



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **Are practicing Catholics more tolerant of other religions than the rest of the world? Comparative analyses based on World Values Survey data**

Tausch, Arno

21 November 2017

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/82843/>

MPRA Paper No. 82843, posted 27 Nov 2017 02:21 UTC

**Are practicing Catholics more tolerant of other religions than the rest of the world?**

**Comparative analyses based on *World Values Survey* data**

## Abstract

Our article developed a new Indicator of Global Tolerance, and analyzed the performance of the practicing Roman Catholics in comparison to the national performances.

Based on the latest survey wave of the *World Values Survey* (2015) we first show how much religious tolerance or intolerance shapes public opinion in the individual countries of the world. We then ask ourselves whether or not active, practicing Roman Catholics, who attend Church Services each Sunday (in Catholic jargon the *Dominicantes*) are more or less tolerant than overall society concerning our chosen tolerance indicators:

- 1) disagree or strongly disagree: The only acceptable religion is my religion
- 2) agree or strongly agree: All religions should be taught in public schools
- 3) agree or strongly agree: People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine
- 4) trust completely or somewhat: people of another religion
- 5) meaning of religion: do good to other people

While practicing Roman Catholics in the Netherlands, Australia, Uruguay, South Korea, and the United States were really at the forefront of national tolerance development, practicing Roman Catholics in the Ukraine, Spain, Lebanon, Nigeria, and Belarus were among the laggards in accepting the values of religious tolerance among their fellow countrymen and countrywomen. Our article has also shown that there are vast differences in the sharing of religious tolerance values around the globe. For the 59 states of the world there are complete data. While e.g. in Sweden and the United States 30% or less of the population have no confidence in people with a religious denomination other than their own, these percentages in Algeria; Armenia; Yemen; Kyrgyzstan; Libya; Morocco; Mexico; Palestine (occupied territories); Peru; Romania; Tunisia; and Uzbekistan are over 70% each. Among the ten states with the lowest general religious tolerance, based on our five indicators, there are nine predominantly Muslim states.

According to our data, the religiously most liberal Catholic community in the world is found in the Caribbean state of Trinidad and Tobago, followed by the practicing Catholics in Australia, Brazil, the Netherlands and the United States. The worst results were reported in Peru, Lebanon, Mexico, Germany and Nigeria. It is also being mentioned that there are equally substantial ranges of examples of best and worst practice within the Muslim communities of the world.

The disappointing results for Germany both at the national level and at the level of the practicing Roman Catholics and the German Muslim community bode ill for the future capability of Germany to integrate the millions of refugees, which came to Germany since the beginnings of the European Refugee Crisis in the fall of 2015.

## JEL Classification

A13 - Relation of Economics to Social Values

Z1 - Cultural Economics; Economic Sociology; Economic Anthropology

Z12 - Religion

The Roman Catholic Church is the religious organization which still commands the largest following among the citizens of Western democracies, and by its self-definition (John Paul II, 1994), it should be a denomination committed to the ideals of neighborly love to the needy, openness for the weakest, and by human understanding. Consequently, the current leadership of the Roman Catholic Church, headed by Pope Francis I, takes an especially liberal and conciliatory view of migration and refugee issues (Kasper, 2015; Scannone, 2016). But in the light of comparative international opinion surveys, have Roman Catholics, practicing their faith, become really a bastion of religious tolerance around the world?

There is of course a vast literature on the Roman Catholic Church and its history over the ages (Koschorke et al., 2007; Perreau-Saussine, 2012; Phayer, 2000, 2001), and also on the legacy of Pope John Paul II (Bernstein and Politi, 1996; Weigel, 2001), who was very influential in pioneering especially the Judeo-Christian dialogue.

In this essay, we would like to reflect then in a detached and empirical way on global religious tolerance and on the role of the active, global Catholics in the formation of global tolerance values, using advanced methods of comparative social science research. We are interested in what the active Roman Catholics – in comparison with overall society –, think about tolerance, and not in the theology of tolerance and ecumenism itself.

The systematic social scientific study of global values and opinions, used in this essay, has of course a long and fruitful history in the social sciences (Davidov et al., 2011). Such studies are made possible by the availability of systematic and comparative opinion surveys over time under the auspices of leading representatives of the social science research community, featuring the global/and or the European populations with a fairly constant questionnaire for several decades now. Such data are available from the *World Values Survey* (WVS).<sup>1</sup> The original data are made freely available to the global scientific publics and render themselves for systematic, multivariate analysis of opinion structures on the basis of the original anonymous interview data. The *World Values Survey* (WVS), which was started in 1981, consists of nationally representative surveys using a common questionnaire conducted in approximately 100 countries, which make up some 90 percent of the world's population. The WVS has become the largest non-commercial, cross-national, time series investigation of human beliefs and values ever conducted. As of the time of writing this article, it includes interviews with almost 400,000 respondents. The countries included in the WVS project comprise practically all of the world's major cultural zones.

The reception of these data in the social science community has been enormous. For a number of years now, some leading economists became interested in studying global comparative opinion data from the *World Values Survey* (Alesina, Algan et al, 2015; Alesina, Giuliano, et al, 2015; McCleary and Barro, 2006). Sociologists, working with the unique comparative and longitudinal opinion survey data from the *World Values Survey* have discovered that there are pretty constant and long-term patterns of change in the direction of secularization, which also affect the predominantly Roman Catholic countries (Inglehart, 2006; Inglehart and Norris, 2003; Norris and Inglehart, 2011). Inglehart and his associates firmly believe that the ability of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to tell people how to live their lives is declining steadily.<sup>2</sup>

The globalization of goods, capital, services and labor implied that international social sciences are analyzing not only these "four freedoms" but also the structures of values in an increasingly inter-connected international society (Tausch, Heshmati and Karoui, 2015).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>

<sup>2</sup> [http://ur.umich.edu/0405/Apr11\\_05/11.shtml](http://ur.umich.edu/0405/Apr11_05/11.shtml)

Important recent studies, based on the *World Values Survey*, such as Inglehart, 2015; Minkov & Hofstede, 2014; Norris & Inglehart, 2015, 2011; and Schwartz, 2014 have filtered out some drivers of global value change, such as the trend towards secular orientation, self-expression, but also such phenomena as power distance, altruism and many others. In the process, these researchers have also become aware of the important role that religious beliefs currently play in the Middle East and in the Muslim world, which seem to contradict secularization trends in the West. Important work - for example by Moaddel & Karabenick, 2013; as well as Tessler, 2015 - also tried to find out under what circumstances public opinion in Muslim-dominated states identifies with the Islamists, and what popular support the Islamists have. Recent such studies, e.g. Tausch, Heshmati and Karoui, 2015 also found out how much xenophobia and anti-Semitism are part of the Islamist spectrum of opinion.

In the following brief survey, based on the latest survey wave of the *World Values Survey* (2015) we will first show how much religious tolerance or intolerance shapes public opinion in the individual countries of the world. On the basis of five questions from the *World Values Survey* (2015), an attempt will be made to formulate a global index of religious tolerance. We then ask ourselves whether or not active, practicing Roman Catholics, who attend Church Services each Sunday (in Catholic jargon the *Dominicantes*) are more or less tolerant than overall society concerning our chosen tolerance indicators.

