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Introduction

“The Bible is a plain book,” declared the early fundamentalist preacher Charles Hodge in 1857. “It is intelligible by the people. And they have the right and are bound to read and interpret it for themselves; so that their faith may rest on the testimony of the Scriptures, and not that of the Church” (Boone 17). Here is a central image of fundamentalism – as true today as 150 years ago. The simple uneducated reader, unchurched and untutored, opens the Biblical text, reads, and finds salvation. For Hodge, the text, read by a reader illuminated by the Holy Spirit, is sufficient. The Text itself instructs the reader, and the Church is an obstacle to the true reading of the text.

My aim tonight is to show why Hodge’s claim makes sense within the rules of Fundamentalism, but cannot make sense to any body who is not part of the form of life which allows those rules to exist. And I want to argue that this is because Fundamentalism is what the French philosopher Michel Foucault would call “a discourse” and that the Fundamentalist simply reading his Bible is immersed in a whole mass of texts that belong to a single discursive formation – Fundamentalism – written by “so many authors who know or do not know one another, criticise one another, invalidate one another, pillage one another, meet without knowing it and obstinately intersect their unique discourses in a web of which they cannot see the whole, and of whose breadth they have a very inadequate idea” (Foucault, 126). What I hope to do then in this lecture is to uncover the logic, to lay out the rules, of this complex version of Christianity.

Broadly speaking, Fundamentalism is the extreme end of that form of Protestantism known as Conservative Evangelicalism. So there is some truth to the notion that a Fundamentalist is a Christian who believes that Billy Graham is a liberal. Certainly it can be said that Fundamentalism is that movement that sees itself as struggling for true Christianity against a new non Christian religion – liberalism, modernism, or secularism that it believes has affected Western Culture generally, and infected Protestant Christianity in particular. While it shares much with Evangelical Christianity, Fundamentalists would see themselves as more faithful to the Bible, more militant against personal moral evils, and less ready to cater to social and intellectual respectability than Evangelicals. Evangelicals for their part would see Fundamentalists in contrast to themselves as being more anti-intellectual, having a mechanical view of the inspiration of the Bible, having a literalistic approach to interpreting the Bible, rejecting involvement with Christians who do not share their views, and denying the social relevance of the Christian Gospel.
The historical origins of the term are clear. The term “fundamentalist” was perhaps first used in 1920 by Curtis Lee Laws in the Baptist Watchman-Examiner to identify those who believed and actively defended the fundamentals of the faith, “to do battle royal for the Fundamentals” as he put it. It referred back to a series of twelve small volumes published between 1910 and 1915 which defended the whole range of traditional Christian teachings against what it saw as their current enemies – Romanism, socialism, modern philosophy, atheism, Mormonism, spiritualism, and so on, but above all liberal (Protestant) theology, German higher criticism of the Bible, and Darwinism. By 1920, the fundamental doctrines it was concerned to defend were the inerrancy of Scripture, the virgin birth of Christ, the substitutionary atonement of Christ, Christ’s bodily resurrection, the historicity of the miracles, the Deity of Christ, and in some cases the premillennial second coming of Christ.

*The Bible and its Authority*

Central to the defense of all of these was that of the Bible and its authority. And the authority of the Bible is, for the fundamentalist dependent upon the assumption of its autonomous meaning, which means its literal truth. Asked what the literal truth of the Bible means, the fundamentalist response will be its “common sense” meaning. Deep, hidden, or esoteric readings of the text are rejected in favour of its plain meaning. At the very least, this means that fundamentalists are genuinely committed to a particular understanding of religious truth.

And it is an understanding of religious truth that it shares with some Muslims and Jews: namely, that truth in general and religious truth in particular is propositional. Religious truth is primarily truth that can be put into sentence form, for intellectual assent. Truth is, moreover, the correspondence of a proposition with an external reality, with things as they really are or were. It follows from this that any biblical passage has only one meaning, the literal one, which is its correspondence to some thing or event in space and time. It is the happening of an event, rather than any significance which may underlay it which has importance.

