follow the Bible firmly believe that the lifestyle of anyone in the LGBT community is a personal choice and they should not be discriminated against, judged, or be killed for their choice. Therefore, although they know that the Bible goes against this kind of practices, they ensure that they are not reflecting it in their lives, and to exercise God's grace to those who choose the life.

On the other hand, those who choose the life should be tolerant of religious institutions, respect their beliefs, and understand that their beliefs are guidelines for living. For the Western civilization to continue to flourish, these levels of understanding and respect must be at the forefront. People who are arguing that religious institutions' procedures on teaching sacred text which rebukes the ways of the LGBT community are creating homophobia potentials and hurting LGBT members, especially if they are of the religious institutions, should analyze the situation sincerely to show that just as the LGBT community have a way to live their life and have a free will to approve or disapprove any beliefs, religious institutions have the same rights. Nonetheless, political correctness makes it hard for the citizens of the West to debate issues and come up with strong, tolerant solutions. Political correctness contributes to the West citizens labeling each other instead of listening to one another. When labeling does not bring any substantial effects on one's opponent, then comes the cry to cancel the individual.

Cancel Culture: Tolerance or Intolerance?

In recent years, there has been a growing call for citizens in the West to oppress each other, especially their opponents. This oppression is viewed through what is popularly called "cancel culture." One view of the concept highlights, "It is argued that Cancel Culture, a fluid, shapeshifting, diversity ethos, grew out of "Online Shaming" (Laidlaw, 2017) and driven by the

“Calling Out” or “Boycott” movement.”⁸² Cancel culture arrived in society as a means for people who disagree with a belief to join together and fight for results in which the writer of an opinion can be fired, which is a damaging punishment.

Since the West develops to be societies that build on men and women listening to each other and not fighting against each other, today’s cancel culture comes as a shock. Many people who go to their social media platform and express opinions, beliefs, or concerns face the penalty of losing their jobs for thinking in such away. However, cancel culture is not a new model in the West, but it was once considered uncivilized. In the time of Luther’s revolution, many who disagreed with the church were canceled, but in a more severe form than losing their jobs—they were burned alive. Today it is hard to differentiate the action of cancel culture by firing versus burning. Critically analyzing it, the ones who get fired still have their lives and can move on, versus those who got burned alive—this individual is dead and cannot move on with anything. However, there is one core principle behind firing and burning; the individuals who got fired from their jobs and those who got burnt alive have one thing in common, they disagreed with the popular viewpoint on one or more issues.

As the West developed, it realizes that to have a society in which people are going to live together without major internal conflicts and wars, some form of compromise had to occur. America is a product of that compromise. When men in Europe found it challenging and life-risking to live against the church’s rule, they fled to America and established a state in which such intolerance would not take place where people were killed for disagreeing with the ruling class. Free thinkers establish the nation on freedom—especially freedom of expression and speech. If someone disagrees with the Founding Fathers that the state should not collect taxes

⁸² Richard B. Duque, "The Active Shooter Paradox: Why the Rise of Cancel Culture, “Me Too,” ANTIFA and Black Lives Matter... Matters," *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 60, (2021): 11.

since it reflects Europe, this individual would be free to express his belief without being killed. For the West to get to this stage of tolerance was a journey and it did not happen overnight. However, one thing is shown is that for the West to become a society of intolerance and start to practice acts such as firing someone over free speech, it is more accessible to destroy what the West worked for, for centuries.

Today's practice of going against one's opponent in the essence of a driving force for the individuals to lose their jobs, reflects the actions of the church in Luther's revolution era in which people who disagreed with the church were killed. Today's action of canceled culture is not a true reflection of the West and should not be allowed to continue in the future. Practices such as firing people over an opinion does not promote harmony among people of the West. These disunities are a product of intolerance and will lead to wars, which would be repeating the West's history. The church was intolerant of their opponents during Luther's revolution and were killing people who disagreed with them. The church was wrong in the intolerance violently displayed to their opponents. The same can be said about those who fired and called out for others to be fired or boycott because of their different perspective on issues—if it was wrong in the 1500s and 1600s, it is still wrong today. If the church and its opponents found a way to get along and end the years of wars, today, citizens in the West can do the same thing; exercise tolerance and find a way to move ahead without calling down destruction on their opponents.

Today's West Level of Intolerance Is Questioning

With the concept of political correctness, canceled culture, and the redefinition of tolerance (accepting no matter what), the West continues to be in turmoil. Two places in which these unrests manifest is in politics (via bills and laws) and the schools. One of the bills presented on America's House floor was a bill titled HR-5. The following summarizes a section

of the bill:

A BILL To prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes. This Act may be cited as the “Equality Act”. Discrimination can occur on the basis of the sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition of an individual, as well as because of sex-based stereotypes. Each of these factors alone can serve as the basis for discrimination, and each is a form of sex discrimination. A single instance of discrimination may have more than one basis. For example, discrimination against a married same-sex couple could be based on the sex stereotype that marriage should only be between heterosexual couples, the sexual orientation of the two individuals in the couple, or both...⁸³

Such a bill goes against everyone who practices a religion in which the sacred text teaches that marriage is only between a man and a woman; in so, it is questioning to why in the West such a Bill would be proposed since in America there are many different religions and many of them teach that marriage is only between a man and woman. Is the government ignorant of the religious teaching, or is the government intolerant of the religious institution? It is hard to say what the government is trying to achieve with a bill such as this.

If the West will uphold tolerance and co-existence and promote diversity, then a Bill such as this does the opposite. If religious institutions are forced to choose between the government rulings and their sacred text, then there is a form of intolerance being exercised towards the religious group. History shows that the Roman Empire had such intolerance, and in return, they killed hundreds of Christians. If actions such as HR-5 are being passed into laws, is the government asking religious institutions to choose, and if these institutions choose their sacred text, will they be punished? Also, if they are punished, does the American society still have the First Amendment, which gives citizens the liberty to worship or not? This form of intolerance is not a manifestation of the West. If the West believed in diversity and the openness of promoting different cultures, then in what areas does such a bill enhance diversity? Indeed, the bill seeks to

⁸³ The House of Representatives (USA) <https://lc.org/PDFs/BILLS-117hr5ih.pdf>

promote the proper treatment of the American citizens who choose a type of lifestyle, etc. However, forcing people to approve their lifestyle would be against humanity and the right against freedom of expression according to what the West teaches. In so, it is questionable if a Western society like America is going forward or repeating the history of intolerance. If a religious institution chooses not to marry a same-sex couple on behalf of their sacred text teaching that marriage is only between a man and woman, what are the consequences according to this bill, and why are people being punished for their religious belief? How is this different from Luther's revolution when people who were not with the church got killed because of not "accepting" the churches rules? A bill such as this questions if the West understands its history and if there are some forms of failures regarding how the West presents its case for being greatest in promoting individual rights.