We then compare the performance of the practicing Roman Catholics with overall society. The present essay is thus well within a large and growing tradition to study “*real existing*” Catholicism in an empirical social scientific framework (Fox et al., 2004; Philpott and Shah, 2011; Sandier and Sandier, 2004; Shelledy, 2004). Global secularization trends notwithstanding, the Roman Church still commands the fellowship of more than 1.2 billion global citizens.<sup>3</sup>

After presenting the background to this study, we briefly deal with the data and methods, and then present the results. In a final section, we will deal with some of the conclusions to be drawn.

## **Background**

One of our hypotheses is that the Roman Catholic Second Vatican Council and its commitment to inter-religious tolerance (see Bea, 1966; Connelly, 2012; Valkenberg and Cirelli, 2016) in many ways paved the way for the high degree of societal tolerance in predominantly Catholic Western countries over many decades, irrespective of the fact whether Catholics in those countries live a secular or a more religious life. Our second hypothesis is that the Second Vatican Council and its message of international ecumenical understanding has become the social reality in the lives of the Catholic faithful only to a different degree and that not everywhere, Roman Catholics are at the vanguard of ecumenical tolerance. The process of secularization, especially in countries, where the Roman Church once was a very powerful institution, often implied that the remaining “hard core” of practicing Roman Catholics is less tolerant than the society surrounding the faithful. By contrast, the Roman Catholic faithful are often at the vanguard of tolerance in countries, where Roman Catholics are in a minority position.

Let us recall here central role of the declaration “*Nostra Aetate*” of the Second Vatican Council, which has become the main pillar of the evolving Catholic global interreligious

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.nationmaster.com/>; <http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/>; <http://www.pewforum.org/2013/02/13/the-global-catholic-population/>; <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-21443313>

dialogue, honored, among others by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.<sup>4</sup> “*Nostra Aetate*” indeed explicitly praises<sup>5</sup> the spiritual values of Hinduism and Buddhism, and adds:

*Likewise, other religions found everywhere try to counter the restlessness of the human heart, each in its own manner, by proposing "ways," comprising teachings, rules of life, and sacred rites. The Catholic Church rejects nothing that is true and holy in these religions. She regards with sincere reverence those ways of conduct and of life, those precepts and teachings which, though differing in many aspects from the ones she holds and sets forth, nonetheless often reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all men. The Church, therefore, exhorts her sons, that through dialogue and collaboration with the followers of other religions”*

With particular emphasis, *Nostra Aetate* also mentions Muslims and Islam, and stresses the inseparable bonds of Christianity with Judaism, by referring explicitly to what it calls the

*the bond that spiritually ties the people of the New Covenant to Abraham's stock: Since the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews is thus so great, this sacred synod wants to foster and recommend that mutual understanding and respect which is the fruit, above all, of biblical and theological studies as well as of fraternal dialogues. Furthermore, in her rejection of every persecution against any man, the Church, mindful of the patrimony she shares with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but by the Gospel's spiritual love, decries hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.*

*[...] No foundation therefore remains for any theory or practice that leads to discrimination between man and man or people and people, so far as their human dignity and the rights flowing from it are concerned.*

*The Church reproves, as foreign to the mind of Christ, any discrimination against men or harassment of them because of their race, color, condition of life, or religion. On the contrary, following in the footsteps of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, this sacred synod ardently implores the Christian faithful to "maintain good fellowship among the nations" (1 Peter 2:12), and, if possible, to live for their part in peace with all men, so that they may truly be sons of the Father who is in heaven.*

Precisely the Second Vatican Council provided the Roman Catholic Church with the theoretical tools to leave behind the centuries of anti-Semitism and intolerance which are too well-known in history (Jikeli and Allouche-Benayoun, 2012; Kertzer, 2007; Wistrich, 2010; Wistrich, 2004, 2007, 2010).

In the present article, we feature on Roman Catholicism in the framework of the “*civic culture*” of their respective societies (Almond and Verba, 2015) and the role played by Catholicism in it (Silver and Dowley, 2000).

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/ecumenical-and-interreligious/index.cfm>

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651028\\_nostra-aetate\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651028_nostra-aetate_en.html)

## Data and methods

So, this essay firmly shares the established methodology of *World Values Survey* - based comparative opinion research (Davidov et al., 2008; Inglehart, 2006; Norris and Inglehart, 2015; Tausch, Heshmati and Karoui, 2014). We are of course well aware of many past valuable attempts to arrive at theologically and social scientifically well-founded comparisons of global religions and civilizations in the growing international scientific tradition of ecumenical religious studies (Küng, 1997, 2002, Lenoir and Tardan-Masquelier, 1997; Lenoir, 2008, Röhrich, 2004, 2010; Sacks, 1998, 2003, 2005, 2014).

But our present essay relies on the statistical analysis of open survey data and is based on the commonly used statistical software IBM SPSS XXIV, utilized at many universities and research centers around the world.<sup>6</sup> Our simple statistical calculations relied on cross tables and comparisons of means.

The chosen SPSS data-files from the WVS data base was the database named “*WVS\_Longitudinal\_1981\_2014\_spss\_v2015\_04\_18.sav*”.

For all analyzed groups and sub-groups, a minimum sample of at least 30 respondents per country had to be available in the original data sets to be able to attempt reasonable predictions for the general or sectoral publics to be analyzed (for a survey of the vast methodological literature on the subject, see Tausch, Heshmati and Karoui, 2014).

For the calculation of the Global Tolerance Indicator, we relied on the well-established methodology of the United Nations Human Development Programme and its UNDP Human Development Index (UNDP, 2014). The *World Values Survey* offers fairly encompassing and comparable data on tolerance items. The chosen *World Values Survey* tolerance indicators were:

1. disagree or strongly disagree: The only acceptable religion is my religion (mean) F203
2. agree or strongly agree: All religions should be taught in public schools (mean) F204
3. agree or strongly agree: People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine (mean) F205
4. trust completely or somewhat: people of another religion (mean) G007\_35B
5. meaning of religion: do good to other people (% -percentages) F200

Since the 1990s, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP, 2014) calculates the internationally recognized “*Human Development Index*,” which equally weights life expectancy, education, and real income. Life expectancy, education, and real incomes are projected on a scale from 0 (worst value) to 1 (best value). Although UNDP calculation methods have become somewhat more complicated in recent years, the simple rationale remains: our Index of Religious Tolerance is the average of the five components, other religions are acceptable; all religions should be taught in public schools; people who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine; trust people of another religion; and the meaning of religion is to do good to other people.

---

<sup>6</sup> IBM SPSS SPSS Statistics, <http://www-03.ibm.com/software/products/en/spss-statistics>.

## Results

We have made our full results in our Appendix. For the 59 states of the world there are complete data. While e.g. in Sweden and the United States 30% or less of the population have no confidence in people with a religious denomination other than their own, these percentages in Algeria; Armenia; Yemen; Kyrgyzstan; Libya; Morocco; Mexico; Palestine (occupied territories); Peru; Romania; Tunisia; and Uzbekistan are over 70% each. Unfortunately, the clear north-south divide of religious tolerance on our globe also corresponds to a clear denominational gap. Among the ten states with the lowest general religious tolerance, based on our five indicators, there are nine predominantly Muslim states.