Now Fundamentalism prides itself on incarnating, as it were, not only true Christianity, but original and primitive Christianity. But here, in its most core belief in the single meaning of the Bible it is unknowingly and unerringly (inerrantly, one might say) modernist. Prior to the Enlightenment, the Bible was generally seen as being a multi-layered text, with multiple meanings. To be sure, the text had a literal or historical meaning but also allegorical, typological,
moral, and more generally a mystical or hidden meaning which it was the task of interpretation variously to bring out. But the Enlightenment left the literal/historical as the only meaning. With the rise of historical criticism in the post-enlightenment period, the meaning of the text was sought behind the text, as it were, in its history. But for Fundamentalists, there is no historical meaning behind the text. The text and its historical meaning coincide – this is what taking the Bible literally literally means.

For Fundamentalists, this co-incidence of text and meaning is grounded in the Reformation. They see themselves as heirs of the Protestants Reformers. Where the Reformers held firm against the tyranny of the Church in their emphasis on the authority of Scripture, so they stand firm against the oppression of Biblical scholarship. Where the Reformers stood against the control of the Bible by an ecclesiastical elite, they see themselves as nailing themselves against the wall of a Scholarly elite. For the Fundamentalist, the medieval allegorical method of Roman Catholicism has simply been replaced by the modern historical methods of liberal Protestants, or more recently, by Catholic historical criticism, and it is equally pernicious. In this sense, where by “intellectual” we intend the Biblical critics of the Universities and Seminaries of the mainstream denomination, Fundamentalists are proudly anti-intellectual. The badge of “the simple Bible Christian” is worn with pride.

But of course, neither Luther nor Calvin were fundamentalists in the modern sense. Quite the contrary. Luther saw the authority of the doctrine of Justification by Faith overriding the authority of Scripture, and was more than happy to see the Epistle of James removed from the Canon of Scripture. In contrast to the modern Fundamentalist, the Reformers were able to distinguish between the Word of God and the words of God. For the reformers, the Word of God lay behind the words of God; for Fundamentalism, there is no distinction between Word and words. Thus the reformers, like liberal theologians in the modern period are able to distinguish between the meaning of the text and the medium of the words. For the Fundamentalist, no such distinction is possible: the medium and the message are identical. And thus we can see why, for the Fundamentalist, to question the medium, the words themselves, is to question the message, the Word of God, and is tantamount to questioning the authority of its author – God.

An Inerrant Text?

Having said all which, and as James Barr has pointed out, the real concern of the Fundamentalist is not with the literal truth of Scripture but with its inerrancy. Literalness may vary up or down.
But it is inerrancy that is the constant factor: “Being wholly and verbally God-given,” Declared the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy in 1978, “Scripture is without error or fault in all its teaching, no less in what it states about God’s acts in creation, about the events of world history, and about its own literary origins under God, than in its witness to God’s saving grace in individual lives. The authority of Scripture is inescapably impaired if this total divine inerrancy is in any way limited or disregarded, or made relative to a view of truth contrary to the Bible’s own…” (Boone, 26). Thus, a literal interpretation of the Genesis story would have it that the earth was created in what the text says, six days, and some fundamentalists will hold to this. But many fundamentalists, taking into account scientific data on the age of the earth will accept “days” as referring to geological ages. Thus is the text squared with science, and its inerrancy maintained, although at the expense of its literal truth.

Inerrancy is crucial for another reason. For Fundamentalists, the admission of one error is the thin end of a wedge which inevitably leads to atheism. Admit a textual error and, it is believed, the next thing you know you will be denying the Resurrection of Christ and the whole mansion of Christian cards will come tumbling down. More importantly, the Bible is inerrant because it tells us so. Jesus says the Bible is without error, as do Peter and Paul. Thus it is so. As James Barr puts it, “the full theological status of Jesus Christ and the Apostles is deployed as a power that will enforce the traditional authorship and historicity of these various documents. Jesus said this, and this is final; to question this is to say that he was wrong, and if he was wrong in this, then he may perfectly well be wrong in everything” (Barr, 73). Thus for example, R.G.V. Tasker: “If He (Jesus) could be mistaken on matters which He regarded as of the strictest relevance to his own person and ministry, It is difficult to see exactly how or why He either can or should be trusted anywhere else” (Barr, 74). The circularity involved in the argument that the affirmation by the Bible that it is inerrant is guaranteed by its inerrancy is obvious. But in defence of the Fundamentalist, it should be said that the inerrancy of the Bible is not a doctrine drawn from the Bible’s claims about itself. That the Bible is inerrant is a grammatical law of fundamentalist discourse prior to any claims the Bible may make about itself. That it does itself claim to be so is, for the fundamentalist a bonus extra.