Another gray area of intolerance on the rise is what should be taught in the classroom. When the argument that the West is a secular society that promotes diversity and it is wrong to practice one kind or any religion in the public school, which led to the removal of Christian practices such as Bible reading and praying, it is seen as appropriate. However, today there is a push to have children learn about sexual ideologies such as identities and different families. The Western citizens should not fight for one-sided ideologies if they want the West to remain fair and unbiased. If one set of ideologies and practices is deemed a violation of the Establishment Clause, then all ideologies equally should be seen as a violation of the Clause. Nonetheless, it is essential to highlight that removing religious practices from public schools was not a Western value. What would be better is for the public place to continue to be open to every ideology and let them freely be expressed in public and in schools.

With the level of intolerance rising in all sectors of the West, including having Bills such

as HR-5, which can be turned into law, the Western societies need a “savior” to help stir the countries away from repeating history. This savior will help the West citizens continue to enjoy freedom and keep the West as societies where people can live freely and exercise their rights to live as they like, if they are not hurting their neighbors. Too much of the millennial progressive era movements are not truly reflecting the West, and they are creating barriers in which citizens are finding it hard to co-exist again. Western societies developed to a level where tolerance became like oxygen; the West value of tolerance has been an example for other continents to learn and implement actions to become a more tolerant society. The West should continue setting an example and not to take steps backward.

Millennial Progressive Era Movements Undermine Concrete Truths

Some of the core principles behind the millennial progressive era movements are that the West societies have based so much on emotions that people are continuously trying not to hurt others’ feelings and aiming to reach a society in which everyone can experience a type of happiness, and not worry about being limited because of their neighbors’ belief. Unfortunately, in the eyes of the citizens who believe that they cannot fully enjoy their lives in the manner they wish, it is not because their lifestyles have limits, but rather because of their opponents’ “discrimination.” When the West stood to debate topics, they knew that there were many different parts to an argument, and no debate is one-sided. Since the West secular societies tend to move towards relative truth perspectives of the world, it is well understood that “Relativism holds that mutually opposed points of view can all be valid.”⁸⁴ If truths are associated with culture, and all are valid, then what is the millennial progressive era movements foundation on agreeing or disagreeing when debating issues? Do they believe that there are multiple sides

⁸⁴ Avery C. Dulles, “On Relativism,” *Nova et Vetera* (Denver, CO), 15, no. 3, (2017): 730.

(truths) to the argument or just their side?

Continuously the millennial progressive era movements show one side to arguments (the side they believe firmly), and the other sides are not counted as worthy. This is questioning if relative truth can support such a behavior. One of the concrete truths in the millennial progressive era movements fail to see is that their opponents have a perspective on the issue and that their view is valid, just like theirs. If individuals who are seeking ways in to make the West a better place fail to understand basic elements that are needed for people to live together in harmony, then these individuals must seek change and be the forerunners for citizens who are going to help develop the West, so that it can be a comfortable environment for all people. The millennial progressive era movements must first be ready to acknowledge their opponents' side to an argument, and if their perspective (those who are pushing for significant changes) is valid, then they will easily win the debates, the mind, and the hearts of the people.

When the first significant act against discriminatory practices got passed in America, commonly known as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it outlawed discrimination based on race, sex, religion, color, and national origin. When looking at the bill closely, let's take race, color, and national origin; there is concrete truth that if someone was born in the states and is white in color, of the European race, his national origin is American. According to the 1964 bill, this individual should not be discriminated against in the public space because he is white, of the European race, and that his country is America. People can emotionally gravitate to this bill because it reflects truths. Even before the millennial progressive era movements, other movements reflected concrete truths in which everyone could relate. In the West, human life is valuable; therefore, it is everyone's responsibility to ensure that individual life is being respected. Therefore, no one should face any situation that brings fear because they are of specific color,

origin, and race.

The 1964 bill seeks to protect sex—in this case, the “God-given” gender. An individual whose God-given gender is male, if his goal is to become a nurse, should not experience any rejection because society primarily associates the profession as a woman’s job. Also, if an individual whose God-given gender is female desires to work instead of being a stay-at-home mom, she should not be stigmatized because of her choice to pursue a career. The bill of 1964 triggers an emotion because everyone in society can relate to its concrete truth. People may have a belief that women’s role is in the home (this can even be an interpretation of their religious text), but because of the West’s fruitfulness in upholding everyone’s opinion, the person’s point of view is valid. However, when the individual pushes for laws that restrict women because of their opinions and beliefs, then it creates enmities. In this case, women and men who have different views wouldn’t be fairly represented in the eyes of the law. Therefore, the bill of 1964 presented both opinions by tearing down any stigmatization within the society as a whole and putting the issue matter in the hand of the individual. If the woman chooses to work, it is excellent; if she decides to stay home, it is excellent. The person who believes that women’s place is in the home will have to learn to respect/tolerate the woman’s choice in the public space. Even so, the women in the public area will have to respect/tolerate the men and women who believe women’s place is in the home.

Lastly, the bill addressed concerns over religion. Religion, whether one practices it or not, is a significant part of the West. Without religion, there is no West. Since many of the first people who migrated to America before the revolution had some training in Christian principles, it reflects its mannerism and beliefs. To reiterate, the West’s belief people have free will and should be able to choose freely what kind of life they live is strictly a Christian understanding

that the Creator makes all men equal and gives them choices. It is not so simple to separate religion from the West. However, America has significant success in that it creates an atmosphere in which people can freely practice or not practice a religion. Therefore, according to the 1964 bill, if someone chooses the lifestyle of not practicing a religion, the individual should not be isolated or barred from enjoying freely the things life has to offer. When it comes to religion and the 1964 bill, it was commonly understood that those who choose to practice a religion have a set of beliefs, and they live by these beliefs. Therefore, if someone cannot work on Saturdays because of his religion, the store owner is asked to let the individual work another day. Most of them choose to let the individual work on Sundays instead of Saturdays. In doing so, the store owner would not be discriminating because of religious practices and would create harmony and avoid contentions. Accommodating the person does not limit the company since other employees would be willing to work on Saturdays; however, not hiring the person because of his religious limitations would be a drastic approach in a society with tremendous diversity.