Only public opinion in predominantly Christian Armenia is among this laggard group. Of course, our surveys also show the large relative deficit of religious tolerance in Germany, the worst ranked member of the European Union. Germany occupies only rank 40 of 59 ranked states. Unfortunately, after all the pogroms of history, the Thirty Years' War, the Shoah and the two World Wars of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, flexibility and tolerance in religious thought in Germany still seem to be not so often encountered as in the best-practice countries Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Brazil, New Zealand, and Australia.

Some food for thought is also provided by our statistical data for the decision makers of the Catholic Church. The Church celebrated recently the 55<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the beginning of the Second Vatican Council (October 11, 1962) as well as the 52<sup>nd</sup> anniversary of the proclamation of the Declaration of the Council "*Nostra Aetate*" (December 8, 1965). But do the nearly 500 million of the 1.3 billion Catholics who still celebrate Holy Mass on Sundays, as *Nostra Aetate* suggests, believe in religious tolerance?

According to our data, the religiously most liberal Catholic community in the world is found in the Caribbean state of Trinidad and Tobago, followed by the practicing Catholics in Australia, Brazil, the Netherlands and the United States. The worst results were reported in Peru, Lebanon, Mexico, Germany and Nigeria. Our data also provide an answer to the question of where practicing Catholics represent a more tolerant attitude towards members of other religions than the respective total populations. The Catholic communities in the Netherlands, Australia and Uruguay, in particular, are to be mentioned positively, while the practice of Catholicism in Ukraine, Spain and Lebanon falls far short of the development of tolerance in society as a whole.

It is also being mentioned that there are equally substantial ranges of examples of best and worst practice within the Muslim communities of the world. According to our data, flagship models of a liberal and tolerant Islam can be encountered in Trinidad and Tobago, and also in Georgia, India, Ghana and South Africa.


Religious tolerance is also a matter for the global South, and not just for the global North and its migration recipient countries. In some countries of the Muslim world, there are sometimes to be encountered extreme forms of aversion against the religions of the "others", while there are also outstanding examples of religiously tolerant Muslim communities.

However, it is also worrying that the performance of Germany, the main destination of European inward immigration from summer 2015 onwards, is relatively poor in terms of religious tolerance: not only the Catholic community, but also other religious groups in Germany, and also German Muslims are among the worse ranked communities of their fellow believers in the world.



**Map 1: Index of Religious Tolerance**

---



Best: Sweden, Trinidad and Tobago, Brazil, New Zealand, Australia  
Worst: Algeria, Yemen, Morocco, Palestinian Territories, Qatar

## Map 2: *Dominicantes*: Index of Religious Tolerance

---



Best: Trinidad and Tobago, Australia, Brazil, Netherlands, United States

Worst: Peru, Lebanon, Mexico, Germany, Nigeria

### Map 3: *Dominicantes* Global leaders or laggards: Index of Religious Tolerance

---



Best: Netherlands, Australia, Uruguay, South Korea, United States  
Worst: Ukraine, Spain, Lebanon, Nigeria, Belarus

#### *Conclusions and prospects*

Our article developed a new Indicator of Global Tolerance, and analyzed the performance of the practicing Roman Catholics in comparison to the national performances.

While practicing Roman Catholics in the Netherlands, Australia, Uruguay, South Korea, and the United States were really at the forefront of national tolerance development, practicing Roman Catholics in the Ukraine, Spain, Lebanon, Nigeria, and Belarus were among the laggards in accepting the values of religious tolerance among their fellow countrymen and countrywomen.

Our article has shown that there are vast differences in the sharing of religious tolerance values around the globe.

The disappointing results for Germany both at the national level and at the level of the practicing Roman Catholics and the German Muslim community bode ill for the future capability of Germany to integrate the millions of refugees which came to Germany since the beginnings of the European Refugee Crisis in the fall of 2015.

## Appendix

Original data from the *World Values Survey* – online Data Analysis according to *World Values Survey*  
<http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp> (2017) and SPSS XXIV

		positive	negative	negative	negative	positive
	Country/region	disagree: the only acceptable religion is my religion (mean)	disagree: all religions should be taught in public schools (mean)	disagree: people who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine (mean)	Do not trust people of another religion	Meaning of religion: To follow religious norms and ceremonies vs to do good to other people (do good to other people)
Country/region	sample	The only acceptable religion is my religion	All religions should be taught in public schools	People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine	Trust: People of another religion (B)	Do good to other people
Algeria	countrywide	1,290	3,300	2,810	3,330	39%
Argentina	countrywide	3,150	2,840	2,140	2,410	85%
Argentina	<i>Dominicantes</i>	3,100	2,500	2,100	2,330	82%
Armenia	countrywide	1,770	3,230	2,520	3,340	70%
Australia	countrywide	3,390	2,790	1,830	2,310	76%
Australia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	3,070	2,450	1,610	2,120	89%
Azerbaijan	countrywide	2,080	2,970	2,200	2,970	71%

Bahrain	countrywide	1,840	2,070	2,100	2,630	54%
Belarus	countrywide	2,930	2,660	1,890	2,700	77%
Belarus	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,630	3,140	1,810	2,660	85%
Brazil	countrywide	3,020	2,170	1,920	2,560	87%
Brazil	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,840	2,050	1,870	2,460	87%
Chile	countrywide	3,090	2,170	1,910	2,680	79%
Chile	<i>Dominicantes</i>	3,030	2,110	1,830	2,610	70%
China	countrywide	3,340	3,230	2,880	3,070	80%
Colombia	countrywide	2,590	2,300	2,140	2,920	88%
Colombia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,460	2,390	2,180	2,910	86%
Cyprus	countrywide	2,430	3,000	1,890	2,980	80%
Cyprus	Muslims	2,500	2,820	2,200	2,800	65%
Ecuador	countrywide	2,800	2,400	2,090	2,860	83%
Ecuador	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,730	2,430	1,960	2,840	81%
Estonia	countrywide	3,000	2,500	1,890	2,680	66%
Georgia	countrywide	1,660	3,100	1,940	2,700	81%
Georgia	Muslims	2,170	2,560	1,510	2,010	76%
Germany	countrywide	2,900	2,820	2,350	2,590	43%
Germany	Muslims	2,470	2,010	1,890	2,320	19%
Germany	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,500	2,460	2,230	2,560	50%
Ghana	countrywide	2,550	1,900	2,180	2,570	61%
Ghana	Muslims	2,290	1,600	1,920	2,190	41%
Ghana	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,670	1,850	2,040	2,480	58%
Hong Kong	countrywide	2,680	2,730	2,360	2,560	73%
India	countrywide	2,560	2,010	2,030	2,510	53%
India	Muslims	2,520	1,890	2,080	2,290	67%
Iraq	countrywide	1,730	2,600	2,360	2,880	49%
Iraq	Muslims	1,720	2,610	2,360	2,880	49%
Japan	countrywide	2,960	2,830	2,790	3,180	70%
Jordan	countrywide	1,280	2,830	2,320	2,880	55%