Thus Fundamentalism sees itself as reproducing the world of the Bible. And for this reason, Fundamentalist preaching lives in Biblical space. To John Rice, “The sermon must be definitely scriptural…. One ought to establish the theme of the sermon directly upon a text or Scripture in
the plain meaning of that Scripture, and then one should prove all the subdivisions of the sermon by Scriptures. It should be distinctly a Bible kind of sermon” (Boone, 97).

There is an implicit denial here that the preacher is interpreting the text. And there is a concealment of the interpretive role of the Preacher which empowers him in his authority over ordinary believers. It is God’s word not his own word that he delivers. So paradoxically, the denial of the power to interpret the text empowers the preacher. He can assume divine authority, and wield discipline within his Church: “The Thomas Road Baptist Church,” writes Jerry Falwell, “attempts to get every believer to join the church, hence under the discipline of the Word of God. … Discipline is not found in ‘consensus’ of deacons or of a congregation. This discipline is found in the Word of God and men are judged by it” (Boone, 96).

But in spite of appearances and claims to the contrary, the preacher’s boundaries are limited. They are determined by a textual world beyond the limits of the Biblical text, the world of Fundamentalist Biblical commentary, of Conservative scholarly literature, of works that are sound and wholesome because they support and reinforce the view that the Bible is inerrant and infallible. It is not without irony that those traditions most reliant upon a Book – Judaism, Christianity, and Islam abound in commentarial literature which limits the boundaries of the text, and allows the reader to remain safe within the walls of orthodoxy.

It is in the discourse created by these secondary texts that the Fundamentalist lives, and moves, and gains a hearing. To use the linguistic currency of Fundamentalism is to demonstrate one’s commitment to it; a case of “justification not by faith but by words”. Thus, Daniel Stevick: “A way of talking, a way of acting, a body of predictable responses, have grown up within Fundamentalism, and conformity with these is the criterion of acceptance…. A quite specific group of catchphrases mark a Fundamentalist. Some of them, such as ‘infallible word,’ ‘second coming,’ Jesus saves,’ ‘accepting Christ,’ and ‘personal saviour’, are not strictly biblical. Yet these shibboleths are made the basis for inclusion or exclusion by a group which claims sole and supreme loyalty to the Bible” (Stevick, 56).

But even fundamentalists are faced with a Bible whose errancy on some points is obvious even to them. And many are forced to admit that there are errors in the text as we have it. The response is to move inerrancy away from the present text as we have it now to the past text as originally given. Fundamentalists are renowned for their adoration of the King James or Authorised version
of the Bible. But for Reuben A Torrey for example: “No one, as far as I know, holds that the English translation of the Bible is absolutely infallible and inerrant. The doctrine held by many is that the Scriptures as originally given were absolutely infallible and inerrant, and that our English translation is a substantially accurate rendering of the Scriptures as originally given…. [the] original manuscripts were copied many times with great care and exactness, but naturally some errors crept into the copies that were made” (Boone, 29).

To those outside the interpretative community of Fundamentalism, the admission of errancy to the text we have, and the attribution of inerrancy to the lost autographs renders the doctrine of inerrancy useless. But within the community, it continues to serve a two fold purpose. On the one hand, the assumed closeness of the Authorised Version of the Bible to the original autographs allows it to function, to all intents and practical purposes as the inerrant word of God. But the notion of the original uncorrupted autographs allows the deflection of any criticism of problems found in the current text. The theory of the original pure autographs allows for the rejection of the human dimension of the text – a possibility which textual and historical criticism continually opens up, while simultaneously affirming the divine dimension of the text.

Having said which, let me qualify that last statement somewhat. The theory of the original autographs would be well served also by a doctrine of divine dictation. Indeed, the doctrine of inerrancy would seem to require not only original autographs but original autographs without the possibility of human error. But fundamentalism strenuously resists a theory of divine dictation. Thus, for for example, “We need not suppose”, declares Michael Green, that there was anything mechanical in God’s inspiration of the sacred writers, as if they were God’s secretaries to whom he dictated his letters”(Barr, 290).