As shown, the 1964 bill had concrete truths to which the people in America can relate; therefore, it was a top accomplishment in the eyes of the citizens. It did not leave any questions unanswered. It was clear, and the citizens could connect the dots. When looking deeply at the 1964 bill on issues surrounding religious discrimination, author Kenneth L. Marcus points out that “the 1964 Act’s basic purpose to provide new mechanisms to enforce previously established rights, not to create new rights or to provide enforcement mechanisms that apply only to a subcategory of the groups.”⁸⁵ America was established on the knowledge that the citizens have rights, and their rights should not be oppressed in any form. Nonetheless, even though the states had this foundation, the actions were not there—it took time and maturity. As Marcus highlights,

⁸⁵ Kenneth L. Marcus, "Anti-Zionism as Racism: Campus Anti-Semitism and the Civil Rights Act of 1964," *The William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 15, no. 3 (2007): 839.

the 1964 bill's purpose was to enforce human's divine rights embedded in America's foundation. The rights that the West believes their citizens are entitled to, are embedded in concrete truth like people are free, the West is a place for free societies; therefore, people should live and be free no matter what their faith is, skin color, origin, and sex. The more the society can relate to the issues, the more they are likely to agree with the law. Also, the West understood the truth that people in the public space will have different opinions from the 1964 bill; however, they are not being forced to accept the truth that a man can be a nurse as well as a woman, etc. However, they are asked to be tolerant of men who desire to be nurses, just as it asked these men to be tolerant of other's views that nursing is a job for women. Despite people's opinions on the issues, they could still co-exist without anyone being insulted, put down, fired, etc.

When analyzing truth, Benedict XVI discusses,

For the real problem of mankind is the darkening of truth. Truth is replaced by the decision of the majority, because there can be no truth. Culture is set against truth. This relativism...as a basic attitude of enlightened people...This is also the reason why practice is now substituted for truth and why the whole axis of religions is thereby displaced: we do not know what is true, but we do know what we should do: raise up and introduce a better society.⁸⁶

The Pope's argument shows that the post-modern society has one good desire, and it is to introduce a better society. However, when this better society is raised on the practice of popularity, and there is no truth, how would they know if the results are indeed a better society? At some point, the post-modern West must come to the grips that there are truths in the world, and relativism cannot be applied to every situation. The darkening of truth is evident in today's West. Although there has been a principle used in mathematics for thousands of years which equvalate four to two plus two, today's post-modernism societies in the West challenge these concrete truths by exchanging logic and facts with feelings.

⁸⁶ Ratzinger, *Truth and Tolerance*, loc 686, 763, 765.

When the 1964 bill passed, it presented facts and truths. Today if one should take the bill to a different continent, people will be able to relate to the bill without having any confusion about what the bill is saying. They would easily understand that people should not be rejected in public places because he is from a different country, has a particular religion, have a particular look, and is a male. All this someone in a foreign country can relate to because it is based on logic, facts, and have concrete truths. Moving forward, if the millennial progressive era movements are serious about introducing and establishing a better society, they will have to implement some truths to have that better world they are desiring.

In the process of eliminating truths, the millennial progressive era movements create a more intolerant West, which is now on the brink to have a civil war. Looking deeply at a bill like HR-5, it moved from concrete truths to feelings. The bill seeks to protect people and issues not as they are, but how one feels about it and interprets it. If someone has a different interpretation, then that individual may face being labeled as someone who discriminates. For laws that will punish individuals to be effective, everyone in society must have some concrete truth circulating the laws. If the government writes that people who steal must go to jail for a month, the society as a whole may believe that people who steal must face a judgment—this is the concrete truth. However, everyone will have a different belief in the punishment, and this is wherein the West negotiations take place. For example, when a bill like HR-5 is extended to protect someone who believes that she is a male, she may move ahead with the surgery and change to become a male. From a human rights perspective in the West that everyone deserves respect, this individual should not receive any treatment that will block them from the joy of the public space. However, there is the 1964 bill that protects other areas of life, like religion; in so, the millennial progressive era movements need clarity in explaining how the HR-5 bill protects citizens who

are protected under the 1964 bill. Whenever there is a bill that undermines another bill but creates more problems in the society, the millennial progressive era movements are doing the opposite of what they seek to accomplish, which is to build a better society.

A better society has understanding and does not circulate confusion. From an illustration perspective, if a God-given male doctor is a gynecologist, however, he identifies as a female, and a God-given female patient refused the gynecologist's care because the God-given sex was male, can the patient be sued for discrimination? Also, if a Christian refuses to give religious services to someone who identifies as a male or female, is this Christian subjected to the discrimination law? And if they are, how does the 1964 bill protect the citizens? When the West societies finish solving these debatable issues, then it will be fit to move forward with making a better society, but it cannot have a better society without addressing the concerns of the citizens.

In the foundation of the West, everyone is protected through upholding human dignity and treating each other with respect. Even the individuals who believe that they are of one gender or another and even multiple, according to the West's practice of tolerance, the person is treated with human dignity. Still, people have the right to choose and live their free will. If the individual free will is that he does not want to associate with a particular race or religion, he is not forced to have any association with that race or religion. People of that race or religion will exercise mutual respect for that individual and leave him to have his free will.

Nonetheless, the public space is not as easy, and people will have to share a common ground with each other and this common ground needs truth. One truth is that people have religious rights, and what is included in that right is the protection for them to follow their religious teachings. If the millennial progressive era movements seek to undermine religions, they will create a West which will become a far worse uncooperative place. Another critical

concept the West is built on is one's belief and freedom to exercise his belief without violating other's individual human rights. The millennial progressive era movements must clearly explain how they are going to protect religious and strong beliefs of individuals' rights and freedoms. All this would be possible if the movements were willing to include concrete truth.

CHAPTER SIX

THE CHAPLAIN'S ROLE IN UPHOLDING TOLERANCE IN THE WEST

The millennial progressive era movements such as political correctness, cancel culture, acceptance, and the rejection of concrete truth have harmful effects on all sectors of society. It creates a West of fear instead of promoting the West of free. People are confused about what they can do and many are worried that Western societies will become a failure if they do not learn from history and avoid repeating it. In the effort to help the West continue to uphold values of tolerance, professions such as chaplaincy can help. However, if the millennial progressive era movements continue to manifest within the society, many careers would suffer—chaplaincy is one of them.

The Rejection of Concrete Truth Impact on Chaplaincy

Chaplaincy is a career that needs truth for it to succeed. The society in which the chaplains work must have some mutual respect for religions and for people to practice their religion freely. The West has shown for centuries, especially America, that they have accomplished major success in promoting religion, which the citizens may or may not choose to practice. But it did not become successful by promoting that the people have to practice a religion or that the people cannot practice a religion. History in the West taught that people once were forced to practice a religion, which created wars when they refused. If the millennial progressive era movements undermine this history and create a West in which people cannot practice any religion, it will start a new war.