Kazakhstan	countrywide	2,780	2,820	2,100	2,670	83%
Kazakhstan	Muslims	2,600	2,650	1,940	2,720	79%
Kuwait	countrywide	1,580	2,900	2,600	2,690	46%
Kyrgyzstan	countrywide	1,980	2,720	2,200	3,100	63%
Kyrgyzstan	Muslims	1,930	2,710	2,210	3,130	62%
Lebanon	countrywide	2,470	2,270	2,070	2,580	62%
Lebanon	Muslims	2,440	2,230	2,110	2,500	56%
Lebanon	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,200	2,220	2,050	2,900	52%
Libya	countrywide	1,200	3,320	2,330	3,270	67%
Malaysia	countrywide	2,010	2,120	2,050	2,790	36%
Malaysia	Muslims	1,810	2,200	2,050	2,820	24%
Mexico	countrywide	2,610	2,790	2,230	3,030	85%
Mexico	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,410	2,720	2,190	3,060	86%
Morocco	countrywide	1,530	3,250	2,720	3,120	30%
Netherlands	countrywide	3,320	2,770	2,090	2,620	67%
Netherlands	Muslims	1,970	2,220	2,000	2,550	70%
Netherlands	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,890	2,290	1,760	2,300	77%
New Zealand	countrywide	3,300	2,990	1,880	1,990	79%
Nigeria	countrywide	2,020	1,880	2,080	2,650	62%
Nigeria	Muslims	1,850	1,690	2,030	2,590	50%
Nigeria	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,130	2,190	2,230	2,940	73%
Pakistan	countrywide	1,430	2,180	2,450	3,070	29%
Palestinian Terr.	countrywide	1,490	2,960	2,750	3,280	51%
Peru	countrywide	2,600	2,600	2,230	3,200	82%
Peru	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,460	2,550	2,200	3,170	79%
Philippines	countrywide	2,100	2,160	2,080	2,760	77%
Philippines	Muslims	1,450	1,570	1,830	2,750	61%
Philippines	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,100	2,200	2,060	2,750	75%
Poland	countrywide	2,620	2,170	1,740	2,540	75%
Poland	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,410	2,140	1,770	2,540	80%

Qatar	countrywide	1,090	3,190	2,440	2,610	36%
Romania	countrywide	2,530	2,350	1,960	2,960	76%
Russia	countrywide	2,790	2,520	1,990	2,790	81%
Russia	Muslims	2,600	2,520	2,140	2,430	65%
Rwanda	countrywide	3,010	2,680	2,200	2,500	60%
Rwanda	Muslims	2,890	2,260	1,840	2,510	41%
Rwanda	<i>Dominicantes</i>	3,170	2,720	2,210	2,470	54%
Singapore	countrywide	3,000	2,640	2,120	2,410	54%
Singapore	Muslims	2,790	2,480	2,030	2,250	44%
Singapore	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,940	2,520	2,000	2,310	56%
Slovenia	countrywide	2,900	2,530	1,920	2,900	78%
Slovenia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,570	2,290	1,850	2,960	79%
South Africa	countrywide	2,270	1,870	1,860	2,390	54%
South Africa	Muslims	1,960	1,670	1,560	2,260	38%
South Africa	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,060	1,820	1,790	2,290	47%
South Korea	countrywide	3,090	3,000	2,330	2,680	53%
South Korea	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,850	2,720	2,060	2,480	44%
Spain	countrywide	3,020	2,810	2,080	2,590	90%
Spain	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,590	2,730	2,170	2,740	77%
Sweden	countrywide	3,530	1,730	1,770	2,030	94%
Taiwan	countrywide	3,050	2,510	2,040	2,530	87%
Thailand	countrywide	2,540	2,380	1,980	2,930	60%
Trinidad and Tobago	countrywide	3,110	1,590	1,750	2,420	90%
Trinidad and Tobago	Muslims	2,860	1,440	1,670	2,420	90%
Trinidad and Tobago	<i>Dominicantes</i>	3,060	1,490	1,540	2,450	89%
Tunisia	countrywide	1,460	2,800	2,330	3,430	48%
Turkey	countrywide	1,780	2,400	2,010	2,910	34%

Ukraine	countrywide	2,700	2,730	1,880	2,680	84%
Ukraine	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,620	3,030	2,250	2,710	83%
United States	countrywide	3,090	2,810	1,930	2,260	79%
United States	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,980	2,580	1,840	2,110	80%
United States	Jews	3,510	3,160	1,800	2,030	73%
Uruguay	countrywide	3,130	2,990	2,160	2,610	90%
Uruguay	<i>Dominicantes</i>	2,820	2,570	2,070	2,420	97%
Uzbekistan	countrywide	1,750	2,810	1,780	3,270	67%
Yemen	countrywide	1,400	3,300	2,720	3,480	53%
Zimbabwe	countrywide	3,020	2,730	2,220	2,780	68%
Zimbabwe	<i>Dominicantes</i>	3,030	2,660	2,200	2,850	60%
max	max	3,530	3,320	2,880	3,480	97%
min	min	1,090	1,440	1,510	1,990	19%



### Religious Tolerance Index by countries

Country/region	sample	The only acceptable religion is my religion	All religions should be taught in public schools	People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine	Trust: People of another religion (B)	Do good to other people	Religious Tolerance Index
Algeria	countrywide	0,082	0,011	0,051	0,101	0,254	0,100
Argentina	countrywide	0,844	0,255	0,540	0,718	0,844	0,640
Argentina	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,824	0,436	0,569	0,772	0,807	0,682
Armenia	countrywide	0,279	0,048	0,263	0,094	0,658	0,268
Australia	countrywide	0,943	0,282	0,766	0,785	0,732	0,702
Australia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,811	0,463	0,927	0,913	0,897	0,802
Azerbaijan	countrywide	0,406	0,186	0,496	0,342	0,666	0,419
Bahrain	countrywide	0,307	0,665	0,569	0,570	0,457	0,514
Belarus	countrywide	0,754	0,351	0,723	0,523	0,749	0,620
Belarus	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,631	0,096	0,781	0,550	0,852	0,582
Brazil	countrywide	0,791	0,612	0,701	0,617	0,872	0,719
Brazil	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,717	0,676	0,737	0,685	0,876	0,738
Chile	countrywide	0,820	0,612	0,708	0,537	0,774	0,690
Chile	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,795	0,644	0,766	0,584	0,651	0,688
China	countrywide	0,922	0,048	0,000	0,275	0,786	0,406
Colombia	countrywide	0,615	0,543	0,540	0,376	0,879	0,590
Colombia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,561	0,495	0,511	0,383	0,865	0,563
Cyprus	countrywide	0,549	0,170	0,723	0,336	0,781	0,512
Cyprus	Muslims	0,578	0,266	0,496	0,456	0,589	0,477
Ecuador	countrywide	0,701	0,489	0,577	0,416	0,825	0,602