But it is not at all clear why they are so resistant to this. Hans Frei gives a clue, and it is one that depends on Fundamentalists as being heirs of the Enlightenment, more specifically heirs of Deism. For Deists, divine dictation implied something undesirably mysterious and worse enthusiastic. It bespoke unbridled emotion and the loss of reason. So the denial of the authors of the Bible in ecstatic trance automatically writing down divine words is a reflection of the marked rationalism and empiricism of its discourse which finds its roots ultimately in the empirical method of Francis Bacon, the predilection of Puritans for reasonable religion, and the Common Sense Scottish philosophers. No one dictates to Fundamentalists. The will do all the dictating necessary. The fear of the infection of enthusiasm continues to show itself more practically
among Fundamentalists in their wariness of Pentecostal tongue speaking and revivalist extremes more generally.

**Fundamentalism and Science**

The claim that Fundamentalist discourse is markedly empiricist and rationalist may come as something of a surprise to many, who are inclined to think of Fundamentalism as archetypically irrational. But in its approach to the miraculous, for example, it is as rationalist as any liberal theology. A natural explanation is preferred wherever possible. As James Barr puts it, what on the face of it are gross divine interventions are reduced to very limited concatenations of natural forces. Here, for example, is K.A.Kitchen on the plagues of Egypt which result from excessive inundation of the Nile: “the excessive inundation may have brought with it microcosms known as flagellates which would redden the river and also cause conditions that would kill the fish. Decomposing fish floating inshore would drive the frogs ashore, having also infected them with Bacillus anthracis. The third plague would be mosquitoes, and the fourth a fly, Stomoxys calcitrans, both encouraged to breed freely in the conditions produced by a high inundation. The cattle disease of the fifth plague would be anthrax contracted from the dead frogs, and the ‘blains’ on man and beast (sixth plague), a skin anthrax from the Stomoxys fly of the fourth plague” (Barr, 241-2), and so on.

Here we are far removed from the literal reading of the Bible. The plain sense of Scripture – the continual supernatural intervention of God – is here replaced by a naturally occurring series of events for which God merely provides the occasion. No eighteenth century Deist could do better.

This combination of the Bible and Science strikes as odd those of us who recall that Fundamentalism created its own identity in opposition to science and especially to Darwinism. Here too, Fundamentalism has moved some ground. George Marsden points out that, by the 1970s, most evangelical scientists teaching at Christian colleges accepted some form of theistic evolution or “progressive creationism” as they often preferred to call it (Marsden, 156). But the traditional antipathy between Fundamentalism and evolution has continued since the 1970s in the movement known as creation science which is dedicated to a belief in the literal interpretation of the first few chapters of Genesis which necessarily precludes evolution.

For Henry M. Morris, the idea of an evolutionary origin must have had its first beginnings in the mind of Satan himself (see Clark and Morris, 80). But even Creation Science does not position
itself rhetorically as a conflict between evolution and the Bible (though this is clearly its underlying rationale) but as a conflict between a view of creation as the benevolent outcome of a conscious design (and thus of a conscious Designer) and the serendipitous outcome of the arbitrary play of impersonal evolutionary forces. Ironically, here the 18th century Enlightenment is brought to bat on behalf of 20th century conservative Biblicists.

*Fall, Redemption & Last Things*

Most liberal theology has given up on a cosmic process which would see the history of the world in terms of creation, fall, redemption, and last things preceded by the return of Christ. But, although eschewing historical criticism, Fundamentalism is nonetheless committed to a grand view of history. And it takes the Fall of man as a key part of the historical process.

In Fundamentalist eyes, sinfulness is an inherent part of the human condition. Though created good, man rebelled against God at an historical point in time, and his continuing in sin is a continuation of that rebellion (Barr, 27). Salvation is the removal of the boundary between man and God which has been created by sin which removal is effected by the work of Christ. God in Christ effectively substituted for us. Blood, sacrificial lambs, and God’s righteous anger are much to the fore here.

Christ has atoned for our sins but it remains up to us to appropriate the effects of Christ’s work. The believer is required to accept Jesus Christ as a personal Lord and Saviour. The believer is born again in what might be an intensely personal conversion experience. As the bumper stickers have it, Christians remain sinners, but forgiven ones. The responsibility remains upon every individual to continue the inevitable battle against temptation, sin and the Devil through the regimen of prayer and Bible study, assisted in the progress of sanctification by the Holy Spirit.