Embracing truths can prevent a war such as this. When the Puritans came to the shores of America, they were religious men running from the oppression of other religious men. However, they were able to use their experience and understand that for a society to operate decently, it must embrace all types of people—people who are willing or not willing to worship are two

types of citizens a flourishing society needs. Looking again at the desire of the millennial progressive era movements, they show that they desire to build a better society; however, they have some miscalculations. These miscalculations affect people with religious or strong beliefs.

Chaplains need society to embrace concrete truths, and it requires a society that respects beliefs—not accepting them. If it is wrong for a Christian chaplain to force his beliefs on others, it is also wrong for others to force their belief on that chaplain. People in the West who are in line with truth will acknowledge the statement above as having some form of truth. Therefore, they will examine where the common ground for citizens is to meet and get along, and the common ground will be tolerance or respect. Chaplains, daily in their profession cannot go about asking others to accept them; therefore, not rejecting concrete truth, chaplains develop tolerance to understand that people cannot hurt them, but people can reject them, and people have a right to reject chaplains because it is their freedom in the West to do so.

One of the most significant impacts the rejection of concrete truth has on the role of chaplaincy is that it supports political correctness in the form of deception, and this will never be good for any society to become better. Since political correctness is well viewed as a principle in which those who live in the West are barred from freely expressing their views on pressing issues, unfortunately, the chaplain's position is in danger on all sides. The chaplain is in danger with his beliefs, with his God/gods, with his career, and with his image. If the chaplain chooses to obey his God/gods, he will probably lose his job; if he goes ahead and loses his job because of choosing his God/gods, then there is a big risk that his reputation would be smeared. Such an action cannot help to build a better West. Concrete truths represent tolerance in the form of respecting and *putting up with*; therefore, forcing chaplains to be politically correct can result in two significant things that can cause havoc in the public sector. The first is that there is a truth

that no one likes to be deceived, and humankind rather knows their neighbors' thoughts towards them before becoming too close to the individual. Suppose there is an atheist chaplain who has a Christian client, but the chaplain develops a relationship with the patient without expressing his true beliefs. Through political correctness the chaplain tells the patient God/god bless you, while he does not believe that there is a God/god, then how should the client react to the chaplain? If the client felt deceived, how can both the chaplain and client move forward? Chaplains' impact in upholding the West principle of tolerance is crucial to demonstrate to the millennial progressive era movements that the key to having a better society lies in the truth. One cannot expect to embrace and celebrate diversity by eliminating truths.

Chaplaincy Art in Demonstrating Diversity

Advancing diversity is a significant part of the millennial progressive era movements. They believe that people from all walks of life should live in the West, and all should be accepted. However, the movements put forth their beliefs with an iron fist, and through force they call on the citizens to accept each other as they are. However, when it comes to those individuals with some form of beliefs that do not line up with the movements, then they call for those individuals to be canceled. The iron fist of the millennial progressive era movements fails to realize the beauty of Western freedom and to see that their beliefs discriminate and isolate citizens. While they aim for an all-inclusive society, the reality is that only those who are on their side are included in their desired society.

The foundation of the West always was built to have an all-inclusive society. It started when the West, especially America, only had this foundational principle on paper and it was not yet implemented in the people's actions. However, through learning, development, and understanding tolerance, the West managed to make a society for all people. When the millennial

progressive era movements speak about diversity, the chaplaincy profession can demonstrate to them the fundamental necessity of embracing a diverse society. The field chaplaincy by itself is diverse in religion, gender, identity, race, and even beliefs; these individuals also work in public spaces such as hospitals, schools, and even the military. The profession, being so diverse, flourishes because it upholds concrete truth and portrays honesty towards diversity. Chaplaincy is a diverse field by having different individuals from all walks of life and not rejecting or canceling some of the individuals because of their culture. Instead, it is a profession that has understanding, and in the areas where there are disagreements, they exercise common ground through tolerance. In every aspect of the field, there is a common ground. The common ground of the West is freedom; for chaplaincy, it is giving hope; for the post-modernism progressive, it is a better society. The West presents freedom to its citizens by preaching that they can aim to have life, liberty, and happiness. Chaplains give hope through offering and respecting beliefs, and in all these for both the West and the chaplaincy field, no one in society is left out, isolated, or canceled. On the other hand, the millennial progressive era movements try to build a better society by dividing, canceling, and isolating—what kind of better does this represent?

When debating the public space and upholding the field of chaplaincy, institutions like the military first “recognizes religious diversity as an empirical fact.”⁸⁷ By doing this, the institution can recognize facts and recognize the importance of these facts in the lives of humanity. In so, an institution like the military thrives with chaplains because of observing certain factual beliefs. All diversity comes with a difference, not just through color, looks, religion, or race. There are also the individual’s beliefs, and to have a peaceful co-existence the empirical fact that there are differences in beliefs, which must be acknowledged and respected.

⁸⁷ Kim P. Hansen, *Military Chaplains and Religious Diversity* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 120.

When analyzing successful institutions in the West that have a diversity of people and can function with limited confusion, Kim P. Hansen states:

The institutionalization of the plural ideal means that the Department of Defense endorses a model of religious interaction and work that Richard G. Hutcheson calls “cooperative pluralism.” Chaplains are supposed to work together in harmony to achieve as much free exercise of religion as is practicable, always being mindful of minorities’ needs. Hutcheson, himself a former chaplain, emphasizes the collective nature of this effort because chaplains can only do so much acting alone. Teams of chaplains with “mutual responsibility” to each other and their commands can accomplish much more.⁸⁸

These chaplains who stand to work together within themselves have diversity and beliefs with which other chaplains may disagree. Still, through mutual responsibility, respect, and the desire to promote harmony, they seek not to let their diversity become an unbearable issue. They can accomplish more through the exercise of the Western teaching on tolerance.

In the field of chaplaincy, chaplains work with clients at times to whom they will have to say no. An example is when a Jewish chaplain must turn down an invitation from a client because the event is on his day of worship. The chaplain may honor his client’s invitation by asking another chaplain who can work on Saturdays to attend the event on his behalf to show spiritual support—this would be teamwork. The client can deny the offer and look at the situation as offensive; however, because of his understanding and willingness to understand the chaplain’s rights and beliefs, he exercises tolerance towards the chaplain. Over many years, the West was able to develop the understanding that life is not only through the government and those who are in authority, it is also about the citizens’ lives as well. In the process, the government must understand the citizens’ rights as they understand the government’s rights; both sides are called on to show and exercise tolerance and respect. Chaplaincy has a beauty in which, just like the government of the West and its citizens, it exercises respect to those they are in

⁸⁸ Hansen, *Military Chaplains and Religious Diversity*, 120.

contact with, just as those whom they serve show respect to the chaplain. Anyone who desires as the post-modernism movements to establish a better society can look at the field of chaplaincy and realize despite the numerous faults. Even when some of them have wrong beliefs, they can work as a team and be effective. All this is down through tolerance.