Ecuador	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,672	0,473	0,672	0,430	0,793	0,608
Estonia	countrywide	0,783	0,436	0,723	0,537	0,598	0,615
Georgia	countrywide	0,234	0,117	0,686	0,523	0,795	0,471
Georgia	Muslims	0,443	0,404	1,000	0,987	0,728	0,712
Germany	countrywide	0,742	0,266	0,387	0,597	0,315	0,461
Germany	Muslims	0,566	0,697	0,723	0,779	0,000	0,553
Germany	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,578	0,457	0,474	0,617	0,401	0,506
Ghana	countrywide	0,598	0,755	0,511	0,611	0,537	0,602
Ghana	Muslims	0,492	0,915	0,701	0,866	0,284	0,652
Ghana	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,648	0,782	0,613	0,671	0,501	0,643
Hong Kong	countrywide	0,652	0,314	0,380	0,617	0,698	0,532
India	countrywide	0,602	0,697	0,620	0,651	0,438	0,602
India	Muslims	0,586	0,761	0,584	0,799	0,614	0,669
Iraq	countrywide	0,262	0,383	0,380	0,403	0,392	0,364
Iraq	Muslims	0,258	0,378	0,380	0,403	0,389	0,361
Japan	countrywide	0,766	0,261	0,066	0,201	0,651	0,389
Jordan	countrywide	0,078	0,261	0,409	0,403	0,460	0,322
Kazakhstan	countrywide	0,693	0,266	0,569	0,544	0,827	0,580
Kazakhstan	Muslims	0,619	0,356	0,686	0,510	0,773	0,589
Kuwait	countrywide	0,201	0,223	0,204	0,530	0,346	0,301
Kyrgyzstan	countrywide	0,365	0,319	0,496	0,255	0,570	0,401
Kyrgyzstan	Muslims	0,344	0,324	0,489	0,235	0,554	0,389
Lebanon	countrywide	0,566	0,559	0,591	0,604	0,548	0,574
Lebanon	Muslims	0,553	0,580	0,562	0,658	0,478	0,566
Lebanon	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,455	0,585	0,606	0,389	0,427	0,492
Libya	countrywide	0,045	0,000	0,401	0,141	0,616	0,241
Malaysia	countrywide	0,377	0,638	0,606	0,463	0,219	0,461
Malaysia	Muslims	0,295	0,596	0,606	0,443	0,069	0,402
Mexico	countrywide	0,623	0,282	0,474	0,302	0,849	0,506
Mexico	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,541	0,319	0,504	0,282	0,855	0,500

Morocco	countrywide	0,180	0,037	0,117	0,242	0,140	0,143
Netherlands	countrywide	0,914	0,293	0,577	0,577	0,616	0,595
Netherlands	Muslims	0,361	0,585	0,642	0,624	0,656	0,574
Netherlands	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,738	0,548	0,818	0,792	0,741	0,727
New Zealand	countrywide	0,906	0,176	0,730	1,000	0,772	0,717
Nigeria	countrywide	0,381	0,766	0,584	0,557	0,551	0,568
Nigeria	Muslims	0,311	0,867	0,620	0,597	0,403	0,560
Nigeria	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,426	0,601	0,474	0,362	0,689	0,511
Pakistan	countrywide	0,139	0,606	0,314	0,275	0,128	0,292
Palestinian Terr.	countrywide	0,164	0,191	0,095	0,134	0,413	0,200
Peru	countrywide	0,619	0,383	0,474	0,188	0,813	0,495
Peru	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,561	0,410	0,496	0,208	0,770	0,489
Philippines	countrywide	0,414	0,617	0,584	0,483	0,741	0,568
Philippines	Muslims	0,148	0,931	0,766	0,490	0,542	0,575
Philippines	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,414	0,596	0,599	0,490	0,714	0,562
Poland	countrywide	0,627	0,612	0,832	0,631	0,719	0,684
Poland	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,541	0,628	0,810	0,631	0,782	0,678
Qatar	countrywide	0,000	0,069	0,321	0,584	0,219	0,239
Romania	countrywide	0,590	0,516	0,672	0,349	0,736	0,573
Russia	countrywide	0,697	0,426	0,650	0,463	0,790	0,605
Russia	Muslims	0,619	0,426	0,540	0,705	0,592	0,576
Rwanda	countrywide	0,787	0,340	0,496	0,658	0,533	0,563
Rwanda	Muslims	0,738	0,564	0,759	0,651	0,279	0,598
Rwanda	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,852	0,319	0,489	0,678	0,452	0,558
Singapore	countrywide	0,783	0,362	0,555	0,718	0,446	0,573
Singapore	Muslims	0,697	0,447	0,620	0,826	0,325	0,583
Singapore	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,758	0,426	0,642	0,785	0,473	0,617
Slovenia	countrywide	0,742	0,420	0,701	0,389	0,759	0,602
Slovenia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,607	0,548	0,752	0,349	0,765	0,604
South Africa	countrywide	0,484	0,771	0,745	0,732	0,452	0,636

South Africa	Muslims	0,357	0,878	0,964	0,819	0,245	0,652
South Africa	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,398	0,798	0,796	0,799	0,362	0,630
South Korea	countrywide	0,820	0,170	0,401	0,537	0,444	0,474
South Korea	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,721	0,319	0,599	0,671	0,329	0,528
Spain	countrywide	0,791	0,271	0,584	0,597	0,907	0,630
Spain	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,615	0,314	0,518	0,497	0,741	0,537
Sweden	countrywide	1,000	0,846	0,810	0,973	0,958	0,917
Taiwan	countrywide	0,803	0,431	0,613	0,638	0,875	0,672
Thailand	countrywide	0,594	0,500	0,657	0,369	0,533	0,531
Trinidad and Tobago	countrywide	0,828	0,920	0,825	0,711	0,913	0,840
Trinidad and Tobago	Muslims	0,725	1,000	0,883	0,711	0,915	0,847
Trinidad and Tobago	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,807	0,973	0,978	0,691	0,903	0,871
Tunisia	countrywide	0,152	0,277	0,401	0,034	0,380	0,249
Turkey	countrywide	0,283	0,489	0,635	0,383	0,196	0,397
Ukraine	countrywide	0,660	0,314	0,730	0,537	0,830	0,614
Ukraine	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,627	0,154	0,460	0,517	0,820	0,516
United States	countrywide	0,820	0,271	0,693	0,819	0,770	0,675
United States	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,775	0,394	0,759	0,919	0,788	0,727
United States	Jews	0,992	0,085	0,788	0,973	0,696	0,707
Uruguay	countrywide	0,836	0,176	0,526	0,584	0,907	0,606
Uruguay	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,709	0,399	0,591	0,711	1,000	0,682
Uzbekistan	countrywide	0,270	0,271	0,803	0,141	0,622	0,422
Yemen	countrywide	0,127	0,011	0,117	0,000	0,432	0,137
Zimbabwe	countrywide	0,791	0,314	0,482	0,470	0,625	0,536
Zimbabwe	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,795	0,351	0,496	0,423	0,528	0,519

