

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

# American Evangelicals and Islam: The Pluralist Option

This final chapter briefly and informally explores ten ways in which American evangelicals might take action and apply the insights of Christian pluralism in their own context. These ten reflections draw from the major theological and political lessons explored throughout this book. It is my opinion that if evangelicals are going to become a generative force for Muslim rights and deep pluralism in America, they will need to make these ten moves—among others.

### 1. Avoid the Rhetoric of the Right and the Left

The first lesson American evangelicals can learn from the European experience with Islam is to avoid listening to right- and left-wing rhetoric when it comes to Muslim immigration and the politics of difference. In the opening chapters, we explored in great detail how both of these political voices framed the debate over Islam in narrow and counter-productive ways. Both paradigms were found to be simplistic, myopic, and ultimately destructive.

The left-wing voice in the Netherlands framed the conflict with words like openness and generosity, tolerance and diversity, inclusion and multiculturalism. For this voice, the political goal was inclusiveness and an open door. In reaction to this voice, a second, right-wing voice arose in the Netherlands to frame the debate with words like law and order, safety and security, nation and culture. For this voice, the political goal was a restrictive and high wall. And so the majority of Dutch discussions about Islam over the past four decades have been dominated by a desire for either “open doors” or “high walls.”

If the Dutch story has taught us anything, it is this: myopic political visions that seek either high walls or open doors as political ends in and of themselves are not only destabilizing, they are also dangerous.

As you will recall from the first two chapters, the politics of open doors ruled the Netherlands during the 1980s and 1990s to disastrous effect. The left's generous but flawed policies failed the country in a variety of ways. First, they failed to provide a sufficient plan for how they would sufficiently prepare Muslim immigrants to thrive in a very different culture and a very challenging marketplace. Second, advocates of open doors did not wrestle with the many cultural challenges and questions these newcomers would present to the Dutch people or their neighborhoods, schools, organizations, and cities. As newcomers failed to thrive and as their rates of poverty, unemployment, crime, and domestic abuse rose, so too did the racial and cultural tensions. Third, the left instituted a harmful gag-order of political correctness on Dutch political discourse. Citizens who questioned the generous open-door policies or criticized Islam in any way were quickly branded with the deadly labels of "racist" and "bigot." Fourth, Dutch citizens were not prepared to show the sort of deep vulnerability, hospitality, and love that immigrants and asylum-seekers need. Many of the Dutch treated the religious conservatism of the newcomers with sarcasm, jokes, patronizing re-education programs, and a sense of modern superiority. The individualistic spiritualities of Amsterdam did not provide Dutch citizens with a thick enough moral life for the challenges of deep—and sometimes dangerous—difference. Finally, while Dutch advocates of the open door liked the idea of diversity, they were not prepared for the raw and challenging reality of living next door to people with convictions about gender, sexuality, religion, politics, and morality that differed significantly from their own. As the saying goes, liberals want a diverse society of citizens who look different—but think the same—as they do. Deep diversity, it turns out, was much easier for the left to espouse in theory than it was for them to embody in practice.

Predictably, the failures of the left's open-door policies led to a fierce political backlash. Dutch political culture took a hard and fast turn to the right. Today, Dutch politicians rarely dare to mention the word *multiculturalism*. Moreover, across the political spectrum, politicians regularly advocate for higher levels of immigrant scrutiny and restriction, higher language requirements, and higher expectations for the cultural assimilation of Islam into the secular Dutch whole. The political discussion today is now dominated by the rhetoric of high walls—not open doors. As a result of this shift, large swaths of Dutch citizens now see Islam as fundamentally incompatible with Dutch

society. They embrace the narrative of a clash of civilizations, believing that one side must ultimately win out. Needless to say, this hard right-wing turn from open doors to higher walls has done nothing but worsen the already growing tensions between Mecca and Amsterdam.

American evangelicals are now being drawn into a similar false choice. The left offers American citizens vague talk about diversity and acceptance, political correctness, identity politics, and simplistic chants of “Let them in! Let them in!” Meanwhile, the American right responds to the issue by parroting European clash rhetoric, casting this historical moment as an absolute confrontation between two completely opposing worldviews—which only one side can win.

In the end, the story of the Netherlands is an object lesson for American evangelicals in the failure of an exclusive focus on either open doors or high walls. When differences are deep, fast, and close, simplistic approaches to complex and dynamic differences fall apart. American evangelicals must find ways to avoid these faulty and ultimately fatal approaches to the politics of difference.