When looking at the profession of a chaplain in the West, it promotes beliefs, establishes tolerance, and demonstrates how people can live together and help each other even when they do not agree with each other.

A Profound Illustration

As the millennial progressive era movements seek to make the West a better place, it fails because of some enlightenment beliefs. Nonetheless, when they seek to uphold change, diversity, and equality, they are honestly working on keeping up with human dignity. Falling short in their works, they create cultural wars.

For this illustration, chaplains who are Christians and believe in the Bible as the foundation for guidance will be used. Chaplain Y practices Christianity and loves working with all clients, even the LGBT community. As a chaplain, he does his work proficiently, and as a human, he upholds human dignity. He always carries around a Bible and on the cover is Micah 6:8. This very verse reminds him daily that God wants him to live justly, love mercy, and be humble. He is well-loved in his everyday life, and his clients look up to him. Also, Chaplain Y is a partner in chaplaincy and takes care of his other chaplain co-workers. While doing his daily job, client L came to him and asked for prayers. Client L has a child going under surgery to have a sex change, and she wants the Lord's protection. Client L herself attends church. Chaplain Y, always uses scripture to guide his prayer and as they bow to pray only believes that he can pray Matthew 6:10, which asks for the Lord's will. After Client L left the office, she felt that the

prayer was discriminating and isolating towards her child, so she spoke with a lawyer.

In the illustration, Chaplain Y could have told the client what the child is doing is a sin according to the Bible, and the Lord cannot bless sin rather, He renders a judgment. He could also have asked the client to speak with another chaplain whose religious belief is not violated. Chaplain Y instead did his best to meet the client's needs; sadly, his best for her was not good enough. In this case, one could say that Client L knows that Chaplain Y is a Christian and should have never asked such a prayer of him. However, Client L, who is a Christian, may believe that as a Christian she went to Chaplain Y since they are both Christians. Therefore, in this case, one may agree that Chaplain Y was not 'loving' enough to care for the client's child. Another may say that the client should have found out if the form of Christianity Chaplain Y practices, if rendering such a prayer would violate his belief. However, according to the West tolerance, Chaplain Y had respect for the client. Still, the client had limited respect for Chaplain Y. If Chaplain Y receives a lawsuit in which relativism is the theme of the argument, he may lose his job, but if freedom is the theme of the lawsuit, then he may be set free. Nonetheless, he may sometimes be remembered as the chaplain who was not nice enough to a client and his reputation may be damaged.

All that occurred in that illustration resulted from the millennial progressive era movements. It does not only cause cultural wars within the society, but it also creates problems even within religions. As the times are changing and people have diverse beliefs, chaplains are the best to illustrate the accommodation of diverse beliefs. Chaplains can operate in a diverse environment through the beautiful works of freedom offered by the West. The chaplain does not sue individuals because they violate their religious rights by asking for services, which they know the chaplain cannot render. Neither does the chaplain call for individuals to lose their jobs

or be canceled because they violate the chaplain's rights. Instead, the chaplain understands that the individual has a concern or an event. Individuals may desire services from chaplains for reasons like Client L in the illustration above. However, just like chaplains, people have limits, and the West freedoms help them exercise their limits. The millennial progressive era movements can learn a lot from chaplaincy if they genuinely desire a better society.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The tolerance of the West is a gift to the world, just as the West is today's gift to the World. In 2019 according to the Department in Homeland and Security statistics, it shows that over a million people got their permanent stay in the country of America.⁸⁹ These people came from all over the world. They are of all colors, religions, races, identities, and beliefs. Some are old, others are young, and the rest are children. The West opens its borders yearly to give these people a chance to come into countries like America to build their lives and the economy. Many of these people come from countries that discriminate against women, sexualities, colors, and religions. Therefore, the people who have the opportunity to now live in America will need to understand that although they believe that women should only accept the authority of their husbands, women can make choices in the West, and they have a right to decide how to live their lives and find happiness. Individuals coming from countries where women are not treated well will have to learn how to do so and how to do it respectfully. If they come from a country where people are killed who have same sex relationships, they will have to learn how to respect them and value their freedom of choice in America.

Nonetheless, people who have these beliefs come to the West knowing that they are allowed various practices and beliefs; they understand that the West is a place where they can live with people even though they disagree with them. They don't have to hurt or violate them. Migrants understand that they can keep their diversity in the West and are not forced to lose anything precious to them regarding their religious and cultural life. In all honesty, the West presents a golden spoon on a platter for people who value freedom. A woman can come from a

⁸⁹ DHS, <https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2019>.

world where she is killed because of her desire to have multiple men, but in the West, she enjoys her freedom to love as much as she wants, and she will not face judgment. However, the woman must understand that life is a two-way street, and even though she may not have people who will kill her in the West for her actions, there will be people who choose not to associate with her. People who choose to avoid her are free to do so.

Despite how successful the West looks today; history shows its struggle. Before America was established, the West, through the Roman Empire, established a pluralistic society; however, they had a lot of challenges with tolerance. Through their intolerance, many lost their lives. When observing the attitude of the Romans towards Christianity, Gibbon ponders, “we recollect the universal toleration of Polytheism, as it was invariably maintained by the faith of the people...we are at a loss to discover what new offense the Christians had committed...(that the Romans) inflict a severe punishment on any part of their subjects, who had chosen for themselves a singular but an inoffensive mode of faith and worship.”⁹⁰ Gibbon continues to discuss that “The religious policy of the ancient world (Rome) seems to have assumed a more stern and intolerant character, to oppose the progress of Christianity.”⁹¹ Gibbon’s viewpoint would make anyone wonder why Rome would exercise such intolerance, especially when the society was well-known for religious tolerance. However, no matter how great it becomes, no society is immune to intolerance. It takes patience, understanding, and the willingness of the people to work towards a society of tolerance, especially if they desire to have a multicultural country. After Rome, Europe rose, became powerful, went all over the globe, and conquered other nations. Nonetheless, being intolerant was one of their main principles. They were arrogant

⁹⁰ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 612.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 613.

and believed that their race was superior to others, so they treated specific individuals with no human dignity. Also, they believed in a particular Christianity, and anyone who dared to go against this Christian practice was subjected to be killed. Their one-way belief system created wars. The Christians who worshiped but not with the church at the time had to flee for their lives.