### Religious Tolerance Index – total populations

Country/region	sample	The only acceptable religion is my religion	All religions should be taught in public schools	People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine	Trust: People of another religion (B)	Do good to other people	Religious Tolerance Index
Sweden	countrywide	1,000	0,846	0,810	0,973	0,958	0,917
Trinidad and Tobago	countrywide	0,828	0,920	0,825	0,711	0,913	0,840
Brazil	countrywide	0,791	0,612	0,701	0,617	0,872	0,719
New Zealand	countrywide	0,906	0,176	0,730	1,000	0,772	0,717
Australia	countrywide	0,943	0,282	0,766	0,785	0,732	0,702
Chile	countrywide	0,820	0,612	0,708	0,537	0,774	0,690
Poland	countrywide	0,627	0,612	0,832	0,631	0,719	0,684
United States	countrywide	0,820	0,271	0,693	0,819	0,770	0,675
Taiwan	countrywide	0,803	0,431	0,613	0,638	0,875	0,672
Argentina	countrywide	0,844	0,255	0,540	0,718	0,844	0,640
South Africa	countrywide	0,484	0,771	0,745	0,732	0,452	0,636
Spain	countrywide	0,791	0,271	0,584	0,597	0,907	0,630
Belarus	countrywide	0,754	0,351	0,723	0,523	0,749	0,620
Estonia	countrywide	0,783	0,436	0,723	0,537	0,598	0,615
Ukraine	countrywide	0,660	0,314	0,730	0,537	0,830	0,614
Uruguay	countrywide	0,836	0,176	0,526	0,584	0,907	0,606
Russia	countrywide	0,697	0,426	0,650	0,463	0,790	0,605
Ecuador	countrywide	0,701	0,489	0,577	0,416	0,825	0,602
Ghana	countrywide	0,598	0,755	0,511	0,611	0,537	0,602
India	countrywide	0,602	0,697	0,620	0,651	0,438	0,602

Slovenia	countrywide	0,742	0,420	0,701	0,389	0,759	0,602
Netherlands	countrywide	0,914	0,293	0,577	0,577	0,616	0,595
Colombia	countrywide	0,615	0,543	0,540	0,376	0,879	0,590
Kazakhstan	countrywide	0,693	0,266	0,569	0,544	0,827	0,580
Lebanon	countrywide	0,566	0,559	0,591	0,604	0,548	0,574
Romania	countrywide	0,590	0,516	0,672	0,349	0,736	0,573
Singapore	countrywide	0,783	0,362	0,555	0,718	0,446	0,573
Nigeria	countrywide	0,381	0,766	0,584	0,557	0,551	0,568
Philippines	countrywide	0,414	0,617	0,584	0,483	0,741	0,568
Rwanda	countrywide	0,787	0,340	0,496	0,658	0,533	0,563
Zimbabwe	countrywide	0,791	0,314	0,482	0,470	0,625	0,536
Hong Kong	countrywide	0,652	0,314	0,380	0,617	0,698	0,532
Thailand	countrywide	0,594	0,500	0,657	0,369	0,533	0,531
Bahrain	countrywide	0,307	0,665	0,569	0,570	0,457	0,514
Cyprus	countrywide	0,549	0,170	0,723	0,336	0,781	0,512
Mexico	countrywide	0,623	0,282	0,474	0,302	0,849	0,506
Peru	countrywide	0,619	0,383	0,474	0,188	0,813	0,495
South Korea	countrywide	0,820	0,170	0,401	0,537	0,444	0,474
Georgia	countrywide	0,234	0,117	0,686	0,523	0,795	0,471
Germany	countrywide	0,742	0,266	0,387	0,597	0,315	0,461
Malaysia	countrywide	0,377	0,638	0,606	0,463	0,219	0,461
Uzbekistan	countrywide	0,270	0,271	0,803	0,141	0,622	0,422
Azerbaijan	countrywide	0,406	0,186	0,496	0,342	0,666	0,419
China	countrywide	0,922	0,048	0,000	0,275	0,786	0,406
Kyrgyzstan	countrywide	0,365	0,319	0,496	0,255	0,570	0,401
Turkey	countrywide	0,283	0,489	0,635	0,383	0,196	0,397
Japan	countrywide	0,766	0,261	0,066	0,201	0,651	0,389
Iraq	countrywide	0,262	0,383	0,380	0,403	0,392	0,364
Jordan	countrywide	0,078	0,261	0,409	0,403	0,460	0,322
Kuwait	countrywide	0,201	0,223	0,204	0,530	0,346	0,301
Pakistan	countrywide	0,139	0,606	0,314	0,275	0,128	0,292

Armenia	countrywide	0,279	0,048	0,263	0,094	0,658	0,268
Tunisia	countrywide	0,152	0,277	0,401	0,034	0,380	0,249
Libya	countrywide	0,045	0,000	0,401	0,141	0,616	0,241
Qatar	countrywide	0,000	0,069	0,321	0,584	0,219	0,239
Palestinian Terr.	countrywide	0,164	0,191	0,095	0,134	0,413	0,200
Morocco	countrywide	0,180	0,037	0,117	0,242	0,140	0,143
Yemen	countrywide	0,127	0,011	0,117	0,000	0,432	0,137
Algeria	countrywide	0,082	0,011	0,051	0,101	0,254	0,100

### Religious Tolerance Index - *Dominicantes*

Country/region	sample	The only acceptable religion is my religion	All religions should be taught in public schools	People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine	Trust: People of another religion (B)	Do good to other people	Religious Tolerance Index
Trinidad and Tobago	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,807	0,973	0,978	0,691	0,903	0,871
Australia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,811	0,463	0,927	0,913	0,897	0,802
Brazil	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,717	0,676	0,737	0,685	0,876	0,738
Netherlands	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,738	0,548	0,818	0,792	0,741	0,727
United States	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,775	0,394	0,759	0,919	0,788	0,727
Chile	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,795	0,644	0,766	0,584	0,651	0,688
Argentina	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,824	0,436	0,569	0,772	0,807	0,682
Uruguay	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,709	0,399	0,591	0,711	1,000	0,682
Poland	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,541	0,628	0,810	0,631	0,782	0,678
Ghana	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,648	0,782	0,613	0,671	0,501	0,643
South Africa	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,398	0,798	0,796	0,799	0,362	0,630
Singapore	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,758	0,426	0,642	0,785	0,473	0,617
Ecuador	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,672	0,473	0,672	0,430	0,793	0,608
Slovenia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,607	0,548	0,752	0,349	0,765	0,604
Belarus	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,631	0,096	0,781	0,550	0,852	0,582
Colombia	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,561	0,495	0,511	0,383	0,865	0,563
Philippines	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,414	0,596	0,599	0,490	0,714	0,562
Rwanda	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,852	0,319	0,489	0,678	0,452	0,558
Spain	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,615	0,314	0,518	0,497	0,741	0,537
South Korea	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,721	0,319	0,599	0,671	0,329	0,528



Zimbabwe	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,795	0,351	0,496	0,423	0,528	0,519
Ukraine	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,627	0,154	0,460	0,517	0,820	0,516
Nigeria	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,426	0,601	0,474	0,362	0,689	0,511
Germany	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,578	0,457	0,474	0,617	0,401	0,506
Mexico	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,541	0,319	0,504	0,282	0,855	0,500
Lebanon	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,455	0,585	0,606	0,389	0,427	0,492
Peru	<i>Dominicantes</i>	0,561	0,410	0,496	0,208	0,770	0,489