## 2. Defend Muslim Spaces

American evangelicals commonly look at Muslim spaces (Islamic families, charities, mosques, schools, and organizations) with great suspicion. They imagine these gatherings to be subversive and diabolical. Like many Americans, they worry that Muslim spaces encourage segregation, extremism, and violence. The research in the preceding chapter demonstrates these assumptions to be seriously flawed.

The true driving force of Islamic extremism and terrorism in the West is not Islamic community—but Islamic individualism. As Cesari stated earlier, terrorists are most commonly produced—not through poverty—but through a sense of fragmentation and displacement. When an individual Muslim is disconnected from communal ties of a healthy family, school, mosque, and culture, that person is most vulnerable to join the more cosmic and violent forms of Internet-based Islamic extremism. If American evangelicals are determined to fear something, they should not fear the gathering of Muslims, but their scattering.

Reflecting on the production of extremism in the Netherlands, Sam Cheribi points to a variety of social and political pressure points that fracture and destroy Muslim families and communities. When combined, these external

forces quickly become a “pulverizing machine that destroys the individual who happens to be Muslim and reconstitutes him or her as someone who is only a part of a larger, alienated, monolithic entity, in this case the ‘Muslim threat.’”<sup>1</sup>

As it was demonstrated earlier, Muslim families, schools, mosques, and organizations in the United States all play a critical role in the communal formation and empowerment of Muslim American citizens. Finally, these communities have an important bridging function in that they give Muslim Americans the ability to connect and have conversations with outside institutions, religions, and governments.

As an important aside, note that while these spaces connect Muslims to each other and American society, evangelicals should never ask these spaces to serve as an American assimilation factory. A Muslim space, be it a family, mosque, or school, should never be judged by its ability to turn an individual Muslim into a modern, democratic capitalist. This is emphatically *not* its purpose.

Instead, American evangelicals should praise the fact that these Muslim spaces produce distinctly *Muslim* citizens with their own distinct visions of the good. These distinctly Muslim visions will, at times, conflict in the public square with Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, conservative, and liberal visions. And this is a *good* thing, which evangelicals should celebrate. For, if evangelicals want the freedom to voice their own distinct visions in America, they must fight for the Muslim’s right to do so as well. As Abraham Kuyper declared to his Christian pluralists more than a century ago, “That freedom which we want for ourselves we must not withhold from others!”<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Embrace Cultural Marginalization

American evangelicals are a moral and political minority in the United States. Their cultural and political power is receding with each passing year. Many of them have yet to accept this fact. Wounded veterans of old culture wars, older American evangelicals are well trained in fighting for their own religious rights and privileges, but they have little experience fighting for the rights and privileges of other faiths. This will need to change. For the time being, many

1. Sam Cherribi, *In the House of War: Dutch Islam Observed* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 5.

2. Abraham Kuyper, *Pro Rege of het koningschap van Christus* (Kampen: Kok, 1912), 3:181–82.

evangelicals still long to “take America back” and “claim America for Jesus.” The path forward for American evangelicals must include an acceptance of their minority status in a pluralistic culture.

Critical theorist Nancy Fraser argues that lasting democracy depends, not on an enforced moral or cultural consensus, but on a generative conflict between diverse subcultures. She argues that the common belief that democracy requires a homogenous set of national values and beliefs is wrongheaded. Democracy requires a “multiplicity of publics” challenging one another’s conception of the good.<sup>3</sup> Fraser argues that diverse moral communities and countercultures each serve a critical democratic function. Moreover, Fraser warns that if the majority community goes unchecked by these minority “counter-publics,” the majority will inevitably grow in its destructive hegemony and pursue even more aggressive cultural uniformity.

The path forward for American evangelicals must include a reimagining of what it means to be a moral minority who agitates for the rights of other moral minorities—including Islam. At this point, evangelicals might learn from the insightful questions asked by Gert-Jan Segers, a pluralist parliamentary leader in the Dutch Christian Union. He asked his fellow Dutch evangelicals, “Can we be peacemakers? Can we make a constructive contribution to this great social dispute even if our contribution is from the margins of society?”<sup>4</sup>

As soon as evangelicals lay down their dreams of American cultural domination, they can pick up the more humble—and, frankly, more interesting—dream of American pluralism, justice, and respectful contestation.