Europe developed into a maturing society for a while, and tolerance began to be the forerunner; however, at first, there was much bloodshed. Germany rose as a country and killed millions of people. One research on the subject matter of anti-Semitism discusses that “Nazi indoctrination contributed importantly to the long-term persistence of anti-Semitism in Germany. And conversely, the strong interaction with preexisting attitudes suggests that confirmation bias played an important role in shaping anti-Semitic beliefs.”⁹² For centuries in the West, particularly Europe struggled with tolerating those different from them. They saw cultural differences as a threat, a curse, and people who deserved to be killed. When looking closely at the hatred towards people of Jewish descent, ideologies such as they are trying to replace us, they want to rule the world, and that they came from apes and should not be allowed to live besides non-Jewish individuals, became a practicing doctrine. Not long after, the ideologies became real to those who felt threatened, and without any consideration for human dignity, they took the lives of many.

Europeans were able to come to America and establish a country that would do better. A country in which the values were human dignity and freedom. However, not long after coming to the New World and developing a new country, some practices continued with the Europeans living in America. They continued the tradition of slavery, which degraded Africans to one-third of a human. The European men living in America continue their cultural practice of not

⁹² Nico Voigtländer, and Hans-Joachim Voth, "Nazi Indoctrination and Anti-Semitic Beliefs in Germany," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - PNAS* 112, no. 26 (2015).

upholding human dignity. Even after fighting a revolution, making the country a free nation, and implementing doctrines such as all men are created equal, they still saw certain men as unequal and inferior. When looking at how Africans were treated in America, Fredrick Douglass mourned, “I speak advisedly when I say this, —that killing a slave, or any colored person, in Talbot county, Maryland, is not treated as a crime, either by the courts or the community.”⁹³ Nonetheless, he lived to see a bloody war that gave these men their freedom from bondage, but not freedom to enjoy their inalienable rights, which according to the understanding of America’s Declaration of Independence, these rights “inseparable from our humanity...[it is] universal and nontransferable...Human beings never lose their unalienable rights – though they can be violated – because such rights are essential to the dignity and capacity for freedom that are woven into human nature.”⁹⁴ Although America’s Declaration of Independence emphasizes upholding human dignity through their God-given rights, the country struggled to be true to its pledge.

At the time of the Founding Fathers, America understood that God had given men rights, and men should be able to live out these rights. They understood that violations of these rights would help to break a society. These were men coming from a broken society because it did not respect people’s God-given rights; therefore, the men who helped form America did so with all the intentions to uphold these rights. They were not perfect. They were biased in applying the rights; however, they had a solid foundation. It took America over a century to exercise its foundation physically. Even today, when the country celebrates people who are non-white, there are still men and women who believe that they are not of any importance. Nonetheless, the country believes that everyone has the right to life and can live how they seem fit; it only asks

⁹³ Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, 20.

⁹⁴ Christopher James Wolfe, "Unalienable Rights and some Libertarians," *Perspectives on Political Science* 51, no. 1 (2022;2021): 2.

that people do not violate each other's rights.

The only way America and the West can establish all these beauties is through the practice of tolerance. Tolerance is not an act of force. When Europe was under the mighty hand of the church and kingship, the people lived by an iron fist. If someone went against the ruling power, he would pay the penalty. However, after the war became too much and the people pressed on to have the freedom to worship, "The so-called 'Toleration Act' of 1689 meant that for the first time Protestant Dissenters from the Church of England could worship separately in their own meeting houses. For many Dissenters it was a half-victory."⁹⁵ The people in Europe who went against the church suffered. The American Founding Fathers understood this and came up with a philosophy that people could live free from government brutality. Over time, they learned that people living together peacefully needed a connection. The only way they could connect people of all beliefs and diverse backgrounds would be through tolerance.

Tolerance taught people that everyone in society could be who they wish if they are not posing a danger to their fellow citizens. Tolerance taught people they could have beliefs, but they should not use those beliefs to ill-treat their fellow citizens. Tolerance also helped them realize that it is the best method for society to coexist even when people disagree. Today Jews are still living in Germany, Blacks live in America, and Native Americans still live in their country. How is this possible when all these individuals were once treated with hatred? It is only through tolerance that a Nazi learns that Jews are humans and should not aim to kill people; the same can be said about racism towards Blacks and Native Americans. People who dislike them learn to put up with them and respect their human rights.

The Western concept of liberalism helps achieve the standard of human dignity the West

⁹⁵ Carys Brown, "Politeness, Hypocrisy and Protestant Dissent in England After the Toleration Act, c.1689-c.1750," *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41, no. 1 (2018): 61.

desires. When looking closely at the matter, scholar Tom J. Farer highlights that, “A third argument for active accommodation of illiberal minority cultures by European governments grounds itself in the freedom of association and in the claim that among the elements that constitute Liberalism tolerance should be deemed paramount.”⁹⁶ However, despite the tolerance level the Western society develops Farer shows that for it to be effective the “long-settled political order other than an imperial one needs and will therefore passionately defend a ‘common moral standpoint.’ It is usually constructed over time through negotiation and struggle among groups of residents with different views and interests, constructed through great effort and possibly violent conflict.”⁹⁷ Today, post-modern millennials should not seek to go through violent conflicts for the West to become an “accepting” society. Instead, they should seek to build upon the tolerance that has been successfully implemented in Western societies.

For tolerance to work, there is one crucial understanding, and it is the fact that people cannot be forced to accept something. However, they can be asked to show respect and be taught how to show respect; showing respect is not a sign of approval. Tolerance helps the citizens in the West to be free. It is a part of “Liberalism, not as a political party but rather as a belief system, with its original nineteenth century emphasis on freeing the individual from arbitrary or unreasonable constraints imposed by the state.”⁹⁸

Post-modernism started with various enlightenment. People began to question religions, scientists, and philosophies. In the West, this is observed as a beautiful thing. One thing that can be admired about the new generation (millennials), is the observation that they are changing

⁹⁶ Tom J. Farer, "The Clash of Cultures, the Tension within Liberalism, and the Proper Limits of Tolerance," *Human Rights Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (2014): 13.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁹⁸ Farer, "The Clash of Cultures, 2.

things in many areas of life. Communications used to be by mail; today's generation has multiple ways to communicate and most of them get to their destination in seconds. The millennial generation offers a lot to the world; however, many results of their movements undermine liberalism in the West in that consideration for individual freedom is not shown. Through their movements, the state is allowed to overreach, and many times this affects religious practices and the beliefs of others. Today, the results have the West struggling to maintain the level of peace it has acquired for decades.