### Religious Tolerance Index - Muslims

Country/region	sample	The only acceptable religion is my religion	All religions should be taught in public schools	People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine	Trust: People of another religion (B)	Do good to other people	Religious Tolerance Index
Trinidad and Tobago	Muslims	0,725	1,000	0,883	0,711	0,915	0,847
Georgia	Muslims	0,443	0,404	1,000	0,987	0,728	0,712
India	Muslims	0,586	0,761	0,584	0,799	0,614	0,669
Ghana	Muslims	0,492	0,915	0,701	0,866	0,284	0,652
South Africa	Muslims	0,357	0,878	0,964	0,819	0,245	0,652
Rwanda	Muslims	0,738	0,564	0,759	0,651	0,279	0,598
Kazakhstan	Muslims	0,619	0,356	0,686	0,510	0,773	0,589
Singapore	Muslims	0,697	0,447	0,620	0,826	0,325	0,583
Russia	Muslims	0,619	0,426	0,540	0,705	0,592	0,576
Philippines	Muslims	0,148	0,931	0,766	0,490	0,542	0,575
Netherlands	Muslims	0,361	0,585	0,642	0,624	0,656	0,574
Lebanon	Muslims	0,553	0,580	0,562	0,658	0,478	0,566
Nigeria	Muslims	0,311	0,867	0,620	0,597	0,403	0,560
Germany	Muslims	0,566	0,697	0,723	0,779	0,000	0,553
Cyprus	Muslims	0,578	0,266	0,496	0,456	0,589	0,477
Malaysia	Muslims	0,295	0,596	0,606	0,443	0,069	0,402
Kyrgyzstan	Muslims	0,344	0,324	0,489	0,235	0,554	0,389
Iraq	Muslims	0,258	0,378	0,380	0,403	0,389	0,361


### Differences in the Religious Tolerance Index *Dominicantes* – Total society

Country	other religions acceptable	All religions should be taught in public schools	People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine	Trust: People of another religion	religion: do good to other people	Religious Tolerance Index
Netherlands	-0,176	0,255	0,241	0,215	0,125	0,132
Australia	-0,131	0,181	0,161	0,128	0,165	0,100
Uruguay	-0,127	0,223	0,066	0,128	0,093	0,077
South Korea	-0,098	0,149	0,197	0,134	-0,115	0,053
United States	-0,045	0,122	0,066	0,101	0,018	0,052
Germany	-0,164	0,191	0,088	0,020	0,085	0,044
Singapore	-0,025	0,064	0,088	0,067	0,027	0,044
Argentina	-0,020	0,181	0,029	0,054	-0,037	0,041
Ghana	0,049	0,027	0,102	0,060	-0,036	0,041
Trinidad and Tobago	-0,020	0,053	0,153	-0,020	-0,010	0,031
Brazil	-0,074	0,064	0,036	0,067	0,004	0,019
Ecuador	-0,029	-0,016	0,095	0,013	-0,032	0,006
Slovenia	-0,135	0,128	0,051	-0,040	0,006	0,002
Chile	-0,025	0,032	0,058	0,047	-0,124	-0,002
Rwanda	0,066	-0,021	-0,007	0,020	-0,082	-0,005
Philippines	0,000	-0,021	0,015	0,007	-0,027	-0,005
Poland	-0,086	0,016	-0,022	0,000	0,062	-0,006
South Africa	-0,086	0,027	0,051	0,067	-0,089	-0,006
Mexico	-0,082	0,037	0,029	-0,020	0,005	-0,006

Peru	-0,057	0,027	0,022	0,020	-0,042	-0,006
Zimbabwe	0,004	0,037	0,015	-0,047	-0,097	-0,018
Colombia	-0,053	-0,048	-0,029	0,007	-0,014	-0,028
Belarus	-0,123	-0,255	0,058	0,027	0,103	-0,038
Nigeria	0,045	-0,165	-0,109	-0,195	0,138	-0,057
Lebanon	-0,111	0,027	0,015	-0,215	-0,121	-0,081
Spain	-0,176	0,043	-0,066	-0,101	-0,166	-0,093
Ukraine	-0,033	-0,160	-0,270	-0,020	-0,010	-0,099

other religions acceptable (*component Index, total population*)


---



Highest: Sweden; Australia; China; Netherlands; New Zealand  
Lowest: Qatar; Libya; Jordan; Algeria; Yemen

All religions should be taught in public schools (*component Index, total population*)

---




Highest: Trinidad and Tobago; Sweden; South Africa; Nigeria; Ghana

Lowest: Libya; Yemen; Algeria; Morocco; China

People who belong to different religions are probably just as moral as those who belong to mine (*component Index, total population*)

---




Highest: Poland; Trinidad and Tobago; Sweden; Uzbekistan; Australia

Lowest: China; Algeria; Japan; Palestinian Terr.; Morocco

**Trust: People of another religion (*component Index, total population*)**

---




Highest: New Zealand; Sweden; United States; Australia; South Africa

Lowest: Yemen; Tunisia; Armenia; Algeria; Palestinian Terr.



religion: do good to other people (*component Index, total population*)

---



Highest: Sweden; Trinidad and Tobago; Uruguay; Spain; Colombia

Lowest: Pakistan; Morocco; Turkey; Qatar; Malaysia

## Literature

- ADL (2015). ADL Global 100. Available at <http://global100.adl.org/>
- Alesina, A., Algan, Y., Cahuc, P.; & Giuliano, P. (2015). Family values and the regulation of labor. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 13(4), 599-630
- Alesina, A.; & Ferrara, E. L. (2000). The determinants of trust (No. w7621). National bureau of economic research
- Alesina, A.; & Giuliano, P. (2015). Culture and institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 53(4), 898-944
- Almond, G. A. (1948). The political ideas of Christian democracy. *The Journal of Politics*, 10(04), 734-763
- Almond, G. A. (1996). *The Civic Culture: Prehistory, Retrospect, and Prospect*. CSD Working Papers, University of California, e-scholarship, Permalink: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4mml285j>
- Almond, G. A. (2002). *Ventures in Political Science: Narratives and Reflections*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers
- Almond, G. A.; & Verba, S. (2015). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Princeton University Press
- Bea, A. (1966). *The church and the Jewish people; a commentary on the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on the relation of the Church to non-Christian religions*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Connelly, J. (2012). *From enemy to brother: the revolution in Catholic teaching on the Jews, 1933-1965*. Harvard University Press.
- Davidov E.; Schmidt P.; & Billiet J. (2011). *Cross-cultural analysis: methods and applications*. New York: Routledge.
- Davidov, E., Schmidt, P.; & Schwartz, S. H. (2008). Bringing values back in the adequacy of the *European Social Survey* to measure values in 20 countries. *Public opinion quarterly*, 72(3), 420-445
- Fox, J. (2000). *A world survey of religion and the state*. Cambridge, at the University Press.
- Fox, J., Sandler, S.; & Sandier, S. (2004). Bringing religion into international relations (pp. 9-10). New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Inglehart, R. F. (2006). Mapping global values. *Comparative Sociology*, 5(2), 115-136
- Inglehart, R. F. (2008). Changing values among western publics from 1970 to 2006. *West European Politics*, 31(1-2), 130-146.
- Inglehart, R. F. (2015). *The silent revolution: Changing values and political styles among Western publics*. Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values. *American Sociological Review*. 65 (1): 19-51 available at: [http://scholaR.F.google.at/citations?view\\_op=view\\_citation&hl=de&user=r3vC6IAAAAAAJ&citation\\_for\\_view=r3vC6IAAAAAAJ:9yKSN-GCB0IC](http://scholaR.F.google.at/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=de&user=r3vC6IAAAAAAJ&citation_for_view=r3vC6IAAAAAAJ:9yKSN-GCB0IC).
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Norris P. (2012). *The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Understanding Human Security*. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35(1): 71-95.
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change around the world*. Cambridge University Press
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Norris, P. (2009). *The true clash of civilizations*. Foreign policy, November 4 (2009), available at: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2009/11/04/the-true-clash-of-civilizations/>.