#### 4. Build Institutions

In order to constitute a minority counter-culture for Christian pluralism, evangelicals will need to do more than write a series of books like this. Abraham Kuyper and his movement for Christian pluralism demonstrate that good ideas go nowhere without strong institutions. Vibrant Christian organizations, universities, and media outlets perfect, empower, and extend the ideas of Christian pluralism into the public square. Evangelicals will need a rich collection of schools, organizations, and journals dedicated to the ideals of

3. Nancy Fraser, *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the “Postsocialist” Condition* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 85.

4. Gert-Jan Segers, *Voorwaarden voor vrede: de komst van de islam, de integratie van moslims en de identiteit van Nederland* (Amsterdam: Buijten and Schipperheijn Motief, 2009), 107.

Christian pluralism. While American evangelicals are well known for their organizing skills, many of their current institutions were initially designed for a period of cultural dominance, not a period of cultural pluralism and partnership. In this new age, evangelical colleges, universities, and seminaries will still need to form strong leaders with strong evangelical convictions. That said, their students will also need to be well prepared to build cultural bridges, collaborations, and conversations, as well.

Evangelical contestations with other moral communities will continue—they may well proliferate. That said, evangelical students will need to be prepared to handle these contestations with grace, civility, and creativity. If the evangelical curriculums of the past were designed for cultural dominance, those of the future will need to be designed for cultural conversation and constructive contestation.

Evangelical political organizations will also need to be radically reconceived. First and foremost, they will need to detach themselves from their unhealthy alliance to the Republican Party. This perverted political alliance has drawn evangelical leaders and institutions deeper and deeper into a party that has become increasingly nativist and Islamophobic. In this new age, many evangelical activists will still feel called to serve faithfully within the Democratic and Republican Parties. That said, evangelical activists *must* cultivate a more provisional and contingent connection to these parties and the ideologies they represent. When it comes to the political issue of Islam, evangelicals must come to support Christian political organizations and think tanks who not only resist the demonization of Islam, but who positively advocate for Muslim rights, freedoms, and dignity.

Surveying the current landscape of evangelical political organizations, I see one tangible bright spot in the Center for Public Justice in Washington, DC. This bipartisan, Christian think tank is uniquely committed to the pluralistic approach to justice issues that we have been discussing throughout this book. While many evangelical organizations advocate for the religious rights of Christians, CPJ is unique in that it advocates for the public rights and freedoms of all faith communities—including Islam. CPJ does not engage in this work because it believes that all faiths are somehow equally true—whatever this bromide means. Instead, CPJ advocates for the universal rights of all religions because of their exclusive commitment to Christ, who commands justice for all.

Across the United States, numerous peacemaking and dialogue organizations are being developed that evangelicals can support and join. Peace Cataly is dedicated to catalyzing peace, understanding, and reconciliation

between Christians and Muslims. Peace Catalyst provides hands-on training and seminars for Christian leaders, churches, and organizations interested in peacemaking activities and engagement with their Muslim neighbors.<sup>5</sup>

American evangelicals can join countless other institutional and organizational efforts. In terms of regular reading material, the *Evangelical Interfaith Dialogue Journal* contains excellent reflections from scholars and practitioners on the front lines of interfaith engagement. Another area of potential engagement is refugee resettlement. Some of the largest organizations resettling Muslim refugees in the United States are actually run by Christian churches. Their numbers include Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services, Episcopal Migration Services, World Relief, and the US Conference of Catholic Bishops. Finally, beyond formal institutions, numerous organic conversations and organizations are springing up throughout North America. For example, two women in California—one Muslim, the other Christian—recently launched an online conversation entitled “Miss Understanding” to report on their growing friendship.

### 5. Find Muslim Cobelligerents

One of the most critical lessons American evangelicals can learn from Abraham Kuyper and the early Christian pluralist movement is the need for cobelligerents. Kuyper’s movement was relatively small in the Netherlands (roughly 15 percent of the population), yet the pluralists won monumental constitutional reforms through their cobelligerence with Roman Catholics. As we saw, Dutch Protestants and Catholics had a long history of contention, distrust, and even hatred. However, they found that they had a number of common political concerns and ultimately they decided to work together. Rather than fighting alone to secure their own rights and freedoms, imagine what could be achieved if evangelicals invited American Muslims, Jews, Catholics, Hindus, and Buddhists for a discussion about how their communities could advance their common concerns for religious freedom and the flourishing of all.

While cobelligerence with other faiths could certainly increase the political influence of evangelicalism, that is not my primary concern. For decades now, evangelicals have cultivated a terrible public reputation for being politically selfish and cynical. The optics of evangelicals standing side by side with

5. My thanks to Cory Willson and Matthew Krabill, the editors of the *Evangelical Interfaith Dialogue Journal*, both of whom provided me with numerous helpful suggestions of churches and organizations of note.