Nevertheless, the West trusts the younger generation to keep up its good tradition and make the West a better society. In the process of aiming for a better society through progressive movements, the participants of the movements are making significant errors, and one of the most dangerous ones is to ignore history. When looking at the progressive movements, especially the most recent HR-5 bill debater, Callie H. Burt, discusses how,

Female sex-based provisions remain important given both women's historical disadvantages and different reproductive biology...I submit that the bill, in current form, fails to strike a balance between the rights, needs, and interests of two marginalized (and overlapping) groups—trans people and females—and instead prioritizes the demands of trans people over the hard-won rights of female people.⁹⁹

Continually as the progressive movements keep on fighting, they overlook the hard work of other successes of the West. It seems as if the participants behind the movement only care about their desires. They care only about their feelings, their beliefs, and their truths. People who disagree with them will have to speak deceptively because they are afraid to be canceled and lose their jobs, preventing them from helping their families. People who disagree with them are isolated from the public space, and there has been a bill that protects the public space from

⁹⁹ Callie H. Burt, "Scrutinizing the U.S. Equality Act 2019: A Feminist Examination of Definitional Changes and Sociolegal Ramifications," *Feminist Criminology* 15, no. 4 (2020): 365.

anyone's abuse since 1964. It seems as if the progressive era seeks to rewrite history; however, no one knows how many lives will be lost and how many wars will be fought before these individuals understand that they cannot build a better society without common ground. Common ground will be needed for society to have peace and harmony.

Mutual grounds need respect through tolerance and not through force or "acceptance," as the millennial progressive movements seek. When examining the issue in the West, which continues to see a mixture of all cultures, and many which have an illiberal way of viewing things, Farer highlights "the position of Kymlicka and others who argue that cultural differences should be fully respected but only up to the point where minority practices clearly violate fundamental human rights."¹⁰⁰ This form of respect is tolerance, and it has been taking the West towards one of the most prominent multicultural societies.

Today, the West is struggling to uphold its practice of tolerance. The West finds itself, especially America, in a situation where political correctness, canceled culture, and forced acceptance have never been at such high levels. Many citizens are confused and ask if they still live in a free world. Therefore, citizens of the West must take the stage to demonstrate to their neighbors the importance of tolerance and how it has been the cornerstone of the West for years. Chaplains can accomplish this challenge because they consist of people from all cultures and religions with individual beliefs and values in the field of a widely diverse Western culture. Over the years, as the West developed and secularism becomes popular, traditional religious practices have decreased; even the state transit to where it calls on institutions to uphold spiritual care, sometimes even more than religious care. Through the Affordable Health Care Act, the hospital is one of these examples. Chaplains have the challenge of demonstrating to the public their

¹⁰⁰Farer, "The Clash of Cultures, 15.

importance.

Nonetheless, chaplaincy is a field that caters to bringing hope to people. In the process chaplains continue to show that their own religious beliefs, personal beliefs, nor their diversity, stand in the way of bringing hope to people in the West. Chaplaincy is one of the careers and maybe the most significant career, which upholds the West's true meaning of tolerance. It is not hard to find a Jewish chaplain serving a Muslim individual, and both have zero conflicts. This is only possible through the tolerance that the West teaches, which advocates that people do not have to agree, like or love each other, but uphold others human dignity and rights to freely be who they want to be. All this is possible through mutual respect.

The West continues to have a lot to offer to the world. It is a place like chaplaincy that continues to praise diversity. However, one thing that should never be overlooked is that "Each culture has its own values, norms, institutions, beliefs, and modes of thinking,"¹⁰¹ Therefore, movements seeking to undermine Western societies' cultures should not be encouraged in the West. Millennial progressive movements must understand the values of all cultures and beliefs. If they are seeking to have a better society, they should do so in a manner that will not bring down the West and the values it fought for to become a paradise for freedom. If the West is going to remain the free world, millennial progressive movements will have to uphold its history and seek to make it a better place by not repeating the history of intolerance. Instead, they should go back to the foundation of the West and give people the opportunity to openly debate and find common ground. Multicultural societies like the West can only continue in glory through common ground agreements among its citizens.

¹⁰¹ Farer, "The Clash of Cultures, 18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, Basheer. "Freedom of Expression and Blasphemy Laws." <https://www.islamicity.org/79966/freedom-of-expression-and-blasphemy-laws/>
- Bauman, Zygmunt and Aleksandra Kania. "That West Meant to be Declining." *Thesis Eleven* 149, no. 1 (2018): 91-99.
- Boghian, Ioana. "Psycho-Pedagogical Approach to the Concept of Tolerance." *Journal of Innovation in Psychology, Education and Didactics* 21, no. 1 (2017): 97-110.
- Brown, Carys. "Politeness, Hypocrisy and Protestant Dissent in England After the Toleration Act, c.1689-c.1750." *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 41, no. 1 (2018): 61-80.
- Burt, Callie H. "Scrutinizing the U.S. Equality Act 2019: A Feminist Examination of Definitional Changes and Sociolegal Ramifications." *Feminist Criminology* 15, no. 4 (2020): 363-409.
- Cannell, Fenella. "The Anthropology of Secularism." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39 (2010): 85-100.
- Castro, Antonio J. "Themes in the Research on Preservice Teachers' Views of Cultural Diversity: Implications for Researching Millennial Preservice Teachers." *Educational Researcher* 39, no. 3 (2010): 198-210.
- Dulles, Avery C. "On Relativism," *Nova et Vetera* (Denver, CO), 15, no. 3, (2017): 729-743.
- Chemerinsky, Erwin. "Why Separate Church and State?" *Oregon Law Review* 85, no. 2 (2006): 351-369.
- Constitution of the United States. <https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-1/>
- Corrigan, John, and Lynn S. Neal. *Religious Intolerance in America a Documentary History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Crowne, Kerri Anne. "Cultural Exposure, Emotional Intelligence, and Cultural Intelligence: An Exploratory Study." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* 13, no. 1 (April 2013): 5-22.
- Dadon-Golan, Zehorit, Adrian Ziderman, and Iris BenDavid-Hadar. "Does University Attendance Impact Students' Political Tolerance and Open-Mindedness: The Atypical Case of Israel?" *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* 13, no. 4 (2021): 1133-1153.
- Declaration of Independence: A Transcription, (1776). *National Achieves*, <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript>.

