

Religious Tolerance and Campus Nondiscrimination Policy Analysis

Posted on January 8, 2020

In a dilemma related to religious tolerance, Tina, who is a student at California State University, is facing a choice concerning the destiny of her school's Interschool Christian fellowship. Tina is a helping and volunteer student leader who grips Christian religious views as Interschool is always obligatory for the student leaders to do so. California State University has just made new rules and regulations necessitating that every approved campus group have a non-discrimination rule and regulations that indicate that a society could not need its leaders to have some specific beliefs that include religion. Tina is being held in a religious tolerance-based dilemma. Would she negotiate on her Christian principles to continue to be lawful in the senses of others or keep true to her trust even if it means probably estranging other people from the moral update of the gospel that Tina required to feast (Nandy, 1988)?

Tina's choice is hard as no matter which verdict she takes, she loses something, and likewise, each of his decisions will disturb other persons both indirectly and directly. If she refuses to acclimate to the new policy of California State University, the entire group will miss out on the funding of capital, publicity, and other out-reaching proceedings. Tina's interpretation of these is a prospect to extend the gospel and place higher importance on this. If she selects to refuse the new alterations in the rules and regulations, she must track the Interschool group without any funding of capital or any assistance from California State University. This will make it more difficult to attract more new members into the Interschool group. Tina also has the risk of being reported for not obeying the policies of California State University. Tina is facing two leading choices. Whether she did not do anything and continued to run her Interschool in the mode, it, however, risks being written up by the officials of the California State University if somebody complains to her. She can also alter the management of her group with the aim that the students in authority do not have to keep Christian views and beliefs. Tina could be pacifying other people but will not be acting in morality or practicing her right to free speech (Newman, 1982).

Core Beliefs

Morality, liberty, admiration for one's fellow man, and the duty to extend the gospel all play a significant part in this situation. Spending a truthful life is authoritative in the Christian religion. Speaking the truth is very vital to the Lord and he made it one of his ten main directives. The Christian religion requires the follower only to trust and live their trust realistically. It means that they are showing reliable conduct and are not liable on one point and telling another point. Followers of the past church were killed as they survived amenably as the Christian people and spread the good

updates in public. These individuals are making up cases of what it means to truly live one's belief. Honesty is a necessary element of the Christian religion, as Christian people have to trust each other. Mathew 22:36-39 quotes Jesus as saying, "'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.' This is the 1st and the utmost directive. And the 2nd one is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'" One cannot love God with all their heart if they deny him publicly, nor can they love their neighbor if they are not honest about their intentions (Habermas, 2004).

Resolution

Tina must not have to select amongst her religious-based beliefs and liberty of speech. These two points are rights that are given to her as a resident in the 1st Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. However, her dilemma has forced her hand. Tina can continuously run the group in the same way she is running the group now. This will have straightforward clashes with the new rules and regulations of California State University, and hence, she cannot continue it with strong mindfulness. The duty of the Intervarsity group to extend the gospel and deliver the partnership will also be importantly inadequate by a furtive process in the new policy of the California state university. Tina's selection is hard but based on ethics. She lets Intervarsity go unaccepted and unsponsored by California State University. This choice means that they will miss out on the perquisites and certain other prospects. However, they will attain their liberty and know that they are truthful to their beliefs and faiths (Cantor, 1994).

Evaluate

There are together the harms and advantages to some of Tina's likely choices. If Tina chooses to be true to her belief and faith and to the rules and regulations of the Intervarsity group, she will lose a lot of assistance that is knotted to being formally accepted by California State University. In the upcoming, it would be harder to arrange seminars and meetings, reserve the meeting places, promote the group in the university, and have unrestricted access to the faculty and the students. The benefits and welfare for Tina and the other Intervarsity followers are having the liberty to run Intervarsity groups with the precise technique. Here is nothing that declares the group could not endure running casually in the university. This is a better choice for the organization as it lets them continue a Christian-led group that spreads out to individuals of all qualifications.

Compare

Absolute realities like morality are particularly vital to the Christian religion. Absolute realities do not play a similar part in a skeptical world-view, which considers that everybody needs to understand realism for them and choose their particular ethics and strictly follow these ethics. This is known as moral relativity. In this worldview, Tina is furthermore probable to admit the policies of California

State University fluctuate to mollify them but endure to conduct Intersivity group commercials though she enjoys behindhand closed doors. This will not be incorrect in this worldview as no total reality means the meaning of 'right' and 'wrong' could vary contingent on the condition.

Conclusion

Religious tolerance-based dilemmas are mostly problematic even when they are not the issues of life and death. This is obvious in Tina's circumstances. Tina's problem arises at California State University, and it deals with how a group of students would behave by itself. It is improbable that any resolution to her religious-based dilemma would be a life-changing instance; however, it would still make sense due to the worldviews. Her worldview would prejudice the choice Tina makes, and some results of that decision would be treated over the lenses of her worldview. A similar point will be correct for most people in society. This instance is a testament to the control of worldviews.

References

Cantor, D. (1994). *The religious right: The assault on tolerance & pluralism in America*. Anti-Defamation League.

Habermas, J. (2004). Religious tolerance—the pacemaker for cultural rights. *Philosophy*, 79(1), 5-18.

Nandy, A. (1988). The politics of secularism and the recovery of religious tolerance. *Alternatives*, 13(2), 177-194.

Newman, J. (1982). *Foundations of religious tolerance*. Univ of Toronto Pr.