Muslims, Jews, Catholics, Mormons, Buddhists, and Hindus is far superior to the optics of evangelicals standing alone, demanding more freedom for themselves. The added bonus, of course, is that this is the right thing to do.

Furthermore, while American evangelicals may not recognize it, they have a lot in common with their Muslim neighbors. Both sides care deeply about the spiritual integrity of their worship, families, schools, and community. Both sides are concerned about the over-sexualization of their children and culture. Both are annoyed when liberals explain to them that all religions are basically the same. Both are tired of being labeled culturally backward, ignorant, and regressive. Both desire to freely embody their visions of the good life in the public square. While evangelicals and Muslims are different in a variety of ways, there are more than enough opportunities for their occasional cooperation and cobelligence in American life.

Beyond increased influence and a better public image, cobelligence has one final benefit for evangelicals—(trans)formation. When evangelicals engage in dialogue and collaboration with Muslims, they might actually learn something from their interlocutors. Evangelicals might slowly come to know, respect, and even enjoy their Muslim neighbors.

While deep differences will—and should—remain between Muslims and evangelicals, through dialogue and cobelligence these two interlocutors might begin to imagine a contested but generative political life together.

## **6. Deconstruct Christian Nationalism**

Kuyper was able to convince his movement of nineteenth-century Christian pluralists that Christian nationalism would be detrimental to both Christianity and the nation. American evangelicals should listen. Kuyper insisted that the Dutch church should never attempt to coercively unite the pluriform faiths of the Netherlands under its own roof. The church, he argued, is, by definition, “antithetical to the unity dream. . . . This is its essential character, its very nature.”<sup>6</sup> The church is, and ought to be, a distinct moral community within the nation. American evangelicals who long to “claim America for Christ” would do well to heed his warnings about the detrimental effects of Christian nationalism.

6. Abraham Kuyper, “Calvinism: Source and Stronghold of Our Constitutional Liberties” in *Abraham Kuyper: A Centennial Reader*, ed. James Bratt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 390.



In chapter three we explored Kuyper's indentification of two distinct ways in which churches have historically attempted to solve the problem of religious diversity. The first was through force and aggression. Here the church tried to unite the nation through the violent assimilation of minority faiths. The second method was by watering down the church—thinning the church out so that it could unite the diverse faiths of the nation. The first solution violently dissolves the nation into the church; the second dissolves the church into the nation.

While these two modes of Christian nationalism appear quite different, Kuyper argued that they rest upon the same fatal mistakes. They both assume that the religious diversity of a nation is a solvable problem, and they both assume that it is the church's responsibility to solve it. In order to solve religious difference, the church must either surrender its peaceableness (and become violent) or the church must surrender its principled distinctiveness (and become watered-down). For Kuyper, if the church forcefully assimilated outsiders or allowed itself to be assimilated into another community, it would suffer a fundamental "loss of its character."<sup>7</sup> In light of this, when American evangelicals play with the idea of Christian nationalism, they are playing with the very integrity of Christ's church.

American evangelicals would do well to listen to Abraham Kuyper and accept the fact that America's many faiths are inevitably pervasive, public, and pluriform. When it comes to American Muslims, evangelicals must accept that there is no way to ignore, privatize, or assimilate Islamic faith or culture. Islam is here, Islam is public, and Islam is different. The pluralist project cannot begin until American evangelicals accept this truth. Once evangelicals have done this, they can say with Kuyper, "I know of no other solution than to accept—freely and candidly, without any reservations—a free multiformity."<sup>8</sup>

Once Kuyper accepted this reality, he could finally begin to advocate a pluralistic approach for a nation that was irretrievably divided. For, Kuyper insisted, our pluralistic reforms "do not divide the nation or break society . . . they find the nation divided, conviction against conviction and they reckon with this undeniable fact!"<sup>9</sup> Once evangelicals put down the dream of Christian nationalism and accept Islam's presence in American life, they can begin

7. Kuyper, "Calvinism: Source and Stronghold," in Bratt, *Centennial Reader*, 390.

8. Abraham Kuyper, "Uniformity: The Curse of Modern Life," in *Abraham Kuyper: A Centennial Reader*, ed. James Bratt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 39.

9. Abraham Kuyper, *Pro Rege*, 3:181–82. Trans. and quoted in Wendy Fish Naylor, "Abraham Kuyper and the Emergence of the Neo-Calvinist Pluralism in the Dutch School Struggle" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2006), 147.

the much more interesting process of exploring how they can love their Muslim neighbors with the hospitality, justice, and grace of Jesus Christ.