- Douglass, Fredrick. *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass: An American Slave, Written by Himself*. Simon & Schuster 2004.
- Dowd, Robert A. "Religious Diversity and Religious Tolerance: Lessons from Nigeria." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60, no. 4 (2016): 617-644.
- Drake, H.A. "Intolerance, Religious Violence, and Political Legitimacy in Late Antiquity." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 79, no. 1 (2011): 193–235.
- Duque, Richard B., Robert Rivera, and E. J. LeBlanc. "The Active Shooter Paradox: Why the Rise of Cancel Culture, "Me Too", ANTIFA and Black Lives Matter... Matters." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 60, (2021): 101544.
- Edwards, Mark. "Can Christianity Save Civilisation? Liberal Protestant Anti-Secularism in Interwar America." *Journal of Religious History* 39, no. 1 (2015): 51-67.
- Eisenstein, Marie A. and Inc NetLibrary. *Religion and the Politics of Tolerance: How Christianity Builds Democracy*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- Farer, Tom J. "The Clash of Cultures, the Tension within Liberalism, and the Proper Limits of Tolerance." *Human Rights Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (2014): 1-21.
- Feldman, Keith P. and Leerom Medovoi. "Race/Religion/War: An Introduction." *Social Text* 34, no. 4 (2016): 1-17.
- Fessenden, Tracy. *Culture and Redemption: Religion, the Secular, and American Literature*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2007; 2008; 2011; 2006; 2014.
- Friedrich, Matthew D. "The Affordable Care Act and Hospital Chaplaincy: Re-Visioning Spiritual Care, Re-Valuing Institutional Wholeness." *Journal of Health Care Chaplaincy* 21, no. 3 (2015): 108-121.
- Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Volume the First*. London: Electric Book Co., 2001.
- Gibson, James, Christopher Claassen, and Joan Barceló. "Deplorables: Emotions, Political Sophistication, and Political Intolerance." *American Politics Research* 48, no. 2 (2020): 252-262.
- Goodman, Lenn Evan. *Religious Pluralism and Values in the Public Sphere*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2014; 2013.
- Golriz, Golshan. "Does Religion Prevent LGBTQ Acceptance? A Case Study with Queer and Trans Muslims in Toronto, Canada." *Journal of Homosexuality* 68, no. 14 (2021): 2451-2475.

Granath, Solveig and Magnus Ullén. "'The Elevation of Sensitivity Over Truth': Political Correctness and Related Phrases in the Time Magazine Corpus." *Applied Linguistics* 40, no. 2 (2019;2017;): 265-287.

Hansen, Kim Philip. *Military Chaplains and Religious Diversity*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Harbingers Daily. <https://harbingersdaily.com/30-year-military-chaplain-fired-from-air-force-his-crime-biblical-views-on-sexual-morality/>

Henry, Patrick. "Speech to the Second Virginia Convention"
<https://www.owleyes.org/text/speech-to-the-second-virginia-convention/read/text-of-henrys-speech#root-28>.

Hirsh, Michael, Ahmad Hassan Awan, and Jayanta Krishna Sarmah. "India and Pakistan: Outlining a Path Towards Peace." *Policy Perspectives (Islamabad)* 15, no. 1 (2018): 21-42.

Hyde, Walter Woodburn. "*Progress of Christianity*." In *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire, 164–92*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946.

Kenney, J. Scott. "Western Civilization, Inequality, and the Diversity Shell Game." *Academic Questions* 32, no. 3 (2019): 354-360.

Kocet, Michael M. and Barbara J. Herlihy. "Addressing Value-Based Conflicts within the Counseling Relationship: A Decision-Making Model." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 92, no. 2 (2014): 180-186.

Lawler, Peter. "The Good State: In Praise of 'Classical' Internationalism." *Review of International Studies* 31, no. 3 (2005): 427–49.

Locke, John. *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. The Federalist Papers, 1689.

Lozano, J. Félix and Teresa Eserich. "Cultural Diversity in Business: A Critical Reflection on the Ideology of Tolerance." *Journal of Business Ethics* 142, no. 4 (2017, 2016): 679-696.

Marcus, Kenneth L. "Anti-Zionism as Racism: Campus Anti-Semitism and the Civil Rights Act of 1964." *The William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal* 15, no. 3 (2007): 837.

Medium. <https://medium.com/discourse/over-60-of-americans-are-afraid-to-express-their-political-beliefs-c2619746c7f1#:~:text=Almost%20a%20third%20of%20employed%20Americans%20said%20they,worry%20about%20their%20political%20opinions%20harming%20their%20career.>

Newman, Peter A., Sophia Fantus, Michael R. Woodford, and Marie-Jolie Rwigema. "'Pray that

God Will Change You”: The Religious Social Ecology of Bias-Based Bullying Targeting Sexual and Gender Minority Youth—A Qualitative Study of Service Providers and Educators." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 33, no. 5 (2018): 523-548.

Ngendo, Virginia. <https://www.legit.ng/1276893-famous-voltaire-quotes-love-religion-government-more.html>

Pauck, Wilhelm. "The Christian Faith and Religious Tolerance." *Church History* 15, no. 3 (Sep 01, 1946): 220-235.

Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewforum.org/2019/10/17/in-u-s-decline-of-christianity-continues-at-rapid-pace/#:~:text=Self-described%20atheists%20now%20account%20for%204%25%20of%20U.S.,%E2%80%9Cnothing%20in%20particular%2C%E2%80%9D%20up%20from%2012%25%20in%202009.>

Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal. *Truth And Tolerance*. Ignatius Press, 2004.

Raeder, Linda C. "Postmodernism, Multiculturalism, and the Death of Tolerance: The Transformation of American Society." *Humanitas* 30, no. 1 (2017): 59-85.

Ramirez, Alejandro. "Tolerance vs Acceptance." *Washington University Political Review*, (2020) <https://www.wupr.org/2020/10/20/tolerance-vs-acceptance/>

Religions in the USA, <https://religionfacts.com/usa>.

Sonnier-Thompson, Bre. "The Uncertain Future of Western Civilization." *International Politics Reviews* 5, no. 2 (2017): 122-126.

Stade, Ronald S. "The Social Life of Fighting Words: The Case of Political Correctness." *Conflict and Society* 3, no. 1 (2017): 108-124.

Stein, Samuel. "Progress for Whom, Toward what? Progressive Politics and New York City's Mandatory Inclusionary Housing." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 40, no. 6 (2018): 770-781.

Szeto, Elson. "How do Principals' Practices Reflect Democratic Leadership for Inclusion in Diverse School Settings? A Hong Kong Case Study." *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership* 49, no. 3 (2021;2020;): 471-492.

The House of Representatives (USA) <https://lc.org/PDFs/BILLS-117hr5ih.pdf>

The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/26/us/harvard-chaplain-greg-epstein.html>

Voigtländer, Nico and Hans-Joachim Voth. "Nazi Indoctrination and Anti-Semitic Beliefs in Germany." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences - PNAS* 112, no. 26 (2015):

7931-7936.

Wolfe, Christopher James. "Unalienable Rights and some Libertarians." *Perspectives on Political Science* 51, no. 1 (2022; 2021): 1-6.

Wolverton, Joe, II. "Faith in the Face of Skepticism: The Pilgrims, the Indians, and the Truth about the First Thanksgiving. (History--Past and Perspective)." *The New American (Belmont, Mass.)* 25, no. 24 (2009): 36-39.

Youngblood, Peter. "Interfaith Chaplaincy as Interpretive Hospitality." *Religions (Basel, Switzerland)* 10, no. 3 (2019): 226.