- Inglehart, R. F.; & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2818659> HKS Working Paper No. RWP16-026
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Welzel C. (2003). Political Culture and Democracy: Analyzing Cross-Level Linkages. *Comparative Politics*, 36 (1): 61-79.
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Welzel C. (2009). How Development Leads to Democracy. What We Know About Modernization. *Foreign Affairs*, March, April (freely available at: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64821/ronald-inglehart-and-christian-welzel/how-development-leads-to-democracy>).
- Inglehart, R. F.; & Welzel, C. (2010). Changing mass priorities: The link between modernization and democracy. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(02), 551-567.
- Jikeli, G.; & Allouche-Benayoun, J. (Eds.). (2012). Perceptions of the Holocaust in Europe and Muslim communities: Sources, comparisons and educational challenges (Vol. 5). Springer Science & Business Media
- John Paul II. (1994). Catechism of the Catholic church. Rome: Urbi Et Orbi Communications ; available at : [http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\\_INDEX.HTM](http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_INDEX.HTM)
- Kasper, W. (2015). Pope Francis' Revolution of Tenderness and Love. Paulist Press.
- Kertzer, D. I. (2007). The Popes against the Jews: The Vatican's role in the rise of modern anti-Semitism. Vintage
- Koschorke, K., Ludwig, F.; & Delgado, M. (2007). A history of Christianity in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, 1450-1990: A documentary sourcebook. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
- Küng, H. (1997). A global ethic for global politics and economics. / Hans Küng; translated by John Bowden from the German. London: SCM Press.
- Küng, H. (2002). Tracing The Way: Spiritual Dimensions of the World Religions. New York: Continuum.
- Lenoir F.; & Tardan-Masquelier Y. (1997). Encyclopédie des religions. Paris: Bayard, 1997
- Lenoir, F. (2008). Le Christ philosophe. Paris: Plon.
- McCleary, R. M.; & Barro, R. J. (2006). Religion and economy. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(2), 49-72
- McCleary, R. M.; & Barro, R. J. (2006). Religion and political economy in an international panel. *Journal for the Scientific study of religion*, 45(2), 149-175
- Minkov, M.; & Hofstede, G. (2014). Nations Versus Religions: Which Has a Stronger Effect on Societal Values?. *Management International Review* 54.6 (2014): 801-824.
- Moaddel, M.; & Karabenick, S. A. (2013). Religious fundamentalism in the Middle East: a cross-national, inter-faith, and inter-ethnic analysis. Amsterdam: Brill
- Norris, P.; & Inglehart, R. F. (2011). Sacred and secular: Religion and politics worldwide. Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P.; & Inglehart, R. F. (2015). Are high levels of existential security conducive to secularization? A response to our critics. In *The changing world religion map* (pp. 3389-3408). Springer Netherlands.
- Perreau-Saussine, E. (2012). Catholicism and Democracy: An Essay in the History of Political Thought. Princeton University Press
- Phayer, M. (2000). The Catholic Church and the Holocaust, 1930-1965. Indiana University Press
- Phayer, M. (2001). Totalitarianism: Questions about Catholic Resistance. *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 70(02), 328-344
- Philpott, D. (2004). The Catholic Wave. *Journal of Democracy*, 15(2), 32-46

- Röhrich, W. (2004). *Die Macht der Religionen: Glaubenskonflikte in der Weltpolitik*. München: Beck.
- Röhrich, W. (2010). *Rückkehr der Kulturen: die neuen Mächte in der Weltpolitik*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Sacks, J. (1998). *Morals and markets: seventh annual IEA Hayek Memorial Lecture given in London on Tuesday, 2 June 1998*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1999.
- Sacks, J. (2003). *The dignity of difference: how to avoid the clash of civilizations*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Sacks, J. (2005). *To heal a fractured world: the ethics of responsibility*. Montreal; Ithaca: McGill-Queens University Press, 2005.
- Sacks, J. (2014). *The religious other: hostility, hospitality, and the hope of human flourishing*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Scannone, J. C. (2016). Pope Francis and the Theology of the People. *Theological Studies*, 77(1), 118-135.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2014). Rethinking the concept and measurement of societal culture in light of empirical findings. *Journal of cross-cultural Psychology* 45.1 (2014): 5-13.
- Shelledy, R. B. (2004). The Vatican's Role in Global Politics. *SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 24(2), 149-162
- Silver, B. D.; & Dowley, K. M. (2000). Measuring Political Culture in Multiethnic Societies Reaggregating the *World Values Survey*. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(4), 517-550
- Tausch, A. (2011). (2011). El Papa ¿Cuántas Divisiones Tiene? Sondeo Global del Catolicismo Mundial Según el 'World Values Survey' y el 'European Social Survey'. E-Book N° 49 Centro Argentino de Estudios Internacionales (in Spanish) [English Title: 'The Pope - How Many Divisions Does He Have?' a First Global Survey of World Catholicism Based on the 'World Values Survey' and the 'European Social Survey'], available at: <http://www.caei.com.ar/es/irebooks.htm>
- Tausch, A. (2014). The New Global Antisemitism: Implications from the Recent Adl-100 Data (Middle East Review of International Affairs, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Fall 2014)), Gloria Center, Herzliya, Israel. *Middle East Review of International Affairs* 18.3 (2014).
- Tausch, A.; & Heshmati, A. (2013). *Globalization, the Human Condition, and Sustainable Development in the Twenty-first Century: Cross-national Perspectives and European Implications*. London, New York and Delhi: Anthem Press.
- Tausch, A.; & Moaddel M. (2009). *What 1.3 billion Muslims really think. An answer to a recent Gallup study, based on the 'World Values Survey'*. Hauppauge, N. Y.: Nova Science Publishers.
- Tausch, A.; Heshmati A.; & Karoui H. (2014). *The Political Algebra of Global Value Change. General Models and Implications for the Muslim World*. Hauppauge, N. Y.: Nova Science Publishers.
- Tessler, M. (2015). *Islam and Politics in the Middle East: Explaining the Views of Ordinary Citizens*. Indiana University Press.
- UNDP (2014). *Human Development Report*. New York and London: Oxford University Press.
- Valkenberg, P.; & Cirelli, A. (2016). *Nostra Aetate: Celebrating 50 Years of the Catholic Church's Dialogue With Jews and Muslims*. CUA Press.
- Weigel, G. (2001). *Witness to hope: the biography of Pope John Paul II*. Harper Collins
- Weigel, G. (2010). *The End and the Beginning: Pope John Paul II - The Victory of Freedom, the Last Years, the Legacy*. Image
- Wistrich, R. S. (1991). *Antisemitism: the longest hatred*. New York: Pantheon Books.

- Wistrich, R. S. (2007). Anti-semitism and multiculturalism: the uneasy connection. Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Anitsemitism, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Wistrich, R. S. (2010). A Lethal Obsession: Anti-Semitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad. New York: Random House.
- World Values Survey* (2017). *World Values Survey*. Available at <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs.jsp>.