## 7. Construct Christian Pluralism

If they believe anything, American evangelicals believe that Christ *alone* is Lord. The logical next step will be asking evangelicals a quintessentially Kuyperian question: if Christ alone is Lord, can Christians continue to claim lordship over Muslims? The answer, of course, is, “No!”

For if Christ—not the Christian—is the only rightful ruler over a Muslim, that has significant consequences for how Christians relate to their Muslim neighbors. If Christ has sovereignly bestowed dignity, rights, and freedoms on Muslim citizens, evangelicals dare not presume to take these sacred rights away. As Abraham Kuyper argued, Christ alone is sovereign over the diverse faiths of a nation. No Christian can dare seize Christ’s temporal or spatial sovereignty over a diverse nation.

If evangelicals wish to honor Christ’s temporal sovereignty over America, they will have to stop trying to control American history. They will need to relinquish their claims to historical sovereignty over America’s past or its future. Evangelicals do not control American history; Christ does. Moreover, Christ will sovereignly decide the time and tenor of his eschatological return. His exclusive temporal sovereignty should greatly humble the apocalyptic predictions and prognostications of evangelical dispensationalists. Finally, evangelical fears about a future clash of civilizations or an Islamification of America betray a fundamental lack of trust in Christ, who is sovereign over American history.

In the same vein, if evangelicals wish to honor Christ’s spatial sovereignty over America, they will have to stop allowing the American government to invade, monitor, and control sacred Muslim spaces. Evangelicals will need to actively resist the American government’s claims to spatial sovereignty over Muslim schools, charities, mosques, families, media, and so on. They will need to defend these spaces, not out of charity, but because Christ’s spatial sovereignty demands that these sacred spaces be honored and respected. As Abraham Kuyper argued long ago, before a government “crosses the boundary” into a faith community, it recognizes that it is walking on holy ground and “respectfully ‘takes the shoes off from its feet.’”<sup>10</sup>

10. Kuyper, “Sphere Sovereignty,” in *Centennial Reader*, 477.

Releasing their imaginary grasp on American time and space will be difficult for American evangelicals. That said, they will experience a great relief in the end. No longer will they bear the imagined burden of American cultural and religious leadership. Instead, they will be set free to serve as one moral minority voice within a pluralistic culture. Their new responsibility will be to embody a faithful witness to the justice and hospitality of Jesus Christ. Rather than dominate American culture, they will seek to be a distinct source of salt, light, and leaven lifting up the whole.

### 8. Follow the Whole Christ

As we discussed in chapter six, a respect for Christ's exclusive sovereignty over Muslim spaces is not enough. The complex fear, distrust, and division of this historical moment demands more than simply the kingship of Christ. Evangelicals making their way amidst this complex conflict need the whole Christ—every bit of him. In chapter six we explored the public implications of this more complex Christ.

We explored, for example, the public implications of Christ's humble healing and liberation of the slave who came to arrest him on the Mount of Olives. Amidst the chaos and violence of clubs, torches, and swords, Jesus—the king of American evangelicals—quietly kneeled down, picked up the man's severed ear, and healed him—all the while rebuking his followers and commanding them to put away their swords. In this brief encounter with Jesus, American evangelicals are confronted with the power of Christ's humility and healing—not simply for his friends, but his enemies too. Klaas Schilder's reflections on this encounter allow American evangelicals the opportunity to reflect on the power of small acts of healing and vulnerability for friend and foe alike amidst the so-called clash of civilizations.

Moving on to Schilder's more grotesque portrayal of the naked Christ on the cross, American evangelicals are here forced to gaze upon their own naked fear, hatred, and violence. Gazing at Christ's nakedness, evangelicals are forced to finally admit their own propensity for aggression and their own need for mercy. The cross exposes all—including American evangelicals. Looking at the naked body of Jesus, they are forced to admit a humbling truth: "I put him there on that cross. I am capable of this violence. I am looking at my own naked aggression." The evangelical who has gazed upon the naked cross can no longer essentialize the Muslim neighbor as some violent *thing* that is wholly other from him- or herself. On Golgotha, all of humanity—evangelicals and

Muslims—participated in the violence of the cross. This is a hard but stubborn truth. Schilder was right, “We want to avert our eyes, but we may not. We *must* look on.” For Christ “made this plundering of His clothes a sign for all ensuing generations.”<sup>11</sup>