Fundamentalists live too in the heightened expectation of the second coming of Christ, more so than their liberal or evangelical brethren. The dominant element is ‘prophecy,’ the working out from the apocalyptic texts of Daniel, Ezekiel, and Revelation the signs of the end times. The most influential of the schemes of the End in Fundamentalism is Dispensationalism which owes its origin to J.N. Derby, a 19th century founder of the Plymouth Brethren. But it influenced Fundamentalism through its incorporation into the Scofield Reference Bible published in 1909, and the New Scofield Bible published in 1967. For many fundamentalists readers, the Bible is read through the eyes of the Scofield commentary. Odd this! As Timothy Weber remarks, “In
the final analysis, there is something incongruous about fundamentalists who say that they can read the Bible by themselves, then pore over Scofield’s notes to find out what the text really means” (Boone, 82).

According to Scofield, the history of the world can be divided into seven distinct dispensations or ages, the first five taking us from Innocence to the death of Christ, the last two from the death of Christ to the Second Coming and personal reign of Christ. Crucially dispensationalists are pre-millenialists, who expect the eventual deterioration of the world will culminate in a seven-year period of tribulation, an outpouring of the divine wrath and judgement which will close with the second coming of Christ and then his reign on earth during the millennium. True believers will not suffer on earth during the time of tribulation, but will be raptured up from off the earth until they return with Christ to reign with him in the millennial period. In sense then, this is a third coming. At the end of this period, the last Judgement occurs, and all are sent to their eternal destinations – heaven or hell. The key advantage to this style of dispensationalism is that, by ruling out in principle the Age of the Church, the time of the rapture is not predictable – and thus it could come at any moment.

*Fundamentalism, Politics, and Society*

It is not uncommon among revivalist movements within Christianity to favour the individual’s personal vertical relationship with God over his or her horizontal responsibilities to the neighbour. The social and political consequences of this are significant. Human efforts to change the world are on these terms against the divine plan. If it is really the case that God is planning for things to get worse, it is the duty of the Christian to bring lost souls to the Lord Jesus, not to engage in social and political activism. Pat Robertson does not believe that world peace is part of God’s plan: “There is no way that a United Nations, a League of Nations, peace treaties, disarmament treaties, or any other human instrument can bring about peace” (Robertson, 53).

Having said all which, we are all aware of Fundamentalist activism on behalf of the right wing of politics, and their concerns about the very decay of the society which may herald the time of tribulation. Jerry Falwell and his now defunct Moral Majority, far from scorning the political process as Dispensationalists do, became actively involved in political lobbying on such issues as abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment, prayer in Schools and textbook legislation. Jerry
Falwell was one of the rare people not to blame Osama bin Laden for the recent attacks on New York and Washington, preferring to lay most of the blame on the internal moral decay within America, most notably on the feminists, the gays, the lesbians, and the abortionists (Kutler, 1). But Falwell himself, as a consequence of his willingness to work outside of Fundamentalist circles is himself looked upon as an apostate from true Christianity. Bob Jones Jr of the ultra Conservative Bob Jones University described Falwell as “the most dangerous man in America today as far as Biblical Christianity is concerned”, because he “uses such good things as morality and reform in an attempt to deceive Christians into alliance with apostasy”(Harris,45).

This sense of a nation set apart is definitive of Fundamentalists. For they do see themselves as the true and only Christians. And they reject any involvement with those who do not share their views. The contrast between the true and the nominal Christian is, on the face of it, that between those who are genuinely committed and those who are not, but in practice it is a contrast between those who hold true Fundamentalist doctrines and those who do not. Here is the core of what many see as Fundamentalism’s typically arrogant and intolerant attitudes not only to those of other religions but also to other Christians.

But to expect Fundamentalists to be tolerant of others is to expect them to act against what they see as the essentials of Christianity. Jerusalem has nothing to do with Athens. The true Gospel is intended to be a stumbling block not only to Jews and Gentiles but other Christians. And no compromise is possible. As James Barr has put it, “the fundamentalist’s position about true and nominal Christianity is intrinsic to his faith: to ask him to modify it is to ask him for something which he cannot perform. To abandon this element is for him not only to abandon an unnecessarily uncharitable judgement about others, but to abandon the very process of perception by which he understands himself as one grasped and held by God”(Barr, 17). His own identity is fundamentally dependent on the demonisation of the other.

