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**Abstract:**

Intolerance appears to be commonplace all around the world. Many reports of intolerance are reported daily between people having different ideologies and belonging to different religions. There are different cases of intolerance almost in all countries between different religious groups, fascist and antifascist groups. These events have many examples such as the “burka ban” on Muslim women in many western countries, and a ban on the building of new minarets.

The psychology of three understandings of intolerance is **Prejudicial intolerance, Intuitive intolerance,** and **Deliberative intolerance.** These three understandings have different implications such as how to respond to intolerance and how the difference of ideas can cause strong differences between different groups on basis of culture and religion.

These different kinds of intolerance go through three phases **affective state, psychological process, and behavioral outcome.**

**Main theme:**

| **Dimension** | **Prejudicial intolerance** | **Intuitive intolerance** | **Deliberative intolerance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Affective state | Negative out-group feelings (antipathy, hatred) | Disapproval of out-group practices as different | Disapproval of specific practices  as being harmful and unfair |
| Psychological process | Rigidity, closedmindedness | Immediate intuitions and emotions | Weighting contrasting moral  reasons |
| Behavioral outcome | In-group superiority and out-group discrimination | Intergroup differentiation with double standards | In-group protection and rejection  of practices regardless of the actor |

**Summary:**

**Prejudicial intolerance** is one of three forms of intolerance. It refers to a rigid form of thinking. Psychologists equate tolerance with a mindset that is open to accepting different ideas from different people. While intolerance is compared with a mindset that does not accept the ideas of others. They oppose the ideas of others and this behavior of them causes negativity in society. A prejudiced person has a narrow and closed mindset. This kind of person feels it difficult to accept the beliefs, ideas, and ideologies of others. Contrary, nonjudgmental persons have an open mindset and are flexible towards different ideas from different groups. For example, we see intolerance in offices where people show intolerance towards their colleagues on basis of race, or religion.

**Intuitive intolerance** is inter-group intolerance. This form of understanding of intolerance is based on the classical notion of tolerance. In this form of understanding group-based intolerance is observed. According to research, a huge difference was found in the ideas of different countries regarding the ban on wearing hijab. On the other hand, if a Muslim country does such things, then they face a lot of criticism from the west. Moreover, the dominant groups are mostly intolerant towards the rights of minorities. They don’t observe their rights whether religious or cultural. People criticize a culture, religion, or ideology when it does not consider their religion, culture, or ideology respectful. According to intuitive intolerance, people can also apply a double standard by accepting the practices of any other group. Research shows that 38% of Western Europeans applied a double standard by accepting some Muslim as well as Christian practices. People who claim that they are not intolerant and are open-minded and they respect ethnic, political, or religious groups, may be intolerant towards some of these groups. Believing that all religions and groups are not equally valid leads society towards intolerance.

**Deliberative intolerance** refers to the idea that no group is tolerant of everything. According to this understanding, some particular beliefs and practices departed unacceptably from a presupposed standard. A person may be intolerant of the religious practices of a particular group and may reject some beliefs in an intolerant way. For example, in the Netherlands, a group of people supports a ban on hijab and the building of mosques only based on disliking Muslims. Following the dual-process model of moral judgmentdeliberative intolerance is based on a process of reflective reasoning. This kind of reasoning supports rejecting a religious practice rather than accepting it. For instance, we can consider the “hijab ban” which can raise gender equality issues, or we can observe in many places that Islamic school foundations are rejected just because they hate Muslims. But if we want to give equal rights to every religion and group, all countries must show tolerance.

**Strength:**

The author has provided detailed knowledge about the three psychologies of tolerance which is the strength of this article. It tells us about these types of intolerances by providing different examples from different parts of the world.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the author explained these psychologies of intolerance, he didn’t mention the alternatives for these problems.

**Opinion and Conclusion:**

Intolerance is increasing in our societies in different forms but it cannot be accepted. We must do proper work to eliminate intolerance from society so that we can reduce violence in our societies. To reduce **intolerance,** we can use certain **educational strategies, diversity training courses, and media campaigns.** Education is one of the best weapons against intolerance. We can educate our people so that they will know how to oppose someone, and how to criticize someone. Because it is very important to watch over our behavior so that it is not aggressive. Furthermore, diversity training courses help us reduce civil rights violations and teamwork.
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