In the Christology of Hans Boersma, American evangelicals must wrestle with the fact that hospitality is absolutely central to Christ’s cross and the knowledge of what it means to carry one. American evangelicals at this historical moment are locked in a massive debate about Muslim refugees escaping the Syrian civil war. Does America have a responsibility to open itself up to the needs, pain, and potential violence of these asylum-seekers? Christ did. According to Boersma, this is exactly what the cross represents—the hospitality of God. On the cross we witness the opening of God’s very self to the pain and violence of the world. The outstretched hands of Christ have public implications for how American evangelicals respond to the Syrian refugee crisis. Christ’s cruciform hospitality does not promise a romantic rainbow nation of multicultural harmony. Cruciform hospitality lived out amidst deep difference and violence means that there will be pain—even blood. Nevertheless, this is the cost of cruciform hospitality evangelicals must be prepared to pay in a divided nation.

Finally, we examined Herman Bavinck’s pervasive vision of Christ’s redemptive work in every sphere of social and political life. For Bavinck insisted that the “fruits of Christ’s sacrifice are not restricted to any one area of life; they are not limited, as so many people think nowadays, to the religious-ethical life, to the heart, the inner chamber, or the church, but are extended to the entire world.”<sup>12</sup> In light of this picture, American evangelicals can participate in Christ’s pervasive redemptive work in every sphere of American society.

In other words, the grace that evangelicals have received in their hearts can—and must—be lived out in every aspect of their public lives alongside their Muslim neighbors. As evangelicals interact with Islam at work and school, in politics and business, through the media and the marketplace, the hospitality they have received from Christ must be given to their Muslim neighbors.

Rather than looking at their Muslim neighbors through the lenses of the world (security concerns, cultural clashes and controversies, and so on),

11. Klaas Schilder, *Christ Crucified*, trans. Henry Zylstra (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1940), 168.

12. Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics*, ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003–2008), 3: 451.

American evangelicals must view their Muslim neighbors first and foremost through their primary lens—Jesus Christ. Christ’s sovereignty, humility, nakedness, hospitality, sacrifice, and healing must be the ultimate framework through which American evangelicals not only see but also engage their Muslim neighbor.

### 9. Go Through Worship Training

It will not be enough, however, for American evangelicals to simply have the framework of Christ; they will need to develop the heart of Christ as well.

In chapter seven we argued that if Christian pluralists were going to form strong and durable hearts capable of resisting the politics of fear, worship would need to play a central role. We argued that durable hearts and lasting affections do not emerge instantaneously. Sturdy and strong hearts require exercise, practice, discipline, habituation, and a supportive community of desire and imagination. This is why we stressed the importance of worship.

However fearful, hateful, or angry evangelical hearts feel throughout the week, they can begin the slow process of redirecting themselves towards the humility, grace, and hospitality of Christ in and through Sunday worship. In the sanctuary, evangelical citizens have the opportunity to hear stories of hospitality, sing songs of justice, pray prayers of humility, assume postures of openness, and look upon images of grace. They can, in short, train their hearts to desire hospitality over hostility.

Of course, heads and hearts are notoriously stubborn, and worship works slowly. That said, if American evangelicals are ever going to serve as a faithful and lasting voice for Muslim rights and dignity in the United States, worship formation will have to play a significant role. For in a fear-filled age, durable pluralists will require formative spaces of confession, lament, encouragement, humility, and direction. For the American evangelical, that space will and must be the sanctuary.

### 10. Make Pluralism Vocational

Finally, while a few American evangelicals will serve in the elite offices of national politics, media, and the academy, the vast majority of them will lead relatively ordinary lives alongside their Muslim neighbors. If evangelicals are going to be a force for pluralism in America, they will need to do so at both

the national and the local level. Evangelicals are going to need a vocational approach to peacemaking and hospitality with their Muslim neighbors. They will need to see their vocational spaces in businesses, schools, hospitals, neighborhood councils, and city halls as sacred spaces of hospitality, justice, and grace. These so-called mundane vocational spaces need to be understood as critically important places in which the love of Christ can be made manifest.

When a coworker is harassed, when a local Mosque is vandalized, when a student requests a space for prayer, when a customer asks for a different meal, or a patient requests a translator, all of these relatively small moments must be seen by everyday evangelicals as treasured opportunities to embody the hospitality of Christ in a fragmenting world. After all, evangelicals follow a God who—during a time of great fear and fragmentation—offered not only his love, but his very self.