This is re-inforced too by a traditional doctrine of hell as a place of eternal torments to which the vast majority of humankind are destined. The hell fire and damnation sermon still has pride of place. Thus Curtis Hudson: “I can’t stand the screams in a psychiatric ward. I can’t stand the crying and screams at the emergency clinic at the hospital for long without having to leave. In Hell all hope is gone, and those imprisoned there know all hope is gone. Those in Hell know they will never get out, that this is it – ten billion years, ten trillion years, ten billion, trillion years and they will still be there!”(Boone, 101). And this doctrine of Hell is the direct consequence of their
inerrantist approach to the Bible. Jesus taught the doctrine of eternal punishment in the Bible: The word Gehenna Kenneth Kantzer tells us “is described as everlasting punishment, everlasting fire, the fire that shall never be quenched, everlasting flames, eternal fire, and so on. That awful word appears 12 times in the New Testament; 11 of those references come from the lips of our Savior”(Boone, 106). So who is more credible the liberal clergymen who denies the eternal punishment of the wicked, or the Son of God?

Fundamentalism and the Either/Or
Here then there is a key to Fundamentalist discourse in this uncompromising Either/Or. It is a tradition with a long history in Christianity which reaches back to Tertullian, and forward to Karl Barth’s dialectical theology in the 20th century via Soren Kierkegaard in the 19th. And it stands in contrast with that other strand of Christian theology which, in interplay with its surrounding culture, attempts to present a Christianity relevant to the day. Although it would vehemently deny it, as a child of Modernism, Fundamentalism is just as culture bound as any liberal cultural theology. But its rhetoric of the eternal Gospel based on Biblical truth versus the temporal gospel following the fleeting fashions of the day is a powerful one.

For those of us who are followers of liberal theologies, or of no theologies at all, we are destined to live in a world of varying greys. The old absolutes are gone. The old certainties, even those of modernity, are no more. And postmodernity does not only promise no new certainties but has relegated to a dark corner of the Western mind any hope of any certainty at all. Compassion, tolerance, all the virtues can no longer be grounded in a metaphysical realm of certainty – of the divine and the good. Such virtues – any virtues - can only be driven by the conviction that a world determined by the absence of virtue – as we have seen to our horror in the United States –is too awful to contemplate.

The world of the Fundamentalist is a different one. My world is one which, unfortunately does not, cannot, make any ultimate sense. Theirs is one that does. It provides certainties where mine provides only doubts, it gives unambiguous answers where mine offers ambiguous questions. In mine, meaning is dispersed, in theirs, present and unified. Here is Francis Schaeffer: “With the propositional communication from the personal God before us, not only the things of the cosmos and history match up but everything on the upper and lower storeys matches too; grace and nature; a moral absolute and morals; the universal point of reference and the particulars, and the emotional and aesthetic realities of man as well” (Schaeffer, 109).
In our human desire that there should be a grand order to things I am at one with the Fundamentalists. We all share an emotional need for unity, a need to put things in some kind of significant order. Science still seeks for a grand unified theory. And we, like Fundamentalists, are heirs to the myth that the secret to the mystery of all things might lay within the pages of some one book, and between or behind its words. This is part of the power of Christianity, Judaism and Islam, the Religions of the Book, and their conviction that ultimate truth is to be found capable of expression in words. That a Book holds the key to the understanding of the universe underlies too those esoteric and occult traditions which seek to harness the power within words, in the conviction that, in the beginning there was only the word.

But the world which they have created is not one which is within the Biblical text. It is one which they have created in their reading of the text. The faith of Fundamentalists rest no more on the Bible than the faith of any Christians. The meaning which the Bible has for them emerges in the world between the text and their reading of it within the context of the community of faith of which they are a part. The Bible has many meanings. And there are many Bibles, as many as there are varying communities of faith within which the Bible is read. The Fundamentalist inhabits one of many Biblical worlds, each as legitimate as any other. At the end of the day, the world created by the fundamentalist has a unity and coherence, and a certainty about it of which I am not a little envious. But it is, and perhaps in part for these reasons, a harsh, intolerant, and judgmental world which they inhabit. They are welcome to it, but I have no wish to share it.
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